


**Factor Endowments and the Heckscher-  
Olin Model**  
 EE451  
 Chayun Tantivasadakarn  
 Faculty of Economics, Thammasat University

1

Chayun Tantivasadakarn




**Outline**

- Assumptions
- Autarky equilibrium
- The Heckscher-Ohlin Theorem
- Factor-Price-Equalization Theorem
- The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem
- The Rybczynski Theorem
- Testing the Heckscher-Ohlin Model
- Specific-Factor model

2

Chayun Tantivasadakarn




**Assumptions**

- 2 countries, Home and Foreign
- 2 homogenous goods, rice (X) and airplanes (Y)
- 2 homogenous factors, labor (L) and capital (K)
- CRTS and identical technology across countries
- Each good has different factor intensities and no factor intensity reversal
- Capital markets:  $K = K_X + K_Y$  and  $K^* = K_X^* + K_Y^*$
- Labor markets:  $L = L_X + L_Y$  and  $L^* = L_X^* + L_Y^*$
- Countries have **different factor abundance**
- Perfect competition in all markets

3

Chayun Tantivasadakarn







**Assumptions**

- Perfectly mobile factors within each country
  - Same wage rate earned in both industries of each country
  - Same rental rate earned in both industries of each country
- Identical and homothetic preferences across countries
  - A poorer country will buy less of both rice and airplane, but in the same ratio as a richer country facing the same prices
  - Not a realistic assumption, but it allows us to **focus attention on the differences in resources as the sole reason for trade**
- No transportation costs, no market distortions, no government interventions

4

Chayun Tantivasadakarn



### Factor intensity reversal (FIR): Example

- Although all countries may have access to the same technologies, the machines used in the U.S. are different from those used in Asia and elsewhere
- Shoe production in US uses automated manufacturing machine, while the same production in India uses individual sewing machine
- In call centers, technologies are virtually identical and therefore factor intensities are similar across countries
- So, shoes in India are labor intensive compared to the call center—the opposite of the U.S.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

9

### Factor Abundance


- The two nations are identical in every way except its factor abundance or the ratio between the capital stock and labor force that each country has.
- Factor abundance refers to supply of factors of countries
- It is assumed here that the supply of factors are fixed and Home is relatively labor abundant and Foreign is relatively capital abundant or the capital to labor supply in F is higher than those in H or

$$\frac{\bar{K}^*}{\bar{L}^*} > \frac{\bar{K}}{\bar{L}}$$

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

10

### Factor Abundance and PPCs



Chayun Tantivasadakarn

11

### Factor Abundance and PPCs

- Home is L-abundant; its PPC is biased toward the X axis.
- Foreign is K-abundant; its PPC is biased toward the Y axis.
- This result holds, regardless of the sizes of the two economies as long as the factor proportions are the same.
  - Endowment point  $E^*$  and  $E'$  lie on the same ray  $k$  along with which relative endowments are the same.
  - Because of CRTS, isoquants for X and Y are both homogeneous of degree one.
  - PPC shrinks in or grows out in a parallel fashion.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

12

### Autarky equilibrium

- Given identical homothetic preferences, H's autarky equilibrium is at A while F's is at A\*.

$$P_A^* = \left( \frac{P_X^*}{P_Y^*} \right)^A > \left( \frac{P_X}{P_Y} \right)^A = P_A$$

H has comp. adv. in X and F has comp. adv. in Y.  
Note this result hold even with the smaller size economy with  $\bar{Y}'/X'$ .

What if preferences are sufficiently biased toward X?

Chayun Tantivassadakarn 13

### The Heckscher-Ohlin Theorem

- Since  $P_A^* > P_A$ , X from H is cheaper and Y from F is cheaper.
- $D_X$  in H rises and  $P_X/P_Y$  rises.  $D_Y$  in F rises and  $P_X^*/P_Y^*$  falls until they are equalize at  $P_W$ .

H's production point moves to  $Q^*$  and consumes at C.  
F's production point moves to  $Q^*$  and consumes at  $C^*$ .  
F exports  $B^*Q^*$  and imports  $B^*C^*$ .  
H exports  $BQ = B^*C^*$  and imports  $BC = B^*Q^*$ .  
Both countries gain from trade.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn 14

### Equilibrium relative price: Offer curves

Chayun Tantivassadakarn 15

### The Heckscher-Ohlin Theorem

- The Heckscher-Ohlin Theorem: **Given the assumptions of the model, a country will export the commodity that intensively uses its relatively abundant factor.**
- It is also referred to as the **Factor-Proportions Theory**
- H is L-abundant, so the relative wage rate is lower and suitable to produce X which is L-intensive.
- F is K-abundant, so the relative interest rate is lower and suitable to produce Y which is K-intensive.
- H exports the L service which is its abundant factor and imports the K service which is its scarce factor.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn 16

| Top 10 Exports |                                     |                                     |                                      |                                      |                                      |
|----------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Rank           | 1999                                | 2000                                | 2001                                 | 2002                                 | 2003                                 |
| 1              | Computers & Parts<br>(307.3 \$Bn.)  | Computers & Parts<br>(348.1 \$Bn.)  | Computers & Parts<br>(351.8 \$Bn.)   | Computers & Parts<br>(320.6 \$Bn.)   | Computers & Parts<br>(340.1 \$Bn.)   |
| 2              | I.C.<br>(111.8 \$Bn.)               | I.C.<br>(179.3 \$Bn.)               | I.C.<br>(154.9 \$Bn.)                | I.C.<br>(148.1 \$Bn.)                | I.C.<br>(191.6 \$Bn.)                |
| 3              | Garments<br>(110.3 \$Bn.)           | Garments<br>(124.2 \$Bn.)           | Garments<br>(129.1 \$Bn.)            | Automobiles & Parts<br>(125.3 \$Bn.) | Automobiles & Parts<br>(165.1 \$Bn.) |
| 4              | Canned Seafood<br>(76.4 \$Bn.)      | Automobiles & Parts<br>(96.5 \$Bn.) | Automobiles & Parts<br>(117.6 \$Bn.) | Garments<br>(116.6 \$Bn.)            | Rubber<br>(115.8 \$Bn.)              |
| 5              | Rice<br>(73.8 \$Bn.)                | Canned Seafood<br>(82.8 \$Bn.)      | Canned Seafood<br>(89.4 \$Bn.)       | Gen's & Jewelry<br>(93.1 \$Bn.)      | Garments<br>(114.9 \$Bn.)            |
| 6              | Automobiles & Parts<br>(72.0 \$Bn.) | Radios, T.V.<br>(78.0 \$Bn.)        | Gen's & Jewelry<br>(81.3 \$Bn.)      | Radios, T.V.<br>(90.1 \$Bn.)         | Gen's & Jewelry<br>(104.5 \$Bn.)     |
| 7              | Gen's & Jewelry<br>(67.5 \$Bn.)     | Plastic Pellets<br>(74.0 \$Bn.)     | Radios, T.V.<br>(74.9 \$Bn.)         | Canned Seafood<br>(86.5 \$Bn.)       | Radios, T.V.<br>(103.8 \$Bn.)        |
| 8              | Radios, T.V.<br>(51.2 \$Bn.)        | Gen's & Jewelry<br>(69.4 \$Bn.)     | Plastic Pellets<br>(71.4 \$Bn.)      | Plastic Pellets<br>(77.1 \$Bn.)      | Plastic Pellets<br>(89.3 \$Bn.)      |
| 9              | Frozen Shrimps<br>(49.3 \$Bn.)      | Rice<br>(65.6 \$Bn.)                | Rice<br>(70.1 \$Bn.)                 | Rubber<br>(74.6 \$Bn.)               | Canned Seafood<br>(88.9 \$Bn.)       |
| 10             | Plastic Pellets<br>(46.0 \$Bn.)     | Rubber<br>(60.7 \$Bn.)              | Rubber<br>(58.7 \$Bn.)               | Rice<br>(70.0 \$Bn.)                 | Rice<br>(76.7 \$Bn.)                 |


Source : Department of Trade Negotiations, Ministry of Commerce

### Factor-Price-Equalization Theorem (FPE)

- The Heckscher-Ohlin Theorem shows that the differences in endowments lead to different factor prices, different pattern of comparative advantage and trade.
- But international trade eventually equalizes the commodity prices and change the production. What impact international trade should have on the factor prices of the trade partners?
- FPE Theorem predicts that international trade will equalize the relative factor prices.
- To show this we need to find the relationship between the commodity prices and the factor prices.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

18



Chayun Tantivasadakarn

19

### Commodity prices and factor prices

- At an initial price ratio  $P_A$ , the equilibrium on the PPC is at point A.
- This point corresponds to point A' in the Edgeworth box diagram.
- Point A is the tangency point between the  $X_A$  and  $Y_A$  isoquants on the contact curve, the equilibrium factor price ratio is  $(w/r)_A$ .
- Suppose the relative price increases to  $P_B$ , the equilibrium on the PPC moves to point B. Outputs of X will rise and Y will fall.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

20

### Commodity prices and factor prices

- This point corresponds to point B' in the Edgeworth box diagram and the equilibrium factor price ratio is  $(w/r)_B$ .
- Given CRTS technology, the slope of  $X_B$  at point B' must be the same as the slope of  $X_A$  at point C which is higher than the slope of  $X_A$  at point A or  $(w/r)_B > (w/r)_A$ .
- This implies that as the relative commodity prices increases, the relative factor prices also increase.

$$\frac{w}{r} = f\left(\frac{P_X}{P_Y}\right)$$

21

### Commodity prices and factor prices

$$\frac{w}{r} = f\left(\frac{P_X}{P_Y}\right)$$

- There is a unique relationship between relative commodity prices and the relative factor prices as long as both goods are produced.
- Reason: Since X is labor intensive, as  $P_X/P_Y$  increases, production of X increases. This demands more labor and increases the wage rate.

22

### Factor-Price-Equalization Theorem (FPE)

- Note that this function is the same for both countries by CRTS and identical technology.
- Since free trade causing the relative commodity prices to equalize, the relative factor prices must also equalize.
- **The Factor-Price-Equalization Theorem: Under identical CRTS, free trade in commodities will equalize relative factor prices through the equalization of relative commodity prices, so long as both countries produce both goods.**

23

### Why don't we observe FPE?

- Significant transportation costs.
- Trade restrictions: tariffs and quotas.
- Market distortions: monopolies, labor union
- Non CRTS technology
- Not identical technology
- Factor-intensity reversal
- Heterogeneous factor

Even though FPE is unlikely, trade can result in strong tendencies in that direction.

24

### The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem

- The theorem intends to show that the change in commodity prices change the distribution of real incomes between capital and labor.
- From profit maximization conditions: VMP = factor price,

$$MP_L^X = W/P_X \quad MP_K^X = r/P_X$$


$$MP_L^Y = W/P_Y \quad MP_K^Y = r/P_Y$$

If the marginal products change, the real returns will change.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

25

### The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem



Chayun Tantivassadakarn

26


### The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem

- Movement from A' to D reduces L keeping K constant. Law of Diminishing Returns implies further that  $MP_L$  at D is higher than that at A'.
- By CRTS, the  $MP_L$  is constant along the ray  $O_XDCB'$ . So  $MP_L$  at point D and B' are the same.
- $MP_L$  at point B' is higher than  $MP_L$  at point A' and  $w/P_X$  is higher.
- Hence, the increase in commodity prices, movement from A' to B', has increased  $MP_L$  and  $w/P_X$ .

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

27

### The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem



Chayun Tantivassadakarn

28

### The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem


- Movement from  $A'$  to E raises K keeping L constant. Law of Diminishing Returns implies further that  $MP_K$  at E is lower than that at  $A'$ .
- By CRTS, the  $MP_K$  is constant along the ray  $O_X CB'$ . So  $MP_K$  at point E and  $B'$  are the same.
- $MP_K$  at point  $B'$  is lower than  $MP_K$  at point  $A'$  and  $r/P_X$  is lower.
- Hence, these prove that the increase in commodity prices, movement from A to B, has decreased  $MP_K$  and  $r/P_X$ .

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

29

### The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem

- Note that the K-L ratios in X at point  $A'$  is lower than those at point  $B'$  because  $(w/r)_A < (w/r)_B$  or  $k_{XA} < k_{XB}$  and  $k_{YA} < k_{YB}$



Chayun Tantivassadakarn

30

### The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem

- Movement from  $A'$  to  $B'$  increases X but decreases Y --> increases demand for L but decreases demand for K --> increase  $w/r$ , causing  $K/L$  to rise for both goods.
- This implies that any increase in K-L ratios will increase the real wage of L and lower the real returns to K.
- Since the movement from point  $A'$  to  $B'$  also increases the K-L ratios in Y, this will also increase the real wage of L and lower the real returns to K in industry Y.
- These results hold as long as the economy remains incompletely specialized.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

31

### The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem

**The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem:** If there are CRTS and if both goods continue to be produced, a relative increase in the price of a commodity will increase the real return to the factor used intensively in that industry and reduce the real return to the other factor.

- A labor abundant country enters free trade. This will increase the relative price of labor intensive goods, make the workers better off and capitalists worse off.
  - Workers will support free trade while capitalists will oppose it.
  - Not only workers in labor intensive sectors will be better off, but also workers in capital intensive sectors

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

32


### The Rybczynski Theorem

- The theorem show the relationship between changes in factor endowments and changes in the outputs of the two commodities when their prices are assumed to be constant.
- For instance, a country gains labor endowment through labor immigration.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

33

### The Rybczynski Theorem



Chayun Tantivasadakarn

34

### The Rybczynski Theorem

- At the initial equilibrium point E on the contract curve where the isoquants of X and Y tangent, the K-L ratio for X and Y are  $k_X$  and  $k_Y$ , respectively.
- Suppose L is increased by  $\Delta L$ , the origin for Y is shifted from  $O_Y$  to  $O'_Y$ .
- Recall that there is a one-to-one relationship between  $P_X/P_Y$  and  $w/r$ . Since  $P_X/P_Y$  is constant, so is  $w/r$ . Therefore, the K-L ratios in both goods are not affected.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

35

### The Rybczynski Theorem

- Even though the endowment L has increased, the ray  $k_X$  and  $k_Y$  are not affected.
- Hence, the K-L ratio for Y is shifted parallel from  $k_Y$  to  $k'_Y$  and point E' must be the new equilibrium.
- Since point E' is farther from origin  $O_X$  than is point E, output of X must increase.
- Output of Y must decrease since  $O'_Y E'$  is shorter than  $O_Y E$  ( $O'_Y E'$  is equal to  $O_Y C < O_Y E$ ).

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

36


### The Rybczynski Theorem

- **The Rybczynski Theorem:** If relative commodity prices are constant and if both commodities continue to be produced, **an increase in the supply of a factor will lead to an increase in the output of the commodities using that factor intensively and a decrease in the output of the other commodities.**
- Reason: The increase in L-intensive good, X, draws both L and K from K-intensive good, Y, causing Y to contract.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

37

### The Rybczynski Theorem



- An increase in L endowment will shift the PPC biased toward the X (L-intensive good) axis from XY to X'Y'. Since P is constant, the equilibrium moves from E to E'. The line joining them is called the Rybczynski line. Note that X increases while Y decreases.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

38

### Testing the Heckscher-Ohlin Model

- **Tests on U.S. Data**
  - **Leontief paradox:** Leontief found that U.S. exports were less capital-intensive than U.S. imports, even though the U.S. is the most capital-abundant country in the world.

#### Factor Content of U.S. Exports and Imports for 1962

|  | Imports     | Exports     |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Capital per million dollars                          | \$2,132,000 | \$1,876,000 |
| Labor (person-years) per million dollars             | 119         | 131         |
| Capital-labor ratio (dollars per worker)             | \$17,916    | \$14,321    |
| Average years of education per worker                | 9.9         | 10.1        |
| Proportion of engineers and scientists in work force | 0.0189      | 0.0255      |

Source: Robert Baldwin, "Determinants of the Commodity Structure of U.S. Trade," *American Economic Review* 61 (March 1971), pp. 126-145.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

39

### Testing the Heckscher-Ohlin Model

- Leontief used labor and capital used directly in the production of final good exports in each industry.
- He also measured the labor and capital used indirectly in the industries that produced the intermediate inputs used in making exports.
- The capital is high because we are measuring the whole capital stock—not the part actually used to produce exports.
- The capital/labor ratio was \$14,000: each person employed was working with \$14,000 worth of capital.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

40

**Testing the Heckscher-Ohlin Model**

- It was impossible for Leontief to get information on the amount of labor and capital used to produce imports.
- He used data on U.S. technology to calculate estimated amounts of labor and capital used in imports from abroad.
  - Remember the HO model assume technologies are the same across countries.
- This gave a capital/labor ratio of \$18,200 per worker.
  - This exceeds the ratio for exports.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn 41

**Heckscher-Ohlin Model**

- Leontief assumed correctly that in 1947 the U.S. was capital abundant relative to the rest of the world.
  - From the HO model, Leontief expected that the U.S. would export capital intensive goods and import labor intensive goods.
- Leontief, however, found the opposite.
  - The capital labor ratio for U.S. imports was higher than for exports.
- This contradiction came to be called **Leontief's paradox**.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn 42

**Testing the Heckscher-Ohlin Model**

- **Tests on Global Data:** A study by Bowen, Leamer, and Sveikauskas tested the Heckscher-Ohlin model using data for a large number of countries.
  - This study confirms the Leontief paradox on a broader level.
- **Tests on North-South Trade**
  - North-South trade in manufactures seems to fit the Heckscher-Ohlin theory much better than the overall pattern of international trade.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn 43

**Testing the Heckscher-Ohlin Model**

- A study by Treffer in 1995 showed that technological differences across a sample of countries are very large.

**Estimated Technological Efficiency, 1983 (United States = 1)**

| Country      |      |
|--------------|------|
| Bangladesh   | 0.03 |
| Thailand     | 0.17 |
| Hong Kong    | 0.40 |
| Japan        | 0.70 |
| West Germany | 0.78 |

**Source:** Treffer, *American Economic Review*, (December 1995), p. 1037.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn 44

### Possible explanations for the Leontief paradox

- Assumptions of H-O model are too restrictive:
  - land and natural resources
  - skilled and unskilled labor
- Demand biases for goods in which it normally has comparative advantage.
- Non-identical technologies.
- Factor intensity reversal.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

45

### Summary

- The Heckscher-Ohlin model, in which two goods are produced using two factors of production, emphasizes the role of resources in trade.
- The Heckscher-Ohlin theorem predicts that a country will export the commodity which uses *intensively* its *abundant* factor and import the commodity which uses *intensively* its *scarce* factor.
- International trade tends to equalize factor prices. Complete FPE is not observed due to transportation costs, barriers to trade, distortions, differences in technology and inputs.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

46

### Summary

- A rise in the relative price of the labor-intensive good will shift the distribution of income in favor of labor:
  - The real wage of labor will rise in terms of both goods, while the real income of capitalists will fall in terms of both goods.
- For any given commodity prices, an increase in a factor of production increases the supply of the good that uses this factor intensively and reduces the supply of the other good.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

47

### Summary

- The owners of a country's abundant factors gain from trade, but the owners of scarce factors lose.
- Empirical evidence is mixed on the Heckscher-Ohlin model.
  - Most researchers do not believe that differences in resources alone can explain the pattern of world trade or world factor prices.

Chayun Tantivassadakarn

48

### The Specific-Factor Model

- H-O model assume free mobility of factors between sectors which can only happen in the long run.
- In the short run, some factors, such as capital take a long time to be converted from one industry to others.
- This model assume that capital is fixed and specific to each sector but labor still freely mobile.
- It is a short run version of H-O model.

### The Specific-Factor Model: Assumptions

- 2 countries, 2 homogenous goods: X and Y
- Perfect competition in all markets.  $P_X$  and  $P_Y$  are given.
- 3 factors: mobile Labor (L), specific capital for X ( $K_X$ ), specific capital for Y ( $K_Y$ ).

$$X = F(K_X, L_X)$$


$$Y = G(K_Y, L_Y)$$

- Full employment conditions

$$K_X = \bar{K}_X, \quad K_Y = \bar{K}_Y,$$

$$L_X + L_Y = \bar{L}$$

### The Specific-Factor Model: PPC



### The Specific-Factor Model: labor allocation

- Profit maximization requires that

$$VMP_L^X = P_X MP_L^X = w$$

$$VMP_L^Y = P_Y MP_L^Y = w$$

- Since labor is freely mobile, there must be only one wage rate. Hence, labor will move across industries until  $VMP_L^X = VMP_L^Y$ .
- $VMP_L^X$  is plotted from left to right while  $VMP_L^Y$  is plotted from right to left.
- The length of the horizontal axis represents the labor supply:  $\bar{L} = L_X + L_Y$

### The Specific-Factor Model: labor allocation

At  $L_1$ ,  $w_X > w_Y$ .

- Labor will move from Y to X until wages are equalized at  $w$ .
- Employment in X =  $L_X$ .
- Employment in Y =  $L_Y$ .
- Labor income = area  $wO_XO_Yw$ .
- Capitalist return in X =  $AwM$ . Capitalist return in Y =  $AwN$ .

Chayun Tantivasadakarn 53

### The Specific-Factor Model: increase in $\bar{K}_X$

- $MP_L^X$  and  $VMP_L^X$  move up.
- This increases  $w$ ,  $L_X$ , X and decreases  $L_Y$  and Y.
- $r_X$  must fall since  $\bar{K}_X$  increases.  $r_Y$  must also fall since output Y fall.
- Since good prices are fixed, real wage increases and real returns on both specific factor decreases.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn 54

### The Specific-Factor Model: increase in $K_X$

- If technology is constant returns to scale, the marginal product depends on K-L ratio. For instance,  $X = L^\alpha K^{1-\alpha}$ ,

$$MP_L^X = \alpha \left[ \frac{K}{L} \right]^{1-\alpha}, \quad MP_K^X = (1-\alpha) \left[ \frac{L}{K} \right]^\alpha$$

- From  $P_X MP_L^X = w$  and  $P_X MP_K^X = r_X$ , we know that  $w/P_X = MP_L^X$  and  $r_X/P_X = MP_K^X$ .
- When  $K/L$  increases,  $MP_L^X$  and  $w/P_X$  increase; at the same time  $MP_K^X$  and  $r_X/P_X$  decrease

Chayun Tantivasadakarn 55

### The Specific-Factor Model: increase in L

Chayun Tanti 56

### The Specific-Factor Model: increase in L

- The increase in L, will increase the length of the labor axis and carry the  $VMP^Y_L$  with it.
- Nominal wage falls due to the increase in labor supply.
- Both X and Y increase.
- Nominal  $r_X$  and  $r_Y$  rise because the increase in outputs increase the demand for their specific factors.
- Since good prices are constant, real wage falls, real  $r_X$  and  $r_Y$  both rise.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

57


### The Specific-Factor Model: increase in endowment

- At constant commodity prices, any increase in the endowment of a specific factor will increase the real returns to the mobile factor and lower the real returns to both specific factors.
- An increase in the endowment of the mobile factor will reduce its own real income and increase the real income of both specific factors.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

58

### The Specific-Factor Model: change in a price



- If  $P_X$  increases by free trade,  $VMP^X_L$  shifts upward.
- The  $w_X > w_Y$ , labor will move from Y to X until wages are equalized at  $w'$ .
- Note that  $w'$  increases less than the increase in  $P_X$ .

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

59

### The Specific-Factor Model: change in a price

- Employment in X,  $L_X$  increases. Employment in Y,  $L_Y$  decreases.
- Nominal labor income increases.  $w/P_Y$  increases while  $w/P_X$  decreases since  $w$  increases less than  $P_X$ .
- Capitalists nominal return in X increases to area  $Bw'M'$ .  $r_X/P_Y$  increases.  $r_X/P_X$  increases since  $MP^X_K$  increases by more  $L_X$ .
- Capitalists nominal return in Y decreases to area  $Bw'N$ . Both  $r_Y/P_Y$  and  $r_Y/P_X$  decreases.

Chayun Tantivasadakarn

60

### The Specific-Factor Model: change in a price



- A relative price increase of a good increases the real return of the specific factor used in that industry, reduces the real return of the other specific factor, and has an ambiguous effect on the mobile factor.
- Free trade affects the real returns in the short run differently from the long run.
- Different groups of capitalists may support free trade differently in the short run.