

No. 142 (82-9)

Relative Price Changes and Biases  
of Technical Change in Japan  
-- KLEM Production Model

by  
Masahiro Kuroda and Wago Hajime

January, 1982

On the other hand the bias of technical changes with respect to time had experienced a remarkable change in some industries. Before the oil crisis in Japan "capital using - labor saving - energy and material neutral" bias of technical changes are dominant in many industries. After the oil crisis, the results suggest that the bias of technical change moved significantly corresponding to the changes of the relative prices as shown in [Table 6].

The bias of technical change with respect to capital input moves to the input saving way for eleven industries. On the contrary in sixteen industries the bias of technical change with respect to labor input moves to the input using way. Also the bias of technical change with respect to energy and materials moves into the input saving way in almost one-third of the thirty industries.

---

\* This report is an intermediate product of the co-research project, 'Energy and Economic Growth' supported by the Japanese National Science Foundation. Also our work was discussed in the project, 'Energy and Economic Growth in the United States and Japan' which is processing between Dale W. Jorgenson and M. Kuroda within the financial support of the U.S. National Science Foundation. But the views and interpretations in this paper are those of authors. We would like to thank Dale W. Jorgenson, Chikashi Moriguchi, Mieko Nishimizu, Iwao Ozaki, Mitsuo Saito and Kanji Yoshioka for valuable comments and data supports. Also we have to many thanks Akiko Ota for her assistant in paper preparation.

## 1. Theoretical Framework

Our production model aims to explain the producer behavior in each industrial sector of Japan. We assume that there exist a twice differentiable production function, by which the gross flow of output,  $X_i$  in  $i$ -th sector is related to the service flows of four inputs: labor( $L_i$ ), capital( $K_i$ ), energy( $E_i$ ) and other intermediate materials( $M_i$ ).

We assume further that the production function is characterized by constant returns to scale and Hicks - neutral technical changes.

$$(1.1) \quad X_i = f_i(L_i, K_i, E_i, M_i, t),$$

where  $t$  denotes time trend.

Under the competitive market conditions, producer behavior can be described equivalently in terms of production functions or price possibility frontiers. We can deduce the price possibility frontier as a dual framework of the production function (1.1).

$$(1.2) \quad q_i = g_i(P_{Li}, P_{Ki}, P_{Ei}, P_{Mi}, t)$$

where  $q_i$  is the price of output of industry  $i$  and  $P_{ji}$  ( $j=K,L,E,M$ ) represent the price of labor service, capital service, energy input and other intermediate material input in industry  $i$  respectively.<sup>(1)</sup>

Further we assume that the price possibility frontier (1.2) can be specified by the following trans-log price function.(2)

$$(1.3) \quad \ln q_i = \alpha_0^i + \sum_j \alpha_j^i \ln P_{ji} \\ + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{kj} \beta_{kj}^i \ln P_{ki} \ln P_{ji} + \alpha_t \cdot t \\ + \sum_{jt} \beta_{jt}^i \ln P_{ji}^i t + \frac{1}{2} \beta_{ttt}^i t^2$$

where  $\alpha^i$ ,  $\alpha_j^i$  ( $j=K,L,E,M$ ),  $\beta_{kj}^i$  ( $k,j=K,L,E,M$ ),  $\alpha_t^i$ ,  $\beta_{jt}^i$  ( $j=K,L,E,M$ ) and  $\beta_{tt}^i$  denote the parameters of the price function of  $i$ -th sector. (3)

As well known, trans-log price function is one of sufficiently flexible functional forms, which give a second order approximation to an arbitrary twice-differentiable function.

According to well known Shapard Lemma under the condition of the perfect competitive market, we can obtain the share function assuming the profit maximization behavior of producer. (4)

$$(1.4) \quad \frac{\partial \ln q^i}{\partial \ln P_j^i} = \frac{P_{ji}}{q_i} \cdot \frac{Y_{ji}}{X_i} = W_{ji}, \quad (j=K,L,E,M)$$

where  $Y_{ji}$  corresponds to each input,  $K_i, L_i, E_i$  and  $M_i$  for  $j=K,L,E$  and  $M$  and  $W_{ji}$  represents income share of  $j$ -th input in the  $i$ -th industrial sector.

Similarly we can define the rate of technical change as the negative of the shift of the function in terms of the price possibility frontier.

$$(1.5) \quad - \frac{\partial \ln q^i}{\partial t} = W_{ti}$$

where  $W_{ti}$  denotes the rate of technical change. From the trans-log specification of the price possibility frontier, we can deduce the following system of the share functions and the negative of the rate of technical change.

(1.6)

$$W_{K1} = \frac{P_{K1}K_1}{P_1X_1} = \alpha_K^1 + \beta_{KK}^1 \ln P_{K1} + \beta_{KL}^1 \ln P_{L1} + \beta_{KE}^1 \ln P_{E1} + \beta_{KM}^1 \ln P_{M1} + \beta_{Kt}^1 t$$

$$W_{L1} = \frac{P_{L1}L_1}{P_1X_1} = \alpha_L^1 + \beta_{LK}^1 \ln P_{K1} + \beta_{LL}^1 \ln P_{L1} + \beta_{LE}^1 \ln P_{E1} + \beta_{LM}^1 \ln P_{M1} + \beta_{Lt}^1 t$$

$$W_{E1} = \frac{P_{E1}E_1}{P_1X_1} = \alpha_E^1 + \beta_{EK}^1 \ln P_{K1} + \beta_{EL}^1 \ln P_{L1} + \beta_{EE}^1 \ln P_{E1} + \beta_{EM}^1 \ln P_{M1} + \beta_{Et}^1 t$$

$$W_{M1} = \frac{P_{M1}M_1}{P_1X_1} = \alpha_M^1 + \beta_{MK}^1 \ln P_{K1} + \beta_{ML}^1 \ln P_{L1} + \beta_{ME}^1 \ln P_{E1} + \beta_{MM}^1 \ln P_{M1} + \beta_{Mt}^1 t$$

$$-W_{t1} = \frac{\partial \ln q_1}{\partial t} = \alpha_t^1 + \beta_{tK}^1 \ln P_{K1} + \beta_{tL}^1 \ln P_{L1} + \beta_{tE}^1 \ln P_{E1} + \beta_{tM}^1 \ln P_{M1} + \beta_{tt}^1 t$$

( i = 1.....31 )

- 
- (1) For further discussion, see Samuelson(1953) and Fuss-Mcfadden (1978).
  - (2) For trans-log specification, see Christensen, Jorgenson and Lau(1973).
  - (3) The trans-log KLEM price frontier function is estimated by Berndt and Wood (1975) in the U.S. manufacturing during the period 1947-1971. Fraumeni-Jorgenson (1981) tried to estimate the trans-log model by the 36 industrial sectoral data in U.S.. Wills (1979) analyzed the properties of the technical change in the U.S. primary metal industry by a trans-log price frontier. In the articles of the productivity analysis, we can find several articles in which fluctuations of the productivities are related to the specification of the trans-log production or price frontier functions ; Gollop and Jorgenson (1980), Mohr (1980) and Madoo and Hansen (1980).

Deductions of the trans-log price function give the economic interpretation of parameters as the share elasticity with respect to input price, biases of technical change and the rate of change of the negative of the rate of technical change.

Share Elasticity

$$(1.7) \quad U_{jk}^i = \frac{\partial W_{ji}}{\partial \ln P_{ki}} = \beta_{jk}^i \quad (j.k = K.L.E.M).$$

Biases of technical change

$$(1.8) \quad U_{jt}^i = \frac{\partial (-W_{ti})}{\partial \ln P_{ji}} = \beta_{jt}^i \quad (j = K.L.E.M).$$

The rate of change of the negative of the rate of technical changes

$$(1.9) \quad U_{tt}^i = \frac{\partial (-W_{ti})}{\partial t} = \beta_{tt}^i .$$

We have to introduce some theoretical constraints in the formulation of trans-log price frontier function, so that the trans-log price function becomes consistent with the theory of producer's equilibrium.<sup>(5)</sup>

Firstly adding-up condition of accounting identity imposes the following restrictions on (1.3). Under these restrictions the relative share must sum to unity and only three of the first four equations in (1.6) is independent.

---

(4) See Shephard (1970).

(5) Fraumeni-Jorgenson (1981).

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha_K^i + \alpha_L^i + \alpha_E^i + \alpha_M^i = 1 \\
(1.10) \quad & \beta_{KK}^i + \beta_{LK}^i + \beta_{EK}^i + \beta_{MK}^i = 0 \\
& \beta_{KL}^i + \beta_{LL}^i + \beta_{EL}^i + \beta_{ML}^i = 0 \\
& \beta_{KE}^i + \beta_{LE}^i + \beta_{EE}^i + \beta_{ME}^i = 0 \\
& \beta_{KM}^i + \beta_{LM}^i + \beta_{EM}^i + \beta_{MM}^i = 0 \\
& \beta_{Kt}^i + \beta_{Lt}^i + \beta_{Et}^i + \beta_{Mt}^i = 0
\end{aligned}$$

In our four inputs model, which we will call KLEM model below, it involves estimating explicitly thirty parameters for each industry. If the material share equation is deleted, the six additional parameters are calculated from independently estimated twenty-four parameters.

Secondly the ten symmetry restrictions of the KLEM model with the material share equation deleted are as follows.

(1.11)

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta_{KL}^i &= \beta_{LK}^i \\
\beta_{KE}^i &= \beta_{EK}^i \\
\beta_{KM}^i &= \beta_{MK}^i = -\beta_{KK}^i - \beta_{LK}^i - \beta_{EK}^i \\
\beta_{LE}^i &= \beta_{EL}^i \\
\beta_{LM}^i &= \beta_{ML}^i = -\beta_{KL}^i - \beta_{LL}^i - \beta_{EL}^i \\
\beta_{EM}^i &= \beta_{ME}^i = -\beta_{KE}^i - \beta_{LE}^i - \beta_{EE}^i
\end{aligned}$$

$$\beta_{Kt}^i = \beta_{tK}^i$$

$$\beta_{Lt}^i = \beta_{tL}^i$$

$$\beta_{Et}^i = \beta_{tE}^i$$

$$\beta_{Mt}^i = \beta_{tM}^i = -\beta_{Kt}^i - \beta_{Lt}^i - \beta_{Et}^i$$

Given these restrictions, there are fourteen unknown KLEM model parameters to be estimated for each industry.

The accounting identity and symmetry restrictions taken together imply that the price possibility frontiers are homogeneous of degree one.

Finally monotonicity and concavity are desirable price possibility frontier curvature properties according to economic theory.

The conditions for monotonicity and concavity can be obtained by differentiating the price possibility frontier with respect to prices. With respect to the KLEM model, the first order partial derivatives are

$$(1.12) \quad \frac{\partial q_i}{\partial P_K^i} = \frac{q_i}{P_K^i} \cdot \frac{\partial \ln q_i}{\partial \ln P_K^i} = \frac{q_i}{P_K^i} W_K^i,$$

$$\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial P_L^i} = \frac{q_i}{P_L^i} \cdot \frac{\partial \ln q_i}{\partial \ln P_L^i} = \frac{q_i}{P_L^i} W_L^i,$$

$$\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial P_E^i} = \frac{q_i}{P_E^i} \cdot \frac{\partial \ln q_i}{\partial \ln P_E^i} = \frac{q_i}{P_E^i} W_E^i,$$

$$\frac{\partial q_i}{\partial P_M^i} = \frac{q_i}{P_M^i} \cdot \frac{\partial \ln q_i}{\partial \ln P_M^i} = \frac{q_i}{P_M^i} W_M^i.$$



The second order partial and cross-partial derivatives of the price possibility frontier can be written by

$$(1.13) \quad \frac{\partial^2 q_i}{\partial P_j^{i^2}} = \frac{q_i}{P_j^{i^2}} (\beta_{jj}^i + W_j^{i^2} - W_j^i)$$

(j = K,L,E,M) ,

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 q_i}{\partial P_j^i \partial P_K^i} = \frac{q_i}{P_j^i P_K^i} (\beta_{jK}^i + W_j^i W_K^i)$$

(j,K = K,L,E,M) .

These second order partial derivatives determine the Hessian of the price possibility frontier,  $H^{*i}$  at the point of base year ( $q_i, P_{ji} = 1.0, j=K,L,E,M$ ).

(1.14)

$$H^{*i} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{KK} + W_K^i(W_K^i - 1) & \beta_{KL} + W_K^i W_L^i & \beta_{KE} + W_K^i W_E^i & \beta_{KM} + W_K^i W_M^i \\ & \beta_{LL} + W_L^i(W_L^i - 1) & \beta_{LE} + W_L^i W_E^i & \beta_{LM} + W_L^i W_M^i \\ & & \beta_{EE} + W_E^i(W_E^i - 1) & \beta_{EM} + W_E^i W_M^i \\ & & & \beta_{MM} + W_M^i(W_M^i - 1) \end{bmatrix}$$

$H^{*1}$  can be expressed by an alternative way of expressing  $H^1$  as follows.

(1.15)

$$H^1 = (\beta_{jK}^1) + W^1 W^{1'} - \hat{W}^1$$

$$(\beta_{jK}^1) = \begin{bmatrix} \beta_{KK}^1 & \beta_{KL}^1 & \beta_{KE}^1 & \beta_{KM}^1 \\ \beta_{KL}^1 & \beta_{LL}^1 & \beta_{LE}^1 & \beta_{LM}^1 \\ \beta_{KE}^1 & \beta_{LE}^1 & \beta_{EE}^1 & \beta_{EM}^1 \\ \beta_{KM}^1 & \beta_{LM}^1 & \beta_{EM}^1 & \beta_{MM}^1 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$W_i = \begin{bmatrix} W_K^1 \\ W_L^1 \\ W_E^1 \\ W_M^1 \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{W}^1 = \begin{bmatrix} W_K^1 & & & 0 \\ & W_L^1 & & \\ & & W_E^1 & \\ 0 & & & W_M^1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Monotonicity requires that each element of  $W^1$  has to be non-negative. If each element of  $W^1$  were non-negative, matrix,  $W^1 W^{1'} - \hat{W}^1$  might be a negative semi-definite matrix, so that the sufficient condition of concavity of  $H^{*1}$  is consistent with the negative semi-definiteness of  $[\beta_{jK}^1]$ . In this case the negative semi-definiteness of  $[\beta_{jK}^1]$  guarantees the monotonicity

and concavity of the price frontier function regardless of the level of  $W_j^1$ . We call it conditions of "global concavity".

The negative semi-definiteness of  $[\beta_{jk}^1]$  for the global concavity might be tested by searching the negativity of diagonal factors in the Cholesky Factorization of  $[\beta_{jk}^1]$ .

Instead of the global concavity, we can impose the weaker condition of concavity on the price possibility frontier, which means that the concavity of the function might be satisfied within the observed fluctuation of the income share,  $W_j^1$  ( $j=K,L,E,M$ ). We call it the condition of "local concavity".

Our KLEM production model describing the producer behavior in terms of the trans-log price possibility frontier has to be imposed the above theoretical restrictions: homogeneity, symmetry, monotonicity and concavity.

## 2. Stochastic Specification and Estimation

Stochastic specification of KLEM model can be drawn on the U.S. model estimated by Jorgenson-Fraumeni [1981]. They assumed the additive disturbances  $\epsilon_j^*$  in each of the equations (1.6), reflecting errors in cost minimization. Under the adding-up condition one of the equations in (1.6) is not independent. This implies that the sum of the additive disturbance terms in the first four equations equals zero in every time period. Therefore they assumed that the truncated covariance matrix corresponding to one equation being deleted might be nonsingular and the truncated vector of disturbances is independently and identically normally distributed with a zero mean vector and covariance matrix  $\Omega$ . We will use the same assumption in our KLEM model.

The rate of technical change for the production possibility frontier,  $W_t$  in (1.6) is unobservable directly. Following discrete Divisia index of technical change is exact with the trans-log price frontier function. (Diewert (1976))

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.1) \quad -W_{ti} &= \ln q_i(t) - \ln q_i(t-1) \\
 &- \bar{W}_{Ki} (\ln P_{Ki}(t) - \ln P_{Ki}(t-1)) \\
 &- \bar{W}_{Li} (\ln P_{Li}(t) - \ln P_{Li}(t-1)) \\
 &- \bar{W}_{Ei} (\ln P_{Ei}(t) - \ln P_{Ei}(t-1)) \\
 &- \bar{W}_{Mi} (\ln P_{Mi}(t) - \ln P_{Mi}(t-1)) ,
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \bar{W}_{Ki} &= \frac{1}{2} [W_{Ki}(t) + W_{Ki}(t-1)], \\
 \bar{W}_{Li} &= \frac{1}{2} [W_{Li}(t) + W_{Li}(t-1)], \\
 \bar{W}_{Ei} &= \frac{1}{2} [W_{Ei}(t) + W_{Ei}(t-1)], \\
 \bar{W}_{Mi} &= \frac{1}{2} [W_{Mi}(t) + W_{Mi}(t-1)], \\
 \bar{W}_{ti} &= \frac{1}{2} [W_{ti}(t) + W_{ti}(t-1)] .
 \end{aligned}$$

Using this index number -  $W_t$ , the final behavioral equation, (1.6) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 (2.2) \quad -\bar{W}_t &= \alpha_t + \beta_{Kt} \overline{\ln P_{Ki}} + \beta_{Lt} \overline{\ln P_{Li}} \\
 &+ \beta_{Et} \overline{\ln P_{Ei}} + \beta_{Mt} \overline{\ln P_{Mi}} + \beta_{tt} \cdot \bar{t} ,
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\overline{\ln P_{Ki}} = \frac{1}{2} [\ln P_{Ki}(t) + \ln P_{Ki}(t-1)],$$

$$\overline{\ln P_{Li}} = \frac{1}{2} [\ln P_{Li}(t) + \ln P_{Li}(t-1)],$$

$$\overline{\ln P_{Ei}} = \frac{1}{2} [\ln P_{Ei}(t) + \ln P_{Ei}(t-1)],$$

$$\overline{\ln P_{Mi}} = \frac{1}{2} [\ln P_{Mi}(t) + \ln P_{Mi}(t-1)],$$

$$\bar{t} = \frac{1}{2} [t + (t-1)].$$

We then transform the set of behavioral equation (1.6) into the following set of equations that can be estimated:

$$(2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} \overline{W_{Ki}} &= \alpha_K^i + \beta_{KK}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ki}} + \beta_{KL}^i \overline{\ln P_{Li}} + \beta_{KE}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ei}} + \beta_{KM}^i \overline{\ln P_{Mi}} + \beta_{Kt}^i \bar{t} + \epsilon_{Kt} \\ \overline{W_{Li}} &= \alpha_L^i + \beta_{KL}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ki}} + \beta_{LL}^i \overline{\ln P_{Li}} + \beta_{LE}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ei}} + \beta_{LM}^i \overline{\ln P_{Mi}} + \beta_{Lt}^i \bar{t} + \epsilon_{Lt} \\ \overline{W_{Ei}} &= \alpha_E^i + \beta_{KE}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ki}} + \beta_{LE}^i \overline{\ln P_{Li}} + \beta_{EE}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ei}} + \beta_{EM}^i \overline{\ln P_{Mi}} + \beta_{Et}^i \bar{t} + \epsilon_{Et} \\ \overline{W_{Mi}} &= \alpha_M^i + \beta_{KM}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ki}} + \beta_{LM}^i \overline{\ln P_{Li}} + \beta_{EM}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ei}} + \beta_{MM}^i \overline{\ln P_{Mi}} + \beta_{Mt}^i \bar{t} + \epsilon_{Mt} \\ \overline{W_t} &= \alpha_t^i + \beta_{Kt}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ki}} + \beta_{Lt}^i \overline{\ln P_{Li}} + \beta_{Et}^i \overline{\ln P_{Ei}} + \beta_{Mt}^i \overline{\ln P_{Mi}} + \beta_{tt}^i \bar{t} + \epsilon_{tt} \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\overline{\epsilon_K} = \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_K(t) + \epsilon_K(t-1)]$$

$$\overline{\epsilon_L} = \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_L(t) + \epsilon_L(t-1)]$$

$$\overline{\epsilon_E} = \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_E(t) + \epsilon_E(t-1)]$$

$$\overline{\epsilon_M} = \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_M(t) + \epsilon_M(t-1)]$$

$$\overline{\epsilon_t} = \frac{1}{2} [\epsilon_t(t) + \epsilon_t(t-1)]$$

The error terms {  $\overline{\epsilon_K}$ ,  $\overline{\epsilon_L}$ ,  $\overline{\epsilon_E}$ ,  $\overline{\epsilon_M}$ ,  $\overline{\epsilon_t}$  } are now serially correlated.

Applying NL3SLS in TSP system, we tried to estimate parameters in the simultaneous equation (2.3) after deleting the serial correlation in the errors. (Jorgenson-Fraumeni (1981))

Here we will list the instrumental variables in our estimation. Gallant [1974] has shown that NL3SLS estimation is strongly consistent, asymptotically normally distributed.

#### List of Instrumental Variables

- Z1 : Constant
- Z2 : Time trend
- Z3 : Nominal government current expenditure
- Z4 : Nominal government fixed capital formation
- Z5 : Total time endowment
- Z6 : Average effective rate of indirect tax
- Z7 : Average effective rate of income tax
- Z8 : Effective rate of corporate income tax
- Z9 : Effective rate of corporate enterprise tax
- Z10: Effective rate of non-corporate income tax
- Z11: Effective rate of non-corporate enterprise tax

- Z12: Aquisition tax rate for real estate  
 Z13: Property tax rate for buildings and other structure  
 Z14: Property tax rate for automobile  
 Z15: Property tax rate for depreciable goods except automobil  
 and building  
 Z16: Property tax rate for land  
 Z17: Over-all price of labor service

We can obtain some measurement of technological properties in each industry from the estimated parameters. Allen partial elasticity of substitution is defined in terms of trans-log price possibility frontier as follows: (6)

$$(2.4) \quad \sigma_{kj}^i = \beta_{kj}^i / W_k^i W_j^i + 1 \quad (k \neq j, k, j = K.L.E.M)$$

$$\sigma_{jj}^i = \beta_{jj}^i / W_j^{i^2} - 1/W_j^i + 1 \quad (j = K.L.E.M).$$

Also we can define the price elasticity of demand under the perfect competitiveness of the market as follows:

$$(2.5) \quad \frac{\partial \ln x_{ji}}{\partial \ln P_{ki}} = \frac{P_{ki}}{x_{ji}} \cdot \frac{\partial x_{ji}}{\partial P_{ki}} = W_k^i \sigma_{jk}^i \quad (k, j = K.L.E.M.).$$

Concavity restriction in the price possibility frontier requires the following conditions.

$$(2.6) \quad \sigma_{jj}^i = \beta_{jj}^i / W_j^{i^2} - 1/W_j^i + 1 < 0$$

or

$$\beta_{jj}^i < W_j^i (1 - W_j^i) \quad (j = K.L.E.M.)$$

$$(2.7) \quad W_L^i \sigma_{KL}^i + W_E^i \sigma_{KE}^i + W_M^i \sigma_{KM}^i < 0 ,$$

$$W_K^i \sigma_{LK}^i + W_E^i \sigma_{LE}^i + W_M^i \sigma_{LM}^i < 0 ,$$

$$W_K^i \sigma_{EK}^i + W_L^i \sigma_{EL}^i + W_M^i \sigma_{EM}^i < 0 ,$$

$$W_K^i \sigma_{MK}^i + W_L^i \sigma_{ML}^i + W_E^i \sigma_{ME}^i < 0 .$$

Substituting (2.4) into each equation of (2.7) and imposing the restriction of homogeneity of degree one, we can deduce (2.6) again. This implies that if condition (2.6) is imposed on the trans-log price possibility frontier local concavity condition is satisfied during the sampling period. In our estimating procedures we try to estimate trans-log price function with restriction, (2.6), when unconstrained parameters did not accomplish to concavity condition.

### 3. Design of Experiment and Data Sources

Annual observations during the period, 1960-1977 were prepared for estimating the trans-log price possibility frontier in 30 industrial sectors shown in [Table 1]. As well-known, discrete Divisia index are consistent with a trans-log aggregator functional form. Here we will summarize briefly compiling procedures for price index of output and inputs in each industrial sector. (7)

#### Output, Energy and Intermediate Material Input:

Divisia price index of output, energy and intermediate material input were constructed from the estimated time-series input-output tables. In Japan input-output tables classified



[Table 1] List of Industrial Sectors

	Industry Name: 31 industrial orders		Gollop-Jorgensen (1980): 51 industrial orders
[A]	1. Agriculture, Forestry and Fisheries		Agricultural Production Agricultural Service
[M]	2. Mining		Metal mining Coal mining Crude Petroleum & N.Gas Nonmetallic mining
[C]	3. Construction		Contract Construction
[Fo]	4. Food and Kindred Products		Food & kindred Products
[Tx]	5. Textile Mill Products		Textile Mill Products
[Ap]	6. Apparel and other Fabricated Textile Products		Apparel & Other Fabr. Tex.
[Lm]	7. Lumber and Wood Products, except Furniture		Lumber and Wood Prod.
[F]	8. Furniture and Fixture		Furniture & Fixture
[P]	9. Paper and Allied Products		Paper & Allied Products
[Pr]	10. Printing, Publishing and Allied Products		Printing & Publishing
[Ch]	11. Chemical and Allied Products		Chemical & Allied Products
[R]	12. Petroleum Refinery and Related Industries		Petroleum & Coal Products
[Ru]	13. Rubber and Miscellaneous Plastic Products		Rubber & Misc. Plastic Prod.
[Le]	14. Leather and Leather Products		Leather & Leather Products

Continued

[S]	15.	Stone, Clay and Glass Products	Stone, Clay & Glass Prod.
[I]	16.	Iron and Steel	
[N]	17.	Non-ferrous Metal	Primary Metal Products
[Fa]	18.	Fabricated Metal Products	Fabricated Metal Products
[MH]	19.	Machinery	Machinery Ex. Electrical
[EM]	20.	Electric Machinery	Elec. Machinery Eqpt. & Supplies
[Mv]	21.	Motor Vehicles and Equipment	Motor Vehicles & Eqpt.
[Te]	22.	Transportation Equipment except Motor	Trans. Eqpt. Ex. Motor
[PM]	23.	Precision Instruments	Prof. Photo Eqpt. & Watches
[OM]	24.	Miscellaneous Manufacturing	Misc. Manufacturing Industry
[Tr]	25.	Transportation and Communication	Tabacco Manufacturing
			Railroad & Rail Express Service
			Street Rail, Bus Lines & Taxi
			Trucking Services & Warehousing
			Water Transportation
			Air Transportation
			Transportation Service
			Telephone, Telegraph Mics.
			Radio Broadcasting & TV.
[El]	26.	Electric Utility, Gas Supply and Water Supply	Electric Utility
			Gas Utility
[W]	27.	Wholesale and Retail Trade	Water Supply & Sanitary Service
			Wholesale Trade
			Retail Trade
[F1]	28.	Finance and Insurance	Finance, Insurance & Real Est.
[RE]	29.	Real Estate	
[Sv]	30.	Service	Service Ex. Priv Households

on commodity basis have been compiled every five years since 1955. At first we tried to estimate the time-series input-output tables compiled with consistent concepts and definitions over the period 1960-1977, by using published tables as benchmarks. We applied here Lagrangian method instead of well-known RAS method. Secondly we tried to convert estimated tables classified by commodity basis into transaction tables based upon industry by using information of product mix in each industrial sector. Column vector in estimated transaction table represents the intermediate input structure classified by commodity and the primary input structure in each industrial sector. Commodity transaction in each cell includes both domestic and imported goods. We tried to sum up non-competitive imports like crude oil in each sector and reclassify them as a directly allocated import. In Japan almost all of crude oil products are imported. Then imported crude oil are allocated directly to mining, petroleum refinery industry and electric utility sector. Finally secondary energy products fabricated in the petroleum refinery industry or electric utility sector are provided to other industrial sectors. In such dependency of intermediate input transaction we can simply understand that energy inputs in each industry except mining, petroleum refinery and electric utility are secondary energy produced in the latter three industries and directly allocated energy import is one of intermediate inputs in mining, petroleum refinery industry and electric utility sector. Energy input price index in  $i$ -th industry is defined by the aggregated price of both petroleum refinery and electric utility products as follows.

$$(3.1) \quad P_{Ei}(t) = P_{Ei}(t-1) \prod_{j=1}^J \left( \frac{P_{Oj}(t)}{P_{Oj}(t-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}(S_{ij}(t) + S_{ij}(t-1))}$$

where  $P_{oj}(t)$  represents the over-all price of j-th commodity and  $S_j(t)$  denotes input share of j-th energy input to total energy input in i-th sector.

$P_{oj}(t)$  is defined by the similar divisia aggregation of both j-th domestic and imported commodity prices.

$$(3.2) \quad P_{oj}(t) = P_{oj}(t-1) \prod_{k=1}^2 \left( \frac{P_{cjk}(t)}{P_{cjk}(t-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}(u_{jk}(t) + u_{jk}(t-1))}$$

where  $P_{cjl}(t)$  denotes price of domestically produced j-th commodity and  $P_{cj2}(t)$  denotes price of imported j-th commodity.

$u_{j1}(t)$  represents share of j-th domestically produced commodity and  $u_{j2}(t)$  is share of j-th imported commodity.

Price index of other intermediate material inputs is defined by similar divisia aggregation.

$$(3.3) \quad P_{Mi}(t) = P_{Mi}(t-1) \prod_{j=1}^n \left( \frac{P_{oj}(t)}{P_{oj}(t-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}(S_i(t) + S_i(t-1))}$$

(J<sub>12</sub>, 25)

where  $P_{oj}(t)$  is a over-all price of j-th commodity.

Price index of j-th industrial output is also defined by the divisia aggregation of domestically produced commodity price.

$$(3.4) \quad q_j(t) = q_j(t-1) \prod_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{P_{cil}(t)}{P_{cil}(t-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}(v_{il}(t) + v_{il}(t-1))}$$

where  $v_{il}(t)$  represent the nominal share of i-th commodity product to total product in j-th industry.

## Labor Input

Similarly we can formulate discrete Divisia price index of labor service as follows:

$$(3.5) \quad P_{Li}(t) = P_{Li}(t-1) \prod_{klmn} \left( \frac{w_{klmn,i}(t)}{w_{klmn,i}(t-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} [u_{klmn,i}(t) + u_{klmn,i}(t-1)]}$$

where  $w_{klmn,i}(t)$  denotes price of  $klmn$ -th labor service type in  $i$ -th sector and  $u_{klmn,i}$  stands for the income share of  $klmn$ -th labor type in total labor compensation of  $i$ -th sector.

Labor type is classified as follows:

(1) Employment status (1. ordinary employee, 2. temporary worker, 3. daily worker, 4. self-employed, 5. Un-paid family worker),  
(2) Sex (1. Male, 2. Female), (3) Occupation (1. Blue-collar worker, 2. White-collar worker), (4) Education (1. Elementary and Junior high school, 2. High school, 3. Junior college and Technical school, 4. College and University), (5) Age (1. less 17 years old, 2. 18-19 years old, 3. 20-24 years old, 4. 25-29 years old, 5. 30-34 years old, 6. 35-39 years old, 7. 40-44 years old, 8. 45-49 years old, 9. 50-54 years old, 10. 55-59 years old, 11. 60-64 years old, 12. more than 65 years old), (6) Industry shown in Table [1-1].  
Data for the ordinary workers in the non-agricultural sectors are principally available on the source of Basic Wage Structure Survey (BWSS). Estimates for the ordinary workers in agricultural and government service sectors are deduced from Labor Force Survey (LFS). Data for temporary worker, daily worker, self-employed and un-paid family worker were estimated from LFS, Manufacturing Census, Establishment Census and Employment Status Survey.

### Capital Input

We can define divisia price index of capital service input as follows:

$$(3.6) \quad P_{Ki}(t) = P_{Ki}(t-1) \prod_{klmn} \left( \frac{C_{klmn.i}(t)}{C_{klmn.i}(t-1)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}(\omega_{klmn.i}(t) + \omega_{klmn.i}(t-1))}$$

where  $C_{klmn.it}$  represents capital service price of  $klmn$ -th type capital service input and  $\omega_{klmn.i}(t)$  stands for the income share of  $klmn$ -th capital service type in total capital compensation of  $i$ -th sector.

Unlike the prices of labor service, we can not directly observe the price of capital service,  $C_{klmn.it}$ . According to well-known procedures of imputative calculation, we can deduce a relationship in which the capital service price is regarded as a function of price of  $klmn$ -th investment goods,  $q_{klmn.it}$ , rate of return on capital  $\gamma_{it}$ , economic rate of replacement,  $\mu_{it}$  and certain tax variables.

Ignoring tax variables for the simplicity, we can derive the next well-known relationship,

$$(3.7) \quad C_{klmn.it} = q_{klmn.it} (\gamma_{it} + \mu_{klmn.it})^{-\frac{q_{klmn.it}}{q_{klmn.it}}}$$

On the other hand the data of business surplus adjusted for compensation of capital in  $i$ -th sector,  $B_{it}$  are available through the estimation of time-series input-output tables. Under the assumptions of the competitive market and of the linear homogeneity of price possibility frontier function,  $B_{it}$  must be equalized to the total capital service cost of  $i$ -th industry.

(3.8)

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_{it} &= \sum_{klmn} C_{klmn.it} \cdot K_{klmn.it} \\
 &= \sum_{klmn} q_{klmn.it} \left( \gamma_{it} + \mu_{klmn.i} - \frac{\dot{q}_{klmn.it}}{q_{klmn.it}} \right) K_{klmn.it}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $K_{klmn.it}$  denotes  $klmn$ -th type capital asset in constant price. Regarding this relation as the equation of unknown variable,  $\gamma_{it}$  and putting the observed data of  $B_{it}$ ,  $q_{klmn.it}$ ,  $\mu_{klmn.i}$  and  $K_{klmn.it}$  to this equation, we can solve the rate of return,  $\gamma_{it}$  in  $i$ -th sector and hence impute the capital service price,  $C_{klmn.it}$  in (3.7). Substituting estimated time-series of  $C_{klmn.it}$  into (3.6), we can estimate division price index of capital service.

(6) Allen partial elasticity of substitution is defined as follows:

$$(1) \quad \sigma_{ij} = \frac{\sum f_{ia_i}}{a_i a_j} \cdot \frac{F_{ij}}{F}$$

where  $a_i$  denotes quantities of  $i$ -th input,  $f_i$  represents the first derivatives with respect to  $i$ -th input and  $F$  and  $F_{ij}$  stand for the matrix of the second order derivatives with respect to inputs and its co-factor of  $f_{ij}$  in  $F$ . Under the assumption of competitive equilibrium, definition (1) can be rewritten as follows:

$$(2) \quad \sigma_{ij} = \frac{\sum \frac{P_i}{P} a_i}{a_i a_j} \cdot q \cdot \frac{\partial a_i}{\partial P_j} = \frac{\sum P_i a_i}{a_i a_j} \cdot \frac{\partial a_i}{\partial P_j},$$

where  $P_i$  denotes prices of  $i$ -th input and  $q$  denotes prices of output.

According to the Shephard's Lemma,

$$(3) \quad \frac{\partial q}{\partial P_i} = g_i = a_i,$$

$$(4) \quad \frac{\partial^2 q}{\partial P_i \partial P_j} = g_{ij} = \frac{\partial a_i}{\partial P_j}.$$

Substituting (3) and (4) into (2), we obtain

$$(5) \quad \sigma_{ij} = \frac{q}{g_i g_j} g_{ij} = q \left( \frac{\partial^2 q}{\partial P_i \partial P_j} \right) / \left( \frac{\partial q}{\partial P_i} \right) \left( \frac{\partial q}{\partial P_j} \right)$$

Assuming the trans-log specification of price frontier function and substituting partial derivatives of the first two orders, we can obtain the equations, (2.4).

(7) For further discussion, see Jorgenson and Kuroda(1981) and Kuroda and Imamura(1981).

#### 4. Estimated Results

We estimated trans-log price frontier function in the 30 industrial sector level. In the Japanese economy the oil crisis in 1973-74 had an enormous impact on the economic structure through the rapid changes of the relative price system. We can expect that the parameters of price frontier function might have been changed adjusting with the dramatic fluctuation of economy.

Therefore we tried to estimate the parameters of price frontier function firstly in the samples during the period 1960-1972, which do not include the impacts of oil crisis, and secondly in the samples during the period 1960-1977, which reflect the fluctuations after the oil crisis. If the impacts of the oil crisis were dominant in samples including after 1973, parameters estimated in the latter samples might have statistically significant differences from those in the former samples. We call below the former samples and the latter samples case [A] and case [B] respectively.

First of all we estimated parameters only on the restrictions of homogeneity and symmetry both during the period 1960-1972 and 1960-1977. Results satisfied with monotonicity and concavity globally are obtained in only one industry; transportation equipment in case [A] and four industries; mining, machinery, whole-sale and real estate in case [B]. With respect to industries which did not satisfy with monotonicity and concavity conditions we tried to estimate parameters with restrictions of (2.6) in order to accomplish to the local concavity. To test the validity of the local concavity restrictions we can obtain test statistics. From the results of unrestricted and restricted estimations we calculate the change in the weighed sum of squared residuals resulting from restrictions imposed. We divide this change by the sum



[Table 2] F-Ratios for Test of Concavity Restriction  
on the Form of Price Possibility Frontiers

	Sample 1960-1972		Sample 1960-1977	
	d.f.( $v_1/v_2$ )	F-value	d.f.( $v_1/v_2$ )	F-value
1. Agriculture	(4 / 38)	1.0357	(1 / 54)	0.4940
2. Mining	(1 / 38)	0.5618		-----**
3. Construction	(3 / 38)	0.2406	(2 / 54)	0.0 *
4. Food & Kindred	(2 / 38)	2.2980	(1 / 54)	0.0 *
5. Textile	(2 / 38)	0.4721	(1 / 54)	0.0 *
6. Apparel	(3 / 38)	0.0 *	(2 / 54)	3.2676
7. Lumber	(4 / 38)	0.9266	(2 / 54)	4.1660
8. Furniture	(2 / 38)	0.0 *	(2 / 54)	0.0 *
9. Paper	(1 / 38)	0.3384	(1 / 54)	1.1133
10. Printing	(4 / 38)	3.4987	(1 / 54)	0.0 *
11. Chemical	(1 / 38)	0.6398	(2 / 54)	3.5734
12. Petroleum	(1 / 38)	0.0 *	(2 / 54)	1.2638
13. Rubber	(2 / 38)	0.4805	(2 / 54)	1.6727
14. Leather	(3 / 38)	1.1368	(2 / 54)	2.0012
15. Stone	(1 / 38)	1.5765	(2 / 54)	1.4509
16. Iron	(1 / 38)	0.0 *	(2 / 54)	0.0 *
17. Non-ferrous	(2 / 38)	0.0 *	(2 / 54)	2.8761
18. Fab.Metal	(2 / 38)	0.1742	(2 / 54)	1.5956
19. Machinery	(1 / 38)	0.4398		-----**
20. Elec. M.	(1 / 38)	0.2114	(1 / 54)	3.7352
21. Motor	(2 / 38)	0.0 *	(2 / 54)	0.0 *
22. Trans. Eq.		-----**	(2 / 54)	0.0 *
23. Precision	(1 / 38)	3.5867	(1 / 54)	0.9935
24. Mis. Mng.	(3 / 38)	1.9053	(2 / 54)	4.6226
25. Trans.	(1 / 38)	5.5098	(1 / 54)	0.7245
26. Elec. U.	(1 / 38)	2.9600	(1 / 54)	5.8452
27. Whole-sale	(2 / 38)	1.0302		-----**
28. Finance	(2 / 38)	0.0 *	(1 / 54)	0.1936
29. Real Estate	(3 / 38)	0.0 *		-----**
30. Service	(3 / 38)		(2 / 54)	0.7925

\* The estimated change in the sum of squared residuals is negative.

\*\* Parameters are satisfied with concavity condition in the non-restricted estimation.

of squared residuals at unrestricted estimation. Finally, we divide both numerator and denominator of this ratio by the appropriate number of degrees of freedom. The resulting test statistics is distributed, asymptotically, as  $F(v_1, v_2)$ , where  $v_1$  is numerator degrees of freedom and  $v_2$  is the denominator degrees of freedom. F statistics by industries are summarized in [Table 2]. At a level of significance of 0.01 we accept the hypothesis that restrictions implied by (2.6) are valid for the price frontier function in all industries.

Lists of estimated parameters are reported in Appendix. Values in parenthesis denote t-value of each parameter, which is strongly consistent, asymptotically normally distributed.

Let us summarize our results.

The estimated share elasticities with respect to price :  $\beta_{KK}$ ,  $\beta_{LL}$ ,  $\beta_{EE}$  and  $\beta_{MM}$  describe the implications of patterns of substitution for the distribution of the value of output among capital, labor, energy and materials inputs. Positive share elasticities imply that the corresponding value shares increase with an increase in prices ; negative share elasticities imply that the value share decrease with price ; zero share elasticities correspond to value share that are independent of price. Some parameters of share elasticities are a priori given for the concavity conditions of (2.6). Since other unrestricted parameters are normally distributed, we can test the statistical validity of null-hypothesis ( $\beta_{11}=0$ ) in each industry. Results are summarized in [Table 3].

According to the results  $\beta_{KK}$  is positive for nineteen (restricted (8) + unrestricted(11) ) of thirty and approximately zero for eleven of thirty industries in case[A], so that the value share of capital input increases with an increase of price in the two-third of thirty industries while the value share is independent of price in other one-third of thirty industries. On the other hand this property of

[Table 3] Summary of Share Elasticity

	[Case A]					[Case B]				
	Restricted		Non-restricted			Restricted		Non-restricted		
	$\beta > 0$	$\beta < 0$	$\beta > 0$	$\beta = 0$	$\beta < 0$	$\beta > 0$	$\beta < 0$	$\beta > 0$	$\beta = 0$	$\beta < 0$
$\beta_{KK}$	8	0	11	11	0	15	0	9	6	0
$\beta_{LL}$	14	0	3	13	0	2	0	4	23	1
$\beta_{EE}$	18	0	0	10	2	21	0	0	7	2
$\beta_{MM}$	0	0	10	19	1	0	0	4	24	2

Notes: (1) column 'Restricted' represents the numbers of industries in which parameters are restricted by constraints (2.6).  
 (2) At a level of significant of 0.01 we test the null-hypothesis ( $\beta_{ii}=0$ ) in each parameter. columns 'Non-restricted' denote the numbers of industries.

$\beta_{KK}$  does not change remarkably in case [B].  $\beta_{LL}$  is positive for seventeen (restricted(14) + unrestricted(3) ) of thirty and zero for thirteen of thirty industries in case [A], so that the number of industries in which its value share of labor input increases with an increase of price is more than the number of industries in which its change is independent of price. On the other hand in case [B] the number of industries with positive share elasticity is less than the number of industries with zero share elasticity, so that after the oil crisis the changes of value share of labor input trend to be independent of its price.  $\beta_{EE}$  is positive for eighteen, zero for ten and negative for two of thirty industries in case [A], so that the value share of energy input increases with an increase of price in the two-third of thirty industries. This properties of energy share elasticity are maintained after the oil crisis.

[Table 4] Estimates of Own Price Elasticity

	E K K		E L L		E E E		E M M	
	Sam. 13	Sam. 18	Sam. 13	Sam. 18	Sam. 13	Sam. 18	Sam. 13	Sam. 18
(1) Agriculture	-0.184 <sup>a</sup>	-0.184 <sup>a</sup>	-0.0511 <sup>a</sup>	-0.264	-0.261 <sup>a</sup>	-0.696	-0.249 <sup>*</sup>	-0.546 <sup>*</sup>
(2) Mining	-0.319	-0.215	-0.0541 <sup>a</sup>	-0.732	-2.377 <sup>*</sup>	-2.161 <sup>*</sup>	-1.426 <sup>*</sup>	-2.327 <sup>*</sup>
(3) Construction	-0.465 <sup>a</sup>	-0.518 <sup>a</sup>	-0.0344 <sup>a</sup>	-0.879	-0.242 <sup>a</sup>	-0.341 <sup>a</sup>	-0.112	-0.175
(4) Food & Kindred	-0.616 <sup>*</sup>	-0.780 <sup>*</sup>	-0.721 <sup>*</sup>	-0.697 <sup>*</sup>	-0.136 <sup>a</sup>	-0.213 <sup>a</sup>	-0.378 <sup>*</sup>	-0.369 <sup>*</sup>
(5) Textile	-0.529 <sup>*</sup>	-0.573 <sup>*</sup>	-0.437 <sup>*</sup>	-0.610 <sup>*</sup>	-0.0965 <sup>a</sup>	-0.322 <sup>a</sup>	-0.236 <sup>*</sup>	-0.254 <sup>*</sup>
(6) Apparel	-0.833 <sup>a</sup>	-0.833 <sup>a</sup>	-0.676 <sup>*</sup>	-1.05 <sup>*</sup>	-5.746	-0.357 <sup>a</sup>	-0.400 <sup>*</sup>	-0.600 <sup>*</sup>
(7) Lumber	-0.204 <sup>a</sup>	-0.722 <sup>a</sup>	-0.183 <sup>a</sup>	-0.691 <sup>*</sup>	-0.146 <sup>a</sup>	-0.426 <sup>a</sup>	-0.089	-0.266 <sup>*</sup>
(8) Furniture	-0.760 <sup>a</sup>	-0.760 <sup>a</sup>	-0.289	-0.796 <sup>*</sup>	-0.275 <sup>a</sup>	-0.306 <sup>a</sup>	-0.193	-0.307
(9) Paper	-0.668 <sup>*</sup>	-0.476 <sup>*</sup>	-0.146 <sup>a</sup>	-0.653 <sup>*</sup>	-2.491	-0.130 <sup>a</sup>	-0.362	-0.252 <sup>*</sup>
(10) Printing	-0.191 <sup>a</sup>	-0.860 <sup>a</sup>	-0.122 <sup>a</sup>	-0.792 <sup>*</sup>	-0.183 <sup>a</sup>	-0.263	-0.123 <sup>*</sup>	-0.517 <sup>*</sup>
(11) Chemical	-0.394 <sup>*</sup>	-0.358 <sup>a</sup>	-0.130 <sup>a</sup>	-0.463	-0.263 <sup>*</sup>	-0.0530 <sup>a</sup>	-0.169	-0.229 <sup>*</sup>
(12) Petroleum	-0.372 <sup>*</sup>	-0.505 <sup>a</sup>	-0.0311 <sup>a</sup>	-0.314 <sup>a</sup>	-1.918 <sup>*</sup>	-1.54 <sup>*</sup>	-0.236	-0.297 <sup>*</sup>
(13) Rubber	-0.316 <sup>*</sup>	-0.500 <sup>a</sup>	-0.184 <sup>a</sup>	-1.048 <sup>*</sup>	-0.356	-0.181 <sup>a</sup>	-0.138 <sup>*</sup>	-0.396 <sup>*</sup>
(14) Leather	-0.545	-0.512 <sup>a</sup>	-0.255 <sup>a</sup>	-0.906 <sup>*</sup>	-0.438 <sup>a</sup>	-0.507 <sup>a</sup>	-0.142 <sup>*</sup>	-0.195 <sup>*</sup>
(15) Stone	-0.566 <sup>*</sup>	-0.359 <sup>a</sup>	-0.936 <sup>*</sup>	-1.074 <sup>*</sup>	-0.0117 <sup>a</sup>	-0.0117 <sup>a</sup>	-0.771 <sup>*</sup>	-0.427 <sup>*</sup>
(16) Iron	-0.589 <sup>*</sup>	-0.500 <sup>*</sup>	-0.0909 <sup>a</sup>	-0.521 <sup>*</sup>	-0.526	-0.211 <sup>a</sup>	-0.180	-0.152 <sup>*</sup>
(17) Non-ferrous	-0.747 <sup>*</sup>	-0.637	-0.265 <sup>a</sup>	-0.265 <sup>a</sup>	-0.0787 <sup>a</sup>	-0.0787 <sup>a</sup>	-0.141	-0.270 <sup>*</sup>
(18) Fab. Metal	-0.510 <sup>a</sup>	-0.510 <sup>a</sup>	-0.570 <sup>*</sup>	-0.893 <sup>*</sup>	-0.394 <sup>a</sup>	-0.394 <sup>a</sup>	-0.380 <sup>*</sup>	-0.362 <sup>*</sup>
(19) Machinery	-0.644 <sup>*</sup>	-0.518 <sup>*</sup>	-0.792 <sup>*</sup>	-1.256 <sup>*</sup>	-3.112 <sup>*</sup>	-0.565	-0.543 <sup>*</sup>	-0.487 <sup>*</sup>
(20) Elec. M.	-0.780 <sup>*</sup>	-0.682 <sup>*</sup>	-0.680 <sup>*</sup>	-1.139 <sup>*</sup>	-0.0727 <sup>a</sup>	-0.239 <sup>a</sup>	-0.376 <sup>*</sup>	-0.375 <sup>*</sup>
(21) Motor	-0.567 <sup>*</sup>	-0.605 <sup>*</sup>	-0.859 <sup>*</sup>	-0.701 <sup>*</sup>	-1.819	-0.965	-0.362 <sup>*</sup>	-0.293 <sup>*</sup>
(22) Trans. Eq.	-0.529 <sup>*</sup>	-0.539 <sup>a</sup>	-0.392 <sup>*</sup>	-0.650	-1.290	-0.259 <sup>a</sup>	-0.314 <sup>*</sup>	-0.467 <sup>*</sup>

[Table 4 ] Continued

(23) Precision	-0.456*	-0.467*	-0.608*	-0.568	-1.583*	-0.272 <sup>a</sup>	-0.432*	-0.316*
(24) Mis. Mng.	-0.358*	-0.509 <sup>a</sup> *	-0.197a	-0.726*	-0.174a	-0.174 <sup>a</sup>	-0.118*	-0.295*
(25) Trans.	-0.567	-0.532*	-0.865*	-0.613*	-0.0415a	-0.0415 <sup>a</sup>	-1.017	-0.823
(26) Elec. U.	-0.355*	-0.321*	-0.450*	-0.536*	-1.451*	-2.10*	-0.220	-1.29*
(27) Whole-sale	-0.438*	-0.403*	-0.344	-0.627*	-0.897a	-1.60	-0.127	-0.610*
(28) Finance	-0.492*	-0.449*	-0.892*	-0.975*	-0.111a	-0.293 <sup>a</sup>	-0.743*	-0.632*
(29) Real Estate	-0.142*	-0.144*	-0.0399a	-1.69*	-0.251a	-0.483	-0.559*	-0.900*
(30) Service	-0.573a	-0.159a	-0.622*	-0.371*	-0.0285a	-0.0285 <sup>a</sup>	-0.0577	-0.0082

- Notes: (1) All values of own price elasticity are evaluated at the base period, 1970.  
(2) Values attached mark "a" are calculated from constrained parameter,  $\beta_{ij}$  for the local concavity restriction.  
(3) Values attached mark "\*" are statistically significant on the level of significance of .01.  
(4) Columns 'Sam. 13' and 'Sam. 18' denote estimates in case [A] and case [B] respectively.

Finally  $\beta_{MM}$  shows to be approximately zero in the two-third of thirty industries in both case [A] and case [B]. In six industries the positive value share elasticity changed into approximately zero after the oil crisis.

[Table 4] represents the estimated own price elasticity in each industry. Own price elasticity of capital service is less than unity absolutely in all industries of case [A] and case [B]. On the other hand own price elasticity of labor input is significantly more than unity in some industries of case [B]; apparel, rubber products, stone and clay, electric machinery and real estate. Own price elasticity of energy input is estimated higher than that we expected. Especially in mining, petroleum and electricity and gas utility the price elasticities are more than unity. As I mentioned in the design of experiments of our work, directly imported energy resource is allocated into above three sectors and products of these three sectors are distributed into other industries as secondary energy products. Therefore in the above three sectors the price elasticity of energy input might be reflected on the price elasticity of materials inputs. We have to notice that the price elasticity of materials input in petroleum refinery industry is less than unity; -0.236 in case [A] and -0.297 in case [B]. On the other hand the price elasticity of materials input in mining and electric utility are also more than unity, so that these facts might reflect substitution between alternative energy resources historically. Own price elasticities of energy input in other sectors are less than unity. Especially industries like stone and clay, iron and steel and chemical which are designated as energy intensive industries have smaller price elasticity than the average. Finally own price elasticities of materials input are less than unity in all industries except mining and transportation in case [A] and mining and electric utility in case [B].

Parameters  $\beta_{ij}$  ( $i \neq j$ ) of the cross products in the price frontier function are related to the elasticity of substitutions among inputs. Allen partial elasticity of substitution is defined as (2.4), which is shown in [Table 5]. Values of elasticities in [Table 5] are evaluated at the base period, 1970, by using observed value shares in 1970. At the given level of each value share in 1970 we can test the statistical validity of the null hypothesis,  $\sigma_{kj}^i = 0$ . Positive Allen partial elasticity,  $\sigma_{kj}^i > 0$  imply that the k-th input is substitutable to the j-th input; negative Allen partial elasticity,  $\sigma_{kj}^i < 0$  imply that the k-th input is complementary to the j-th input; zero Allen partial elasticity,  $\sigma_{kj}^i = 0$  imply that the k-th input is independent to the j-th input. (8 We find that the Allen partial elasticity of substitutions between capital and labor are significantly positive, that is substitutable, only for seven industries in case [A] and in nine industries in case [B]; negative, that is complementary, only for five industries in case [A] and five industries in case [B]; zero, that is independent, for eighteen industries in case [A] and sixteen industries in case [B].

Secondly the Allen partial elasticity of substitutions between capital and energy are significantly positive for nine industries in case [A] and three in case [B]; negative for two in case [A] and ten in case [B]; zero for nineteen in case [A] and seventeen in case [B]. After the oil crisis the relations between capital and energy trend to be complimentary for several industries such as mining, chemical, nonferrous metal, fabricated metal, finance and services.

Thirdly elasticities of substitution between capital and materials are significantly positive for all industries both in case [A] and case [B], so that relations between capital and materials are substitutable with fairly large elasticities of substitution.

[Table 5] Estimates of Allen Partial Elasticity of Substitution

A K L (Sample-13)

Substitutable	Complementary
2 Mining	1 Agriculture
3 Construction	4 Food & Kindred
6 Apparel	5 Textile
9 Paper	7 Lumber
11 Chemical	8 Furniture
16 Iron	10 Printing
17 Non-ferrous	12 Petroleum
20 Ecle. M.	13 Rubber
25 Trans.	14 Leather
26 Elec. U.	15 Stone
27 Whole-sale	18 Fab. Metal
28 Finance	19 Machinery
29 Real Estate	21 Motor
30 Service	22 Trans. Eq.
	23 Precision
	24 Mis. Mng.

A K L (Sample-18)

Substitutable	Complementary
2 Mining	1 Agriculture
3 Construction	5 Textile
4 Food & Kindred	6 Apparel
8 Furniture	7 Lumber
10 Printing	9 Paper
11 Chemical	17 Non-ferrous
12 Petroleum	18 Fab. Metal
13 Rubber	19 Machinery
14 Leather	20 Elec. U.
15 Stone	22 Trans. Eq.
16 Iron	23 Precision
21 Motor	
24 Mis. Mng.	
25 Trans.	
26 Elec. U.	
27 Whole-sale	
28 Finance	
29 Real Estate	
30 Service	

Notes:

(1) AKL, AKE, AKM, ALE, ALM and AEM denote Allen Partial Elasticity of Substitution among four inputs-capital, labor, energy and intermediate material respectively.

(2) Values attached marks "\*" and "\*\*\*" are statistically significant on the level of significance of .0.1 and .0.5.

(3) Results in Sample-13 and Sample-18 are corresponding to results in case [A] and case [B].



[Table 5 ] Continued

A K E (Sample-13)			A K E (Sample-18)		
	Substitutable	Complementary	Substitutable	Complementary	
1	Agriculture	1.910*	1	Agriculture	1.128
2	Mining	0.385	2	Mining	-1.558**
3	Construction	0.214	3	Construction	0.808
4	Food & Kindred	0.320	4	Food & Kindred	-0.113
5	Textile	1.286*	5	Textile	0.464
6	Lumber	2.31**	6	Apparel	-6.64*
7	Furniture	9.03**	7	Lumber	5.488
8	Printing	0.940	8	Furniture	1.781
9	Chemical	0.711	9	Paper	-1.19
10	Petroleum	0.251	10	Printing	1.324
11	Rubber	1.107*	11	Chemical	-0.966**
12	Leather	4.08	12	Petroleum	2.42*
13	Non-ferrous	0.144*	13	Rubber	-0.124
14	Fab. Metal	0.312	14	Leather	-2.403
15	Elec. M.	2.081	15	Stone	-2.367*
16	Motor	1.464*	16	Iron	-6.286*
17	Trans. Eq.	0.903	17	Non-ferrous	-0.411**
18	Precision	1.631*	18	Fab. Metal	-3.889**
19	Trans.	1.318	19	Machinery	-1.362
20	Elect. U.	0.143*	20	Elec. M.	-0.405
21	Whole-sale	2.854**	21	Trans. Eq.	-2.192
22	Finance	1.126**	22	Mis. Mng.	-3.240*
23	Real Estate	1.600	23	Elec. U.	-0.160
24	Service	0.615	24	Finance	-16.207**
			25	Service	-1.854

[Table 5] Continued

A K M (Sample 113)		A K M (Sample-18)	
Substitutable	Complementary	Substitutable	Complementary
1 Agriculture	0.643*	1 Agriculture	0.760*
2 Mining	0.387	2 Mining	1.194*
3 Construction	0.610*	3 Construction	0.716*
4 Food & Kindred	1.006*	4 Food & Kindred	1.11 *
5 Textile	0.813*	5 Textile	0.843*
6 Apparel	0.969*	6 Apparel	1.65 *
7 Lumber	0.507*	7 Lumber	0.894*
8 Furniture	1.21 *	8 Furniture	1.097*
9 Paper	0.922*	9 Paper	0.792*
10 Printing	0.493*	10 Printing	1.103*
11 Chemical	0.433**	11 Chemical	0.558*
12 Petroleum	0.648*	12 Petroleum	0.447*
13 Rubber	0.493*	13 Rubber	0.394*
14 Leather	0.836**	14 Leather	0.492*
15 Stone	1.364*	15 Stone	0.560*
16 Iron	0.863*	16 Iron	1.167*
17 Non-ferrous	1.01 *	17 Non-ferrous	1.02 *
18 Fab. Metal	1.28 *	18 Fab. Metal	1.195*
19 Machinery	1.25 *	19 Machinery	0.971*
20 Elec. M.	1.149 *	20 Elec. M.	1.068*
21 Motor	0.869 *	21 Motor	0.833*
22 Trans. Eq.	0.903 *	22 Trans. Eq.	1.256*
23 Precision	1.001 *	23 Precision	0.915*
24 Mis. Mng.	0.642 *	24 Mis. Mng.	0.766*

[Table 5] Continued

25 Trans.	1.362 **
26 Elec. U.	0.195
27 Whole-sale	0.265
28 Finance	0.615 *
29 Real Estate	0.906 *
30 Service	0.642 *

25 Trans.	0.797 **
26 Elec. U.	0.731 *
27 Whole-sale	0.422 **
28 Finance	0.874 *
29 Real Estate	0.929 *
30 Service	0.343 **

A L E (Sample-13)

A L E (Sample-18)

Substitutable

Substitutable

Complementary

Complementary

1 Agriculture	2.897 *	2 Mining	-2.231 *	1 Agriculture	0.177	2 Mining	-0.0487
4 Food & Kindred	4.56 *	3 Construction	-1.607	3 Construction	15.90 *	6 Apparel	-3.76
5 Textile	1.02 *	6 Apparel	-0.453	4 Food & Kindred	2.81	7 Lumber	-2.08
7 Lumber	2.03 *	9 Paper	-3.85	5 Textile	3.54	11 Chemical	-0.76
8 Furniture	2.23	11 Chemical	-2.49	8 Furniture	10.24 *	12 Petroleum	-12.64 *
10 Printing	1.73 *	15 Stone	-3.48	9 Paper	0.627	13 Rubber	-1.52
12 Petroleum	20.78 **	19 Machinery	-0.553	10 Printing	1.25	24 Mis. Mng	-1.09
13 Rubber	0.486	20 Elec. M.	-3.12	14 Leather	9.10 **	27 Whole-sale	-13.14 *
14 Leather	2.90 *	22 Trans. Eq.	-0.476	15 Stone	0.178		
16 Iron	1.35			16 Iron	14.963 *		
17 Non-ferrous	9.06 **			17 Non-ferrous	0.578		
18 Fab. Metal	3.48			18 Fab. Metal	9.91 *		
21 Motor	0.941			19 Machinery	9.04		
23 Precision	0.395			20 Elec. M.	16.30 **		
24 Mis. Mng.	1.023 **			21 Motor	0.905		
25 Trans.	2.97 **			22 Trans. Eq.	4.30 **		
26 Elec. U.	2.59 **			23 Precision	5.50		

[Table 5] Continued

27	Whole-sale	0.831*
28	Finance	1.54*
29	Real Estate	27.33
30	Service	12.28*

25	Trans.	0.105**
26	Elec. U.	2.04**
28	Finance	32.09**
29	Real Estate	57.51*
30	Service	16.50*

A L M (Sample-13)

	Substitutable	Complementary
1	Agriculture	0.331*
2	Mining	0.132
3	Construction	0.016
4	Food & Kindred	1.09*
5	Textile	0.761
6	Apparel	0.770*
7	Lumber	0.316*
8	Furniture	0.460
9	Paper	0.318
10	Printing	0.244*
11	Chemical	0.225
13	Rubber	0.295**
14	Leather	0.380*
15	Stone	2.10*
18	Fab. Metal	1.05**
19	Machinery	1.47*
20	Elec. M.	1.09
21	Motor	1.332*
22	Trans. Eq.	0.691*
	12 Petroleum	-1.45
	16 Iron	-0.151
	17 Non-ferrous	-0.567
	26 Elec. U.	-2.245
	29 Real Estate	-5.868*
	30 Service	-0.285

A L M (Sample-18)

	Substitutable	Complementary
1	Agriculture	1.05*
2	Mining	2.46**
3	Construction	0.819**
4	Food & Kindred	0.669*
5	Textile	0.845*
6	Apparel	1.81*
7	Lumber	1.00*
8	Furniture	1.02*
9	Paper	0.960*
10	Printing	1.26*
11	Chemical	0.539
12	Petroleum	1.10*
13	Rubber	1.48*
14	Leather	0.930*
15	Stone	1.51*
17	Non-ferrous	0.425
18	Fab. Metal	1.18*
19	Machinery	1.93*
20	Elec. M.	1.47*
	16 Iron	-0.856*
	26 Elec. U.	-0.516
	30 Service	-0.168

[Table 5] Continued

23 Precision	1.15*
24 Mis. Mng.	0.297*
25 Trans.	2.31*
27 Whole-sale	0.211**
28 Finance	1.67**

21 Motor	0.964*
22 Trans. Eq.	1.28*
23 Precision	0.918*
24 Mis. Mng.	1.05*
25 Trans.	1.66*
27 Whole-sale	1.32*
28 Finance	1.13
29 Real Estate	6.56

A E M (Sample-13)

	Substitutable	Complementary
2 Mining	11.46*	1 Agriculture -2.844*
3 Construction	0.824	4 Food & Kindred -0.719
6 Apparel	10.090**	5 Textile -0.396*
9 Paper	4.33	7 Lumber -0.577*
11 Chemical	0.639	8 Furniture -1.53
12 Petroleum	1.76**	10 Printing -0.838
13 Rubber	0.149	14 Leather -0.68
15 Stone	2.07**	17 Non-ferrous -0.979
16 Iron	0.872	18 Fab. Metal -0.669
19 Machinery	5.416*	25 Trans. -5.60*
20 Elec. M.	0.214	27 Whole-sale -0.588
21 Motor	2.165	28 Finance -3.00*
22 Trans. Eq.	1.98	29 Real Estate -9.86
23 Precision	2.06**	30 Service -5.14*
24 Mis. Mng.	0.125	
26 Elec. U.	3.579*	

A E M (Sample-18)

	Substitutable	Complementary
1 Agriculture	1.42	3 Construction -4.53*
2 Mining	11.26*	4 Food & Kindred -0.0957
6 Apparel	2.88*	5 Textile -0.163
7 Lumber	0.587	8 Furniture -4.10*
9 Paper	0.384	10 Printing -0.487
11 Chemical	0.601**	14 Leather -1.20
12 Petroleum	2.12*	18 Fab. Metal -2.10
13 Rubber	0.857**	19 Machinery -1.142
15 Stone	0.764*	20 Elec. M. -3.15**
16 Iron	0.381	22 Trans. Eq. -0.331
17 Non-ferrous	0.195	23 Precision -2.03
21 Motor	0.907	25 Trans. -0.596
24 Mis. Mng.	0.981*	28 Finance -10.51
26 Elec. U.	7.03*	29 Real Estate -13.75**
27 Whole-sale	2.36	30 Service -4.20

Fourthly elasticities of substitution between labor and energy are significantly positive for fourteen in case [A] and ten in case [B]; negative for one in case [A] and two in case [B]; zero for fifteen in case [A] and eighteen in case [B].

Fifthly elasticities of substitution between labor and materials are significantly positive for sixteen in case [A] and twenty-three in case [B]; negative for one in case [A] and one in case [B]; zero for thirteen in case [A] and six in case [B].

Finally elasticities of substitution between energy and materials are positive for seven industries in case [A] and eight in case [B]; negative for six in case [A] and four in case [B]; zero for seventeen in case [A] and eighteen in case [B].

We continue the interpretation of the parameters estimates given in Appendix with estimated biases of technical change with respect to price. These parameters can be interpreted as the change in the share of each input with respect to time, holding prices constant. If the bias of technical change with respect to the price of the  $j$ -th input is positive, we call that technical change is  $j$ -th input using; if the bias is negative, we say that technical change is  $j$ -th input saving; if the bias is approximately zero, we say that technical change is neutral. Since the estimated parameters,  $\beta_{jt}^i$  are asymptotically normally distributed, we can test the statistical validity of the null-hypothesis,  $\beta_{jt}^i = 0.0$ .

A classification of industries by patterns of the biases of technical change is given in [Table 6]. In the table, U.N and S denote that the bias of technical change is using, neutral and saving in each input respectively.

According to the results in case [A] the bias of technical changes with respect to capital input is positive for nineteen of thirty industries and zero for eleven, so that the bias is capital using for two third of thirty industries. On the other hand the bias with respect to labor input is negative for fourteen

[Table 6] Changes of Bias of Technical progress

	Case [A] Sample 1960-1972				Case [B] Sample 1960-1977				K	L	E	M
	K	L	E	M	K	L	E	M				
1. Agriculture	U	S	N	U	U	S	N	N				o
2. Mining	U	S	U	N	U	N	U	N	x			o
3. Construction	U	S	N	U	U	N	S	N		x	o	o
4. Food & Kindred	U	N	S	N	N	N	N	N	o		x	o
5. Textile	U	N	S	N	U	N	N	S			x	o
6. Apparel	N	N	N	N	U	N	N	S	x			o
7. Lumber	U	S	N	U	N	N	N	N	o	x		o
8. Furniture	N	N	N	N	S	U	S	N	o	x	o	
9. Paper	N	S	N	N	U	N	N	N	x	x		
10. Printing	U	S	N	U	S	U	N	S	o	x		o
11. Chemical	U	S	U	N	N	N	U	N	o	x		
12. Petroleum	U	S	S	N	S	S	U	U	o	x		
13. Rubber	U	S	S	N	N	U	N	S	o	x	x	o
14. Leather	U	S	N	N	N	U	S	S	o	x		o
15. Stone	U	N	N	S	U	N	N	S				
16. Iron	U	S	N	N	U	S	N	N				
17. Non-ferrous	N	N	N	N	U	S	N	N	x	o		
18. Fab.Metal	U	N	N	N	U	N	S	N			o	
19. Machinery	U	N	N	N	U	U	N	N		x		
20. Elec.M.	N	N	N	N	N	U	S	N		x	o	
21. Motor	N	U	N	N	S	U	N	U	o			x
22. Trans. Eq.	U	S	N	N	U	N	N	S		x		o
23. Precision	U	N	N	N	U	N	S	N			o	
24. Mis. Mng.	U	S	U	N	U	N	N	S		x	o	o
25. Trans.	N	U	N	U	S	U	U	N	o		x	o
26. Elec. U.	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N				
27. Whole-sale	N	N	N	N	U	U	N	S	x	x		o
28. Finance	N	N	N	N	S	U	S	N	o	x	o	
29. Real Estate	N	S	N	U	S	U	N	N	o	x		o
30. Service	U	U	S	S	U	N	S	S		o		

Note:

- (1) U, N and S denote that the bias of technical changes is using, neutral and saving in each input respectively. U means that parameter  $\beta_{jt}$  ( $j=K,L,E,M$ ) is significantly positive. S means that parameter  $\beta_{jt}$  is significantly negative. In the case that null hypothesis  $\beta_{jt}=0$  is not rejected, bias of technical progress is regarded as neutral.
- (2) First four columns are results estimated from the sample period 1960-1972 and fifth through eighth columns represent results estimated from the sample period 1960-1977.
- (3) Marks o and x represent the evaluation of changes in bias of technical changes, o implies the bias of technical progress changes to the input saving way. x implies it changes to the input using way.

and zero for fifteen of thirty industries; so that we can not find labor using technology bias before the oil crisis. Thirdly the bias of technical changes with respect to energy input is energy using for two industries, energy saving for five and energy neutral for twenty-three of thirty industries. Finally the bias of technological changes with respect to materials input is material using for six, saving for two and neutral for twenty-two of thirty industries.

We can say roughly the properties of the bias of technical change as capital using - labor saving - energy and material neutral technical bias over the period before the oil crisis. This fact with respect to the technical bias is consistent with the changes of the relative prices among four inputs, so that it might suggest the explanation of the technical bias by the induced technology theory. After the oil crisis, the results suggest that the bias of technical change moved relevantly. In [Table 6], mark o and x represent the evaluation of changes in bias of technical changes. o implies that the bias changes to the input saving way ; x implies that it changes to the input using way.

As for the bias of capital input, the bias changes to the input saving way for twelve of sixteen industries, in which the change of the bias is statistically significant. On the contrary, the bias of technical changes with respect to labor input move to the input using way for sixteen of eighteen industries, in which the change of the bias is statistically significant. As for the bias of technical changes with respect to energy and materials, results suggests that the biases with respect to those inputs move to the saving way for eight industries of thirteen industries and thirteen industries of fourteen industries respectively, in which the changes of the bias are statistically significant.

The final parameter in our models is the rate of change of the negative of the rate of technical change,  $\beta_{tt}^1$ . We find that the



null-hypothesis,  $\beta_{tt}^i = 0$  in each industry does not reject in all industries, so that the rate of change of the negative of the rate of technical change is approximately zero.

## 5. Concluding Remarks

Description of the producers behavior in the 30 industrial sectors by measuring the trans-log price frontier function reveals some properties in terms of the price elasticity, the elasticity of substitutions and the bias of technical changes as given in the previous section.

Our research suggested some possibility and the necessity of the further research.

1. The estimation of the trans-log price frontier function — even if the inputs are only four inputs — K.L.E and M.— is fairly unstable. Especially the fitness of the negative of the rate of technical change,  $-W_t$  has some possibility of the improvement. Specification of the factor argumenting technical progress instead of the Hick neutrality might be one of possibility to be tested.<sup>(9)</sup>
2. It might be an interesting subject to describe the bias of the technical change in terms of the induced innovation theory. Especially the movement of the bias of technical change after the oil crisis in Japan has to be explained consistently with the fluctuation of the relative prices.

- 
- (8) We can refer other measurement of the partial elasticities of substitution with respect to capital, labor and energy input in the macro production analysis. Berndt — Wood(1975) and Hudson — Jorgenson(1974) reported that energy is complement to capital, substitutable to labor and materials in the analysis of the U.S. manufacturing data. Griffin — Gregory(1976) and Pindyck(1977) reported that energy is substitutable to capital and labor in the analysis of OECD data.
- (9) Wills(1979) reported the some specification in terms of the factor argumenting technical progress.

[Appendix] Estimated Parameter of Trans-log Price Frontier Function

1. Agriculture				2. Mining				
Sam.1-13		Sam.1-18		Sam.1-13		Sam.1-18		
coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	
AK	0.167	(14.30)	0.164	(13.934)	0.270	(11.409)	0.290	(7.335)
BKK	0.16		0.16		0.114	(2.982)	0.154	(3.153)
BKL	-0.119	(9.55)	-0.125	(9.243)	-0.0312	(1.036)	-0.0661	(1.238)
BKE	0.00493	(1.69)	-0.00392	(0.776)	-0.0255	(2.540)	-0.106	(3.674)
BKT	0.0148	(13.14)	0.0156	(15.038)	0.00995	(4.381)	0.00688	(2.061)
AL	0.486	(91.99)	0.443	(20.917)	0.489	(39.838)	0.296	(4.509)
BLL	0.18		0.124	(4.167)	0.18		0.00119	(0.0140)
BLE	0.00825	(5.58)	-0.00358	(0.279)	-0.0925	(4.564)	-0.0300	(0.730)
BLT	-0.0201	(30.61)	-0.0162	(8.799)	-0.0204	(14.029)	-0.00215	(0.377)
AE	0.0154		0.00838	(1.148)	0.0268	(1.323)	0.0513	(1.540)
BEE	0.012		0.00477	(0.517)	-0.161	(3.728)	-0.138	(3.887)
BET	0.0000115	(0.152)	0.000741	(1.038)	0.00706	(3.970)	0.00544	(1.904)
AT	-0.0101	(0.158)	-0.0129	(0.268)	0.0713	(0.879)	0.0619	(0.985)
BTT	0.000995	(0.126)	0.00215	(0.483)	-0.0103	(1.029)	-0.00663	(1.141)
AM	0.332	(29.188)	0.385	(14.250)	0.215	(5.964)	0.363	(5.090)
BKM	-0.0459	(4.02)	-0.0309	(1.834)	-0.0576	(1.587)	0.0182	(0.439)
BLM	-0.0692	(5.55)	0.00464	(0.107)	-0.0563	(1.415)	0.0949	(1.100)
BEM	-0.0251	(7.20)	0.00273	(0.106)	0.279	(5.492)	0.274	(5.312)
BMM	0.1403	(6.10)	0.0235	(0.302)	-0.165	(1.868)	-0.387	(2.693)
BMT	0.00523	(4.603)	-0.000136	(0.0547)	0.00342	(0.994)	-0.0102	(1.498)

## 3. Construction

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.0665	(5.375)	0.0783	(6.83)
BKK	0.058		0.05	
BKL	-0.0183	(1.732)	-0.0223	(2.49)
BKE	-0.00241	(0.960)	-0.000589	(0.0978)
BKT	0.00755	(6.090)	0.00517	(5.12)
AL	0.367	(42.204)	0.182	(5.26)
BLL	0.15		-0.0144	(0.375)
BLE	-0.0103	(0.528)	0.0590	(3.25)
BLT	-0.0136	(14.093)	0.00300	(0.974)
AE	0.00315	(0.160)	0.0720	(4.22)
BEE	0.015		0.013	
BET	0.00134	(0.737)	-0.00484	(3.37)
AT	0.00519	(0.0374)	0.0449	(0.432)
BTT	0.00331	(0.193)	-0.00216	(0.225)
AM	0.564	(28.100)	0.667	(13.38)
BKM	-0.0373	(3.502)	-0.0271	(2.56)
BLM	-0.121	(5.390)	-0.0223	(0.406)
BEM	-0.00227	(0.106)	-0.0714	(3.53)
BMM	0.161	(3.341)	0.121	(1.56)
BWT	0.00376	(2.324)	-0.00332	(0.753)

## 4. Food &amp; Kindred

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.215	(9.83)	0.274	(15.92)
	0.0309	(1.045)	-0.0129	(0.556)
	-0.0296	(3.67)	-0.00182	(0.214)
	-0.00236	(0.74)	-0.00386	(0.721)
	0.00487	(2.25)	-0.00119	(0.750)
	0.111	(7.61)	0.0980	(9.63)
	0.0183	(1.22)	0.0211	(1.70)
	0.00494	(2.08)	0.00252	(0.379)
	-0.0000065	(0.004)	0.00106	(1.21)
	0.0144		0.0136	(2.40)
	0.011		0.01	
	-0.000238	(5.15)	-0.000181	(0.377)
	0.0320	(0.507)	0.0610	(1.22)
	0.00151	(0.194)	-0.00385	(0.831)
	0.659	(27.211)	0.614	(31.10)
	0.00101	(0.033)	0.0186	(0.756)
	0.00647	(0.34)	-0.0218	(1.15)
	-0.0136	(2.48)	-0.00866	(0.906)
	0.0062	(0.148)	0.0118	(0.312)
	-0.00462	(1.95)	0.000313	(0.176)

## 5. Textile

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.132	(16.30)	0.143	(19.81)
BKK	0.0547	(6.78)	0.0455	(4.02)
BKL	-0.0290	(4.28)	-0.0215	(4.05)
BKE	0.00088	(0.925)	-0.00164	(0.446)
BKT	0.00637	(8.26)	0.00504	(7.27)
AL	0.123	(3.49)	0.105	(8.42)
BLL	0.0444	(1.37)	0.0280	(2.24)
BLE	0.000033	(0.10)	0.00353	(0.493)
BLT	-0.00286	(0.882)	-0.00113	(1.02)
AE	0.0155		0.0194	(2.68)
BEE	0.013		0.0097	
BET	-0.000139	(6.55)	-0.000514	(0.817)
AT	0.0329	(0.916)	0.0284	(0.784)
BTT	-0.000818	(0.184)	-0.0000736	(0.0220)
AM	0.730	(18.62)	0.733	(44.64)
BKM	-0.0265	(2.20)	-0.0223	(1.99)
BLM	-0.0154	(0.43)	-0.0100	(0.626)
BEM	-0.0139	(14.96)	-0.0116	(1.52)
BMM	0.0559	(1.34)	0.0440	(1.87)
BMT	-0.00337	(0.93)	-0.00340	(2.32)

## 6. Apparel

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.110		0.0591	(4.83)
	0.0056		0.0056	
	0.0096	(1.53)	-0.0459	(7.57)
	-0.0127	(3.97)	-0.0117	(5.11)
	0.00079	(1.35)	0.00398	(3.56)
	0.187		0.146	(4.29)
	0.0248	(4.02)	-0.0505	(1.53)
	-0.0037	(0.15)	-0.0121	(1.30)
	0.00063	(1.19)	0.00417	(1.37)
	0.0239	(0.87)	0.00396	(0.388)
	-0.0604	(1.80)	0.008	
	-0.00087	(0.35)	0.000271	(0.299)
	0.1039	(0.828)	-0.00778	(0.0757)
	-0.0133	(0.846)	0.00144	(0.152)
	0.679	(24.56)	0.791	(19.82)
	-0.00244	(0.40)	0.0521	(7.53)
	-0.0306	(1.02)	0.109	(2.95)
	0.0768	(1.91)	0.0159	(1.80)
	-0.0437	(0.69)	-0.177	(4.15)
	-0.00056	(0.21)	-0.00842	(2.36)

7. Lumber

Sam.1-13

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.0427	(4.03)	0.0774	(10.355)
BKK	0.053		0.015	
BKL	-0.0283	(3.260)	-0.0141	(2.326)
BKE	0.00137	(0.950)	0.00470	(1.232)
BKT	0.00284	(2.828)	-0.000938	(1.576)
AL	0.285	(55.36)	0.172	(7.0737)
BLL	0.12		0.0225	(1.108)
BLE	0.00285	(3.758)	-0.00846	(0.733)
BLT	-0.00834	(13.99)	0.00193	(0.928)
AE	0.0143		0.000219	(0.0156)
BEE	0.012		0.008	
BET	-0.000029	(0.671)	0.00131	(1.0674)
AT	0.00681	(0.0586)	0.0361	(0.365)
BTT	0.00361	(0.251)	-0.00223	(0.244)
AM	0.658	(70.04)	0.751	(33.618)
BKM	-0.0260	(2.87)	-0.00558	(0.780)
BLM	-0.0944	(10.75)	0.0000383	(0.00206)
BEM	-0.0162	(8.21)	-0.00424	(0.516)
BMM	0.1367	(7.40)	0.00978	(0.514)
BMT	0.0055	(5.63)	-0.00231	(1.154)

8. Furniture

Sam.1-13

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.903	(5.57)	0.104	(10.296)
	0.012		0.012	
	-0.0290	(2.49)	-0.0172	(2.392)
	0.00733	(1.63)	0.000712	(0.211)
	-0.00213	(1.27)	-0.00341	(3.818)
	0.364	(4.56)	0.193	(5.842)
	0.120	(1.61)	-0.0194	(0.653)
	0.00431	(0.161)	0.0324	(2.947)
	-0.00815	(1.13)	0.00726	(2.514)
	0.00688	(0.248)	0.0427	(3.357)
	0.0091		0.0087	
	0.000497	(0.197)	-0.00259	(2.345)
	0.0205	(0.151)	0.0481	(0.474)
	0.00127	(0.0758)	-0.00208	(0.222)
	0.539	(7.47)	0.660	(17.842)
	0.00967	(0.934)	0.00444	(0.530)
	-0.0951	(1.38)	0.00412	(0.119)
	-0.0207	(0.718)	-0.0418	(3.881)
	0.106	(1.45)	0.0332	(0.784)
	0.00978	(1.48)	-0.00126	(0.390)

## 9. Paper

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.146	(8.865)	0.141	(12.54)
BKK	0.0276	(1.533)	0.0599	(4.19)
BKL	-0.00941	(0.624)	-0.0212	(1.85)
BKE	-0.00918	(0.454)	-0.0147	(2.47)
BKT	0.00175	(1.162)	0.00228	(2.11)
AL	0.167	(18.667)	0.107	(5.70)
BLL	0.08		0.0257	(1.23)
BLE	-0.0206	(0.429)	-0.00159	(0.183)
BLT	-0.00526	(6.990)	0.0000766	(0.0455)
AE	0.0445	(0.947)	0.0473	(5.91)
BEE	-0.0608	(0.689)	0.033	
BET	-0.0000139	(0.00327)	-0.000670	(0.944)
AT	-0.0175	(0.844)	0.0439	(0.268)
BTT	0.0116	(0.451)	-0.000260	(0.0172)
AM	0.643	(15.166)	0.704	(32.69)
BKM	-0.00897	(0.319)	-0.0240	(1.53)
BLM	-0.0500	(0.983)	-0.00290	(0.120)
BEM	0.0906	(0.776)	-0.0168	(1.92)
BMM	-0.0317	(0.190)	0.0436	(1.31)
BMT	0.00352	(0.873)	-0.00169	(0.899)

## 10. Printing

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.0501	(5.03)	0.174	(13.916)
	0.071		0.004	
	-0.0421	(4.93)	0.0101	(1.623)
	0.000042	(0.041)	0.000229	(0.308)
	0.0053	(4.99)	-0.00729	(6.383)
	0.442	(38.04)	0.204	(6.472)
	0.18		-0.0383	(1.245)
	0.00167	(1.126)	0.000564	(0.129)
	-0.0110	(9.56)	0.0114	(4.044)
	0.0067		0.00553	(1.396)
	0.0057		0.00514	(1.293)
	-0.0000023	(0.084)	0.000102	(0.279)
	-0.0293	(0.0168)	0.0498	(0.364)
	0.00998	(0.451)	-0.00163	(0.129)
	0.501	(95.54)	0.616	(21.641)
	-0.0287	(3.46)	0.00586	(0.950)
	-0.139	(16.90)	0.0479	(1.710)
	-0.0073	(2.96)	-0.00593	(0.817)
	0.1755	(10.75)	-0.0478	(1.696)
	0.00579	(9.57)	-0.00424	(1.654)

## 11. Chemical

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.166	(8.378)	0.195	(14.716)
BKK	0.0859	(3.996)	0.094	
BKL	-0.00546	(0.437)	-0.003040	(0.3038)
BKE	-0.00470	(0.580)	-0.0319	(4.0694)
BKT	0.00548	(3.063)	0.00118	(1.0539)
AL	0.182	(26.583)	0.134	(6.349)
BLL	0.084		0.0472	(2.174)
BLE	-0.0278	(2.206)	-0.01402	(0.771)
BLT	-0.00627	(9.733)	-0.00145	(0.761)
AE	0.0328	(2.270)	0.035001	(1.971)
BEE	0.0479	(1.303)	0.063	
BET	0.00368	(2.777)	0.00329	(2.0628)
AT	0.00537	(0.0477)	0.0491	(0.555)
BTT	0.00691	(0.497)	-0.00142	(0.174)
AM	0.620	(24.193)	0.636	(23.564)
BKM	-0.0758	(3.032)	-0.05899	(6.845)
BLM	-0.0507	(3.109)	-0.03014	(1.164)
BEM	-0.0154	(0.348)	-0.017006	(1.184)
BMM	0.142	(2.283)	0.1061	(2.971)
BMT	-0.00290	(1.267)	-0.00302	(1.252)

## 12. Petroleum

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.235	(9.373)	0.308	(23.32)
	0.0961	(3.443)	0.061	
	-0.0242	(1.466)	0.00662	(1.67)
	-0.0131	(0.973)	0.0248	(3.03)
	-0.000331	(0.122)	-0.00622	(5.10)
	0.0929	(11.508)	0.0663	(19.11)
	0.033		0.023	
	0.0463	(1.921)	-0.0319	(3.21)
	-0.00487	(5.035)	-0.00237	(6.74)
	0.139	(4.373)	0.0453	(3.94)
	-0.0651	(2.541)	-0.0401	(1.86)
	-0.00596	(2.038)	0.00212	(2.15)
	0.0186	(0.0986)	0.102	(0.530)
	0.0118	(0.503)	-0.00752	(0.421)
	0.515	(9.632)	0.580	(41.48)
	-0.0588	(1.278)	-0.0924	(9.77)
	-0.551	(1.717)	0.00232	(0.340)
	0.0319	(0.894)	0.0472	(3.68)
	0.0820	(0.883)	0.0429	(4.51)
	0.0112	(2.100)	0.00647	(4.81)

13. Rubber  
Sam.1-13

14. Leather  
Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.00878	(0.215)	0.112	(5.367)	0.0340	(1.56)
BKK	0.0773	(4.01)	0.051		0.0357	(1.36)
BKL	-0.0330	(1.84)	0.00614	(0.420)	-0.0286	(1.83)
BKE	0.00034	(0.245)	-0.00363	(0.886)	0.0046	(1.23)
BKT	0.0119	(3.40)	0.00103	(0.582)	0.00558	(2.65)
AL	0.356	(18.97)	0.0688	(2.006)	0.227	(32.36)
BLL	0.13		-0.0576	(2.508)	0.1	
BLE	-0.0025	(2.29)	-0.0124	(1.870)	0.0049	(2.78)
BLT	-0.0123	(8.21)	0.0135	(4.928)	-0.00495	(6.68)
AE	0.026		0.0177	(1.795)	0.0113	
BEE	0.0141	(1.78)	0.018		0.008	
BET	-0.00029	(5.34)	0.000429	(0.539)	0.000024	(0.33)
AT	0.0153	(0.114)	0.0788	(0.759)	-0.0089	(0.077)
BTT	0.00455	(0.274)	-0.00369	(0.384)	0.00578	(0.407)
AM	0.608	(24.61)	0.802	(31.374)	0.727	(41.02)
BKM	-0.0446	(3.29)	-0.0535	(4.373)	-0.0116	(0.454)
BLM	-0.0944	(5.35)	0.0638	(2.940)	-0.0762	(4.99)
BEM	-0.0118	(1.48)	-0.00199	(0.290)	-0.0174	(3.41)
BMM	0.1509	(5.88)	-0.00834	(0.304)	0.1054	(3.24)
BMT	0.00069	(0.302)	-0.0149	(7.011)	-0.00066	(0.37)
					-0.00551	(2.288)
					0.007	
					-0.00186	(1.772)
					0.0297	(0.338)
					-0.000269	(0.0332)
					0.792	(28.546)
					-0.0363	(3.087)
					-0.00877	(0.289)
					-0.0228	(1.787)
					0.0679	(1.644)
					-0.00551	(2.288)



## 15. Stone

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.0941	(6.173)	0.149	(13.316)
BKK	0.0464	(2.500)	0.086	
BKL	-0.0384	(2.747)	0.00326	(0.318)
BKE	-0.0473	(3.637)	-0.0418	(5.625)
BKT	0.00879	(6.247)	0.00289	(3.130)
AL	0.184	(4.290)	0.152	(7.373)
BLL	-0.0205	(0.497)	-0.0453	(1.961)
BLE	-0.0521	(1.418)	-0.00957	(0.631)
BLT	-0.000291	(0.0768)	0.00253	(1.369)
AE	0.0352	(0.984)	0.0740	(5.234)
BEE	0.06		0.06	
BET	0.00299	(0.934)	-0.000269	(0.212)
AT	0.00483	(0.0398)	0.0360	(0.375)
BTT	0.00546	(0.365)	-0.000801	(0.0901)
AM	0.686	(13.468)	0.625	(24.967)
BKM	0.0393	(1.243)	-0.0475	(3.970)
BLM	0.111	(1.949)	0.0516	(1.828)
BEM	0.0394	(0.945)	-0.00865	(0.778)
BMM	-0.190	(1.800)	0.00450	(0.134)
BMT	-0.0115	(2.487)	-0.00516	(2.307)

## 16. Iron

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.131	(11.856)	0.144	(20.72)
	0.0395	(3.069)	0.0530	(5.94)
	-0.00244	(0.291)	0.00089	(0.18)
	-0.0219	(2.072)	-0.0724	(4.65)
	0.00255	(2.282)	0.00143	(2.10)
	0.114	(28.943)	0.0812	(7.58)
	0.051		0.0251	(2.36)
	0.00135	(0.0395)	0.0544	(6.75)
	-0.00470	(10.706)	-0.0021	(2.23)
	0.0424	(1.089)	0.0842	
	0.0266	(0.529)	0.047	
	0.00247	(0.684)	-0.00045	(0.90)
	0.0130	(0.0963)	0.0618	(0.542)
	0.00798	(0.480)	-0.00198	(0.188)
	0.713	(16.430)	0.690	(59.261)
	-0.0152	(0.780)	0.0185	(1.04)
	-0.0499	(1.288)	-0.0805	(5.26)
	-0.00601	(0.0810)	-0.0290	(1.77)
	0.0711	(0.606)	0.091	(2.43)
	-0.000326	(0.0759)	0.00109	(1.03)

## 17. Non-ferrous

## 18. Ferrous Metal

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.222	(10.67)	0.194	(10.66)	0.106	(0.867)	0.0530	(4.257)
BKK	0.00617	(0.383)	0.0310	(1.87)	0.046		0.046	
BKL	0.00143	(0.0796)	-0.0200	(1.40)	-0.0665	(6.79)	-0.0466	(4.963)
BKE	-0.00835	(1.23)	-0.0138	(2.64)	-0.00210	(1.23)	-0.0149	(2.458)
BKT	0.000496	(0.243)	0.00328	(1.86)	0.0102	(8.33)	0.00487	(4.606)
AL	0.0990	(8.95)	0.107	(11.07)	0.313	(3.61)	0.228	(10.049)
BLL	0.05		0.05		0.0462	(0.596)	-0.0256	(1.216)
BLE	0.0265	(1.63)	-0.00139	(0.147)	0.0133	(1.04)	0.0477	(3.019)
BLT	-0.00203	(1.59)	-0.00238	(2.44)	-0.00681	(0.842)	0.00112	(0.542)
AE	0.0620	(3.79)	0.0342	(3.54)	0.0258	(1.83)	0.0604	(3.640)
BEE	0.038		0.038		0.014		0.014	
BET	-0.00174	(1.14)	0.000975	(1.12)	-0.000404	(0.305)	-0.00354	(2.344)
AT	0.0144	(0.0613)	0.0408	(0.207)	0.0298	(0.413)	0.0426	(0.762)
BTT	0.0110	(0.380)	0.00395	(0.217)	0.000518	(0.0585)	-0.00147	(0.284)
AM	0.617	(29.49)	0.664	(41.45)	0.651	(8.49)	0.658	(26.337)
BKM	0.000757	(0.0379)	0.00278	(0.180)	0.0226	(2.59)	0.0155	(2.281)
BLM	-0.0779	(3.17)	-0.0286	(1.62)	0.00700	(0.102)	0.0245	(1.012)
BEM	-0.0561	(3.33)	-0.0228	(2.65)	-0.0252	(1.97)	-0.0468	(3.191)
BMM	0.133	(2.75)	0.0486	(1.54)	-0.00441	(0.0706)	0.00682	(0.192)
BMT	0.00328	(1.59)	-0.00187	(1.27)	-0.00299	(0.419)	-0.00245	(1.069)

## 19. Machinery

20. Fcfe. M.

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.1032	(8.43)	0.128	(8.860)	0.153	(8.881)	0.173	(14.5601)
BKK	0.0318	(2.41)	0.0542	(3.544)	0.00622	(0.534)	0.0245	(1.681)
BKL	-0.0553	(6.89)	-0.0456	(4.391)	-0.0268	(1.964)	-0.0297	(2.928)
BKE	-0.00545	(3.38)	-0.00529	(1.256)	0.00242	(0.186)	-0.00315	(0.619)
BKT	0.00572	(4.03)	0.00281	(1.837)	0.00253	(1.571)	-0.000358	(0.335)
AL	0.194	(3.34)	0.0974	(1.977)	0.158	(2.453)	0.0660	(1.986)
BLL	0.00652	(0.135)	-0.0725	(1.676)	0.0254	(0.460)	-0.0417	(1.3996)
BLE	-0.0332	(2.92)	0.0172	(0.830)	-0.00723	(0.158)	0.0269	(2.0173)
BLT	-0.00045	(0.085)	0.00832	(1.841)	0.000124	(0.0211)	0.00884	(2.967)
AE	0.0141		0.0356	(1.516)	0.00920	(0.171)	0.0456	(3.0304)
BEE	-0.0267	(2.04)	0.00531	(0.371)	0.011		0.009	
BET	-0.000073	(0.97)	-0.00221	(1.011)	0.000275	(0.0563)	-0.00295	(2.276)
AT	0.0615	(0.417)	0.0802	(0.725)	0.0385	(0.171)	0.0783	(0.461)
BTT	0.00077	(0.0427)	-0.00252	(0.246)	0.00457	(0.165)	-0.00230	(0.147)
AM	0.689	(12.19)	0.739	(11.281)	0.680	(7.603)	0.715	(16.982)
BKM	0.0288	(2.47)	-0.00331	(0.190)	0.0182	(0.722)	0.00828	(0.664)
BLM	0.0521	(1.09)	0.101	(1.754)	0.00864	(0.112)	0.0445	(1.204)
BEM	0.0355	(2.36)	-0.0172	(0.508)	-0.00619	(0.136)	-0.0327	(2.377)
BMM	-0.116	(2.31)	-0.0804	(0.902)	-0.0206	(0.171)	-0.020084	(0.412)
BMT	-0.0052	(1.00)	-0.00893	(1.474)	-0.00293	(0.355)	-0.00553	(1.468)

21. Motor  
Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.189	(7.584)	0.216	(16.122)
BKK	0.459	(2.050)	0.0389	(2.916)
BKL	-0.0305	(2.088)	-0.0187	(2.553)
BKE	0.000953	(0.363)	0.000570	(0.189)
BKT	-0.000895	(0.383)	-0.00413	(3.505)
AL	0.111		0.124	
BLL	0.00129	(0.128)	0.0219	(4.222)
BLE	-0.0000851	(0.0501)	-0.000137	(0.0636)
BLT	0.00196	(4.933)	0.00105	(6.438)
AE	0.011		0.0109	
BEE	-0.00951	(0.847)	0.000254	(0.0468)
BET	0.0000261	(0.319)	-0.0000350	(0.374)
AT	0.0702	(0.399)	0.105	(0.789)
BTT	0.00252	(0.116)	-0.00454	(0.370)
AM	0.689	(27.577)	0.650	(48.594)
BKM	-0.0163	(0.679)	-0.0208	(1.417)
BLM	0.0293	(1.255)	-0.00312	(0.247)
BEM	0.00864	(0.768)	-0.000688	(0.118)
BMM	-0.0217	(0.525)	0.0246	(0.949)
BMT	-0.00109	(0.474)	0.00312	(2.656)

1  
5  
1

22. Trans. Eq.  
Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.0726	(3.104)	0.0516	(2.819)
	0.0516	(2.120)	0.05	
	-0.0402	(2.214)	-0.0714	(5.015)
	-0.000185	(0.0541)	-0.00610	(1.027)
	0.00954	(3.977)	0.0104	(6.260)
	0.333	(9.810)	0.231	(6.959)
	0.0809	(2.557)	0.0302	(0.876)
	-0.00318	(0.569)	0.00711	(0.545)
	-0.0130	(3.935)	-0.00185	(0.611)
	0.0165	(2.616)	0.0218	(1.688)
	-0.00330	(0.195)	0.008	
	-0.000451	(0.726)	-0.000980	(0.837)
	0.0679	(0.903)	0.0545	(0.730)
	-0.00888	(0.957)	-0.00434	(0.628)
	0.578	(13.793)	0.696	(19.515)
	-0.0112	(0.469)	0.0275	(1.974)
	-0.0375	(1.186)	0.0341	(1.053)
	0.00667	(0.358)	-0.00901	(0.757)
	0.0420	(0.923)	-0.0526	(1.358)
	0.00390	(0.941)	-0.00753	(2.304)

## 23. Precision

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.0700	(5.83)	0.08808	(8.986)
BKK	0.0551	(6.40)	0.0537	(7.0328)
BKL	-0.0562	(6.96)	-0.0476	(7.995)
BKE	0.00106	(1.45)	0.00104	(0.562)
BKT	0.00583	(4.89)	0.00347	(3.973)
AL	0.199	(3.62)	0.200656	(7.4299)
BLL	0.0368	(0.718)	0.0463	(1.758)
BLE	-0.0018	(1.52)	0.0133	(1.435)
BLT	0.00181	(0.36)	0.00181	(0.77006)
AE	0.013		0.0273	(2.917)
BEE	-0.0074	(1.01)	0.0089	
BET	-0.000034	(0.72)	-0.00147	(1.823)
AT	0.0271	(0.568)	0.0556	(1.471)
BTT	0.00152	(0.258)	-0.00336	(0.961)
AM	0.718	(12.25)	0.684	(21.836)
BKM	0.00101	(0.011)	-0.00704	(1.0394)
BLM	0.00212	(0.389)	-0.0119	(0.384)
BEM	0.0681	(0.949)	-0.0232	(2.346)
BMM	-0.0294	(0.489)	0.0421	(1.0878)
BMT	-0.00760	(1.410)	-0.00381	(1.385)

## 24. Mis. Mng.

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.0159	(0.735)	0.0490	(4.367)
	0.0495	(4.53)	0.036	
	-0.0234	(1.93)	-0.0144	(1.545)
	-0.00382	(1.81)	-0.00706	(3.408)
	0.0066	(3.30)	0.00297	(3.132)
	0.312	(25.38)	0.177	(6.384)
	0.12		0.0151	(0.750)
	0.000087	(0.04)	-0.00770	(1.658)
	-0.0107	(8.84)	0.00205	(0.850)
	0.0179		0.0121	(2.009)
	0.015		0.015	
	-0.000003	(0.06)	0.000487	(0.923)
	-0.0119	(0.089)	0.0379	(0.370)
	0.0078	(0.478)	-0.000139	(0.0147)
	0.653	(49.53)	0.762	(37.539)
	-0.0222	(1.95)	-0.0146	(1.749)
	-0.0966	(8.75)	-0.00699	(0.409)
	-0.0113	(2.89)	-0.000245	(0.0539)
	0.130	(7.31)	0.00782	(0.400)
	0.00400	(3.13)	-0.00550	(3.140)

## 25. Trans.

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.231	(3.846)	0.285	(7.413)
BKK	0.0466	(0.637)	0.0546	(1.112)
BKL	-0.0741	(1.598)	-0.0375	(1.256)
BKE	0.00403	(0.225)	-0.00391	(0.1797)
BKT	-0.000650	(0.119)	-0.00763	(2.256)
AL	0.245	(2.956)	0.332	(5.651)
BLL	-0.130	(1.430)	-0.02045	(0.294)
BLE	0.0463	(1.338)	-0.02105	(1.0179)
BLT	0.0179	(2.367)	0.0111	(2.0753)
AE	0.0831	(2.524)	0.0147	(0.6701)
BEE	0.049		0.049	
BET	-0.00212	(0.706)	0.00526	(2.827)
AT	0.0310	(0.324)	0.0415	(0.578)
BTT	-0.000753	(0.0638)	-0.003297	(0.497)
AM	0.441	(5.153)	0.368	(5.375)
BKM	0.0235	(0.563)	-0.0132	(0.555)
BLM	0.158	(1.576)	0.07903	(0.941)
BEM	-0.0993	(2.973)	-0.02402	(1.0615)
BMM	-0.0819	(0.663)	-0.0418	(0.395)
BMT	-0.0152	(1.926)	-0.00875	(1.398)

## 26. Elec. U.

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.472	(13.646)	0.458	(14.33)
	0.0971	(2.285)	0.111	(4.09)
	0.039	(1.265)	-0.0106	(0.70)
	-0.0538	(6.193)	-0.0729	(5.26)
	-0.0048	(1.299)	-0.0056	(1.62)
	0.158		0.151	(5.92)
	0.0674	(2.276)	0.0516	(1.69)
	0.0456	(0.876)	0.0299	(1.10)
	0.0016	(1.508)	0.00219	(0.93)
	0.141	(2.707)	0.159	
	-0.094	(1.803)	-0.196	(2.93)
	0.00055	(0.118)	0.00080	(0.94)
	-0.1122	(0.499)	-0.00069	(0.003)
	0.0276	(0.998)	0.00456	(0.217)
	0.228	(3.563)	0.231	(8.27)
	-0.0831	(2.964)	-0.0278	(1.20)
	-0.1592	(1.791)	-0.0714	(1.95)
	0.1023	(1.930)	0.239	(2.86)
	0.1338	(1.112)	-0.140	(1.30)
	0.0027	(0.436)	-0.0026	(0.91)

## 27. Whole-sale

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.257	(12.398)	0.236	(20.70)
BKK	0.0784	(4.192)	0.0891	(5.37)
BKL	-0.0168	(0.724)	-0.0429	(3.34)
BKE	-0.0168	(2.891)	0.0155	(2.42)
BKT	0.0032	(1.666)	0.00541	(4.77)
AL	0.356	(5.973)	0.279	(13.04)
BLL	0.1072	(1.611)	0.0186	(0.691)
BLE	-0.00161	(0.921)	-0.0113	(0.929)
BLT	-0.00284	(1.389)	0.00418	(2.11)
AE	0.029		0.0282	(3.20)
BEE	0.022		-0.0190	(2.14)
BET	0.000049	(0.474)	0.0000908	(0.112)
AT	-0.0325	(0.204)	0.0125	(0.105)
BTT	0.00769	(0.391)	0.000855	(0.0776)
AM	0.357	(5.049)	0.457	(16.50)
BKM	-0.0783	(2.541)	-0.0616	(2.95)
BLM	-0.0887	(1.13)	0.0356	(0.951)
BEM	-0.0173	(3.18)	0.0148	(0.618)
BMM	0.1844	(1.874)	0.0112	(0.159)
BMT	-0.00043	(0.067)	-0.00968	(3.82)

## 28. Finance

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
	0.397	(25.548)	0.435	(26.6401)
	0.0396	(1.275)	0.0575	(1.457)
	0.00351	(0.131)	0.007204	(0.273)
	0.000371	(0.220)	-0.05055	(2.449)
	0.000172	(0.097)	-0.004079	(2.725)
	0.282	(5.456)	0.239	(4.946)
	-0.0612	(0.766)	-0.0864	(1.0115)
	0.00119	(1.51)	0.0682	(2.0767)
	0.00382	(0.796)	0.008087	(1.816)
	0.0079		0.04054	(1.967)
	0.0063		0.05	
	-0.000069	(2.281)	-0.003304	(1.789)
	0.0420	(0.348)	0.0326	(0.354)
	-0.00542	(0.366)	-0.003203	(0.377)
	0.312	(6.309)	0.286	(4.5098)
	-0.0434	(2.661)	-0.0142	(0.499)
	0.0565	(0.750)	0.01104	(0.10054)
	-0.00786	(5.744)	-0.0226	(0.689)
	-0.00515	(0.068)	0.0257	(0.184)
	-0.00392	(0.863)	-0.0007031	(0.121)

29. Real Estate

30. Service

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

Sam.1-13

Sam.1-18

	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value	coef.	t-value
AK	0.858	(117.052)	0.856	(160.29)	0.264	(9.24)	0.231	(16.01)
BKK	0.0126	(1.54)	0.0115	(2.02)	0.03		0.17	
BKL	-0.00251	(0.55)	-0.00391	(1.00)	0.0284	(0.788)	-0.0472	(2.60)
BKE	0.00015	(0.051)	0.000247	(0.227)	-0.00273	(0.520)	-0.0203	(2.63)
BKT	-0.000157	(2.09)	-0.00127	(2.56)	0.00682	(2.40)	0.00914	(7.06)
AL	0.038	(17.17)	0.0118	(1.47)	0.18		0.198	
BLL	0.022		-0.0168	(1.36)	0.0355	(2.72)	0.0805	(7.36)
BLE	0.00165	(0.58)	0.00356	(0.734)	0.0425	(3.12)	0.0547	(2.48)
BLT	-0.00101	(3.87)	0.00157	(2.20)	0.000639	(1.33)	-0.00044	(1.16)
AE	0.0024		0.00394	(1.45)	0.0561	(5.73)	0.0622	(3.98)
BEE	0.002		0.00138	(0.529)	0.02		0.02	
BET	-0.0000076	(0.08)	-0.000151	(0.601)	-0.00309	(3.47)	-0.00352	(2.51)
AT	-0.164	(0.395)	0.00983	(0.0310)	-0.0373	(0.377)	-0.00397	(0.052)
BTT	0.0368	(0.715)	0.00515	(0.176)	0.00592	(0.484)	0.000314	(0.045)
AM	0.100	(15.82)	0.128	(14.82)	0.500	(16.68)	0.508	(21.12)
BKM	-0.0103	(1.31)	-0.00786	(1.64)	-0.0557	(1.38)	-0.103	(4.76)
BLM	-0.0211	(5.16)	0.0171	(1.16)	-0.106	(2.86)	-0.0879	(2.23)
BEM	-0.0038	(0.71)	-0.00518	(0.765)	-0.0598	(4.30)	-0.0544	(2.63)
BMM	0.0352	(3.21)	-0.00406	(0.202)	0.222	(2.73)	0.2448	(3.42)
BMT	0.00256	(3.98)	-0.000155	(0.194)	-0.00437	(1.43)	-0.0052	(2.38)



## REFERENCES

- (1) Berndt, E.R. and L.R. Christenson. (1973), "The internal structure of functional relationships : Separability, substitution and Aggregation," Review of Economic Studies, XL No.3.
- (2) \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_ (1973), "The Trans-log function and the substitution of equipment, structures and labor in U.S. manufacturing 1929-68," Journal of Econometrics, 1, No.1, pp.81-113.
- (3) Berndt, E.R. and D.O. Wood. (1975), "Technology, prices, and the derived for energy," Review of Economics and Statistics, LVII, No.3.
- (4) Christensen, L.R., Jorgenson, D.W. and Lau, L.J. (1973), "Transcendental Logarithmic Production Frontiers," RES VOL.55, No.1, Feb.
- (5) Diewert, W.E. (1976), "Exact and Superlative Index Number," Journal of Econometrics, Vol.4.
- (6) Fuss, M. and D. Mcfadden. (1978), Production Economics: A Dual Approach to Theory and Applications. Vol.1 & 2, North-Holland.
- (7) Gollop, F.M. and D.W. Jorgenson. (1980), "U.S. Economic Growth by Industry, 1947-1973," New Developments in Productivity Measurement and Analysis, Kendrick, J.W. and B.N. Voccara, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
- (8) Jorgenson, D.W. (1981), "Econometric Methods for Applied General Equilibrium Modeling," Harvard Institute of Economic Research, Discussion Paper.
- (9) \_\_\_\_\_ and B.M. Fraumeni. (1981), "Relative Price and Technical Change," Harvard Institute of Economic Research, Discussion Paper.
- (10) \_\_\_\_\_ and M. Kuroda. (1981), "Energy and Economic Growth in the United States and Japan," N.S.F. report.
- (11) \_\_\_\_\_ and M. Nishimizu. (1978), "U.S. and Japanese Economic Growth, 1952-1974 : An International Comparison," The Economic Journal, Vol.88, Dec.
- (12) Klotz, B., R. Madoo and R. Hansen. (1980), "A Study of High and Low "Labor Productivity" Establishment in U.S. Manufacturing," New Developments in Productivity Measurement and Analysis, Kendrickeds. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
- (13) Kuroda, M. (1981 a), "Nihon Keizai no Seisensei Suui to Shijo no Performance (Productivity Change and Market Performance)," Kikan Gendai Keizai, Vol.43, Summer.
- (14) \_\_\_\_\_ (1981 b), "A Method of Estimation for the Updating: Transaction Matrix in the Input-Output Relationships," Keio Economic Observatory, Discussion Paper, Vol.1.
- (15) \_\_\_\_\_ and H. Imamura. (1981), "Productivity and Market Performance - Time-series Analysis (1960-1977) in the Japanese Economy," Keio Economic Observatory, Discussion Paper, Vol.2.
- (16) Mohr, F. Michael. (1980), "The Long-Term Structure of Production, Factor Demand, and Factor Productivity in U.S. Manufacturing Industries," New Developments in Productivity Measurement and Analysis, Kendrick eds. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.

- (17) Samuelson, P.A. (1953), "Prices of Factors and Goods in General Equilibrium," The Review of Economic Studies, Vol.21, pp.1-20.
- (18) Shephard, R.W. (1970), The Theory of Cost and Production, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- (19) Uzawa, H. (1962), "Production Functions with Constant Elasticities of Substitution," Review of Economic Studies, Vol.29, No.81, Oct.
- (20) Wills, John. (1979), "Technical Change in the U.S. Primary Metals Industry," Journal of Econometrics, Vol.10, pp.85-98.

INSTITUTE OF SOCIO-ECONOMIC PLANNING

Discussion Paper Series (1981.4- )

- No. 113 Sho-Ichiro Kusumoto,  
"On the Equilibrium Concepts in a General Equilibrium Theory with Public Goods and Taxes-Pareto Optimality and Existence," (April, 1981).
- No. 114 Ryosuke Hotaka,  
"A Meta-Database for a Database Design Method," (May, 1981).
- No. 115 Hidehiko Tanimura,  
"A Minimum-Distance Location Model of Central Facilities with Entropy-Maximizing Spatial Interaction," (May, 1981).
- No. 116 Sho-Ichiro Kusumoto, Kanemi Ban, Hajime Wago and Kazumi Asako,  
"Rational Savings, Price Expectation and Money Supply in a Growing Economy," (July, 1981).
- No. 117 Sho-Ichiro Kusumoto,  
"On the Equilibrium Concepts in a General Equilibrium Theory with Public Goods and Taxes II -- "Surplus" Maximum," (June, 1981).
- No. 118 Hajime Eto,  
"Decision-Theoretical Foundations of the Validities of Technology Forecasting Methods," (June, 1981).
- No. 119 Hiroyuki Odagiri,  
"Internal Promotion, Intrafirm Wage Structure and Corporate Growth," (July, 1981).
- No. 120 Hajime Eto and Kyoko Makino,  
"The Validity of the Simon's Firm-Size Model and its Revision," (August, 1981).
- No. 121 Satoru Fujishige,  
"Structures of Polytopes Determined by Submodular Functions on Crossing Families," (August, 1981).
- No. 122 Hajime Eto,  
"Epistemologico-Logical Approach to the Validity of Model in View of the Fuzzy System Model," (August, 1981).
- No. 123 Hiroyuki Odagiri,  
"R & D Expenditures, Royalty Payments, and Sales Growth in Japanese Manufacturing Corporations," (August, 1981).
- No. 124 Noboru Sakashita,  
"Evaluation of Regional Development Policy-An Alternative Approach," (September, 1981).
- No. 125 Takao Fukuchi and Noriyoshi Oguchi,  
"A Generalization of Keynesian Macromodel; the STIC Model," (September, 1981).
- No. 126 Kazumi Asako,  
"The Penrose Effect and the Long-Run Equilibrium of a Monetary Optimizing Model: Superneutrality and Nonexistence," (September, 1981).
- No. 127 Isao Ohashi,  
"Optimal Properties of Wage and Layoff Policies and the Impact of Trade Unionism," (August, 1981).
- No. 128 Kanemi Ban,  
"A Macroeconometric Model of Japan with Rational Expectations," (September, 1981).
- No. 129 Yoshitsugu Yamamoto and Kiyoshi Murata,  
"A New Variable Dimension Algorithm : Extension for Separable Mappings, Geometric Interpretation and Some Applications," (October, 1981).
- No. 130 Hirotaka Sakasegawa,  
"Numerical Analysis on Tandem Queueing System with Blocking," (November, 1981).

- No. 131 Ikuo Kabashima,  
"Supportive Participatory Model of Development - Political Participation and  
Income Distribution in Growing Economies - ," (December, 1981).
- No. 132 Seizo Ikuta,  
"Multistage Decision Process with Random Observations and its Applications,"  
(December, 1981).
- No. 133 Yuji Kubo,  
"Interindustry Linkages and Industrial Development," (December, 1981).
- No. 134 Kazumi Asako and Ryuhei Wakasugi,  
"Government Capital, Income Distribution, and Optimal Taxation,"  
(January, 1982).
- No. 135 Satoru Fujishige,  
"The Theory of Semimodular Programs," (January, 1982).
- No. 136 Yoshitsugu Kanemoto,  
"Pricing and Investment Policies in the System of Competitive Commuter  
Railways," (January, 1982).
- No. 137 Koichi Mera,  
"National Spatial Policies and Urban Development: Lessons from the Japanese  
Experience," (January, 1982).
- No. 138 Hajime Eto and Kyoko Makino,  
"Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Differentiation Process in Technology  
Gap between Developed and Developing Nations," (February, 1982).
- No. 139 Hajime Eto,  
"Evaluation Model of Technological Aid Policy to Developing Countries,"  
(February, 1982).
- No. 140 Hiroyuki Odagiri,  
"Product Innovation in a Cournot Economy: Competition on Innovation and  
Competition on Imitation," (March, 1982).
- No. 141 Kazumi Asako,  
"Money Supply Uncertainty and Activist Stabilization Policy under Rational  
Expectations," (March, 1982).
- No. 142 Hajime Wago and Masahiro Kuroda,  
"Relative Price Changes and Biases of Technical Change in Japan -- KLEM  
Production Model," (January, 1982).