

UNIVERSITY OF HOHENHEIM

FACULTY OF BUSINESS, ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES



HOHENHEIM DISCUSSION PAPERS
IN BUSINESS, ECONOMICS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Institute of Economics

DISCUSSION PAPER **31**-2017

**LONGEVITY-INDUCED VERTICAL
INNOVATION AND THE TRADEOFF
BETWEEN LIFE AND GROWTH**

Annarita Baldanzi


University of Milan/University of Pavia

Klaus Prettner

University of Hohenheim

Paul Tscheuschner

University of Hohenheim



www.wiso.uni-hohenheim.de

Discussion Paper 31-2017

**Longevity-induced vertical innovation and the
tradeoff between life and growth**

Annarita Baldanzi, Klaus Prettnner, Paul Tscheuschner

Download this Discussion Paper from our homepage:

<https://wiso.uni-hohenheim.de/papers>

ISSN 2364-2084

Die Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences dienen der schnellen Verbreitung von Forschungsarbeiten der Fakultät Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften. Die Beiträge liegen in alleiniger Verantwortung der Autoren und stellen nicht notwendigerweise die Meinung der Fakultät Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaften dar.

Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences are intended to make results of the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences research available to the public in order to encourage scientific discussion and suggestions for revisions. The authors are solely responsible for the contents which do not necessarily represent the opinion of the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences.

Longevity-induced vertical innovation and the tradeoff between life and growth

Annarita Baldanzi^{a,b} Klaus Prettnner^c Paul Tscheuschner^c

^a University of Milan

Department of Economics, Management and Quantitative Methods
Via Conservatorio 7
20122 Milan, Italy
annarita.baldanzi@unimi.it

^b University of Pavia

Department of Economics and Management
Via San Felice 5
27100 Pavia, Italy

^c University of Hohenheim

Institute of Economics
Schloss, Osthof-West
70599 Stuttgart, Germany
tscheuschner.paul@uni-hohenheim.de

Abstract

We analyze the economic growth effects of rising longevity in a framework of endogenous growth driven by quality-improving innovations. We show that a rise in longevity raises savings and thereby reduces the market interest rate. Since the monopoly profits generated by a successful innovation are discounted by the endogenous market interest rate, this raises the net present value of innovations, which, in turn, fosters R&D. The associated increase in the employment of scientists leads to faster technological progress and a higher long-run economic growth rate. From a welfare perspective, we show that the direct effect of an increase in life expectancy on lifetime utility is much larger than the indirect effect of the induced higher consumption due to faster economic growth. Consequently, the debate on rising health care expenditures should not predominantly be based on the growth effects of health care.

JEL classification: J11, J17, O31, O41.

Keywords: Long-run growth, vertical innovation, increasing life expectancy, welfare effects of changing longevity, size of health-care sectors.

1 Introduction

While there are deep-rooted concerns on the negative economic consequences of population aging in the public debate (see, for example, The Economist, 2011a,b), a negative effect on economic growth is not yet visible empirically (Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2017). One of the reasons might be that increasing longevity, which is one of the two causes of population aging, has positive side effects that work so as to raise economic growth. For example, individuals save more if they expect a longer life in order to be able to sustain their living standards in a prolonged retirement period (Bloom et al., 2003, 2007, 2010). Another channel is that increasing longevity leads to a longer working life such that the incentives to invest in education are higher, which in turn raises labor productivity and thereby economic growth (Cervellati and Sunde, 2013; Strulik and Werner, 2016). In general, despite the earlier work of Acemoglu and Johnson (2007) who found a negative causal effect of increasing life expectancy on economic growth, the more recent empirical evidence suggests that the increase in life expectancy over the last decades by itself has been a driver of economic growth in industrialized countries (Lorentzen et al., 2008; Cervellati and Sunde, 2011; Aghion et al., 2011; Bloom et al., 2014; Gehringer and Prettnner, 2017).

We aim to contribute to this debate by elaborating on the theoretical mechanism by which increasing longevity affects economic growth in modern knowledge-based economies. In these economies, the standard neoclassical type of growth model in terms of which the debate on the effects of increasing life expectancy is usually framed (Solow, 1956; Cass, 1965; Diamond, 1965) are not suitable because long-run growth in these economies is driven by endogenous technological progress and not by physical capital accumulation (Romer, 1990; Jones, 1995; Strulik et al., 2013). While there has been some progress in the analysis of the effects of increasing longevity on horizontal innovation, i.e., the introduction of new products (see, for example, Prettnner, 2013; Prettnner and Trimborn, 2016; Hashimoto and Tabata, 2016), we are not aware of a comparable study that is based on vertical innovations, i.e., quality-improvements of existing products. Closing this gap in the literature is important because i) due to the different mechanism by which growth is generated in the vertical innovation framework, the way increasing longevity affects economic growth might be different, ii) the welfare implications could be different because in the vertical innovation framework, there is a Schumpeterian creative destruction effect to the extent that a new innovation drives the old incumbent out of business. Consequently, long-run growth might be too high from a social point of view within this setting.

Despite that endogenous and semi-endogenous growth models with vertical in-

novations (Grossman and Helpman, 1991; Aghion and Howitt, 1992; Segerström, 1998) analyze the economic growth effects of changing population size and changing population growth, they do not examine the consequences of changing longevity. The reason is that a single representative individual who lives forever makes all the relevant economic decisions in these models. We introduce an overlapping generations structure that allows for the analysis of changing life expectancy into the model proposed by Aghion and Howitt (1992), which has been simplified subsequently by Aghion and Howitt (1999, 2005, 2009). The basic mechanism in this framework is that research activities randomly lead to quality-improving innovations. The more researchers an economy employs and the more productive these researchers are in generating innovations, the higher is the probability that a new innovation occurs in a given time period. A quality-improving innovation raises the productivity of intermediate goods in producing the final consumption good. Consequently, a higher probability of innovations raises long-run economic growth.

We introduce age-specific heterogeneity into this setting by assuming a demographic structure with three overlapping generations in discrete time, childhood, adulthood, and retirement. Individuals face an exogenously given survival probability from adulthood to retirement. Varying this parameter allows us to analyze the effects of changing longevity. If longevity increases, the economy saves more at the aggregate level, which reduces the market interest rate. This is an important difference to Aghion and Howitt (1992), who assume a constant and exogenous interest rate. Since innovators discount the future expected profits of an innovation by the market interest rate, this raises the net present value of an innovation, which, in turn, raises the incentive to come up with a quality-improving new idea. To raise the probability of a successful quality-improvement, R&D firms hire additional researchers, which raises the innovation rate and in turn productivity growth.

We apply the resulting framework to decompose the welfare effects of increasing longevity into two separate effects. The direct effect is that higher life expectancy allows individuals to enjoy consumption over a longer expected time period. The indirect effect is that the increase in life expectancy induces innovation, which in turn raises growth of aggregate output and consumption. We show that the direct welfare effect is much higher than the indirect welfare effect based on induced economic growth. This result is consistent with the literature that shows that raising investments in the health sector of an economy beyond the growth-maximizing point – such that the additional resources channeled toward the health sector even reduce economic growth – can be Pareto improving (Kuhn and Prettnner, 2016). Furthermore, we show that the relative importance of the direct welfare effect increases

with economic development. This is in turn consistent with Hall and Jones (2007) who show that, as the economy develops, it is optimal to invest an ever larger share of aggregate income in better health.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce the overlapping generations structure that we implement into a standard model of vertical innovations. In Section 3 we derive our main analytical results with respect to the growth effects of increasing life expectancy and the numerical results with respect to the welfare decomposition into the direct effect and the indirect effect. In Section 4 we summarize and draw some lessons from a policy perspective.

2 The model

2.1 Consumption side

Consider an overlapping generations economy with single-sex individuals living for three time periods: childhood, adulthood, and retirement. Childhood lasts for 20 years, adulthood for 40 years, and the phase of retirement can last for 40 years after which an individual dies for sure. Consequently, the maximum achievable life span is 100 years. However, there is a survival probability from adulthood to retirement which determines the overall life expectancy. Children face no economic decisions and fulfill their consumption needs via parental expenditures. The single-sex adult individual consumes, saves for retirement, works for the wage rate w_t , and gives birth to one child such that the cohort size stays constant. We assume that parents give birth to children in the middle of the adulthood period such the children enter adulthood at the time when adults enter retirement. Retirees only consume out of the savings accumulated as adults (see Samuelson, 1958; Diamond, 1965, for the corresponding consumption-savings decision of adults).

We conceptualize an adult's remaining lifetime utility (u_t) by means of a logarithmic utility function that ensures analytical tractability. This function is given by

$$u_t = \ln(c_{1,t}) + \phi\beta \ln(c_{2,t+1}), \quad (1)$$

where $c_{1,t}$ is the consumption of an adult at time t , $c_{2,t+1}$ refers to consumption in retirement at time $t + 1$, $0 < \phi < 1$ is the survival probability between adulthood and retirement¹, and $0 < \beta < 1$ is the discount factor. Following Blanchard (1985) and Yaari (1965), there are perfect and fair annuity markets such that individuals

¹For similar treatments of the survival probability in the overlapping generations literature, see, for example, Blackburn and Cipriani (2002), Chakraborty (2004), and Zhang and Zhang (2005).

insure themselves against the risk of dying with positive assets. Thanks to the annuity market, all savings are intermediated through mutual funds. At the end of the first period, every individual deposits her savings with a mutual fund, which buys assets in the form of shares of firms, yielding a gross return of $(1 + r_{t+1})/\phi$. In this expression, r_{t+1} is the real rate of return on savings and it is equivalent to the dividend yield plus the valuation gain of the investment. The budget constraints of adults and retirees are therefore given by

$$c_{1,t} + s_t = w_t, \quad (2)$$

$$c_{2,t+1} = \frac{1 + r_{t+1}}{\phi} \cdot s_t, \quad (3)$$

where consumption as adult plus savings for retirement (s_t) cannot exceed wage income in the first period of life [equation (2)] and consumption of retirees that survived from adulthood to retirement is given by the savings carried over from adulthood plus the return earned by investing in the annuity market [equation (3)]. Combining the budget constraints, the lifetime budget constraint is obtained as

$$c_{1,t} + \phi \frac{c_{2,t+1}}{1 + r_{t+1}} = w_t. \quad (4)$$

From the first-order conditions, the individual Euler Equation follows as

$$\frac{c_{2,t+1}}{c_{1,t}} = (1 + r_{t+1}) \beta. \quad (5)$$

Notice that the survival probability drops out of the individual Euler Equation because of the fully insured mortality risk. Since the birth rate is assumed to be equal to the replacement rate, the relative cohort size between adults and retirees is only influenced by the survival probability to the extent that $N_{2,t+1} = \phi N_{1,t}$. Defining aggregate consumption of adults and of retirees by $C_{1,t} = c_{1,t} N_{1,t}$ and $C_{2,t+1} = c_{2,t+1} N_{2,t+1}$, respectively, aggregation yields $c_{2,t+1} N_{2,t+1} = (1 + r_{t+1}) \beta c_{1,t} \phi N_{1,t}$. From this expression, the “aggregate” Euler equation follows immediately as

$$\frac{C_{2,t+1}}{C_{1,t}} = (1 + r_{t+1}) \beta \phi. \quad (6)$$

We notice that aggregate consumption growth rises with the survival probability, i.e., $\partial(C_{2,t+1}/C_{1,t})/\partial\phi > 0$. The economic intuition is straightforward: the introduction of lifetime uncertainty induces individuals to reduce their propensity to save. Therefore, aggregate savings are smaller, which reduces aggregate consumption growth. In the individual Euler equation, this negative effect on consumption growth exists as

well but it is exactly offset by the additional transfers by the life insurance company from the individuals who die between adulthood and retirement. Consequently, the death process only slows down the growth of aggregate consumption.

2.2 Production side

The production side of the economy is a simplified version of the production side of the Schumpeterian growth model as developed by Aghion and Howitt (1992) and further elaborated upon in Aghion and Howitt (2005, 1999). There are three sectors, the final goods sector, the intermediate goods sector, and the R&D sector. The aggregate final good is produced under perfect competition using the intermediate good as input. The intermediate good is in turn produced by a monopoly in the intermediate goods sector, with a one-to-one technology out of labor. The monopolist owns the patent of the most recent quality-improving innovation developed in the R&D sector. When the next quality-improving innovation occurs, the incumbent is driven out of business and loses the monopoly rents. Since firms in the intermediate goods sector earn a positive profit stream due to monopolistic competition (as long as they are in the position of being the incumbent), the firms have positive value and their shares are sold via the mutual funds to the households in the economy. We abstract from physical capital such that these shares represent the only savings vehicle. Introducing physical capital would complicate the model substantially without changing the main mechanisms.²

The final good is denoted by Y_t and produced according to the production function

$$Y_t = A_t x_t^\alpha, \quad (7)$$

where A_t refers to the productivity of the intermediate good in producing the final good, x_t is the intermediate good produced by the monopolist, and $0 < \alpha < 1$ is the elasticity of output with respect to intermediate inputs. Innovations are tantamount to the introduction of a new variety of the single intermediate good with a higher quality that replaces the previous one. The new intermediate good increases the productivity A_t by a constant factor $\gamma > 1$ such that

$$A_{i+1} = \gamma \cdot A_i. \quad (8)$$

where i refers to the number of innovations that have occurred until now (Aghion

²For a framework of horizontal innovation with increasing longevity in which both types of assets, physical capital and shares of intermediate goods producers are available, see Prettnner (2013).

and Howitt, 1992).

The intermediate good is produced by using the amount x_t of the production factor labor as denoted by L because of the one-for-one technology according to which one unit of labor produces one unit of the intermediate good. Labor is also used in the research sector, with the amount being denoted by n_t . Consequently, the labor market clearing condition is

$$L = x_t + n_t. \tag{9}$$

Given employment n_t in the research sector, the arrival of innovations follows a random Poisson arrival rate $\lambda \cdot n_t$, where $\lambda > 0$ denotes the productivity of researchers. This means that more researchers and a higher productivity of these researchers both increase the probability of a successful innovation in a given period. The firm that succeeds to obtain the newest innovation from the R&D sector monopolizes the intermediate goods sector until it is replaced by the next innovator. Employment of researchers can be calculated with the help of the no-arbitrage condition

$$w_i = \lambda V_{i+1}, \tag{10}$$

where w_i refers to the wage of the researchers and V_{i+1} to the discounted expected payoff of innovation $i + 1$. The no-arbitrage condition states that the investment of the research firm in terms of the wage bill for scientists has to equal the expected discounted payoff of an innovation in terms of a quality improvement and the associated monopoly rents over the period in which the innovator will be the new incumbent. The value of V_{i+1} is in turn determined by the no-arbitrage equation for the investments of households given by

$$rV_{i+1} = \pi_{i+1} - \lambda n_{i+1} V_{i+1}. \tag{11}$$

The left-hand side is the income earned on an investment of the amount V_{i+1} at the risk free interest rate r , while the right-hand side consists of the monopoly profits due to owning the incumbent firm minus the expected loss that occurs when the incumbent is driven out of business by a new quality-improving innovation. While in Aghion and Howitt (1999) the interest rate is exogenously given, in our overlapping generations framework the “aggregate” Euler equation determines the real interest rate. Hence, we endogenize the interest rate, which is particularly important when analyzing the growth effects of increasing life expectancy.

From Equation (11), we obtain

$$V_{i+1} = \frac{\pi_{i+1}}{r + \lambda n_{i+1}}.$$

It is straightforward that $\partial V_{i+1}/\partial n_{i+1} < 0$, i.e., if more researchers are employed in the R&D sector, the probability of the next innovation is larger, which implies lower monopoly profits because an incumbent can expect to be replaced earlier. The incumbent innovator determines optimal output x_i by maximizing

$$\pi_i = p_i(x_i)x_i - w_i x_i \quad (12)$$

with respect to the choice of x_i . This choice in turn determines the profits π_i . Given perfect competition in the final good sector, $p_i(x_i) = A_i \alpha x_i^{\alpha-1}$ is the inverse demand function for intermediates. The maximization of profits then yields

$$x_i = \left(\frac{\alpha^2 A_i}{w_i} \right)^{1/(1-\alpha)}. \quad (13)$$

Substituting $p_i(x_i)$ into Equation (12), we obtain

$$\pi_i = \left(\frac{1}{\alpha} - 1 \right) w_i x_i = A_i \frac{1-\alpha}{\alpha} \omega_i x_i = A_i \tilde{\pi}, \quad (14)$$

where $\omega_i = w_i/A_i$ is the productivity-adjusted wage rate and $\tilde{\pi} = (1-\alpha)\omega x/\alpha$. Exploiting the new definition of profits in Equation (14) and dividing both sides of Equation (10) by A_i acknowledging that $A_{i+1}/A_i = \gamma$ from Equation (8), we can rewrite the no-arbitrage condition as

$$\omega_i = \lambda \frac{\gamma \tilde{\pi} (\omega_{i+1})}{r + \lambda n_{i+1}}. \quad (15)$$

To be consistent, we rewrite the labor market clearing condition in terms of the productivity-adjusted wage rate

$$L = n_i + \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{\omega_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}. \quad (16)$$

The production function, Equation (7), can be reformulated as $Y_i = A_i (L - n_i)^\alpha$ by exploiting the labor market clearing condition. This implies that

$$Y_{i+1} = \gamma Y_i, \quad (17)$$

meaning that output grows at the rate $\gamma - 1$ for each innovation that occurs. Since the time between two innovations is random, we compute the average growth rate of the economy over time by relying on the relation

$$\ln Y_{t+1} = \ln Y_t + \ln \gamma \cdot \epsilon_t, \quad (18)$$

where ϵ_t is the number of innovations between time t and time $t + 1$. The number of innovations is Poisson distributed with the parameter $\lambda \cdot n$ describing the average number of innovations by time step. Computing the expectation of Equation (18), we get the average growth rate of the economy, g_t , as

$$g_t = E(\ln Y_{t+1} - \ln Y_t) = \lambda \cdot n_t \cdot \ln \gamma. \quad (19)$$

Note that this is also the growth rate of per capita GDP at the steady state because we assume that fertility is at the replacement rate.

2.3 The balanced growth path

Along the balanced growth path, all markets clear and the common long-run growth rate of technology and output is constant. The endogenous consumption-savings decision of individuals affects the real interest rate and, as obvious from Equation (15), exerts an influence on the demand for research, which affects the number of scientists and thereby the frequency of quality-improving innovations. This in turn determines the growth rate of the economy. Along the balanced growth path, the time dimension is not relevant because the growth rate is constant such that we suppress the time index and the innovation index from now on. The model dynamics along the balanced growth path are summarized by the following four-dimensional system of equations:

$$g_C = (1 + r)\beta\phi - 1, \quad (20)$$

$$g_Y = \lambda n \cdot \ln(\gamma), \quad (21)$$

$$1 = \frac{\lambda\gamma(1 - \alpha)(L - n)}{\alpha(r + \lambda n)}, \quad (22)$$

$$L = n + \left(\frac{\alpha^2}{\omega}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}. \quad (23)$$

Along the balanced growth path, aggregate consumption grows at the same rate as aggregate output such that $g_C = g_Y$ as referred to in Equations (20) and (21). Assuming a sufficiently high λ ensures that innovations arrive with a high probability

within one period. Recalling that we have an overlapping generations framework in which a time period lasts for approximately 40 years, it is reasonable that many innovations occur within one period on average. Equation (22) can be derived by plugging the flow of profits $\tilde{\pi} = (1 - \alpha)\omega x/\alpha = (1 - \alpha)\omega(L - n)/\alpha$ into the no-arbitrage condition and Equation (23) is the labor market clearing condition.

Using Equations (20)-(23), we solve for the four unknowns $g = g_C = g_Y$, r , n , and ω . The associated long-run growth rate of the economy boils down to

$$g = \max \left\{ \frac{\ln(\gamma)\{\alpha + \beta\phi[(\alpha - 1)\gamma\lambda L - \alpha]\}}{\beta\phi[\alpha(\gamma - 1) - \gamma] - \alpha\ln(\gamma)}, 0 \right\}. \quad (24)$$

Note that the first expression within the curly brackets is typically positive as long as the product of β , ϕ , γ , λ , and L is not too low. However, there is the possibility that research incentives are too low to sustain a positive growth rate, for example, if the productivity of researchers, λ , is close to zero. Since employment of researchers and with it the long-run growth rate of the economy cannot become negative, we have the lower bound of zero on the long-run growth rate as reflected in the formulation of Equation (24). In this case, the economy would be in a corner solution associated with long-run stagnation.

3 Results

3.1 Growth effects

Since we are interested in the effects of rising life expectancy on long-run economic growth, we analyze the effect of the survival probability, ϕ , on the long-run balanced growth rate. A higher survival probability implies a higher life expectancy and also a higher average age in the economy, such that an increase in ϕ is tantamount to population aging. We can state the following proposition.

Proposition 1. *The long-run growth rate, g , increases in response to a higher survival probability, ϕ .*

Proof. The partial derivative of the growth rate with respect to the survival probability is given by

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial \phi} = \frac{\alpha\beta\ln(\gamma)\{\alpha + \gamma - \alpha\gamma + \ln(\gamma)[\alpha - (\alpha - 1)\gamma\lambda L]\}}{[\beta\phi(\alpha + \gamma - \alpha\gamma) + \alpha\ln(\gamma)]^2}. \quad (25)$$

The denominator of this expression is always positive. Taking into account that $0 < \alpha < 1$, the numerator is also always positive such that the survival probability

ϕ has a strictly positive effect on the long-run growth rate of the economy. □

The economic intuition for this finding is that an increase in life expectancy reduces the generational turnover and therefore raises aggregate savings. Given the higher savings, the mutual funds can invest more into the shares of intermediate goods companies which raises the demand for new innovations. This in turn leads to a higher employment level in the research sector such that the probability of successful innovations within each period increases. As a consequence, the long-run growth rate of aggregate consumption and aggregate output rise.

Interestingly, since higher savings imply a decrease in the interest rate, individual consumption growth decreases. This is due to the perfectly insured risk of death: a change in the survival probability does not affect individual consumption growth directly but only indirectly via the reduction in the interest rate. A lower interest rate implies that individual consumption growth decreases. On the aggregate level, however, there are two opposing effects. An increase in ϕ has a direct positive effect on aggregate consumption growth because of the reduction in the generational turnover effect, whereas the decrease in the interest rate has an indirect negative effect on aggregate consumption growth. The negative indirect effect of a lower interest rate, r , will always be overcompensated by the positive direct effect of a higher survival rate, ϕ . Otherwise, aggregate savings would not rise and the interest rate would not decrease to start with. Altogether, therefore, aggregate consumption growth increases with the survival probability. Consequently, a rising survival probability reduces the wedge between individual consumption growth and aggregate consumption growth. In the limit of $\phi = 1$, inspection of the individual and the “aggregate” Euler equation shows that they are the same. In this case, we would be back in the standard formulation of an overlapping generations model.

Inspecting the long-run growth rate g in Equation (24), shows that the effects of β , λ , and L are positive, while the effect of α is negative. These results are the same as expected and in line with the literature. The effect of γ is ambiguous, but for a reasonably high γ , it is positive because the monopolist enjoys higher rents, which eventually increases the incentives to invest in research. The negative relationship for low values of γ is caused by n becoming negative, which is, however, ruled out for economic reasons.

In Figure 1, we show the relationship between the growth rate g and the survival probability ϕ for the following values of the parameters. We assume that the size of the workforce is $L = 161$ million persons, approximately the size of the workforce in the United States. The choice of the discount factor $\beta = 0.1$ corresponds to a yearly




Figure 1: Survival probability and the long-run growth rate

discount rate of approximately 6%, the size of $\gamma = 1.1$ implies that every successful quality improvement increases productivity by 10%. The survival probability ϕ is set such that life expectancy corresponds to the value in the United States of 78.75 years (World Bank, 2016). Finally, we set the productivity of scientists to $\lambda = 0.0000001737$ to fit the implied growth rate of the model to the actual aggregate growth rate of the United States economy over 40 years. The low value of λ makes intuitively sense because, in reality, the probability of one single scientist to come up with a quality-improving innovation of an order of magnitude corresponding to 10% is rather low.

As described above, we observe a strictly positive effect of the survival probability ϕ on the long-run growth rate g . Notice that the effect of the survival probability on economic growth is concave such that the positive effect of an increase in the survival probability is high for a low level of the survival probability, whereas the converse holds true for a high level of the survival probability. For very low values of ϕ , i.e., for a very low life expectancy, the number of scientists and the economic growth rate could turn negative. While this can be explained by the same logic as above, the outcome is not meaningful in an economic sense such that, in this case, the economy is trapped in the stagnation equilibrium with no employment in the research sector and a growth rate of zero.

3.2 Welfare effects

We have shown that increases in longevity positively impact on long-run economic growth. It is clear that in our overlapping generations economy, higher economic growth is related to higher welfare at the individual as well as at the aggregate

level. Keeping that in mind, the welfare gains can be disentangled into two separate effects:

- (1) Increases in longevity positively impact on the savings rate, which raises productivity and thus the growth rate of the economy. In the long run, this increases consumption and therefore welfare.
- (2) Individuals do not only derive utility from the higher consumption induced by the effect of higher life expectancy on economic growth but also from the direct effect of living longer.

Considering these two channels, it is interesting to analyze the relative importance of each channel depending on the health status of the inhabitants of an economy (measured by ϕ) and depending on how developed an economy already is (measured by the level of technology A_t). We do so by comparing how an increase in longevity of 1 year, i.e., an increase in ϕ of 0.025, impacts on the relative importance of productivity gains for the gains in overall welfare. In so doing, we isolate the welfare effect of an increase in longevity by calculating the welfare derived from higher consumption due to higher productivity, given a *counterfactually unchanged* survival probability. Then we calculate the welfare effect of an increase in longevity as the share of the total increase in welfare that is due to an increase in longevity. We perform these calculations depending on

- a) initial life expectancy (ϕ),
- b) the development stage of the economy (A_t).

The result is illustrated in Figure 2. In this case ϕ refers to the initial survival probability, such that life expectancy is 60 years at $\phi = 0$ and 100 years at $\phi = 1$. The welfare share refers to the share of welfare increases due to increases in productivity after life expectancy has increased by 1 year. It is apparent that higher initial life expectancy implies a lower relative importance of increases in productivity for individual welfare gains. Put differently, for economies with an already high life expectancy, a further increase in ϕ mostly increases welfare because of additional utility derived from living longer. Additional utility gains derived from higher consumption become less important. The same logic applies to the comparison in case of different development stages. The more developed an economy is, the less important are productivity gains for increases in welfare.³ This result contains a very plausible

³The values of A correspond to wage rates in the range of 5,000\$ to 50,000\$, indicating the different welfare shares from developing countries to developed countries.




Figure 2: Relative share of productivity gains for gains in welfare

logic: in order to enjoy their welfare longer, individuals in well-developed economies prefer increases in life expectancy over increases in productivity. We summarize this in the following remark.

Remark 1. *Increases in life expectancy primarily raise welfare because individuals live longer. The resulting improvements in productivity become less important the better the health status of the inhabitants of an economy and the more developed an economy is.*

To make this intuition clearer, Table 1 contains a numerical example. We adjust the parameters in this exercise such that they correspond to the observed values for the United States, which corresponds to the actual welfare shares. We then conduct a comparative static analysis by separately decreasing the initial life expectancy by 10 years, the wage rate by 10,000\$ and the size of the work force by 20 million, ceteris paribus. This allows us to understand how different parameter values impact on the importance of the welfare share of productivity.

The results confirm the relationships explained in Figure 2. High initial life expectancy as well as high initial productivity imply that the increase in welfare triggered by an increase in life expectancy is predominantly due to the welfare derived from living longer. Furthermore, it is surprising that the development stage does not change the picture by much – even though a negative relationship with the welfare share of productivity gains can be observed. Even for less developed economies, the welfare share of longevity gains exceeds the one of productivity gains. The same weak relationship holds true for the size of the work force, L , because of the scale effect in the R&D sector.

	Productivity	Longevity
	share	share
Actual parameter values	38.36%	61.64%
Initial life expectancy reduced by 10 years	60.79%	39.21%
Yearly wage rate per worker reduced by 10,000\$	38.76%	61.24%
Size of the work force reduced by 20 million	38.96%	61.04%

Table 1: Decomposition of additional utility for an increase in life expectancy of 1 year

Remark 2. *Even for early stages of development, the higher growth rate of the economy that is induced by the rise in longevity, is less important for welfare gains than the actual utility gain derived from living longer in the first place.*

Altogether, the results are clear and straightforward. The welfare gains of additional growth that is induced by living longer are much smaller than the direct welfare gains of living longer. This is fully consistent with the results of Kuhn and Prettnner (2016) who show that an increase of the health sector beyond the growth-maximizing size is actually a Pareto improvement. In other words, choosing the size of the health care sector solely by considering its economic growth effect crucially misses the point because it disregards the large direct welfare effects of higher life expectancy. Furthermore, we have shown that the relative welfare gain that is due to living longer increases with the level of development of an economy. This is fully in line with the result of Hall and Jones (2007) who show that an increase in the share of resources devoted to health care is the optimal outcome in the course of economic development.

4 Conclusions

We introduce a demographic structure with three overlapping generations, childhood, adulthood, and retirement into an endogenous growth model based on vertical innovations, i.e., quality improvements of intermediate goods. In this setting, individuals face an exogenously given survival probability from adulthood to retirement, which determines the life expectancy in the economy. We show that increasing longevity by means of a rise in the exogenous survival probability leads to higher aggregate savings, which raises the demand for innovation. This in turn leads to higher

employment in the R&D sector, faster technological progress and higher long-run economic growth.

We also assess the welfare effects of rising longevity and decompose the effect into the direct welfare effect of living longer, and the indirect consumption effect of the higher induced economic growth rate. We show that the direct welfare effects are much larger than the indirect welfare effects. Furthermore, the relative importance of the direct welfare effect increases with economic development. Both of these results are consistent with the literature and they emphasize that focusing solely on the growth effects of any health care reform misses a crucial point.

References

- Acemoglu, D. and Johnson, S. (2007). Disease and Development: The Effect of Life Expectancy on Economic Growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 115(No. 6):925–985.
- Acemoglu, D. and Restrepo, P. (2017). Secular Stagnation? The Effect of Aging on Economic Growth in the Age of Automation. NBER Working Paper 23077.
- Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (1992). A model of growth through creative destruction. *Econometrica*, Vol. 60(No. 2):323–351.
- Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (1999). *Endogenous Economic Growth*. The MIT Press.
- Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (2005). *Handbook of Economic Growth, Volume 1A*, chapter 2: “Growth with Quality-Improving Innovations: An Integrated Framework”, pages 68–110.
- Aghion, P. and Howitt, P. (2009). *The Economics of Growth*. MIT Press.
- Aghion, P., Howitt, P., and Murin, F. (2011). The Relationship Between Health and Growth: When Lucas Meets Nelson-Phelps. *Review of Economics and Institutions*, Vol. 2(No. 1):1–24.
- Blackburn, K. and Cipriani, G. P. (2002). A model of longevity, fertility and growth. *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 26(2):187–204.
- Blanchard, O. J. (1985). Debt, deficits and finite horizons. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 93(No. 2):223–247.
- Bloom, D., Canning, D., and Fink, G. (2014). Disease and development revisited. *The Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 122(No. 6):1355–1366.

- Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., and Fink, G. (2010). Implications of Population Ageing for Economic Growth. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 26(No. 4):583–612.
- Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., and Graham, B. (2003). Longevity and Life-cycle Savings. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 105(No. 3):319–338.
- Bloom, D. E., Canning, D., Mansfield, R. K., and Moore, M. (2007). Demographic change, social security systems, and savings. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 54:92–114.
- Cass, D. (1965). Optimum growth in an aggregative model of capital accumulation. *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 32(No. 3):233–240.
- Cervellati, M. and Sunde, U. (2011). Life expectancy and economic growth: the role of the demographic transition. *Journal of Economic Growth*, Vol. 16:99–133.
- Cervellati, M. and Sunde, U. (2013). Life expectancy, schooling, and lifetime labor supply: Theory and evidence revisited. *Econometrica*, Vol. 81(No. 5):2055–2086.
- Chakraborty, S. (2004). Endogenous lifetime and economic growth. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 116(1):119–137.
- Diamond, P. A. (1965). National debt in a neoclassical growth model. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 55(No. 5):1126–1150.
- Gehring, A. and Prettnner, K. (2017). Longevity and technological change. *Macroeconomic Dynamics*. (forthcoming).
- Grossman, G. M. and Helpman, E. (1991). Quality ladders in the theory of economic growth. *Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 58(No. 1):43–61.
- Hall, R. E. and Jones, C. I. (2007). The Value of Life and the Rise in Health Spending. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 122:39–72.
- Hashimoto, K. and Tabata, K. (2016). Demographic change, human capital accumulation and R&D-based growth. *Canadian Economic Review*. (forthcoming).
- Jones, C. I. (1995). R&D-based models of economic growth. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 103(No. 4):759–783.
- Kuhn, M. and Prettnner, K. (2016). Growth and welfare effects of health care in knowledge based economies. *Journal of Health Economics*, Vol. 46:100–119.

- Lorentzen, P., McMillan, J., and Wacziarg, R. (2008). Death and development. *Journal of Economic Growth*, Vol. 13:81–124.
- Prettner, K. (2013). Population aging and endogenous economic growth. *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 26(No. 2):811–834.
- Prettner, K. and Trimborn, T. (2016). Demographic change and R&D-based economic growth. *Economica*, (forthcoming).
- Romer, P. (1990). Endogenous technological change. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 98(No. 5):71–102.
- Samuelson, P. A. (1958). An exact consumption-loan model of interest with or without the social contrivance of money. *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 66(No. 6).
- Segerström, P. S. (1998). Endogenous growth without scale effects. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 88(No. 5):1290–1310.
- Solow, R. M. (1956). A contribution to the theory of economic growth. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 70(No. 1):65–94.
- Strulik, H., Prettner, K., and Prskawetz, A. (2013). The past and future of knowledge-based growth. *Journal of Economic Growth*, Vol. 18(No. 4). 411–437.
- Strulik, H. and Werner, K. (2016). 50 is the New 30 – Long-run Trends of Schooling and Retirement Explained by Human Aging. *Journal of Economic Growth*, Vol. 21:165–187.
- The Economist (2011a). 70 or bust! Why the retirement age must go up. A special report on pensions. *The Economist*, April 7th 2011.
- The Economist (2011b). Briefing Demography. A tale of three islands. *The Economist*, October 22nd 2011.
- World Bank (2016). World Development Indicators & Global Development Finance Database. Available at: <http://databank.worldbank.org/data/reports.aspx?source=world-development-indicators#>.
- Yaari, M. E. (1965). Uncertain lifetime, life insurance and the theory of the consumer. *The Review of Economic Studies*, Vol. 32(No. 2):137–150.

Zhang, J. and Zhang, J. (2005). The effect of life expectancy on fertility, saving, schooling and economic growth: Theory and evidence. *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, Vol. 107(No. 1):45–66.

Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences

The Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences continues since 2015 the established "FZID Discussion Paper Series" of the "Centre for Research on Innovation and Services (FZID)" under the name "Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences".

Institutes

510	Institute of Financial Management
520	Institute of Economics
530	Institute of Health Care & Public Management
540	Institute of Communication Science
550	Institute of Law and Social Sciences
560	Institute of Economic and Business Education
570	Institute of Marketing & Management
580	Institute of Interorganizational Management & Performance

Research Areas (since 2017)

INEPA	"Inequality and Economic Policy Analysis"
TKID	"Transformation der Kommunikation – Integration und Desintegration"
NegoTrans	"Negotiation Research – Transformation, Technology, Media and Costs"
INEF	"Innovation, Entrepreneurship and Finance"

Download Hohenheim Discussion Papers in Business, Economics and Social Sciences from our homepage: <https://wiso.uni-hohenheim.de/papers>

No.	Author	Title	Inst
01-2015	Thomas Beissinger, Philipp Baudy	THE IMPACT OF TEMPORARY AGENCY WORK ON TRADE UNION WAGE SETTING: A Theoretical Analysis	520
02-2015	Fabian Wahl	PARTICIPATIVE POLITICAL INSTITUTIONS AND CITY DEVELOPMENT 800-1800	520
03-2015	Tommaso Proietti, Martyna Marczak, Gianluigi Mazzi	EUROMIND-D: A DENSITY ESTIMATE OF MONTHLY GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT FOR THE EURO AREA	520
04-2015	Thomas Beissinger, Nathalie Chusseau, Joël Hellier	OFFSHORING AND LABOUR MARKET REFORMS: MODELLING THE GERMAN EXPERIENCE	520
05-2015	Matthias Mueller, Kristina Bogner, Tobias Buchmann, Muhamed Kudic	SIMULATING KNOWLEDGE DIFFUSION IN FOUR STRUCTURALLY DISTINCT NETWORKS – AN AGENT-BASED SIMULATION MODEL	520
06-2015	Martyna Marczak, Thomas Beissinger	BIDIRECTIONAL RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INVESTOR SENTIMENT AND EXCESS RETURNS: NEW EVIDENCE FROM THE WAVELET PERSPECTIVE	520
07-2015	Peng Nie, Galit Nimrod, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	INTERNET USE AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING IN CHINA	530

No.	Author	Title	Inst
08-2015	Fabian Wahl	THE LONG SHADOW OF HISTORY ROMAN LEGACY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT – EVIDENCE FROM THE GERMAN LIMES	520
09-2015	Peng Nie, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	COMMUTE TIME AND SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING IN URBAN CHINA	530
10-2015	Kristina Bogner	THE EFFECT OF PROJECT FUNDING ON INNOVATIVE PERFORMANCE AN AGENT-BASED SIMULATION MODEL	520
11-2015	Bogang Jun, Tai-Yoo Kim	A NEO-SCHUMPETERIAN PERSPECTIVE ON THE ANALYTICAL MACROECONOMIC FRAMEWORK: THE EXPANDED REPRODUCTION SYSTEM	520
12-2015	Volker Grossmann Aderonke Osikominu Marius Osterfeld	ARE SOCIOCULTURAL FACTORS IMPORTANT FOR STUDYING A SCIENCE UNIVERSITY MAJOR?	520
13-2015	Martyna Marczak Tommaso Proietti Stefano Grassi	A DATA–CLEANING AUGMENTED KALMAN FILTER FOR ROBUST ESTIMATION OF STATE SPACE MODELS	520
14-2015	Carolina Castagnetti Luisa Rosti Marina Töpfer	THE REVERSAL OF THE GENDER PAY GAP AMONG PUBLIC-CONTEST SELECTED YOUNG EMPLOYEES	520
15-2015	Alexander Opitz	DEMOCRATIC PROSPECTS IN IMPERIAL RUSSIA: THE REVOLUTION OF 1905 AND THE POLITICAL STOCK MARKET	520
01-2016	Michael Ahlheim, Jan Neidhardt	NON-TRADING BEHAVIOUR IN CHOICE EXPERIMENTS	520
02-2016	Bogang Jun, Alexander Gerybadze, Tai-Yoo Kim	THE LEGACY OF FRIEDRICH LIST: THE EXPANSIVE REPRODUCTION SYSTEM AND THE KOREAN HISTORY OF INDUSTRIALIZATION	520
03-2016	Peng Nie, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	FOOD INSECURITY AMONG OLDER EUROPEANS: EVIDENCE FROM THE SURVEY OF HEALTH, AGEING, AND RETIREMENT IN EUROPE	530
04-2016	Peter Spahn	POPULATION GROWTH, SAVING, INTEREST RATES AND STAGNATION. DISCUSSING THE EGGERTSSON- MEHROTRA-MODEL	520
05-2016	Vincent Dekker, Kristina Strohmaier, Nicole Bosch	A DATA-DRIVEN PROCEDURE TO DETERMINE THE BUNCHING WINDOW – AN APPLICATION TO THE NETHERLANDS	520
06-2016	Philipp Baudy, Dario Cords	DEREGULATION OF TEMPORARY AGENCY EMPLOYMENT IN A UNIONIZED ECONOMY: DOES THIS REALLY LEAD TO A SUBSTITUTION OF REGULAR EMPLOYMENT?	520

No.	Author	Title	Inst
07-2016	Robin Jessen, Davud Rostam-Afschar, Sebastian Schmitz	HOW IMPORTANT IS PRECAUTIONARY LABOR SUPPLY?	520
08-2016	Peng Nie, Alfonso Sousa-Poza, Jianhong Xue	FUEL FOR LIFE: DOMESTIC COOKING FUELS AND WOMEN'S HEALTH IN RURAL CHINA	530
09-2016	Bogang Jun, Seung Kyu-Yi, Tobias Buchmann, Matthias Müller	THE CO-EVOLUTION OF INNOVATION NETWORKS: COLLABORATION BETWEEN WEST AND EAST GERMANY FROM 1972 TO 2014	520
10-2016	Vladan Ivanovic, Vadim Kufenko, Boris Begovic Nenad Stanistic, Vincent Geloso	CONTINUITY UNDER A DIFFERENT NAME. THE OUTCOME OF PRIVATISATION IN SERBIA	520
11-2016	David E. Bloom Michael Kuhn Klaus Prettnner	THE CONTRIBUTION OF FEMALE HEALTH TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	520
12-2016	Franz X. Hof Klaus Prettnner	THE QUEST FOR STATUS AND R&D-BASED GROWTH	520
13-2016	Jung-In Yeon Andreas Pyka Tai-Yoo Kim	STRUCTURAL SHIFT AND INCREASING VARIETY IN KOREA, 1960–2010: EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE OF THE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MODEL BY THE CREATION OF NEW SECTORS	520
14-2016	Benjamin Fuchs	THE EFFECT OF TEENAGE EMPLOYMENT ON CHARACTER SKILLS, EXPECTATIONS AND OCCUPATIONAL CHOICE STRATEGIES	520
15-2016	Seung-Kyu Yi Bogang Jun	HAS THE GERMAN REUNIFICATION STRENGTHENED GERMANY'S NATIONAL INNOVATION SYSTEM? TRIPLE HELIX DYNAMICS OF GERMANY'S INNOVATION SYSTEM	520
16-2016	Gregor Pfeifer Fabian Wahl Martyna Marczyk	ILLUMINATING THE WORLD CUP EFFECT: NIGHT LIGHTS EVIDENCE FROM SOUTH AFRICA	520
17-2016	Malte Klein Andreas Sauer	CELEBRATING 30 YEARS OF INNOVATION SYSTEM RESEARCH: WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW ABOUT INNOVATION SYSTEMS	570
18-2016	Klaus Prettnner	THE IMPLICATIONS OF AUTOMATION FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH AND THE LABOR SHARE	520
19-2016	Klaus Prettnner Andreas Schaefer	HIGHER EDUCATION AND THE FALL AND RISE OF INEQUALITY	520
20-2016	Vadim Kufenko Klaus Prettnner	YOU CAN'T ALWAYS GET WHAT YOU WANT? ESTIMATOR CHOICE AND THE SPEED OF CONVERGENCE	520

No.	Author	Title	Inst
01-2017	Annarita Baldanzi Alberto Bucci Klaus Prettner	CHILDRENS HEALTH, HUMAN CAPITAL ACCUMULATION, AND R&D-BASED ECONOMIC GROWTH	INEPA
02-2017	Julius Tennert Marie Lambert Hans-Peter Burghof	MORAL HAZARD IN VC-FINANCE: MORE EXPENSIVE THAN YOU THOUGHT	INEF
03-2017	Michael Ahlheim Oliver Frör Nguyen Minh Duc Antonia Rehl Ute Siepmann Pham Van Dinh	LABOUR AS A UTILITY MEASURE RECONSIDERED	520
04-2017	Bohdan Kukharskyy Sebastian Seiffert	GUN VIOLENCE IN THE U.S.: CORRELATES AND CAUSES	520
05-2017	Ana Abeliansky Klaus Prettner	AUTOMATION AND DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGE	520
06-2017	Vincent Geloso Vadim Kufenko	INEQUALITY AND GUARD LABOR, OR PROHIBITION AND GUARD LABOR?	INEPA
07-2017	Emanuel Gasteiger Klaus Prettner	ON THE POSSIBILITY OF AUTOMATION-INDUCED STAGNATION	520
08-2017	Klaus Prettner Holger Strulik	THE LOST RACE AGAINST THE MACHINE: AUTOMATION, EDUCATION, AND INEQUALITY IN AN R&D-BASED GROWTH MODEL	INEPA
09-2017	David E. Bloom Simiao Chen Michael Kuhn Mark E. McGovern Les Oxley Klaus Prettner	THE ECONOMIC BURDEN OF CHRONIC DISEASES: ESTIMATES AND PROJECTIONS FOR CHINA, JAPAN, AND SOUTH KOREA	520
10-2017	Sebastian Till Braun Nadja Dwenger	THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT SHAPES REFUGEE INTEGRATION: EVIDENCE FROM POST-WAR GERMANY	INEPA
11-2017	Vadim Kufenko Klaus Prettner Vincent Geloso	DIVERGENCE, CONVERGENCE, AND THE HISTORY-AUGMENTED SOLOW MODEL	INEPA
12-2017	Frank M. Fossen Ray Rees Davud Rostam-Afschar Viktor Steiner	HOW DO ENTREPRENEURIAL PORTFOLIOS RESPOND TO INCOME TAXATION?	520
13-2017	Steffen Otterbach Michael Rogan	SPATIAL DIFFERENCES IN STUNTING AND HOUSEHOLD AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION IN SOUTH AFRICA: (RE-) EXAMINING THE LINKS USING NATIONAL PANEL SURVEY DATA	INEPA
14-2017	Carolina Castagnetti Luisa Rosti Marina Töpfer	THE CONVERGENCE OF THE GENDER PAY GAP – AN ALTERNATIVE ESTIMATION APPROACH	INEPA

No.	Author	Title	Inst
15-2017	Andreas Hecht	ON THE DETERMINANTS OF SPECULATION – A CASE FOR EXTENDED DISCLOSURES IN CORPORATE RISK MANAGEMENT	510
16-2017	Mareike Schoop D. Marc Kilgour (Editors)	PROCEEDINGS OF THE 17 TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GROUP DECISION AND NEGOTIATION	NegoTrans
17-2017	Mareike Schoop D. Marc Kilgour (Editors)	DOCTORAL CONSORTIUM OF THE 17 TH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON GROUP DECISION AND NEGOTIATION	NegoTrans
18-2017	Sibylle Lehmann-Hasemeyer Fabian Wahl	SAVING BANKS AND THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION IN PRUSSIA SUPPORTING REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT WITH PUBLIC FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS	520
19-2017	Stephanie Glaser	A REVIEW OF SPATIAL ECONOMETRIC MODELS FOR COUNT DATA	520
20-2017	Dario Cords	ENDOGENOUS TECHNOLOGY, MATCHING, AND LABOUR UNIONS: DOES LOW-SKILLED IMMIGRATION AFFECT THE TECHNOLOGICAL ALIGNMENT OF THE HOST COUNTRY?	INEPA
21-2017	Micha Kaiser Jan M. Bauer	PRESCHOOL CHILD CARE AND CHILD WELL-BEING IN GERMANY: DOES THE MIGRANT EXPERIENCE DIFFER?	INEPA
22-2017	Thilo R. Huning Fabian Wahl	LORD OF THE LEMONS: ORIGIN AND DYNAMICS OF STATE CAPACITY	520
23-2017	Matthias Busse Ceren Erdogan Henning Mühlen	STRUCTURAL TRANSFORMATION AND ITS RELEVANCE FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH IN SUB-SHARAN AFRICA	INEPA
24-2017	Sibylle Lehmann-Hasemeyer Alexander Opitz	THE VALUE OF POLITICAL CONNECTIONS IN THE FIRST GERMAN DEMOCRACY – EVIDENCE FROM THE BERLIN STOCK EXCHANGE	520
25-2017	Samuel Mburu Micha Kaiser Alfonso Sousa-Poza	LIVESTOCK ASSET DYNAMICS AMONG PASTORALISTS IN NORTHERN KENYA	INEPA
26-2017	Marina Töpfer	DETAILED RIF DECOMPOSITION WITH SELECTION – THE GENDER PAY GAP IN ITALY	INEPA
27-2017	Robin Jessen Maria Metzling Davud Rostam-Afschar	OPTIMAL TAXATION UNDER DIFFERENT CONCEPTS OF JUSTNESS	INEPA
28-2017	Alexander Kressner Katja Schimmelpfeng	CLUSTERING SURGICAL PROCEDURES FOR MASTER SURGICAL SCHEDULING	580
29-2017	Clemens Lankisch Klaus Prettnner Alexia Prskawetz	ROBOTS AND THE SKILL PREMIUM: AN AUTOMATION-BASED EXPLANATION OF WAGE INEQUALITY	INEPA

No.	Author	Title	Inst
30-2017	Ann-Sophie Adelhelm Melanie Bathelt Mirjam Bathelt Bettina Bürkin Sascha Klein Sabrina Straub Lea Wagner Fabienne Walz	ARBEITSWELT: DIGITAL – BELASTUNG: REAL? DER ERLEBTE WANDEL DER ARBEITSWELT INNERHALB DER IT-BRANCHE AUS SICHT DER ARBEITNEHMER	550
31-2017	Annarita Baldanzi Klaus Prettnner Paul Tscheuschner	LONGEVITY-INDUCED VERICAL INNOVATION AND THE TRADEOFF BETWEEN LIFE AND GROWTH	520

FZID Discussion Papers

(published 2009-2014)

Competence Centers

IK	Innovation and Knowledge
ICT	Information Systems and Communication Systems
CRFM	Corporate Finance and Risk Management
HCM	Health Care Management
CM	Communication Management
MM	Marketing Management
ECO	Economics

Download FZID Discussion Papers from our homepage: https://wiso.uni-hohenheim.de/archiv_fzid_papers

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
01-2009	Julian P. Christ	NEW ECONOMIC GEOGRAPHY RELOADED: Localized Knowledge Spillovers and the Geography of Innovation	IK
02-2009	André P. Slowak	MARKET FIELD STRUCTURE & DYNAMICS IN INDUSTRIAL AUTOMATION	IK
03-2009	Pier Paolo Saviotti, Andreas Pyka	GENERALIZED BARRIERS TO ENTRY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	IK
04-2009	Uwe Focht, Andreas Richter and Jörg Schiller	INTERMEDIATION AND MATCHING IN INSURANCE MARKETS	HCM
05-2009	Julian P. Christ, André P. Slowak	WHY BLU-RAY VS. HD-DVD IS NOT VHS VS. BETAMAX: THE CO-EVOLUTION OF STANDARD-SETTING CONSORTIA	IK
06-2009	Gabriel Felbermayr, Mario Larch and Wolfgang Lechthaler	UNEMPLOYMENT IN AN INTERDEPENDENT WORLD	ECO
07-2009	Steffen Otterbach	MISMATCHES BETWEEN ACTUAL AND PREFERRED WORK TIME: Empirical Evidence of Hours Constraints in 21 Countries	HCM
08-2009	Sven Wydra	PRODUCTION AND EMPLOYMENT IMPACTS OF NEW TECHNOLOGIES – ANALYSIS FOR BIOTECHNOLOGY	IK
09-2009	Ralf Richter, Jochen Streb	CATCHING-UP AND FALLING BEHIND KNOWLEDGE SPILLOVER FROM AMERICAN TO GERMAN MACHINE TOOL MAKERS	IK

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
10-2010	Rahel Aichele, Gabriel Felbermayr	KYOTO AND THE CARBON CONTENT OF TRADE	ECO
11-2010	David E. Bloom, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF LOW FERTILITY IN EUROPE	HCM
12-2010	Michael Ahlheim, Oliver Frör	DRINKING AND PROTECTING – A MARKET APPROACH TO THE PRESERVATION OF CORK OAK LANDSCAPES	ECO
13-2010	Michael Ahlheim, Oliver Frör, Antonia Heinke, Nguyen Minh Duc, and Pham Van Dinh	LABOUR AS A UTILITY MEASURE IN CONTINGENT VALUATION STUDIES – HOW GOOD IS IT REALLY?	ECO
14-2010	Julian P. Christ	THE GEOGRAPHY AND CO-LOCATION OF EUROPEAN TECHNOLOGY-SPECIFIC CO-INVENTORSHIP NETWORKS	IK
15-2010	Harald Degner	WINDOWS OF TECHNOLOGICAL OPPORTUNITY DO TECHNOLOGICAL BOOMS INFLUENCE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN FIRM SIZE AND INNOVATIVENESS?	IK
16-2010	Tobias A. Jopp	THE WELFARE STATE EVOLVES: GERMAN KNAPPSCHAFTEN, 1854-1923	HCM
17-2010	Stefan Kirn (Ed.)	PROCESS OF CHANGE IN ORGANISATIONS THROUGH eHEALTH	ICT
18-2010	Jörg Schiller	ÖKONOMISCHE ASPEKTE DER ENTLOHNUNG UND REGULIERUNG UNABHÄNGIGER VERSICHERUNGSVERMITTLER	HCM
19-2010	Frauke Lammers, Jörg Schiller	CONTRACT DESIGN AND INSURANCE FRAUD: AN EXPERIMENTAL INVESTIGATION	HCM
20-2010	Martyna Marczak, Thomas Beissinger	REAL WAGES AND THE BUSINESS CYCLE IN GERMANY	ECO
21-2010	Harald Degner, Jochen Streb	FOREIGN PATENTING IN GERMANY, 1877-1932	IK
22-2010	Heiko Stüber, Thomas Beissinger	DOES DOWNWARD NOMINAL WAGE RIGIDITY DAMPEN WAGE INCREASES?	ECO
23-2010	Mark Spoerer, Jochen Streb	GUNS AND BUTTER – BUT NO MARGARINE: THE IMPACT OF NAZI ECONOMIC POLICIES ON GERMAN FOOD CONSUMPTION, 1933-38	ECO

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
24-2011	Dhammika Dharmapala, Nadine Riedel	EARNINGS SHOCKS AND TAX-MOTIVATED INCOME-SHIFTING: EVIDENCE FROM EUROPEAN MULTINATIONALS	ECO
25-2011	Michael Schuele, Stefan Kirn	QUALITATIVES, RÄUMLICHES SCHLIEßEN ZUR KOLLISIONSERKENNUNG UND KOLLISIONSVERMEIDUNG AUTONOMER BDI-AGENTEN	ICT
26-2011	Marcus Müller, Guillaume Stern, Ansgar Jacob and Stefan Kirn	VERHALTENSMODELLE FÜR SOFTWAREAGENTEN IM PUBLIC GOODS GAME	ICT
27-2011	Monnet Benoit, Patrick Gbakoua and Alfonso Sousa-Poza	ENGEL CURVES, SPATIAL VARIATION IN PRICES AND DEMAND FOR COMMODITIES IN CÔTE D'IVOIRE	ECO
28-2011	Nadine Riedel, Hannah Schildberg- Hörisch	ASYMMETRIC OBLIGATIONS	ECO
29-2011	Nicole Waidlein	CAUSES OF PERSISTENT PRODUCTIVITY DIFFERENCES IN THE WEST GERMAN STATES IN THE PERIOD FROM 1950 TO 1990	IK
30-2011	Dominik Hartmann, Atilio Arata	MEASURING SOCIAL CAPITAL AND INNOVATION IN POOR AGRICULTURAL COMMUNITIES. THE CASE OF CHÁPARRA - PERU	IK
31-2011	Peter Spahn	DIE WÄHRUNGSKRISEUNION DIE EURO-VERSCHULDUNG DER NATIONALSTAATEN ALS SCHWACHSTELLE DER EWU	ECO
32-2011	Fabian Wahl	DIE ENTWICKLUNG DES LEBENSSTANDARDS IM DRITTEN REICH – EINE GLÜCKSÖKONOMISCHE PERSPEKTIVE	ECO
33-2011	Giorgio Triulzi, Ramon Scholz and Andreas Pyka	R&D AND KNOWLEDGE DYNAMICS IN UNIVERSITY-INDUSTRY RELATIONSHIPS IN BIOTECH AND PHARMACEUTICALS: AN AGENT-BASED MODEL	IK
34-2011	Claus D. Müller- Hengstenberg, Stefan Kirn	ANWENDUNG DES ÖFFENTLICHEN VERGABERECHTS AUF MODERNE IT SOFTWAREENTWICKLUNGSVERFAHREN	ICT
35-2011	Andreas Pyka	AVOIDING EVOLUTIONARY INEFFICIENCIES IN INNOVATION NETWORKS	IK
36-2011	David Bell, Steffen Otterbach and Alfonso Sousa-Poza	WORK HOURS CONSTRAINTS AND HEALTH	HCM
37-2011	Lukas Scheffknecht, Felix Geiger	A BEHAVIORAL MACROECONOMIC MODEL WITH ENDOGENOUS BOOM-BUST CYCLES AND LEVERAGE DYNAMICS	ECO
38-2011	Yin Krogmann, Ulrich Schwalbe	INTER-FIRM R&D NETWORKS IN THE GLOBAL PHARMACEUTICAL BIOTECHNOLOGY INDUSTRY DURING 1985–1998: A CONCEPTUAL AND EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS	IK

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
39-2011	Michael Ahlheim, Tobias Börger and Oliver Frör	RESPONDENT INCENTIVES IN CONTINGENT VALUATION: THE ROLE OF RECIPROCITY	ECO
40-2011	Tobias Börger	A DIRECT TEST OF SOCIALLY DESIRABLE RESPONDING IN CONTINGENT VALUATION INTERVIEWS	ECO
41-2011	Ralf Rukwid, Julian P. Christ	QUANTITATIVE CLUSTERIDENTIFIKATION AUF EBENE DER DEUTSCHEN STADT- UND LANDKREISE (1999-2008)	IK

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
42-2012	Benjamin Schön, Andreas Pyka	A TAXONOMY OF INNOVATION NETWORKS	IK
43-2012	Dirk Foremny, Nadine Riedel	BUSINESS TAXES AND THE ELECTORAL CYCLE	ECO
44-2012	Gisela Di Meglio, Andreas Pyka and Luis Rubalcaba	VARIETIES OF SERVICE ECONOMIES IN EUROPE	IK
45-2012	Ralf Rukwid, Julian P. Christ	INNOVATIONSPOTENTIALE IN BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG: PRODUKTIONSCLUSTER IM BEREICH „METALL, ELEKTRO, IKT“ UND REGIONALE VERFÜGBARKEIT AKADEMISCHER FACHKRÄFTE IN DEN MINT-FÄCHERN	IK
46-2012	Julian P. Christ, Ralf Rukwid	INNOVATIONSPOTENTIALE IN BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG: BRANCHENSPEZIFISCHE FORSCHUNGS- UND ENTWICKLUNGSAKTIVITÄT, REGIONALES PATENTAUFKOMMEN UND BESCHÄFTIGUNGSSTRUKTUR	IK
47-2012	Oliver Sauter	ASSESSING UNCERTAINTY IN EUROPE AND THE US - IS THERE A COMMON FACTOR?	ECO
48-2012	Dominik Hartmann	SEN MEETS SCHUMPETER. INTRODUCING STRUCTURAL AND DYNAMIC ELEMENTS INTO THE HUMAN CAPABILITY APPROACH	IK
49-2012	Harold Paredes- Frigolett, Andreas Pyka	DISTAL EMBEDDING AS A TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION NETWORK FORMATION STRATEGY	IK
50-2012	Martyna Marczak, Víctor Gómez	CYCLICALITY OF REAL WAGES IN THE USA AND GERMANY: NEW INSIGHTS FROM WAVELET ANALYSIS	ECO
51-2012	André P. Slowak	DIE DURCHSETZUNG VON SCHNITTSTELLEN IN DER STANDARDSETZUNG: FALLBEISPIEL LADESYSYSTEM ELEKTROMOBILITÄT	IK
52-2012	Fabian Wahl	WHY IT MATTERS WHAT PEOPLE THINK - BELIEFS, LEGAL ORIGINS AND THE DEEP ROOTS OF TRUST	ECO
53-2012	Dominik Hartmann, Micha Kaiser	STATISTISCHER ÜBERBLICK DER TÜRKISCHEN MIGRATION IN BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG UND DEUTSCHLAND	IK
54-2012	Dominik Hartmann, Andreas Pyka, Seda Aydin, Lena Klauß, Fabian Stahl, Ali Santircioglu, Silvia Oberegelsbacher, Sheida Rashidi, Gaye Onan and Suna Erginkoç	IDENTIFIZIERUNG UND ANALYSE DEUTSCH-TÜRKISCHER INNOVATIONSNETZWERKE. ERSTE ERGEBNISSE DES TGIN- PROJEKTES	IK
55-2012	Michael Ahlheim, Tobias Börger and Oliver Frör	THE ECOLOGICAL PRICE OF GETTING RICH IN A GREEN DESERT: A CONTINGENT VALUATION STUDY IN RURAL SOUTHWEST CHINA	ECO

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
56-2012	Matthias Strifler Thomas Beissinger	FAIRNESS CONSIDERATIONS IN LABOR UNION WAGE SETTING – A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS	ECO
57-2012	Peter Spahn	INTEGRATION DURCH WÄHRUNGSUNION? DER FALL DER EURO-ZONE	ECO
58-2012	Sibylle H. Lehmann	TAKING FIRMS TO THE STOCK MARKET: IPOS AND THE IMPORTANCE OF LARGE BANKS IN IMPERIAL GERMANY 1896-1913	ECO
59-2012	Sibylle H. Lehmann, Philipp Hauber and Alexander Opitz	POLITICAL RIGHTS, TAXATION, AND FIRM VALUATION – EVIDENCE FROM SAXONY AROUND 1900	ECO
60-2012	Martyna Marczak, Víctor Gómez	SPECTRAN, A SET OF MATLAB PROGRAMS FOR SPECTRAL ANALYSIS	ECO
61-2012	Theresa Lohse, Nadine Riedel	THE IMPACT OF TRANSFER PRICING REGULATIONS ON PROFIT SHIFTING WITHIN EUROPEAN MULTINATIONALS	ECO

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
62-2013	Heiko Stüber	REAL WAGE CYCLICALITY OF NEWLY HIRED WORKERS	ECO
63-2013	David E. Bloom, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	AGEING AND PRODUCTIVITY	HCM
64-2013	Martyna Marczak, V́ctor G3mez	MONTHLY US BUSINESS CYCLE INDICATORS: A NEW MULTIVARIATE APPROACH BASED ON A BAND-PASS FILTER	ECO
65-2013	Dominik Hartmann, Andreas Pyka	INNOVATION, ECONOMIC DIVERSIFICATION AND HUMAN DEVELOPMENT	IK
66-2013	Christof Ernst, Katharina Richter and Nadine Riedel	CORPORATE TAXATION AND THE QUALITY OF RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT	ECO
67-2013	Michael Ahlheim, Oliver Fr3r, Jiang Tong, Luo Jing and Sonna Pelz	NONUSE VALUES OF CLIMATE POLICY - AN EMPIRICAL STUDY IN XINJIANG AND BEIJING	ECO
68-2013	Michael Ahlheim, Friedrich Schneider	CONSIDERING HOUSEHOLD SIZE IN CONTINGENT VALUATION STUDIES	ECO
69-2013	Fabio Bertoni, Tereza Tykvov3	WHICH FORM OF VENTURE CAPITAL IS MOST SUPPORTIVE OF INNOVATION? EVIDENCE FROM EUROPEAN BIOTECHNOLOGY COMPANIES	CFRM
70-2013	Tobias Buchmann, Andreas Pyka	THE EVOLUTION OF INNOVATION NETWORKS: THE CASE OF A GERMAN AUTOMOTIVE NETWORK	IK
71-2013	B. Vermeulen, A. Pyka, J. A. La Poutr3 and A. G. de Kok	CAPABILITY-BASED GOVERNANCE PATTERNS OVER THE PRODUCT LIFE-CYCLE	IK
72-2013	Beatriz Fabiola L3pez Ulloa, Valerie M3ller and Alfonso Sousa- Poza	HOW DOES SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING EVOLVE WITH AGE? A LITERATURE REVIEW	HCM
73-2013	Wencke Gwozdz, Alfonso Sousa-Poza, Lucia A. Reisch, Wolfgang Ahrens, Stefaan De Henauw, Gabriele Eiben, Juan M. Fern3ndez-Alvira, Charalampos Hadjigeorgiou, Eva Kov3cs, Fabio Lauria, Toomas Veidebaum, Garrath Williams, Karin Bammann	MATERNAL EMPLOYMENT AND CHILDHOOD OBESITY – A EUROPEAN PERSPECTIVE	HCM

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
74-2013	Andreas Haas, Annette Hofmann	RISIKEN AUS CLOUD-COMPUTING-SERVICES: FRAGEN DES RISIKOMANAGEMENTS UND ASPEKTE DER VERSICHERBARKEIT	HCM
75-2013	Yin Krogmann, Nadine Riedel and Ulrich Schwalbe	INTER-FIRM R&D NETWORKS IN PHARMACEUTICAL BIOTECHNOLOGY: WHAT DETERMINES FIRM'S CENTRALITY-BASED PARTNERING CAPABILITY?	ECO, IK
76-2013	Peter Spahn	MACROECONOMIC STABILISATION AND BANK LENDING: A SIMPLE WORKHORSE MODEL	ECO
77-2013	Sheida Rashidi, Andreas Pyka	MIGRATION AND INNOVATION – A SURVEY	IK
78-2013	Benjamin Schön, Andreas Pyka	THE SUCCESS FACTORS OF TECHNOLOGY-SOURCING THROUGH MERGERS & ACQUISITIONS – AN INTUITIVE META- ANALYSIS	IK
79-2013	Irene Prostoplow, Andreas Pyka and Barbara Heller-Schuh	TURKISH-GERMAN INNOVATION NETWORKS IN THE EUROPEAN RESEARCH LANDSCAPE	IK
80-2013	Eva Schlenker, Kai D. Schmid	CAPITAL INCOME SHARES AND INCOME INEQUALITY IN THE EUROPEAN UNION	ECO
81-2013	Michael Ahlheim, Tobias Börger and Oliver Frör	THE INFLUENCE OF ETHNICITY AND CULTURE ON THE VALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENTS – RESULTS FROM A CVM STUDY IN SOUTHWEST CHINA –	ECO
82-2013	Fabian Wahl	DOES MEDIEVAL TRADE STILL MATTER? HISTORICAL TRADE CENTERS, AGGLOMERATION AND CONTEMPORARY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT	ECO
83-2013	Peter Spahn	SUBPRIME AND EURO CRISIS: SHOULD WE BLAME THE ECONOMISTS?	ECO
84-2013	Daniel Guffarth, Michael J. Barber	THE EUROPEAN AEROSPACE R&D COLLABORATION NETWORK	IK
85-2013	Athanasios Saitis	KARTELLBEKÄMPFUNG UND INTERNE KARTELLSTRUKTUREN: EIN NETZWERKTHEORETISCHER ANSATZ	IK

Nr.	Autor	Titel	CC
86-2014	Stefan Kirn, Claus D. Müller-Hengstenberg	INTELLIGENTE (SOFTWARE-)AGENTEN: EINE NEUE HERAUSFORDERUNG FÜR DIE GESELLSCHAFT UND UNSER RECHTSSYSTEM?	ICT
87-2014	Peng Nie, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	MATERNAL EMPLOYMENT AND CHILDHOOD OBESITY IN CHINA: EVIDENCE FROM THE CHINA HEALTH AND NUTRITION SURVEY	HCM
88-2014	Steffen Otterbach, Alfonso Sousa-Poza	JOB INSECURITY, EMPLOYABILITY, AND HEALTH: AN ANALYSIS FOR GERMANY ACROSS GENERATIONS	HCM
89-2014	Carsten Burhop, Sibylle H. Lehmann-Hasemeyer	THE GEOGRAPHY OF STOCK EXCHANGES IN IMPERIAL GERMANY	ECO
90-2014	Martyna Marczak, Tommaso Proietti	OUTLIER DETECTION IN STRUCTURAL TIME SERIES MODELS: THE INDICATOR SATURATION APPROACH	ECO
91-2014	Sophie Urmetzer, Andreas Pyka	VARIETIES OF KNOWLEDGE-BASED BIOECONOMIES	IK
92-2014	Bogang Jun, Joongho Lee	THE TRADEOFF BETWEEN FERTILITY AND EDUCATION: EVIDENCE FROM THE KOREAN DEVELOPMENT PATH	IK
93-2014	Bogang Jun, Tai-Yoo Kim	NON-FINANCIAL HURDLES FOR HUMAN CAPITAL ACCUMULATION: LANDOWNERSHIP IN KOREA UNDER JAPANESE RULE	IK
94-2014	Michael Ahlheim, Oliver Frör, Gerhard Langenberger and Sonna Pelz	CHINESE URBANITES AND THE PRESERVATION OF RARE SPECIES IN REMOTE PARTS OF THE COUNTRY – THE EXAMPLE OF EAGLEWOOD	ECO
95-2014	Harold Paredes-Frigolett, Andreas Pyka, Javier Pereira and Luiz Flávio Autran Monteiro Gomes	RANKING THE PERFORMANCE OF NATIONAL INNOVATION SYSTEMS IN THE IBERIAN PENINSULA AND LATIN AMERICA FROM A NEO-SCHUMPETERIAN ECONOMICS PERSPECTIVE	IK
96-2014	Daniel Guffarth, Michael J. Barber	NETWORK EVOLUTION, SUCCESS, AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE EUROPEAN AEROSPACE INDUSTRY	IK

IMPRINT

University of Hohenheim

Dean's Office of the Faculty of Business, Economics and Social Sciences

Palace Hohenheim 1 B

70593 Stuttgart | Germany

Fon +49 (0)711 459 22488

Fax +49 (0)711 459 22785

E-mail wiso@uni-hohenheim.de

Web www.wiso.uni-hohenheim.de