Growing Like India

The Unequal Effects of Service-Led Growth

Tianyu Fan, Michael Peters and Fabrizio Zilibotti

Services and Structural Transformation Workshop - World Bank February 1, 2023

Motivation

- Services play large and growing role in poor countries today
- Two views:



Motivation

- Services play large and growing role in poor countries today
- Two views:



- This paper: Welfare effects of service-led growth
 - Focus: Heterogeneous effects across space and the income distribution
 - Approach: Equilibrium Development Accounting
 - Distinguish demand from productivity using data on employment, expenditure ... and a spatial equilibrium model





Growth without Industrialization in the Developing World



The Service Sector in India



The Service Sector in India



Productivity growth in consumer services:

- 1. Important role for rise in living standards
- 2. Main beneficiaries: rich consumers in urban locations

Outline for today's talk

- Theoretical Framework
- Measurement and Estimation
- Quantification of Unequal Welfare Effects

Measuring Productivity in Consumer Services

Suppose region *r* produces a non-tradable good for local consumers

$$Y_{rt} = x_{rFt}^{\lambda_F} x_{rGt}^{\lambda_G} \left(\mathscr{A}_{rt} H_{rCSt} \right)^{\lambda_{CS}}$$



• Equilibrium Prices:

$$P_{rt} \propto p_{rFt}^{\lambda_F} p_{rGt}^{\lambda_G} w_{rt}^{\lambda_{CS}} \mathscr{A}_{rt}^{-\lambda_{CS}}$$

- Problems:
 - Unobserved local prices
 - Input-output matrix (λ_j)
 - Unobserved quality differences

- Idea: observe consumers' spending shares on CS value added
- Suppose preferences were homothetic:



- Idea: observe consumers' spending shares on CS value added
- Suppose preferences were homothetic:



- Idea: observe consumers' spending shares on CS value added
- Suppose preferences were homothetic:



- Idea: observe consumers' spending shares on CS value added
- Suppose preferences were homothetic:



- Idea: observe consumers' spending shares on CS value added
- Suppose preferences were homothetic:



- Idea: observe consumers' spending shares on CS value added
- Suppose preferences were non-homothetic:



- Idea: observe consumers' spending shares on CS value added
- Suppose preferences were non-homothetic:



- Idea: observe consumers' spending shares on CS value added
- Suppose preferences were non-homothetic:



- Idea: observe consumers' spending shares on CS value added
- Suppose preferences were non-homothetic:



- Quantitative version of this intuition
 - General equilibrium trade model
 - Continuum of goods
 - Heterogeneous consumers with different human capital *q*
 - 400 Districts
 - Regional trade costs
- Equilibrium: CS employment share = Local CS expenditure share

$$\frac{H_{rCSt}}{H_{rt}} = \omega_{CS} - \overline{\nu}_{CS} \left(\frac{E_{rt}\left[q\right] w_{rt}^{1-\omega_{CS}}}{P_{rFt}^{\omega_{F}} P_{rGt}^{\omega_{G}}}\right)^{-\varepsilon} A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon}$$

- Quantitative version of this intuition
 - General equilibrium trade model
 - Continuum of goods
 - Heterogeneous consumers with different human capital *q*
 - 400 Districts
 - Regional trade costs
- Equilibrium: CS employment share = Local CS expenditure share

$$\frac{H_{rCSt}}{H_{rt}} = \omega_{CS} - \overline{\nu}_{CS} \left(\frac{E_{rt} \left[q \right] w_{rt}^{1-\omega_{CS}}}{P_{rFt}^{\omega_{F}} P_{rGt}^{\omega_{G}}} \right)^{-\varepsilon} A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon}$$

Income effect

High wages Local human capital Cheap food and goods

- Quantitative version of this intuition
 - General equilibrium trade model
 - Continuum of goods
 - Heterogeneous consumers with different human capital *q*
 - 400 Districts
 - Regional trade costs
- Equilibrium: CS employment share = Local CS expenditure share

$$\frac{H_{rCSt}}{H_{rt}} = \omega_{CS} - \overline{\nu}_{CS} \left(\begin{array}{c} E_{rt} \left[q \right] w_{rt}^{1-\omega_{CS}} \\ P_{rFt}^{\omega_{F}} P_{rGt}^{\omega_{G}} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ P_{rFt}^{-\omega_{F}} P_{rGt}^{-\omega_{F}} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCS}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCS}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCS}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCS}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCS}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCS}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCSt}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rCS}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \end{array} \right)^{-\varepsilon} \left(\begin{array}{c} A_{rCS}^{-\omega_{CS}\varepsilon} \\ A_{rC$$

Income effect

High wages Local human capital Cheap food and goods Service-led growth High CS productivity

- Quantitative version of this intuition
 - General equilibrium trade model
 - Continuum of goods
 - Heterogeneous consumers with different human capital *q*
 - 400 Districts
 - Regional trade costs
- Equilibrium: CS employment share = Local CS expenditure share



Outline

- Theoretical Framework
- Measurement and Estimation
- Quantification of Unequal Welfare Effects

- National Sample Surveys: 1987 2011; Micro survey; 400 districts
 - Earnings
 - Sectoral employment patterns
 - Schooling \longrightarrow Human capital in region *r* (using Mincerian returns)
- Survey on household expenditure
 - Expenditure shares to estimate Engel elasticity ε
- Economic Census (EC) and Survey of Service Firms (SSF)
 - Allocate service workers to Consumer Services and Producer Services (= Goods!)

Estimates of Consumer Service Productivity

• Recover estimates of $\{A_{rF1987}, A_{rG1987}, A_{rCS1987}\}_r$ and $\{A_{rF2011}, A_{rG2011}, A_{rCS2011}\}_r$

The urban CS productivity premium





Estimates of Consumer Service Productivity

• Recover estimates of $\{A_{rF1987}, A_{rG1987}, A_{rCS1987}\}_r$ and $\{A_{rF2011}, A_{rG2011}, A_{rCS2011}\}_r$



Service-led growth: 1987-2011





Other Sectors

Outline

- Theoretical Framework
- Measurement and Estimation
- Quantification of Unequal Welfare Effects

- Welfare effects of rising CS productivity
- Money metric: General equilibrium equivalent variation

"By how much could we change individuals' income in 2011 to make them indifferent between status quo and a situation where CS productivity had not grown since 1987?"

$$\mathscr{V}(qw_{r2011}(1+\boldsymbol{\varpi}_{q}), \mathbf{P}_{r2011}) \equiv \mathscr{V}\left(qw_{r}^{A_{CS1987}}, \mathbf{P}_{r}^{A_{rCS1987}}\right)$$

- Three concepts
 - 1. Individual heterogeneity: Welfare across income ladder
 - 2. Regional Welfare: Utilitarian welfare by region
 - 3. Aggregate Welfare: Pop-weighted average of utilitarian welfare

Individual heterogeneity: Income distribution



Growth in consumer services is pro-rich

Individual heterogeneity: Income distribution

Spatial heterogeneity: Urbanization quintiles



- Growth in consumer services is pro-rich
- Growth in consumer services benefits cities

Individual heterogeneity: Income distribution

Spatial heterogeneity: Urbanization quintiles



- Growth in consumer services is pro-rich
- Growth in agriculture is pro-poor

Growth in consumer services benefits cities

Individual heterogeneity: Income distribution

Spatial heterogeneity: Urbanization quintiles



- Growth in consumer services is pro-rich
- Growth in agriculture is pro-poor

- Growth in consumer services benefits cities
- Growth in agriculture benefits rural locations

5th

Aggregate Welfare Effects



• Large aggregate welfare effect of prod. growth in CS ($\approx 21\%$)

Conclusion

- Growth of service sector: cause of consequence of growth?
- India 1987-2011: Substantial growth in productivity of consumer services

- Pro-rich

- Particularly salient for urban consumers
- Premature De-Industrialization" necessarily bad?
- Important lingering questions:
 - **Determinants** of CS productivity growth? Marketization?
 - Are these patterns representative of the developing world today?
 - Gender inequality during the structure transformation