

Modelling Complementarity in Monopolistic Competition

KIMINORI MATSUYAMA

In recent years, monopolistic competition models have frequently been applied in macroeconomics, international and interregional economics, and economic growth and development. In this paper, I present a highly selective review in this area, with special emphasis on complementarity and its role in generating multiplier processes, agglomeration, underdevelopment traps, regional disparities, and sustainable growth or, more generally, what Myrdal (1957) called the "principle of circular and cumulative causation."

I. Introduction

In recent years, the paradigm of monopolistic competition has been applied to model a variety of aggregate phenomena, particularly in macroeconomics, international and interregional economics, and economic growth and development. Monopolistic competition can be defined as a situation of imperfect competition with the following features:

- a) The products sold are differentiated. Each firm, as a sole producer of its own brand, is aware of its monopoly power and sets the price of its product.
- b) The number of firms (and products) is so large that each firm ignores its strategic interactions with other firms; its action is negligible in the aggregate economy.
- c) Entry is unrestricted and occurs until the profits of incumbent firms diminish to zero.

These features make the paradigm of monopolistic competition very useful for modelling aggregate phenomena. First, as a form of imperfect competition, it allows us to describe decentralized allocations in the presence of increasing returns. Second, unlike oligopoly models, it helps us to focus on the aggregate implications of increasing returns without worrying about strategic interactions among firms and the validity of profit maximization as the objective of firms. Third, in models of monopolistic competition, the range of products supplied in the market is endogenously determined through entries and exits.

Much of the author's work reported here was done while visiting the Hoover Institution at Stanford University, the Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis, and the Institute for International Economic Studies, University of Stockholm, Sweden. He would also like to thank the Bank of Japan for giving him the opportunity to report this project. Any views expressed here are his and should not be attributed to any other individual or organization.

This feature makes monopolistic competition a useful apparatus within which to formalize growth and development processes, since economies grow and our living standards rise not so much by producing or consuming more of the same products, but by adding new products to the list of those we already produce and consume.

In this paper, I intend to present a highly selective review of recent developments in this area. Central to the discussion is the notion of complementarity. Broadly speaking, complementarities are said to exist when two phenomena (or two actions, or two activities) reinforce each other. For example, if expansion of industry A leads to expansion of industry B, which, in turn, leads to the further expansion of A, then the two industries are complementary to each other. Or, if the arrival of a new store in a town makes it a desirable location for other stores, then there are complementarities in the locational decisions. Such complementarity introduces some circularity in the economic system, which has profound implications for the stability of the system. If a change in a certain activity is initiated by an exogenous shock, this leads to a similar change in complementary activities and starts a cumulative process of mutual interaction in which the change in one activity is continuously supported by the reaction of the others in a circular manner. Many writers of the past, such as Hicks (1950), Kaldor (1985), Kalecki (1939), Myrdal (1957), and Nurkse (1953), among others, have stressed that cumulative processes of this kind should be an essential element in explaining business cycles, underdevelopment, economic growth, and regional inequalities.

On the other hand, the standard neoclassical paradigm, exemplified by Arrow and Hahn (1971), emphasizes the self-adjusting mechanisms of market forces. The stability of equilibrium in the standard theory comes from resource constraints. As different activities compete for scarce resources, expansion of one comes only at the expense of others. In a system with well-functioning markets, resource allocation is efficient, which leaves little room for complementarity and circular causation. Imperfect competition and increasing returns, as departures from the standard paradigm, make the system less stable and more conducive to complementarities and cumulative processes.

Ever since publication of Edward Chamberlin's famous book in 1933, a large number of studies have applied the paradigm of monopolistic competition in a variety of contexts. Indeed, there are already many excellent surveys, such as Beath and Katsoulacos (1991), Benassy (1991), Eaton and Lipsey (1989), Stiglitz (1986), and Tirole (1988). These studies, however, are written from a different perspective and scope. They address questions like: "How do models of monopolistic competition differ from oligopoly models?" or "What is the most appropriate way to model product differentiation?" or "Does market equilibrium provide optimal product diversity and selection?" *i.e.* they are written from predominantly partial equilibrium or industrial organizational perspectives. Some studies, such as Benassy (1991) and Hart (1985), discuss general equilibrium models of monopolistic competition, but their concerns remain largely theoretical, such as the existence of equilibrium, its uniqueness, and the limit theorem.

In this paper, on the other hand, I will present how general equilibrium models of monopolistic competition can be applied to explain complementarities and cumulative phenomena and discuss their implications in the context of macroeconomics, international and regional economics, as well as growth and development.

II. The Monopoly Pricing Distortion and Multiplier Processes

The departure from perfect competition means that the firm, faced with downward sloping demand, sets the price above marginal cost. In the presence of such a distortion, aggregate demand management could be effective in stimulating aggregate economic activity as well as in raising the welfare of the economy. To grasp the intuition behind the mechanism, suppose the government increased its demand for monopolistically competitive goods financed by a lump-sum tax. Since the prices exceed marginal costs, such a shift in demand would increase the level of monopoly profits and thus national income. This increased income would generate additional demand for monopolistically competitive goods, which further raises profits and income and so on. With monopoly price distortion, the equilibrium behavior of the economy resembles the multiplier process described in a simple textbook Keynesian model.

A. The Simple Model

The idea can be modelled as follows. To focus on monopoly pricing distortions I will ignore the entry process and endogenous changes in product variety, *i.e.* it is assumed that the economy produces a fixed set of products, each of which is supplied by a sole monopolist. Let $z \in [0,1]$ be the index of a product, as well as the monopolistic firm producing it. The assumption of restricted entry may be defended by asserting that some specific factors, such as entrepreneurial capital, are required to operate firms, and they are fixed in supply. Or one could simply argue that the model describes the short-run equilibrium.

The representative consumer is endowed with L units of labor, holds the ownership shares of all profit-making firms, and maximizes the following preferences,

$$\alpha \int_0^1 \ln c(z) dz + (1-\alpha) \ln(N),$$

where $c(z)$ denotes consumption of variety z , and N leisure; α represents the marginal budget share of the product group, $z \in [0,1]$, and is assumed to be between zero and one. Taking leisure as a numeraire, the budget constraint is given by

$$\int_0^1 p(z) c(z) dz + N \leq Y - T,$$

where $Y=L+\Pi$, which represents aggregate income equal to the sum of labor income, L , and profit, Π , while T is the lump-sum tax. As a solution to this consumption decision problem, one can obtain demand for each variety of goods as,

$$c(z) = \frac{\alpha(Y-T)}{p(z)},$$

Let us assume that the government spends G equally for all goods regardless of their prices. Then, the total demand for each good is given by $q(z) = \{\alpha(Y-T) + G\} / p(z)$. The government also hires N' units of labor; the budget constraint requires $T = G + N'$.

Each variety can be produced by two types of firms. First, there is a competitive fringe of firms that convert one unit of labor input into one unit of output with constant returns to scale technology. Second, there is a unique monopolist firm with access to an increasing returns to scale technology. This firm alone can produce q units of output by using $aq + F$ units of labor input, where $0 \leq a < 1$, and F represents the fixed cost. This firm chooses $p(z)$ to maximize profit, $\pi(z) = p(z)q(z) - [aq(z) + F]$. In doing so, it treats C and G as fixed parameters; although this firm has some monopoly power over its own variety, it is negligible relative to the aggregate economy. Because of the unit elasticity of total demand and the competitive fringe, the monopolist practices limit pricing, $p(z) = 1$, and thus $\mu = 1 - a = \{p(z) - a\} / p(z)$ can be interpreted as the profit margin. Since all monopolists face the same incentive, $p(z') = 1$ and thus $c(z) = C = \alpha(Y-T)$ and $q(z) = \alpha(Y-T) + G$ for all $z \in [0, 1]$. Aggregate profit is therefore equal to $\Pi = \pi(z) = \mu[\alpha(Y-T) + G] - F$. Note that higher aggregate demand increases aggregate profit with a positive profit margin.

The income identity implies $Y = L + \Pi = L + \mu[\alpha(Y-T) + G] - F$, or

$$Y = A + \mu \alpha Y, \quad (1)$$

where

$$A \equiv L - F + \mu(G - \alpha T)$$

is the 'autonomous' component of aggregate income. Solving the income identity equation (1) for equilibrium income yields

$$Y = \frac{A}{1 - \mu \alpha} = \frac{L - F + \mu(G - \alpha T)}{1 - \mu \alpha}. \quad (2)$$

Note that one unit increase in government spending on the monopolistically competitive products raises A by α when unaccompanied by a tax increase, and by $\mu(1 - \alpha)$ when financed by the lump-sum tax. This autonomous increase in income generates an induced demand increase by α , hence further increasing income by $\mu \alpha$. Through such a cumulative process, aggregate income increases by an amount equal to the original increase in the 'autonomous' component of aggregate income, 'multiplied' by $1 + \mu \alpha + (\mu \alpha)^2 + \dots = 1 / (1 - \mu \alpha)$.

B. Aggregate Demand Spillovers

It is easy to show that such an aggregate demand policy improves the welfare of the

representative consumer. This is because in equilibrium the non-competitive goods are consumed too little, due to monopoly pricing. Alternatively, this inefficiency can be understood in terms of aggregate demand spillovers. To see this, suppose that all consumers simultaneously increase their demand for the non-competitive goods; this leads to a more efficient allocation of resources as the marginal benefit of consumption exceeds the social cost of production. Nevertheless, no individual consumer has any incentive to demand more in equilibrium. This discrepancy between the effects of coordinated versus unilateral demand increases arises, as the potential gains generated by a unilateral shift in demand, materialized as an increase in monopoly profit, will be widely dispersed in the economy. This spillover effect creates a kind of free-rider problem in consumption decision. An increase in government spending improves welfare as it solves the free-rider problem.

Benassy (1978) and Negishi (1978, 1979) earlier demonstrated underemployment and insufficient aggregate demand in monopolistically competitive economies, under the so-called "subjective demand" approach. For the "objective demand" approach, see Blanchard and Kiyotaki (1987), Hart (1982), Startz (1989), and Weitzman (1982). Some of these studies recently emphasized aggregate demand management policies as a way of solving the free-rider problems that arise from aggregate demand spillovers. Cooper and John (1988) discussed this issue in a more general context.

C. Complementarity

It is also important to note that an expansionary aggregate demand policy leads to a boom, in which all producers benefit simultaneously. Demand spillover effects create complementarity across all sectors of the economy. Such complementarity would be more transparent when the model is extended to have two product groups, $i=1$ and 2 , with n_i being the size of group i . Let α_i , μ_i , and Π_i be the budget share, profit margin, and profit level of product group i , respectively. Then, $Y=L+\Pi_1+\Pi_2$, and, if the government spends G_i on product group i , $\Pi_i = \mu_i[\alpha_i(Y-T)+G_i]-n_iF$. The profits of the two groups thus satisfy

$$\Pi_1 = A_1 + \mu_1 \alpha_1 (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2), \quad (3)$$

$$\Pi_2 = A_2 + \mu_2 \alpha_2 (\Pi_1 + \Pi_2), \quad (4)$$

where

$$A_1 \equiv \mu_1 [G_1 + \alpha_1(L-T)] - n_1F$$

$$A_2 \equiv \mu_2 [G_2 + \alpha_2(L-T)] - n_2F$$

summarize the autonomous components of the profit of the two groups. The second terms in equations (3) and (4) represent the induced components; a unit increase in total income generates additional demand for sector i by α_i , which increases its profit by $\alpha_i\mu_i$.

In Figure 1, the steeper line represents equation (3); its slope is equal to $(1-\mu_1\alpha_1)/\mu_1\alpha_1$. An increase in A_1 shifts this line to the right. The other line represents equation (4), whose slope is $\mu_2\alpha_2/(1-\mu_2\alpha_2)$; an increase in A_2 shifts it upward. The equilibrium profit in each group is given at the intersection. To solve explicitly,


$$\begin{bmatrix} \Pi_1 \\ \Pi_2 \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{1-\mu_1\alpha_1-\mu_2\alpha_2} \begin{bmatrix} 1-\mu_2\alpha_2 & \mu_1\alpha_1 \\ \mu_2\alpha_2 & 1-\mu_1\alpha_1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} A_1 \\ A_2 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Note that an increase in government spending on one group increases not only the profit (and output) of that group, but also the profit and output of the other group. Thus, expansion of one sector benefits the other; the two sectors now become complementary to each other through demand spillover effects.

D. International Economics

This implication can be carried over into international contexts. An increase in autonomous demand for domestic products leads to a higher level of monopoly profits in the economy and thus of national income. This increased income will generate additional demand for domestic products, leading to a multiplier process. To the extent that increased income in demand falls on foreign goods and raises aggregate profits abroad, it also creates similar chain reactions and leads to an increase in income abroad. Thus, under imperfect competition, there are positive spillover effects of country specific demand shocks. *See Matsuyama (1992a) for a formal demonstration.*

Figure 1



E. Economic Development

The profit multiplier process and aggregate spillover effects are also important in understanding some problems in economic development. Murphy, Shleifer and Vishny (1989), using models similar to the one discussed above, demonstrated that aggregate demand spillovers, when strong enough, can create underdevelopment traps. In their models, the monopolist, instead of being equipped with the increasing returns to scale technology, decides whether to adopt the technology or to stay with the competitive fringe. Because of the fixed cost associated with the technology, the incentive to adopt depends on the market size. The market size, however, depends on the purchasing power of workers, which, in turn, depends on the extent of industrialization in the economy, that is, how widely the modern efficient production method is adopted. Thus, the more firms use the modern technology, the more profitable becomes its use. The complementarity of investment across industries leads to the coexistence of good and bad equilibrium. In the former, all industries adopt modern technologies; in the latter, all industries stay with cottage production, which Murphy, Shleifer, and Vishny interpreted as an underdevelopment trap. The model thus captures the old idea, which dates back to Rosenstein-Rodan (1943), Nurkse (1953), and Hirschman (1958), who emphasize the complementarity of modernization efforts across industries as the main obstacle to economic development. Rosenstein-Rodan (1943), in particular, used this idea to advocate large-scale development planning as a way of breaking away from underdevelopment traps. It should be stressed, however, that the complementarity of investment across industries does not necessarily provide the rationale for comprehensive central planning, as coordinated investment could be achieved through “the infectious influence of business psychology (Nurkse 1962, p.249),” which may be orchestrated by no more than some form of indicative planning. *See Matsuyama (1992b) for more on this issue.*

In the models discussed above, the range of products in the economy is fixed, and hence monopoly rents are not dissipated away by the process of entry. Once unrestricted entry is allowed for, monopoly profits would disappear and so would the complementarity through the profit multiplier process. Nevertheless, free entry brings another source of complementarity as the entry of new firms generally expands the variety of products supplied in the market. I will turn to this issue in the remainder of the paper.

III. Expanding Product Variety and Increasing Returns

To understand how the entry process could lead to complementarity, it is important to note that the entry of new firms, by introducing new products and services to the market, gives rise to increasing returns at the aggregate level. The idea is not new. Young (1928), for example, stressed the progressive division and specialization of industries, rather than the subdivision of labor within a firm, as an essential part of the process by which increasing returns were realized. The formal modelling of this idea is, however,

fairly recent.

A. The Model

To demonstrate the idea, I will use the following stripped-down version of the Dixit and Stiglitz (1977) model. Suppose that a single consumption good is produced by assembling a variety of differentiated intermediate inputs. The technology satisfies the property of constant returns to scale for a given set of inputs. More specifically, the production function takes a form of symmetric CES (Constant Elasticity of Substitution):

$$x = \left[\int_0^n [x(z)]^{1-\frac{1}{\sigma}} dz \right]^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}}, \quad (\sigma > 1)$$

with $x(z)$ being the amount of input z employed in production, and $[0, n]$ the range of intermediate inputs available in the marketplace. It assumes that the rate of substitution between every pair is equal to σ . The restriction, $\sigma > 1$, implies that no input is essential; X is well-defined even if some differentiated inputs are not used at all. Such a restriction is necessary as we consider the situation in which the range of products offered may vary.

One implication of this specification of product differentiation deserves special emphasis. That is, the productivity of intermediate inputs increases the greater the range of inputs available. To see this, let us suppose that all varieties are produced by the same amount, which, in fact, would be the case in optimal and equilibrium allocations. By letting $x(z)=x$, we have

$$x = n^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}} x. \quad (5)$$

Let $M=nx$ be total inputs used. Then, the average productivity of inputs, $X/M=n^{1/(\sigma-1)}$, increases with n . This arguably captures the notion that the introduction of new capital goods and producer services of a highly specialized nature would enhance the efficiency of the economy. Ethier (1982) and Romer (1987) ascribe this property of the CES specification as increasing returns due to specialization, or to the division of labor, in production.

The costs of expanding product variety and of increasing specialization come from economies of scale in the production of differentiated intermediate inputs. If there were no economies of scale, then productivity could rise indefinitely by adding more and more varieties to the list of differentiated products, and producing less and less of each variety. As before, let us suppose that the production of x units of each variety requires $ax+F$ units of labor; F is the fixed cost and a is the marginal labor requirement. For notational convenience, let us choose the unit of measurement so as to have $a=1-1/\sigma$. Finally, the labor resource constraint is

$$L = n(ax+F), \quad (6)$$

where L is the total labor supply in the economy. Combining equations (5) and (6) yields

$$x = \frac{n^{\frac{1}{\sigma-1}}}{a} (L - nF) .$$

Hence, the optimal product variety, one that maximizes the above expression, and per capita consumption are

$$n^* = \frac{L}{\sigma F} , \quad \frac{X^*}{L} = \left[\frac{L}{\sigma F} \right]^{\frac{1}{\sigma-1}} .$$

They are larger a) when the fixed cost is small, b) when the products are less substitutable, and c) when the size of the economy is large.

A market equilibrium for this economy consists of the competitive final goods sector with the constant returns to scale production function, X , and the monopolistically competitive intermediate inputs sector with the labor input function, $ax + F$. Taking the final goods price, P , and the prices of intermediate inputs, $p(z)$ for $z \in [0, n]$, as fixed, final goods producers seek to maximize their profit by choosing the cost-minimizing input combination. It is straightforward to derive the demand function for each input

$$\frac{x(z)}{X} = \left[\frac{p(z)}{P} \right]^{-\sigma} .$$

Furthermore, the zero profit condition implies that the output price must be equal to the unit cost:

$$P = \left[\int_0^n [p(z)]^{1-\sigma} dz \right]^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} .$$

Given the demand function derived above, each intermediate producer sets the price to maximize its profit. In doing so, it takes P and X as fixed. This means that the elasticity of demand with respect to the producer's own price is σ , so that the profit-maximizing price remains $p(z)(1 - 1/\sigma) = a$, or $p(z) = 1$. The equilibrium price of the final good hence becomes

$$P = n^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} . \tag{7}$$

Note that an increasing availability of specialized inputs leads to a lower output price, despite each input price remains constant. This is nothing but the mirror image of the efficiency effect of increasing specialization pointed out earlier.

The gross profit of each firm (*i.e.* gross of the fixed cost) can be shown to be proportional to the output produced:

$$\pi = (p - a)x = \frac{x}{\sigma} . \tag{8}$$

Using the labor market clearing condition equation (6), gross profit can be expressed as a

function of the number of firms:

$$\pi(n) = \frac{1}{\sigma-1} \left[\frac{L}{n} - F \right]. \quad (9)$$

Note that this is a decreasing function of n , as shown in Figure 2. The entry of firms hence reduces the profit of incumbent firms; and entry continues as long as gross profit exceeds fixed cost, F . Thus, there is a unique equilibrium, depicted as point E in Figure 2. Some algebra shows that the equilibrium product variety and per capita consumption are


$$n^e = \frac{L}{\sigma F}, \quad \frac{X^e}{L} = \left[\frac{L}{\sigma F} \right]^{\frac{1}{\sigma-1}}.$$

In market equilibrium, the variety of intermediate inputs, or the division of labor, is limited by the extent of the market; in a large economy, more firms stay and a wider range of products are offered; this division of labor enhances the efficiency of production, and therefore consumers living in a larger economy will be better off. (As equilibrium profit is zero, aggregate income consists only of wage income, so per capita output is equal to the equilibrium real wage in this model.) The equilibrium output of each firm is

$$x^e = \sigma F,$$

which is to say that, with large fixed costs and in the presence of close substitutes, the firms need to sell more to break even.

Figure 2



B. Economic Integration

This model has some significant implications when applied to international and interregional economics. Imagine that there exist two economies of the kind analyzed above, say East and West, and that they are originally isolated from each other. Furthermore, assume that the two economies have identical tastes and technologies. They differ only in labor supply; L denotes the labor supply of East and L^* that of West. Now let us ask "What would happen if they are integrated into each other?" The answer to this question crucially depends on the mobility of goods and labor.

1. The Effects of Trade

First, suppose that the products can be transported at zero cost, but labor is immobile. Free trade in goods ensures that the same set of intermediate inputs is available everywhere, so that the final goods sector in both economies achieve the same level of efficiency, while the varieties produced in each region are determined by the labor resource constraint. Symmetry implies that the number of intermediate inputs produced in each region is proportional to the labor supply; East produces $n=L/\sigma F$ varieties, and West produces $n^*=L^*/\sigma F$ varieties. Both regions enjoy the same level of productivity and per capita output of the final good is equal to

$$\left[\frac{L+L^*}{\sigma F} \right]^{\frac{1}{\sigma-1}}.$$

As the productivity depends on the availability of differentiated inputs in this model, economic integration through trade improves efficiency in both regions, and hence it is mutually beneficial. True, the larger economy may boast a much wider array of inputs produced than the smaller economy. However, as long as all inputs are available, this would not handicap the smaller economy. In fact, by comparing the situation before and after economic integration, it is easily seen that productivity gains are larger for the smaller economy.

With the notable exception of Negishi (1972) and others, imperfect competition and economies of scale had received little attention in the theoretical trade literature for many years. The systematic study of trade in differentiated products finally took off and has grown enormously during the last decade, following the path-breaking studies by Dixit and Norman, Krugman and Lancaster in the late 1970s. I have touched on only one of many important lessons that stem from this literature (*see* Helpman and Krugman, 1985, chapters 6-9 for more).

2. The Effects of Factor Mobility

Let us now suppose that there are impediments to trade, but economic integration makes it possible for some workers to migrate across the economies. Footloose workers migrate from the smaller economy to the larger economy, where the equilibrium wage is

higher. As a result, the population distribution becomes more lopsided. New firms are created in the larger economy, while firms are forced to close down in the smaller economy, which makes those who stay in the smaller economy worse off. With the limited mobility of goods, increasing returns are now region-specific. This induces the footloose workers to concentrate into one region. Economies of scale are realized only through agglomeration. It should be noted that economic integration benefits the immobile workers in the larger economy, while hurting those left behind in the smaller economy. This provides a striking contrast with the case of trade in differentiated goods, where all (immobile) workers gain, and those in the smaller economy gain most. Fujita (1989, chapter 8.4), Helpman and Krugman (1985, chapters 10-11), Rivera-Batiz (1988), discussed the effects of impediments to trade in differentiated goods on the regional distribution of economic activity.

In the policy debates concerning Europe 1992 and the North American Free Trade Area (NAFTA), much has been discussed on the possible impact of economic integration on smaller economies. Many argue that, incorporated into a larger market area, small economies can enjoy all the benefits of economies of scale, and become main beneficiaries of economic integration. Others believe, however, that economic integration and the free movement of labor and capital leads to a concentration of economic activities at the center, leaving peripheries underdeveloped. The above analysis suggests that both arguments have some theoretical merits and we need much more detailed information about the process of economic integration in order to determine the impact. See Krugman and Venables (1990) and Krugman (1991) for a further exploration of this issue.

IV. Complementarity and Agglomeration

The regional disparities caused by the migration of workers represent just one example of agglomeration phenomena, more general patterns that we observe everywhere in the real world. For instance, most industries tend to be concentrated in a few areas in any given country. On a much smaller scale, we see that retail stores and restaurants tend to cluster together in certain sections of a city. Some sort of complementarity is obviously important for explaining retail store clustering, but we cannot entirely attribute it to the physical characteristics of products sold by these stores. True, we often observe that restaurants and theaters tend to cluster together, as they offer complementary services. In more extreme cases, such as nuts and bolts or left and right shoes, complementarities are so strong that they should be sold together in the same store. What is less obvious is that stores that sell very similar products and hence compete directly for customers also cluster together. Examples abound, such as automobile dealers, bookstores, camera shops, electronics shops, and furniture stores, hairdressers, etc. Why are these stores not spread more geographically? The need to share

common infrastructure may be one reason, but the universality suggests that there is something more that makes them cluster together.

A slight extension of the model in the previous section, taken from Matsuyama (1992c), helps to explain why stores that sell similar products cluster together. The only difference is that the differentiated products, now interpreted as consumer goods, are divided into two groups, 1 and 2; let n_i denote the product variety offered in group i . The consumer maximizes the following preferences,

$$V(X_1, X_2) = \left[X_1^{1-\frac{1}{\epsilon}} + X_2^{1-\frac{1}{\epsilon}} \right]^{\frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon-1}}$$

where

$$X_i = \left[\int_0^{n_i} [x_i(z)]^{1-\frac{1}{\sigma}} dz \right]^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}}, \quad (\sigma > 1)$$

for $i=1$ and 2 . Here, V aggregates the two composites of differentiated goods, and ϵ represents the intergroup elasticity of substitution, while σ may be referred to as the intragroup elasticity of substitution. Note that this model is reduced to the previous one if $\epsilon = \sigma$. As before, each firm sets the price equal to one; and hence all goods in the same group are produced by the same amount, $x_i(z)=x_i$. This implies that equations (5), (7), and (8) hold for each group. As the relative demand of the two composites satisfies $X_1/X_2=[P_1/P_2]^{-\epsilon}$, the ratio of the gross profit in the two groups is equal to

$$\frac{\pi_1}{\pi_2} = \frac{x_1}{x_2} = \frac{X_1 \left[\frac{n_1}{n_2} \right]^{\frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma}}}{X_2 \left[\frac{n_1}{n_2} \right]^{\frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma}}} = \left[\frac{P_1}{P_2} \right]^{-\epsilon} \left[\frac{n_1}{n_2} \right]^{\frac{\sigma}{1-\sigma}} = \left[\frac{n_1}{n_2} \right]^{\frac{\epsilon-\sigma}{\sigma-1}}.$$

This shows that the relation between profit and product variety depends on the relative magnitude of ϵ and σ . For example, suppose that group 1 consists of restaurants and group 2 retail stores. A pair of restaurants or a pair of stores are much closer substitutes than dining and shopping ($\epsilon < \sigma$). Then, the profit level is negatively related to the variety. If there are too many restaurants and a few stores in the city, restaurants will close down and new stores will open in the long run. Entry and exit processes equalize the numbers of the two types of establishments. On the other hand, suppose that there are two streets in the city and products are grouped according to their location. It is costly to move back and forth between the two streets, but *ex ante* most consumers are almost indifferent *vis-à-vis* the two locations. Then, ϵ is close to infinity, so that $\epsilon > \sigma$ and hence the profit level is positively related to the number of shops. Entry of a new firm, by attracting more customers, would benefit existing firms in the same street. This introduces complementarity into the locational decision, and entry and exit processes lead to all stores clustering into a single location.

It should be noted that clustering of two products can occur in this model even when the rate of substitution between them, σ , is high. What makes a pair of products complementary to each other is the presence of a third alternative, rather than the

physical characteristics of the two products. This point was made by Hicks and Allen (1934). They criticized the notions of substitutes and complements given by earlier writers and proposed a new definition based on the property of market demand in the presence of many commodities.

V. Circular and Cumulative Causation in Growth and Development

Complementarity in the entry processes and associated expanding product variety is also useful for understanding some fundamental problems of economic growth and development. Satisfactory treatment of these issues, of course, requires a dynamic model and, in fact, the literature has evolved primarily by extending the dynamic monopolistic competition model by Judd (1985). Nonetheless, I will refrain from developing dynamic models, as the static framework can go a long way to illustrate the main ideas in the literature.

A. Underdevelopment Traps

One critical aspect of the development process is that productivity growth is realized through an ever greater indirectness in production. One of the main obstacles to economic development is that complicated technologies often require a variety of non-tradable inputs and producer services. In underdeveloped regions, the lack of local support industries forces the use of relatively simple production methods in downstream industries. This, in turn, implies a small market for specialized inputs; the lack of local demand prevents a network of support industries from springing up. Thus, the two factors, the lack of demand and the lack of support industries, are mutually interrelated. Not only is the division of labor limited by the extent of the market, but also the extent of the market is limited by the division of labor. Such a circular causation creates underdevelopment traps. Of course, the circularity does not always imply a vicious circle. If regions acquire more than a critical mass of support industries, the very fact that the relation is circular generates a virtuous cycle. Over time, the division of labor becomes far more elaborate, the production process more indirect, involving an increasing degree of specialized inputs. Through such a cumulative process, the economy experiences productivity growth and rising living standards. In the presence of complementarity, nothing succeeds like success, and poverty becomes its own cause.

Again, a slight extension of the model in III., taken from Matsuyama (1992c, Section 3), helps to capture this idea. Let us now suppose that a single consumption good is produced with the following constant returns of scale production function,

$$C = F(X, N) ,$$

where N is labor input. This specification allows the final goods industry to substitute between labor intensive and intermediate input intensive technologies. The relative

demand for N to X is given by an increasing function of P ,

$$\frac{N}{X} = \Phi(P), \quad (10)$$

with the elasticity of substitution between X and N being equal to $\epsilon(P) \equiv d \log \Phi(P) / d \log P$. The pricing behavior of monopolistically competitive firms is the same as before, so that $p(z) = 1$ for all z , and all varieties are produced by the same amount; hence equations (5) and (7) remain valid. Instead of equation (6), the labor market condition now becomes,


$$n(ax + F) + N = L. \quad (6')$$

For any given n , equations (5), (6'), (7), and (10) can be solved for x . From equation (8), the gross profit per firm satisfies

$$\pi(n) = \frac{L - nF}{(\sigma - 1)n + \sigma \Phi(n^{1-\sigma}) n^{\frac{\sigma}{\sigma-1}}}. \quad (9')$$

This shows that, with a large $\epsilon(P)$, the profit function can be increasing in n . For example, suppose that $F(X, N)$ is a CES, with $\epsilon(P) \equiv \epsilon$. Then, $\Phi(P) = \beta P^\epsilon$ and the profit function has a single peak when $\epsilon > \sigma$. In this case, there are three equilibria, as shown in Figure 3. The middle equilibrium, S_M , represents the threshold level below which the firms make losses. If the economy is slightly above the middle equilibrium, there is an inducement to start up. The profit per firm rises with the number of firms around the middle equilibrium, which make it unstable. The other two equilibria, S_0 and S_H , are

Figure 3



both stable. In the lower range, the limited availability of specialized inputs induces the final goods sector to use relatively labor intensive technologies, which implies the small market size for input producers. No firm is able to stay in the market, and $n=0$, or S_0 , represents a state of underdevelopment toward which the economy gravitates. The higher level equilibrium, S_H , on the other hand, is characterized by a wider range of intermediate inputs and a higher share of the intermediate inputs sector in GNP.

More generally, this model could have an arbitrary number of stable equilibria, as the property of constant returns to scale imposes very few restrictions on the relative factor demand $\Phi(P)$. An example can easily be constructed by allowing the final goods sector to have access to a finite number of Leontief (*i.e.* fixed coefficient) technologies. Furthermore, it can be shown that equilibrium per capita consumption is positively related to the equilibrium product variety. The model is thus consistent with the idea of the stages of economic development.

The multiplicity of stable equilibria arises in this model because the benefits of a new input are not completely appropriated by the firm that introduces it. With an increasing variety of inputs, the entry induces the final goods sector to switch to more intermediate input intensive technologies, thereby generating demand for other input producers. No individual firm, however, takes into account such pecuniary externalities. Of course, a coordinated, simultaneous entry of firms would solve the demand spillover effects, making it possible for the economy to jump from S_0 to S_H . However, this is partly due to the static nature of the model. In an explicit dynamic setting, where starting up new firms requires reallocation of current resources from production and the benefits of productivity growth are realized only in the future, Ciccone and Matsuyama (1992) shows that the resource constraint makes coordinated entry unprofitable, and the economy cannot escape from the state of underdevelopment; thus $n=0$ becomes a poverty 'trap.'

It is also worth pointing out that, at a more formal level, the mechanisms generating multiple equilibria in this model are similar to those discussed in the previous section. The possibility of substitution between labor intensive and intermediate input intensive technologies makes intermediate inputs complementary to each other, even when the rate of substitution between two intermediate inputs is high.

B. International Economics

The above model also suggests that international trade could be responsible for uneven development. To see this, consider the following model of a small open economy, adopted from Rodríguez (1993). There are two tradable consumer goods, A and B , and preferences are given by $C_A^\alpha C_B^{1-\alpha}$. Both consumer goods sectors are competitive, and the production function of sector A is X , while that of B is N . In the absence of international trade, this is analytically equivalent to an economy of a single final goods industry with the production function $F(X, N) = X^\alpha N^{1-\alpha}$. Relative demand is then $\Phi(P) = (1/\alpha - 1)P$ and the profit function is a decreasing function of n , as depicted by the

dotted curve in Figure 4. There is a unique stable equilibrium, in which the economy produces both consumer goods. Some algebra shows that the profit function is


$$\pi(n) = \frac{\alpha}{\sigma - \alpha} \left[\frac{L}{n} - F \right],$$

and the equilibrium product variety is

$$n = \frac{\alpha L}{\sigma F}.$$

Suppose now that the economy trades in the world market, where the relative price of the two tradeable goods is exogenously given and equal to one. The possibility of trade makes the two consumer goods perfect substitutes for the competitive firms. Thus, the economy specializes in *A* when $P = n^{1/(1-\sigma)} < 1$ or $n > 1$; it specializes in *B* when $n < 1$. The gross profit is thus given by equation (6) when $n > 1$, but is equal to zero if $n < 1$. If $L > \sigma F$, there are two stable equilibria, $n = 0$ and $n = L/\sigma F$, with $n = 1$ being the threshold level, as shown in Figure 4. In this example, international trade creates an underdevelopment trap. Furthermore, if $\alpha L > \sigma F$, the autarky would help to generate the critical mass of support industries, so that a temporary isolation would help the economy to escape the underdevelopment trap. The model thus captures an element of the views expressed by Baran (1957), Myrdal (1957), and most notably by Prebisch (1950).

Figure 4



C. Sustainable Growth

Note that in the previous model, the cumulative process of growth and development ultimately peters out. This is because the resource constraint eventually becomes strong enough to counteract demand complementarities. In industrialized countries, however, all indices seem to point steadily upward. On the average, and in the long run, there are no signs of any slowdown in the momentum of economic development in these countries. Recent literature on endogenous growth shows that complementarity in the technology of entry activity may itself be important for sustainable growth.

Again, the model in **III.** can be used to illustrate the basic idea. As shown in Figure 2, the benefit of entry, gross profit, declines with new entries. In order to offset the tendency of smaller profits, the cost of entry must also decline. One way of doing this, taking from Rivera-Batiz and Romer (1991) and Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1992), is to assume that starting up new firms requires F units of the final good, instead of labor. The idea is that new generations of computers would help scientists to design new products, hence this model is called "the lab equipment model" by Rivera-Batiz and Romer. Under this specification, entry activity also benefits from increasing returns due to specialization, which introduces a complementarity in the entry process and makes growth sustainable.

As labor is used only in manufacturing intermediate inputs, the labor market condition becomes simply $nax=L$. Gross profit is thus $\pi=x/\sigma=L/(\sigma-1)n$, which is still declining in n . The cost of entry, on the other hand, becomes PF , so that the entry of new firms would continue as long as

$$\pi(n) = \frac{L}{(\sigma-1)n} \geq n^{\frac{1}{1-\sigma}} F, \quad (9'')$$


or

$$\frac{L}{(\sigma-1)F} \geq n^{\frac{2-\sigma}{1-\sigma}}.$$

If $\sigma=2$, then both the benefits and costs of entry fall at the same rate, and the inducement to start up new firms always exists as long as $L>(\sigma-1)F$. If $\sigma<2$, the case shown in Figure 5, the cost of entry falls faster than the benefit. This creates the threshold for development, but the cumulative process of growth, once started, will never stop.

An alternative way of generating sustainable growth, taken from Romer (1990) and Grossman and Helpman (1992, Chapter 3), is to introduce a learning-by-doing in the process of entry, while maintaining the assumption of the fixed cost being paid by labor. More specifically, let us suppose that the amount of labor required in start-up operations declines with the number of firms, say, F/n^λ . This is to say that the stock of knowledge useful for setting up new firms is increasing in n . The idea is that entrepreneurs starting new businesses or scientists designing new products can learn from past experiences, hence named "the knowledge-driven model" by Rivera-Batiz and Romer. The labor

Figure 5



market clearing condition is now

$$L = n \left[ax + \frac{F}{n^\lambda} \right].$$

By substituting this expression in equation (8), one can show that the entry of new firms would continue as long as

$$\pi(n) = \frac{1}{\sigma-1} \left[\frac{L}{n} - \frac{F}{n^\lambda} \right] \geq \frac{F}{n^\lambda}$$

or

$$\frac{L}{\sigma F} \geq n^{1-\lambda}.$$

If labor productivity in start-up operations is proportional to the number of firms ($\lambda=1$), as assumed in Romer, and Grossman and Helpman, then there is always an incentive to start up new firms and introduce new products as long as $L > \sigma F$. If the learning-by-doing or knowledge-spillover effect is stronger ($\lambda > 1$), then the possibility of under-development traps arises, but, again, the cumulative process of growth, once started, will never stop.

VI. Concluding Remarks

In recent years, monopolistic competition models have frequently been applied in the context of macroeconomics, international, and interregional economics, as well as growth and development. The three features of monopolistic competition, the monopoly power of differentiated goods producers, the lack of strategic interactions, and the explicit analysis of entry and exit processes, make it a useful framework within which to examine the aggregate implications of monopoly distortions, increasing returns, and expanding product variety. In this paper, I have presented a highly selective review in this area, with special emphasis on complementarity and its role in generating multiplier processes, agglomeration, underdevelopment traps, regional disparities, and sustainable growth, or more generally, what Myrdal (1957) called the "principle of circular and cumulative causation."

I should point out that monopolistic competition is not the only way of modelling complementarity. As the self-adjusting nature of market forces in the standard neo-classical paradigm is due to its efficient resource allocation, any departure from the standard paradigm would increase the chance of generating complementarities, thereby introducing instability and cumulative processes. For example, it is well-known that more decentralized trading processes, instead of well-organized Walrasian markets, create complementarities, which have been used to explain underemployment and business cycles (Diamond 1982; Diamond and Fudenberg 1989; Howitt and McAfee 1992; Mortensen 1989, 1991) and the universal adoption of a single medium of exchange (Kiyotaki and Wright 1989; Matsuyama, Kiyotaki, and Matsui, 1993). Recent work on asymmetric information also demonstrated that information externalities generate complementarities and cumulative processes and that they are used to explain a variety of phenomena, such as custom, fashion, and fads (Banerjee 1992; Bikhchandani, Hirshleifer, and Welch 1992), market crashes (Caplin and Leahy 1992), and racial segregation (Coate and Loury 1991).

Or for that matter, pure technological externalities, either static Marshallian external economies or dynamic learning-by-doing effects, could generate complementarities. Many existing studies (including my own) used external economies to model a variety of phenomena discussed in this paper, while maintaining the other assumptions of the neoclassical paradigm: *see*, for example, Arthur (1990), Faini (1984), Krugman (1981, 1987), Lucas (1988), Matsuyama (1992d) for international and interregional inequalities and industrial localization; Azariadis and Drazen (1990), Durlauf (1990) and Matsuyama (1991) for underdevelopment traps; and Lucas (1988) and Romer (1986) for sustainable growth. Even some monopolistic competition models, such as the knowledge-driven models of sustainable growth discussed in the previous section, rely on pure externalities. It is hard to deny that pure technological externalities resulting from knowledge spillovers are important in explaining some of these phenomena. But, at the same time, some

would feel that assuming externalities in the standard paradigm would be a cheap way of generating complementarities. Krugman (1991), for example, argues against relying too much on assuming pure externalities. My own view is that models with pure externalities are often useful and convenient for exploring the consequences of complementarities, but should be taken at most as a reduced form that is meant to capture some underlying mechanisms generating complementarities. And any result, particularly on the effects of policies, needs to be interpreted with great caution since a change in the environment might also affect the nature of complementarities, as illustrated by a couple of examples in this paper.

Kiminori Matsuyama: Associate Professor, Department of Economics, Northwestern University, U.S.A.

References

- Arrow, K. J., and F. H. Hahn, *General Competitive Analysis*, San Francisco: Holden-Day, 1971.
- Arthur, W. B., " 'Silicon Valley' Locational Clusters: When Do Increasing Returns Imply Monopoly?" *Mathematical Social Sciences* 19, February 1990, pp. 235-251.
- Azariadis, C., and A. Drazen, "Threshold Externalities in Economic Development," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 105, May 1990, pp. 501-526.
- Baran, P., *The Political Economy of Growth*, Monthly Review Press, 1957.
- Banerjee, A. V., "A Simple Model of Herd Behavior," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 107, August 1992, pp. 797-817.
- Barro, R. J., and X. Sala-i-Martin, "Public Finance in Models of Economic Growth," *Review of Economic Studies* 59, October 1992, pp. 645-661.
- Beath, J., and Y. Katsoulacos, *The Economic Theory of Product Differentiation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Benassy, J.-P., "A Neo-Keynesian Model of Price and Quantity Determination in Disequilibrium," in G. Schwödiauer, ed., *Equilibrium and Disequilibrium in Economic Theory*, Boston: Reidel, 1978.
- , "Monopolistic Competition," in W. Hildenbrand and H. Sonnenschein, eds., *Handbook of Mathematical Economics* Vol. IV, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1991.
- Bikhchandani, S., D. Hirshleifer, and I. Welch, "A Theory of Fads, Fashion, Custom, and Cultural Change as Informational Cascades," *Journal of Political Economy* 100, October 1992, pp. 992-1026.
- Blanchard, O. J., and N. Kiyotaki, "Monopolistic Competition and the Effect of Aggregate Demand," *American Economic Review* 77, September 1987, pp. 647-666.
- Caplin, A. S., and J. Leahy, "Business as Usual, Market Crashes, and Wisdom after the Fact," unpublished, Columbia University and Harvard University, 1992.
- Chamberlin, E. H., *Theory of Monopolistic Competition*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933.
- Ciccone, A., and K. Matsuyama, "Start-up Costs and Pecuniary Externalities as Barriers to Economic Development," Working Papers in Economics E-92-14, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, 1992.
- Coate, S., and G. Loury, "Affirmative Action as a Remedy for Statistical Discrimination," unpublished, Harvard University, 1991.

- Cooper, R., and A. John, "Coordinating Coordination Failures in Keynesian Models," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 103, August 1988, pp. 441-463.
- Diamond, P., "Aggregate Demand Management in Search Equilibrium," *Journal of Political Economy* 90, October 1982, pp. 881-894.
- , and D. Fudenberg, "Rational Expectations Business Cycles in Search Equilibrium," *Journal of Political Economy* 97, June 1989, pp. 606-619.
- Dixit, A., and J. E. Stiglitz, "Monopolistic Competition and Optimum Product Variety," *American Economic Review* 67, 1977, pp. 297-308.
- Durlauf, S. D., "Nonergodic Economic Growth," unpublished, Stanford University, 1990.
- Eaton, B. C., and R. G. Lipsey, "Product Differentiation" in R. Schmalensee and R. D. Willig, eds, *Handbook of Industrial Organization*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1989.
- Ethier, W., "National and International Returns to Scale in the Modern Theory of International Trade," *American Economic Review* 72, 1982, pp. 389-405.
- Faini, R., "Increasing Returns, Non-traded Inputs and Regional Development," *Economic Journal* 94, June 1984, pp. 308-323.
- Fujita, M., *Urban Economic Theory: Land Use and City Size*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- Grossman, G., and E. Helpman, *Innovation and Growth in the Global Economy*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1992.
- Hart, O. D., "A Model of Imperfect Competition with Keynesian Features," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 97, 1982, pp. 109-138.
- , "Imperfect Competition in General Equilibrium: An Overview of Recent Work," in K. J. Arrow, and S. Honkapohja, eds., *Frontiers of Economics*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1985.
- Helpman, E., and P. Krugman, *Market Structure and Foreign Trade*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1985.
- Hicks, J. R., *A Contribution to the Theory of the Trade Cycle*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1950.
- , and R. C. D. Allen, "A Reconsideration of the Theory of Value, Parts I and II," *Economica*, N.S., February 1934, pp. 52-76, and May 1934, pp. 196-219.
- Hirschman, A. O., *The Strategy of Economic Development*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958.
- Howitt, P., and R. P. McAfee, "Animal Spirits," *American Economic Review* 82, June 1992, pp. 493-507.
- Judd, K., "On the Performance of Patents," *Econometrica* 53, 1985, pp. 567-585.
- Kaldor, N., *Economics without Equilibrium*, University College Cardiff Press, 1985.
- Kalecki, M., *Essays in the Theory of Economic Fluctuations*, London: Allen & Unwin, 1939.
- Kiyotaki, N., and R. Wright, "On Money as a Medium of Exchange," *Journal of Political Economy* 97, August 1989, pp. 927-954.
- Krugman, P. R., "Trade, Accumulation, and Uneven Development," *Journal of Development Economics* 8, 1981, pp. 149-161.
- , "The Narrow Moving Band, the Dutch Disease, and the Competitive Consequences of Mrs. Thatcher: Notes on Trade in the Presence of Dynamic Scale Economies," *Journal of Development Economics* 27, 1987, pp. 41-55.
- , *Geography and Trade*, Cambridge: The MIT Press, 1991.
- , and A. J. Venables, "Integration and the Competitiveness of Peripheral Industry," in C. Bliss and J. Braga de Macedo, eds, *Unity with Diversity in the European Community*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Lucas, R. E. Jr., "On the Mechanics of Economic Development," *Journal of Monetary Economics* 22, July 1988, pp. 3-42.
- Matsuyama, K., "Increasing Returns, Industrialization, and Indeterminacy of Equilibria," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106, May 1991, pp. 617-650.
- , "Imperfect Competition, Foreign Trade, and the Multipliers: Machlup-Metzler Fifty Years Later," Working Papers in Economics E-92-4, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, 1992a.
- , "The Market Size, Entrepreneurship, and the Big Push," *Journal of the Japanese and International Economies* 6, December 1992b, pp. 347-364.

- , "Making Monopolistic Competition More Useful," Working Papers in Economics E-92-18, Hoover Institution, Stanford University, 1992c.
- , "Agricultural Productivity, Comparative Advantage, and Economic Growth," *Journal of Economic Theory* 58, December 1992d, pp.317-334.
- , N. Kiyotaki, and A. Matsui, "Toward a Theory of International Currency," *Review of Economic Studies* 60, April 1993, pp.283-307.
- Mortensen, D. T., "The Persistence and Indeterminacy of Unemployment," *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 91, 1989, pp. 347-370.
- , "Equilibrium Unemployment Cycles," Center for Mathematical Studies in Economics and Management Sciences Discussion Paper #939, Northwestern University, 1991.
- Murphy, K., A. Shleifer, and R. Vishny, "Industrialization and the Big Push," *Journal of Political Economy* 97, October 1989, pp. 1003-1026.
- Myrdal, G., *Economic Theory and Under-Developed Regions*, London: Duckworth, 1957.
- Negishi, T., *General Equilibrium Theory and International Trade*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1972.
- , "Existence of Under Employment Equilibrium" in G. Schwödiauer, ed., *Equilibrium and Disequilibrium in Economic Theory*, Boston: Reidel, 1978.
- , *Microeconomic Foundations of Keynesian Macroeconomics*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1979.
- Nurkse, R., *Problems of Capital Formation in Underdeveloped Countries*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.
- , *Equilibrium and Growth in the World Economy: Economic Essays by Ragnar Nurkse*, in Gottfried Haberler and Robert M. Stern, eds., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1962.
- Prebisch, R., *Economic Development of Latin America and Its Principal Problems*, The Economic Commission for Latin America, United Nations, 1950.
- Rivera-Batiz, F. L., "Increasing Returns, Monopolistic Competition, and Agglomeration Economies in Consumption and Production," *Regional Science and Urban Economics* 18, 1988, pp. 125-153.
- , and P. M. Romer, "Economic Integration and Endogenous Growth," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106, May 1991, pp. 531-555.
- Rodríguez, A., "Underdevelopment: A Trap with an Exit," unpublished, Stanford University, 1993.
- Romer, P. M., "Increasing Returns and Long Run Growth," *Journal of Political Economy* 94, 1986, pp. 1002-1037.
- , "Growth Based on Increasing Returns Due to Specialization," *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 77, May 1987, pp. 56-62.
- , "Endogenous Technological Change," *Journal of Political Economy* 98, October 1990, pp. S71-S102.
- Rosenstein-Rodan, P. N., "Problems of Industrialization of Eastern and South-Eastern Europe," *Economic Journal* 53, June-September 1943, pp. 202-211.
- Startz, R., "Monopolistic Competition as a Foundation for Keynesian Macroeconomic Models," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 104, November 1989, pp.737-752.
- Stiglitz, J. E., "Towards a More General Theory of Monopolistic Competition," in M. H. Peston and R. E. Quandt, eds., *Prices, Competition, and Equilibrium*, Oxford: Phillip Allan/Barnes & Noble Books, 1986.
- Tirole, J., *The Theory of Industrial Organization*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988.
- Weitzman, M., "Increasing Returns and the Foundations of Unemployment Theory," *The Economic Journal* 92, December 1982, pp. 787-804.
- Young, A. A., "Increasing Returns and Economic Progress," *Economic Journal* 38, 1928, pp. 527-542.