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Abstract

In this paper we present a decomposition of aggregate labour productivity growth (ALP) into three main components: sectoral total factor productivity (TFP), sectoral capital deepening and structural change (reallociation of labour across sectors). In order to disentangle the relative contribution of these factors, we adopt an econometric approach to estimate production functions for 28 sectors in the major European countries, Japan, Australia and the US (data are obtained from the EU-KLEMS project; period 1977-2007; 13 countries). Estimates of the production frontiers are obtained using a model which allows flexible identification of country specific time trends (temporal variation in individual heterogeneity) and time variation in the vector of slope coefficients of the production frontiers (bias in technical change). We find that the main driver of aggregate labour productivity growth is the sectoral factor deepening effect. TFP growth is very stable across years and across countries and it ranges between 0.2-0.5% per year, thus accounting for less than 30% of the growth in ALP in most countries. The structural change component has a slightly negative effect on ALP, pointing to the fact that the displacement of labour has been unfavorable to aggregate labour productivity.
1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the relative contribution of three main factors to aggregate labour productivity growth: sectoral total factor productivity (TFP), sectoral capital deepening and structural change (re allocation of labour across sectors). In order to disentangle the relative contribution of these factors, we adopt an econometric approach to estimate production frontiers for 28 sectors in the major European countries, Japan, Australia and the US (data are obtained from the EU-KLEMS project; period 1977-2007; 13 countries). Estimates of the production frontiers are obtained using a flexible translog specification which allows the identification of country specific time trends (temporal variation in individual heterogeneity) and time variation in the vector of slope coefficients of the production frontiers (bias in technical change). The framework can be thought as an extension of the fixed effects model and is especially useful when dealing with EU-KLEMS data because of their “long” panel nature (i.e., small number of countries for a relative long time span). The specification can be written as a standard state-space formulation and estimated using Kalman filtering and smoothing algorithms.

The decomposition of labour productivity growth is obtained as follow. First, we apply the econometric model to the 28 sectors in order to obtain estimates of the coefficients of the production frontiers. Second, we use this estimates to produce a decomposition of sectoral labour productivity growth into capital deepening and TFP. Third, we disentangle the effect of the increase of labour productivity at sectoral level (arising from capital deepening and TFP) from the effect of the displacement of labour across sectors. In fact, if the labour share of high productivity sectors increase with respect to low productivity sectors, aggregate labour productivity will improve because of this mobility (even if labour productivity growth at sectoral level is kept constant). This effect is what we call structural change. Fourth, we consider an enhanced decomposition of aggregate labour productivity in which the aggregate effect of sectoral capital deepening and sectoral TFP growth are separated. Our final decomposition of aggregate labour productivity growth will entail therefore three components: the contribution of sectoral TFP growth, the effect of sectoral capital deepening, and the effect of structural change (labour mobility across sectors).

Our results suggest that the main driver of aggregate labour productivity growth is the sectoral factor deepening effect. TFP growth is very stable across years and across countries and
it ranges between 0.2-0.5% per year. The structural change component has a slightly negative
effect on aggregate labour productivity growth, pointing to the fact that the displacement of
labour has been unfavorable to aggregate labour productivity.

The paper is organized as follow. In section 2 we present the basic production model
and its state-space representation. In section 3, the econometric estimation strategy is pre-
sented. Section 4 introduces the decomposition of aggregate labour productivity growth into
the aforementioned components. Section 5 describes the data used and the main empirical
result. Finally, section 6 concludes.

2 The production model

The sectoral production technology is represented via a constant returns to scale (CRS) pro-
duction function where a single output $y^j_{it}$ (log of output) is produced by means of multiple
inputs $X^j_{it}$ where $i = 1, \ldots, N$ indexes the number of countries, $t = 1, \ldots, T$ indexes the number
of time periods and $j = 1, \ldots, J$ indexes the number of sectors. A translog specification can be
accommodated by including the log of inputs, the squared log of inputs and interaction terms
into the vector $X^j_{it}$:

$$y^j_{it} = \gamma^j_{it} + X^j_{it}\beta^j_t + \epsilon^j_{it} \quad (1)$$

Since we assume CRS the production function can be expressed in intensive form and all
the variables can be normalized by the quantity of labour. Therefore equation (1) contains on
the left-hand side the log of labour productivity (output per worker) and on the right-hand side
the log of inputs over labour (for example, capital per worker). The intensive form production
function defined in (1) is time varying due to the time varying coefficients $(\gamma^j_{it}, \beta^j_t)$. If one is
willing to assume no productivity change then the production frontier becomes time invariant
$y^j_{it} = \gamma^j_i + X^j_{it}\beta^j + \epsilon^j_{it}$. In this last equation the technology is fixed (no technical change as
the parameters are time invariant) and the country specific intercept is a standard fixed effect
unobserved heterogeneity component. It is possible to estimate such a model using standard
panel data estimators (for a detailed discussion of this point see Schmidt and Sickles, 1984).
Of course, the validity of such a procedure is predicated on the assumption that the production
function parameters are time invariant and this is a tolerable assumption for “short” panels.
On the other hand, when $T$ becomes larger the time invariant model becomes less appealing. In this instance the state-space representation provides the best option to elegantly estimate the time-varying model. In order to do so, we need to introduce some further assumption on the law of motion of the parameters of the model. We assume that both the country specific intercepts and the slope of the production function follow a random walk:

\[
\begin{align*}
\gamma_t^j &= \gamma_{t-1}^j + \psi_t^j \\
\beta_t^j &= \beta_{t-1}^j + \nu_t^j
\end{align*}
\]

where $\gamma_t^j = (\gamma_{1t}^j, \ldots, \gamma_N^j)^\prime$, $\psi_t \sim N(0, H_t = \sigma^2 \eta I_N)$ and $\nu_t \sim N(0, Q_t)$ are independently distributed random errors ($Q_t$ is defined in the next section with more detail). In order to estimate the model via the Kalman filter we need to write it in the standard form. This can be easily done by defining the following matrices and vectors: $\alpha_t^j = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_t^j \\ \beta_t^j \end{pmatrix}$, $Z_t^j = [I_N, X_t^j]$, $D = \begin{bmatrix} I_N \\ I_K \end{bmatrix}$, $\eta_t^j = \begin{pmatrix} \psi_t^j \\ \nu_t^j \end{pmatrix}$. Equations (1) and (2) can now be represented using the following more compact notation:

\[
y_t^j = Z_t^j \alpha_t^j + \epsilon_t^j
\]

\[
\alpha_t^j = D \alpha_{t-1}^j + \eta_t^j
\]

where $D$ will be omitted from here on as it is $I_{N+K}$. This is a standard state-space model and the $\alpha_t^j$ can be that can be estimated via the Kalman filter and smoothing algorithms given estimates of the variance-covariances $Q_t$ and $H_t$. The first equation is called the measurement equation, while the second equation is called the transition equation. In the next section we present details on the estimation of the model in a Bayesian framework.
3 The Econometric Estimation

We estimate the state-space form derived in the previous section in a Bayesian framework (this differs from the classical estimation strategy followed by Peyrache and Rambaldi (2012) in the fact that it allows more flexibility in the specification of the covariance matrices). We initialize the state vector using a diffuse prior $a_0 \sim N(a_0,P_0)$ and define the transition equation covariance matrix $Q_t$ as a partitioned diagonal matrix where the partition divides the state vector into two components. The first component contains $N$ stochastic trends ($\gamma_t$) and the second component contains $K$ time-varying slopes ($\beta_t$). The specification is such that contemporaneous correlation is allowed within each component, although no correlation is allowed across the two components. Therefore the specification is of the form $Q_t = \text{diag}(\Omega_{\gamma,t}, \Omega_{\beta,t})$. We do not directly specify these diagonal sub-matrices, but use what is known as a dynamic discounting approach originating from the engineering and statistical literature. A detail treatment of this approach can be found in West and Harrison (1999), Ch.6. The limiting behaviour of the mean square error of the filter when using discounting has been studied by Triantafyllopoulos (2007). Here we only make a brief presentation as it is needed to establish notation and present the Bayesian estimation algorithm.

The conditional distribution of the state (posterior in a Bayesian context) at period $t-1$ is given by $\alpha_{t-1} \sim N(a_{t-1|t-1}, P_{t-1|t-1})$, where $a_{t-1|t-1}$ is a filter estimate (given $H_t$ and $Q_t$). The Kalman filter prediction equations provide the priors of the state in a Bayesian context. At period $t$, the prior distribution is $\alpha_{t|t-1} \sim N(a_{t|t-1}, P_{t|t-1})$, where, given the form of the econometric model in this study, are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
    a_{t|t-1} &= a_{t-1|t-1} \\
    P_{t|t-1} &= P_{t-1|t-1} + Q_t
\end{align*}
$$

A prediction of $y_t$ can be made at time $t$ given all known information at $t-1$. We can write a distribution for the prediction $y_{t|t-1} \sim N(\hat{y}_{t|t-1}, F_{t|t-1})$, where,

$$
\begin{align*}
    \hat{y}_{t|t-1} &= Z_t a_{t|t-1} \\
    F_{t|t-1} &= Z_t P_{t|t-1} Z_t' + H_t
\end{align*}
$$
Once information for time \( t \) is available the updating of the state can occur. This forms a posterior in a Bayesian context, \( \alpha_t \sim N(a_{t|t}, P_{t|t}) \), where,

\[
\begin{align*}
a_{t|t} &= a_{t|t-1} + K_t \nu_t \\
\nu_t &= y_t - Z_t a_{t|t-1} \\
K_t &= P_{t|t-1} Z_t F_t^{-1} \\
P_{t|t} &= P_{t|t-1} - K_t F_t K_t'
\end{align*}
\tag{7}
\]

In (5), the precision of \( \alpha_{t|t-1} \) is associated with \( P_{t|t-1}^{-1} \), and that of \( \alpha_{t-1|t-1} \) is \( P_{t-1|t-1}^{-1} \). However, \( P_{t-1|t-1}^{-1} \) is the precision of \( \alpha_{t|t-1} \) if there is no stochastic change in the state vector from period \( t - 1 \) to period \( t \) (\( Q_t = 0 \)). In fact this is the global model (converging state). However, locally the dynamics are better captured by \( Q_t \neq 0 \). The discount literature specifies the precision \( P_{t|t-1}^{-1} \) as a discounted \( P_{t-1|t-1}^{-1} \) by a proportion.

\[
P_{t|t-1} = \Delta^{-1/2} P_{t-1|t-1} \Delta^{-1/2}
\tag{8}
\]

where \( \Delta = \text{diag}(\delta_\gamma I_N, \delta_\beta I_K) \), \( 0 < \delta_\gamma \leq 1 \) and \( 0 < \delta_\beta \leq 1 \) are the discount factors associated with the country specific trends (\( \gamma_t \)) and slope parameters (\( \beta_t \)) in the model.

Using (8) and the second equation in (5), it is easy to see that \( Q_t = (P_{t-1|t-1}^{-1} - \Delta^{-1/2} P_{t-1|t-1} \Delta^{-1/2}) \), which is a partitioned diagonal matrix as required, and \( Q_t = 0 \) if the discount factors are equal to 1.

The estimation of the country specific trends, \( \gamma_t \), and slope parameters \( \beta_t \) is achieved by using the forward filter (equations (7) which provides estimates \( \gamma_{t|t} \) and \( \beta_{t|t} \) at each \( t \)). Subsequently, these estimates are revised to be made conditional on the complete sample by running a smoothing algorithm to compute \( \gamma_{t|T} \) and \( \beta_{t|T} \) (the equations of the classical smoother are presented in the Appendix) and their mean square error \( P_{t|T} \). However, in order to obtain estimates using these two algorithms (forward filter and backward filter), we require values of additional parameters, which in this case are \( \theta = [\sigma^2_e, \delta_\gamma, \delta_\beta] \). When \( \theta \) is known, the Kalman filter and appropriate smoothing provide the minimum mean square estimator of the state and corresponding MSE (minimum linear estimator if normality is not assume), which is the posterior distribution of \( \alpha_t \) in a Bayesian approach. However, these additional parameters are
seldom known and thus must be estimated. In a Classical setting they are considered fixed parameters and can be consistently estimated by evaluation of the likelihood (see Harvey (1989), Ch. 3 or Durbin and Koopman (2012), Ch. 2) and then used to replace the unknown parameters in the forward and backward filters. In a Bayesian framework, all parameters of the model are estimated using MCMC algorithms, typically the Gibbs sampler. This is a standard Bayesian estimation of a state space model, and thus we only briefly describe the algorithm here, and present some details in the Appendix. One noteworthy point is that in the conventional Bayesian literature the discount factors are not directly estimated, but calibrated as they are typically in the range of 0.9 - 0.99. Recent work by Koop and Korobilis (2013) proposes to use a model averaging approach over a range of values of the discount factors (they use the term forgetting factors in their work). We have not pursued this approach in this version of the paper. Instead, we use diagnostic tools to inform the calibration of the discount factors. A conventional diagnostic tool is to use standardised one-step ahead prediction errors. The one-step ahead prediction errors are $\nu_t$ (see (7), which are standardised by constructing

$$u_t = L_t' \nu_t$$

where $L_t$ is the lower Choleski factor of $F_t^{-1}$ ($L_t L_t' = F_t^{-1}$)

These standardised prediction errors are conditionally independent and follow standard Normal distributions ($u_t \sim N(0, I)$)$^1$

From the above discussion it follows that given a set value for $\Delta$, the Gibbs sampler has two blocks. The first block is to draw the state from $p(\alpha|y, h_{\epsilon})$, where $\alpha = [\alpha_1', ..., \alpha_T']'$ and $y = [y_1', ..., y_T']$. In the second block we draw $h_{\epsilon} = \sigma^2_e$ from $p(h_{\epsilon})p(y|h_{\epsilon})$. This can be repeated for alternative values of $\Delta$ if $u_t$ are found to deviate from the standard normal.

$^1$The one-step prediction errors analysis not only provides information of goodness of fit, but also addresses other key issues such as irregularities in the data series (outliers), model inadequacies (observational variance structure, choice of discount factor), or both (see for example West and Harrison (1999), Durbin and Koopman (2012)). The first can be examined via raw errors sequence whilst the latter is detected via investigating the observed deviation in the standardised error sequence.
4 Aggregate labour productivity decomposition

The purpose of this section is to establish a productivity decomposition at the aggregate level for each country in each time period. This decomposition exercise can be interpreted as a post-estimation exercise, given our estimates of the production model presented in section 3. In order to do so we follow a two-step decomposition procedure: in the first step we decompose sectoral labour productivity growth into the contribution of total factor productivity (TFP) and factor deepening (FD); in the second step we define aggregate labour productivity growth for each country and decompose it by aggregating TFP and FD across sectors. For each country, in each time period and for each sector labour productivity growth is given by the difference in the log of output per worker in two time periods; by using equation (1) we obtain:

\[ y_{it+1}^j - y_{it}^j = \gamma_{it+1}^j + X_{it+1}^j \beta_{it+1}^j - \gamma_{it}^j - X_{it}^j \beta_{it}^j \]  

This observed change can be imputed to three different effects: i) the shift in the country specific intercept, ii) the shift in the slope parameters and iii) the growth in the inputs. The first two effects are what one usually refers to as productivity change, while the last effect is an input growth effect. To isolate the productivity effect from the input growth effect we use a Malmquist logic, keeping some of the variables fixed while moving the others in order to separate the relative contribution of the different effects. TFP can be measured keeping the level of inputs at the base period level, obtaining the equivalent of the base period Malmquist productivity index:

\[ TFP_1 = \gamma_{it+1}^j - \gamma_{it}^j + X_{it+1}^j (\beta_{it+1}^j - \beta_{it}^j) \]  

Keeping the level of inputs at the comparison period value, we obtain the equivalent of the comparison period Malmquist productivity index:

\[ TFP_2 = \gamma_{it+1}^j - \gamma_{it}^j + X_{it+1}^j (\beta_{it+1}^j - \beta_{it}^j) \]  

and to avoid the arbitrariness of choosing the base, we use the geometric mean of these two
indexes in order to get an index of productivity growth:

\[ TFP_{it}^j = \frac{1}{2} (TFP_1 + TFP_2) = \gamma_{it+1}^j - \gamma_{it}^j + \frac{1}{2} (X_{it}^j + X_{it+1}^j) \left( \beta_{it+1}^j - \beta_{it}^j \right) \]  

(12)

The input growth effect or factor accumulation effect (FD) can be computed using the same logic. The base period index is:

\[ FD_1 = (X_{it+1}^j - X_{it}^j) \beta_{it}^j \]  

(13)

The comparison period index is:

\[ FD_2 = (X_{it+1}^j - X_{it}^j) \beta_{it+1}^j \]  

(14)

Finally, we use the geometric mean as a measure of the input growth effect:

\[ FD_{it}^j = \frac{1}{2} (FD_1 + FD_2) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \beta_{it}^j + \beta_{it+1}^j \right) (X_{it+1}^j - X_{it}^j) \]  

(15)

It is easy to verify that the two effects are an exhaustive and mutually exclusive decomposition of the log change in output per worker:

\[ y_{it+1}^j - y_{it}^j = TFP_{it}^j + FD_{it}^j \]  

(16)

Therefore TFP has the standard interpretation of being the difference between output growth and input growth between two time periods. Moreover, since we allow for a time-varying slopes in the production function, the TFP measure defined in (12) incorporates any possible bias in technical change that could occur. All these components are country and time specific.

We now turn our attention to the aggregation of these quantities across sectors in order to obtain the effect of sectoral TFP growth onto aggregate labour productivity (ALP). Since we use EU-KLEMS data, output will be proxied by gross output and our input vector consist basically of 3 quantities: number of hours worked, capital services and intermediate inputs (II).
The following accounting identity will hold in each sector for each time period:

\[ VA_{it}^j = GO_{it}^j - II_{it}^j \]

i.e. value added is equal to the difference between the value of gross output and the value of intermediate inputs. Aggregating across sectors one obtains:

\[ VA_{it} = GO_{it} + II_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} (GO_{it}^j - II_{it}^j) \]

Since we use a volume measure of gross output \( Q_{it}^j \) and a volume measure of intermediate inputs \( M_{it}^j \), the associated price indexes will be: \( P_{it}^j = \frac{GO_{it}^j}{Q_{it}^j} \) and \( W_{it}^j = \frac{II_{it}^j}{M_{it}^j} \). In each time period gross output for the economy is equal to

\[ GO_{it} = P_{it}Q_{it} = \sum_{j=1}^{J} P_{it}^j Q_{it}^j \]

For the economy at aggregate level, we have aggregate labour equal to \( L_{it} = \sum_j L_{it}^j \) and aggregate labour productivity:

\[ Y_{it} = \frac{Q_{it}}{L_{it}} = \sum_j \frac{Q_{it}^j}{L_{it}^j} = \sum_j \frac{Q_{it}^j}{L_{it}^j} \cdot \frac{L_{it}^j}{L_{it}} = \sum_j s_{it}^j Y_{it}^j \]

The change in aggregate labour productivity is:

\[ \frac{Y_{it+1}}{Y_{it}} = \frac{\sum_j s_{it+1}^j Y_{it+1}^j}{\sum_j s_{it}^j Y_{it}^j} \]

This can be decomposed as:

\[ ALP = \frac{Y_{it+1}}{Y_{it}} = \frac{\sum_j s_{it+1}^j Y_{it+1}^j}{\sum_j s_{it}^j Y_{it}^j} = \frac{\sum_j s_{it+1}^j Y_{it+1}^j}{\sum_j s_{it}^j Y_{it}^j} = SC \cdot SLP \]

The first terms can be written as:

\[ SC = \sum_j \delta_{it}^j \frac{s_{it+1}^j}{s_{it}^j} \]
where \( \sum_j \delta^j_t = \sum_j \frac{s^j_{it} Y^j_{it+1}}{\sum_j s^j_{it} Y^j_{it+1}} = 1 \). The second term can be expressed as:

\[
SLP = \sum_j \pi^j_{it} \frac{Y^j_{it+1}}{Y^j_{it}}
\]

with \( \sum_j \pi^j_{it} = \sum_j \frac{s^j_{it} Y^j_{it}}{\sum_j s^j_{it} Y^j_{it}} = 1 \). Since sectoral labour productivity growth is equal to the product of total factor productivity (TFP) and factor deepening (FD) we may further decompose the index in equation (17). In fact, TFP can be aggregated using gross output shares as weights (see Zelenyuk, 2006):

\[
TFP_{it} = \sum \theta^j_{it} TFP^j_{it}
\]

where \( \theta^j_{it} = \frac{GO^j_{it}}{\sum_j s^j_{it} Y^j_{it}} \). The capital deepening component is obtained residually as the ratio of the previous two indexes. Therefore the overall aggregate decomposition for each country in each year will be:

\[
ALP = SC \cdot SLP = SC \cdot TFP \cdot KD
\]

5 Empirics

The EU-KLEMS dataset is an official project that collects input and output data on prices and quantities for 26 industrialized countries in the time span 1970-2007 (see O’Mahony and Timmer (2009)). For each industry the database provides value data on gross output, capital compensation, intermediate inputs (materials and energy) along with fixed base price and quantity index numbers (1995=100). We used the amount of total hours worked by persons engaged as a proxy for the quantity of labour (the alternative of using the number of persons engaged is less satisfactory). Since gross output, intermediate inputs and capital services are measured in local currencies we used PPPs to adjust for cross-sectional differential in the general level of prices. PPPs indexes use US as benchmark (US=100, 1995=100), are sector specific (i.e., each sector has different PPPs) and different for sectoral output, intermediate inputs and capital services (i.e., there are three sets of PPPs). Due to lack of data (missing values) we limit our attention to a subset of data, specifically 13 countries and 20 industrial sectors in the time span 1977-2007. The list of countries and sectors is reported in Table 1.
We build a balanced panel dataset in the following way. Let $j = 1, \ldots, 20$ be the sector and $i = 1, \ldots, 13$ the country, then the index of sectoral output for country $i$ at time $t$ $Y_{it}^j$ is:

$$Y_{it}^j = \frac{GO_{i1995}^j}{PPP_{i}^j I_{it}^j}$$

(19)

where $GO_{i1995}^j$ is the value of gross output in 1995 for sector $j$ in country $i$; $I_{it}^j$ is the fixed base index of sectoral output quantity change between time $t$ and the base period 1995; $PPP_{i}^j$ is the purchasing power parity of country $i$ in sector $j$. With a similar procedure quantity index numbers are built for intermediate output (materials) and capital services. With this procedure we obtain a “true” balanced panel data set where cross-sectional (cross-country) comparability is built using PPPs and time comparability is built using fixed base quantity index numbers. This procedure guarantees that in each time period countries can be compared. The result is a quantity index number that proxies sectoral output production, a quantity index number proxying capital services, a quantity index number that proxies the level of materials used and the number of hours worked for the labour input. All the variables obtained with this procedure have been normalized by the sample minimum. The usual procedure of normalizing variables by sample mean is very unfruitful in our modeling setting. In fact, consider that the sign of the capital bias component depends on: the sign of $[\beta_{kt+1} - \beta_{kt}]$ that is common to all countries and the sign of $(\log k_{it+1} + \log k_{it})$ that is country specific. Now, if we normalize by the sample mean for a positive (negative) sign of $[\beta_{kt+1} - \beta_{kt}]$ the countries below the sample mean will have a negative (positive) capital bias, while the countries above the mean will have a positive (negative) capital bias. This is unreasonable, since although the magnitude of the capital bias should be proportional to the quantity of capital used, it should be monotonic for all the countries, i.e. the same for all the countries. This is guaranteed by a transformation by the sample minimum.

Our main empirical results are reported in Table 2. We report aggregate labour productivity growth (ALP) and its decomposition into the three components described in Section 4: structural change (SC), TFP and factor deepening (FD). We report the average growth rate for each component in each decade and for the whole period. With the exemption of Japan, TFP growth is very stable across the different decades for all countries at values between 0.2-
0.5%. Structural change has been slightly negative for most countries in these decades while the main contributor to labour productivity growth has been factor deepening. For example, by looking at US figures it is clear that SC and TFP are stable across decades and the main driver in the differences in labour productivity growth is a factor deepening effect. This trend is quite similar in the sample of countries considered in this study. In fact, the main changes in aggregate labour productivity growth are driven by the factor deepening component. This is clear by looking, for example, at the trends of Italy: TFP growth is quite stable (below 0.2%), as it is the structural change component (exception in the first decade). The dramatic drop in aggregate labour productivity growth from 2.9% in the second decade to 1.0% in the first decade is basically entirely explained by the factor deepening component. Japan is the only exception to this main trend, with the highest TFP growth of 0.7% on average on the entire period. It should also be noted that though at a low level, TFP growth is always positive for all countries in all decades. This point to the fact that even if TFP is not the main component of labour productivity growth, it is yet very stable at a positive rate.

![Table 2 here](image)

The parameter estimates for the 28 sectors as well as residual analysis are available from the authors and will be included in the next version of the paper.

## 6 Conclusions

In this paper we propose an econometric method to estimate sectoral level production functions for a group of 13 OECD countries in the years 1977-2006. We use the sectoral production functions to decompose sectoral labour productivity growth into a TFP component and a factor deepening component. We then aggregate these components to obtain a decomposition of aggregate labour productivity growth for the entire economy into three components: structural change, aggregate TFP and aggregate factor deepening. The structural change component represents the effect of labour displacement across the different sectors of the economy. The empirical results point to the fact that the factor deepening component accounts for the lion’s share of aggregate labour productivity growth. Aggregate TFP growth (with the exception of Japan) ranges between 0.2-0.5% per annum across the whole period for all countries. Structural
change has had a slightly negative effect for some of the countries in the sample and does not represent a major contributor to long run aggregate labour productivity growth.
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Tables and Figures
Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Labour</th>
<th>Capital</th>
<th>Materials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wood and products of wood and cork</td>
<td>Min 828</td>
<td>Max 13,440</td>
<td>Min 21</td>
<td>Max 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coke, refined petroleum and nuclear fuel</td>
<td>Min 594</td>
<td>Max 26,013</td>
<td>Min 1</td>
<td>Max 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals and chemical</td>
<td>Min 2,396</td>
<td>Max 72,095</td>
<td>Min 29</td>
<td>Max 488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubber and plastics</td>
<td>Min 960</td>
<td>Max 29,991</td>
<td>Min 21</td>
<td>Max 421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-metallic mineral</td>
<td>Min 1,478</td>
<td>Max 25,253</td>
<td>Min 22</td>
<td>Max 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery, nec</td>
<td>Min 3,363</td>
<td>Max 60,374</td>
<td>Min 44</td>
<td>Max 922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post and telecommunications</td>
<td>Min 840</td>
<td>Max 56,011</td>
<td>Min 66</td>
<td>Max 748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food, beverages and tobacco</td>
<td>Min 5,235</td>
<td>Max 91,369</td>
<td>Min 62</td>
<td>Max 1,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles, textile, leather and footwear</td>
<td>Min 959</td>
<td>Max 31,519</td>
<td>Min 14</td>
<td>Max 926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulp, paper, paper, printing and publishing</td>
<td>Min 3,088</td>
<td>Max 54,036</td>
<td>Min 50</td>
<td>Max 874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic metals and fabricated metal</td>
<td>Min 2,735</td>
<td>Max 87,388</td>
<td>Min 68</td>
<td>Max 1,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and optical equipment</td>
<td>Min 1,274</td>
<td>Max 77,569</td>
<td>Min 50</td>
<td>Max 1,214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport equipment</td>
<td>Min 1,004</td>
<td>Max 86,388</td>
<td>Min 19</td>
<td>Max 809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing nec; recycling</td>
<td>Min 1,255</td>
<td>Max 22,571</td>
<td>Min 26</td>
<td>Max 521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport and storage</td>
<td>Min 5,281</td>
<td>Max 79,752</td>
<td>Min 21</td>
<td>Max 2,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, hunting, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>Min 3,912</td>
<td>Max 40,804</td>
<td>Min 111</td>
<td>Max 2,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>Min 128</td>
<td>Max 22,024</td>
<td>Min 5</td>
<td>Max 250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas and water supply</td>
<td>Min 1,388</td>
<td>Max 42,786</td>
<td>Min 19</td>
<td>Max 310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Min 10,350</td>
<td>Max 161,265</td>
<td>Min 226</td>
<td>Max 3,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>Min 2,471</td>
<td>Max 59,378</td>
<td>Min 83</td>
<td>Max 2,643</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: EU-KLEMS Dataset. List of countries included: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, UK, USA.
### Table 2: Decomposition of Aggregate Labour Productivity Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>SLP</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>TFP</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>SLP</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>TFP</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>SLP</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>TFP</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
<td>SLP</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>TFP</td>
<td>FD</td>
<td>ALP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>-0.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUT</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEL</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DNK</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESP</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRA</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GER</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITA</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPN</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLD</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Appendix

#### A.1 Backward Filter- Classical Smoother

The posterior distribution is $\alpha_t \sim N(\alpha_{tT}, P_{tT})$ where,
\[ a_{t|T} = a_{t|t} + B_t(a_{t+1|T} - a_{t+1|t}) \]
\[ P_{t|T} = P_{t|t} - B_t(P_{t+1|T} - P_{t+1|T})B_t' \]
\[ B_t = P_{t|t}P_{t+1|t}^{-1} \]
\[ a_{t+1|T} = a_{t+1|t+1} \]
\[ P_{t+1|T} = P_{t+1|t+1} \quad \text{where } t = t - 1, \ldots, 1 \]

### A.2 MCMC algorithm

For many technical derivations it is easier to work with the inverse of the variances, error precisions, than with the variances and thus the vector \( \theta \), is redefined \( \theta = [\delta_h, \delta_\beta, h_\epsilon] \), where \( h_\epsilon = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} \). Following the conventional Bayesian approach, priors for the state vector, \( \alpha_t \), and additional other parameters, here \( h_\epsilon \), need to be defined. The priors will be then updated via the likelihood function to obtain the conditional posterior densities. The distribution of the original state, \( \alpha_0 \), follows the literature and it is given by a diffuse prior \( N(0, P_0) \) where \( P_0 \) is sufficiently large. The prior for \( h_\epsilon \) is Gamma \( G(\kappa, \nu) \). It is noted that \( \delta_\epsilon, \delta_\beta \) are fixed throughout the running of the MCMC algorithm.

To summarise the priors used in this study are:

\[ p(\alpha_0, h_\epsilon) = p(\alpha_0)p(h_\epsilon) \]

\[ p(h_\epsilon) = f_G(m_0, n_0) \]
\[ p(\alpha_0) = f_N(0, \kappa) \text{ where } \kappa \text{ is sufficiently large.} \]

The likelihood for the state space model is:

\[ p(y_1, \ldots, y_T|h_\epsilon) = p(y|h_\epsilon) = p(y_1) \prod_{t=2}^{T} p(y_t|Y_{t-1}) \]

where \( Y_{t-1} = (y_1, \ldots, y_{t-1})' \)

\[ \log p(y_1, \ldots, y_T|h_\epsilon) = -\sum_{t=1}^{T} \frac{1}{2} \ln |F_t| - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^{T} y_t - Z_t a_{t|t-1} | F_t^{-1} (y_t - Z_t a_{t|t-1}) \]

The joint posterior is:

\[ p(\alpha, h_\epsilon|y) = p(\alpha_0, h_\epsilon)p(y_1) \prod_{t=2}^{T} p(y_t|Y_{t-1}) \]  

(21)

where \( \alpha = [\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_T]' \); \( y = [y_1, \ldots, y_T]' \)

\( h_\epsilon \) can be easily to sample from (21), but it is not the case for \( \alpha \). An alternative way to sample \( \alpha_t \) is to use MCMC algorithm; and the following joint density function is adopted.

\[ p(\alpha, h_\epsilon|y) = p(\alpha)p(h_\epsilon)p(y|\alpha, h_\epsilon) \]  

(22)

where

\[ p(y|\alpha, h_\epsilon) = \prod_{t=1}^{T} (2\pi h_\epsilon^{-1})^{-1/2} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} h_\epsilon (y_t - Z_t \alpha_t)' (y_t - Z_t \alpha_t) \right) \]

\[ p(\alpha) = p(\alpha_0) \prod_{t=1}^{T} p(\alpha_t|\alpha_{t-1}) \]

The full expression is \( p(\alpha|\delta) = p(\alpha_0) \prod_{t=1}^{T} p(\alpha_t|\alpha_{t-1}, \Delta) \). We suppress \( \Delta \) here for \( \Delta \) is fixed throughout MCMC algorithm.
• **Block 1:** Draw \( \alpha \) from \( p(\alpha | y, h_c) \)

Many methods have been proposed in the literature to draw the state vector such as Carter and Kohn (1994), Fruhwirth-Schnatter (1994), DeJong and Shephard (1995) and Durbin and Koopman (2002). The Durbin and Koopman (2002) method with some modifications will be applied here.

- **Step 1:** Sample \( \eta^+ \) from \( N(0, Q_t) \), \( \alpha_0^+ \) from \( N(\alpha_0, P_0) \), \( \epsilon^+_t \) from \( N(0, H_t) \). Then use equation (3) and (4) to generate the \( y^+, \alpha^+ \).

- **Step 2:** Use the Kalman Filter (7) and Smoother (20) equations to compute the smoothed vector \( \hat{\alpha} = E(\alpha | y) \), and \( \hat{\alpha}^+ = E(\alpha^+ | y^+) \) (where \( \hat{\alpha} \) is the smoothed estimate given the actual observation \( y^+ \) whereas \( \hat{\alpha}^+ \) is the smoothed estimate given the sampled observation \( y^+ \)).

- **Step 3:** Following Durbin and Koopman (2002), \( \tilde{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha}^+ - \hat{\alpha}^+ + \alpha^+ \) is considered as the draw \( \alpha \) from \( p(\alpha | y, h_c) \)

• **Block 2:** Draw \( h_c \) from \( p(h_c)p(y|h_c) \) which is the Gamma distribution \( G(\frac{s^t}{2}, \frac{\nu^t}{2}) \) where

\[
\begin{align*}
s^t_c &= 1 + s^*_{t-1} \\
\nu^t_c &= \nu^*_{t-1} + \frac{\nu^t_{t-1}}{s^*_{t-1}} \left[ (y_t - Z_t a_{t|t-1})' F_t^{-1}(y_t - Z_t a_{t|t-1}) \right]
\end{align*}
\]

**B The Estimated Model**

The empirical model estimated in this paper is a translog function where the parameters of the square and cross-product terms are kept as time invariant. Thus, we can re-write the model (3) as

\[
\begin{align*}
y_t &= Z_t \alpha_t + M_t \beta + \epsilon_t & \epsilon_t & \sim N(0, H_t) \quad (23) \\
\alpha_t &= \alpha_{t-1} + \eta_t & \eta_t & \sim N(0, Q_t) \quad (24)
\end{align*}
\]

where

\[
\begin{align*}
y_t & \sim N \times 1; \ t = 1, ..., T \\
Z^t_t = [ I_N \ X_t ]; \ X_t \text{ is } N \times K_1 \\
\alpha_t & = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma_t \\ \beta_t \end{bmatrix} \text{ is the } m \times 1 \text{ state vector; } \alpha_0 \sim N(\alpha_0, P_0); \text{ where } m = N + K_1 \\
M_t & \sim N \times K_2, \text{ and } K_1 + K_2 = K \\
\beta & \text{ are the parameters attached to the regressors in } M_t \\
\beta_0 & \sim N(b_0, P_0) \\
\epsilon_t & \sim N(0, H_t); \ H_t = \sigma^2_t I_N
\end{align*}
\]
To estimate this model we used a slightly modified algorithm that estimates $\beta$ as a separate block in the Gibbs sampler.

### B.1 The filter

**Forward Filter**

Posterior at period $t-1$

$$\alpha_{t-1} \sim N(a_{t-1|t-1}, P_{t-1|t-1})$$

Prior at period $t$

$$\begin{align*}
\alpha_{t|t-1} & \sim N(a_{t|t-1}, P_{t|t-1}) \\
a_{t|t-1} & = a_{t-1|t-1} \\
P_{t|t-1} & = P_{t-1|t-1} + Q_t
\end{align*} \tag{25}$$

Forecast at $t$

$$\begin{align*}
y^*_{t|t-1} & \sim N(y^*_t, F_{t|t-1}) \\
\hat{y}_{t|t-1} & = Z^*_t a_{t|t-1} + M_t b \\
F_{t|t-1} & = Z^*_t P_{t|t-1} Z^*_t + H_t
\end{align*} \tag{26}$$

Posterior at $t$

$$\begin{align*}
\alpha_t & \sim N(a_{t|t}, P_{t|t}) \\
a_{t|t} & = a_{t|t-1} + K_t \nu_t \\
\nu_t & = y^*_t - Z^*_t a_{t|t-1} - M_t b \\
K_t & = P_{t|t-1} Z^*_t \nu_t \\
P_{t|t} & = P_{t|t-1} - K_t F_t K_t^{-1}
\end{align*} \tag{27}$$

The backward filter remains as in A.1.

### B.2 MCMC algorithm

The priors:

$$p(\alpha_0, h_\epsilon) = p(\alpha_0)p(\beta_0)p(h_\epsilon)$$

$$p(h_\epsilon) = f_G(\frac{\nu_0}{2}, \frac{\nu_0^2}{2})$$

$p(\alpha_0) = f_N(0, \kappa)$ where $\kappa$ is sufficiently large.

$p(\beta_0) = f_N(0, \kappa)$ where $\kappa$ is sufficiently large.

The likelihood for the state space model is:

$$p(y_1, \ldots, y_T|h_\epsilon) = p(y|h_\epsilon) = p(y_1) \prod_{t=2}^T p(y_t|Y_{t-1})$$

where $Y_{t-1} = (y'_1, \ldots, y'_{t-1})'$

$$\log p(y_1, \ldots, y_T|h_\epsilon) = -\frac{\nu_0^T}{2} N \ln 2\pi - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \ln |F_t| - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{t=1}^T \nu_t' F_t^{-1} \nu_t;$$

$$\nu_t = y_t - Z_t a_{t|t-1} - M_t b$$

The joint posterior is:
\[
p(\alpha, \beta, h_\epsilon | y) = p(\alpha_0, \beta_0, h_\epsilon) p(y_1) \prod_{t=2}^{T} p(y_t | Y_{t-1})
\]

(28)

where \( \alpha = [\alpha'_1, \ldots, \alpha'_T]' \); \( y = [y_1, \ldots, y_T] \)

\( h_\epsilon \) can be easily to sample from (28), but that is not the case for \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). An alternative way
to sample \( \alpha_t \) is to use MCMC algorithm; and the following joint density function is adopted.

\[
p(\alpha, h_\epsilon | y) = p(\alpha)p(\beta_0)p(h_\epsilon)p(y|\alpha, \beta, h_\epsilon)
\]

(29)

where

\[
p(y|\alpha, h_\epsilon) = \prod_{t=1}^{T} \left( \frac{1}{2\pi h_\epsilon} \right)^{-1/2} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} h_\epsilon (y_t - Z_t\alpha_t - M_t\beta)'(y_t - Z_t\alpha_t - M_t\beta) \right)
\]

\[
p(\alpha) = p(\alpha_0) \prod_{t=1}^{T} p(\alpha_t|\alpha_{t-1})
\]

**Block 1:** Draw \( \alpha \) from \( p(\alpha|y, \beta, h_\epsilon) \)

- Step 1: Sample \( \eta_t^+ \) from \( N(0, Q_t) \), \( \epsilon_0^+ \) from \( N(\alpha_0, P_0) \), \( \epsilon_t^+ \) from \( N(0, H_t) \). Then use equation (3) and (4) to generate the \( y^+, \alpha^+ \).

- Step 2: Use the Kalman Filter (27) and Smoother (20) equations to compute the smoothed vector \( \hat{\alpha} = E(\alpha|y) \), and \( \hat{\alpha}^+ = E(\alpha^+|y^+) \) (where \( \hat{\alpha} \) is the smoothed estimate given the actual observation \( y^+ \) whereas \( \hat{\alpha}^+ \) is the smoothed estimate given the sampled observation \( y^+ \)).

- Step 3: Following Durbin and Koopman (2002), \( \tilde{\alpha} = \hat{\alpha} - \hat{\alpha}^+ + \alpha^+ \) is considered as the draw \( \alpha \) from \( p(\alpha|y, h_\epsilon) \)

**Block 2:** Draw \( \beta \) from \( p(\beta_0)p(y|\alpha, \beta, h_\epsilon) \) which is the multivariate Normal distribution \( N(b, P) \)

\[
P = (P_0^{-1} + h_\epsilon \sum_{t=1}^{T} M_t' M_t)^{-1}
\]

\[
b = \overline{P} \left[ (P_0^{-1} b_0 + h_\epsilon \sum_{t=1}^{T} M_t (y_t - Z_t\alpha_t) \right]
\]

**Block 3:** Draw \( h_\epsilon \) from \( p(h_\epsilon)p(y|h_\epsilon) \) which is the Gamma distribution \( G(\frac{s_t^\epsilon}{2}, \frac{v_t^\epsilon}{2}) \) where

\[
s_t^\epsilon = 1 + s_{t-1}^\epsilon
\]

\[
v_t^\epsilon = v_{t-1}^\epsilon + \frac{v_{t-1}^\epsilon}{s_{t-1}^\epsilon} \left[ (y_t - Z_t\alpha_{t-1} - M_t b)' F_t^{-1}(y_t - Z_t\alpha_{t-1} - M_t b) \right]
\]
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