

Lecture 6

Economic Growth: Human Capital

Eric Doviak

Economic Growth and Economic Fluctuations

Why Study Other Growth Models?

- Because the Solow Model comes up short.
- Recall from Lecture 2 that in the Long-Run:
 - firms hire labor up to the point where the wage equals price times marginal product of labor (MPL): $w = p \cdot \text{MPL}$
 - firms hire capital up to the point where the rental rate on capital equals price times marginal product of capital (MPK): $r = p \cdot \text{MPK}$
- Next recall from Lecture 4, the production function that incorporates technological progress:

$$Y = K^\alpha \cdot (AL)^{1-\alpha}$$

- The MPL of this production function is:
- The MPK of this production function is:

$$\text{MPL} = (1 - \alpha) \cdot K^\alpha \cdot A^{1-\alpha} \cdot L^{-\alpha}$$

$$\text{MPK} = \alpha \cdot K^{\alpha-1} \cdot (AL)^{1-\alpha}$$

- Finally, recall from Lecture 3, that if economic profit is zero, then:

$$p \cdot Y = r \cdot K + w \cdot L$$

Why Study Other Growth Models?

- Now bring all three of those conditions together:

$$p \cdot Y = r \cdot K + w \cdot L$$

$$p \cdot Y = p \cdot MPK \cdot K + p \cdot MPL \cdot L$$

$$Y = \alpha \cdot K^{\alpha-1} \cdot (AL)^{1-\alpha} \cdot K + (1-\alpha) \cdot K^{\alpha} \cdot A^{1-\alpha} \cdot L^{-\alpha} \cdot L$$

$$Y = \alpha \cdot Y + (1-\alpha) \cdot Y$$

- This implies that:
 - Capital's share of national income is equal to α and
 - Labor's share of national income is equal to $(1-\alpha)$
- In practice, we know that capital's share of national income is roughly constant across countries and approximately one-third, i.e. $\alpha \approx 1/3$
- Next, consider two countries. According to the Penn World Tables, in 2000, real GDP per worker was \$64,437 in the US and \$1479 in Nigeria.
- Now if the US and Nigeria share the same technology and if differences in capital per worker explain differences in output per worker and if $\alpha \approx 1/3$, then capital per worker is 83,077 times higher in the US than it is in Nigeria.
- Does that look right to you? ... I didn't think so.

What's wrong with the Solow Model?

- The Solow Model that we examined in the previous lecture assumes that output is produced using:
 - physical capital (i.e. machinery, buildings, etc.)
 - human labor
- In an extension of that model, we also incorporated technological progress
- If we were to use the Solow Model to examine levels of output across countries, then we would have to assume that there are no difference in human labor across countries (i.e. that human labor is homogenous)
- Is that assumption realistic? No.
- If you ever work with a poorly educated person, you'll notice that they're much less productive than you are.
- When a complication arises in the task that they are performing, they don't know what to do and often make bad decisions.
- Models of economic growth that incorporate "Human Capital" attempt to examine differences in education levels.

What is Human Capital?

- The Solow Model that we examined in the previous lecture assumes that the Marginal Product of Labor is positive.
- But what would be the marginal product of a person without any child-rearing or education at all? (i.e. someone who was “raised by wolves”).
- It would be virtually zero.
- In this sense, all of the returns to human labor must reflect returns to human capital.

- If we assume that there is some minimum level of human capital that human beings acquire more or less automatically (e.g. the ability to walk and talk, etc.), then:
 - we can interpret this minimum level as the input of “raw labor”
 - and separately examine differences in output levels that occur because some societies have higher average levels of human capital than others

the Mankiw-Romer-Weil Model

- In 1992, N. Gregory Mankiw, David Romer and David N. Weil published a variant of the Solow Model that better explains cross-country differences in GDP per worker.
- In particular, they explored the relationship between cross-country differences in human capital per worker and cross-country differences in output per worker.
- Like Solow, they divide output among consumption and investment:

$$Y = C + I$$

- but they further divide investment into investment in physical capital and investment in human capital:

$$I = I_K + I_H$$

- and they assume that output is produced using physical capital, K , human capital, H , and effective labor, AL

$$Y = K^\alpha \cdot H^\beta \cdot (AL)^{1-\alpha-\beta} \quad \text{where:} \quad \begin{array}{l} 0 < \alpha < 1 \quad 0 < \beta < 1 \\ 0 < \alpha + \beta < 1 \end{array}$$

Physical and Human Capital

- The underlying theory behind the Mankiw-Romer-Weil Model:
 - countries with higher levels of:
- technology,
- physical capital per worker and
- human capital per worker
 - have higher levels of output per worker.
- If their theory is correct, then all we have to do to increase output per worker – and lift billions of people out of poverty – is:
 - provide them with technological “know-how”
 - increase the amount of physical capital they have to work with and
 - provide them with more schooling – to increase their levels of human capital

MRW Steady State

- In the Mankiw-Romer-Weil Model, the economy must converge to a steady state where:
 - physical capital per unit of effective labor is constant over time
 - human capital per unit of effective labor is constant over time
- For example, imagine a country devastated by war and emigration:
 - its physical capital stock was destroyed by bombing campaigns
 - its human capital stock was depleted by the emigration of its best and brightest to America
- Is the country now doomed to perpetual poverty? No.
- If the economy devotes a large share of its (substantially reduced) output to investment in new physical and human capital, then:
 - over time it will replace its lost physical capital stock
 - over time it will replace its lost human capital stock
 - over time it will converge to a higher steady state level of output per unit of effective labor
- This is an incredibly optimistic model!
- All a country needs is high saving rates!

MRW Steady State

- Now, imagine a very rich country:
 - it has so many factories and machines that its physical capital stock (per unit of effective labor) is the highest in the world
 - it boasts the best universities in the world and its human capital stock (per unit of effective labor) is also the highest in the world
- Will this country always be the richest in the world? Not necessarily.
- If the residents of this country suddenly become decadent and consume all of their output and stop investing new physical and human capital, then over time:
 - its physical capital stock (per unit of effective labor) will diminish
 - its human capital stock (per unit of effective labor) will diminish
 - over time it will converge to a lower steady state level of output per unit of effective labor

“Lazy hands make a man poor, but diligent hands bring wealth.”
– Proverbs 10:4

So what do we want?

- If we want our economy’s living standards to be higher, then we want:
 - a higher physical capital saving rate, s_K
 - a higher human capital saving rate, s_H
 - a lower rate of physical and human capital depreciation, δ
 - a lower labor force growth rate, n
 - a HIGHER rate of technological progress, g
- All of these should be intuitive, although the last “want” – a higher rate of technological progress – can be confusing.
- After all, doesn’t a higher rate of technological progress reduce the steady state level of output per unit of effective labor? Yes, but ...
 - A person doesn’t consume output per unit of effective labor
 - A person consumes output per worker
- Recall from Lecture 4 that when we incorporate technological progress into the model the steady state growth rate of output per worker is equal to the rate of growth of technological progress.
- A faster rate of growth of technological progress implies a rapidly rising standard of living for the residents of that economy