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INTRODUCTION

Empirical studies of labor demand characteristically come up with two results that conflict with predictions drawn from simple static theory. First, theory suggests that, because labor is usually assumed to be the most variable factor in the short run, increasing amounts of it will be needed for added increments of output. In fact, over the business cycle, the opposite occurs. As output rises, employment increases less than proportionately. Second, theory suggests that, over the long run, with all inputs variable, returns to scale will be constant or diminishing. In fact, empirical studies of labor demand appear to imply long-run increasing returns to scale.

A widely accepted explanation for the implied increasing returns is labor hoarding; during a downturn in output, firms hold unneeded skilled workers "in inventory" in order to avoid the cost of finding replacements when demand picks up again. In accounting for labor hoarding, the first step has been to use partial adjustment models. However, the accounting has been incomplete—the implied returns to scale are still increasing. We believe that this is, in part, a consequence of failure to adequately model expectations.

A standard assumption, implicit in partial adjustment models (including models of interrelated factor demand) is that future values of the exogenous variables are expected to be

1For a discussion of constant returns as a truism, see Friedman [4], pp. 136-138. Engineering cost curves at the plant level do tend to find only modest deviations from constant returns to scale (see Scherer [19], pp. 94-98). Studies of labor demand appear to imply long-run increasing returns to scale.
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the same as the present values, or to differ by a time trend. This assumption, however, can not be appropriate as a description of how expectations move over the business cycle; employers have information from previous cycles which tells them that their business will recover from a recession.

Expectations of exogenous variables can be important if there are high fixed costs to changing employment levels. This importance has been noted by a number of economists including Gould [3], Brechling [1], and Nadiri and Rosen [14]. With the recent work on modeling expectations, especially rational expectations, labor demand models have begun to explicitly include the future (see Sims [20], Sargent [16], and Kennan [7]).

The Sims and Kennan papers both discuss the tendency to find increasing returns to labor in empirical studies. Sims attributes the findings to measurement error and the assumption of static expectations. By taking these into account, he does find a proportional response of employment to output, but only when the labor input is measured as man-hours, not when it is measured as the number of workers employed. Kennan finds sharply decreasing returns for both durables and nondurables, the latter to an extent which he considers unreasonable.

The usefulness of extending the study of the role of expectations in labor demand becomes clear in light of various government policies on employment adjustment. For example, it has been standard practice to use input-output studies to analyze the effect of imports on the domestic demand for the output of competing and related industries. In input-output
analyses, it is assumed that imports cause proportional and immediate effects on industry employment. Rising imports, according to the input-output model, will cause large, sudden, decreases in employment.

The assumption of immediate and proportional adjustment does not accord with empirical evidence of gradual adjustment as well as labor-output elasticities less than one. The assumption would therefore require that imports have a special effect. A possible justification for a "special" effect of imports is that firms, upon seeing competing imports enter their market, interpret the change as permanent, completely revising their view of the future and adjusting employment accordingly, even if skilled workers (i.e., workers with high hiring and training costs) are involved. We test for a special effect of imports in a "rational expectations" model. The model must include two parts, one describing how expected output affects labor demand, the other describing how output (and, hence, expected output) is generated as a function of imports and other determinants.

Our procedure illustrates a useful characteristic of the theory of rational expectations: In the process of generating expectations the researcher automatically finds out how the different determinants in the model (e.g., imports) affect expectations. Alternative assumptions about the formation of expectations, such as surveys of anticipations or adaptive expectations, do not have this characteristic.

The model is applied to eleven industries at the two-digit SIC level. This disaggregation is important for theoretical reasons since industries differ in the amount and specificity
of human capital. As part of our study we: (1) disentangle the effects of expectations from the process that generates them; (2) make a direct comparison with a model of static expectations; (3) compare the short-run effects on labor arising from changes in imports and in UNP.
THE DEMAND FOR EMPLOYMENT

In the theory of labor demand, a firm balances two motivations on its current holdings of labor: first, minimizing the cost of producing current output; second, keeping on hand enough workers to avoid large costs of adjusting to expected changes in output.

To derive a labor demand equation that incorporates those considerations, we begin with the assumption that, subject to a given production function, the employer minimizes the cost of producing a given stream of present and (expected) future output, including costs of adjustment.

To focus on the input of primary interest (the number of workers \([N]\)), we combine all other inputs into a composite factor \([Z]\). This includes inputs such as capital, capital utilization, and utilization of the labor force, e.g., average weekly hours or other unobservable measures of labor utilization.

The production function is of the general form:\(^2\)

\[
Q_t = f(N_t, Z_t), \quad f_N, f_Z > 0; \quad f_{NN}, f_{ZZ} < 0.
\] (1)

---

More complete derivations of the demand for employment are presented in appendices A and B, respectively. The first describes more carefully the approach taken in this section (see Sargent [16] and Levy [8]). The second is a different and perhaps more intuitive approach (see Levy [8]).

A time trend could be included to represent other influences on labor demand that change smoothly over time, such as technological progress or the firm's capital stock. Since the derivation of labor demand is virtually the same, it is not included until the regression results are presented.
We assume this can be rewritten in inverse form:

\[ z_t = g \left( Q_t, N_t \right) \]  

(2)

and work with the second order Taylor expansion

\[ z_t = a + bN_t + \frac{c}{2} N_t^2 + dN_t Q_t + eQ_t + \frac{f}{2} Q_t^2 \]  

(3)

The (external) adjustment cost is also assumed to be quadratic.

\[ \phi_t = \frac{\phi}{2} \left( N_{t+1} - N_t \right)^2, \quad \phi_N > 0, \quad \phi_{NN} > 0, \]  

(4)

where \( \phi \) is a dollar cost of adjustment per man.\(^1\) The firm's cost in period \( t+j \) is:

\[
C_{t+j} = W_{t+j} N_{t+j} + q_{t+j} Z_{t+j} + \frac{\phi}{2} \left( N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j} \right)^2
\]

\[ = W_{t+j} N_{t+j} + q_{t+j} \left( a + bN_{t+j} + \frac{c}{2} N_{t+j}^2 + dN_{t+j} Q_{t+j} + eQ_{t+j} + fQ_{t+j}^2 \right) \]

\[ + \frac{\phi}{2} \left( N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j} \right)^2 \]

(5)

where \( W_{t+j} \) = wage paid to labor in time period \( t+j \)

\( q_{t+j} \) = wage paid to input Z in time period \( t+j \)

The demand for labor at time \( t+1 \) will emerge as the solution to the minimization of the discounted expected flow of costs to the firm \( (V_t) \). Substituting for \( Z \) in (5) from (3), the required present value is:

---

\(^1\)This cost function displays increasing marginal costs and so is consistent with lagged adjustment of \( N \).
\[ V_t = E_t \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} (1+r)^{-j} \left[ W_{t+j}N_{t+j} + q_{t+j}(a + bN_{t+j}) + \frac{c}{2} N_{t+j} + dN_{t+j}Q_{t+j} + cQ_{t+j} + \frac{f}{2} Q_{t+j}^2 \right] \]

We assume that wages \( W_t \), the price of input \( Z \) \( q_t \), and adjustment costs \( \phi_t \) increase by the same percent over time.\(^2\) Thus, the firm faces only an exogenous process \( \{Q_{t+j}\}_{j=0}^{\infty} \) in its minimization problem.

Differentiating with respect to \( N_{t+j} \) yields the first order conditions:

\[ E_{t+j}N_{t+j+1} - \frac{1}{h} N_{t+j} + aN_{t+j+1} = \frac{1}{\phi} X_{t+j} \]

\[ j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots \]

where \( h = \frac{1}{2+r+c\frac{q}{\phi}} \)

\[ a = 1 + r \]

\[ X_{t+j} = W + bQ + dQ_{t+j} \]

Equation (7) describes an infinite sequence of equations. Their solution is facilitated by rewriting (7) as

\[ \left( 1 - \frac{1}{h}L + aL^2 \right) E_{t+j}N_{t+j+1} = \frac{1}{\phi} X_{t+j} \]

where \( L \) is the lag operator \( (LY_t = Y_{t-1}) \).

---

\(^1\)\( E_t \) is the expectation operator. \( E_t Y_{t+j} \) is the expected value of \( Y_{t+j} \) based on information in the \( t \)th period.

\(^2\)A generalization of the model that allows for different growth paths for the different prices is presented later in the paper.
Factoring the lag polynomial yields:

\[(1-\lambda_1 L)(1-\lambda_2 L)E_{t+j}N_{t+j+1} = \frac{1}{\phi}X_{t+j}\]  

(9)

where \[\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{n} = a + \frac{\phi+cq}{\phi}\]  

(10)

and \[\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = a^1\]

It can be shown that for any finite \(\phi\), \(\lambda_1 < 1\) and \(\lambda_2 > a > 1\).

Using the forward inverse of \((1-\lambda_2 L)\), since \(\lambda_2 > 1\), we obtain

\[(1-\lambda_1 L)E_{t+j}N_{t+j+1} = -\frac{\phi \lambda_2}{1-\lambda_2} X_{t+j}\]  

(11)

\[= -\frac{\lambda_1}{a \phi} \frac{1}{1-\lambda_2} E_{t+j}X_{t+j+1}\]

(since \(L^{-1}X_{t+j} = X_{t+j+1}\))

Writing the denominator as

\[(1-\lambda_2^{-1} L^{-1}) = 1 + \lambda_2^{-1} L^{-1} + \lambda_2^{-2} L^{-2} + \ldots\]  

(12)

and using this expression in equation (11) leads to the final equation for labor demand in the \(t+j+1\)st period:

\[\lambda_1 = \frac{2ha}{1+\sqrt{1-4h^2}a}\]

This can be shown to be less than 1 for any bounded and positive \(\phi\) and greater than 0 for any positive \(r\).
This minimization and its solution is a special case of minimizing over a quadratic objective function with an infinite horizon. The general problem is discussed in papers by Simon [18], Theil [21], and Sargent [17], specific models concerned with labor demand in Kennan [7] and Sargent [16].
Equation (13) indicates that labor demand depends on current output and future outputs in a declining geometric pattern. Employers do not know future output, and so must act on the basis of expectations. We assume that output is generated by the following model.\(^1\)

\[
\ln D_t = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 \ln Y_t + \alpha_2 \ln \left( \frac{Y_t}{Y_{t-1}} \right) + \alpha_3 \ln P_t \\
+ \alpha_4 D_1 + \alpha_5 D_2 + \alpha_6 D_3 + \alpha_7 t
\]  

\[
\ln Y_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln Y_{t-1} + \beta_2 \ln Y_{t-2} + \beta_3 D_1 + \beta_4 D_2 \\
+ \beta_5 D_3 + \beta_6 t
\]  

\[
\ln M_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \ln M_{t-1} + \gamma_2 \ln M_{t-2} + \gamma_2 D_1 \\
+ \gamma_4 D_2 + \gamma_5 D_3 + \gamma_6 t
\]  

\[
\ln P_t = \delta_0 + \delta_1 \ln P_{t-1} + \delta_2 \ln P_{t-2} + \delta_3 D_1 \\
+ \delta_4 D_2 + \delta_5 D_3 + \delta_6 t
\]

\[Q = D-M\]

where \(Q\) is domestic production
\(D\) is total demand for an industry's products (includes both domestic production and imports)
\(M\) is imports
\(Y\) is constant dollar GNP
\(P\) is the wholesale price index for the industry's output; relative to the overall wholesale price index

\(^1\)These equations represent the basic version of the model. To capture differences among industries the actual regression equations will include only significant terms and some include alternative specifications of key variables e.g., to capture cyclical elements, the variable \(\ln \left( \frac{Y_t}{Y_{t-4}} \right)\) may be used instead of \(\ln \left( \frac{Y_t}{Y_{t-1}} \right)\).
D1, D2, D3 are dummy variables used to account for seasonal factors.

\( t \) is a time trend.

\( AP \) is the average value of \( P \) over the current and three preceding periods.

All variables except the dummy variables, the time trend, and GNP are specific to the individual industries.\(^1\)

To summarize, for a specific industry, total demand (= domestic output plus imports) is expressed as a function of variables such as real GNP, relative prices (WPI of the industry/WPI of all manufactured goods), time, and seasonal dummy variables. Domestic output is determined as the difference between total demand and imports, the latter treated as exogenous.

The essence of rational expectations is that expectations are made according to the same statistical process that generates the actual variable. Hence, the model above is also a model of expectations. The model can be used to form expectations one period forward given the current and lagged information. For example, imports one period forward are projected from equation (16) with \( M_{t-1} \) now referring to the current period and \( M_{t-2} \) now referring to last period. Imports two periods forward are estimated with the same equation, with \( M_{t-2} \) referring to the current period and \( M_{t-1} \) referring to the forecast one period forward. To obtain expectations of output, the same recursive forecasting scheme is applied to the model.

---

\(^1\) Note that the equation for imports (16) does not include the price of imports relative to domestic; this is a consequence of a lack of data on import prices at the 2-digit level.
as a whole. In other words, rational forecasts several periods forward are formed by making use of nearer term rational forecasts.¹

¹The statistical theory behind this technique is discussed in an appendix available on request (or in [8]). Malinvaud [18] and Sargent [17] discuss these issues as well.
DATA

To estimate the equations for labor demand and for generating expectations, we used quarterly data at the two-digit level on imports, output, prices, and employment in the following industries:

- Textile Mill Products (SIC 22)
- Apparel and Other Textile Products (23)
- Paper and Allied Products (26)
- Rubber and Plastic Products (30)
- Leather and Leather Products (31)
- Stone, Clay, and Glass Products (32)
- Primary Metals (33)
- Fabricated Metal Products (34)
- Machinery, Except Electrical (35)
- Electrical Equipment and Supplies (36)
- Transportation Equipment (37)

These industries exhibited varying degrees of import penetration—from less than 3 percent to almost 23 percent.

Empirical estimation of the relationship between domestic output and imports by industry requires data on prices of
domestic and imported goods. Unfortunately, these data are unavailable at the two-digit level. This is even true for unit values, the type of import prices typically used for very highly aggregated or highly disaggregated products. At the two-digit level, the best available measure was the quarterly value of imports by industry from the first quarter of 1968 to the fourth quarter of 1977. These data were collected by the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

To use value data without the individual deflators, it was therefore necessary to make an important assumption—namely, that domestic products are perfect substitutes for products of the same kind supplied from foreign firms. This commonly used assumption implies that elasticities of substitution between these products are infinite and that the corresponding price ratios are constant. It means that the wholesale price index of the domestically produced good is an appropriate deflator (at least, up to a constant) for the imported good as well.

Total demand for a product (total demand = domestic output plus imports) is specified as a function of variables including real GNP, relative prices (WPI of the industry/WPI of all manufactured goods), time, and seasonal dummy variables. Imports are determined exogenously so that domestic output is determined as the difference between total demand and imports. The same variables that are in the total demand equation would be in the domestic output equation except that domestic output is also dependent upon imports.

Although the assumptions made above are not as general as one might like, they are probably the best alternative when a proper measure of import prices can not be found. At worst, they probably do no more than overstate the effect of imports.
on domestic output, thereby putting an upper bound on the
decrease in labor demand due to imported products.

Since total demand is defined to be equal to domestic output
plus imports, it was necessary to use a value figure for
domestic output. The measure used was taken from shipments
and inventory data collected by industry. For nine of the
industries (all except 23 and 31), total demand was calcu-
lated as the sum of shipments, the change in inventories, and
imports. Shipments plus the change in inventories is a
measure of industry production and is therefore an important
determinant of labor demand. Since shipment and inventory
data are measured in dollar value, the units match the import
data. This would not have been true for many other measures,
most notably the Federal Reserve Board Index of Production.
Real values for both total demand and imports were obtained
by deflating by the wholesale price index for each two-digit
industry.

The shipment and inventory data were obtained from the Bureau
of the Census publication, Manufacturers' Shipments, Inven-
tories and Orders 1955-1977 [26] and all wholesale price
indexes, including a general one for all manufactured goods,
were obtained in the BLS publication, Producer Prices and
Price Indexes [29].

For industries 23 and 31, only annual shipment data were ob-
tainable from the above source. Quarterly indexes of produc-
tion (from the FRB) were used to convert the annual figures
to quarterly data. Thus, real total demand in these in-
dustries was measured as the sum of shipments and imports
divided by the corresponding wholesale price index.
Finally, the measure of employment used was the number of production workers in each industry. These data were obtained from the Bureau of Labor Statistics publication Employment and Earnings [27], the standard source for employment data by industry.
EMPIRICAL RESULTS

Empirical estimation of the model proceeded in two parts. First, for each industry, the three-equation system used to generate expectations ((14), (16), (17)) was estimated using OLS or, when appropriate, a GLS correction for serial correlation. The regression equations are presented in appendix C. The estimated equations were then solved to generate forecasts of output. Second, labor demand (13) was estimated using nonlinear least squares with the infinite distributed lead in expected output truncated at eight quarters. The nonlinear estimates of labor demand are shown in table 1.

For the hypothesis that expectations are important (and generated as assumed here), the crucial coefficient is $b_3$ which from equation (13) is equal to $\lambda_1/a$. A high value for $b_3$ implies a strong effect of future output on current labor demand. Estimates are positive in all industries and significant in seven of the eleven. The industries can be grouped by $b_3$ as shown in table 2.

1The use of eight quarters, or two years, reflects the view that this time frame adequately captures the firm's planning horizon. Although it is true that tests over many different horizons might lead to slightly different results, the number of industries studied limits experimentation. Experimentation with longer leads in a few industries yielded similar results.

2Conceptually, the truncation of the expectation series at eight leads in the future means that the last coefficient has a somewhat different interpretation. The truncation implies that $Q_{t+9}^* = Q_{t+10}^* = \ldots$, so that the coefficient on the last expectation series used $(Q_{t+9}^*)$ is really $b_3^9/(1-b_3)$. This number will vary from $b_3^9$ by a negligible amount and so is ignored in the computation of the estimated elasticities presented in this section.
TABLE 1

LABOR DEMAND REGRESSION EQUATIONS BY INDUSTRY
(Current and Expected Output)

\[ N_{t+1} = b_1 + b_2 \sum_{i=1}^{9} b_i Q_{t+i}^* + b_4 b_3 N_t + b_5 \text{ TIME} + b_6 D1 + b_7 D2 + b_8 D3 + b_9 D37^* \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Industry 22</th>
<th>Industry 23</th>
<th>Industry 26</th>
<th>Industry 30</th>
<th>Industry 31</th>
<th>Industry 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b_1</td>
<td>9.24</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>112.</td>
<td>210.</td>
<td>9.51</td>
<td>86.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.112)</td>
<td>(.790)</td>
<td>(1.80)</td>
<td>(4.32)</td>
<td>(.261)</td>
<td>(3.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_2</td>
<td>.937</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.815)</td>
<td>(.925)</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>(.365)</td>
<td>(.137)</td>
<td>(1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_3</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.16)</td>
<td>(1.57)</td>
<td>(3.38)</td>
<td>(.466)</td>
<td>(.153)</td>
<td>(2.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_4</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.217</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.03)</td>
<td>(1.77)</td>
<td>(4.12)</td>
<td>(.149)</td>
<td>(.156)</td>
<td>(3.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_5</td>
<td>-.729</td>
<td>.491</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>-1.58</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>-.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2.79)</td>
<td>(1.29)</td>
<td>(-3.97)</td>
<td>(-4.14)</td>
<td>(.697)</td>
<td>(-5.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_6</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>-43.1</td>
<td>-4.71</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
<td>-4.73</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-.370)</td>
<td>(-5.46)</td>
<td>(-1.22)</td>
<td>(-1.58)</td>
<td>(-1.59)</td>
<td>(4.91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_7</td>
<td>9.85</td>
<td>-16.3</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>-16.8</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.58)</td>
<td>(-1.62)</td>
<td>(1.88)</td>
<td>(-1.55)</td>
<td>(.673)</td>
<td>(5.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>-29.1</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.76)</td>
<td>(-3.66)</td>
<td>(1.38)</td>
<td>(2.28)</td>
<td>(-1.05)</td>
<td>(6.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b_9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R^2</td>
<td>.874</td>
<td>.940</td>
<td>.879</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>.977</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.421</td>
<td>1.091</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For industries 22, 26, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, the range of the regressions was Q2 1968 to Q4 1977. For industries 23 and 37, the range was Q3 1968 to Q4 1977. For industry 33, the range was Q4 1968 to Q4 1977.

*Dummy variable used to represent the major automobile strike in Q4 1970.
\[ N_{t+1} = b_1 + b_2 \sum_{i=1}^{9} b_{3i}^* + b_4 b_3 N_t + b_5 \text{TIME} + b_6 D_1 + b_7 D_2 + b_8 D_3 + b_9 D_{37}^* \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>Industry 35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b_1)</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>-168.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>452.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.06)</td>
<td>(-0.603)</td>
<td>(.643)</td>
<td>(.232)</td>
<td>(.3.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b_2)</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.49)</td>
<td>(1.13)</td>
<td>(.687)</td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(.588)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b_3)</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>.831</td>
<td>.820</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.52)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(3.06)</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
<td>(.915)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b_4)</td>
<td>.822</td>
<td>.717</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.93)</td>
<td>(6.42)</td>
<td>(4.18)</td>
<td>(3.79)</td>
<td>(1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b_5)</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>-.083</td>
<td>-1.08</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>-4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-5.55)</td>
<td>(-3.92)</td>
<td>(-2.45)</td>
<td>(-5.20)</td>
<td>(-2.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b_6)</td>
<td>-4.14</td>
<td>-7.21</td>
<td>-11.2</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>-17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-4.12)</td>
<td>(-9.44)</td>
<td>(-1.05)</td>
<td>(.450)</td>
<td>(-.930)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b_7)</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>-22.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>-18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.438)</td>
<td>(.843)</td>
<td>(-2.06)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(-.773)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b_8)</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>-7.74</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.48)</td>
<td>(4.22)</td>
<td>(-6.76)</td>
<td>(3.75)</td>
<td>(2.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b_9)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(R^2)</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(DW)</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For industries 22, 26, 30, 32, 34, 35, 36, the range of the regressions was Q2 1968 to Q4 1977. For industries 23 and 37, the range was Q3 1968 to Q4 1977. For industry 33, the range was Q4 1968 to Q4 1977.

*Dummy variable used to represent the major automobile strike in Q4 1970.
TABLE 2

INDUSTRIES GROUPED ACCORDING TO THE VALUE OF $b_3$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High Values of $b_3$</th>
<th>Textile Mill Products (22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.7 and higher</td>
<td>Paper and Allied Products (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High implied adjustment costs</td>
<td>Fabricated Metal Products (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations important</td>
<td>Machinery, exc. electrical (35)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lower, but Significant Values of $b_3$</th>
<th>Stone, Clay, and Glass (32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$b_3 = .3$ to $.5$</td>
<td>Primary Metals (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Electrical Equipment and (36) Supplies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Insignificant $b_3$</th>
<th>Apparel and Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low implied adjustment costs</td>
<td>Textile Products (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations unimportant</td>
<td>Rubber and Plastic Products (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leather and Leather Products (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Equipment (37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The estimates of $b_2 \left( = \frac{d \theta}{d \phi} \right)$ in equation (13) are not significant by a t-test at the 5 percent level. This, however, is purely a consequence of collinearity with $b_3$, for F tests of the hypothesis that output does not enter demand indicated rejection for every industry.

The coefficient $b_4$ should always be greater than one and from the theory should equal one plus the rate of interest. Though $b_4$ is always positive, it is estimated with wide confidence bounds and substantial variation across equations which sometimes result in values below one. \(^1\)

The summary statistics are of interest primarily for comparisons with the partial adjustment model, a special case in which expectations are static. For a comparison of the two models, the results of estimating a (linear) partial adjustment equation are presented in table 3. The comparison suggests the superiority of the expectations model: the $R^2$ and Durbin-Watson statistics are greater in every case for the expectations model.

The familiar finding of strongly increasing returns to labor (i.e., elasticities much less than one) is evident in the elasticities calculated from the linear equation (partial adjustment model). The elasticities, shown in table 4, are all less than one and range from .493 (industry 37) to .792 (industry 36). The simple average over all industries is .644. The nonlinear equation incorporating expectations leads to elasticities that are higher in every industry than those found in the partial adjustment model. In those

\(^1\)Appendix D provides somewhat more detail on the imprecision of $b_4$, the estimated coefficient of $1+r$. 
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TABLE 3
LABOR DEMAND REGRESSION EQUATIONS BY INDUSTRY
(Current Output Only)

\[ N_{t+1} = a_1 + a_2Q_{t+1} + a_3N_t + a_4D1 + a_5D2 + a_6D3 + a_7\text{TIME} + a_8D37^* \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Industry 22</th>
<th>Industry 23</th>
<th>Industry 26</th>
<th>Industry 30</th>
<th>Industry 31</th>
<th>Industry 32</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a_1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.70)</td>
<td>(1.12)</td>
<td>(2.84)</td>
<td>(6.08)</td>
<td>(4.06)</td>
<td>(4.56)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_2</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>6.84</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>6.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.19)</td>
<td>(6.43)</td>
<td>(2.71)</td>
<td>(7.05)</td>
<td>(2.93)</td>
<td>(8.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_3</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.802</td>
<td>.300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7.24)</td>
<td>(9.20)</td>
<td>(3.53)</td>
<td>(-.109)</td>
<td>(9.03)</td>
<td>(3.66)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_4</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
<td>-44.6</td>
<td>-6.08</td>
<td>-10.7</td>
<td>-4.99</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-.402)</td>
<td>(-5.64)</td>
<td>(-1.42)</td>
<td>(-1.60)</td>
<td>(-2.11)</td>
<td>(6.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_5</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>-25.7</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>-20.1</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.666)</td>
<td>(-3.09)</td>
<td>(.793)</td>
<td>(-2.76)</td>
<td>(.831)</td>
<td>(5.51)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_6</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>-35.2</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>-2.72</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.64)</td>
<td>(-4.59)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(2.28)</td>
<td>(-1.21)</td>
<td>(5.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a_7</td>
<td>-.859</td>
<td>.383</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>-1.55</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>-.901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-2.87)</td>
<td>(1.63)</td>
<td>(-2.85)</td>
<td>(-4.23)</td>
<td>(.750)</td>
<td>(-6.70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \] | .840 | .934 | .847 | .893 | .977 | .950 |
\[ DW \] | .936 | 1.42 | .615 | 1.98 | 1.11 | 1.34 |

The range of the regressions is the same as in the previous labor demand regressions.

*Dummy variable used to represent the major automobile strike in Q4 1970.
\[ N_{t+1} = a_1 + a_2 Q_{t+1} + a_3 N_t + a_4 D_1 + a_5 D_2 + a_6 D_3 + a_7 \text{TIME} + a_8 D3^* \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>34</th>
<th>35</th>
<th>36</th>
<th>37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a_1)</td>
<td>394.</td>
<td>216.</td>
<td>170.</td>
<td>294.</td>
<td>498.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.77)</td>
<td>(3.95)</td>
<td>(2.50)</td>
<td>(3.68)</td>
<td>(3.63)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a_2)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.68)</td>
<td>(7.89)</td>
<td>(4.92)</td>
<td>(6.63)</td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a_3)</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>.366</td>
<td>.620</td>
<td>.353</td>
<td>.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.75)</td>
<td>(4.40)</td>
<td>(7.62)</td>
<td>(3.59)</td>
<td>(3.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a_4)</td>
<td>-8.71</td>
<td>-13.6</td>
<td>-23.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>-17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-.860)</td>
<td>(-1.82)</td>
<td>(-1.83)</td>
<td>(.953)</td>
<td>(-.918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a_5)</td>
<td>-17.0</td>
<td>-24.5</td>
<td>-38.1</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>-31.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.52)</td>
<td>(-2.67)</td>
<td>(-3.06)</td>
<td>(2.52)</td>
<td>(-1.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a_6)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>8.17</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.07)</td>
<td>(2.87)</td>
<td>(.643)</td>
<td>(5.17)</td>
<td>(2.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a_7)</td>
<td>-2.98</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>-4.97</td>
<td>-4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-5.31)</td>
<td>(.677)</td>
<td>(-1.98)</td>
<td>(-5.59)</td>
<td>(-2.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a_8)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-162.7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(-3.64)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 \]

\[ .919 .934 .930 .915 .860 \]

\[ DW \]

\[ 1.03 1.49 .592 1.53 1.81 \]

The range of the regressions is the same as in the previous labor demand regressions.

*Dummy variable used to represent major automobile strike in Q4 1970.
TABLE 4  
LONG RUN ELASTICITIES OF LABOR  
WITH RESPECT TO OUTPUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>( e_1 ) (linear equation)</th>
<th>( e_2 ) (nonlinear equation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>1.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>.714</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.503</td>
<td>.684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.573</td>
<td>.660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>.621</td>
<td>.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.712</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.562</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>1.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.757</td>
<td>.971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.792</td>
<td>.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>.644</td>
<td>.821</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ e_1 = \frac{a_2}{1-a_3} \cdot \frac{\bar{Q}}{\bar{N}} \]
\[ e_2 = \frac{b_2 \cdot \Sigma b_i}{1-b_3 \cdot b_4} \cdot \frac{\bar{Q}}{\bar{N}} \]

where the \( a_i \)'s are the coefficients from the linear labor demand equation

the \( b_i \)'s are the coefficients from the nonlinear labor demand equation

and \( \bar{Q}, \bar{N} \) are the means of output and employment, respectively.
industries where $b_3$ was significant, the average is .91 which implies near constant returns. This result is obtained even though the labor input is measured by the number of workers. This contrasts with Sim's findings of increasing returns to workers. In the other industries, taking account of the future did not appreciably improve the estimated returns to scale.
AUTOCORRELATION

That the nonlinear model improves the Durbin-Watson statistic seems to indicate that introducing expectations accounts for one source of autocorrelation. This accords with the interpretation of autocorrelation as the consequence of omitted variables (in this case, expectations) which are themselves autocorrelated (see Madalla [9] p. 274).

Because both the linear and nonlinear equations contain a lagged dependent variable the coefficients, t-values, and the Durbin-Watson statistic are subject to bias. Whether it is worthwhile trying to do anything about autocorrelation is unclear. One view is that it is preferable not to perform a correction but to use a measure of autocorrelation, such as the Durbin-Watson or an estimated $\rho$ to indicate the extent to which there remain problems of omission or specification. Further, Maeshiro [10] has shown that in small samples with trended explanatory variables, GLS can frequently lead to a greater mean square error and even greater bias, because of increased multicollinearity.

It may still be instructive to consider the results of adjusting the nonlinear equation for autocorrelation. For 6 of the industries, this adjustment makes little difference. In 3 of the 6 (industries 30, 31, and 37) the estimated $b_3$ was still insignificantly different from 0 and so the simple partial adjustment model would suffice. In the other 3 (industries 32, 34, and 36) the estimated $\rho$ was small and insignificant; the results presented in table 1 continue to be appropriate.
Results for the other five industries, where the adjustment does make a difference, are reported in table 5. For 2 industries, 22 and 33, the sharpest changes have to do with decreases in the value of $b_4$ (the estimate of $1+r$). This finding is not unexpected when correcting for autocorrelation since $b_4$ is the coefficient on the lagged dependent variable. The estimated covariances imply that it is also, however, a consequence of added multicollinearity problems arising from the extra coefficient ($\rho$) to be estimated (since $\rho$ and $b_4$ are somewhat collinear). In a third industry, 23, the coefficients $b_3$ and $b_4$ increase in value and both now become significant. In all 3 industries, in spite of slight changes in the values of $b_3$ and $b_4$ the elasticities are similar to those calculated earlier when $\rho$ was not estimated.

In two industries, 26 and 35, estimating $\rho$ induced a lack of convergence in the nonlinear routine, possibly because of added multicollinearity. For industry 26, the lack of convergence was overcome by including a dummy variable for the final quarter of 1974 and the first quarter of 1975. These were quarters of extreme labor dishoarding to an extent inconsistent with our model; they would make a good base for future work on the conditions when hoarding breaks down.

For industry 35, the problem of nonconvergence could be solved by including relative wage terms.\footnote{In general, however, when relative wages were included in the industry labor demand equations they did not improve the regression results.} This required modifying the cost function (5). Otherwise the first order conditions lead to a second-order difference equation (given in equation (7)) with nonconstant coefficients due to the term $\frac{cq_t}{\phi}$.

\footnote{In general, however, when relative wages were included in the industry labor demand equations they did not improve the regression results.}
TABLE 5
LABOR DEMAND REGRESSION EQUATIONS BY INDUSTRY
(Current and Expected Output)
(Correction for Autocorrelation)

\[ N_{t+1} = b_1 + b_2 \sum_{i=1}^{9} b_3^i t^{i+1} + b_4 b_3^i N_t + b_5 \text{TIME} + b_6 D_1 + b_7 D_2 \]
\[ + b_8 D_3 + b_9 D_37 + b_{10} D_{26} + b_{11} \sum_{i=1}^{9} b_3^i W^{i+1} \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Industry 22</th>
<th>Industry 23</th>
<th>Industry 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( b_1 )</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>133.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.367)</td>
<td>(.66)</td>
<td>(1.82)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_2 )</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.827)</td>
<td>(1.01)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_3 )</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.62)</td>
<td>(2.28)</td>
<td>(2.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_4 )</td>
<td>0.638</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.74)</td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td>(2.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_5 )</td>
<td>-1.88</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.85)</td>
<td>(.957)</td>
<td>(-3.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_6 )</td>
<td>-3.62</td>
<td>-40.86</td>
<td>-4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.995)</td>
<td>(-6.24)</td>
<td>(-2.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_7 )</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>-14.26</td>
<td>0.513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.42)</td>
<td>(-1.58)</td>
<td>(1.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_8 )</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>-26.84</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.17)</td>
<td>(-4.3)</td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_9 )</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_{10} )</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_{11} )</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(-7.44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \rho \)  
\( .769 \)  
\( (4.54) \)
TABLE 5 (Cont'd)

\[ N_{t+1} = b_1 + b_2 \sum_{i=1}^{9} b_i^i Q_{t+i}^* + b_4 b_3 N_t + b_5 \text{TIME} + b_6 D_1 + b_7 D_2 \]

\[ + b_8 D_3 + b_9 D_{37} + b_{10} D_{26} + b_{11} \sum_{i=1}^{9} b_i^i W_{t+i}^* \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>33</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( b_1 )</td>
<td>448.</td>
<td>884.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.90)</td>
<td>(2.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_2 )</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.85)</td>
<td>(1.60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_3 )</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.29)</td>
<td>(3.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_4 )</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.736)</td>
<td>(1.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_5 )</td>
<td>-4.24</td>
<td>-3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-4.58)</td>
<td>(-2.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_6 )</td>
<td>-12.84</td>
<td>-10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-1.84)</td>
<td>(-1.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_7 )</td>
<td>-7.47</td>
<td>-18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(-.728)</td>
<td>(-2.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_8 )</td>
<td>17.68</td>
<td>6.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.54)</td>
<td>(.704)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_9 )</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_{10} )</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( b_{11} )</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-439.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>(-1.58)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \rho \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>33</th>
<th>Industry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.86)</td>
<td>(2.91)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We adopt a variant of the cost function discussed by Sims and Kennan which assumes that costs are made up of disequilibrium (away from equilibrium level labor, \( N^* \)) and adjustment costs, and is given by

\[
C_{t+j} = \frac{\alpha}{2} \left( N_{t+j} - N^*_{t+j} \right)^2 + \frac{\phi}{2} \left( N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j} \right)^2.
\]  

Using this in the expected discounted cost function leads to a labor demand equation quite similar to equation (13) except that \( \lambda_1 \) now equals \( \frac{2h\bar{\alpha}}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4(h')^2a}} \) where \( (h')^{-1} = \frac{a + (2+r)\phi}{\phi} \) (previously, \( h^{-1} = \frac{cq + (2+r)\phi}{\phi} \) so that \( \alpha \) substitutes for \( cq \) in the definition of \( h \)).

The results for industries 26 and 35 are included in table 5. The coefficient \( b_3 \) was quite significant in both cases although the magnitude fell somewhat from the previous regressions.

In general, the autocorrelation correction did not change the qualitative results; the same set of seven industries shows a significant dependence between labor demand and rational expectations of the future and one industry (23) is added to the set.
A COMPARISON OF SHORT-RUN AND LONG-RUN ELASTICITIES

This section describes how the theoretical labor demand model and empirical output model may be used to determine how changes in imports and GNP affect labor demand. We wish to determine the extent to which changes in current imports lead to changes in expected imports, which then lead to changes in expected output and then, finally, to changes in employment.

Although the results of this calculation are of interest for public policy reasons, it also illustrates the usefulness of the labor demand model that incorporates expectations of the future. For example, in the present case, it is used to distinguish between different sources of output change. Current output will change by the same amount regardless of whether the change comes about due to changes in imports or GNP. The effect on what is expected to happen will be quite different, however.

An increase in imports in a particular industry may be viewed by domestic producers as requiring a permanent decrease in that industry's domestic production. If so, it should cause nearly immediate adjustment in employment. Alternatively, imports may be small enough relative to industry demand, or contain enough random variation, that firms do not adjust quickly.

The Calculation of Short-Run Elasticities

In order to estimate the speed of adjustment of employment to imports and compare it to other sources of output change, the model is used to evaluate the derivative of employment with respect to current output. Whereas, the long-run elasticity assumes a steady state for N and Q and is calculated as
the short-run elasticity uses current values \( N_0 \) and \( Q_0 \) and is calculated as

\[ e_L = \frac{dN}{dQ} \frac{Q_0}{N_0} \]

The quantity of interest is the derivative \( dN_0/dQ_0 \). In the model, this derivative will incorporate the effect of current output on expected output, which then affects current employment. Alternative calculations are made for a change in current output attributable to imports and a change attributable to a change in GNP. In both cases, the decrease in current output is identical. Calculated differences in the response of employment were due to what changes in output firms expected in the future. If changes in current imports represent a permanent change, the effect on expected output will be greater. In turn, employment should respond faster to a given change. Calculations are only made for those industries where expectations of output are important (a significant \( b_3 \)).

The derivative of current employment with respect to current output (via a change in imports) was estimated by totally differentiating the nonlinear model. The change in labor demand arises from a change in imports, both current and expected, leading to changes in domestic output.
The equations were of the following form:

\[ \text{dlnM}_i = g_1 \text{dlnM}_{i-1} + g_2 \text{dlnM}_{i-2}, \quad i=1,\ldots,8 \]
\[ \text{dQ}_i = -\text{dM}_i, \quad i=1,\ldots,8 \]
\[ \text{dN}_0 = b_2 \sum b_i^3 \text{dQ}_i \]

The current period is signified by the subscript o. The subscript i denotes the number of periods in the future. The equations themselves are the total differential of the estimated equations in the model. Thus, the coefficients \( g_1 \) and \( g_2 \) are the coefficients in the import equation where two lags in imports are the important explanatory variables. A change in current imports leads to the forecasts incorporating this change through these coefficients. This equation denotes a number of equations referring to expectations at different points in the future.

\[ \text{dlnM}_1 = g_1 \text{dlnM}_0 \]
\[ \text{dlnM}_2 = g_1 \text{dlnM}_1 + g_2 \text{dlnM}_0 \]
\[ \text{dlnM}_3 = g_1 \text{dlnM}_2 + g_2 \text{dlnM}_1 \]
\[ \ldots \]
\[ \ldots \]

With an initial value for \( \text{dM}_0 \) equal in amount to the value obtained from a 5 percent change in GNP, these and the previous equations are used successively to solve \( \text{dM}_1, \ldots, \text{dM}_8 \), then \( \text{dQ}_0, \ldots, \text{dQ}_8 \), and finally \( \text{dN}_0 \). From this, \( \text{dN}_0/\text{dQ}_0 \) is calculated and then converted to an elasticity at the sample means.
In order to estimate the corresponding derivative that results from a change in GNP, we use a similar procedure. The equations were of the form:

\[ \frac{d\ln GNP_i}{d\ln GNP_{i-1}} = f_1 \frac{d\ln GNP_{i-1}}{d\ln GNP_{i-2}}, \quad i=1, \ldots, 8 \]

\[ \frac{d\ln Q_i}{d\ln GNP_{i-1}} = h_1 \frac{d\ln GNP_i}{d\ln GNP_{i-1}} + h_2 \frac{d\ln GNP}{d\ln GNP_{i-1}}, \quad i=1, \ldots, 8 \]

\[ dN_0 = b_2 \sum b_3^i dQ_i. \]

Once the alternative derivatives of employment with respect to current output were evaluated, they were then converted to an elasticity. The elasticities for the seven industries are reported in table 6. The symbols \( e_G \) and \( e_M \) denote the short-run elasticities derived when GNP and imports change, respectively. The symbol \( e_2 \) is the long-run elasticity derived earlier and repeated here for convenience. Also, an adjustment parameter (or speed of adjustment), \( \eta \), is obtained by dividing the short-run elasticity by the long-run elasticity in each case (also denoted by \( G \) or \( M \)). The adjustment parameter is the fraction of adjustment completed by the firm in each period, toward the equilibrium level \( N^* \). The parameter is analogous to the parameter \( \eta \) in the simple partial adjustment model

\[ N_t - N_{t-1} = \eta [N^* - N_{t-1}] \]

As expected, short-run elasticities are all lower than the long-run elasticities. More surprisingly, in every industry, the short-run change in labor demand is greater for a change in GNP than for imports. Apparently, even though changes in GNP may be thought of by the firm as cyclical changes, and
TABLE 6

SHORT-RUN ELASTICITIES AND ADJUSTMENT PARAMETERS FOR A CHANGE IN GNP and IMPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>( e_G )</th>
<th>( e_M )</th>
<th>( e_L )</th>
<th>( \eta_G )</th>
<th>( \eta_M )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>.256</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>1.008</td>
<td>.254</td>
<td>.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.314</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.684</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.380</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>.869</td>
<td>.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.483</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.733</td>
<td>.659</td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.726</td>
<td>.273</td>
<td>1.396</td>
<td>.520</td>
<td>.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.971</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>.386</td>
<td>.845</td>
<td>.755</td>
<td>.457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
therefore only "temporary," the decrease in labor demand in response to the change is greater and occurs more rapidly. The adjustment of labor to GNP occurs substantially more quickly than the adjustment to a higher level of imports.
CONCLUSIONS

Our most important results are summarized below.

(1) Expectations of the future, though typically omitted from empirical studies of labor demand, have an important effect and should be incorporated explicitly. This is true even for the fairly simple output model developed earlier. In particular, we found that for eight of the eleven two-digit industries studied, expectations, as measured assuming rationality, had a significant effect on current labor demand.

(2) The incorporation of expectations tends to reduce measured economies of scale, so that the estimated long-run labor-output elasticity is closer to one. This raises the possibility that any remaining deviation from constant returns is also a consequence of omitted variable bias.

(3) It does seem feasible to distinguish empirically the effects of different sources of output change. In our case, we started with the hypothesis that changes in imports would induce more rapid adjustment than changes in GNP, but the empirical evidence pointed in the opposite direction.
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APPENDIX A

DERIVATION OF THE DEMAND FOR LABOR
Appendix A presents a more complete description of the derivation in the text using the methodology proposed in Sargent [17]. This methodology is of interest primarily for two reasons: (1) much of our work is based on Sargent's past work on rational expectations and (2) in his recent work he proposed a model quite similar to the one already discussed. In that model, he uses a quadratic adjustment cost function coupled with a quadratic single-input production function.

This appendix consists of two sections. The first is a general discussion of lag operators which are used in the derivation. A lag operator is one which when taken to the nth power and multiplied by a variable, X, gives the value of X shifted back n periods. The second section is the alternative derivation of the labor demand equation to be used in the empirical work.

LAG OPERATORS

We shall consider polynomials in the lag operator

\[ A(L) = a_0 + a_1L + a_2L^2 + \ldots = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_jL^j \]  
(A-1)

where the a's are constants and \( LX_t = X_{t-1} \) and \( L^nX_t = X_{t-n} \). Then

\[ A(L)X_t = a_0X_t + a_1X_{t-1} + \ldots = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} a_jX_{t-j} \]. The polynomials \( A(L) \) that will be considered in this paper are "rational" in the sense that they can be expressed as the ratio

A-1
\[ A(L) = B(L)/C(L) \]  
(A-2)

where

\[ B(L) = \sum_{j=0}^{m} b_j L^j, \quad C(L) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} c_j L^j \]

and the \( b_j \)'s and \( c_j \)'s are constants.

For a simple example of a rational polynomial in \( L \) and one which will become important later in this section, consider

\[ A(L) = \frac{1}{1-\lambda L} \]  
(A-3)

As long as \(| \lambda | < 1\), there is the following useful expansion

\[ \frac{1}{1-\lambda L} = 1 + \lambda L + \lambda^2 L^2 + \ldots \]  
(A-4)

If \(| \lambda | > 1\), or equivalently where \( \left| \frac{1}{\lambda} \right| < 1 \), an alternative expansion become useful for the polynomial \( 1/(1-\lambda L) \). That is,

\[
\frac{1}{1-\lambda L} = \frac{-(\lambda L)^{-1}}{1-(\lambda L)^{-1}} = -\frac{1}{\lambda L} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\lambda} L^{-1} + \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^2 L^{-2} + \ldots \right) \\
= -\frac{1}{\lambda} L^{-1} - \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^2 L^{-2} - \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^3 L^{-3} - \ldots \]  
(A-5)

Equation (A-5) implies that

\[
\frac{1}{1-\lambda L} X_t = -\frac{1}{\lambda} X_{t+1} - \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^2 X_{t+2} - \ldots = -\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{1}{\lambda}\right)^i X_{t+i} 
\]

which says that \((1/(1-\lambda L))X_t\) is a geometrically declining weighted sum of future values of \(X\).
THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

The sum of discounted costs is given by the following equation:

\[ V_t = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \left( \prod_{i=0}^{j} \frac{1}{a_{t+i}} \right) C_{t+j} \text{ where } a_{t+i} = 1 + r_{t+i} \]

and

\[
C_{t+j} = W_{t+j}N_{t+j}q_{t+j}^2 + \frac{c}{2} \left( N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j} \right)^2
\]

= \[ W_{t+j}N_{t+j} + q_{t+j} \left( a+bN_{t+j} + \frac{c}{2} N_{t+j}^2 + dN_{t+j}Q_{t+j} + eQ_{t+j} + fQ_{t+j}^2 \right) + \frac{\phi}{2} \left( N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j} \right)^2 \]

The firm is assumed to know the sequences

\[ \left\{ W_{t+j} \right\}_{j=0}^{\infty} \text{ and } \left\{ Q_{t+j} \right\}_{j=0}^{\infty} \]

and chooses a sequence

\[ \left\{ N_{t+j} \right\}_{j=0}^{\infty} \]

to maximize \( V_t \). For simplicity,

an additional assumption is made that the sequences

\[ \left\{ q_{t+j} \right\}_{j=0}^{\infty} \text{ and } \left\{ a_{t+j} \right\}_{j=0}^{\infty} \]

are constant over time

and equal \( q \) and \( a \), respectively. Further, it is assumed for all \( t \) that for some \( K>0 \), \( |N_t| < Kx^t \), where \( 1 < x < a \); sequences that satisfy these inequalities for some \( K>0 \) and \( 1 < x < a \) will be termed of exponential order less than \( a \) (this terminology is due to Sargent).

The first order conditions to the cost minimization problem are given by

\[ \text{In this and the next appendix, we have dropped the expectation operator, } E_t, \text{ and assume that } \left\{ W_{t+j} \right\} \text{ and } \left\{ Q_{t+j} \right\} \text{ are known with certainty to simplify the derivation. To show that the solution to the quadratic discounted cost function exhibits "certainty equivalence," see [8] or [17].} \]
\[ \frac{\partial V_t}{\partial N_{t+j}} = \phi \left( N_{t+j} - N_{t+j-1} \right) \frac{1}{a_t \cdots a_{t+j-1}} \]
\[ + \left[ W_{t+j} + q_{t+j} \left( b + c N_{t+j} + d Q_{t+j} \right) \right. \]
\[ - \phi \left( N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j} \right) \frac{1}{a_t \cdots a_{t+j}} \]
\[ = 0, \text{ for } j=0,1,\ldots,T-1, \text{ and } \]
\[ \frac{\partial V_t}{\partial N_{t+T}} = \frac{1}{a_t \cdots a_{t+T}} \phi \left( N_{t+T+1} - N_{t+T} \right) = 0 \text{ for } j=T. \] (A-7b)

After some rearrangement, equation (A-7a) is equal to

\[ N_{t+j} = h_{t+j} \left( a_{t+j} N_{t+j-1} - \frac{X_{t+j}}{\phi} + N_{t+j+1} \right) \]

where \( h_{t+j} = h = \frac{1}{2+r+\frac{cq}{\phi}} \) and \( X_{t+j} = W_{t+j} + b q + d q Q_{t+j} \)

It will turn out to be convenient to rearrange this equation as

\[ N_{t+j+1} - \frac{1}{h} N_{t+j} + a N_{t+j-1} = \frac{1}{\phi} X_{t+j} \quad j=0,1,\ldots,T-1 \] (A-8)

Two boundary conditions are needed to solve this second order difference equation. The first is given by the initial level of labor, i.e., \( N_{t-1} \). The second is given by the terminal condition (A-7b). That condition is known as the transversality condition and is necessary for optimality. Taking the limit as \( T \to \infty \), it is given by

\[ \lim_{T \to \infty} \left( \frac{1}{a} \right)^{T+1} \phi \left( N_{t+T+1} - N_{t+T} \right) = 0. \] (A-9)

A sufficient condition for this to hold is that the solution sequence of the \( N_{t+j} \)'s be of exponential order less than \( a \).

To show sufficiency, note that
Previously, it was given that \( \frac{x}{a} < 1 \) (since \( x < a \)). This means that the limit of both terms as \( T \to \infty \) is zero and the transversality condition (A-9) is satisfied.

The necessary conditions for optimality for the infinite horizon problem are satisfied if a solution to difference equation (A-8) is found subject to the initial value \( N_{t-1} \) and the transversality condition (A-9).

To arrive at a solution for (A-8), we begin by writing it as

\[
\left(1 - \frac{1}{h} L + aL^2\right)N_{t+j+1} = \frac{1}{\phi} X_{t+j}
\]  

(A-10)

It is useful to write the polynomial \( 1 - \frac{1}{h} L + aL^2 \) in an alternative way, given by what is termed the "factorization"

\[
1 - t_1 L - t_2 L^2 = (1 - \lambda_1 L)(1 - \lambda_2 L)
= 1 - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) L + \lambda_1 \lambda_2 L^2
\]  

(A-11)

where \( t_1 = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{h} \) and \( t_2 = -\lambda_1 \lambda_2 = -a \).

The l.h.s. of (A-11) is the polynomial \( 1-t_1 z - t_2 z^2 \).
Notice that

\[(1-\lambda_1z)(1-\lambda_2z) = \lambda_1\lambda_2 \left(\frac{1}{\lambda_1} - z\right)\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_2} - z\right).\]  \hspace{1cm} (A-12)

When set equal to 0, this equation is satisfied at the two roots \(z = 1/\lambda_1\) and \(z = 1/\lambda_2\). The characteristic equation \(1-t_1z-t_2z^2=0\) could be solved for two values of \(z\).

Before calculating the solution to the second order difference equation, however, let us follow Sargent and provide a more heuristic solution. Remember that

\[\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = \frac{1}{h} = a + \frac{\phi+cq}{\phi}\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{where } \frac{\phi+cq}{\phi} > 1. \hspace{1cm} (A-13)

and

\[\lambda_1\lambda_2 = a \text{ or } \lambda_2 = a/\lambda_1.\] \hspace{1cm} (A-14)

Equation (A-13) means that \(\lambda_1\) must satisfy

\[\frac{1}{h} = \lambda_1 + a/\lambda_1\]

or \(a + \frac{\phi+cq}{\phi} = \lambda_1 + a/\lambda_1 = f(\lambda_1)\).

Figure 1 is used to help illustrate how \(\lambda_1\) and \(\lambda_2\) are determined. First, the function \(f(\lambda)\) achieves a minimum at \(\lambda = \sqrt{a}\) and is equal to \(2\sqrt{a}\) at this point. For any \(a > 1\), or equivalently, for any \(r > 0\), it can be shown that \(1+a > 2\sqrt{a}\). The function \(f(\lambda)\) equals \(1+a\) when \(\lambda = 1\) and \(\lambda = a\). This means that the solutions for \(\lambda_1\) and \(\lambda_2\) are real and distinct and as implied in the picture. We have assumed (w.l.o.g.) that \(\lambda_1 < \lambda_2\), or more specifically, that \(\lambda_1 < \sqrt{a} < \lambda_2\). Since

\[\frac{1}{h} = a + \frac{\phi+cq}{\phi},\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{then as long as } \frac{\phi+cq}{\phi} > 0, \frac{1}{h} > 1+a.\]  \hspace{1cm} \text{This implies that } \lambda_1 < 1 \text{ and } \lambda_2 > a.
We are now able to use the factorization and write equation (A-8) as

\[
(1-\lambda_1 L)(1-\lambda_2 L)X_{t+j+1} = \frac{1}{\phi} X_{t+j} .
\]

In order to satisfy the transversality condition it is necessary to use the forward inverse of \((1-\lambda_2 L)\) (see equation (A-5) in the lag operators section) or

\[
(1-\lambda_1 L)X_{t+j+1} = -\left(\frac{\phi \lambda_2}{1-\lambda_2 L^{-1}}\right) X_{t+j} . \tag{A-15}
\]

From the relationship \(\lambda_2 = a/\lambda_1\), we may rewrite this expression as

\[
(1-\lambda_1 L)X_{t+j+1} = -\left(\frac{\lambda_1}{a\phi}\right) \frac{1}{1-\lambda_2 L^{-1}} X_{t+j+1} . \tag{A-16}
\]

(since \(L^{-1} X_{t+j} = X_{t+j+1}\)).
Writing the denominator as
\[(1-\lambda_2^{-1}L^{-1})^{-1} = 1+\lambda_2^{-1}L^{-1}+\lambda_2^{-2}L^{-2} + \ldots\]
and using this expression in equation (A-16) leads to the equation for labor demand in the \(t+j+1\)th period:

\[N_{t+j+1} = \lambda_1 N_{t+j} - \frac{\lambda_1}{a} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{\lambda_2} \right)^i X_{t+j+1+i}\]

or

\[N_{t+j+1} = \lambda_1 N_{t+j} - \frac{\lambda_1}{a} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\lambda_1}{a} \right)^i X_{t+j+1+i}\]  \hspace{1cm} (A-17)

Although we have derived a range on \(\lambda_1\) and \(\lambda_2\), an explicit value in terms of the production function parameters, interest rates, other factor input costs, and the adjustment cost parameter has not been given. In order to do this now, it is necessary to use the characteristic equation given by

\[1-t_1 z-t_2 z^2=0\]

where it was previously stated that \(t_1 = 1/h\) and \(t_2 = -a\). The roots are given by the quadratic formula

\[z = \frac{-t_1 \pm \sqrt{t_1^2 + 4t_2}}{2t_2}\]

Substituting in the values for \(t_1\) and \(t_2\) leads to

\[z = \frac{-\frac{1}{h} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{1}{h^2} - 4a\right)}}{-2a} = \frac{-\frac{1}{h} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{1-4h^2a}{h^2}\right)}}{-2a}\]

\[= \frac{-\frac{1}{h} \pm \sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{-2a}\]

A-8
or finally,

\[ z = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2ha}. \]

Remember that \( z \) is equal to the reciprocals of \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \).

Therefore, when

\[ z = \frac{1 + \sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2ha} \]

then

\[ \lambda_1 = \frac{1}{z} = \frac{2ha}{1 + \sqrt{1-4h^2a}}, \]

and an expression for equation (A-17) is obtained.\(^1\)

\(^1\) The same can be shown for \( z = \frac{1}{\lambda_2} \) where \( \lambda_2 = \frac{1-\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2ha} \).

It can be shown that \( \frac{1}{\lambda_2} < 1 \) and is equivalent to \( \frac{\lambda_1}{a} \) (substitute in for the values of \( \lambda_1 \) and \( \lambda_2 \) and use the relationship \( \lambda_1\lambda_2 = a \) and it is derived quite simply).
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A SECOND DERIVATION OF THE DEMAND FOR LABOR

The model includes a simple quadratic adjustment cost function in a framework similar to the one developed by Brechling [1]. It will turn out that the firm's demand for labor in the present period depends upon the entire future path of the exogenous variables. In particular, the exogenous variable of most interest is the output measure.

THE ASSUMPTIONS

Turning now to the development of the model, a standard production function is assumed where output in period $t$ is produced by two factor inputs—labor and aggregate input $Z$ (which has already been briefly discussed):

$$Q_t = F(N_t, Z_t), \quad F_N > 0, \quad F_Z > 0, \quad F_{NN} < 0, \quad F_{ZZ} < 0. \quad (3-1)$$

$N$ may be thought of as the number of men at work or the total number of man-hours; we assume it refers to the number of men. The firm is assumed to be a cost minimizer and takes output as given. Rather than use the production function, we assume that the inverse production function (in terms of $Z_t$) exists. This presents no problem, for example, if a Cobb-Douglas or CES production function is assumed. These functions are not suitable for optimization over time, so we work with a quadratic expression around the steady state $(Q^*, N^*)$ of the inverse production function $G(Q_t, N_t)$. This quadratic approximation can be interpreted as Taylor's expansion:
The signs of the coefficients \( c \) and \( d \) will turn out to be important later on; it is necessary that

\[
c > 0, \quad d < 0. \tag{B-3}
\]

For Cobb-Douglas or CES production functions, the second order conditions assure that these are met.

The firm is assumed at time \( t \) to minimize the sum of discounted future costs or payments to factors (including adjustment costs) where this cost is represented for the \( t+j \)th period as,

\[
C_{t+j} = W_{t+j}N_{t+j} + q_{t+j}Z_{t+j} + \frac{\phi}{2} \left( N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j} \right)^2 \tag{B-4}
\]

This flow of costs is discounted by interest rates \((r_t, \ldots, r_{t+T})\) and summed over periods \( j = 0, \ldots, T \). To find the optimal plan for the firm note that the only choice variable is \( N_{t+j} \), since \( Q_{t+j} \) is given to the firm and \( Z_{t+j} \) is assumed to adjust instantaneously to produce this output according to the production function.

\[\text{---}
\]

\(^1\)Although this can be made more general.
Focusing on three terms in the sum of discounted costs, namely those for periods t+j-1, t+j, and T gives:

\[ V_t' = \ldots + \left[ W_{t+j-1} N_{t+j-1} + Q_{t+j-1} \left( a + b N_{t+j-1} + \frac{c}{2} N_{t+j-1}^2 \right) + d N_{t+j-1} Q_{t+j-1} + e Q_{t+j-1} + f Q_{t+j-1}^2 \right] + \frac{\phi}{2} \left( N_{t+j} - N_{t+j-1} \right)^2 \left( 1 + r_t \right) \cdots \left( 1 + r_{t+j-1} \right) \]

\[ + \left[ W_{t+j} N_{t+j} + Q_{t+j} \left( a + b N_{t+j} + \frac{c}{2} N_{t+j}^2 + d N_{t+j} Q_{t+j} + e Q_{t+j} + f Q_{t+j}^2 \right) \right] + \frac{\phi}{2} \left( N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j} \right)^2 \left( 1 + r_t \right) \cdots \left( 1 + r_{t+j} \right) \]

\[ + \ldots + \left[ W_T N_T + Q_T \left( a + b N_T + \frac{c}{2} N_T^2 + d N_T Q_T + e Q_T + f Q_T^2 \right) \right] + \frac{\phi}{2} \left( N_{t+T} - N_{t+T-1} \right)^2 \left( 1 + r_t \right) \cdots \left( 1 + r_{t+T} \right) \]

THE FIRST-ORDER CONDITIONS AND THE SOLUTION FOR LABOR DEMAND

Differentiating (B-5) with respect to \( N_{t+j} \) and \( N_{t+T} \) gives the following first order conditions:

\[ \frac{\partial V_t'}{\partial N_{t+j}} = \phi \left( N_{t+j} - N_{t+j-1} \right) \left( 1 + r_t \right) \left( 1 + r_{t+j-1} \right) + \frac{1}{\left( 1 + r_t \right) \cdots \left( 1 + r_{t+j-1} \right)} \]

\[ + \left[ W_{t+j} + Q_{t+j} \left( b + c N_{t+j} + d Q_{t+j} \right) \right] - \phi \left( N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j} \right) \left( 1 + r_t \right) \left( 1 + r_{t+j} \right) = 0 \]

\[ \frac{\partial V_t'}{\partial N_{t+T}} = \phi \left( N_{t+T} - N_{t+T-1} \right) \left( 1 + r_t \right) \left( 1 + r_{t+T} \right) + \frac{1}{\left( 1 + r_t \right) \cdots \left( 1 + r_{t+T} \right)} = 0 \]
Equation (B-6) must hold for all $j$ between 0 and $T$. The next equation (B-6a) represents an end-point condition (transversality condition) and has been discussed in more detail in appendix A. Multiply equation (B-6) by $(1+r_t)\ldots(1+r_{t+j})$ to obtain,

$$
\phi \left(N_{t+j} - N_{t+j-1}\right) (1+r_{t+j}) + W_{t+j} + b q_{t+j} + c q_{t+j} N_{t+j} + d q_{t+j} Q_{t+j} - \phi \left(N_{t+j+1} - N_{t+j}\right) = 0
$$

and collect terms for $N_{t+j}$

$$
N_{t+j} \left[(1+r_{t+j})\phi + c q_{t+j} + 1\right] = \phi N_{t+j-1} \left(1+r_{t+j}\right) - W_{t+j} - b q_{t+j} - d q_{t+j} Q_{t+j} + \phi N_{t+j+1}.
$$

Dividing by the adjustment cost $\phi$, yields

$$
N_{t+j} \left[\left(1+r_{t+j}\right) + \frac{c q_{t+j} + 1}{\phi}\right] = N_{t+j-1} \left(1+r_{t+j}\right) - \frac{W_{t+j}}{\phi} - \frac{b q_{t+j}}{\phi} - \frac{d q_{t+j} Q_{t+j}}{\phi} + N_{t+j+1}
$$

or

$$
N_{t+j} = \frac{1}{\left(1+r_{t+j}\right) + \frac{c q_{t+j} + 1}{\phi}} \left[N_{t+j-1} \left(1+r_{t+j}\right) - \frac{W_{t+j}}{\phi} - \frac{b q_{t+j}}{\phi} - \frac{d q_{t+j} Q_{t+j}}{\phi} + N_{t+j+1}\right].
$$

\(^{1}\)Note that for $\phi=0$ (i.e., no adjustment costs) and after some rearrangement (B-8) implies the following:

$$
N_{t+j} = \frac{-W_{t+j} - b q_{t+j} - d q_{t+j} Q_{t+j}}{c q_{t+j}} = -\frac{b}{c} - \frac{c' W_{t+j}}{q_{t+j}} - d' Q_{t+j}
$$

where $c' = \frac{1}{c} > 0$

\[\]

$d' = \frac{d}{c} < 0$. 

B-4
In order to simplify the exposition, the following relationships are used throughout the paper. Let

\[ h_{t+j} = h\left(r_{t+j}, q_{t+j}\right) = \frac{1}{2+r_{t+j}+\frac{q_{t+j}}{\phi}} \] (B-9)

and

\[ a_{t+j} = (1+r_{t+j}) \] (B-10)

Using (3-9) and (3-10), (B-8) now becomes

\[ N_{t+j} = h_{t+j}\left[N_{t+j-1}a_{t+j} - \frac{W_{t+j}+bq_{t+j}+dq_{t+j}Q_{t+j}}{\phi} + N_{t+j+1}\right] \] (B-8a)

Furthermore, let \( X_{t+j} = W_{t+j}+bq_{t+j}+dq_{t+j}Q_{t+j} \) leading to

\[ N_{t+j} = h_{t+j}\left[N_{t+j-1}a_{t+j} - \frac{X_{t+j}}{\phi} + N_{t+j+1}\right] \] (B-8b)

which is a nonhomogeneous difference equation with non-constant coefficients (because \( X_t, N_t, \) and \( a_t \) will vary over time).

To derive a general solution to this equation, let us first assume that the present period is denoted by \( 1 \), last period by \( 0 \), and the future by \( 2, 3, \ldots, \) etc. At the end of the derivation, the more general notation will be used. The use of the simple notation is used only to illustrate the solution.

We begin by rewriting equation (B-8b) as

\[ N_1 = h_1 a_1 N_0 - h_1 \frac{X_1}{\phi} + h_1 N_2 \] (B-11)
where \( N_0 \), last period's labor services, is known to the firm.

Similarly, for period 2,

\[
N_2 = h_2 a_2 N_1 - h_2 \frac{x_2}{\phi} + h_2 N_3 \tag{B-12}
\]

From (B-11), we substitute for \( N_1 \), yielding

\[
N_2 = h_2 a_2 \left[ h_1 a_1 N_0 - h_1 \frac{x_1}{\phi} + h_1 N_2 \right] - h_2 \frac{x_2}{\phi} + h_2 N_3 \tag{B-12a}
\]

Solving for \( N_2 \), we have

\[
N_2 = \frac{h_2 h_1 a_2 a_1}{1 - h_2 h_1 a_2} N_0 - \frac{h_2 h_1 a_2}{1 - h_2 h_1 a_2} \frac{x_1}{\phi} - \frac{h_2}{1 - h_2 h_1 a_2} \frac{x_2}{\phi} + h_2 N_3 \tag{B-12b}
\]

For ease of exposition, define

\[
Y_t = \frac{h_t}{1 - h_t a_t Y_{t-1}} \tag{B-13}
\]

where \( Y_0 = 0 \).

Using the relationship in (B-12b) yields

\[
N_2 = Y_2 Y_1 a_2 a_1 N_0 - Y_2 Y_1 a_2 \frac{x_1}{\phi} - Y_2 \frac{x_2}{\phi} + Y_2 N_3 \tag{B-12c}
\]

Substituting (B-12c) into (B-11), we have

\[
N_1 = Y_1 a_1 N_0 - Y_1 \frac{x_1}{\phi} + Y_1 \left[ Y_2 Y_1 a_2 a_1 N_0 - Y_2 Y_1 a_2 \frac{x_1}{\phi} - Y_2 \frac{x_2}{\phi} + Y_2 N_3 \right] \tag{B-14}
\]
For period 3, equation (B-8b) is

$$N_3 = h_3 a_3 N_2 - h_3 \frac{x_3}{\phi} + h_3 N_4$$

(B-15)

As before, since $N_2$ is known from equation (B-12c), we solve for $N_3$ in (B-15) as a function of $N_0$, $\frac{x_1}{\phi}$, $\frac{x_2}{\phi}$, $\frac{x_3}{\phi}$ and $N_4$ and substitute this expression into (B-14). Continuing in this way, the final expression for $N_1$ may be written as

$$N_1 = y_1 a_1 N_0 - y_1 \frac{x_1}{\phi} + y_1 \left[ y_2 y_1 a_2 a_1 N_0 - y_2 y_1 a_2 \frac{x_1}{\phi} - y_2 \frac{x_2}{\phi} ight. \\
+ y_2 \left[ y_3 y_2 a_3 a_2 a_1 N_0 - y_3 y_2 a_3 a_2 \frac{x_1}{\phi} \\
- y_3 y_2 a_3 \frac{x_2}{\phi} - y_3 \frac{x_3}{\phi} + y_3 \left[ y_4 \ldots y_1 a_4 \ldots a_1 N_0 \\
- y_4 \ldots y_1 a_4 \ldots a_2 \frac{x_1}{\phi} - y_4 \ldots y_2 a_4 a_3 \frac{x_2}{\phi} \\
- y_4 y_3 a_4 \frac{x_3}{\phi} - y_4 \frac{x_4}{\phi} + y_4 \left[ \ldots \ldots \right] \right] \right]$$

(B-14a)

This equation relates the demand for labor in period 1 (the present period) as a function of $N_0$, $\frac{x_1}{\phi}$, $\frac{x_2}{\phi}$, $\ldots$, $\frac{x_k}{\phi}$, $\ldots$, $\frac{x_{T-1}}{\phi}$ (the values of the exogenous variables in the present and future time periods) and $N_T$ (labor used in period $T$, the end of the firm). Equation (B-14a) is a rather complicated expression and one that is not in readily useable form. There are certain properties that, intuitively, the coefficients on the $x_k$s should have. These include being less than one and have declining effect as $k$ increases (i.e., the more distant into the future is the variable the less should be its effect on the firm's demand for labor in the present period).
In order to study the coefficients on the r.h.s. variables, it is useful to rearrange them and obtain:

for \( N_0 \): 
\[
y_1 a_1 + y_1^2 y_2 a_1 a_2 + y_1^2 y_3 a_1 a_2 a_3 + y_1^2 y_4^2 y_4 a_1 \ldots a_4 + \ldots + y_1^2 \ldots y_t y_{t+1} a_1 \ldots a_{t+1} + \ldots
\]

\[
- \frac{x_1}{\phi} = y_1 + y_1^2 y_2 a_2 + y_1^2 y_3 a_2 a_3 + y_1^2 y_4^2 y_4 a_2 a_3 a_4 + \ldots + y_1^2 \ldots y_t y_{t+1} a_2 \ldots a_{t+1} + \ldots
\]

\[
- \frac{x_2}{\phi} = y_1 y_2 + y_1 y_2 y_3 a_3 + y_1^2 y_2 y_3 y_4 a_3 a_4 + \ldots + y_1^2 \ldots y_t y_{t+1} a_3 \ldots a_{t+1} + \ldots
\]

\[
- \frac{x_3}{\phi} = y_1 y_2 y_3 + y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 a_4 + y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 y_5 a_4 a_5 + \ldots + y_1 y_2 y_3 \ldots y_t y_{t+1} a_4 \ldots a_{t+1} + \ldots
\]

\[
\vdots
\]

\[
- \frac{x_k}{\phi} = y_1 \ldots y_k + y_1 \ldots y_{k-1} y_k y_{k+1} a_k + \ldots + y_1 \ldots y_k \ldots y_t y_{t+1} a_k \ldots a_{t+1} + \ldots
\]

\[
N_T = y_1 y_2 \ldots y_T = \prod_{i=1}^{T} y_i.
\]

We now make a simplifying assumption in order to make the problem tractable. This simplification involves equations (B-9) and (B-10). Specifically, it is assumed that these functions are constant over time, or
\[ h = h_t = \frac{1}{2 + r + \frac{Cq}{\phi}}, \text{ for all } t = 0,1,\ldots \quad (B-9a) \]

\[ a = a_t = 1 + r, \text{ for all } t = 0,1,\ldots \quad (B-10a) \]

This assumption says that the price of capital \( q_t \) and the interest rate \( r_t \) are the same for each time period. Earlier, it was stated that \( W_t/\phi \) and \( W_t/q_t \) may be allowed to grow at the same rate since this generalization is also sufficient to provide a tractable solution. (Note that we are not assuming that output is expected to remain constant.)

Either assumption enables us to work more easily with the \( y \) function already introduced (equation (B-13)). Note that this equation is a fairly complicated continued fraction. With \( a_t \) and \( h_t \) constant, it would look as follows:

\[ Y_t = \frac{h}{1 - h} \frac{1}{1 - h} \frac{1}{1 - h} \cdots \text{t-terms} \]

The variable of interest is the product of the \( y_t \)'s since that is what has been derived in equation (B-14a). In order to show the pattern of \( y_t \), start with \( y_1, y_1y_2, y_1y_2y_3, \ldots \), or

\[ \ldots \]
\[ y_1 = h \]
\[ y_1 y_2 = h \frac{h}{1-h^2a} = \frac{h^2}{1-h^2a} \]
\[ y_1 y_2 y_3 = h \frac{h}{1-h^2a} \frac{h}{1-h^2a} = \frac{h^3}{1-2h^2a} \]
\[ y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 = \frac{h^4}{1-3h^2a+(h^2a)^2} \]
\[ y_1 y_2 y_3 y_4 y_5 = \frac{h^5}{1-4h^2a+3(h^2a)^2} \]
and so on.

Let \( D_t \) be equal to the denominator of the product \( y_1, \ldots, y_t \).

Then the product of the \( y_i \)'s may be written as

\[
\prod_{i=1}^{s} y_i = \frac{h^s}{D_s} \quad s \geq 1 \tag{B-16}
\]

Furthermore, there are two (equivalent) ways of characterizing \( D_t \):

\[
D_t = \sum_{i=0}^{(t-1)/2} \binom{t-i}{i} (-h^2a)^i, \text{ t odd} \tag{B-17}
\]
\[
\sum_{i=0}^{t/2} \binom{t-i}{i} (-h^2a)^i, \text{ t even}
\]

and

\[
D_t = D_{t-1} - h^2aD_{t-2} \tag{B-18}
\]
Although equation (B-17) looks something like the binomial expansion, it is not a particularly useful characterization of the process. Equation (B-18) is, on the other hand, a fairly simple second order difference equation and its solution will turn out to be quite useful later on in the paper.

First, as a means of solving the second order difference equation given in equation (B-18), note that an equivalent expression for the equation is given by

\[ D_{t+2} - D_{t+1} + h^2 a D_t = 0. \]  

This is a second order homogeneous difference equation with a general solution of the following form:

\[ D_t = c_1 d_1^t + c_2 d_2^t. \]

In order to solve (B-19), it is necessary to determine the roots, \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \), of the characteristic equation,

\[ d^2 - d + h^2 a = 0 \]

which has a solution

\[ d = \frac{1+\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2}. \]

Then let

\[ d_1 = \frac{1+\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2}, \quad d_2 = \frac{1-\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2}. \]
we shall use the facts that \( D_0 = D_1 = 1 \) to solve for the constants \( c_1 \) and \( c_2 \):

\[
D_0 = 1 = c_1 + c_2 \tag{B-22}
\]

or

\[
c_2 = 1 - c_1
\]

and

\[
D_1 = 1 = c_1 d_1 + c_2 d_2
\]

\[
1 = c_1 \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}}{2} + (1 - c_1) \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}}{2}.
\]

Let \( Y = \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a} \).

We then have,

\[
1 = c_1 \frac{1 + Y}{2} + (1 - c_1) \frac{1 - Y}{2}
\]

\[
= \frac{c_1}{2} + \frac{c_1 Y}{2} + \frac{1 - Y}{2} - \frac{c_1}{2} + \frac{c_1 Y}{2}
\]

\[
1 + Y = 2c_1 Y, \text{ or}
\]

\[
\frac{1 + Y}{2Y} = c_1
\]

and from (B-22)

\[
c_2 = 1 - \frac{1 + Y}{2Y} = \frac{Y - 1}{2Y}.
\]

\( D_0 \) is obviously 1 since \( y_1 = h_1 \). To show \( D_0 = 1 \), use the relationship \( D_2 = D_1 - h^2a D_0 \). Since \( D_2 = 1 - h^2a \) and \( D_1 = 1 \), then \( D_0 \) must equal 1.
Then using (B-20) and substituting in the value for Y,

\[ D_t = c_1 d_1^t + c_2 d_2^t \]

\[ = \left( \frac{1+\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2\sqrt{1-4h^2a}} \right) \left( \frac{1+\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2} \right)^t \]

\[ + \left( \frac{-1+\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2\sqrt{1-4h^2a}} \right) \left( \frac{1-\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2} \right)^t \]

or

\[ D_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-4h^2a}} \left( \frac{1+\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2} \right)^{t+1} \]

\[ - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-4h^2a}} \left( \frac{1-\sqrt{1-4h^2a}}{2} \right)^{t+1} \]

Before using equation (B-23), it is necessary to reduce the solution to the coefficients on \( N_0, \frac{X_1}{\phi}, \frac{X_2}{\phi}, \ldots \) from a finite sum to a more useable expression. Fortunately, the task is not quite so formidable as it first appears. We begin the solution by summing the first two terms. Then the next term is added and so on. A definite pattern becomes evident and a proof by induction is used to show the relationship holds for all \( t = 1, 2, \ldots, T \).

It turns out that this method of proof may be used to solve for all the coefficients. This section shows this explicitly \( \frac{X_i}{\phi} \) where \( i < T \).
To solve for the coefficient on $N_0$, sum the first two terms on $N_0$ and use the expression given by (B-16) to eliminate the product of the $y_i$'s:

$$ha + \frac{h^3a^2}{D_1D_2} = ha\left(1 + \frac{h^2a}{D_1D_2}\right) = ha\left(\frac{D_1D_2 + h^2a}{D_1D_2}\right)$$

It has been stated that $D_1 = 1$ and $D_2 = 1 - h^2a$ so that

$$ha + \frac{h^3a^2}{D_1D_2} = ha \frac{1}{D_1D_2} = \frac{haD_1}{D_2}$$

Adding the next term, $\frac{h^5a^3}{D_2D_3}$

$$\frac{haD_1}{D_1} + \frac{h^5a^3}{D_2D_3} = ha \frac{D_1D_3 + (h^2a)^2}{D_2D_3}$$

Since $D_1 = 1$ and $D_3 = 1 - 2h^2a$

$$\frac{haD_1}{D_1} + \frac{h^5a^3}{D_2D_3} = ha \frac{D_1D_3 + (h^2a)^2}{D_2D_3} = ha \frac{(1 - 2h^2a + (h^2a)^2)}{D_2D_3}$$

But $1 - 2h^2a + (h^2a)^2 = (1 - h^2a)^2 = D_2^2$

and so

$$\frac{haD_1}{D_2} + \frac{h^5a^3}{D_2D_3} = \frac{haD_2}{D_2D_3} = \frac{haD_2}{D_3}$$

\[\text{The terms on } N_0 \text{ are given on page B-8 of the appendix.}\]
We want to prove by induction that this condition holds for any $t$, that is,

$$\frac{h a D_{t-1}}{D_t} + \frac{h a (h^2_a)_t}{D_tD_{t+1}} = \frac{h a D_t}{D_{t+1}} \quad (B-24)$$

Assume $(B-24)$ is true for some $t$. Rearranging it gives

$$h a (D_{t-1}D_{t+1} + (h^2_a)_t) = h a D_t$$

$$(h^2_a)_t = D_t^2 - D_{t-1}D_{t+1} \quad (B-25)$$

From $(B-25)$

$$(h^2_a)_{t+1} = (h^2_a)_t h^2_a$$

$$= (D_t^2 - D_{t-1}D_{t+1})h^2_a \quad (B-26)$$

We also know from $(B-18)$ that $D_t = D_{t-1}h^2aD_{t-2}$ for any $t$, so that equivalently,

$$D_t h^2a = D_{t+1} - D_{t+2} \quad (B-27)$$

and

$$-h^2aD_{t-1} = D_{t+1} - D_t \quad (B-27a)$$

So, using $(B-25)$, $(B-26)$, $(B-27)$ and $(B-27a)$,

$$(h^2_a)_{t+1} = D_t(D_{t+1} - D_{t+2}) + D_{t+1}(D_{t+1} - D_t)$$

$$= D_t D_{t+1} - D_t D_{t+2} + D_{t+1}^2 - D_{t+1}D_t$$

$$= D_{t+1}^2 - D_t D_{t+2}$$
Thus (B-25), and by rearrangement, (B-24) holds with $t$ replaced by $t+1$. This implies that the r.h.s. of (B-24) is the coefficient of $N_0$ when $t+1$ and $t$ are replaced by $T$ and $T-1$, respectively. Explicitly, this coefficient is

$$
\delta_0 = \frac{haDT}{D_T}.
$$

The solution for the other coefficients proceed similarly.

For $\frac{X_1}{p}$, the coefficient is equal to the coefficient on $N_0$ divided by $a$, or specifically

$$
\delta_1 = \frac{hDT}{D_T}.
$$

Since the remaining coefficients, $\gamma_2, \gamma_3, \gamma_4, \ldots$ follow the same pattern, we need only a general proof, similar to the preceding one to show what they are. Therefore, in general, for any $i$, where $2 < i < t < T$, we assume the following equation (B-28) holds for some $t$

$$
\frac{h^iD_{t-1}}{D_t} + \frac{h^{i+1}D_{t-1}(h^2a)(t-i+1)}{D_tD_{t+1}} = \frac{h^{i+1}D_{t-i+1}}{D_{t+1}}.
$$

Rearranging, we have

$$
h^i(D_{t-i}D_{t+1} + D_{i-1}(h^2a)(t-i+1)) = h^{i+1}D_tD_{t-i+1} \tag{B-28a}
$$

or

$$
D_{i-1}(h^2a)(t-i+1) = D_tD_{t-i+1} - D_{t-i}D_{t+1}. 
$$

Using (B-28a) but substituting $t+1$ for $t$,

$$
D_{i-1}(h^2a)(t-i+2) = D_{i-1}(h^2a)(t-i+1)h^2a \tag{B-29}
$$

$$
= (D_tD_{t-i+1} - D_{t-i}D_{t+1})h^2a
$$
But, once again, we use $D_t = D_{t-1} - h^2 aD_{t-2}$, which holds for any $t$, so

$$h^2 aD_t = D_{t+1} - D_{t+2}$$

and

$$-h^2 aD_{t-i} = D_{t-i+2} - D_{t-i+1} \cdot$$

Substituting these expressions into (B-29) yields

$$D_{i-1}(h^2 a)^{t-i+2} = D_{t-i+1} \left( D_{t+1} - D_{t+2} + D_{t+1} \left( D_{t-i+2} - D_{t-i+1} \right) \right)$$

$$= D_{t-i+1} D_{t+1} - D_{t-i+1} D_{t+2} + D_{t+1} D_{t-i+2}$$

$$+ D_{t-i+1} D_{t+1} - D_{t-i+2} D_{t-i+1} D_{t+2} \cdot$$

Therefore (B-29) and hence (B-28) holds with $t$ replaced by $t+1$. The coefficient of $\phi_i$ is the r.h.s. of (B-28) with $t = T-1$.

The last coefficient is the one on $N_T$, labor in the final period. It has already been stated to be

$$\gamma_T = \prod_{i=1}^{T} y_i = \frac{h^T}{D_T} \cdot$$

Collecting all of these terms gives an expression for labor demand in the present period as a function of last period's labor, the present and future values of the exogenous variables up to period $T-1$ and labor demand in the last period, $T$. This expression is given by:
THE SOLUTION FOR LABOR DEMAND IN THE LIMIT

The coefficients in equation (B-29) are all functions of time, since $D_t$ is a time dependent variable. In particular, for each coefficient two different time periods are important—namely, $k$, and $T$, the latter denoting the end of the firm's planning period. Intuitively, it would seem that these coefficients should not depend upon $T$. It does turn out that the coefficient on labor demanded far into the future (where "far into the future" means as $T \to \infty$) approaches 0 and the coefficients on the exogenous variables $k$ periods in the future only depend upon the $k$th time period and no other. This section will derive this explicitly.

We begin by showing that the coefficient on $N_T$ does go to zero as $T$. From equation (B-16),

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \prod_{i=1}^{T} y_i = \lim_{T \to \infty} h_T^T. $$

Dividing this on top and bottom by $d_1^T$, and using equation (B-20), the solution for $D_T$, gives

$$\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{\left(\frac{h}{d_1}\right)^T}{c_1 + c_2 \left(\frac{d_2}{d_1}\right)^T}. $$

\(B-30\)
By the definition of \( h, d_1, \) and \( d_2, \) it follows that \( h/d_1, \)
and \( d_2/d_1 \) are each less than 1. Therefore, this limit, which
is the coefficient of \( N_T \) as \( T \to \infty, \) is 0.

In a similar fashion are found the values of the coefficients
on \( -\frac{X_1}{\phi}, -\frac{X_2}{\phi}, \ldots -\frac{X_k}{\phi}. \) For example, for the coefficient
on \( N_0 \) and \( -\frac{X_1}{\phi}, \)

\[
\lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{D_{T-1}}{D_T} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{c_1 d_1 T^{-1} + c_2 d_2 T^{-1}}{c_1 d_1 + c_2 d_2} = \lim_{T \to \infty} \frac{c_1 - c_2 \left(\frac{d_2}{d_1}\right)^T}{c_1 d_1 - c_2 d_2 \left(\frac{d_2}{d_1}\right)^T} = \frac{1}{d_1} = \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{1-4h^2a}}
\]

Thus, the coefficients on \( N_0 \) and \( -\frac{X_1}{\phi}, \) are

\[
\delta_0 = \frac{2ha}{1+\sqrt{1-4h^2a}} \quad (B-31)
\]
and
\[
\delta_1 = \frac{2h}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}}.
\]

Analogously, it may be shown that for the coefficients \(\delta_2, \ldots, \delta_k\), the solutions are:
\[
\delta_2 = \left(\frac{2h}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}}\right)^2
\]
\[
\delta_k = \left(\frac{2h}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}}\right)^k.
\]
The final form of the equation may then be written as
\[
N_1 = \frac{2ha}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}} N_0 - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2h}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}}\right)^k \frac{x_k}{\phi} \tag{B-32}
\]
or, after substituting in for the exogenous variables,
\[
N_1 = \frac{2ha}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}} N_0 - \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2h}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}}\right)^k
\]
\[
\cdot \frac{1}{\phi} \cdot b_1 - w_k + d_1 q_k
\]
where \(b_1 = bq\)
and \(d_1 = -dq\).

These coefficients can be shown to be less than one. An interesting question, and one which serves as a check on the coefficients, is what happens as \(\phi\), the adjustment cost
parameter, gets larger and larger, eventually going to infinite cost. It might be expected that as the cost of changing the labor force becomes inordinately expensive, it will then stay constant at $N_0$. To show this, remember the definition of $h$, which is

$$h = \frac{1}{2 + r + \frac{c_q}{\phi}}.$$

As $\phi \to \infty$, $h = \frac{1}{2 + r}$, which, in turn, leads to the following:

$$\frac{2ha}{1 + \sqrt{1 - 4h^2a}} = \frac{1}{2(1+r)(2+r)} = \frac{2+2r}{2+r} = \frac{2+2r}{2+r} \frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2}} \frac{1}{(2+r)^2}.$$

Also, since $\frac{1}{\phi} \to 0$ as $\phi \to \infty$, the coefficients on the $X_k$ terms all go to zero. This means that $N_1 = N_0$. 
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APPENDIX C

THE REGRESSION EQUATIONS FOR THE OUTPUT MODEL

To estimate the labor demand equation given by equation (13), we had to form series on expected output by industry. This section presents the results of estimating the three-equation system described by equations (14), (16), and (17) using ordinary least squares (with a correction for autocorrelation of the residuals when necessary). Following the presentation of the regression estimates, a brief discussion of the results is provided.

GENERATING ESTIMATES OF EXPECTED OUTPUT

To generate the (rational) forecasts described earlier, equations are estimated for total demand, imports, relative prices, and GNP. Forecasts of domestic demand are then computed as the difference between the forecasts of total demand and imports (equation (12)). The actual regression equations which are used to generate these forecasts are presented on pages C-4 to C-15.

The first equation for each industry describes the determinants of the total demand for output of that industry. Total demand depends upon real GNP (a scale variable), lags in GNP (which are included to capture cyclical factors), the relative price of the industry's products, a time trend, and dummy variables to correct for seasonal factors.  

1In addition, a number of dummy variables were used to capture particular events affecting an industry's output, imports, or price. For example, imports in the paper industry were greatly affected by a Canadian paper strike in the fourth quarter of 1975. As expected, the coefficient on the dummy variable for this is negatively related to industry imports and quite significantly so. For forecasting purposes, it is important to include these dummy variables, since their exclusion is likely to result in a poorly fitted equation and poor forecasts.
This general form seems to have worked well. In every industry but two (26 and 31), the level of GNP has a significantly positive effect. Cyclicality, represented by the change in GNP over one or four periods or by various lags in GNP, also has strong positive effects in most industries.

Since the logarithmic form is used, the coefficients give the elasticities directly. For example, as GNP increases by one percent, total demand for the products of industry 22 increases by approximately 1.14 percent. In most cases, elasticities are near unity (although industry 37 exhibits a far higher elasticity). Similarly, the elasticity of demand with respect to cyclical factors is quite plausible in every industry and, on average, is also close to one.

Another influence on industry demand is the industry's price relative to a price of all manufactured goods. The response to this price is a measure of substitution between the products in one industry and all other manufacturing industries. In every industry but one (industry 22), the price measure exhibits a significantly negative effect on industry demand. For most industries, the simple relative price term works well. In four industries (26, 30, 34, and 35), an average of relative prices over four periods is used and in one industry (33), an average over eight periods is used. This averaging represents a price change that takes several quarters to take effect. The elasticities also are plausible in magnitude, most being less than or equal to one.

Since imports and relative prices are exogenous variables in the model, the general form for each was kept as simple as possible. Both sets of equations were estimated using a distributed lag model (up to two lags), with a time trend, and seasonal dummy variables included. All price equations
had $R^2$ above .80 and most were over .90. The import equations generally had somewhat more unexplained variance, although most had $R^2$ above .85.

The last forecasting equation to be estimated is the GNP equation. It, too, was estimated as a two quarter distributed lag with a time trend and seasonal dummy variables included. The specification worked well, and the equation has an $R^2$ of .986.
INDUSTRY 22 - TEXTILE MILL PRODUCTS

1. **Total Output**

\[
\ln \frac{\text{SHIP}+ \text{INV}+M}{\text{WPI}} = -3.817 + 1.142 \ln(\text{RGNP}) + 0.695 \ln (\text{RGNP}) - 0.005 \text{ TIME} - 0.004 D1 + 0.0083 D2 - 0.0599 D3
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&(-1.14) \quad (3.41) \quad (1.93) \\
&(-1.34) \quad (-0.06) \quad (1.07) \quad (-8.57)
\end{align*}
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977

R\(^2\) : 0.838

DW : 1.264

p : 0.863

2. **Real Imports**

\[
\ln \frac{M}{\text{WPI}} = 0.346 + 0.705 \ln \frac{M(-1)}{\text{WPI}(-1)} - 0.0026 \text{ TIME}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\quad (2.67) \quad (6.23) \quad \text{(-1.54)}
\end{align*}
\]

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977

R\(^2\) : 0.621

DW : 2.06

3. **Relative Price**

\[
\ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = 0.017 + 1.458 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-1)}{\text{GWPI}(-1)} - 0.708 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-2)}{\text{GWPI}(-2)} - 0.001 \text{ TIME} - 0.012 D1 + 0.002 D2 - 0.007 D3
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&\quad (1.79) \quad (12.02) \quad (-5.87) \\
&\quad (-3.11) \quad (-1.64) \quad (0.33) \quad (-0.93)
\end{align*}
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977

R\(^2\) : 0.958

DW : 2.09

NOTE: t-statistics are listed in parentheses below the coefficients.
INDUSTRY 23 - APPAREL AND OTHER TEXTILE PRODUCTS

1. Total Output

\[
\ln \frac{\text{SHIP} + \text{INV} + M}{\text{WPI}} = -2.178 + 0.931 \ln(\text{RGNP}) + 0.924 \ln \frac{\text{RGNP}}{\text{RGNP}(-4)} \\
\quad + 0.856 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} - 0.019 \text{ TIME} + 0.011 \text{ D1} \\
\quad (-2.77) \quad (2.34) \quad (1.80) \quad (-4) \quad (-3.50) \quad (1.40) \\
\quad + 0.032 \text{ D2} + 0.033 \text{ D3} \\
\quad (3.64) \quad (4.13)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
\[R^2: 0.717\]
\[\text{DW}: 2.06\]
\[\rho: 0.865\]

2. Real Imports

\[
\ln \frac{\text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = 3.152 + 0.565 \ln \frac{\text{M}(-1)}{\text{WPI}(-1)} + 0.014 \text{ TIME} - 0.003 \text{ D1} \\
\quad (-2.83) \quad (3.84) \quad (2.79) \quad (-0.08) \\
\quad + 0.119 \text{ D2} + 0.318 \text{ D3} \\
\quad (2.13) \quad (6.50)
\]

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977
\[R^2: 0.966\]
\[\text{DW}: 1.93\]

3. Relative Price

\[
\ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = 0.020 + 1.508 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-1)}{\text{GWPI}(-1)} - 0.582 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-2)}{\text{GWPI}(-2)} \\
\quad (-2.24) \quad (10.57) \quad (-4.29) \\
\quad - 0.008 \text{ TIME} - 0.019 \text{ D1} - 0.009 \text{ D2} - 0.007 \text{ D3} \\
\quad (-2.02) \quad (-2.1) \quad (-1.60) \quad (-0.84)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
\[R^2: 0.995\]
\[\text{DW}: 2.12\]
\[\rho: -0.45\]
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INDUSTRY 26 - PAPER AND ALLIED PRODUCTS

1. **Total Output**

\[
\ln \frac{\text{SHIP} + \text{INV} + \text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = -5.001 + 1.308 \ln \frac{\text{RGNP}}{\text{RGNP(-1)}} - 1.059 \ln(\text{AP4}) \\
\qquad \quad (-2.07) \quad (3.72) \quad (-2.63) \\
\quad - 0.003 \text{ TIME} + 0.019 \text{ D1} + 0.035 \text{ D2} - 0.004 \text{ D3} \\
\quad \quad \quad (-1.25) \quad (2.40) \quad (4.31) \quad (-0.57)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977  
\(R^2\) : 0.811  
\(\rho\) : 1.593  
\(\rho\) : 0.625

2. **Real Imports**

\[
\ln \frac{M}{\text{WPI}} = 0.773 + 0.693 \ln \frac{M(-1)}{\text{WPI(-1)}} - 0.329 \ln \frac{M(-2)}{\text{WPI(-2)}} \\
\qquad \quad (5.45) \quad (2.27) \quad (-2.53) \\
\quad + 0.006 \text{ TIME} - 0.085 \text{ D1} - 0.020 \text{ D2} - 0.132 \text{ D3} \\
\quad \quad \quad (4.60) \quad (-2.86) \quad (-0.72) \quad (-4.35) \\
\quad - 0.300 \text{ D5*} \\
\quad \quad \quad (-4.95)
\]

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977  
\(R^2\) : 0.852  
\(\rho\) : 1.725

3. **Relative Price**

\[
\ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = .011 + .646 \ln \frac{\text{WPI(-1)}}{\text{GWPI(-1)}} - .03 \text{ DUM73**} \\
\quad \quad \quad (3.46) \quad (7.68) \quad (-3.90)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977  
\(R^2\) : 0.83  
\(\rho\) : 2.30

* Dummy variable used to represent a Canadian paper strike; D5 = 1 in Q4 1975, 0 elsewhere.

** Dummy variable used to account for large drop in relative price of paper, it may reflect the effects of price controls; DUM73 = 1 in Q1 to Q4 1973, 0 elsewhere.
INDUSTRY 30 - RUBBER AND PLASTICS PRODUCTS

1. Total Output

\[
\ln \frac{\text{SHIP} + \text{INV} + \text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = -3.926 + 1.086 \ln(\text{RGNP}) + 0.918 \ln\frac{\text{RGNP}}{\text{RGNP}(-4)}
\]

\[- 0.971 \ln(\text{AP4}) + 0.014 D1 + 0.050 D2 \]

\[- 0.019 D3 \]

\(R^2 \approx 0.776\)

\(DW \approx 1.856\)

\(\rho \approx 0.738\)

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977

2. Real Imports

\[
\ln \frac{M}{\text{WPI}} = -0.117 + 0.732 \ln \frac{M(-1)}{\text{WPI}(-1)} + 0.007 \text{TIME} + 0.201 D1
\]

\[+ 0.181 D2 + 0.119 D3 \]

\(R^2 \approx 0.920\)

\(DW \approx 1.88\)

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977

3. Related Price

\[
\ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = 0.011 + 1.220 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-1)}{\text{GWPI}(-1)} - 0.356 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-2)}{\text{GWPI}(-2)}
\]

\[- 0.0007 \text{TIME} - 0.021 D1 - 0.002 D2 - 0.0008 D3 \]

\(R^2 \approx 0.955\)

\(DW \approx 2.25\)
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INDUSTRY 31 – LEATHER AND LEATHER PRODUCTS

1. **Total Output**

\[
\ln \frac{\text{SHIP}^+ \text{INV}^+ \text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = 2.718 + 1.294 \ln \frac{\text{RGNP}}{\text{RGNP}(-4)} - 0.649 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}}
\]

\[
- 0.015 \text{ TIME} + 0.052 \text{ D1} + 0.038 \text{ D2} + 0.006 \text{ D3}
\]

\[
-6.66 \quad (3.43) \quad (2.23) \quad (0.39)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977

\[R^2: 0.684\]

\[DW: 2.16\]

\[\rho: 0.628\]

2. **Real Imports**

\[
\ln \frac{\text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = 0.628 + 0.476 \ln \frac{\text{M}(-1)}{\text{WPI}(-1)} + 0.440 \ln \frac{\text{M}(-2)}{\text{WPI}(-2)}
\]

\[
+ 0.058 \text{ D1} + 0.015 \text{ D2} + 0.074 \text{ D3}
\]

\[
(1.26) \quad (0.37) \quad (1.60)
\]

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977

\[R^2: 0.845\]

\[DW: 2.17\]

3. **Relative Price**

\[
\ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = 0.019 + 1.485 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-1)}{\text{GWPI}(-1)} - 0.612 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-2)}{\text{GWPI}(-2)}
\]

\[
- 0.0006 \text{ TIME} - 0.014 \text{ D1} + 0.004 \text{ D2} - 0.020 \text{ D3}
\]

\[
(-1.54) \quad (-1.43) \quad (0.40) \quad (-2.01)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977

\[R^2: 0.939\]

\[DW: 2.19\]
INDUSTRY 32 - STONE, CLAY, AND GLASS PRODUCTS

1. Total Output

\[
\ln \frac{\text{SHIP} + \text{INV} + \text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = -10.553 + 0.877 \ln(\text{RGNP}) + 1.099 \ln \frac{\text{RGNP}}{\text{RGNP}(-1)}
\]

\[-0.519 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} - 0.044 \text{ D1} + 0.041 \text{ D2}
\]

\[
+ 0.025 \text{ D3}
\]

\[-(1.89) \text{ (5.99)} \text{ (5.16)}
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
R²: 0.879
DW: 2.01
ρ: 0.977

2. Real Imports

\[
\ln \frac{\text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = 0.020 + 0.837 \ln \frac{\text{M}(-1)}{\text{WPI}(-1)} - 0.019 \text{ D1} + 0.134 \text{ D2}
\]

\[
+ 0.072 \text{ D3}
\]

\[-(0.39) \text{ (8.66)} \text{ (2.71)} \text{ (1.50)}
\]

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1969
R²: 0.73
DW: 2.19

3. Relative Price

\[
\ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = 0.007 + 1.408 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-1)}{\text{GWPI}(-1)} - 0.526 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-2)}{\text{GWPI}(-2)}
\]

\[-0.0008 \text{ D1} - 0.006 \text{ D2} - 0.013 \text{ D3}
\]

\[(-0.13) \text{ (-1.05)} \text{ (-2.18)}
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
R²: 0.884
DW: 2.09
INDUSTRY 33 - PRIMARY METALS

1. Total Output

\[
\ln \frac{\text{SHIP+ INV+M}}{\text{WPI}} = -3.63 + 1.22 \ln(\text{RGNP(-1)}) - 2.53 \ln(\text{AP8}) \\
\quad (2.19) (5.15) (-4.79) \\
\quad + .077 D1 + .07 D2 - .014 D3 + .1 D71^* \\
\quad (1.22) (4.40) (-1.03) (4.89)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
\[R^2 : .791\]
\[DW : 1.40\]
\[\rho : .59\]

2. Real Imports

\[
\ln \frac{M}{\text{WPI}} = 1.34 + .452 \ln \frac{\text{M(-1)}}{\text{WPI(-1)}} - .118 D1 + .04 D2 \\
\quad (3.55) (2.89) (-1.93) (.625) \\
\quad - .031 D3 - .145 DQ^{**} \\
\quad (-.499) (-2.52)
\]

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977
\[R^2 : .584\]
\[DW : 1.79\]

3. Relative Price

\[
\ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = -.005 + 1.34 \ln \frac{\text{WPI(-1)}}{\text{GWPI(-1)}} - .687 \ln \frac{\text{WPI(-2)}}{\text{GWPI(-2)}} \\
\quad (.74) (10.97) (-5.64) \\
\quad + .0009 \text{TIME} \\
\quad (3.05)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
\[R^2 : .886\]
\[DW : 1.927\]
\[\rho : .28\]

* Dummy variable used to represent inventory adjustment because of labor negotiations; D71 = 1 in Q1 and Q2 1971,-1 in Q3 and Q4 1971, 0 elsewhere.

** Dummy variable used to represent quota on imports from 1969 to 1971; DQ = 1 in Q1 to Q4 for 1969, 1970, and 1971; 0 elsewhere.
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INDUSTRY 34 - FABRICATED METAL PRODUCTS

1. Total Output

\[ \ln \left( \frac{SHIP + INV + M}{WPI} \right) = -5.264 + 1.439 \ln(\text{RGNP}(-1)) \]
\[ + 0.921 \ln \left( \frac{\text{RGNP}}{\text{RGNP}(-4)} \right) - 1.577 \ln(\text{AP4}) \]
\[ - 0.0086 \text{ TIME} + 0.017 D1 + 0.063 D2 + 0.003 D3 \]
\[ (-2.23) \quad (4.18) \quad (4.11) \quad (-0.30) \]
\[ -3.91 \quad 1.80 \quad 6.30 \quad 0.37 \]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977

\[ R^2 : 0.911 \]

\[ DW : 2.01 \]

\[ \rho : 0.219 \]

2. Real Imports

\[ \ln \left( \frac{M}{WPI} \right) = 0.065 + 0.686 \ln \left( \frac{M(-1)}{WPI(-1)} \right) + 0.007 \text{ TIME} - 0.004 D1 \]
\[ + 0.089 D2 - 0.003 D3 \]
\[ (0.99) \quad (4.98) \quad (1.78) \quad (-0.08) \]
\[ (-1.81) \quad (-0.05) \]

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977

\[ R^2 : 0.877 \]

\[ DW : 2.03 \]

3. Relative Price

\[ \ln \left( \frac{WPI}{GWPI} \right) = 0.005 + 1.303 \ln \left( \frac{WPI(-1)}{GWPI(-1)} \right) - 0.498 \ln \left( \frac{WPI(-2)}{GWPI(-2)} \right) \]
\[ - 0.009 D1 - 0.0005 D2 - 0.0006 D3 \]
\[ (1.13) \quad (8.70) \quad (-3.32) \]
\[ (-1.49) \quad (-0.07) \quad (-0.09) \]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977

\[ R^2 : 0.816 \]

\[ DW : 2.34 \]
INDUSTRY 35 - MACHINERY, EXCEPT ELECTRICAL

1. Total Output

\[
\ln \frac{\text{SHIP} + \text{INV} + \text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = -11.513 + 0.778 \ln(\text{RGNP}) + 0.833 \ln(\text{RGNP}(-1)) + 0.693 \ln(\text{RGNP}(-2)) - 1.400 \ln(\text{AP4}) + 0.040 D1 + 0.051 D2 - 0.051 D3
\]

\[\text{(1.83) (1.85) (1.55) (3.35) (1.83) (1.85)}\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
\[R^2 : 0.888\]
\[\text{DW} : 0.99\]
\[\rho : 0.963\]

2. Real Imports

\[
\ln \frac{\text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = 0.384 + 0.346 \ln \frac{\text{M}(-1)}{\text{WPI}(-1)} + 0.332 \ln \frac{\text{M}(-2)}{\text{WPI}(-2)} + 0.007 \text{TIME} + 0.069 D1 - 0.129 D2 - 0.006 D3
\]

\[\text{(1.74) (1.97) (1.88) (1.63) (1.50) (-2.71) (-0.12)}\]

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977
\[R^2 : 0.90\]
\[\text{DW} : 1.83\]

3. Relative Price

\[
\ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = 0.009 + 1.440 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-1)}{\text{GWPI}(-1)} - 0.523 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-2)}{\text{GWPI}(-2)} - 0.016 D1 - 0.009 D2 - 0.011 D3
\]

\[\text{(2.20) (9.70) (-3.52) (-2.71) (-1.56) (-2.01)}\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
\[R^2 : 0.920\]
\[\text{DW} : 2.34\]
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INDUSTRY 36 - ELECTRICAL EQUIPMENT AND SUPPLIES

1. Total Output

\[
\ln \frac{\text{SHIP} + \text{INV} + M}{\text{WPI}} = -13.741 + 1.218 \ln(\text{RGNP}) + 0.628 \ln(\text{RGNP}(-1))
\]
\[
+ 0.756 \ln(\text{RGNP}(-2)) - 0.536 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}}
\]
\[
- 0.035 D1 - 0.002 D2 - 0.060 D3
\]
\[
(-3.35) (2.51) (1.08)
\]
\[
(1.52) (-1.32)
\]
\[
(-3.38) (-0.20) (-6.01)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
R^2 : 0.78
DW : 1.48
p : 0.942

2. Real Imports

\[
\ln \frac{M}{\text{WPI}} = 0.351 + 1.070 \ln \frac{M(-1)}{\text{WPI}(-1)} - 0.307 \ln \frac{M(-2)}{\text{WPI}(-2)}
\]
\[
+ 0.007 \text{TIME} - 0.155 D1 + 0.103 D2 - 0.008 D3
\]
\[
(2.49) (6.02) (-1.75)
\]
\[
(1.95) (-4.21) (2.14) (-0.20)
\]

Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977
R^2 : 0.965
DW : 2.06

3. Relative Price

\[
\ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = 0.014 + 1.398 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-1)}{\text{GWPI}(-1)} - 0.491 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-2)}{\text{GWPI}(-2)}
\]
\[
- 0.0007 \text{TIME} - 0.016 D1 - 0.010 D2 - 0.009 D3
\]
\[
(1.51) (9.02) (-3.16)
\]
\[
(-1.41) (-2.81) (-1.75) (-1.66)
\]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
R^2 : 0.988
DW : 2.28
INDUSTRY 37 - TRANSPORTATION EQUIPMENT

1. Total Output

\[ \ln \frac{\text{SHIP+ INV+M}}{\text{WPI}} = -16.586 + 3.177 \ln(\text{RGNP}) + 1.474 \ln \frac{\text{RGNP}}{\text{RGNP}(-1)} \]
\[ \quad - 0.551 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} - 0.015 \text{ TIME} - 0.017 \text{ D1} \]
\[ \quad + 0.030 \text{ D2} - 0.127 \text{ D3} \]
\[ \text{Range: Q1 1963 to Q4 1977 } \]
\[ R^2 : 0.831 \]
\[ DW : 1.81 \]
\[ \rho : 0.361 \]

2. Real Import

\[ \ln \frac{\text{M}}{\text{WPI}} = 0.942 + 0.346 \ln \frac{\text{M}(-1)}{\text{WPI}(-1)} + 0.302 \ln \frac{\text{M}(-2)}{\text{WPI}(-2)} \]
\[ \quad + 0.006 \text{ TIME} + 0.056 \text{ D1} + 0.065 \text{ D2} - 0.186 \text{ D3} \]
\[ \text{Range: Q1 1969 to Q4 1977 } \]
\[ R^2 : 0.886 \]
\[ DW : 1.61 \]
\[ \rho : 0.437 \]

3. Relative Price

\[ \ln \frac{\text{WPI}}{\text{GWPI}} = 0.032 + 1.530 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-1)}{\text{GWPI}(-1)} - 0.613 \ln \frac{\text{WPI}(-2)}{\text{GWPI}(-2)} \]
\[ \quad - 0.0004 \text{ TIME} - 0.053 \text{ D1} - 0.032 \text{ D2} - 0.035 \text{ D3} \]
\[ \text{Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977 } \]
\[ R^2 : 0.977 \]
\[ DW : 2.15 \]
REAL GROSS NATIONAL PRODUCT

\[ \ln(RGNP) = 1.048 + 1.346 \ln(RGNP(-1)) - 0.5 \ln(RGNP(-2)) \]
\[ + 0.001 \ \text{TIME} + 0.011 \ D1 + 0.0035 \ D2 + 0.008 \ D3 \]
\[ (2.09) \quad (3.84) \quad (-3.25) \]
\[ (2.17) \quad (2.42) \quad (.784) \quad (1.76) \]

Range: Q1 1968 to Q4 1977
\[ R^2 = .986 \]
\[ DW = 2.22 \]
APPENDIX D

IMPRECISION ON THE MEASUREMENT OF $b_4$
The empirical estimates of the coefficient on the lagged dependent variable have been found to vary over a greater range than the theoretical model would suggest. According to the model, the value of this coefficient should be greater than one since it is composed of the sum of 1 plus the interest rate. For the eight industries where $b_3$ was found to be significant (which therefore implies that expectations of future output matter) the coefficient on last period's labor was estimated to be greater than one in four industries (23, 26, 32, 36), and it was found to be less than one in the remaining four (22, 33, 34, 35).

This breakdown is somewhat artificial because a simple t-test on this coefficient by industry shows that in almost every case (industry 33 is the exception once autocorrelation is taken account of), $b_4$ is not significantly different from 1. This is true for values of $b_4$ both below and above 1. It would appear, therefore that there is a great deal of random error associated with estimating the value of 1 plus the real interest rate.

The lack of precision of $b_4$, the estimate of $1+r$, may be illustrated through the construction of confidence intervals

---

1This discussion will focus on estimates obtained from either the original estimation or the estimates corrected for autocorrelation. The exception to this will be for industry 35 where relative wage variables appear to be useful additional explanatory variables and are necessary for the convergence of the nonlinear routine.
for $b_4$. We assume that $l+r$ would be equal for all industries so that the $b_4$'s should also be equal. We shall construct the interval around an average $b_4$ over the eight industries listed previously. To get an approximate standard error for the average of $b_4$ across industries, we proceed as if the coefficient had no correlation across industries and approximate the distribution of the average $b_4$ with the normal distribution.\(^1\) Using these assumptions, the standard error of $b_4$ is formed as:

$$
\sigma(b_4) = \frac{1}{n} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{8} \sigma_i^2(b_4)}
$$

where $\sigma(b_4)$ is the standard error of $b_4$

$\sigma_i^2$ is the variance of $b_4$ for industry $i$.

The 95 percent confidence interval may then be formed as:

$$
\bar{b}_4 \pm \sigma(b_4) \times 1.96.
$$

It turns out that $\bar{b}_4 = .86$ and $\sigma(b_4) = .126$ so that the interval has .61 as a lower limit and 1.1 as an upper limit.

Thus, the existence of values of $b_4$ below 1 is explicable, in part, by pure sampling error. There still may remain some bias in $b_4$. The cause of the bias is discussed in the next section.

\(^1\)On a theoretical level, there is no need to assume independence between the $b_4$'s across industries. A joint estimating procedure, such as the seemingly unrelated regression model, could be run with $b_4$ constrained to be equal across all industries. On a practical level, however, getting the estimates would be extremely difficult and so is not attempted here.
Other Possible Problems with $b_4$

There may be bias in $b_4$ due to the use of only eight forecasts in the nonlinear regression. If more distant forecasts were important as determinants of labor demand, their exclusion would lead to omitted variable bias. In particular, since the forecasts are all positively correlated, their omission would cause $b_3$ to be biased upward. Further, if the estimates of $b_3$ and $b_4$ are negatively correlated (and according to the theory, they are since $b_3 = \frac{\lambda_1}{\alpha}$ and $b_4 = \alpha$), then a higher value for $b_3$ would result in a lower value for $b_4$. In fact, the estimated covariances for $b_3$ and $b_4$ obtained from the nonlinear regressions (where $b_3$ is significant) confirm this negative correlation.

To determine whether this hypothesis was reasonable, two industries were chosen and further expectations of output were formed. The two industries were 22 (textiles) and 34 (fabricated metals). Expectations up to 16 periods in the future were formed and included in the labor demand regression.

For industry 34, which did not need an autocorrelation correction, the extra leads seemed to create negligible differences in estimated coefficients. Including expectations up to eight quarters in the future seems sufficient.

For industry 22, which did need an autocorrelation correction, the resulting estimates were somewhat different when 12 leads were included. (The equation when 16 leads were used was virtually the same as for 12.) The results for 12 leads are given below:
\[ N_{t+1} = 244.04 + 2.24 \sum_{i=1}^{13} .779^i Q_{t+1}^i + (.779)(.736)N_t^{(2.89)} -2.21(t+1) -3.11 D_1 + 6.69 D_2 + 12.1 D_3 \]
\[ (-1.58) (-.86) (1.64) (3.47) \]
\[ \rho = .774 \]

Comparing this regression with the one for industry 22 given in table 5, it is clear that the major differences have more to do with the precision of the estimates than the estimates themselves. The coefficient, \( b_2 \), is similar, going from 2.67 to 2.24, but its t-statistic moves from under 1 to over 5. The coefficient, \( b_3 \), is also close to the previous result (moving from .751 to .779), but its t-statistic is now 9.52. The coefficient of greatest interest in this section, \( b_4 \), goes from about .64 to about .74. Although in relative terms this is a fairly large increase, statistically the increase is insignificant. Nevertheless, the addition of more expectation variables does change the coefficient in a direction consistent with economic theory.
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