

# Urbanization with and without Structural Transformation\*

Douglas GOLLIN<sup>a</sup>

Rémi JEDWAB<sup>b</sup>

Dietrich VOLLRATH<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup> *Department of International Development, University of Oxford*

<sup>b</sup> *Department of Economics, George Washington University*

<sup>c</sup> *Department of Economics, University of Houston*

This Version: January 24th, 2012

**Abstract:** We document several new facts regarding urbanization and structural change in developing countries and develop a model that can account for them. Most developing countries follow a standard pattern: urbanization is a by-product of either a “push” from agricultural productivity growth or a “pull” from industrial productivity growth. In these countries urbanization occurs *with* structural transformation and cities are “production cities”, with a mix of workers in tradable and non-tradable sectors. For a distinct subset of countries that rely on natural resource exports, however, urbanization has increased at an equally rapid pace, but it is not associated with an increased importance of manufacturing and services in GDP. In these countries urbanization has taken place in “consumption cities” where the mix of workers is heavily skewed towards non-tradable services. We adapt a standard model of structural transformation to explain how natural resources can both drive urbanization as well as shift the composition of the urban labor force. The model may help explain why natural resource exporters - and Sub-Saharan Africa in particular - have experienced urbanization without structural transformation, which has implications for the pace of long-run growth in these areas.

**Keywords:** Urbanization; Structural Transformation; Resource Curse; Africa

**JEL classification:** L16; N17; O18; O40; O55; R10

---

\*Douglas Gollin, University of Oxford (e-mail: Douglas.Gollin@qeh.ox.ac.uk). Remi Jedwab, George Washington University (e-mail: jedwab@gwu.edu). Dietrich Vollrath, University of Houston (devollrath@uh.edu). We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Institute for International Economic Policy and the Elliott School of International Affairs (SOAR) at GWU.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Urbanization is typically seen as a consequence of economic development, to the point that urbanization rates are often used as a proxy for income per capita. As a country develops, the process of structural transformation from agriculture into manufacturing and services involves a shift of labor out of rural areas and into urban ones. In typical closed-economy models of this process, urbanization and the structural transformation are mechanically linked through a combination of a low income elasticity for food and the assumption that manufacturing and services are predominantly or exclusively urban activities.

However, across countries today there is not a particularly strong association between urbanization and the fraction of economic activity engaged in manufacturing and services. Figure 1 plots these values for the year 2000 for 119 developing countries, along with a quadratic fit. As can be seen, there are a number of countries that are highly urbanized without having seen a large shift of economic activity towards manufacturing and services. The data even point towards a *negative* relationship for countries that are at particularly low levels of manufacturing and services in GDP.

An explanation for this muddled relationship can be seen by breaking up the sample based on the importance of natural resources exports – a term that we define here as including agricultural exports.<sup>1</sup> Within figure 2 countries with natural resources exports as a percent of GDP over 10% are denoted in grey. They make up the vast majority of the countries that do not conform to the standard model of urbanization being coincident with increasing manufacturing and services in GDP. This can be seen more clearly in figures 3 and figures 4. The first shows only those countries for which natural resource exports make up less than 10% of GDP. Here we see, aside from the outlier of Sierra Leone, countries that line up neatly with the expectations of standard models of structural change. The increased importance of manufacturing and services in output is tightly associated with a greater fraction of population living in urban areas. Figure 4, by contrast, shows that among countries with large natural resource export shares, there is no significant relationship between manufacturing and services and the urbanization rate. Many of these countries have achieved high levels of urbanization without an associated structural transformation towards manufacturing and services. Figure 5 confirms that their urbanization process is positively associated with the export of natural resources.

One reason for this pattern might be that natural resource production or exports are themselves large employers of urban workers. But particularly given our measure of resource exports, which includes agriculture, this is almost certainly not the case. Urbanization in these countries is not driven by meaningful shifts of labor into urban areas to work in the natural resource sector. Point-source natural resources (e.g., oil and minerals) are highly capital-intensive, and production of these commodities creates very little direct employment. For example, Angola's urbanization rate was 15% before oil was discovered in the 1960's, but it was 60% in 2010. While crude oil now accounts for over 50% of GDP it employs fewer than 10,000 nationals and a small number of expatriates. Botswana has a similar urbanization rate to Angola, and while the diamond sector accounts for 36% of GDP, it only provides employment for approximately 13,000 people. Cash crops and timber in other countries are produced in rural areas and contribute to *rural* employment, rather than urban employment.

In this paper we study the role of natural resources in creating a divergence between the processes of urbanization and structural transformation. We first establish that the patterns seen in figures 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 are robust relative to other determinants of urbanization. In addition, we document a distinct difference in the composition of urban labor in countries related to the importance of natural resources in output. For countries in which resources are unimportant, we see what we term “production cities”. Consistent with standard models of structural transformation, these cities have a sizable share of labor producing tradable goods such as manufactures. In contrast, for countries that do have significant natural resource exports, urbanization involves “consumption cities”, where almost none of the labor is engaged in producing tradable goods, but instead works in non-tradable sectors such as personal services.

---

<sup>1</sup>Our category of “natural resource exports” could thus be more appropriately characterized as “primary product exports,” in keeping with a longstanding tradition. In fact, the agriculture share of natural resource exports is quite large for many of our countries.

The first part of the paper establishes some empirical regularities with respect to urbanization and economic structure. An important contribution of our paper is purely to point out the flaws in standard assumptions that urbanization is accompanied by manufacturing or industrialization. This seems to have been an accurate depiction of urbanization in many of today's rich countries, and it also seems to have characterized patterns of development in much of East and Southeast Asia. It does not, however, provide an accurate picture of urbanization in sub-Saharan Africa. We believe that documenting the differential patterns of urbanization is important for both economic theory and policy.

The second part of our paper offers a theoretical framework for thinking about the different paths to urbanization. To account for the patterns in the data, we modify a standard model of structural change along several dimensions. The two main changes are to allow for an explicit natural resource sector and to allow for the possibility that our model economy is open to trade. Our model economy has multiple goods: natural resources and food are assumed to be produced in rural areas. Resources are considered tradable, while we treat food as non-tradable. Two other goods are produced in cities. We define one to be a tradable urban sector, corresponding loosely to manufacturing plus tradable services – an increasingly important sector in some developing countries. The other we define as a non-tradable sector, corresponding loosely to urban services. Like many models of structural transformation, we assume a form for preferences that gives rise to non-homotheticities in demand. Specifically, rising incomes are associated with increasing budget shares for the goods produced in urban areas.

In the equilibrium with trade, economies with relatively high productivity in the resource sector will have a comparative advantage in that good. They will thus shift labor towards the resource sector and out of the urban tradables sector. This implies that the composition of urban activity shifts to non-tradable goods, leading to the “consumption cities” we see in the data. Although high levels of productivity in the resource sector do induce some shift of labor towards the natural resource sector, urbanization can still increase as the additional income earned through selling resources at high world prices shifts domestic demand towards urban goods. Hence resource-rich economies can experience urbanization without significant improvements in either agricultural, manufacturing, or service sector productivity.

Within the framework of our model, we consider the consequences of the different types of urbanization on long-run outcomes. Many economists have argued that tradable manufacturing sectors are capable of higher labor productivity growth than non-tradable services (Timmer & Vries, 2007; Duarte & Restuccia, 2010; Rodrik, 2011). In this case, the economic composition of urban areas may matter for aggregate productivity growth. Natural resource exporters that urbanize through “consumption cities” will experience slower productivity growth than countries urbanizing according to the standard model. By skewing the urban mix away from faster-growing sectors, in the long-run resource-rich countries may end up urbanized but relatively poor.

This paper is related to a large body of work on the role of sectoral labor productivity in driving structural change; i.e. the decline in agriculture, the rise and fall of manufacturing, and the rise of services (see Herrendorf, Rogerson & Valentinyi 2011a for a survey of the literature). A first strand of the literature looks at the origins of structural change in developed countries. The “labor push” approach shows how a rise in agricultural productivity (what we might think of as a *Green Revolution*) reduces the “food problem” and releases labor for the modern sector (Schultz, 1953; Gollin, Parente & Rogerson, 2002, 2007; Nunn & Qian, 2011; Michaels, Rauch & Redding, 2012). The “labor pull” approach describes how a rise in non-agricultural productivity (an *industrial revolution*) attracts underemployed labor from agriculture into the modern sector (Lewis, 1954; Harris & Todaro, 1970; Hansen & Prescott, 2002; Lucas, 2004; Alvarez-Cuadrado & Poschke, 2011). A second strand of the literature studies whether income effects or price effects explain structural change. Non-homothetic preferences and rising incomes mean a reallocation of expenditure shares towards non-agricultural goods (Caselli & Coleman II, 2001; Gollin, Parente & Rogerson, 2002, 2007; Matsuyama, 1992, 2002; Voigtländer & Voth, 2006; Galor & Mountford, 2008; Duarte & Restuccia, 2010; Alvarez-Cuadrado & Poschke, 2011). Ngai & Pissarides (2007) and Acemoglu & Guerrieri (2008) see structural change as a consequence of price effects: assuming a low elasticity of substitution across consumption goods, any relative increase in the productivity of one sector leads to a relative decrease in its employment share. Buera & Kaboski (2009), Yi & Zhang (2011), Herrendorf,

Rogerson & Valentinyi (2011*b*) and Michaels, Rauch & Redding (2012) adopt or compare both approaches. According to the income effects approach, any rise in sectoral productivity leads to a reallocation of labor from inferior goods to superior goods. According to the price effects approach, the patterns in structural change can only be explained by a rise in agricultural productivity followed by a rise in manufacturing productivity.

We make several contributions to this literature. First, we document that the processes of urbanization and structural change are not entirely synonymous. It is quite possible for an economy to urbanize without any change in agricultural and manufacturing productivity, which are the only sources of structural change in standard models. (Corden & Neary, 1982; Matsuyama, 1992; Echevarria, 2008; Galor & Mountford, 2008; Teigner, 2011; Yi & Zhang, 2011). Our second contribution relates to the literature on urbanization in developing countries. The economic geography literature suggests that agglomeration promotes growth, in both developed countries (Rosenthal & Strange, 2004; Henderson, 2005) and developing countries (Overman & Venables, 2005; Henderson, 2010; Felkner & Townsend, 2011). Given that urbanization is a form of agglomeration, it has been argued that cities could promote growth in developing countries (Duranton, 2008; Venables, 2010; World Bank, 2009; McKinsey, 2011).<sup>2</sup> What we show here is that the composition of urban areas differs based on the source of the urbanization, and we propose that the “consumption cities” found in natural resource exporters may well be less effective at promoting developing than standard “production cities”. By showing that urbanization need not be universally positive, our setting provides an explanation for the growing “urbanization of global poverty” (Ravallion, Chen & Sangraula, 2007).

Finally, this paper contributes to the literature on Dutch disease and the resource curse (Corden & Neary, 1982; Matsuyama, 1992; Sachs & Warner, 2001; Robinson, Torvik & Verdier, 2006; Angrist & Kugler, 2008; Michaels, 2011; Caselli & Michaels, 2012). Dutch disease models suggest that a country is likely to deindustrialize when its resource sector booms. The boom shifts labor and other resources away from the manufacturing sector into the non-tradable service sector. But the net effect on urbanization is ambiguous. These models do not explain why resource-rich developing countries have urbanized with almost no industrialization. In some sense, we highlight a new dimension of the resource curse – the rise of “consumption cities” that do not produce the same agglomeration economies that are found in typical urban areas.

The paper is organized as follows: Section 2 describes in greater detail the differential patterns of structural transformation in Asia and Africa and provides a more detailed motivation for examining the differences between the two. Section 3 outlines a model of structural transformation in a closed economy. Section 4 extends this model to an open economy. Section 5 examines the dynamics of the structural transformation process. Section 6 concludes.

## 2. PATTERNS OF URBANIZATION IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 showed simple cross-sectional correlations between urbanization and the share of manufacturing and services in GDP for a sample of developing countries. It is useful to consider patterns within specific regions of the world, as they display the correlations more starkly.

First consider figure 6, which plots population-weighted urbanization rates for four regions of the world from 1950–2010. Latin America and the Middle-East/North Africa have consistently had higher urbanization rates than Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia the entire period, but in all regions the urbanization rate roughly doubled over the last sixty years. Particularly interesting is that Sub-Saharan Africa and Asia track each other quite closely in terms of urbanization rates. Both regions are near 40 percent urbanization in 2010, despite the fact that Asia contains a number of the fastest growing nations in history (e.g. South Korea and China), while Sub-Saharan Africa has seen very little growth in income per capita over this period.

---

<sup>2</sup>For instance, McKinsey (2011) writes (p.3-19): “Africa’s long-term growth also will increasingly reflect interrelated social and demographic trends that are creating new engines of domestic growth. Chief among these are urbanization and the rise of the middle-class African consumer. [...] In many African countries, urbanization is boosting productivity (which rises as workers move from agricultural work into urban jobs), demand and investment.”

Urban growth has taken place in both Asia and Africa in cities of all sizes. Although the literature emphasizes the growth of the largest cities in the developing world, urban growth has in fact taken place in cities of all sizes - large, medium, and small. The distribution of city size across regions is quite similar, too. For example, in 2010, there were 257 Asian and 60 African “mega-cities” with over 750,000 inhabitants. Since Asia is roughly four times more populous than Africa, this means that Africa and Asia have approximately the same number of megacities per capita. The megacities represent around 40% of the urban population in both continents.

Asia is an example of the standard story of urbanization *with* structural transformation. The successful Asian economies typically went through both a Green Revolution and an industrial revolution, with urbanization following along as their economic activity shifted away from agricultural activities (Evenson & Gollin, 2003; Young, 2003; Bosworth & Collins, 2008; Brandt, Hsieh & Zhu, 2008; McMillan & Rodrik, 2011). Figure 7 shows that within Asia the expected pattern of urbanization and the share of manufacturing and services in GDP holds up well. The only exceptions are Brunei and Mongolia, which in contrast to most of Asia are heavily dependent on natural resource production.

In contrast, Africa offers a perfect example of urbanization *without* structural transformation. First, there has been little evidence of a Green Revolution in Africa. Its food yields have remained low (Evenson & Gollin, 2003; Caselli, 2005; Restuccia, Yang & Zhu, 2008); in 2009, cereal yields were 2.8 times lower than in Asia, while yields were 2.1 times lower for starchy roots. Second, there has been no industrial revolution in Africa. Its manufacturing and service sectors are relatively small and unproductive (McMillan & Rodrik, 2011; Badiane, 2011); in 2007, employment shares in industry and services were 10% and 26% for Africa, but 24% and 35% for Asia, and African labor productivity was 1.7 and 3.5 times lower in industry and services, respectively (World Bank, 2010).

Yet despite the lack of the standard “push” out of agriculture or “pull” from industry, Africa has urbanized to the same level as Asia over the last half-century. As can be seen in figure 8, there is no tendency for countries that are urbanized to be heavily involved in manufacturing and services. However, figure 9 shows that urbanization in Africa is positively associated with the importance of natural resources exports in GDP. As noted previously, there is little evidence that this relationship is driven by increased numbers of resource workers in urban areas. Rather, Africa’s urbanization appears to be driven by a *natural resource revolution* that provides a different origin for a “push” into urban areas as the increased purchasing power made available from resources increases demand for urban goods (Jedwab, 2012). We find an “Asian” pattern for Latin American and Caribbean countries and an “African” pattern for Middle-East and Northern African countries.<sup>3</sup>

Within Africa, the importance of natural resources to the process of urbanization can be seen over time. Figure 10 plots population-weighted urbanization rates from 1950–2000 for four groups of African countries. The groups are based on the average share of natural resources in total exports in 1960–2000. As can be seen, those countries that rely more heavily on resources are more highly urbanized over this entire period, and the relationship is essentially monotonic within each year.

## 2.1 Cross-sectional Robustness Checks

Table 1 presents results of cross-sectional regressions using a sample of 119 developing countries from the year 2000. The first five columns use the urbanization rate as the dependent variable, regressed on the share of manufacturing and services in GDP as well as the share of natural resource exports in GDP. The regressions in Table 1 are all population weighted.

Column (1) shows that across the entire sample, with no other control variables, both variables have a significant positive relationship with urbanization. The positive effect of manufacturing and services fits with the standard model of structural change. However, the positive association of natural resource exports to urbanization is less obvious, given that natural resources employ very few workers directly

---

<sup>3</sup>See appendix for plots of these relationships.

and/or are based in rural areas (i.e. cocoa). The positive effects of both persist when we include regional fixed effects in column (2).

There are several alternative theories for urbanization in developing countries - and particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa - that may make the results in columns (1) and (2) spurious. A few studies argue that Africa has urbanized without it being fully explained by economic development (Bairoch, 1988; Fay & Opal, 2000). This excessive urbanization is attributed to pull and push factors feeding rural exodus. Some argue that Africa's urban growth can be attributed to rural poverty (Barrios, Bertinelli & Strobl, 2006; Poelhekke, 2010; de Janvry & Sadoulet, 2010). Others have focused on theories of urban bias, arguing that urban-biased policies have led to overurbanization and primacy in poor countries (Lipton, 1977; Bates, 1981; Ades & Glaeser, 1995; Davis & Henderson, 2003). Furthermore, if natural resource exporters systematically use different methods for calculating urbanization rates, the results may simply reflect measurement errors.

In column (3) we incorporate a number of other controls to account for several of these alternative theories as well as the possibility of measurement errors. These are country area in square kilometers, population in thousands, rural density, population growth from 1950–2000 (in percent), a dummy if a country is considered an autocracy, and a dummy for whether the country has experienced an interstate or civil conflict since independence. In addition, we include dummies for four different types of urban definitions used by developing countries. As can be seen in the table, the inclusion of these controls does not alter the positive association of natural resource exports with urbanization rates.<sup>4</sup>

The importance of natural resources for urbanization appears to depend, however, on the scale of natural resource exports, as in the figures shown in the introduction. In column (4) we run the same regression as in column (3), with all controls, but only for the 49 countries that have natural resource exports less than 10% of GDP. For these countries, one can see that manufacturing and services are strongly associated with urbanization, but that there now is no significant relationship to resource exports. In fact the coefficient has become negative. These countries fit the standard model of structural change and urbanization.

In column (5), the 70 countries that do have meaningful natural resource exports are used instead, and here one can see the strong positive effect of those exports on urbanization rates. There remains a positive effect of manufacturing and services in these countries, but the size of the effect is approximately half of the non-resource sample, and the significance has declined. For these countries, natural resource exports are a stronger predictor of urbanization rates than manufacturing and services.

Table 2 presents a set of further robustness checks and alternative specifications regarding the urbanization rate. Column (1) simply repeats our main specification for comparison purposes. Column (2) allows for non-linear effects of the control variables by using their squares in the regression. In column (3) the standard errors are clustered at the region level, where regions refer to groupings below the continent level (see the appendix for a full description). Column (4) uses equal weightings for each country, as opposed to population weights, while column (5) introduces region fixed effects, where regions also refer to the groupings mentioned above. As can be seen, in no case does the overall story of a positive effect of natural resources on urbanization change, although the coefficient dips in size in columns (4) and (5).

The relationship between resource and urbanization changes when we look within specific regions, however. For Asia, where in general countries rely little on natural resource exports, manufacturing and services are significantly related to urbanization and there is a negative (but insignificant) relationship with natural resource exports. In contrast, in column (7) one can see that for African countries there is a very strong relationship between resource exports and urbanization, while there is no effect of manufacturing and services. Within Africa, then, we do not see a coincidence of manufacturing/services and urbanization that is expected in standard models of structural change.

Finally, columns (8) and (9) show that the overall results for urbanization hold even if we only consider the primate city in each country, or if we only consider all but the primate city. Interestingly, natural resource exports do not increase urban primacy more than manufacturing and services.

---

<sup>4</sup>See the data appendix for a full description of the sources for all of these variables.

## 2.2 Composition of Urban Workforce

The evidence of the prior section established that natural resources are strongly associated with urbanization, particularly when we exclude nations for which resources are a small share of exports. Here we establish the second important fact regarding resources and urbanization, related to the composition of labor in urban areas.

At the aggregate level, we measure the importance of manufacturing work in urban areas by taking the ratio of manufacturing labor in all labor to the urbanization rate. Roughly, this gives us a measure of manufacturing labor relative to the total urban population. Obviously, this presumes that all manufacturing labor is urban, which is not necessarily true. So long as there are not systematic differences in the location of manufacturing work across countries, this should only result in additional noise in our regressions, raising the standard errors.

Table 1, columns (6)–(8) report the results of regressing the manufacturing employment to urban population ratio against our standard controls. As can be seen, there is no significant relationship between the manufacturing and services share of GDP with manufacturing employment. There is not much to make of this, given that the share in manufacturing and services is not necessarily monotonically related to the size of the manufacturing sector.

What we do see, however, is that an increased share of natural resources in exports has a significant negative relationship to manufacturing employment relative to urban population. The implication is that, for a given urban population, there are fewer manufacturing workers when resources increase in importance. Urbanization in these countries occurs with a smaller proportion of workers in manufacturing, and this differs distinctly from other places that conform to standard models. Natural resource exporters have fewer manufacturing workers in their urban areas.

We then use IPUMS census data to recreate the sectoral composition of the urban sector for selected developing countries around 2000. IPUMS uses a general recode of 12 industries, but we only focus on urban tradables, i.e. manufacturing (Mfg) and finance, insurance, real estate and business services (Fire). Table A.2 lists all the countries and years for which we estimated the employment share of urban tradables in total urban employment (%). First, using the IPUMS data figure 11 shows the relationship between the employment share of urban tradables in total urban employment (%) and the contribution of natural resource exports to GDP (%) for selected developing countries around 2000. We only select countries for which the urbanization rate is higher than 20% in 2000, so as to compare countries that have begun to experience a shift out of agriculture. As expected, we find a strong negative relationship between urban tradables employment and natural resource exports. Second, if many countries use different urban definitions, this could affect the employment share of urban tradables and the graphic analysis above. For example, a restrictive urban definition would mechanically exclude the small-sized agrotowns, while a narrow urban definition would only select large cities with a strong manufacturing sector. That is why we verify that we obtain the same negative relationship if we study the employment share of urban tradables for the largest city only. Table A.3 lists all the countries and years for which we estimated the employment share of urban tradables in total employment for the largest city (%). Figure 12 shows that this negative relationship is robust to using the largest city only. All in all, this confirms that cities in resource rich countries have less urban tradables, and are more “consumption cities” than “production cities”.

## 3. A MODEL OF STRUCTURAL CHANGE

Most developing countries conform to a standard model of structural change. Shifts of economic activity into urban areas are essentially synonymous with shifts into the manufacturing and service sectors. The source of these shifts, according to the standard models, are either agricultural productivity improvements that “push” labor into urban activities, or improvements in non-agricultural productivity that “pull” labor into urban areas. Our data show that a subset of countries - notably sub-Saharan Africa - are inconsistent with this standard model. They have urbanized to the same extent as other developing countries, but unlike most areas this urbanization is associated with an increased importance of natural resources.

In addition, the composition of urban activity in these areas is tilted towards non-tradable goods, “consumption cities” as we have termed them. In this section we adapt a simple model of structural change to incorporate additional features that allow us to account for the alternative path towards urbanization followed by resource-rich areas such as Sub-Saharan Africa.

### 3.1 Individual Utility and Budgets

Individuals have a constant-elasticity of substitution utility function

$$U_t = \left[ \theta_f^{1/\phi} (c_f - \bar{c}_f)^{(\phi-1)/\phi} + \theta_C^{1/\phi} C^{(\phi-1)/\phi} \right]^{\phi/(\phi-1)} \quad (1)$$

where  $c_f$  is the amount of food consumed and  $\bar{c}_f$  captures a subsistence amount of food that all individuals must consume. This utility for the food good is typical in models of structural change, as it leads to an income elasticity less than one for food, consistent with Engel’s law.

The term  $C$  is an aggregator of non-food consumption items. The parameter  $\phi$  determines the degree to which individuals are willing to substitute between food and the non-food consumption goods. We will go forward assuming that  $\phi \geq 1$ , implying that these goods are weak substitutes. This is consistent with explanations of structural change that emphasize changing relative prices. A change in relative prices that makes  $C$  cheaper will, even holding income constant, lead to a shift out of food consumption and towards  $C$ . However, the subsistence constraint for food,  $\bar{c}_f$ , implies a separate income effect that will shift demand towards non-food items as individuals become richer.<sup>5</sup>

The aggregator  $C$  is defined as

$$C = \left[ \theta_r^{1/\epsilon} c_r^{(\epsilon-1)/\epsilon} + \theta_n^{1/\epsilon} c_n^{(\epsilon-1)/\epsilon} + \theta_d^{1/\epsilon} c_d^{(\epsilon-1)/\epsilon} \right]^{\epsilon/(\epsilon-1)}, \quad (2)$$

also a constant elasticity of substitution function of three goods: resources ( $r$ ), non-tradables ( $n$ ), and tradables ( $d$ ).  $\theta_j$  are the weights individuals put on each good  $j$  and  $\epsilon$  is the elasticity of substitution between them. With this aggregate, we assume that  $\epsilon < 1$ , meaning the goods are complements. Anything that lowers the price of one of these goods will lead to increased consumption of the other goods.

The budget constraint is

$$p_f c_f + p_r c_r + p_n c_n + p_d c_d = w \quad (3)$$

where  $p_j$  are the prices of the goods and  $w$  is the wage. Individuals earn only labor income. It is useful to re-write the budget constraint as follows

$$p_f (c_f - \bar{c}_f) + p_r c_r + p_n c_n + p_d c_d = w - p_f \bar{c}_f \quad (4)$$

where  $w - p_f \bar{c}_f$  is the surplus income available to individuals after they have met their subsistence requirement for food.

Maximizing utility subject to this budget constraint, it is easiest to express the resulting demand functions in terms of expenditure shares. To aid in the exposition, define the following two price indices

$$P_C = \left[ p_r^{1-\epsilon} \theta_r + p_n^{1-\epsilon} \theta_n + p_d^{1-\epsilon} \theta_d \right]^{1/(1-\epsilon)} \quad (5)$$

$$P = \left[ p_f^{1-\phi} \theta_f + P_C^{1-\epsilon} \theta_C \right]^{1/(1-\phi)}. \quad (6)$$

The first,  $P_C$ , is a price index of the non-food goods, while the second is the aggregate price index. Total expenditures on “net” food ( $c_f - \bar{c}_f$ ) are given by

$$p_f (c_f - \bar{c}_f) = (w - p_f \bar{c}_f) \Omega_f, \quad (7)$$

<sup>5</sup>The alternative to assuming that  $\phi \geq 1$  is to insert positive endowments of the non-food items into the utility function. Our assumption is made solely to keep the notation simpler and will not materially alter the results.

where

$$\Omega_f = \frac{p_f^{1-\phi} \theta_f}{P^{1-\phi}} \quad (8)$$

is the fraction of surplus income that individuals spend on food over an above the subsistence constraint.

Given the fraction  $\Omega_f$ , the remaining  $1 - \Omega_f$  of surplus income is spent on the three non-food goods. The split of expenditures among the three goods is dictated by their price relative to the aggregate price  $P_C$ . Specifically, the fractions of surplus income expended on good  $j \in (r, n, d)$ , denoted  $\Omega_j$ , is

$$\Omega_j = (1 - \Omega_f) \frac{p_j^{1-\epsilon} \theta_j}{P_C^{1-\epsilon}}. \quad (9)$$

It is tedious but straightforward to confirm that  $\Omega_f + \Omega_r + \Omega_n + \Omega_d = 1$ . Once we have the production side of the economy in place, we will be able to use this demand structure to determine the allocation of labor across the various sectors of the economy.

### 3.2 Production and Factor Payments

The four goods are produced by technologies linear in labor. So for any given sector  $j$  the production technology is

$$Y_j = A_j L_j \quad (10)$$

for  $j \in (f, r, n, d)$ , where  $A_j$  is productivity in that sector and  $L_j$  is the labor employed in that sector.

Labor is assumed to move freely between the sectors so that in autarky the wage is equivalent to

$$w = p_f A_f = p_r A_r = p_n A_n = p_d A_d \quad (11)$$

which will be used to determine the relative prices between various goods. There is an adding up constraint for labor employed across the sectors

$$L = L_f + L_r + L_d + L_n + L_d. \quad (12)$$

To proceed, it will be useful to define two indices of productivity.

$$A_C = \left[ A_r^{\epsilon-1} \theta_r + A_n^{\epsilon-1} \theta_n + A_d^{\epsilon-1} \theta_d \right]^{1/(\epsilon-1)} \quad (13)$$

$$A = \left[ A_f^{\phi-1} \theta_f + A_C^{\phi-1} \theta_C \right]^{1/(\phi-1)}. \quad (14)$$

Note that an increase in the productivity in any individual sector raises both indices. Furthermore, using the definition of the aggregate price index given previously, it is the case that the real wage is

$$\frac{w}{P} = A. \quad (15)$$

Hence an increase in productivity in any sector raises the real wage.

### 3.3 Equilibrium in Autarky

To begin solving for the equilibrium allocation of labor to the various sectors, note that (11) shows that the relative price between any two sectors can be written as  $p_i/p_j = A_j/A_i$ . In addition, the relative price of food to the non-food aggregate can be expressed as  $p_f/p_C = A_C/A_f$ . Using these relative prices, we can

re-write the fractions of expenditures in terms of productivity levels. We have that

$$\Omega_f = \frac{A_f^{\phi-1} \theta_f}{A^{\phi-1}}. \quad (16)$$

From this, and given our assumption that  $\phi \geq 1$ , an increase in the productivity of the food sector will raise the fraction of surplus income spent on food. However, given that increased productivity in the food sector will also lower the amount spent on purchasing the subsistence amount, the fraction of total income spent on food will decline. An increase in the productivity of any of the non-food sectors will raise  $A$  and lower the fraction spent on food as individuals substitute away to the cheaper non-food items.

We can write the expenditure shares of the non-food items in terms of productivity levels as well,

$$\Omega_j = (1 - \Omega_f) \frac{A_j^{\epsilon-1} \theta_j}{A_C^{\epsilon-1}} \quad (17)$$

for  $j \in (r, n, d)$ . Here, an increase in the productivity of sector  $j$  has two conflicting effects. First, if  $A_j$  rises, this lowers  $\Omega_f$  as noted above, and this tends to increase  $\Omega_j$ . Secondly, though, an increase in  $A_j$  will lower  $\Omega_j$  due to our assumption that  $\epsilon < 1$ . An increase in the productivity of sector  $j$  lowers the price of good  $j$ . But as complements, the lower price of good  $j$  allows individuals to put more of their expenditures into other sectors.<sup>6</sup>

To solve for the equilibrium allocation of labor across sectors, we equate total expenditures on a given sector to the total value of goods produced in that sector. For  $j \in (r, n, d)$  we have that

$$L(w - p_f \bar{c}_f) \Omega_j = p_j Y_j \quad (18)$$

while for the food sector we have that

$$L(w - p_f \bar{c}_f) \Omega_f + L p_f \bar{c}_f = p_f Y_f \quad (19)$$

Given the definition of the production functions, the free mobility of labor, and the definitions of the  $\Omega$  terms, the solution for the fraction of labor employed in any given sector  $j \in (r, n, d)$  is

$$\frac{L_j}{L} = \left(1 - \frac{\bar{c}_f}{A_f}\right) \Omega_j \quad (20)$$

while the fraction employed in food production is

$$\frac{L_f}{L} = \left(1 - \frac{\bar{c}_f}{A_f}\right) \Omega_f + \frac{\bar{c}_f}{A_f}. \quad (21)$$

In each sector, the term  $(1 - \bar{c}_f/A_f)$  represents the surplus time available to workers after they have worked long enough to afford their subsistence amount of food. The expenditure shares  $\Omega$  determine how much of that surplus time is allocated to each sector. For food production, we must also add back in the labor employed producing the subsistence requirement.

Given our solutions for labor allocations, we can also describe the level of urbanization in the economy. We are assuming that the non-tradable and tradable workers constitute the urban population.<sup>7</sup> Hence the urbanization rate is simply

$$u = \frac{L_n}{L} + \frac{L_d}{L} = \left(1 - \frac{\bar{c}_f}{A_f}\right) (\Omega_n + \Omega_d). \quad (22)$$

<sup>6</sup>For sufficiently high levels of  $\Omega_f$ , indicating a large portion of surplus income spent on food, the first effect will dominate and an increase in productivity in a sector will increase the expenditure share on that sector.

<sup>7</sup>Clearly this is an over-simplification. However, it accords with the general patterns of employment in developing countries. Additionally, we ignore the distribution of the urban population across different cities, and do not consider the origin or implications of primate cities.

Urbanization will occur for the standard reasons discussed in models of structural change. Increased food sector productivity has two effects on urbanization. First,  $A_f$  rising will increase surplus income, releasing labor into other activities. This is captured by the  $(1 - \bar{c}_f/A_f)$  term. Secondly, an increase in  $A_f$  will lower the relative price of food, and given our assumption that it is substitutable with the other goods this will draw labor *into* food production. It is straightforward to show that, on net, the first effect dominates and labor is “pushed” into urban areas following an increase in  $A_f$ .

An increase in productivity in either (or both) urban sectors will “pull” labor into urban areas and lead to urbanization. Higher levels of  $A_d$  or  $A_n$  lower their relative price, and this induces a substitution away from food and into other sectors. Additionally, an increase in either sector’s productivity acts as an increase in the real wage, and given the low income elasticity of food, this also induces a shift towards non-food sectors.

In addition to these standard channels to urbanization, there is also the effect of an increase in productivity in the resource sector. As noted previously, increasing resource productivity has two conflicting effects. The first is to lower the relative price of resources, and this causes individuals to substitute away from food and towards resources, raising the expenditure share on resources and hence the labor share in resources. However, the lower relative price of resources will cause individuals to shift expenditure away from resources and towards tradables and non-tradables. When expenditure shares on food are large - as in developing countries generally - then the first effect dominates and the size of the resource sector actually expands.<sup>8</sup>

Note, though, that regardless of what happens to the size of the resource sector it will be the case that urbanization increases. The increased productivity of resources pulls labor out of the food sector, and some of that labor is allocated out to the tradable and non-tradable sectors. In the model, both  $\Omega_n$  and  $\Omega_d$  increase when  $A_r$  increases. Hence the fraction of labor in urban areas will increase following an increase in resource productivity. Similar to the agricultural sector, resources serve here as a “push” into urbanization.

Our model can thus replicate the positive correlation of urbanization and the size of the resource sector seen in the data for Sub-Saharan Africa, and in the regressions for resource-dependent countries. With higher  $A_r$ , a greater fraction of labor will be engaged in the resource sector (which is also its share of GDP given the linear nature of technology) and a greater fraction of labor will be employed in urban areas.

The other characteristic of urban areas in the resource-rich countries is that they are composed primarily of workers in non-tradables; they are “consumption cities”. By itself an increase in  $A_r$  will not induce a change in the composition of urban activity. The ratio of tradable to non-tradable workers in urban areas is simply

$$\frac{L_d}{L_n} = \frac{\theta_d}{\theta_n} \left( \frac{A_d}{A_n} \right)^{\epsilon-1}. \quad (23)$$

The only thing that influences this ratio in our autarkic model is the relative size of  $A_d$  to  $A_n$ , and that is not necessarily related to the level of  $A_r$ . However, the natural resources produced by Sub-Saharan African and Middle-Eastern countries are traded internationally, and as the next section shows this will lead to the possibility of a shift in the composition of urban activities.

### 3.4 Opening to Trade

We now consider the ability to trade both resources and the tradable good internationally at prices  $p_r^*$  and  $p_d^*$ , respectively. For the resource-rich economies, we assume that  $p_r/p_d < p_r^*/p_d^*$ , so that an economy has relatively cheap resources compared to the world. It thus exports resources and imports tradable goods. By itself, one can see that this will cause the *composition* of urban activity to shift away from tradable

<sup>8</sup>Formally, the derivative  $\partial L_r/\partial A_r > 0$  if  $\Omega_f > [(1 - \Omega_r)(1 - \epsilon)/(\phi - 1)]/[\Omega_r + (1 - \epsilon)/(\phi - 1)]$ .

goods and towards non-tradables. In our simple setting, the shift is stark, and the tradable sector ceases to exist, and cities in these countries consist entirely of non-tradable workers.

The index of non-food productivity is now

$$A_C^* = \left[ A_r^{\epsilon-1} \theta_r + A_n^{\epsilon-1} \theta_n + \left( \frac{p_r^* A_r}{p_d^*} \right)^{\epsilon-1} \theta_d \right]^{1/(\epsilon-1)}. \quad (24)$$

The economy is able to convert labor into tradable goods at a higher rate by employing it to produce resources that can be traded for the tradable goods. The productivity level  $A_C^*$  is higher than in autarky, and so the real wage has increased through trade.

The three sectors that operate employ all the labor of the economy, and again we assume free mobility between sectors so that we have

$$w = p_f A_f = p_r^* A_r = p_n A_n. \quad (25)$$

The labor allocations can be solved for as before. The resource sector must meet domestic demand as well as provide exports to acquire tradable goods, so we have

$$\frac{L_r}{L} = \left( 1 - \frac{\bar{c}_f}{A_f} \right) (\Omega_r + \Omega_d), \quad (26)$$

where  $\Omega_r$  is defined as before, except with  $A_C^*$  in its denominator.  $\Omega_d$  is not dependent on domestic tradable productivity, but is now

$$\Omega_d = \left( \frac{p_r^* A_r}{p_d^*} \right)^{\epsilon-1} \frac{\theta_d}{A_C^*}. \quad (27)$$

Urbanization now consists only of those workers producing non-tradables, as tradable goods are provided by resource workers exporting their output. Formally,

$$u = \left( 1 - \frac{\bar{c}_f}{A_f} \right) \Omega_n, \quad (28)$$

where  $\Omega_n$  is defined as before, only with  $A_C^*$  in the denominator.

Given this description of economies with a comparative advantage in natural resources, we can make several statements regarding the process of structural change and urbanization:

**Proposition 1.** *Given our model and the assumption that  $A_d/A_r < p_r^*/p_d^*$ , the following propositions holds:*

- (A) *Urban areas consist entirely of consumption cities, which have only non-tradable workers.*
- (B) *Going from autarky to openness to trade has an ambiguous effect on the urbanization rate.*
- (C) *Once open, an increase in  $A_r$  will increase the urbanization rate.*
- (D) *Once open, an increase in  $p_r^*$  will increase the urbanization rate.*

*Proof.* The four parts of the proposition are straightforward to establish. (A) follows due to comparative advantage. It is cheaper for the economy to sell resources to purchase tradable goods than to produce them itself. Hence the tradable sector goes to zero. For (B), opening to trade implies tradable workers in autarky no longer are employed in that sector, and this lowers urbanization. However, trade raises real incomes, as  $A_C^*$  is greater than  $A_C$  in autarky. This increases the demand for non-tradable goods, increasing  $\Omega_n$ . This acts to raise urbanization. Which effect dominates will depend on the size of the tradable sector in autarky and the size of the real income gain after opening. (C) follows from taking the derivative  $\partial \Omega_n / \partial A_r$ , which is positive. (D) follows from  $\partial \Omega_n / \partial p_r^*$  being positive as well.  $\square$

With a resource-exporting sector included in a standard model of structural change, it is quite possible to

see high urbanization levels occurring without the typical agricultural or industrial revolutions driving it. Resources provide increased purchasing power that makes for higher demand for urban goods. Combined with international trade that makes urban tradable goods an inefficient use of labor, this urbanization will occur solely through an increase in non-tradable workers, leading to what we have termed “consumption cities”.

### 3.5 Implications for Growth

It is commonly assumed that urban agglomerations are centers of productivity growth, both in developing and developed countries (Rosenthal & Strange, 2004; Henderson, 2005; Overman & Venables, 2005; Henderson, 2010; Felkner & Townsend, 2011). Greater urbanization should therefore lead to faster growth (Duranton, 2008; Venables, 2010; World Bank, 2009; McKinsey, 2011). This expected relationship has been embedded into growth models to describe the divergence in output per capita across countries (Lucas, 2009).

However, this literature presumes that urban areas are essentially identical across countries in their economic structure. In our terms, the underlying assumption is that cities are “production cities”, with a mix of tradable good production (often manufacturing) and non-tradable production (often services). However, as we have documented, for a large group of countries urban areas are skewed towards non-tradable production in “consumption cities”. This has the possibility of altering the long-run productivity gains available from increased urbanization.

Recent research suggests that tradable goods have a greater tendency towards productivity growth than non-tradables. Galdon-Sanchez & Schmitz (2002) and Schmitz (2005) document that the threat or actual presence of competition is key to productivity improvements. Tradable goods face global competitors that non-tradable goods do not, and so the incentives for productivity improvement are greater. Reallocations of inputs from low- to high-productivity firms, as well as exit of firms with the lowest productivity, appears to be a significant source of the productivity advantage for the tradable sector (Clerides, Lach & Tybout, 1998; Aw, Chung & Roberts, 2000; Pavcnik, 2002).

More broadly, Duarte & Restuccia (2010) document that services (generally non-tradable) labor productivity growth was much slower than manufacturing labor productivity growth across a sample of countries in the post-war era. In their panel manufacturing labor productivity growth averaged 4.0% per year while services only 1.3%. Timmer & Vries (2007) find that non-market services (similar to our notion of non-tradables) contribute very little to growth in developing countries 1950–2005, while manufacturing is the dominant source.

Individual manufacturing sectors also exhibit a tendency towards unconditional convergence in labor productivity across all countries; sectors with low productivity grow faster. Rodrik (2011) documents the robustness of this relationship across a range of developing and developed countries. There appear to be strong spillover effects at work within manufacturing that lead to rapid productivity growth for those country/sectors that begin with low productivity. Similar effects are not apparent for services.

We do not take a stand here on the exact micro-foundations of endogenous productivity growth that lead to this advantage for tradable manufacturing goods. Rather, we simply note that whatever the underlying model, the available evidence indicates that the tradable sector will be capable of sustaining higher productivity growth than the non-tradable sector, all else being equal.

Within our model, this implies that the composition of urban areas is relevant to aggregate productivity growth. In those places with a comparative advantage in natural resources, urbanization occurs solely through the expansion of non-tradables, and hence their productivity growth will lag behind countries whose urbanization follows a more standard path.

## 4. CONCLUSION

This paper documents several new facts regarding the process of structural transformation and urbanization in developing economies using both cross-country data as well as micro-level surveys. Most developing countries, particularly those in Asia, have experienced urbanization *with* structural transformation and growth in incomes. Urbanization takes place in what we term “production cities”, where labor is mixed between tradable and non-tradable work. For these countries, urbanization is closely related to the share of manufacturing and services in GDP, and they conform closely to standard models of structural transformation.

In contrast, we show that natural resource exporters - with Sub-Saharan Africa as a particularly sharp example - have experienced urbanization *without* structural transformation. Natural resources provided surplus income to these countries that shifted population to urban areas. However, with a comparative advantage in resources, these countries have not needed to develop tradable goods sectors, and so their cities are what we term “consumption cities”, composed only of those working in the non-tradable sector.

We adapt a simple model of structural change to explain the different path taken towards urbanization in the natural resource exporting countries. Introducing resources explicitly allows us to show that productivity increases in that sector (a proxy for new finds of oil, for example) will increase urbanization through non-homotheticities in demand. Allowing for international trade ensures that the urbanization is in “consumption cities” as these countries find it more efficient to import tradable goods than to produce them domestically. In the long run, non-tradables are less amenable to productivity growth and so the natural resource exporters are not able to match the aggregate labor productivity growth of other developing countries.

This paper leaves several open questions. The first is why resource exporting countries have been unable to acquire or develop a comparative advantage in sectors other than those based on resource extraction. We acknowledge the possibility that institutions and colonial history, as well as resource endowments, may have driven this initial specialization. But we do not attempt to model this directly. A second question that we leave unanswered is whether consumption cities will evolve into production cities over time, as they did in the United States or Australia, and appear to be doing in South Africa and Botswana. Our model does not allow for this, and we view it as an important question that warrants further study.

## REFERENCES

- Acemoglu, Daron, and Veronica Guerrieri.** 2008. "Capital Deepening and Nonbalanced Economic Growth." *Journal of Political Economy*, 116(3): 467–498.
- Ades, Alberto F, and Edward L Glaeser.** 1995. "Trade and Circuses: Explaining Urban Giants." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(1): 195–227.
- Alvarez-Cuadrado, Francisco, and Markus Poschke.** 2011. "Structural Change Out of Agriculture: Labor Push versus Labor Pull." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 3(3): 127–58.
- Angrist, Joshua D., and Adriana D. Kugler.** 2008. "Rural Windfall or a New Resource Curse? Coca, Income, and Civil Conflict in Colombia." *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(2): 191–215.
- Aw, Bee Yan, Sukkyun Chung, and Mark J Roberts.** 2000. "Productivity and Turnover in the Export Market: Micro-level Evidence from the Republic of Korea and Taiwan (China)." *World Bank Economic Review*, 14(1): 65–90.
- Badiane, Ousmane.** 2011. *Agriculture and Structural Transformation in Africa*. Center on Food Security and the Environment: Stanford Symposium Series on Global Food Policy and Food Security in the 21st Century.
- Bairoch, Paul.** 1988. *Cities and Economic Development: From the Dawn of History to the Present*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Barrios, Salvador, Luisito Bertinelli, and Eric Strobl.** 2006. "Climatic Change and Rural-Urban Migration: The Case of Sub-Saharan Africa." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 60(3): 357–371.
- Bates, Robert.** 1981. *Markets and States in Tropical Africa: The Political Basis of Agricultural Policies*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Bosworth, Barry, and Susan M. Collins.** 2008. "Accounting for Growth: Comparing China and India." *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 22(1): 45–66.
- Brandt, Loren, Chang-Tai Hsieh, and Xiaodong Zhu.** 2008. "Growth and Structural Transformation in China." In *China's Great Economic Transformation*, ed. L. Brandt and T. G. Rawski, 683–728. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buera, Francisco J., and Joseph P Kaboski.** 2009. "Can Traditional Theories of Structural Change Fit The Data?" *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 7(2-3): 469–477.
- Caselli, Francesco.** 2005. "Accounting for Cross-Country Income Differences." In *Handbook of Economic Growth*. Vol. 1, , ed. P. Aghion and S. Durlauf, Chapter 9, 679–741. Elsevier.
- Caselli, Francesco, and Guy Michaels.** 2012. "Do Oil Windfalls Improve Living Standards? Evidence from Brazil." *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, Forthcoming.
- Caselli, Francesco, and Wilbur John Coleman II.** 2001. "The U.S. Structural Transformation and Regional Convergence: A Reinterpretation." *Journal of Political Economy*, 109(3): 584–616.
- Clerides, Sofronis K., Saul Lach, and James R. Tybout.** 1998. "Is Learning By Exporting Important? Micro-Dynamic Evidence From Colombia, Mexico, And Morocco." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(3): 903–947.
- Corden, W Max, and J Peter Neary.** 1982. "Booming Sector and De-Industrialisation in a Small Open Economy." *Economic Journal*, 92(368): 825–48.
- Davis, James C., and J. Vernon Henderson.** 2003. "Evidence on the political economy of the urbanization process." *Journal of Urban Economics*, 53(1): 98–125.
- de Janvry, Alain, and Elisabeth Sadoulet.** 2010. "Agriculture for Development in Africa: Business-as-Usual or New Departures?" *Journal of African Economies*, 19(suppl 2): ii7–ii39.


- Duarte, Margarida, and Diego Restuccia.** 2010. "The Role of the Structural Transformation in Aggregate Productivity." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 125(1): 129–173.
- Duranton, Gilles.** 2008. "Viewpoint: From Cities to Productivity and Growth in Developing Countries." *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 41(3): 689–736.
- Echevarria, Cristina.** 2008. "International trade and the sectoral composition of production." *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 11(1): 192–206.
- Evenson, Robert E., and Douglas Gollin.** 2003. "Assessing the Impact of the Green Revolution, 1960 to 2000." *Science*, 300(5620): 758–762.
- Fay, Marianne, and Charlotte Opal.** 2000. "Urbanization without growth : a not-so-uncommon phenomenon." The World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series 2412.
- Felkner, John S., and Robert M. Townsend.** 2011. "The Geographic Concentration of Enterprise in Developing Countries." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(4): 2005–2061.
- Galdon-Sanchez, Jose, and James Schmitz.** 2002. "Competitive Pressure and Labor Productivity: World Iron-Ore Markets in the 1980's." *American Economic Review*, 92(4): 1222–1235.
- Galor, Oded, and Andrew Mountford.** 2008. "Trading Population for Productivity: Theory and Evidence." *Review of Economic Studies*, 75(4): 1143–1179.
- Gollin, Douglas, Stephen L. Parente, and Richard Rogerson.** 2002. "The Role of Agriculture in Development." *American Economic Review*, 92(2): 160–164.
- Gollin, Douglas, Stephen L. Parente, and Richard Rogerson.** 2007. "The food problem and the evolution of international income levels." *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54(4): 1230–1255.
- Hansen, Gary D., and Edward C. Prescott.** 2002. "Malthus to Solow." *American Economic Review*, 92(4): 1205–1217.
- Harris, John R., and Michael P. Todaro.** 1970. "Migration, Unemployment & Development: A Two-Sector Analysis." *American Economic Review*, 60(1): 126–42.
- Henderson, J. Vernon.** 2005. "Urbanization and Growth." In *Handbook of Economic Growth*. Vol. 1, , ed. P. Aghion and S. Durlauf, Chapter 24, 1543–1591. Elsevier.
- Henderson, J. Vernon.** 2010. "Cities and Development." *Journal of Regional Science*, 50(1): 515–540.
- Herrendorf, Berthold, Richard Rogerson, and Akos Valentinyi.** 2011a. *Growth and Structural Transformation*. Draft prepared for the Handbook of Economic Growth.
- Herrendorf, Berthold, Richard Rogerson, and Akos Valentinyi.** 2011b. "Two Perspectives on Preferences and Structural Transformation." Institute of Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences IEHAS Discussion Papers 1134.
- Jedwab, Remi.** 2012. "Why is Africa So Urbanized? Evidence from Resource Exports in Ghana and Ivory Coast." Unpublished manuscript, Department of Economics, George Washington University.
- Lewis, Arthur.** 1954. "Economic Development with Unlimited Supplies of Labour." *The Manchester School*, 22(2): 139–191.
- Lipton, Michael.** 1977. *Why Poor People Stay Poor: Urban Bias in World Development*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lucas, Robert E.** 2004. "Life Earnings and Rural-Urban Migration." *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(S1): S29–S59.
- Lucas, Robert E.** 2009. "Trade and the Diffusion of the Industrial Revolution." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 1(1): 1–25.

- Matsuyama, Kiminori.** 1992. "Agricultural Productivity, Comparative Advantage, and Economic Growth." *Journal of Economic Theory*, 58(2): 317–334.
- Matsuyama, Kiminori.** 2002. "The Rise of Mass Consumption Societies." *Journal of Political Economy*, 110(5): 1035–1070.
- McKinsey.** 2011. *Lions on the Move: The Progress and Potential of African Economies*. London : Mc Kinsey Global Institute.
- McMillan, Margaret S., and Dani Rodrik.** 2011. "Globalization, Structural Change and Productivity Growth." NBER Working Papers 17143.
- Michaels, Guy.** 2011. "The Long Term Consequences of Resource-Based Specialisation." *The Economic Journal*, 121(551): 31–57.
- Michaels, Guy, Ferdinand Rauch, and Stephen J. Redding.** 2012. "Urbanization and Structural Transformation." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 127(2): 535–586.
- Ngai, Rachel L., and Christopher A. Pissarides.** 2007. "Structural Change in a Multisector Model of Growth." *American Economic Review*, 97(1): 429–443.
- Nunn, Nathan, and Nancy Qian.** 2011. "The Potato's Contribution to Population and Urbanization: Evidence from an Historical Experiment." *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 126(2).
- Overman, Henry, and Anthony J. Venables.** 2005. "Cities in the Developing World." Centre for Economic Performance, LSE CEP Discussion Papers dp0695.
- Pavcnik, Nina.** 2002. "Trade Liberalization, Exit, and Productivity Improvement: Evidence from Chilean Plants." *Review of Economic Studies*, 69(1): 245–76.
- Poelhekke, Steven.** 2010. "Urban Growth and Uninsured Rural Risk: Booming Towns in Bust Times." *Journal of Development Economics*, In Press.
- Ravallion, Martin, Shaohua Chen, and Prem Sangraula.** 2007. "New Evidence on the Urbanization of Global Poverty." *Population and Development Review*, 33(4): 667–701.
- Restuccia, Diego, Dennis Tao Yang, and Xiaodong Zhu.** 2008. "Agriculture and Aggregate Productivity: A Quantitative Cross-Country Analysis." *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 55(2): 234–250.
- Robinson, James A., Ragnar Torvik, and Thierry Verdier.** 2006. "Political Foundations of the Resource Curse." *Journal of Development Economics*, 79(2): 447–468.
- Rodrik, Dani.** 2011. "Unconditional Convergence." National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc NBER Working Papers 17546.
- Rosenthal, Stuart S., and William C. Strange.** 2004. "Evidence on The Nature and Sources of Agglomeration Economies." In *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics*. Vol. 4, , ed. J. V. Henderson and J. F. Thisse, Chapter 49, 2119–2171. Elsevier.
- Sachs, Jeffrey D., and Andrew M. Warner.** 2001. "The Curse of Natural Resources." *European Economic Review*, 45(4-6): 827–838.
- Schmitz, James.** 2005. "What determines productivity? lessons from the dramatic recovery of the U.S. and Canadian iron-ore industries following their early 1980s crisis."
- Schultz, Theodore W.** 1953. *The Economic Organization of Agriculture*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Teigner, Marc.** 2011. "The Role of Trade in Structural Transformation." Unpublished manuscript, University of Chicago, Department of Economics.
- Timmer, Marcel P., and Gaaitzen J. de Vries.** 2007. "A Cross-country Database For Sectoral Employment And Productivity in Asia and Latin America, 1950-2005."

- Venables, Anthony J.** 2010. "Economic Geography and African Development." *Papers in Regional Science*, 89(3): 469–483.
- Voigtländer, Nico, and Hans-Joachim Voth.** 2006. "Why England? Demographic Factors, Structural Change and Physical Capital Accumulation During the Industrial Revolution." *Journal of Economic Growth*, 11(4): 319–361.
- World Bank.** 2009. *World Development Report 2009: Reshaping Economic Geography*. Washington DC: World Bank Publications.
- World Bank.** 2010. *International Financial Statistics*. Washington D.C.: World Bank.
- Yi, Kei-Mu, and Jing Zhang.** 2011. "Structural Change in an Open Economy." *Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Staff Report*, 456.
- Young, Alwyn.** 2003. "Gold into Base Metals: Productivity Growth in the People's Republic of China during the Reform Period." *Journal of Political Economy*, 111(6): 1220–1261.


## FIGURES

Figure 1: Urbanization and the Contribution of Manufacturing and Services to GDP for Developing Countries, 2000




Notes: This figure shows the relationship between the urbanization rate (%) and the contribution of manufacturing and services to GDP (%) for 119 developing countries across four areas in 2000: Asia, Latin American and the Caribbean, Africa, and Middle-East and North Africa. See Data Appendix for data sources.

Figure 2: Urbanization and the Contribution of Manufacturing and Services to GDP for Developing Countries, by Type of Countries, 2000




Notes: This figure shows the relationship between the urbanization rate (%) and the contribution of manufacturing and services to GDP (%) for 119 developing countries across four areas in 2000: Asia, Latin American and the Caribbean, Africa, and Middle-East and North Africa. Countries for which natural resource exports NRX (fuel, mining, cash crop, food crop and forestry exports) account for less than 10% of GDP are in black. Countries for which natural resource exports NRX account for more than 10% of GDP are in grey. See Data Appendix for data sources.

Figure 3: Urbanization and the Contribution of Manufacturing and Services to GDP for Resource Poor Countries, 2000



Notes: This figure shows the relationship between the urbanization rate (%) and the contribution of manufacturing and services to GDP (%) for 49 resource poor countries in 2000 (natural resource exports NRX < 10% of GDP). Sierra Leone (SLE) has been the resource rich country for most of the 20th century. The civil war in 1991-2002 led to a collapse of its natural resource exports and their contribution to GDP decreased below 10% for 2000 only. See Data Appendix for data sources.


Figure 4: Urbanization and the Contribution of Manufacturing and Services to GDP for Resource Rich Countries, 2000



Notes: This figure shows the relationship between the urbanization rate (%) and the contribution of manufacturing and services to GDP (%) for 70 resource rich countries in 2000 (natural resource exports NRX ≥ 10% of GDP). See Data Appendix for data sources.




Figure 7: Urbanization and the Contribution of Manufacturing and Service Exports to GDP in Asia, 2000




Notes: This figure shows the relationship between the urbanization rate (%) and the contribution of manufacturing and services to GDP (%) for 29 Asian countries. See Data Appendix for data sources.

Figure 8: Urbanization and the Contribution of Manufacturing and Service Exports to GDP in Africa, 2000




Notes: This figure shows the relationship between the urbanization rate (%) and the contribution of manufacturing and services to GDP (%) for 46 African countries. See Data Appendix for data sources.

Figure 9: Urbanization and the Contribution of Natural Resource Exports to GDP in Africa, 2000




Notes: This figure shows the relationship between the urbanization rate (%) and the contribution of natural resource exports (fuel, mining, cash crop, food crop and forestry exports) to GDP (%) for 46 African countries. See Data Appendix for data sources.

Figure 10: Urbanization by Importance of Natural Resources in Africa, 1960-2000




Notes: This figure shows the population-weighted rate of urbanization (%) over time for four groups of African countries based on the share of natural resources in total exports on average in 1960-2010: 0-10%, 10-20%, 20-30%, and more than 30%. See Data Appendix for data sources.

Figure 11: Natural Resource Exports and the Sectoral Composition of the Urban Sector, around 2000



Notes: This figure shows the relationship between the employment share of urban tradables in total urban employment (%) and the contribution of natural resource exports (fuel, mining, cash crop, food crop and forestry exports) to GDP (%) for 41 developing countries around 2000. We use only one observation for each country, the closest to the year 2000. We only select countries for which the urbanization rate is higher than 20% in 2000, so as to compare countries that have begun their transition away from subsistence agriculture. We have no data for 68 countries. Urban tradables consist of manufacturing employment (Mfg.) and finance, insurance, real estate and business services (Fire). See Data Appendix for data sources.

Figure 12: Natural Resource Exports and the Sectoral Composition of the Largest City, around 2000



Notes: This figure shows the relationship between the employment share of urban tradables in total employment for the largest city (%) and the contribution of natural resource exports (fuel, mining, cash crop, food crop and forestry exports) to GDP (%) for 41 developing countries around 2000. We use only one observation for each country, the closest to the year 2000. We only select countries for which the urbanization rate is higher than 20% in 2000, so as to compare countries that have begun their transition away from subsistence agriculture. We have no data for 68 countries. Urban tradables consist of manufacturing employment (Mfg.) and finance, insurance, real estate and business services (Fire). See Data Appendix for data sources.

**TABLE 1: CROSS-SECTIONAL REGRESSION IN 2000, MAIN RESULTS**

| Dependent Variable:                 | Urbanization Rate (%) |                    |                    |                    | Mfg. Empl. Share<br>Urbanization Rate |                     |                   |                   |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                                     | (1)                   | (2)                | (3)                | (4)                | (5)                                   | (6)                 | (7)               | (8)               |
| Sample:                             | NRX/GDP (%)           |                    |                    |                    |                                       |                     |                   |                   |
|                                     | < 10                  |                    |                    |                    | ≥ 10                                  |                     |                   |                   |
| Manufacturing & Services (% of GDP) | 1.22***<br>[0.214]    | 0.83***<br>[0.238] | 0.53***<br>[0.145] | 0.64***<br>[0.194] | 0.32*<br>[0.189]                      | -0.09<br>[0.136]    | -0.09<br>[0.114]  | 0.02<br>[0.112]   |
| Natural Resource Exports (% of GDP) | 1.17***<br>[0.201]    | 0.76***<br>[0.180] | 0.64***<br>[0.163] | -0.16<br>[1.000]   | 0.55***<br>[0.143]                    | -0.50***<br>[0.157] | -0.22*<br>[0.111] | -0.19*<br>[0.099] |
| Area Fixed Effects (4)              | N                     | Y                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                                     | N                   | Y                 | Y                 |
| Controls                            | N                     | N                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                                     | N                   | N                 | Y                 |
| Observations                        | 119                   | 119                | 119                | 49                 | 70                                    | 119                 | 119               | 119               |
| R-squared                           | 0.49                  | 0.65               | 0.72               | 0.92               | 0.67                                  | 0.21                | 0.47              | 0.55              |

Notes: Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses; \* p<0.10, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01. The sample consists of 119 developing countries across four areas: 30 in Asia, 26 in Latin America and the Caribbean, 46 in Sub-Saharan Africa and 17 in the Middle-East and North Africa. The dependent variable in columns (1)-(5) is the urbanization rate (%) in 2000. The dependent variable in columns (6)-(8) is the ratio of the employment share of manufacturing in total employment (%) in 2000 to the urbanization rate (%) in 2000 times 100. All regressions are population-weighted. Columns (2)-(5) and (7)-(8) include area fixed effects. Columns (3)-(5) and (8) include the following controls at the country level: area (sq km), population (1000s), rural density (1000s of rural population per sq km of arable area), population growth in 1950-2000 (%), four dummies for each type of urban definition (administrative, threshold, threshold and administrative, and threshold plus condition) and a dummy if the threshold is lower than 2,500 inhabitants, a dummy equal to one if the country is a small island (< 50,000 sq km), a dummy equal to one if the country's average combined polity score since independence is lower than -5 (the country is then considered as autocratic), and a dummy equal to one if the country has experienced an interstate or civil conflict since independence. See Data Appendix for data sources.

TABLE 2: CROSS-SECTIONAL REGRESSION IN 2000, ROBUSTNESS

| Dependent Variable:                 | Urbanization Rate (%) |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                    |                   |                    |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
|                                     | (1)                   | (2)                | (3)                | (4)                | (5)                | (6)                | (7)                | (8)               | (9)                |
|                                     |                       | Controls Squared   | Cluster Region     | No Pop. Weight.    | Region FE (13)     | Asia Only          | Africa Only        | Largest City      | Other Cities       |
| Manufacturing & Services (% of GDP) | 0.53***<br>[0.145]    | 0.52***<br>[0.145] | 0.53***<br>[0.145] | 0.53***<br>[0.157] | 0.41***<br>[0.119] | 1.06***<br>[0.443] | 0.17<br>[0.191]    | 0.16*<br>[0.081]  | 0.38***<br>[0.130] |
| Natural Resource Exports (% of GDP) | 0.64***<br>[0.163]    | 0.63***<br>[0.153] | 0.64***<br>[0.149] | 0.36***<br>[0.131] | 0.33***<br>[0.112] | -0.56<br>[0.707]   | 0.62***<br>[0.143] | 0.18**<br>[0.075] | 0.46***<br>[0.125] |
| Area Fixed Effects (4)              | Y                     | Y                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                 | Y                  |
| Controls                            | Y                     | Y                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                  | Y                 | Y                  |
| Observations                        | 119                   | 119                | 119                | 119                | 119                | 28                 | 46                 | 119               | 119                |
| R-squared                           | 0.72                  | 0.74               | 0.72               | 0.45               | 0.81               | 0.68               | 0.64               | 0.52              | 0.67               |

Notes: Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses; \* p<0.10, \*\* p<0.05, \*\*\* p<0.01. The sample consists of 119 developing countries across four areas: 30 in Asia, 26 in Latin America and the Caribbean, 46 in Sub-Saharan Africa and 17 in the Middle-East and North Africa. All regressions include area fixed controls and the same controls as listed in the footnote of Table 1. All regressions are population-weighted, except in Column (4). Column (1) shows the main results from Table 1 (Column (3)). Column (2) also includes the square of country area, population, rural density and population growth. Columns (3) cluster observations at the region level (N = 13). Column (4) does not use population weighting. Column (5) includes region fixed effects (N = 13). Column (6) restricts the sample to Asian countries only. Column (7) restricts the sample to African countries. In Column (8), the dependent variable is the urbanization rate using the largest city in the country only, i.e. the share of the population of the largest city in total population in 2000 (%). In Column (9), the dependent variable is the urbanization rate using the other cities in the country only, i.e. the share of the urban population that is not in the largest city in total population in 2000 (%). See Data Appendix for data sources.

## APPENDIX

### A-1. DATA CONSTRUCTION

This appendix describes in details the data we use in our analysis.

#### Spatial Units:

We assemble data for 119 developing countries from 1950 to 2010. The list of countries is reported below in table A.1. These developing countries belong to four areas: Latin America (LAC), Middle-East and North Africa (MENA), Asia and Africa. We also classify them into 13 regions: South America, Central America, Caribbean, Southern Africa, Western Africa, Central Africa, Eastern Africa, Northern Africa, Middle-East, South Asia, South-East Asia, East Asia, and Oceania.

#### Urbanization and Population Data:

We use WUP (2011) to study urbanization rates for 119 developing countries in 1950-2010. The urbanization rate is defined as the share of the urban population in total population (%). From the same sources, we obtain the urbanization rate of the largest city, i.e. the share of the largest city in the total population (%) of the country. The urbanization rate for other cities is deduced by subtracting the urbanization rate of the largest city of the aggregate urbanization rate. The 119 countries use four different types of urban definition for their most recent census: (i) “administrative”: cities are administrative centers of territorial units (e.g., provinces, districts, “communes”, etc.), (ii) “threshold”: cities are localities whose population is superior to a population threshold of X inhabitants (e.g., 10,000, 5,000 or 2,500), (iii) “administrative or threshold”: cities are either administrative centers or localities whose population is superior to a population threshold, and (iv) “threshold with condition”: cities are localities whose population is superior to a population threshold and whose a large share of the labor force is engaged in non-agricultural activities. For each country using a population threshold, we know the threshold and create a dummy if it is less than 2,500 inhabitants. We also use WUP (2011) to obtain a list of Asian and African megacities (> 750,000 inh.). WUP (2011) also reports total population for each country every year 1950-2010.

#### Manufacturing and Service GDP and Employment Data:

We use WB (2012) to estimate the contribution of manufacturing and services to GDP for 119 developing countries in 2000. Using the same source and ILO (2012), we reconstruct the employment share of the manufacturing sector for the 119 countries around 2000. When the data was not reported by WB (2012) and ILO (2012), we used census and/or labor force survey reports available on the website of the statistical institute of the country to fill the missing gaps. Data on the employment structure of the urban sector and largest city in selected developing countries was recreated using the IPUMS 10%, 5% or 1% census sample for the most recent census years (IPUMS 2012). We also used various *Labor Force Survey* (LFS) reports for a few countries. IPUMS uses a standard general recode of 12 industries, which allows us to focus on manufacturing (Mfg) and finance, insurance, real estate and business services (Fire). Table A.2 lists all the countries and years for which we have the sectoral composition of the urban sector, and the contribution of Mfg and Fire. Table A.3 lists all the countries and years for which we have the sectoral composition of the largest city.

#### Natural Resource Exports:

Natural resource exports consist of fuel, mineral, cash crop, food crop and forestry exports. We use WB (2012) and USGS (2012) to estimate the share of fuel and mineral exports in total exports (%) for the 119 countries every five years in 1960-2010. We use FAO (2012) to obtain the export shares of cash and food crops and forestry for the 119 countries every five years in 1960-2010. Lastly, we use Maddison (2008) and WDI (2012) to obtain the share of merchandise exports in GDP for the 119 countries every five years in 1960-2010. Knowing the share of merchandise exports in GDP (%), we can easily reconstruct the contribution of natural resource exports to GDP (%).

#### Controls:

We use various sources to reconstruct a range of controls at the country-level. Country area (sq km) is obtained from WB (2012). Rural density is defined as the ratio of rural population (1000s) to arable area (sq km) in 2000. The arable area of each country is reported by FAO (2012). Population growth is calculated as the percentage change in country population between 1950 and 2010. We create a dummy if the country is a small island. From wikipedia, we obtain a list of all the island countries in the world. An island country is "small" if its area is smaller than 50,000 sq km. We use the Polity IV data series to calculate the average combined polity score for each country from independence to 2000 (Polity IV 2012a). We then create a dummy if the average combined polity score is lower than -5, the threshold for not being considered as autocratic. Lastly, the Polity IV data series also include a measure of political violence for each country from 1964 to date. We create a dummy if the country has ever experienced an interstate or civil conflict from independence to 2000 (Polity IV 2012b).

## REFERENCES

- FAO. 2012. *FAOSTAT*. Roma: Food and Agriculture Organization.
- ILO. 2012. *LABORSTA*. Roma: International Labor Organization.
- IPUMS. 2012. *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, International*. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center.
- Maddison, Angus. 2008. *Historical Statistics of the World Economy: 1-2008 AD*. Groningen Growth and Development Center.
- Polity IV. 2012a. *Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2010: Polity IV Annual Time-Series 1800-2011*. Vienna: Center for Systemic Peace.
- Polity IV. 2012b. *Polity IV Project: Political Regime Characteristics and Transitions, 1800-2010: Major Episodes of Political Violence, 1946-2008*. Vienna: Center for Systemic Peace.
- USGS. 2012. *Bureau of Mines Minerals Yearbook 1963-2010*. Reston: United States Geological Survey.
- WDI. 2012. *World Development Indicators*. Washington: World Bank.
- WUP. 2011. *World Urbanization Prospects, the 2011 Revision*. New York: United Nations.

**TABLE A.1: LIST OF COUNTRIES USED IN THE ANALYSIS**

| Area   | Region          | Country Name    | Country Code |
|--------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Africa | Central Africa  | Angola          | AGO          |
| Africa | Central Africa  | CAR             | CAF          |
| Africa | Central Africa  | Cameroon        | CMR          |
| Africa | Central Africa  | Chad            | TCD          |
| Africa | Central Africa  | Congo           | COG          |
| Africa | Central Africa  | DRC             | ZAR          |
| Africa | Central Africa  | Eq. Guinea      | GNQ          |
| Africa | Central Africa  | Gabon           | GAB          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Burundi         | BDI          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Comoros         | COM          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Djibouti        | DJI          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Eritrea         | ERI          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Ethiopia        | ETH          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Kenya           | KEN          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Madagascar      | MDG          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Malawi          | MWI          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Mauritius       | MUS          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Mozambique      | MOZ          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Rwanda          | RWA          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Somalia         | SOM          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Sudan           | SDN          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Tanzania        | TZA          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Uganda          | UGA          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Zambia          | ZMB          |
| Africa | Eastern Africa  | Zimbabwe        | ZWE          |
| Africa | Southern Africa | Botswana        | BWA          |
| Africa | Southern Africa | Lesotho         | LSO          |
| Africa | Southern Africa | Namibia         | NAM          |
| Africa | Southern Africa | South Africa    | ZAF          |
| Africa | Southern Africa | Swaziland       | SWZ          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Benin           | BEN          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Burkina-Faso    | BFA          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Cape Verde      | CPV          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Gambia          | GMB          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Ghana           | GHA          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Guinea          | GIN          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Guinea-Bissau   | GNB          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Ivory Coast     | CIV          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Liberia         | LBR          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Mali            | MLI          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Mauritania      | MRT          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Niger           | NER          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Nigeria         | NGA          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Senegal         | SEN          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Sierra Leone    | SLE          |
| Africa | Western Africa  | Togo            | TGO          |
| Asia   | East Asia       | China           | CHN          |
| Asia   | East Asia       | Hong Kong       | HKG          |
| Asia   | East Asia       | Japan           | JPN          |
| Asia   | East Asia       | Macao           | MAC          |
| Asia   | East Asia       | Mongolia        | MNG          |
| Asia   | East Asia       | North Korea     | PRK          |
| Asia   | East Asia       | South Korea     | KOR          |
| Asia   | East Asia       | Taiwan          | TWN          |
| Asia   | Oceania         | Fiji            | FJI          |
| Asia   | Oceania         | Papua NG        | PNG          |
| Asia   | Oceania         | Solomon Islands | SLB          |
| Asia   | South Asia      | Afghanistan     | AFG          |
| Asia   | South Asia      | Bangladesh      | BGD          |

| Area | Region          | Country Name   | Country Code |
|------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Asia | South Asia      | Bhutan         | BTN          |
| Asia | South Asia      | India          | IND          |
| Asia | South Asia      | Maldives       | MDV          |
| Asia | South Asia      | Nepal          | NPL          |
| Asia | South Asia      | Pakistan       | PAK          |
| Asia | South Asia      | Sri Lanka      | LKA          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Brunei         | BRN          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Cambodia       | KHM          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Indonesia      | IDN          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Laos           | LAO          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Malaysia       | MYS          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Myanmar        | MMR          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Philippines    | PHL          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Singapore      | SGP          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Thailand       | THA          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Timor-Leste    | TMP          |
| Asia | South-East Asia | Vietnam        | VNM          |
| LAC  | Caribbean       | Bahamas        | BHS          |
| LAC  | Caribbean       | Cuba           | CUB          |
| LAC  | Caribbean       | Dominican Rep. | DOM          |
| LAC  | Caribbean       | Haiti          | HTI          |
| LAC  | Caribbean       | Jamaica        | JAM          |
| LAC  | Caribbean       | Trinidad       | TTO          |
| LAC  | Central America | Belize         | BLZ          |
| LAC  | Central America | Costa Rica     | CRI          |
| LAC  | Central America | El Salvador    | SLV          |
| LAC  | Central America | Guatemala      | GTM          |
| LAC  | Central America | Honduras       | HND          |
| LAC  | Central America | Mexico         | MEX          |
| LAC  | Central America | Nicaragua      | NIC          |
| LAC  | Central America | Panama         | PAN          |
| LAC  | South America   | Argentina      | ARG          |
| LAC  | South America   | Bolivia        | BOL          |
| LAC  | South America   | Brazil         | BRA          |
| LAC  | South America   | Chile          | CHL          |
| LAC  | South America   | Colombia       | COL          |
| LAC  | South America   | Ecuador        | ECU          |
| LAC  | South America   | Guyana         | GUY          |
| LAC  | South America   | Paraguay       | PRY          |
| LAC  | South America   | Peru           | PER          |
| LAC  | South America   | Suriname       | SUR          |
| LAC  | South America   | Uruguay        | URY          |
| LAC  | South America   | Venezuela      | VEN          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Bahrain        | BHR          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Iran           | IRN          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Iraq           | IRQ          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Jordan         | JOR          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Kuwait         | KWT          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Lebanon        | LBN          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Oman           | OMN          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Qatar          | QAT          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Saudi Arabia   | SAU          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Syria          | SYR          |
| MENA | Middle East     | UAE            | ARE          |
| MENA | Middle East     | Yemen          | YEM          |
| MENA | North Africa    | Algeria        | DZA          |
| MENA | North Africa    | Egypt          | EGY          |
| MENA | North Africa    | Libya          | LBY          |
| MENA | North Africa    | Morocco        | MAR          |
| MENA | North Africa    | Tunisia        | TUN          |

*Notes:* This table shows the countries we use in our analysis. LAC = Latin America and the Caribbean. MENA = Middle-East and North Africa. See Data Appendix for data sources.

**TABLE A.2: URBAN SECTORAL COMPOSITION FOR SELECTED COUNTRIES**

| Area   | Country-Year         | Urbanization Rate (%) | NRX/GDP (%) | Mfg & Fire Empl. Share (%) |
|--------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Africa | South Africa 2006    | 56.9                  | 13.4        | 25.7                       |
| Africa | South Africa 2001    | 56.9                  | 13.4        | 28.5                       |
| Africa | South Africa 1996    | 56.9                  | 13.4        | 28                         |
| Africa | Ghana 2000           | 44                    | 31.6        | 19                         |
| Africa | Ethiopia 2004        | 14.7                  | 5.4         | 18                         |
| Africa | Guinea 1983          | 31                    | 20.2        | 5                          |
| Africa | Malawi 1987          | 14.6                  | 20.6        | 13.7                       |
| Africa | Malawi 1998          | 14.6                  | 20.6        | 11.5                       |
| Africa | Malawi 2008          | 14.6                  | 20.6        | 15.9                       |
| Africa | Mali 1998            | 28.1                  | 22.2        | 7.7                        |
| Africa | Rwanda 2002          | 13.8                  | 2.9         | 5.1                        |
| Africa | Sierra Leone 2004    | 35.8                  | 2.0         | 3.5                        |
| Africa | Sudan 2008           | 33.41                 | 14.6        | 10.8                       |
| Africa | Uganda 2002          | 12.1                  | 6.3         | 14.4                       |
| Africa | Senegal 1988         | 40.3                  | 12.3        | –                          |
| Africa | Ivory Coast 2002     | 43.5                  | 32.5        | 10.3                       |
| Asia   | Indonesia 1995       | 42                    | 17.4        | 24.9                       |
| Asia   | Indonesia 2005       | 42                    | 17.4        | 17.9                       |
| Asia   | Malaysia 2000        | 62                    | 15.5        | 32.1                       |
| Asia   | Mongolia 2000        | 57.1                  | 34.5        | –                          |
| Asia   | Nepal 2001           | 13.4                  | 3.4         | 14.7                       |
| Asia   | The Philippines 1990 | 48                    | 4.0         | 22.7                       |
| Asia   | The Philippines 2000 | 48                    | 4.0         | –                          |
| Asia   | Vietnam 1999         | 24.4                  | 24.4        | 25                         |
| Asia   | Thailand 2000        | 31.1                  | 12.4        | 21.4                       |
| Asia   | China 1990           | 35.9                  | 2.4         | –                          |
| Asia   | China 2000           | 35.9                  | 2.4         | 38.7                       |
| Asia   | Cambodia 1998        | 18.6                  | 1.5         | 8.1                        |
| Asia   | India 1999           | 27.7                  | 2.0         | 25.5                       |
| Asia   | India 2004           | 27.7                  | 2.0         | 29.5                       |
| Asia   | Hong Kong 2000       | 100                   | 3.1         | 26.8                       |
| Asia   | Macao 2000           | 100                   | 0.4         | 28.4                       |
| Asia   | Singapore 2000       | 100                   | 8.2         | 51.4                       |
| LAC    | Argentina 2001       | 90.1                  | 6.3         | 21.5                       |
| LAC    | Bolivia 2001         | 61.8                  | 10.1        | 19.9                       |
| LAC    | Brazil 2000          | 81.2                  | 3.6         | 23                         |
| LAC    | Chile 2002           | 85.9                  | 19.5        | 25                         |
| LAC    | El Salvador 2007     | 58.9                  | 11.2        | 25.9                       |
| LAC    | Jamaica 2001         | 51.8                  | 3.4         | 18.9                       |
| LAC    | Mexico 2000          | 74.7                  | 4.3         | 27.5                       |
| LAC    | Nicaragua 2005       | 54.7                  | 11.5        | 22.4                       |
| LAC    | Colombia 1993        | 72.1                  | 8.6         | 24.1                       |
| LAC    | Colombia 2005        | 72.1                  | 8.6         | 18.5                       |
| LAC    | Costa Rica 2000      | 59                    | 12.7        | 28.4                       |
| LAC    | Ecuador 2001         | 60.3                  | 27.7        | 16.9                       |
| LAC    | Cuba 2002            | 75.6                  | 5.0         | –                          |
| LAC    | Panama 2000          | 65.8                  | 6.3         | 18.5                       |
| LAC    | Paraguay 1996        | 55.3                  | 10.2        | 19.1                       |
| LAC    | Peru 1993            | 73                    | 10.4        | 21.9                       |
| LAC    | Peru 2007            | 73                    | 10.4        | 19.2                       |
| LAC    | Uruguay 1996         | 91.3                  | 6.0         | 24.2                       |
| LAC    | Uruguay 2006         | 91.3                  | 6.0         | 22                         |
| LAC    | Venezuela 2001       | 89.9                  | 25.6        | 18.6                       |
| MENA   | Iran 2006            | 64                    | 26.0        | 17.9                       |
| MENA   | Iraq 1997            | 67.8                  | 71.0        | 8                          |
| MENA   | Jordan 2004          | 79.8                  | 8.0         | 18.8                       |
| MENA   | Egypt 1996           | 42.8                  | 3.2         | 23.8                       |
| MENA   | Egypt 2006           | 42.8                  | 3.2         | 23.9                       |
| MENA   | Morocco 2000         | 53.3                  | 7.1         | 23.8                       |
| MENA   | Kuwait 2005          | 98.1                  | 49.2        | 11.2                       |
| MENA   | Qatar 1998           | 96.3                  | 59.7        | 11.4                       |
| MENA   | Bahrain 2002         | 88.4                  | 61.3        | 25                         |

Notes: This table shows the employment share of urban tradables in total urban employment (%) for selected countries around 2000. Urban tradable consists of manufacturing employment (Mfg.) and finance, insurance, real estate and business services (Fire). See Data Appendix for data sources.

**TABLE A.3: SECTORAL COMPOSITION OF THE LARGEST CITY FOR SELECTED COUNTRIES**

| Area   | Country-Year         | Largest City | Urbanization Rate (%) | NRX/GDP (%) | Mfg & Fire Empl. Share (%) |
|--------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Africa | South Africa 2006    | Johannesburg | 56.9                  | 13.4        | 29.9                       |
| Africa | South Africa 2001    | Johannesburg | 56.9                  | 13.4        | 33.5                       |
| Africa | South Africa 1996    | Johannesburg | 56.9                  | 13.4        | 32                         |
| Africa | Ghana 2000           | Accra        | 44                    | 31.6        | 21.9                       |
| Africa | Ethiopia 2004        | Addis Ababa  | 14.7                  | 5.4         | 19.7                       |
| Africa | Guinea 1983          | Conakry      | 31                    | 20.2        | 6.1                        |
| Africa | Malawi 1987          | Lilongwe     | 14.6                  | 20.6        | 2.4                        |
| Africa | Malawi 1998          | Lilongwe     | 14.6                  | 20.6        | 4                          |
| Africa | Malawi 2008          | Lilongwe     | 14.6                  | 20.6        | 7.7                        |
| Africa | Mali 1998            | Bamako       | 28.1                  | 22.2        | 10.2                       |
| Africa | Rwanda 2002          | Kigali       | 13.8                  | 2.9         | 7.7                        |
| Africa | Sierra Leone 2004    | Freetown     | 35.8                  | 2.0         | 5.4                        |
| Africa | Sudan 2008           | Khartoum     | 33.41                 | 14.6        | 18.4                       |
| Africa | Uganda 2002          | Kampala      | 12.1                  | 6.3         | 9.7                        |
| Africa | Senegal 1988         | Dakar        | 40.3                  | 12.3        | 22.3                       |
| Africa | Ivory Coast 2002     | Abidjan      | 43.5                  | 32.5        | 11                         |
| Asia   | Indonesia 1995       | Jakarta      | 42                    | 17.4        | 30.2                       |
| Asia   | Indonesia 2005       | Jakarta      | 42                    | 17.4        | 25.4                       |
| Asia   | Malaysia 2000        | Kuala Lumpur | 62                    | 15.5        | 26.5                       |
| Asia   | Mongolia 2000        | Ulan Bator   | 57.1                  | 34.5        | 18.9                       |
| Asia   | Nepal 2001           | Kathmandu    | 13.4                  | 3.4         | 23.6                       |
| Asia   | The Philippines 1990 | Manila       | 48                    | 4.0         | 28.3                       |
| Asia   | The Philippines 2000 | Manila       | 48                    | 4.0         | 25.3                       |
| Asia   | Vietnam 1999         | Ho Chi Minh  | 24.4                  | 24.4        | 38.5                       |
| Asia   | Thailand 2000        | Bangkok      | 31.1                  | 12.4        | 28.9                       |
| Asia   | China 1990           | Beijing      | 35.9                  | 2.4         | 42.5                       |
| Asia   | China 2000           | Beijing      | 35.9                  | 2.4         | 35.7                       |
| Asia   | Cambodia 1998        | Phnom Penh   | 18.6                  | 1.5         | 17.4                       |
| Asia   | India 1999           | Mumbai       | 27.7                  | 2.0         | 28.7                       |
| Asia   | India 2004           | Mumbai       | 27.7                  | 2.0         | 31.6                       |
| Asia   | Hong Kong 2000       | Hong Kong    | 100                   | 3.1         | 26.8                       |
| Asia   | Macao 2000           | Macao        | 100                   | 0.4         | 28.4                       |
| Asia   | Singapore 2000       | Singapore    | 100                   | 8.2         | 51.4                       |
| LAC    | Argentina 2001       | Buenos Aires | 90.1                  | 6.3         | 28.6                       |
| LAC    | Bolivia 2001         | La Paz       | 61.8                  | 10.1        | 16.2                       |
| LAC    | Brazil 2000          | Sao Paulo    | 81.2                  | 3.6         | 33                         |
| LAC    | Chile 2002           | Chile        | 85.9                  | 19.5        | 30.6                       |
| LAC    | El Salvador 2007     | San Salvador | 58.9                  | 11.2        | 28.3                       |
| LAC    | Jamaica 2001         | Kingston     | 51.8                  | 3.4         | 19.6                       |
| LAC    | Mexico 2000          | Mexico City  | 74.7                  | 4.3         | 27.4                       |
| LAC    | Nicaragua 2005       | Managua      | 54.7                  | 11.5        | 24.9                       |
| LAC    | Colombia 1993        | Bogota       | 72.1                  | 8.6         | 32                         |
| LAC    | Colombia 2005        | Bogota       | 72.1                  | 8.6         | 19.2                       |
| LAC    | Costa Rica 2000      | San Jose     | 59                    | 12.7        | 29.7                       |
| LAC    | Ecuador 2001         | Quito        | 60.3                  | 27.7        | 19.4                       |
| LAC    | Cuba 2002            | Havana       | 75.6                  | 5.0         | 23.9                       |
| LAC    | Panama 2000          | Panama City  | 65.8                  | 6.3         | 21.1                       |
| LAC    | Paraguay 1996        | Asuncion     | 55.3                  | 10.2        | –                          |
| LAC    | Peru 1993            | Lima         | 73                    | 10.4        | 27.1                       |
| LAC    | Peru 2007            | Lima         | 73                    | 10.4        | 25.9                       |
| LAC    | Uruguay 1996         | Montevideo   | 91.3                  | 6.0         | 29.8                       |
| LAC    | Uruguay 2006         | Montevideo   | 91.3                  | 6.0         | 24.9                       |
| LAC    | Venezuela 2001       | Caracas      | 89.9                  | 25.6        | 23.1                       |
| MENA   | Iran 2006            | Teheran      | 64                    | 26.0        | 31.7                       |
| MENA   | Iraq 1997            | Baghdad      | 67.8                  | 71.0        | 8.4                        |
| MENA   | Jordan 2004          | Amman        | 79.8                  | 8.0         | 21.6                       |
| MENA   | Egypt 1996           | Cairo        | 42.8                  | 3.2         | 29                         |
| MENA   | Egypt 2006           | Cairo        | 42.8                  | 3.2         | 25.7                       |
| MENA   | Morocco 2000         | Casablanca   | 53.3                  | 7.1         | 32.9                       |
| MENA   | Kuwait 2005          | Kuwait City  | 98.1                  | 49.2        | –                          |
| MENA   | Qatar 1998           | Doha         | 96.3                  | 59.7        | –                          |
| MENA   | Bahrain 2002         | Manama       | 88.4                  | 61.3        | –                          |

Notes: This table shows the employment share of urban tradables in total employment (%) for the largest city for selected countries around 2000. Urban tradables consist of manufacturing employment (Mfg.) and finance, insurance, real estate and business services (Fire). See Data Appendix for data sources.