

Surveying structural change: Seminal contributions and a bibliometric account

Ester G. Silva^a, Aurora A.C. Teixeira^{b,*}

^a *Faculdade de Letras, Universidade do Porto, Portugal*

^b *INESC Porto, Faculdade de Economia do Porto (FEP), CEMPRE, Universidade do Porto, Portugal*

Received November 2006; received in revised form February 2008; accepted February 2008

Available online 23 February 2008

Abstract

Structural change analysis has an important tradition in economic theory. However, up to the present date, no attempt had been made to provide an overall survey on the matter. This paper aims to fill this gap. To this end, bibliometric methods were applied, combining 9703 citations from the area's 'seed journal' with a review of 910 abstracts of all theoretical and empirical articles on structural change that were published over the past 40 years in the journals indexed in the Econlit. We testify the recent rise of interest in structural change where technological issues gained increasing relevance. The 1990s witnessed a spurt in formal work, but more recently such trend was not confirmed; on the contrary, there has been a strong impetus towards empirically led work. Our analysis further reveals that most contributions put great emphasis on technology-driven growth and lack an appropriate treatment of the demand side.

© 2008 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

JEL classification: O10; O30; C89

Keywords: Structural change; Bibliometrics; Econlit

1. Introduction

Structural change analysis is differentiated from standard economic research in that it assumes that the infinite multiplicity of reality can be studied by focussing on a relatively small number of groups or activities that comprise the economic system, and thus form the economic structure.¹ In this sense, a structural representation provides a selective description of the economic system, which is obtained by substituting the observed heterogeneity with sets of classes of relatively homogeneous groups of agents or sectors of activity. In this framework, the definition of structure and of the unit of analysis is made to depend on the problem under investigation. This allows for a considerable degree of flexibility that is absent from standard micro and macroeconomic analyses, thus making it an appealing tool for the study of economic dynamics. The complexity of economic change is probably better understood within a framework which permits changing from one classification scheme to another, so as to obtain the structural representation that is most suited to analyzing the impact of a particular force of change, or to describing the economic system at a particular

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +35 1225571214; fax: +35 1225505050.

E-mail address: ateixeira@fep.up.pt (A.A.C. Teixeira).

¹ See also Hagemann et al. (2003) for a discussion of the purpose and scope of the economics of structural change.




Fig. 1. Evolution of the relative weight of articles on structural change in the total articles published in Econlit, 1969–2005. *Note:* The line results from dividing the number of papers on structural change by the total number of papers published in each year in journals indexed in Econlit. Just as a reference, the number of papers published under the heading of ‘structural change’ totalled 1247 between 1969 and 2005, whereas the corresponding number for all areas is 453457.

moment in time. Moreover, the division of the economic system into different subsystems means that differentiated patterns of change in those subsystems can be taken into account (the different elements of a productive structure are transformed at different speeds), which is entirely at odds with stationary state dynamics.²

Despite the fact that structural change analysis has an important tradition in economic theory, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no attempt to provide an overall survey on the matter. Several factors may account for this. Firstly, even though the phenomenon of structural change is as old as the very problems of economic development, the term ‘economics of structural change’ was until recently practically unknown. The enormous heterogeneity of studies in this area, inherently related with the complexity of the matter, does not lend itself easily to a unified approach and only recently there have been some attempts (Baranzini and Scazzieri, 1990; Landesmann and Scazzieri, 1996) to organize the theoretical approach in a systematic manner. Secondly, the terms ‘structure’ and ‘structural change’ are widely used in economic research under very different meanings and, in many cases, those meanings have no connection with ‘structural change analysis’ (see our discussion in Section 2 below). This presents several difficulties when trying to identify and organize the existing theoretical and empirical work in the field.

This paper attempts to fill this gap, providing a comprehensive survey of the economic literature on structural change, covering the early foundations until the more recent years. Over this period, an enormous amount of potentially relevant literature has been published, and as such, there is no reasonable way in which justice can be done to its entirety. In these circumstances, emphasis was thus placed on selecting ‘seminal’ contributions, and from there, an attempt was made to establish links with more recent works. This was partially done by applying bibliometric methods, which were used on two different fronts. First of all, we analyzed citations and co-authoring, taking *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* as the ‘seed journal’. This exercise helped us to identify the most influential contributions, particularly in the more recent period, in which the characterization of a particular piece of work as ‘seminal’ is more controversial. At the same time, it provided some clues on the clustering of contributions and on the identification of the main streams of the literature.³ Secondly, a review was conducted of the abstracts of all the theoretical and empirical articles on structural change analysis that were published in the economic journals found in the Econlit database over the past 40 years. The classification of these articles according to the main theme of research and the methodologies used helped us to interpret the recent trends in the literature.

During the last few decades, more precisely from the late 1980s onwards, there has been a growing interest in structural change analysis, as can be seen in Fig. 1. The rising importance of this approach is also related to the estab-

² See the discussion in Landesmann and Scazzieri (1990) on this feature of structural change and on the notion of ‘relative structural invariance’.

³ We acknowledge and deeply thank the contribution of one anonymous referee for highlighting this issue.

lishment, in 1990, of a new journal particularly dedicated to this topic—*Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*. In this context, it seems particularly pertinent to make an assessment of the more recent contributions in this area, and to explore potential links with previous research.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we present a brief discussion on the analytical difficulties associated with the organization of the relevant literature on structural change analysis, describe the bibliometric exercises undertaken, and present a summary of our main bibliometric findings. These helped us establishing the seminal contributions in the field and provided important clues on the organization of the relevant literature in the subsequent sections. In Section 3 we discuss the early foundations of structural change analysis, considering studies by the classical authors and Schumpeter's work. Section 4 is dedicated to the formal analysis of structural change, including the contributions to the analytical representation of economic structure and formal theories of economic growth and structural change. In Section 5 we present some of the applied work that emerged from the 1950s onwards, with particular emphasis on the contributions focusing on empirical and historical processes of structural change. In Section 6 we analyze the recent trends in structural change analysis, presenting an overview and interpretation of these developments. Section 7 concludes.

2. Organizing the literature on structural change

An important aspect to be taken into account when analyzing the literature on the economics of structural change is that the terms 'structure' and 'structural change' are used in economic research under very different meanings, and some of those meanings have no direct bearing on 'structural change analysis'. Moreover, in many cases, there is considerable vagueness in the ways in which the terms are used, which hampers a precise interpretation of what is meant.⁴

In his semantic study of 'structure' and 'structural change', Machlup (1991) provides an extensive list of the various (economic) uses of the terms, distinguishing them according to their relative degree of clearness. Taking into account only the clearer definitions, there are at least nine different meanings with which structure and structural change can be related. Along with the notion of economic structure as 'different arrangements of productive activity in the economy especially to different *distributions* of productive factors among various sectors of the economy, various occupations, geographic regions, types of product, etc.' (Machlup, 1991, p. 76, original emphasis), which seems to be the most common use of the term in development economics and in economic history, there are several other meanings, expressing the appeal of this term in an extensive array of theoretical and applied research. For example, structure is also used to denote the fundamental conditions that are assumed as invariant for purposes of analysis and modelling, regardless of the nature of the model and, simultaneously, it is taken as synonymous of a 'composition that does not change easily' (Machlup, 1991, p. 78), referring mostly to the composition of basic macro-economic magnitudes, such as national product, investment, employment, exports or imports. This latter feature of structure as composition is also apparent in Ishikawa's (1987, p. 523) definition of structural change, in which it is seen as 'a change in the relative weight of significant components of the aggregative indicators of the economy, such as national product and expenditure, exports and imports, and the population and labour force'.

For the purposes of this study, only theoretical and empirical studies developed according to the framework of structural change analysis described above were considered, disregarding all other possible uses of the terms. More precisely, the studies selected were those that divide the economic system into a limited number of subsystems, in order to analyze the dynamic properties of the economy as a whole. Studies focussing on the econometrical meaning of structural change were also disregarded, especially those that are mostly concerned with the development of testing procedures to cope with the phenomenon of time series structural change.

As stated before, in order to enrich the literature survey and provide additional insight on the main trends of research, we developed two major bibliometric exercises. The first one consisted in performing citation analysis, taking *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* (SCED) as the 'seed journal'.⁵ More precisely, a comprehensive analysis was conducted of the references cited in all articles published in this journal, from its first issue up to vol. 18,

⁴ According to Machlup, structure (and thus structural change) 'is often a weaselword used to avoid commitment to a definite and clear thought' (Machlup, 1991, p. 75).

⁵ *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* is a journal particularly dedicated to this topic, and although it only commenced publication in the early 1990s, it is by far the journal with the highest number of publications on the field, according to our research in the Econlit database (21% of

Table 1
The most cited authors in the literature of structural change (ordered by 'average impact')

Author	Number of citations	Number of articles/books	'Average impact' (citations/articles)
Schumpeter J.A.	56	16	3.500
Abramovitz M.	37	11	3.364
Pasinetti L.	94	28	3.357
Nelson R.R.	72	23	3.130
Georgescu-Roegen N.	39	15	2.600
Kaldor N.	51	20	2.550
Arthur W.B.	34	14	2.429
Winter S.G.	52	22	2.364
Fagerberg J.	42	18	2.333
Soete L.	41	18	2.278
Leontief W.	75	33	2.273
Freeman C.	63	28	2.250
Dosi G.	80	37	2.162
David P.A.	30	14	2.143
Goodwin R.M.	89	42	2.119
Pavitt K.	40	19	2.105
Verspagen B.	44	22	2.000
Baumol W.J.	53	28	1.893
Rosenberg N.	37	20	1.850
Wolff E.N.	46	25	1.840
Duchin F.	44	24	1.833
Punzo L.F.	37	22	1.682
Duménil G.	32	25	1.280
Orsenigo L.	30	24	1.250
Eliasson G. ^a	36	31	1.161

Notes: The database includes 6431 different authors of articles/books cited in articles gathered from all the issues of SCED from vol. 1 (1991) up to vol. 18 (1) (2007). The bulk (70% approximately) of authors only have 1 citation. Only 0.7% (42) authors have 30 or more citations. Excluding 'generalist' authors (mainly those from the neoclassical economic growth theory, e.g., Solow, Romer, Helpman, Grossman, Barro), we obtained the top 25 authors in terms of the number of citations.

^a Although this author emerges as one of the most cited the bulk of the citations are self-citations.

issue 1 (January 2007).⁶ The total number of papers analyzed was 419, and from the list of references obtained (which totalled 9703) we calculated the number of citations for both articles and authors and the 'impact' measure for these latter.⁷

Among the most cited authors and articles we observe (Tables 1 and 2) a high predominance of non-orthodox economic research generally associated with 'evolutionary' and 'neo-Schumpeterian' strands of thought. Indeed, along with the (expected) seminal contributions within the realm of structural change analysis from authors such as Pasinetti, Leontief, Goodwin⁸ and Baumol, a significant part of the most-cited writers/works is related with elaborations of Schumpeter's theoretical scheme, relating innovation, economic growth and structural change into a systemic theory of innovation and diffusion, such as the ones developed by Richard Nelson, Sidney Winter, Christopher Freeman and Giovanni Dosi, among others.

total papers from 1969 to 2005).

⁶ A minimal number of papers (15), mostly concentrated in the 1991–1995 period, had to be disregarded due to inappropriate digitalization.

⁷ It is important to note that gathering this reference data was quite a taxing and time-consuming task. The majority of the almost 10 thousands references were collected by a 'copy-paste' procedure from original articles. Only a few more recent articles had their references indexed in *Scopus*, thus permitting that the references be directly exported to an Excel file. Given that the references were not uniformly cited in each of the SCED's articles, we then had to harmonize the references and only afterwards perform the citation analysis. Most of the existing works involving citation analysis do not require such an enormous effort as the journals involved are indexed in ISI Web of Knowledge (produced by Thomson Scientific), which automatically provides the references and corresponding citations.

⁸ Goodwin's later work can also be characterized as 'evolutionary'. During the last 10–15 years of his life, he attempted to integrate, in a unified framework of analysis, Schumpeter's insights on technology and innovation with Marxian ideas of functional distribution of income and Keynes's concern on lack of effective demand. See, for example, Goodwin (1987, 1991, 1993) and Landesmann and Goodwin (1994).

Table 2
The most cited studies in the literature of structural change

Author(s)	Date	Title	Number of citations
Pasinetti L.	1981	Structural Change and Economic Growth. A Theoretical Essay on the Dynamics of the Wealth of Nations	27
Nelson R. and Winter S.	1982	An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change	23
Pasinetti L.	1993	Structural economic dynamics; A Theory of the Consequences of Human Learning	17
Georgescu-Roegen N.	1971	The Entropy Law and the Economic Process	16
Schumpeter J.A.	1934	Theory of Economic Development	16
Smith A.	1776	An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations	16
Sraffa P.	1960	Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities	16
Arthur W.B.	1989	Competing technologies, increasing returns, and lock-in by historical events	14
Goodwin R.M.	1967	A growth cycle	14
Keynes J.M.	1936	The general theory of employment, interest and money	13
Dosi, G.	1988	Sources, Procedures and Micro-economic Effects of Innovation	12
Marx K.	1867	Das Kapital	12
Dosi G.	1982	Technological paradigms and technological trajectories	11
Arrow K.J.	1962	The economic implications of learning by doing	11
David P.	1985	Clio and the economics of QWERTY	10
Baumol W.J.	1967	Macroeconomics of unbalanced growth: the anatomy of urban crisis	10
Freeman C. and Perez C.	1988	Structural crisis of adjustment: business cycles and investment behaviour	10
Leontief W.	1941	The structure of the American economy, 1919–1929	9
Rosenberg N.	1982	Inside the Black Box: Technology and Economics	9
Freeman, C. and Soete, L.	1997	The Economics of Industrial Innovation	9
Kaldor N.	1966	Causes of the slow rate of economic growth in the United Kingdom	9
Ricardo D.	1817	The Principles of Political Economy and Taxation	9
Schumpeter J.A.	1942	Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy	9

Note: The database includes 9702 citations (8200 different articles) gathered from all the issues of SCED from vol. 1 (1991) up to vol. 18 (1) (2007). Only 0.7% (57) articles/books have more than five citations.

Contributions from the Classical period, most prominently represented by Adam Smith, Karl Marx and David Ricardo, figure among the most cited studies. This evidences a clear connection between these authors' early writings and the 'modern' structural change perspective. Along with the more recent work from Schumpeter, who appears as the most cited author (in terms of impact measure), the above-mentioned works constitute the earlier foundations of structural change analysis.

Considering additionally the relevance of co-authorship among the most influential authors on the topic of structural change, the clustering of 'evolutionary authors' (e.g., Giovanni Dosi, Robert Nelson, Sidney Winter, Cristopher Freeman, Luc Soete, Luigi Orsenigo), who present themselves as providing an alternative to mainstream economic theory for the analysis of the evolution of the economic system, emerges quite clearly (grey areas in Table 3).

The second bibliometric exercise presents a complementary portrait, providing important clues on the more recent trends on structural change. In this case, the scrutiny is based on the analysis of the abstracts from all articles published on structural change analysis in the Econlit database from January 1969 to August 2005. The database was constructed by using the term 'structural change' as the search keyword. The total number of analyzed records was 2329, where texts corresponding to comments, rejoinders, *corrigendas* or addressing different meanings of structural change were eliminated from the categorization. Also, some records did not have an abstract and were also excluded (but included in the temporal analysis). In the end, 910 records remained (from a total of 1247 with and without abstracts). Publications on the economics of structural change were analyzed in terms of eleven main topics, which were selected on the basis of the literature review undertaken. Those topics are: (1) development; (2) technical change and innovation; (3) convergence and growth; (4) economic fluctuations; (5) International trade; (6) employment and migrations; (7)

Table 3
The matrix of (co)authorship of the most cited authors in the literature of structural change (by number of citations)

	PasinettiL	GoodwinRM	DosiG	LeontiefW	NelsonRR	FreemanC	SchumpeterJA	BaumolWJ	WinterSG	KaldorN	WolffEN	DuchinF	VerspagnenB	FagerbergJ	SoeteL	PavittK	Georgescu-RoegenN	AbramovitzM	PunzoLF	RosenbergN	EliassonG	ArthurWB	DuménilG	DavidPA	OrsenigoL	Other	
PasinettiL	93																									1	
GoodwinRM		78																									6
DosiG			28																								69
LeontiefW				59																							14
NelsonRR					5																						28
FreemanC						6																					33
SchumpeterJA																											56
BaumolWJ																											18
WinterSG																											33
KaldorN																											8
WolffEN																											48
DuchinF																											17
VerspagnenB																											15
FagerbergJ																											17
SoeteL																											10
PavittK																											27
G.-RoegenN																											1
AbramovitzM																											5
PunzoLF																											7
RosenbergN																											7
EliassonG																											11
ArthurWB																											22
DuménilG																											1
DavidPA																											7
OrsenigoL																											11
Others	1	6	69	14	28	33		18	36	3	24	26	16	7	19	24	1	25	12	10	12	17	4	35	1	35	




Fig. 2. The distribution (%) of papers on structural change by main topics of analysis. *Source:* Authors' own computations based on articles in journals collected from the Econlit database, 1969–2005 ($n = 910$).

Industrial dynamics; (8) institutions and policies; (9) regional and urban economics; (10) measurement and methods; (11) environment and sustainability. Based on this classification, we assessed the relative weight of each topic of research as well as their evolution over the last decades.

Our findings (Fig. 2) reveal that the marked rise of papers published on structural change analysis in the more recent period is accompanied by a change in the main topics of analysis explored. Along with 'convergence and growth' that remains the most relevant category throughout the period under study, but which has recently lost ground, there is a notable increase in 'international trade' and in 'technical change and innovation', topics of analysis whose importance has been continuously rising, and is particularly relevant in more recent years.⁹

The same tendency emerges from the classification of articles by JEL codes (Fig. 3), in which the temporal period under study is extended by an additional decade—the 1970s. In this case, the increasing relevance of technological issues is even more evident: the share of papers concerned with Technological Change (which is usually included under the heading JEL code O—*Development, Technological, Change and Growth*) almost trebled from 5.4% in the 1980s to 13.8% in the 1990s. This trend remained in the 2000s reaching the status of dominant category.

Apart from the major topic of research, the articles selected within the second bibliometric exercise were also classified according to the main method of research used, by considering six major classes: (1) formal; (2) appreciative; (3) formal and empirical; (4) appreciative and empirical; (5) empirical; and (6) surveys.¹⁰ This categorization enabled us not only to perform a full characterization of the literature on structural change analysis, but more importantly, it provided important pointers on the relationship between the increasing relevance of structural change analysis and the (possibly) growing formalism in the research methods used.¹¹

Taking together the results from the bibliometric analysis, we were able to derive a picture of the overall evolution of structural change analysis, from its ancient roots (1700s–1890s) to the more recent period crossing the chronological dimension and the type of research pursued (appreciative, historical, empirical, and formal). Fig. 4 reflects, based on the number of citations, the most influential contributions in the field (e.g., Pasinetti, Leontief, Goodwin, Nelson, Freeman, Dosi, Schumpeter) together with an indication of the main topics of analysis, the more significant research clusters (Marxian School; New School and Development; 'Traverse'; Neo-Schumpeterian and Evolutionary; Environment), and the links among (clusters of) researchers, which are further detailed in the following sections. It provides in addition

⁹ The classification of papers according to the main topic of analysis was only performed from the 1980s onwards, because in the earlier period the selected papers did not have an abstract.

¹⁰ The distinction between formal and appreciative theorizing follows Nelson and Winter's (1982) original proposal and intends to separate the theoretical explanations that are expressed in mathematical terms (through modelization), from the theoretical work in which this kind of construction is absent.

¹¹ The mathematization of economics is probably the most important feature in the history of 20th-century economics (Mirowski, 2002; Weintraub, 2002). The use of models has become the dominant practice—in the view of many, the best way of doing 'good economics'. It is therefore expectable that the current rise of interest in this field is correlated with a change in the main methodologies undertaken.




Fig. 3. The distribution (%) of papers on structural change by JEL codes. *Source:* Authors' own computations based on articles in journals collected from the Econlit database, 1969–2005 ($n=910$).

an illustration of the strategy pursued in the organization of the relevant literature in the present paper. Following a brief characterization of the earlier foundations of structural change analysis (Section 3), the analysis (and discussion) of the relatively separate fields of pure theoretical and applied/historical approaches within the realm of structural change analysis is pursued (Sections 4 and 5). Then (Section 6), the analysis of the more recent period, marked by a strong rise of interest in the field and a change in the main topics of research, is detailed.

3. Foundations of structural change analysis

3.1. Classical economists (1700s–1870)

As the results from the bibliometric exercises make clear, the conceptual foundations of 'structural change analysis' can be found as early as in the period of Classical Economists. Indeed, although they did not actually use the term 'structure' in any significant way, many authors (e.g., [Steuart, 1767](#); [Turgot, 1766](#); [Smith, 1776](#)) contended that the progress of wealth was intimately related to changes in the pattern of interaction among a few critical variables, which can be seen as distinct representations of the economic structure. For example, in [Smith's *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* \(1776\)](#), there is an explicit reference to the relationship between the sectoral composition of the economy and the stage of development reached. In fact, each stage is characterized by a particular composition of product, and a change in this composition is seen as a major requirement to reach higher stages of development.

Furthermore, in classical essays, there is an explicit attempt to identify the major forces that allow the economy to switch from one structure to another. In [Smith's \(1763, 1776\)](#) work, the main dynamic impulse to change comes from the division of labour. The productivity gains associated with labour specialization, related to the greater dexterity of




Fig. 4. Mapping structural change.

the workforce, to the rationalization of resources and to higher incentives to innovate, induced changes in the identity and composition of economic activities, thus giving rise to a new structure of the economy. Ricardo (1817), in his turn, emphasized the role of non-producible resources in the progress of wealth. Output growth requires growth of factor inputs but land is ‘not unlimited in quantity and uniform in quality’ (Ricardo, 1817, p. 70). This means that as growth proceeds, more land must be taken into cultivation, but land cannot be created. The growth of overall production requires then a continuous substitution of produced for non-produced inputs, which implies the changing composition of the productive system, together with significant changes in income distribution.

For the most part, classical economics was carried out in a rather descriptive fashion, without an explicit analytical account of the economic structure. Some exceptions to this general pattern can nevertheless be found in the works of Quesnay (1758) and Marx (1885). The first author, in his *Tableau Économique* (1758), provided a simple description of the analytical structure of the economy, exploring the general interdependence between economic sectors. Crucial to Quesnay’s analysis was the notion that ‘natural proportions’ between sectors could be identified and that it would be possible to examine whether or not a given pattern of social expenditure was a sustainable one. The same idea was also present in Marx’s schemes of accumulation and reproduction of capital (Marx, 1885), perhaps the most rigorous formulation to date of a growth model. Distinguishing between ‘constant’ and ‘variable’ capital, the former representing circulating capital such as raw materials and the latter meaning advances to labour (i.e., wage payments), Marx (1885) argued that the tendency for increases over time in the ratio of constant to variable capital (the ‘organic composition of capital’) implied a re-proportioning of the various commodities produced. He also stressed that this transformation had to follow a particular pattern, so as to achieve a viable expansion of the economic system. In both cases, the analytical representation of the economic structure is based on a circular view of the productive process. Goods are produced not only from natural factors of production, but also from each other, and a particular good x entering the production of a good y can also use the latter in its production.¹² It should be noted, however,

¹² In contrast with this view, the Austrian theory of the formation of capital (von Böhm-Bawerk, 1891) analyzes the productive process from a linear perspective. Defining capital (whether fixed or circulating) as an aggregate of intermediate products, von Böhm-Bawerk formulates the concept of ‘period of production’, which corresponds to the time lag between the investment of ‘original factors’ (land and labour) and the acquisition of

that while Quesnay's scheme is inherently static, with no indication about the way in which the economic system is supposed to evolve over time, Marx does also consider structural dynamics, through its schemes of extended reproduction.¹³

3.2. *The Schumpeterian legacy*

After Marx, the interest in the study of the causes of the 'progress of wealth' strongly declined. The emergence of the marginalist revolution by the end of the 19th century, with its emphasis on the problems of optimal resource allocation, shifted the focus away from long-term dynamics and their association with structural change. A long hiatus thus existed until the appearance of Schumpeter's work, which took up again the analysis of long-term economic movements of the economy at a time of almost complete neglect of the matter.

Like Marx and other classical authors, Schumpeter was aware that structure had to change if there were to be long-term shifts in economic well-being. In his view, innovation¹⁴ – arising from technological competition among firms –, was the major driving force behind such changes: once an (important) innovation was introduced, the prospect of extra profits would lead to a complex process of dissemination by imitation and further improvement by other firms in the market, along with the appearance of other innovations in related fields of activity. There was thus a tendency for innovations to cluster, not only in certain activities, but also in particular time periods. For a while, the 'cluster' of activities in which innovation appeared would grow at a higher rate than the overall growth rate of the economy, but sooner or later, the potential for further growth would become exhausted, and growth would slow down. According to Schumpeter (1939), this cyclical development of clusters could be transmitted to the overall economy, contributing in this way to the observed discontinuity of the growth process and to the formation of business cycles of varying lengths.¹⁵

In Schumpeter's analysis a major thrust is thus entitled to structural change, which is taken not as an additional feature of the growth path, but rather as representing the very essence of economic development. Nevertheless, apart from a general description of the 'swarming' and 'bandwagon' effects associated with the cyclical pattern of the economy, Schumpeter leaves largely unexplored the structural adjustment process of the economy following innovation. In particular, as pointed out by Gualerzi (2001), the impact of the demand side in shaping the overall transformation of the economy is left totally aside.¹⁶

These limitations do not obscure, however, the notable contribution of Schumpeter in providing an endogenous explanation of economic change in the economy, which laid the foundations for much of the recent literature on structural change analysis, as our bibliometric exercises document. The acknowledgement and widespread recognition of Schumpeter's seminal contribution came, nevertheless, many years after the publication of his work,¹⁷ which although reflecting the singularity of Schumpeter's concerns in his lifetime period, may also reflect the non-formalized character of his approach, in a period in which neoclassical economics and mathematical theorizing were becoming increasingly dominant. As a matter of fact, the relative lack of interest in structural change analysis for a long period of time may indeed be related to the strong unbalance towards empirical, historically related studies in detriment of more formally oriented research. There were, however, a number of extremely influential studies in the field adopting

consumable commodities. From this analysis, all goods are grouped according to their distance in time from the consumer, which provides an overall linear picture of the productive process.

¹³ The introduction of dynamics within a 'pure circular-flow model' is accomplished by Marx through the consideration of a 'dynamic behavioural principle', associated with the utilization of the surplus of a particular accounting period in the subsequent period. See, in this respect, Landesmann and Scazzieri (1990).

¹⁴ Schumpeter defines innovation in a broad sense as 'new combinations of existing factors of production' (Schumpeter, 1928, p. 377), exemplifying with the emergence of new products and new methods of production, the creation or exploitation of new markets and new ways to organize business.

¹⁵ Schumpeter's ideas on the relationship between innovation and business cycles were not well received by the economic community at the time of their publication, and were severely criticized by Kuznets (1940), who questioned their logical coherence and adherence to reality. In the 1970s, however, those ideas were once again brought to the fore, and became the centre of an intense debate among the supporters of Schumpeter's thesis on 'long waves' and its detractors, a debate that still persists today. See Fagerberg (2003) for a discussion on the matter.

¹⁶ Schumpeter even argues that 'it is the producer who as a rule initiates economic change, and consumers are educated by him if necessary' (Schumpeter, 1934, cited in Gualerzi, 2001), which makes clear the general irrelevance attributed to consumers and demand in his analysis of economic growth.

¹⁷ Fagerberg (2003) locates the revival of interest in Schumpeter's work in the period following the economic slowdown of the 1970s.

formal methods of analysis, such as Leontief, Pasinetti and Goodwin's contributions (cf. Fig. 4), which are described in some detail in the following section.

4. Formal approaches to structural change and economic growth

Formal theories of economic growth have been typically developed with little reference to the changing structure of the economy. Yet it is well known that growth fundamentally changes the structure of the economy and the composition of its main aggregates.

Formal structural theories of economic growth take as their point of departure an analytical representation of the economic structure, which provides a selective description of the economic system. This analytical step permits the move from 'infinite variety' to a relatively small number of classes in which agents or activities are clustered, thus allowing uneven economic dynamics to be explored more easily (Hagemann et al., 2003). The adoption of a particular structural specification is, of course, dependent upon the focus of the investigation. At this level, a traditional distinction stresses the differences between 'horizontal' and 'vertical' representations of the economic structure. Horizontal representations describe the economic system as a circular structure, with economic activities being clustered into mutually dependent classes. As mentioned earlier, this type of representation of the economic system was a hallmark of classical economists' works, in which production was seen as an essentially circular process. In the modern period, a circular representation of this type, in which no information is given about the time structure of the horizontal interdependencies among sectors (that is, in which a point-input point-output representation of processes is assumed), can be found in von Neumann (1945) and Sraffa (1960) models. Even though they developed their works based on different backgrounds and different intentions, both authors perceived production as a circular process where commodities are produced by means of commodities and production takes place through processes of unit time duration.¹⁸ Leontief (1941, 1991) also explores the idea of general interdependence and circularity of production in his detailed quantitative description of the economic system. In his model, the production process is illustrated by means of multiple causal relationships, where certain commodities are generated by other commodities that are themselves used and consumed in further production. In the dynamic formulations of the Leontief system (e.g., Leontief, 1953, 1970), the horizontal-flow description is supplemented by the specification of construction and delivery lags that incorporate the time structure of inter-sectoral flows. These formulations permit the simulation of structural changes (such as changes in the composition of final demand and changes in technology), assessing their implications in terms of the overall workings of the economic system.

Differently from these contributions, vertical representations exclude the consideration of horizontal interdependencies, stressing unidirectional relationships and asymmetric dependence in the clustering process. An early contribution to the analysis of the economic system in 'vertically-integrated' terms can be found in Sraffa (1960, Appendix A). Sraffa demonstrates that in the general case of production of commodities by means of commodities it is possible to move from a 'circular' to a 'vertical' representation of the economy. This is accomplished by splitting up the circular flow into a number of distinct 'net product' subsystems, in which each subsystem represents a one-way relationship from dated inputs of original factors (labour and means of production) to the corresponding final commodity. Sraffa's brief account on the vertical representation of the economic system would be further developed by Pasinetti (1973). In this work, Pasinetti elegantly displays the analytical operation involved in the transformation of the usual input-output scheme into a set of vertically integrated sectors, providing at the same time a meticulous examination of the logical properties of the process of vertical integration. Under this framework, the economic system is partitioned into a number of vertically integrated sectors equivalent to the number of final commodities produced, with each vertically integrated sector expressing in a consolidated way the quantities of labour and intermediate inputs that are directly or indirectly required to obtain a particular final commodity. The logical operation of forming vertically integrated sectors then allows for an analysis of the general theoretical problems associated with the (uneven) dynamics of growth and its association with technical change without any reference to intermediate uses of the commodities.

An alternative approach to remove horizontal interdependencies in the Sraffa-Leontief system has been proposed by Richard Goodwin (Goodwin, 1976, 1983; Goodwin and Punzo, 1987). This is done by transforming the original

¹⁸ In particular, Sraffa's (1960) major concern was the revival of the classical approach to the theory of production, value and distribution, whereas von Neumann (1945) basically attempted to find an equilibrium solution for a multi-sectoral economic system.

space into an imaginary space, in which the eigenvectors of the square input matrix are used as ‘general coordinates’. This transformation defines n distinct composite commodities, with each commodity being produced entirely out of inputs of its own product, allowing therefore for a separate investigation of a single sector in the economy, as if each sector were a Ricardian ‘Corn Economy’.

A totally vertically integrated representation of production is also proposed by Hicks (1973), who overcomes the difficulty of the Austrian representation of production activities in introducing durable means of production, by defining each productive process as a stream of labour inputs delivering a stream of final product outputs.¹⁹ In his ‘neo-Austrian’ framework, each process of production is seen as comprising two sequentially related phases: a ‘construction’ phase, in which labour is used to produce machinery and no final product is obtained, and the ‘utilization’ phase, in which the machinery obtained in the former phase is combined with labour in the production of final goods. The economic system is thus composed of two large interconnected ‘sections’ (the first including the activities of the construction phase, and the second including the activities of the utilization phase), which places the study of problems of transition between production techniques and, more generally, of non-proportional growth, within the context of historical time.

In an intermediate level between the two extremes of purely horizontal and vertical representations of the economic structure we have Georgescu-Roegen’s (1971) fund-flow model. In this model, the time dimension is explicitly taken into account through the consideration of different time profiles of the inputs, which are classified as being of the ‘fund’ or the ‘flow’ type.²⁰ By adding information on the temporal pattern of use and the combination of resources in the production process, the model allows for the specification of temporal complementarities that provide additional ‘vertical’ information along with conventional information regarding technical coefficients provided by the input–output framework. This opens the way for new perspectives in analyzing the dynamics of economic systems.

Horizontal and vertical representations of the economic structure have been used in a number of seminal contributions analyzing the uneven dynamics of economic growth from a structural change perspective (e.g., Hicks, 1973; Pasinetti, 1981, 1993).²¹ Among these studies there is one strand of research – the so-called ‘traverse analysis’ (see Fig. 4) – that focuses on transition paths, analyzing the changes occurring in an economy that was originally in steady-state and that has been disturbed by changes in the exogenous determinants of growth, such as changes in technology and factor supplies. A common feature of the contributions of this type is the emphasis placed on structural rigidities as major factors determining the dynamics of an economic system subject to a source of change. It is the consideration of such rigidities that places the analysis in the context of historical time, rather than logical time, where economic dynamics are seen as the result of (irreversible) changes taking place in a sequential manner.

Ricardo’s analysis of technological unemployment in his brief chapter ‘On Machinery’ in *Principles* is generally regarded as laying the grounds for this type of research. Following Ricardo, both Lowe and Hicks, the pioneering authors of ‘traverse analysis’, put great emphasis on the possibility that technical change could lead to unemployment, analyzing the conditions under which displaced labour originated during the transition could be reabsorbed at the end of the process. This problem is, however, approached by the authors from different perspectives, which rely on distinct representations of economic structure. Lowe (1955, 1976) adopts a horizontal approach, elaborating on a modified version of the Marxian schema of reproduction. The main modification introduced by Lowe – the division of the Marxian capital goods-producing sector into one sector that produces the equipment for the consumer goods sector, and the ‘machine-tools’ sector that produces the equipment for both subgroups of the capital goods sector – allows him to establish a hierarchical organization of the economy, in which the ‘machine-tools’ sector assumes the key role. Indeed, under the assumption of full utilization of the economy’s capital stock, any process of expansion implies a prior increase in fixed capital in this sector (and subsequently in the other capital-goods producing sector), so as to obtain an increase in the production of consumption goods. The adjustment path of the economy is thus characterized by a *sequential* process of production and re-proportioning of the economy, in which the capital stock is rebuilt.

¹⁹ A flow-input flow-output profile, instead of the Austrian flow-input point-output framework.

²⁰ Under this classification, ‘funds’ represent the agents of the transformation process, entering and exiting the production process with their efficiency intact, whereas ‘flows’ are the objects and the products of the process. Examples of funds or agents are land, capital and human capital, which transform input flows (raw materials, intermediate inputs and inputs needed for maintenance of capital) into output flows (products and waste) (see Georgescu-Roegen, 1971, pp. 230–233). For a presentation of the ‘fund-flow’ model see also Tani (1988) and Piacentini (1995).

²¹ As mentioned before, the use of one particular descriptive–analytical tool, rather than the other, or even the combined use of both methods, is dependent upon the specific focus of the investigation, with the different approaches offering complementary views of the growth process. For a comparative account of the relative merits of horizontal and vertical approaches, see Hagemann (1990).

Hicks made use of the horizontal scheme in his first analysis of the traverse in *Capital and Growth* (1965), in which he develops a two-sector model of an economy which employs labour and tractors to produce corn and tractors, with technical coefficients of production that are fixed for each sector. However, he soon became disappointed with the inter-industry approach, switching to a vertically integrated approach in his *Capital and Time* (1973).²² In this ‘neo-Austrian’ framework, an once-over change in technology leads to a transition period, until the full utilization of the new technology is reached.²³ In particular, there will be a period of time (the ‘early phase of the traverse’) during which processes using old and new techniques will coexist. Hicks uses this framework to re-examine Ricardo’s analysis of technological unemployment, considering alternative dynamic paths—‘full-employment’ and ‘fixwage’ traverses. It is shown that technological unemployment may arise in the transition period, but that the long-term effects are likely to go in the other direction, with displaced labour being fully absorbed at the end of the process.

Both Lowe and Hicks’ works have inspired subsequent developments in the literature. Lowe’s concerns with the strategic role of the machines-tool sector were integrated in studies focusing on economic planning in developing economies in the 1950s and 1960s (e.g., Mahalanobis, 1955; Dobb, 1960; Naqvi, 1963). More recently, a few attempts have been made to analyze some features of transitional paths not explored in the seminal works of Lowe and Hicks, combining both vertical and horizontal representations of the economic structure (e.g., Quadrio-Curzio and Pellizzari, 1999; Baldone, 1996; Quadrio-Curzio, 1986). Baldone (1996), for example, integrates the neo-Austrian method in his inter-industrial representation of the economic system, by defining the production process of the machine sector as a sequence of construction and utilization phases. An important result of the model is that residuals may arise in the transition process, due to disproportions between the availability and the effective use of commodities, which makes the determination of transition paths more complex. A rather complex picture of structural dynamics is also present in Quadrio-Curzio’s contributions. Inspired by Ricardo and taking Sraffa’s *Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities* (1960) as the point of departure for the analysis, Quadrio-Curzio – on his own and in collaboration with Pellizzari – emphasizes the limiting role of scarce, non-produced means of production in the growth process. In particular, he shows by means of a multi-sectoral model that increasing scarcity leads to the activation of successive technologies in order to produce the raw material, leading to the adoption of mixed technologies at each moment in time. As in Baldone (1996), a residual can be created because the structures of the technologies that are successively emerging may differ from ‘older’ technologies, which makes the maximum sustainable growth rate of the economy dependent on the number and type of subsystems that are operated and on their relative compatibility at any point of time.

These recent trends in traverse analysis seem to suggest that important insights on transitional dynamics may be uncovered if horizontal and vertical descriptions of the economic system are taken into account under complementary terms. But despite its inherent potential for the study of economic dynamics, traverse theory seems to remain a relatively unexplored method of enquiry, as only a few authors have introduced relevant contributions in the field.

A different approach to the relationship between structural change and economic growth, developed independently of the analytical construction of the steady-state, can be found in Pasinetti (1981, 1993), who simultaneously presents the higher number of citations and the most cited work in our bibliometric results. In contrast with the studies outlined above, in which structural change is an out-of-equilibrium feature, in Pasinetti’s work it represents the very essence of economic growth. Moreover, whereas in those studies the fundamental forces of change originate mainly in the supply side of the economy, Pasinetti attributes a fundamental role to changes in demand, which are incorporated in the analysis by means of a generalization of Engel’s law.²⁴

²² At the origin of this change was the need to focus on innovations that took the form of new methods for making the same final product, which could not be accomplished in a multi-sectoral model with a horizontal structure, since ‘there is no way of establishing a physical relation between the capital goods that are required in the one technique and those that are required in the other’ (Hicks, 1977, p. 193). Hicks, however, did not exclude entirely the horizontal approach, which is explored, in parallel with the vertical integration approach, in a later work (Hicks, 1985).

²³ As in Lowe’s model, a major result is thus that the inherited stock of fixed capital represents a major bottleneck that the economy has to overcome in order to reach the new steady growth equilibrium path.

²⁴ Leon (1967) also integrates Engel’s law in his theory of growth and structural change. According to his main argument, the non-uniformity of the increase in demand, as predicted by Engel’s law, implies that the rate of profits is permanently differentiated across industries, with the industries that benefit most from consumption increases achieving both higher rates of growth and profit. The simultaneous existence of different profit rates in the economy is, at the same time, explained by the monopolistic structure of the market, which is seen as a ‘permanent feature of capitalism’ (Leon, 1967, p. 54). But unlike Pasinetti’s seminal work, Leon does not express his views in mathematical terms.

Pasinetti attempts to provide a general conception of the dynamics of growth and structural change that explicitly takes into account the uneven impact of technological and demand changes among sectors, an issue typically neglected in contemporary theories of economic growth. In a return to the classical tradition, Pasinetti sets out his analysis in terms of the ‘natural system’, in which all relations are investigated in a pre-institutional context. The basic theoretical scheme, developed in terms of vertically integrated sectors, was presented in great detail in his 1981 book, *Structural Change and Economic Growth*. The 1993 publication, *Structural Economic Dynamics*, represents a continuity in this line of research, but within the more restricted framework of a ‘pure labour production model’, a minimal model ‘that contains the very essential features of the ‘production’ paradigm, to which classical and Keynesian economics belongs’ (Pasinetti, 1993, p. xiv). The primary concern of the model is the definition of the conditions that must be fulfilled for an economy to achieve and maintain a ‘satisfactory state of economic growth’, described as a state in which there is approximately full employment of the labour force and full utilization of productive resources (Pasinetti and Scazzieri, 1987, p. 527). In this framework, individual and social learning is seen as the major engine of economic change. It influences the dynamics of the economic system through two major channels: a ‘strictly technological’ one, which refers to productivity increases and to the emergence of new techniques and new products in the economy, and a demand-related one, associated with the rise in per capita income and its influence on consumer demand, as described by Engel’s law. Technology and demand are thus seen as the main determinants of long-term economic dynamics, although their influences are separated: technology determines the evolution of prices, in line with the classical labour theory of value, whereas effective demand determines the dynamics of production, as within the Keynesian approach.²⁵ The structural dynamics of employment arise as a result of the structural dynamics of technology and of demand. In this respect, Pasinetti (1981, 1993) demonstrates that the full employment condition raises a *permanent* problem of complex macroeconomic coordination.²⁶ The emergence of technical progress, although extremely beneficial in terms of the new goods and services that it introduces, and the rise in productivity that it brings about, also bears complex problems of adjustment in the economy. In fact, an immediate consequence of technical progress is a decrease in technical coefficients, and thus a tendency to generate unemployment as time goes on. Although there are a number of ways to counter this tendency (see Pasinetti, 1993, p. 54), full employment can only be reached if there is an adequate level of labour mobility between productive activities and/or a reduction in the available labour.²⁷ In any case, the necessary adjustment that is needed in each single period of time requires the coordination of individual and collective choices that is far from being automatic. This raises a number of institutional and policy questions so as to adequately respond to the challenging task of pursuing full employment.²⁸

A common strand of criticism of Pasinetti’s theoretical schemes concerns the exogenous treatment of the main engines of structural dynamics, that is, changes in technology and consumer preferences [see, for example, Gualerzi (2001) and Harris (1982)].²⁹ Although Pasinetti relates both factors with the *learning principle*, learning itself is essentially unexplained and therefore the question of what moves the driving forces of the economy remains unanswered. At this level, an extension of Pasinetti’s (1981) model that relates productivity growth with the emergence of technological revolutions, developed along *long-wave* theory arguments, has been proposed by Reati (1998a,b). In this model, radical process innovations entail a substantial rise in productivity for the innovator that is progressively diffused throughout the sector in a non-linear fashion. The pattern of diffusion influences the productivity curve of the sector, which, in turn,

²⁵ The theoretical framework expresses this separation, by considering two systems of equations, in physical quantities and in prices, which remain separated over time. At the same time, changes in demand and in labour productivity, which determine changes in quantity movements and in prices, respectively, are different across sectors.

²⁶ Unlike steady-state growth models, in Pasinetti’s framework there is never a possibility of maintaining equilibrium conditions through time. Technical change and the evolution of consumption patterns operate continuously, thus leading to new conditions of economic equilibrium, one period after another.

²⁷ In this respect, increases of per capita demand would not be sufficient, given the inherent tendency of saturation of consumption described by Engel’s law.

²⁸ It is worth recalling that although this work may be seen as presenting a theory of technological unemployment, following previous insights developed by Keynes, it goes well beyond Keynes’ short-term analysis. In fact, it shows the existence of a permanent problem of unemployment that arises from the very nature of long-run growth, which is a distance removed from the usual Keynesian argument.

²⁹ Gualerzi, in particular, has argued that Pasinetti’s reliance on Engel’s law and on the inherently simplified notion of needs and needs hierarchy is not capable of capturing the technological and social dimensions that influence consumption, meaning that the articulation with economic development cannot be appropriately explored.

determines the dynamics of the price system. The influence of long-wave patterns leads also to an S-shaped profile of demand, as well as physical output in the final sectors (Reati, 1998b).

Andersen (2001) also attempts to endogenize demand and technology factors in Pasinetti's (1993) model, by transforming it into an evolutionary model with explicit microfoundations. The microfoundations rest upon the definition of a number of 'rules of thumb' concerning the endogenous evolution of demand coefficients, labour coefficients and the number of available sectors, which is initially explored in a 'Robinson Crusoe economy', and later is extended to the more general case of an economy formed by several exchanging consumer-producer firms. As acknowledged by the author, the present version of the model demonstrates that Pasinetti's theoretical scheme can be approached from a 'bottom-up' perspective, but there is still a long way to go before its 'structural economic dynamics' can be derived from a micro-founded evolutionary frame of analysis.

Another attempt to endogenize demand in a dynamic theory of growth and structural change, this time through the consideration of an endogenous process of market creation, has been developed by Gualerzi (2001). Gualerzi integrates several elements of Schumpeter, Pasinetti and Levine's contributions (among others) into a demand-led growth theory developed within a Keynesian framework, in which market expansion, associated with the evolution of consumption patterns, leads to and is fuelled by investment. Like in Schumpeter's work, innovation is followed by growth and structural change, but in this case the structural dynamics of market creation is associated with the evolution of consumption patterns. In this context, a great emphasis is put on the adequacy of new products to the individuals' needs (which are socially determined and as such do not arise 'naturally') and an important role is addressed to uncommitted income and to its distribution. Although the theoretical framework is still very general and schematic, and not expressed in a formally rigorous manner, it sheds considerable light on relatively unexplored aspects of the growth process, providing fruitful questions for further research in the field.³⁰

Differently from these contributions, Baumol's (1967) seminal work on the relationship between structural change and economic growth does not explicitly take into account the demand side. A major emphasis is given to the uneven impact of technology among sectors (as in Pasinetti's work), which ultimately explains the 'unbalanced' nature of economic growth. According to Baumol, the economy can be seen as comprising two major groups of activities: those that are technologically progressive, in which innovations, capital deepening and economies of scale boost a continuous rise in productivity; and those that can only enjoy sporadic increases in productivity.³¹ The distinction between sectors is put forward in a model, in which labour productivity rises cumulatively in one sector, whereas in the other it is held constant over time. Since wages increase in the same way in all sectors, this leads to the cumulative rise of relative costs in the non-progressive sector of the economy, which cannot compensate for the rise in wage levels. Consequently, the activities in this sector will tend to be driven off the market, unless their demand is relatively price inelastic. In this case, their relative share in output can be maintained, and as a result, an increasing number of the total labour force must be transferred to this sector, with the consequent slowdown in the rate of growth of the economy (the well-known 'cost-disease' effect). Considering that there is a low substitutability in demand structures, this result can explain the increase in the 'service share' in total employment in the economy, an argument that has had considerable echo in the services literature (Schettkat and Yocarini, 2006).³²

The above-mentioned seminal formal contributions remained at quite a distance from a contemporaneous far more prolific strand of research within a structural change perspective developed along appreciative and historical lines. Furthermore, with the notable exceptions of Leontief's input-output model and Baumol's unbalanced growth model, which have prompted a vast number of empirical applications,³³ most theoretical developments remained confined

³⁰ Gualerzi himself sees his contribution more as a 'framework capable of guiding more focused empirical studies' (Gualerzi, 2001, p. xiii) than a means to provide determinate predictions.

³¹ This distinction stems from the intrinsic nature of the activities, and particularly from the role played by labour in the corresponding production processes (see Baumol, 1967, pp. 415–417).

³² Notarangelo (1999) has recently made an attempt to include the demand side in Baumol's model, introducing Pasinetti's sectoral demand functions. The author shows that the former can be interpreted as a particular case of Pasinetti's model, with labour mobility between productive activities being a necessary condition for macroeconomic stability and sectoral growth rates depending on both productivity and demand factors. It is shown furthermore that the change in the relative shares of employment predicted by Baumol may lead in some cases to the rise of involuntary Keynesian unemployment.

³³ Leontief's input-output approach, in particular, was mainly conceived as a tool applicable to empirical analysis (cf. Leontief, 1987), which explains the widespread dissemination of the method in empirical work. For an overview of the numerous areas of application of input-output models, see Rose and Miernyk (1989).

into the strict field of economic theory, or gave rise only to a few incursions into the empirical level of analysis. A noteworthy example is Pasinetti's model of economic growth and structural change. Despite being the most prominent work on structural change (cf. Table 2), it has only given rise (to our knowledge) to a very recent empirical application developed by Hölzl and Reinstaller (2007).³⁴ There seems thus to remain a wide gap between economic theory and empirical research, despite the growing availability of data and the increasing sophistication of statistical and econometric methods.

5. Empirical and historical processes of structural change

Contrasting with its general neglect in formal theories of economic growth, structural change has traditionally played a fundamental role within empirical and theoretical studies of developing and transition economies. This fact is visible in our 'clustering' of contributions on structural change (see Fig. 4), in which several authors from this area of research are identified, although their influence in the more recent literature on structural change has been relatively small.

The early stages of development economics as an autonomous field of research were characterized by a 'systemic' view of economic reality, with most studies attempting to explore theoretical arguments by which the observed processes of structural transformation could best be explained. Those theoretical explanations were mainly developed along appreciative strands, with little recourse to formal reasoning, and a policy-oriented approach was generally undertaken, where a number of policy recommendations aimed at improving countries' economic performance were formulated. A few examples of this approach can be mentioned. Rostow's 'stage approach' to development (Rostow, 1960) reported the existence of structural discontinuities in the process of development, which were related to the concept of necessary pre-requisites for the transition to higher stages of development. Although this theory was later heavily criticized, in particular by Gershenkron (1962), who argued against the notion of a unique path of development, it had considerable impact on the contemporary views of development. At about this time, the dual-economy models (Lewis, 1954) and 'big-push' theories were also very popular. They all stressed the importance of taking into account sectoral differences in order to explain the overall progress of the economy. In Lewis's model those differences were addressed through the distinction between traditional and modern sectors of the economy. In the face of a stagnant traditional sector with a high elastic supply of labour, the shift of labour towards modern industry would be beneficial at the aggregate level, as workers with low productivity would be put to more productive uses, and growth would continue until the modern sector had exhausted all reserves of labour in the subsistence sector. The works of Rosenstein-Rodan (1943, 1961) and Nurkse (1953), in their turn, emphasized sectoral differences as a requirement for balanced growth. In the former, the complementarities among different industries, such as those between production and consumption structures, were the main argument in favour of large-scale planned industrialization (the 'big-push'). Nurkse, for his part, argued in favour of the promotion of a diversified increase in output that took into account domestic elasticities of demand in order to create mutually supporting demand (Nurkse, 1953). The need for directing investment resources towards expanding the capacity of the basic sectors of the economy through planning was also stressed by Dobb (1960), Sen (1960) and Naqvi (1963), who shared Lowe's concern for the strategic role of the machines-tool sector.

Changes in the composition of production, employment and trade were also crucial within the 'structuralist' school of thought originated at ECLA (Economic Commission for Latin America) (e.g., Prebisch, 1950; Furtado, 1967). The unifying and determinant idea behind this school of thought derived precisely from the notion that developed and developing countries had fundamental differences in the structure of their economies, and that those differences led to a continuous and reinforcing movement towards the progressive dependency of the periphery relatively to the centre. According to the views expressed, unless state intervention aimed at promoting the structural transformation of the economy was implemented, developing economies would face unemployment, external disequilibrium and deterioration of the terms of trade which would materialize into a vicious circle of underdevelopment.

³⁴ The authors specify a structural vector autoregressive model based on Pasinetti's (1981, 1993) work. The SVAR is used to study the impact of productivity and demand shocks in Austrian manufacturing between 1971 and 1995. The results show some similarity with Pasinetti's main predictions; in particular, it is found that sectoral patterns in employment and output growth depend negatively upon productivity growth and positively on sectoral growth rates of demand, even though there is some heterogeneity among sectors.

In a different approach, a vast amount of studies attempted to identify generalizations about long-term economic development and structural change based on comparative study of historical experience. In many cases the analysis started from the aprioristic decomposition of the economic system into a relatively small number of sectors, and structural dynamics were mainly identified with the process of sectoral re-proportioning of the economy. Hoffmann (1931/1958), for example, investigated the pattern of industrial growth in a group of economies distinguishing between consumer and capital goods industries. In his view, all industrialization processes could be described by the evolution of the relative weights of the two groups of industries, with the capital goods industry raising its relative importance in the course of the development process. Fisher (1939), in his turn, adopted a tri-partite decomposition of the economy, distinguishing between primary, secondary and tertiary production. Despite using Clark's original nomenclature,³⁵ Fisher proposed a different interpretation that was based on the structure of consumer demand.³⁶ Under this formulation, Clark's scheme acquired a more precise connection with the relationship between growth and changes in output and demand composition, which according to the author allowed for attention to be focused on the 'growing points' of the economy. A tri-partite decomposition of the economic system, which in broad terms reflects the 'agriculture, industry and services' classification, was also used by Kuznets (1961, 1971) in his noteworthy empirical contribution on the economic growth of nations.³⁷ Building upon historical series of national income and product for a vast number of countries, Kuznets found a historical association between high rates of growth of per capita product and productivity and a high rate of shifts in production structure. The strong association between growth and structural change was then explained as the result of the combined action of three main factors – changes in the structure of consumer demand, changes in comparative advantage and changes in technology – from which technological change assumed clear prominence.

Other studies adopted a similar approach, but derived the decomposition of the economic system from the analysis undertaken, rather than relying on an aprioristic classification of economic activities (e.g., Sventnilson, 1954; Rosenberg, 1963; Chenery, 1960). Sventnilson examined in great detail the process of economic transformation in a number of European countries in the first half of the 20th century, building on long series of national aggregates and markets and industries' data. From this analysis, he pointed out a number of interdependencies between long-term economic growth and structural transformation, emphasizing the role of consumer demand and of investment in the process. The link between investment and economic growth was also stressed by Rosenberg (1963), who highlighted the crucial role that the capital goods sector has had in stimulating technological innovation in today's developed countries. According to the author, not only was it in this sector that most of the major innovations arose, but most importantly, it was the emergence of a progressively more highly specialized capital goods sector that opened the way to the formation of a technological background that has provided the necessary skills and attitudes conducive to technical progress.

The search for uniform patterns in the relationship between long-term economic development and changes in the economic structure using both cross-section and time series data was also actively pursued by Hollis Chenery, on his own and in collaboration with other authors (e.g., Chenery, 1960; Chenery and Taylor, 1968; Chenery and Syrquin, 1975). A common feature of these studies is the use of a rigorous statistical framework in the search of regularities from which an endogenous determination of structural classification schemes and an identification of general patterns of economic development can be derived. Chenery and Taylor (1968), for example, identify three distinct clusters of economies – large, small primary-oriented and small industry-oriented – relying on an extensive comparison of post-war changes in several countries and using a vast array of econometrical tests. In a later work, Chenery and Syrquin (1975) extend the search for uniformities, broadening the number of structural variables and applying regression analysis to a very

³⁵ Clark (1938) identified in broad terms primary production with agriculture and related industries (like fishery, forestry, and hunting), secondary production with manufacturing, and tertiary production with all economic activities not included under the first two categories.

³⁶ Under the proposed framework, primary production would be related to the economic activities that satisfy basic primary needs, secondary production would include 'all manufacturing activities designed to produce things for which there is a more or less standardized or conventional demand, but which could not be described as essentials' (Fisher, 1939, p. 31), and finally, tertiary production would include 'every new or relatively new type of consumers' demand, the production and distribution of which is made possible by improvements in technical efficiency, which release resources hitherto required for primary or secondary production' (Fisher, 1939, p. 32).

³⁷ Although reflecting to some extent the basic criterion of Fisher (1939), this decomposition of the economic system was not used by Kuznets, as it was by Fisher, as a means to infer the growth potential of the economy. In fact, Kuznets points out several flaws in the sectoral structure considered, which arise mainly from its incapacity to reveal the impact of technological progress on growth, the basic source of 'modern economic growth'.

large sample of countries. From this exercise, they derive ‘stylized facts’ of development, and establish a typology of developing countries that takes into account resource endowments and differences in development strategies pursued.

It is worthwhile pointing out that the research associated with the study of developing and transition economies has been developed quite independently from formal theories of growth and structural change, analyzed in the previous section. In fact, there are only a few points of convergence between both streams of the literature, most notably related to the Marxian-based contributions to development and economic planning (e.g., [Feldman, 1928](#); [Mahalanobis, 1955](#); [Dobb, 1960](#); [Sen, 1960](#); [Naqvi, 1963](#)), which, as already noted, adopted theoretical schemes similar to Lowe’s model,³⁸ and to the application of Leontief’s input–output model to the analysis of developing economies. Many early applications of the input–output method were carried out precisely in the analysis of a full range of problems facing developing economies, such as the allocation of investment, barriers to trade, inflation or income distribution.³⁹ For the rest, it seems fair to say that both approaches enjoyed quite separate existences.⁴⁰

The literature on structural change associated with the study of developing and transition economies suffered, however, considerable decline in the 1970s, when development economics experienced a profound transformation in its core methodologies and major topics of debate ([Backhouse, 1990](#)). The interest in the formulation of (ambitious) macro theories of development strongly declined with the shift of development economics towards a micro approach that made intensive use of the neoclassical toolbox. In contrast with earlier models that stressed ‘structural rigidities’, this new (neoclassical) approach assumed the existence of a reasonable degree of flexibility in the economy (e.g., [Little, 1982](#)). The answers to be given to the problems of underdeveloped economies, according to this new approach, ought to be based on the definition of the right incentives to get markets working ([Easterley, 2002](#)), rather than on substituting the market through (structuralist) planned intervention. The resurgence of neoclassical development economics and its reliance on the price mechanism led inevitably to decreasing interest in structural change analysis, although the latter on its own does not necessarily translate into state intervention.⁴¹ But even though to a considerably lesser extent than before, some studies still follow the traditional approach, attempting to formalize earlier theoretical contributions (e.g., [Murphy et al., 1989](#); [Ros, 2000](#)) and to extend and refine the search for regularities regarding structural transformation and economic growth from intercountry and intertemporal comparisons (e.g., [Wang et al., 1992](#); [Raiser et al., 2004](#)).

Some of the earlier structuralist analysis has also re-emerged within the SCEPA (Schwartz Center for Economic Policy Analysis) research group of the New School for Social Research, although in a way more in line with conventional economic analysis. An important part of the research undertaken in this centre, which has a broad policy-oriented approach, focuses on growth and development experiences of developing and transition economies from a structural change perspective (e.g., [Pieper, 2000](#); [You and Lee, 2000](#); [Milberg, 2004](#); [Rada and Taylor, 2006](#)). These studies examine the ways by which transition and developing economies have responded to liberalization and market-oriented policies, emphasizing the role of structural and institutional changes in the process.

6. Recent trends in structural change analysis

As it has been repeatedly pointed out in the literature (see, for example, [Freeman, 1994](#)) the 1980s and 1990s witnessed ‘a far greater readiness to look inside the ‘black box’ ([Rosenberg, 1982](#)) and study the actual processes of invention, innovation and diffusion within and between firms, industries and countries’ ([Freeman, 1994](#), p. 464). The emergence of the *New Economy* and the controversy generated around the impact of information and communication technologies (ICTs) on aggregate productivity growth (the so-called ‘productivity paradox’) further stimulated the debate on technical change and its impact on growth.⁴²

³⁸ Interestingly, a recent contribution from [Araújo and Teixeira \(2002\)](#) formally demonstrates that the Feldman–Mahalanobis growth model can be seen as a particular case of [Pasinetti’s \(1981, 1993\)](#) model of structural change, a relation that had already been established in descriptive terms by [Halevi \(1996\)](#).

³⁹ For a comprehensive overview of the application of input–output analysis in development planning and policy, see [Rose and Miernyk \(1989\)](#).

⁴⁰ It is worth noting, at this point, that whereas [Chenery](#) did not make use of any particular theory in the study of the relationship between structural change and long-term development, he did consider the Walrasian general equilibrium theory in what concerned the overall functioning of markets and prices [see, in this respect, [Chenery \(1988\)](#) and [Ascher \(1996\)](#)].

⁴¹ As [Chenery \(1988\)](#) puts it, ‘recognizing the interrelations among the principal elements of the structural transformation does not in itself constitute an argument for more government intervention or overall planning’ ([Chenery, 1988](#), p. 201).

⁴² See, for example, [Baily and Gordon \(1988\)](#), [David \(1990\)](#) and more recently [Freeman \(2001\)](#) and [Amendola et al. \(2005\)](#).

Together with important developments occurring in mainstream economics (e.g., Lucas, 1988, 1993; Romer, 1990; Grossman and Helpman, 1991; Aghion and Howitt, 1992), a growing body of the literature has been developed in the last 20 years under an alternative approach, known as ‘neo-Schumpeterian’ or ‘evolutionary’ economics. Proponents of this latter approach strongly criticize mainstream economics, arguing that a theory which is firmly grounded on purely rational behaviour and equilibrium assumptions cannot deal appropriately with the complex and uncertain nature of technology (e.g., Nelson and Winter, 1982; Dosi, 1988; Dosi et al., 1988). In contrast, they stress the idea of disharmony and competition in the growth process, and place themselves at quite distant from aggregate production function models, by explicitly addressing the connection between processes of change at micro and industrial levels and overall macroeconomic dynamics. From this perspective, processes of microevolutions of technique, organization and institution are significantly affected by higher-level changes and vice versa, which means that causal connections between macroeconomic variables cannot be fully understood without considering the interdependence among the different levels of analysis (Nelson and Winter, 1982). It is precisely in the connection with this attempt to develop an alternative to mainstream economics for the analysis of the relationship between technical change and economic growth that, according to our view, a substantial part of the recent rise of interest in structural change analysis can be explained. In fact, not only our bibliometric findings suggest a growing relevance of the ‘technical change and innovation’ topic (Figs. 2 and 3), but also many of the most cited authors and works can be associated with neo-Schumpeterian and evolutionary strands of thought (Fig. 4).⁴³ Structural change analysis comes to the fore as a powerful analytical tool that is capable of establishing links between changes at the level of microstructures and higher-level changes, while providing, at the same time, a more realistic account of the process of technology adoption and its effects on the economy, by emphasizing the sequential and path-dependent nature of economic change. In particular, it provides a useful foundation for the study of the problems of adjustment and intertemporal coordination brought on by technical progress, an issue that is totally neglected by the mainstream equilibrium approach, which takes intertemporal coordination for granted.⁴⁴ As Amendola and Gaffard (1998, p. 107) clearly state ‘it is only through the consideration of relations which bring about different aggregations that we introduce real time, irreversibilities, and qualitative change’, and are thus able to address the complexity and uncertainty of technical progress.

Within such a perspective, the strong connection between major technological breakthroughs, structural change and economic growth is analyzed in terms of technological systems, trajectories of technology and technological paradigms. Freeman et al. (1982), in one of the seminal contributions in the field, suggest the notion of ‘new technological system’ to account for the ‘constellations of innovation which are technically and economically interrelated’ (Freeman, 1991, p. 223). A historical overview of the succession of ‘technological systems’ since the First Industrial Revolution is provided by Freeman and Soete (1997), who characterize the current era, strongly based on the application of information and communication technologies, as the ‘information age’. Dosi (1982), in his turn, uses the Kuhnian concept of ‘scientific paradigm’ to derive the analogous concept of ‘technological paradigm’, which in his model ultimately determines the cluster of possible technological directions to pursue (‘technological trajectories’).⁴⁵ This framework allows him to distinguish between continuous changes and discontinuities in technological innovation by considering, respectively, changes along a technological paradigm and changes in the paradigm itself. At the same time, it sheds some light on the procedures by which new technological paradigms emerge and are selected among a set of possible options, thus being able to identify regularities in the pattern of technical change that may partially account for the relatively ordered patterns of growth. Perez (1983, 1985) further explores the relationship between technological trajectories and structural change introducing the concept of ‘techno-economic paradigm’. According to Perez, it is possible to identify the Kondratiev waves with the rise and fall of successive technological revolutions, which introduce new ways of managing and organizing the economy that are so pervasive that they affect almost all industries and economic activities. In this case, the change from one paradigm to another not only lies in the opportunity to economically explore a cluster of radical innovations, as in Dosi’s work, but it is crucially dependent on the emergence of a ‘key factor’

⁴³ The most significant cluster of research is associated with neo-Schumpeterian insights. Along with this very large cluster, in the more recent period a smaller cluster has also emerged, which focuses on economy–environment relationships and on the long-term viability of economic processes.

⁴⁴ See in this respect Amendola and Gaffard (1998), and more recently Amendola et al. (2005).

⁴⁵ Nelson and Winter (1982) use the concept of ‘natural trajectories’ to refer to the same technological paths within a technological paradigm.

whose abundant supply, rapidly falling costs and multiple applications facilitate the spread of innovation throughout the economy.⁴⁶

All these contributions stress the profound impact of the *diffusion* of major technological breakthroughs on the structure of the economy and in economic growth. As the diffusion of the pervasive new technologies unfolds, the dynamic set of industries that is more closely related with its exploitation assumes progressively higher importance, stimulating growth, whereas sectors associated with older technologies see their relative influence diminish. Not only is there considerable change in the growth rates and in the productive structure of the economy, but also important institutional and social changes arise. As argued in the neo-Schumpeterian theory, diffusion is never immediate or automatic, but is strongly dependent on a number of characteristics of the ‘receiving’ economy, and in particular in its ability to adapt its institutions to the new forms of organization and management of the economic activity required by the new technological paradigm [see especially Perez (1985) and Freeman and Perez (1988)]. At the same time, because the assimilation and development of technology by the country (firms) is strongly influenced by the specific historical, cultural and institutional environment where the firms are located, geographical factors gain theoretical relevance, as explored by Nelson and Wright (1992) in their concept of ‘national technology’ and by Freeman (1987, 1992), Nelson (1993) and Lundvall (1992), among others, in the literature on national and regional systems of innovation.

Research developed in neo-Schumpeterian and evolutionary strands focusing on the diffusion process in an international perspective is also heavily cited in our database (e.g., Fagerberg, 1987, 1988, 1994; Abramovitz, 1986, 1994; Dosi et al., 1990; Verspagen, 1993). In this ‘technology-gap’ literature, the non-automatic character of diffusion is once again strongly emphasized. Successful catch-up, it is argued, can only be achieved by countries that possess adequate ‘social capabilities’, that is, those with sufficient educational attainments and adequately qualified and organized institutions that enable them to exploit the available technological opportunities. The pace at which the potential for catch-up is realized depends furthermore on a number of factors, related with the ways in which the diffusion of knowledge is made, the domestic capability to innovate, the pace of structural change, the rates of investment and expansion of demand, and the degree of ‘technological congruence’ (Abramovitz, 1986, 1994) of the backward country in relation to the technological leader.⁴⁷ As indicated earlier, the neo-Schumpeterian approach to the analysis of the relationship between technical change and economic growth is built upon a much broader (and realistic) account of technical change than conventional mainstream analysis. Technical change is conceived as a cumulative and path-dependent ‘learning’ process that is strongly embedded in organizational and institutional structures.⁴⁸ In this process, there is an ever-presence of elements of uncertainty and diversity, and the technology that is ultimately ‘selected’ by market forces is not necessarily the most efficient one (which once more contrasts sharply with mainstream assumptions of optimizing rationality). This issue is explored in great depth in the works of Paul David and W.B. Arthur (e.g., David, 1975, 1985; Arthur, 1988, 1989, 1994), which lie amongst the most cited authors (Table 1). In general terms, David and Arthur show that the occurrence of random events or ‘historical accidents’, particularly in the early phases of the introduction of a technology, may have a decisive influence on the long-run outcomes of the economy. In some cases, the presence of scale economies and increasing returns, whether derived from network externalities, learning effects or investment indivisibilities, may even ‘lock-in’ the economy to an inferior technology, as the example of the QWERTY typewriter keyboard so clearly illustrates (David, 1985).

The above-mentioned neo-Schumpeterian contributions focusing on the long-term dynamic behaviour of the economic system and on its association with technical and institutional change have been mostly developed under appreciative and empirical strands, with little recourse to formalization.⁴⁹ Nevertheless, in the recent past a growing body of research has attempted to formalize the main insights from this literature, following Nelson and Winter’s

⁴⁶ At the turn of the 20th century, for example, the role of key-factor was played by low-cost steel, whereas in our days, according to Perez, it falls upon cheap microelectronics.

⁴⁷ Recent work in this area (Fagerberg and Verspagen, 2002) suggests that catching up on the basis of diffusion has become more difficult in the more recent period, whereas innovation has increased its relative importance. This finding is interpreted as reflecting the new (and higher) requirements imposed by the new technological paradigm (the ICT revolution), in terms of skills and infrastructure, in the process of technological imitation.

⁴⁸ It is worth recalling that the idea of technical change as a learning process, strongly opposed to the neoclassical construction of production functions, is also present in Pasinetti’s seminal contributions on structural change and economic growth (Pasinetti, 1981, 1993).

⁴⁹ Notable exceptions are Arthur’s (1988, 1989, 1994) and Nelson and Winter’s (1982) contributions. These seminal works are, however, mostly focused on the industry-level dynamics of technological evolution, rather than on the analysis of the long-term dynamics of the economic system and its association with structural change.

(1982) urge to combine ‘appreciative theorizing’ with formal modelling. In the long-waves literature, for example, Goodwin (1987) presents a model in which the impact of technology on the economy is transformed by the internal dynamics of the economic system, which reshapes the non-cyclical rate of emergence of a major innovation cluster into both business cycles and long waves. Silverberg and Lehnert (1993), in their turn, develop a Schumpeterian dynamic model based on the Goodwin growth cycle, in which a capital stock ‘vintage’ structure is assumed. Their main finding is that ‘clustering’ of innovations is not necessary for generating long-waves; it is only necessary that the process of arrival of new technologies be stochastic. More recently, Silverberg (2002) presents a ‘mosaic-avalanche’ model based on percolation theory that illustrates the emergence of macro-innovations from a stream of incremental innovations, which are then transmitted to changes in sectoral structures and macro-economic performance. The conceptual framework of ‘technology gaps’ has also been formalized by Verspagen (1991), Amable (1993), and more recently, Los and Verspagen (2006). Verspagen (1991) develops a non-linear model of convergence that accounts for both situations of ‘catching-up’ and ‘falling-behind’. It is shown that countries with relatively low ‘social capability’ levels and with high technological backwardness are in great risk of widening the gap relative to the more developed countries, whereas countries with high relative levels of ‘social capability’ and a small initial technological gap are more likely to catch up. Amable (1993) presents a linear catch-up model in which some of the determinants of ‘social capability’ – investment, innovation and education – are endogenized, and that also allows for both converging and diverging tendencies. More recently, Los and Verspagen (2006) develop a dynamic model in which the impact of innovation, learning and technology spillovers on output growth, convergence and structural change is analyzed. In line with the technology-gap literature, it is found that convergence between countries depends on social capability and on the degree of technological congruence of countries. The simulation results demonstrate, however, that in order to obtain a greater understanding of the dynamics of productivity gaps, the influences of learning-by-doing and of the interaction between economic structure and technology also have to be taken into account.

Other attempts to formalize neo-Schumpeterian and evolutionary insights explicitly address the links between changes at the level of microstructures and higher-level changes, drawing attention to the disequilibrium processes by which new technologies are generated and disseminated in the economy. These theories reveal close connections with structural change analysis, since the dynamics of the economic system are seen as strongly dependent on the structural configuration of the economy and on its pattern of change. One of the earliest contributions in the field can be found in Silverberg et al.’s (1988) evolutionary model of the diffusion of innovations. This model attempts to integrate some crucial features of technology and technical change – namely its inherent diversity and uncertainty, cumulateness and path-dependency – in the process of diffusion, considering an evolutionary environment characterized by micro-diversity and selective pressures at the firm level. Simulation results show that relatively ordered diffusion paths can be derived from turbulent dynamics at the micro-economic level. A similar result is also found in Chiaromonte and Dosi’s (1993) evolutionary model of endogenous economic growth. A relatively stable macroeconomic growth pattern is compatible and indeed requires high heterogeneity at the micro level. The interaction between the micro and macro levels in the economy has been also deeply examined by Eliasson in several studies using the Swedish micro-to-macro MOSES model (e.g., Eliasson, 1984, 1991; Eliasson et al., 2004).

These modelling exercises (and, in general terms, most of the neo-Schumpeterian literature) place great emphasis on technology-driven growth (although combined with factors such as institutional change and industry dynamics), lacking a systematic treatment of the demand side. In the recent past there have been, however, some attempts to combine both supply-side and demand-side factors within the micro-to-macro approach to the process of economic development. Saviotti and Pyka (2004a,b), for example, present a model in which changes in the composition of the economic system accompanying the emergence of pervasive innovations are seen in connection with changes in the demand side of the economy. Indeed, in this model, it is the saturation of given sectors due to Engel’s law that induces changes in the composition of the economic system that in turn provides the stimulus for economic growth. Montobbio (2002) also takes into account the role of demand in his evolutionary model of structural change. In this work the intermediate ‘meso’ level of analysis is brought to the fore, through the extension of Metcalfe’s (1998) model to a multi-sectoral framework.⁵⁰ Along with supply and demand factors, it is shown that specific characteristics of firms and sectors, and the specific combination of the characteristics of the interdependent sectors account for patterns of

⁵⁰ In so doing, the model goes a step further relative to the abundant evolutionary literature on the partial frameworks of firm and industry, approaching the relationship between industrial and macro levels of inquiry while taking explicitly into account the role of microfoundations.




Fig. 5. The distribution (%) of papers on structural change by Type. *Source:* Authors' own computations based on articles in journals collected from the Econlit database, 1969–2005 ($n=910$).

productivity growth at the macroeconomic level.⁵¹ The relationship between the meso and macro levels of inquiry is also approached in a recent paper by Metcalfe et al. (2006). The authors develop an evolutionary model in which growth is perceived as an essentially adaptive process in response to innovation and changes in demand. Productivity growth differences at the industry level and macroeconomic productivity growth emerge from market coordination processes and are explained on the basis of the combined influence of Fabricant's Law and differential income elasticities of demand at the industry level.

In a similar way to the seminal work by Pasinetti (1981, 1993), the explicit consideration of demand issues in these models has been accomplished with recourse to a generalization of Engel's law. As stated before, the reliance on Engel's law only permits that a broad hierarchization of needs be taken into account, and for this reason, it is not capable of addressing the complex interactions between technological change and changes in patterns of consumer behaviour. In this context, the development of a dynamic theory of demand and its interactions with the formal treatment of technological change seems to constitute a very promising avenue for future research.

The attempt to provide a consistent theoretical framework for an alternative approach to the study of economic change, to which the development of a rigorous frame of analysis was seen as a fundamental step (Silverberg, 1988), seems to explain the trend towards increasing formalism observed in the 1990s. In this decade, there was indeed a significant increase in the relative weight of articles adopting a purely formal or a combined formal/empirical approach, as can be seen in Fig. 5.

The tendency towards increasing formalism does not seem to have endured, however, in more recent years (the 2000s), where a new decline of the relative importance of formal studies can be observed.⁵² It seems that along with the emergence of several modelling exercises (from which we have mentioned only a few), the revival of Schumpeterian topics in connection with structural change analysis has materialized much more intensely in empirically led studies, which remained dominant over the entire period. Indeed, the emphasis put by neo-Schumpeterian theory on the relationship between economic growth and the group of dynamic industries associated with the new technological

⁵¹ In particular, changing sectoral composition due to selection and sorting mechanisms within and between industries plays a significant role, which means that positive rates of aggregate productivity growth can occur, even in the absence of technical progress at the firm level.

⁵² When only the papers published in *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* are considered, the relative importance of formal vs. empirical studies is reverted, although the marked rise in empirical work in the 2000s is maintained. Formal studies become the dominant category, with formal and formal + empirical studies representing 59.3% and 44.6% of total papers published in the 1990s and 2000s, respectively.

paradigm has led to a vast amount of empirical research examining the impact of leading technological sectors, and in particular of ICT-related industries, on the processes of economic growth and structural change.⁵³ The contribution from technologically leading industries to aggregate productivity growth has been assessed using both purely descriptive techniques, such as shift-share analysis (e.g., Fagerberg, 2000; Timmer and Szirmai, 2000; Peneder, 2003), and econometric estimation methods (e.g., Amable, 2000; Fagerberg, 2000; Peneder, 2003). Typically, purely accounting procedures find that the structural change effect has only a minor role in explaining productivity growth, whereas the use of econometric approaches reveals in most cases a significant positive relationship between structural variables and economic growth, suggesting the existence of substantial positive spillovers arising from leading technological industries to the rest of the economy (e.g., Amable, 2000; Fagerberg, 2000; Peneder, 2003). At the same time, the role of technology as a source of productivity growth and structural transformation has been examined in a vast number of contributions using input–output analysis (e.g., Peneder et al., 2003; Franke and Kalmbach, 2005; Sánchez Chóliz and Duarte, 2006). The evidence found in these studies points to the important role played by technology in the overall processes of growth and structural change. The results reveal, furthermore, a differentiated impact of technological change among sectors, where the ‘modern sectors’ that have the higher growth rates (generally ICT-related sectors and business-related services) are simultaneously the sectors that experience the most positive impact of technological change (e.g., Oosterhaven and Hoen, 1998; Peneder et al., 2003; Franke and Kalmbach, 2005).

The empirical literature on the role of technologically leading industries on economic growth has led furthermore to a changing image of the services sector, with several studies pointing out the impact of the new technological paradigm on the creation of new and improved services (e.g., Petit and Soete, 2000; Petit, 2002; Peneder et al., 2003). The high productivity growth rates found in these sectors, together with evidence showing the declining role of manufacturing in economic growth in the more recent period (e.g., Fagerberg and Verspagen, 1999, 2002) has led to the abandonment of the traditional view regarding manufacturing as the major producer and user of technology, and as the sector providing the major stimulus for growth (e.g., Kaldor, 1966, 1970; Cornwall, 1976, 1977).⁵⁴ The new evidence on the service sectors has inclusively led to a change of focus in the services literature, as the debate on the consequences of de-industrialisation and on the impact of rising services in productivity slowdown is to some extent replaced by a far more optimistic view, which emphasizes the role of technological factors in the tertiarization process (e.g., Andersen et al., 2000; Miles and Tomlinson, 2000; Peneder et al., 2003).

Along with theoretical insights, much of the empirical literature can be criticized for not addressing such fundamental issues as the change in patterns of demand associated with the spread of new technologies, suffering, to some extent, from ‘technological determinism’.⁵⁵

In this context, and as indicated above, the development of a dynamic theory of demand and technological change in connection with the empirical evidence on changes in the demand side and consumption modes seems to be an imperative issue for future research.

7. Conclusions

In this paper an attempt was made to organize the literature on structural change analysis, from its early foundations until the present days. Despite its important tradition within economic research and the significant revival of interest in the field in more recent times, to the best of our knowledge, such an effort had not yet been undertaken.

Apart from a survey of the economic literature on structural change analysis which emphasizes ‘seminal’ contributions and their links with more recent works, we also provide an interpretation of the most recent trends in the literature. This was partially done with recourse to bibliometric methods, which were used in two different yet complementary

⁵³ The growing concern with the effects of the ICT revolution is reflected in the rising share of papers addressing the issue in the more recent period. Their relative importance within structural change research seems however to remain relatively small (only 11% of papers published in the 2000s), although the classification procedure used may have underestimated their relative share (we only counted as ‘ICT-related papers’ those whose abstract made an explicit reference to these industries).

⁵⁴ There are, however, other studies that find that the rapid growth of highly qualified services and other services is not reflected in a parallel improvement in their productive efficiency (Sánchez Chóliz and Duarte, 2006; Ten Raa and Wolff, 2000) or see their good performance mostly as a consequence of the structural changes occurring in the manufacturing sector (Franke and Kalmbach, 2005).

⁵⁵ An exception can be found in the work of Gualerzi (2001), who has recently provided an empirical account of the structural dynamics of the U.S. economy in the post-war period in which the ICT revolution is seen in connection with changes in demand and modes of life.

ways: firstly by analyzing citation and co-authoring of papers published in the journal *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*; and secondly by reviewing the abstracts of all the theoretical and empirical articles on structural change analysis that were published over the past 40 years in the economic journals indexed in the Econlit database.

Both methodologies are congruent in relating the recent rise of interest in structural change analysis with an attempt to develop an alternative approach to mainstream economic theory when analyzing the relationship between technical change and economic growth. Not only do technological issues gain increasing relevance during the period under study, but also the most influential authors/studies can be seen as strong representatives of such a new perspective in the study of technological change. Our analysis shows, furthermore, that the 1990s have witnessed an increasing relevance of formal work, which is in close agreement with the attempt to consolidate this new approach as an alternative to the rigorous modelling framework of neoclassical economics. Evidence concerning more recent years does not confirm this tendency, although it refers only to half of the decade, which might reflect the strong impetus towards empirically led work prompted by the emergence of the New Economy and its impact on the overall workings of the economic system.

Along with a relative deficit of formal work, our analysis also reveals that most contributions put great emphasis on technology-driven growth (although combined with factors such as institutional change and industry dynamics), lacking an appropriate (micro-based) treatment of the demand side. The development of a dynamic theory of demand and its connections with the formal treatment of structural and technological change seems, therefore, to constitute a highly promising avenue for future research.

Acknowledgements

The authors are deeply indebted for helpful comments and suggestions of three anonymous referees, and of the editor, Bart Verspagen. The usual caveat applies.

References

- Abramovitz, M., 1986. Catching up, forging ahead, and falling behind. *Journal of Economic History* 46 (2), 385–406.
- Abramovitz, M., 1994. The origins of the postwar catch-up and convergence boom. In: Fagerberg, J., Verspagen, B., von Tunzelmann, N. (Eds.), *The Dynamics of Technology, Trade and Growth*. Edward Elgar, Aldershot, pp. 21–52.
- Aghion, P., Howitt, P., 1992. A model of growth through creative destruction. *Econometrica* 60 (2), 323–351.
- Amable, B., 1993. Catch-up and convergence: a model of cumulative growth. *International Review of Applied Economics* 7 (1), 1–25.
- Amable, B., 2000. International specialisation and growth. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 11 (1–2), 413–431.
- Amendola, M., Gaffard, J.L., 1998. *Out of Equilibrium*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Amendola, M., Gaffard, J.L., Saraceno, F., 2005. Technical progress, accumulation and financial constraints: Is the productivity paradox really a paradox? *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 16, 243–261.
- Andersen, B., Howells, J., Hull, R., Miles, I., Roberts, J. (Eds.), 2000. *Knowledge and Innovation in the New Service Economy*. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham.
- Andersen, E.S., 2001. Satiation in an evolutionary model of structural economic dynamics. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 11, 143–164.
- Araújo, R., Teixeira, J., 2002. Structural change and decisions on investment allocation. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 13 (2), 249–258.
- Arthur, W.B., 1988. Self-reinforcing mechanisms in economics. In: Anderson, P.W., Arrow, K.J., Pines, D. (Eds.), *The Economy as an Evolving Complex System*. Addison Wesley.
- Arthur, W.B., 1989. Competing technologies, increasing returns and lock in by historical events. *Economic Journal* 99, 116–131.
- Arthur, W.B., 1994. *Increasing Returns and Path Dependency in the Economy*. The University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor.
- Ascher, W., 1996. The evolution of post-war doctrines in development economics. In: Coats, A.W. (Ed.), *The Post-1945 Internationalization of Economics*. Duke University Press, Durham, NC.
- Backhouse, R.E., 1990. *Economists and the Economy: The Evolution of Economic Ideas*. Transaction Press, Rutgers, NJ.
- Baily, M., Gordon, R., 1988. The productivity slowdown, measurement issues, and the explosion of computer power. In: Brainard, W.C., Perry, G.L. (Eds.), *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*. The Brookings Institution, Washington, DC.
- Baldone, S., 1996. Vertical integration, the temporal structure of production processes, and transition between techniques. In: Landesmann, M.A., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *Production and Economic Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 81–104.
- Baranzini, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), 1990. *The Economic Theory of Structure and Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Baumol, W.J., 1967 June. Macroeconomics of unbalanced growth: the anatomy of urban crisis. *American Economic Review* 57 (3), 415–426.
- Chenery, H.B., 1960. Patterns of industrial growth. *American Economic Review* 50, 624–654.
- Chenery, H.B., 1988. Introduction to Part 2. In: Chenery, H., Srinivasan, T. (Eds.), *Handbook of Development Economics*, vol. 1. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Chenery, H.B., Syrquin, M., 1975. *Patterns of Development, 1957–1970*. Oxford University Press, London.
- Chenery, H.B., Taylor, L., 1968. Development patterns: among countries and over time. *Review of Economics and Statistics* 50 (4), 391–416.

- Chiaromonte, F., Dosi, G., 1993. Heterogeneity competition and macroeconomic dynamics. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 4, 39–63.
- Clark, B., 1938. International comparison of national income. *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv* 47 (1), 51–76.
- Cornwall, J., 1976. Diffusion, convergence and Kaldor's Laws. *Economic Journal* 86, 307–314.
- Cornwall, J., 1977. *Modern Capitalism. Its Growth and Transformation*. Martin Robertson, London.
- David, P., 1975. *Technical Choice, Innovative and Economic Growth: Essays on American and British Experience in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge University Press.
- David, P., 1985. CLIO and the economics of QWERTY. *Papers and Proceedings of the American Economic Association* 75, 332–336.
- David, P.A., 1990. The Dynamo and the Computer: an historical perspective on the modern productivity paradox. *American Economic Review* 80 (2), 355–361.
- Dobb, M.H., 1960. *An Essay on Economic Growth and Planning*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, London.
- Dosi, G., 1982. Technological paradigms and technological trajectories: a suggested interpretation of the determinants and directions of technical change. *Research Policy* 11 (June (3)), 147–162.
- Dosi, G., 1988. Sources, procedures, and microeconomic effects of innovation. *Journal of Economic Literature* 26, 1120–1171.
- Dosi, G., Freeman, C., Nelson, R., Silverberg, G., Soete, L. (Eds.), 1988. *Technical Change and Economic Theory*. Pinter, London.
- Dosi, G., Pavitt, K., Soete, L., 1990. Markets, institutions and technical change in open economies: some policy implications. In: *The Economics of Technical Change and International Trade*. Harvester Wheatsheaf, Great British, pp. 237–263.
- Easterley, W., 2002. *The Elusive Quest for Growth: Economists' Adventures and Misadventures in the Tropics*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Eliasson, G., 1984. Micro heterogeneity of firms and stability of growth. *Journal of Behavior and Economic Organization* 5 (3/4), 249–298.
- Eliasson, G., 1991. Modeling the experimentally organized economy. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 16 (1–2), 153–182.
- Eliasson, G., Johansson, D., Taymaz, E., 2004. Simulating the new economy. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 15, 289–314.
- Fagerberg, J., 1987. A technology gap approach to why growth rates differ. *Research Policy* 16 (2–4), 87–99.
- Fagerberg, J., 1988. International competitiveness. *The Economic Journal* 98, 355–374.
- Fagerberg, J., 1994. Technology and international differences in growth rates. *Journal of Economic Literature* XXXII (3), 1147–1175.
- Fagerberg, J., 2000. Technological progress, structural change and productivity growth: a comparative study. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 11, 393–411.
- Fagerberg, J., 2003. Schumpeter and the revival of evolutionary economics: an appraisal of the literature. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 13, 125–159.
- Fagerberg, J., Verspagen, B., 1999. Modern Capitalism' in the 1970s and 1980s. In: Setterfield, M. (Ed.), *Growth, Employment and Inflation*. Macmillan, London, pp. 113–126.
- Fagerberg, J., Verspagen, B., 2002. Technology-gaps, innovation-diffusion and transformation: an evolutionary approach. *Research Policy* 31, 1291–1304.
- Feldman, G., 1928. On the theory of growth rates of national income. In: Spulber, N. (Ed.), *Foundations of Soviet Strategy for Economic Growth*. Bloomington, Indiana, 1964.
- Fisher, A.G.B., 1939. Production, primary, secondary and tertiary. *Economic Record* 15, 24–38.
- Franke, R., Kalmbach, P., 2005. Structural change in the manufacturing sector and its impact on business-related services: an input–output study for Germany. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 16, 467–488.
- Freeman, C., 1987. *Technology Policy and Economic Performance*. Pinter Publishers, London.
- Freeman, C., 1991. Innovation, changes of techno-economic paradigm and biological analogies in economics. *Revue Économique* 42, 211–232.
- Freeman, C., 1992. Formal scientific and technical institutions in the national system of innovation. In: Lundvall, B.-E. (Ed.), *National Systems of Innovation: Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*. Pinter Publishers, London.
- Freeman, C., 1994. The economics of technical change. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 18, 463–514.
- Freeman, C., 2001. A hard landing for the new economy? Information Technology and the United States National System of Innovation. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 12, 115–139.
- Freeman, C., Perez, C., 1988. Structural crisis of adjustment, business cycles and investment behaviour. In: Dosi, G., et al. (Eds.), *Technical Change and Economic Theory*. Pinter Publishers, London.
- Freeman, C., Soete, L., 1997. *The Economics of Industrial Innovation*. Pinter, London.
- Freeman, C., Clark, J., Soete, L., 1982. *Unemployment and Technical Innovation*. Pinter, London.
- Furtado, C., 1967. *Teoria e política do desenvolvimento econômico*. Companhia Editora Nacional, São Paulo.
- Georgescu-Roegen, N., 1971. *The Entropy Law and the Economic Process*. Harvard UP, Mass./London.
- Gershenkron, A., 1962. *Economic Backwardness in Historical Perspective*. Belknap, Cambridge, MA.
- Goodwin, R.M., 1976. Use of normalized general coordinates in linear value and distribution theory. In: Polenske, K.R., Skolka, J.V. (Eds.), *Advances in Input–Output Analysis*.
- Goodwin, R.M., 1983. *Essays in Linear Economic Structures*. Macmillan, London.
- Goodwin, R.M., 1991. Schumpeter, Keynes and the Theory of Economic Evolution. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 1 (1), 29–47.
- Goodwin, R.M., 1993. Marx–Keynes–Schumpeter Model of economic growth and fluctuations. In: Day, R.H., Chen, P. (Eds.), *Non-linear Dynamics and Evolutionary Economics*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 45–57.
- Goodwin, R.M., Punzo, L.F., 1987. *The Dynamics of a Capitalist Society*. Polity Press in association with Basil Blackwell, Cambridge.
- Goodwin, R.M., 1987. The economy as an evolutionary pulsator. In: Vasko, T. (Ed.), *The Long-Wave Debate*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Grossman, G., Helpman, H., 1991. *Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy*. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Gualerzi, D., 2001. Consumption and Growth: Recovery and Structural. Change in the US economy. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, UK.
- Hagemann, H., 1990. The structural theory of economic growth. In: Baranzini, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *The Economic Theory of Structure and Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 144–171 (Chapter 6).

- Hagemann, H., Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R., 2003. Introduction. In: Hagemann, H., Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *The Economics of Structural Change*, vol. I. Elgar, Cheltenham, UK, pp. xi–xiii.
- Halevi, J., 1996. The significance of the theory of vertically integrated processes for the problem of economic development. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 7, 163–171.
- Harris, D., 1982. Structural change and economic growth: a review article. *Contributions to Political Economy* 1, 25–45.
- Hicks, J., 1965. *Capital and Growth*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hicks, J., 1973. *Capital and Time: A Neo-Austrian Theory*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hicks, J., 1977. *Economic Perspectives*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hicks, J., 1985. *Methods of Dynamic Economics*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Hoffmann, W., 1931/1958. The pattern of industrial growth. In: Hagemann, H., Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *The Economics of Structural Change*, Vol. III, *Critical Writings*. Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
- Hölzl, W., Reinstaller, A., 2007. The impact of productivity and demand shocks on structural dynamics: evidence from Austrian manufacturing. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 18 (2), 145–166.
- Ishikawa, S., 1987. 'Structural Change' An Entry of: *The New Palgrave. A Dictionary of Economics*, IV. Macmillan, London, 523–5.
- Kaldor, N., 1966. *Causes of the Slow Rate of Growth of the United Kingdom*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Kaldor, N., 1970. The Case for Regional Policies. *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* XVII, 337–348.
- Kuznets, S., 1940. Schumpeters business cycles. *American Economic Review* 30 (2), 257–271.
- Kuznets, S., 1961. Quantitative aspects of the economic growth of nations: IV. Long term trends in capital formation proportions. *Economic Development and Cultural Change* 9, 1–124.
- Kuznets, S., 1971. *Economic Growth of Nations: Total Output and Production Structure*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Landesmann, M., Goodwin, R., 1994. Productivity growth, structural change and macroeconomic stability. In: Pasinetti, L., Solow, R. (Eds.), *Economic Growth and the Structure of Long-Term Development*. Macmillan Press, London.
- Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), 1996. *Production and Economic Dynamics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R., 1990. Specification of structure and economic dynamics. In: Baranzini, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *The Economic Theory of Structure and Change*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 95–121 (Chapter 4).
- Leon, P., 1967. *Structural Change and Growth in Capitalism*. Johns Hopkins, Baltimore.
- Leontief, W., 1941. *The Structure of American Economy, 1919–29*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge.
- Leontief, W., 1953. Dynamic analysis. In: Leontief, W. (Ed.), *Studies in the Structure of the American Economy*. Oxford University Press, New York, pp. 53–90.
- Leontief, W., 1970. The dynamic inverse. In: Carter, A.P., Brody, A. (Eds.), *Contributions to Input–Output Analysis*. North-Holland Publishing Company, Amsterdam.
- Leontief, W., 1987. Input–Output Analysis, An Entry of: *The New Palgrave. A Dictionary of Economics*. Macmillan, London, pp. 860–864.
- Leontief, W., 1991. The economy as a circular flow. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 2 (1), 181–212.
- Lewis, A., 1954. Economic development with unlimited supplies of labor. *Manchester School of Economic and Social Studies* 28, 139–191.
- Little, I.M.D., 1982. *Economic Development*. Basic Books.
- Los, B., Verspagen, B., 2006. The evolution of productivity gaps and specialization patterns. *Metroeconomica* 57 (4), 464–493.
- Lowe, A., 1955. Structural analysis of real capital formation. In: *Capital Formation and Economic Growth: A Conference of the Universities—National Bureau Committee for Economic Research*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, pp. 581–634.
- Lowe, A., 1976. *The Path of Economic Growth*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Lucas, R., 1988. On the mechanics of economic development. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 22, 3–42.
- Lucas, R., 1993. Making a miracle. *Econometrica* 61, 251–272.
- Lundvall, B.-A., 1992. *National Systems of Innovation: Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*. Pinter Publishers, London.
- Machlup, F., 1991. *Economic Semantics*, 2nd ed. Transaction Pub.
- Mahalanobis, P.C., 1955. The Approach of Operational Research to 44 Planning in India. *Sankhya: The Indian Journal of Statistics* 16, 3–62 (Parts 1 and 2).
- Marx, K., 1885. III: Schematic presentation of accumulation and supplementary remarks. In: Hagemann, H., Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *The Economics of Structural Change*, Vol. I, *Critical Writings*. 2003, Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
- Metcalfe, J.S., 1998. *Evolutionary Economics and Creative Destruction*. Routledge, London.
- Metcalfe, J.S., Foster, J., Ramlogan, R., 2006. Adaptive economic growth. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 30, 7–32.
- Milberg, 2004. The changing structure of international trade linked to global production systems: what are the policy implications? *International Labour Review* 143, 45–90.
- Miles, I., Tomlinson, M., 2000. Intangible assets and service sectors: the challenges of service industries. In: Buiges, P., Jacquemin, A., Marchipont, J. (Eds.), *Competitiveness and the Value of Intangible Assets*. Edward Elgar.
- Mirowski, P., 2002. *Machine Dreams: How Economics Became a Cyborg Science*. Cambridge University Press, NY.
- Montobbio, F., 2002. An evolutionary model of industrial growth and structural change. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 13, 387–414.
- Murphy, K., Shleifer, A., Vishny, R., 1989. Industrialization and the Big Push. *Journal of Political Economy* 97 (5), 1003–1026.
- Naqvi, K., 1963. Machine tools and machines: a physical interpretation of the marginal rate of saving. *Indian Economic Review* 6, 19–28.
- Nelson, R., Wright, G., 1992. The rise and fall of American technological leadership: the Postwar Era in historical perspective. *Journal of Economic Literature* 30 (4), 1931–1964.
- Nelson, R., Winter, S., 1982. *An Evolutionary Theory of Economic Change*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Nelson, R.R. (Ed.), 1993. *National Innovation Systems: A Comparative Analysis*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Notarangelo, M., 1999. Unbalanced growth: a case of structural dynamics. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 10, 209–223.

- Nurkse, R., 1953. *Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Oosterhaven, J., Hoen, A., 1998. Preferences, technology, trade and real income changes in the European Union. An intercountry decomposition analysis for 1975–1985. *The Annals of Regional Science* 32 (4), 505–524.
- Pasinetti, L.L., 1973. The notion of vertical integration on economic analysis. *Metroeconomica* 25, 1–29.
- Pasinetti, L.L., 1981. *Structural Change and Economic Growth. A Theoretical Essay on the Dynamics of the Wealth of Nations*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pasinetti, L.L., 1993. *Structural Economic Dynamics: A Theory of the Economic Consequences of Human Learning*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Pasinetti, L.L., Scazzieri, R., 1987. Structural Economic Dynamics, An Entry of: *The New Palgrave. Dictionary of Economics*, vol. IV. Macmillan, London, pp. 525–528.
- Peneder, M., 2003. Industrial structure and aggregate growth. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 14, 427–448.
- Peneder, M., Kaniovski, S., Dachs, B., 2003. What follows tertiarisation? structural change and the role of knowledge based services. *The Service Industry Journal* 23, 47–66.
- Perez, C., 1983. Structural change and assimilation of new technologies in the economic and social systems. *Futures* 15 (5), 357–375.
- Perez, C., 1985. Microelectronics, long waves and world structural change: new perspectives for developing countries. *World Development* 13 (3), 441–463.
- Petit, P., 2002. The roots of the new economy: an institutional perspective. *International Productivity Monitor* 4, 39–54.
- Petit, P., Soete, L., 2000. Technical change and employment growth in services: analytical and policy challenges. In: Petit, P., Soete, L. (Eds.), *Technology and the future of European employment*. Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
- Piacentini, P., 1995. Time-explicit theory of production: analytical and operational suggestions following a ‘fund–flow approach’. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 6, 461–483.
- Pieper, U., 2000. Deindustrialization and the social and economic sustainability nexus in developing countries: cross-country evidence on productivity and employment. *Journal of Development Studies* 36 (April (4)), 66–99.
- Prebisch, R., 1950. *The Economic Development of Latin America and its Principal Problems*. United Nations, New York.
- Quadrio-Curzio, A., 1986. Technological scarcity: an essay on production and structural change. In: Baranzini, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *Foundations of Economics: Structures of Inquiry and Economic Theory*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford and New York, pp. 311–338 (Chapter 10).
- Quadrio-Curzio, A., Pellizzari, F., 1999. *Rent, Resources, Technologies*. Springer.
- Quesnay, F., 1758. *Tableau Économique*. In: Hagemann, H., Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *The Economics of Structural Change*, 3rd ed., Vol. I, *Critical Writings*. 2003, Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
- Rada, C., Taylor, L., 2006. Developing and transition economies in the late 20th century: diverging growth rates, economic structures, and sources of demand, SCEPA Working Paper 2006-1.
- Raiser, M., Schaffer, M., Schuchhardt, J., 2004. Benchmarking structural change in transition. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 15 (1), 47–81.
- Reati, A., 1998a. Technological revolutions in Pasinetti's model of structural change: productivity and prices. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 9, 245–262.
- Reati, A., 1998b. A long-wave pattern for output and employment in Pasinetti's Model of structural change. *Economie Appliquée* LI (2), 29–77.
- Ricardo, D., 1817. On rent. In: Hagemann, H., Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *The Economics of Structural Change*, Vol. I, *Critical Writings*. 2003, Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
- Romer, P.M., 1990. Endogenous technical change. *Journal of Political Economy* 98, 71–102.
- Ros, J., 2000. *Development Theory and the Economics of Growth*. University of Michigan Press.
- Rose, A., Miernyk, W., 1989. Input–output analysis: the first fifty years. *Economic Systems Research* 1 (2), 229–272.
- Rosenberg, N., 1963. Capital goods, technology, and economic growth. In: Hagemann, H., Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *The Economics of Structural Change*, Vol. I, *Critical Writings*. Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
- Rosenberg, N., 1982. *Inside the Black Box: Technology and Economics*. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Rosenstein-Rodan, P., 1943. Problems of industrialization in Eastern and South-Eastern Europe. *Economic Journal* 53, 202–211.
- Rosenstein-Rodan, P., 1961. Notes on the theory of the big-push. In: Ellis, H.S., Wallich, H.C. (Eds.), *Economic Development for Latin America*. Macmillan, London.
- Rostow, W.W., 1960. *The Stages of Economic Growth: A Non-communist Manifesto*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Sánchez Chóliz, J., Duarte, R., 2006. The effect of structural change on the self-reliance and interdependence of aggregate sectors: the case of Spain, 1980–1994. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 17 (1), 27–45.
- Saviotti, P., Pyka, A., 2004a. Economic development by the creation of new sectors. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics* 14 (1), 1–35.
- Saviotti, P.P., Pyka, A., 2004b. Economic development, qualitative change and employment creation. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 15, 265–287.
- Schettkat, R., Yocarini, L., 2006. The shift to services employment: a review of the literature. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 17, 127–147.
- Schumpeter, J., 1928. The Instability of Capitalism. In: Hagemann, H., Landesmann, M., Scazzieri, R. (Eds.), *The Economics of Structural Change*, Vol. I, *Critical Writings*. Edward Elgar, Aldershot.
- Schumpeter, J.A., 1939. *Business Cycles: A Theoretical, Historical, and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process*. McGraw-Hill, New York and London.
- Sen, A., 1960. *Choice of Techniques*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Silverberg, G., 2002. The discrete charm of the bourgeoisie: quantum and continuous perspectives on innovation and growth. *Research Policy* 31 (8–9), 1275–1289.

- Silverberg, G., Lehnert, D., 1993. Long waves and 'evolutionary chaos' in a simple Schumpeterian model of embodied technical change. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 4 (1), 9–37.
- Silverberg, G., 1988. Modelling economic dynamics and technical change: mathematical approaches to self-organisation and evolution. In: Dosi, G., Freeman, C., Nelson, R., Silverberg, G., Soete, L. (Eds.), *Technical Change and Economic Theory*. Pinter, London.
- Silverberg, G., Dosi, G., Orsenigo, L., 1988. Innovation, diversity and diffusion: a self-organisation model. *Economic Journal* 98, 1032–1054.
- Smith, A., 1763. Division of labour. In: Meek, R.L., Raphael, D.D., Stein, P.G. (Eds.) *Lectures on Jurisprudence, Lecture of Tuesday, 29 March 1763*. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1978, pp. 340–349.
- Smith, A., 1776. In: Campbell, R.H., Skinner, A.S., Todd, W.B. (Eds.), *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1976.
- Sraffa, P., 1960. On 'Sub-Systems'. In: *Production of Commodities by Means of Commodities: Prelude to a Critique of Economic Theory, Appendix A*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 89.
- Steuart, J., 1767. In: Skinner, A.S. (Ed.), *An Inquiry into the Principles of the Political Oeconomy*. Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh and London, 1966.
- Svennilson, I., 1954. The process of economic growth. In: *Growth and Stagnation in the European Economy*. U.N. Economic Commission for Europe, Geneva (Chapter 1).
- Tani, P., 1988. Flows, funds, and sectoral interdependence in the theory of production. *Political Economy Studies in the Surplus Approach* 4, 3–21.
- Ten Raa, T., Wolff, E., 2000. Engines of growth in the US economy. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 11 (1–2), 473–489.
- Timmer, M.P., Szirmai, A., 2000. Productivity in Asian manufacturing: the unimportance of structural change. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 11, 371–392.
- Turgot, A.R.J., 1766. Reflections on the formation and the distribution of wealth. In: Meek, R.L. (Ed.), *Turgot on Progress, Sociology and Economics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1973, pp. 119–134.
- Verspagen, B., 1991. A new empirical approach to catching up or falling behind. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 2, 359–380.
- Verspagen, B., 1993. *Uneven Growth Between Interdependent Economies: An Evolutionary View on Technology Gaps, Trade and Growth*. Avebury, Aldershot.
- von Böhm-Bawerk, E., 1891. The Theory of the Formation of Capital, in *The Positive Theory of Capital*, translated by W. Smart, Book II. G.E. Stechert and Co., New York (Chapter IV), 1930.
- von Neumann, J., 1945. A model of general economic equilibrium, *Review of Economic Studies* 13 (1), 1–9.
- Wang, C., Sun, J., Chou, T., 1992. Sources of economic growth and structural change: a revised approach. *Journal of Development Economics* 38, 383–401.
- Weintraub, R., 2002. *How Economics Became a Mathematical Science*. Duke University Press, Durham.
- You, J., Lee J., 2000. Economic and social consequences of globalization: the case of South Korea, SCEPA Working Paper No. 17.