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SUMMARY

This paper is concerned with the treatment of commodity and activity balances in a national accounts context. It makes use of a general method for reducing the size of a social accounting-matrix (SAM) by apportioning the elements of one or more accounts to the rest. The national accounts are looked at in terms of their usefulness for policy analysis, not least analysis of the impact of price changes. The SNX convention of separately distinguishing activities and commodities is endorsed. However, in contrast to the SNA, it is argued that for analytic purposes commodity transactions should be recorded at market prices, with a separate account for each market for a given commodity in which a distinct price prevails. The SNA SAM is shown to be a reduced form of the SAM resulting from this recommended treatment of commodity transactions, while a further round of reductions (apportionments), yields SAMs which are familiar from input-output analysis, in which activities and commodities are not separately distinguished. It is argued that no special effort would be required to produce SAMs in which commodity balances are recorded at market prices as recommended here, and that all reduced form versions of such SAMs, including the SNA, are inferior as a basis for the analysis of price effects on the structure of production.
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1. Introduction

The first objective in this paper is to set out, in schematic form, a social accounting matrix (SAM) tableaux for the representation of commodity balances in an economy, and to discuss appropriate criteria for classifying activities and commodities within such a framework.

A second objective is to present a mathematical technique which eliminates a subset of the accounts in a SAM and proves to be an interesting way of reducing their size, in the sense that it formalizes methods commonly adopted in practice.

These two elements of a data framework and a mathematical technique are brought together by applying the latter to the former at two levels. To begin with, it is shown that the SAM framework promoted as the UN System of National Accounts (SNA) can be obtained by reducing the data framework which is initially presented here. Accordingly, the SNA SAM can be described as a reduced form of the SAM which provides the starting point for discussion in this paper. It is then shown that, by a further stage of reduction, tables can be obtained which show commodity balances and interindustry relationships on either a commodity x commodity or an industry x industry basis, thus eliminating the extra details which are necessary when commodities and industries are separately distinguished.

In demonstrating how the SNA format can be obtained mathematically from the SAM initially presented, it is by no means implied that this step is to be encouraged. On the contrary, the spirit of the discussion is that the

1/ See UNSO (1968).
SNA format and, in particular, the approximate basic price structure adopted there for presenting commodity balances implies a very special mathematical structure or economic model. Some of its implied ambiguities in the measurement of price effects have been discussed by Greenfield and Fell (1979). Here, two consequences of assuming this model can be noted. One is to cloud commodity balances in a mistique which reduces their intelligibility; and the other is to yield a derived set of data which cannot support analysis of problems which are assumed away by the highly specialized economic theory which alone justifies the SNA construct. These problems center around import substitution, economic duality and the deepening of the industrial structure, all of which are important characteristics of economic development. The argument, therefore, is that the SNX format encourages national income statistics in a direction that is not only unnecessarily complicated but also counterproductive from the perspective of economic analysis for developing countries. In promoting a reduced form SAM, the SNA encourages loss of important information on structure.

Accounting for Commodities and Activities

2.1 The basic SAM framework

The SAM which provides the starting point for discussion in this paper is set out in Table 1. It follows the SNA in distinguishing separate accounts for production activities (industries) and commodities, and also has a detailed set of accounts for indirect taxes (and subsidies) on commodities. All other accounts are consolidated into a single account since their detail is not important for present purposes.
SNA which is important is that all commodity transactions are recorded at purchaser (market) prices.

Since 'all other' is a single, consolidated account, its total income, \( y_0 \), is a scalar. This is made up of three types of elements: (i) the total revenues from various types of commodity taxes, recorded in the row vector \( y^t \); (ii) the value added of the various production activities, recorded in the vector \( v \) and defined to include taxes on activities; and (iii) the value of imports of various commodities as recorded in the row vector \( m^t \).

Because Table 1 is a SAM, corresponding row and column totals must be equal. For the 'all other' account, the column details of matching expenditures are simply final demands for commodities, which are here split as between primary commodities, the column vector \( f_p \), and higher level commodities, the column vector \( f_n \). The nature of this split in commodity accounts is crucial in what follows.

As can be seen from the fourth column of Table 1, primary commodity markets are supplied by imports, \( m^t \), and by the outputs of domestic production activities as given by the make-matrix \( T_{a,p} \). In aggregate, these supplies yield totals, \( y^t_p \), which are sold either to meet final demands, \( f_p \), or to higher level commodity markets, \( T_{p,h} \). Note that there are no sales from higher level commodity markets to the primary level, and that output of domestic production activities is sold only to primary markets.

I/ I have written elsewhere with various collaborators on Sow these other accounts might be treated. See for example, Pyatt and Round (1977), Pyatt, Roc and associates (1977) and Pyatt and Thorbecke (1976).
As shown by Table 1, the higher level markets buy from primary markets and these transactions are recorded in $T_{p,h}$. Sales by the higher level markets are sales to final buyers, $f_h$; to production activities, (i.e. intermediate demand), $T_{h,a}$; and to each other, $T_{h,h}$.

This apparently elaborate scheme of commodity accounting is necessary to provide a SAM which adheres to the rule of having a separate account for each market in which the price of a commodity is different. Since there can be wide variations in commodity prices across markets, a single account for each commodity will not suffice, and several may be needed.

A simple example which illustrates the SAM framework in Table 1 relates to the case of a fisherman who retains some of his catch for home consumption and sells the remainder at the quayside to a trader, who subsequently sells it in distant markets. These distant markets constitute the higher level market(s) for fish: the quayside is the primary market in this case. Thus the fish retained for home consumption, valued at the quayside price, is recorded as an element of $f_p$, while the sale of the remainder is recorded in $T_{p,h}$. Buying this remainder is not the only cost for the trader. He must also provide distribution and transport services to move his fish to distant markets. These costs will also be recorded in $T_{p,h}$ or in $T_{h,h}$, depending on whether they are purchased from primary or higher level markets. The resulting total costs of the higher level market for fish are then matched by final or intermediate sales, recorded in $f_h$ and $T_{h,a}$, respectively.

This example serves to illustrate that the role of primary markets is to buy the outputs of domestic and foreign production activities at their point of origin within a country, and to sell these to any buyers at that
point, but otherwise to simply make these outputs available as commodity supplies to the higher level commodity markets. The role of the latter is then to bring these primary commodities to market(s) and otherwise reconstitute them as available supplies to be bought at market prices.

Clearly, there can be numerous different commodity market accounts in Table I and, in particular, the number of such accounts is likely to exceed the number of production activities. This is partly because it would be conventional to think of $T_{a,p}$ as a square matrix on the understanding that there are equal numbers of primary commodity markets and production activities; and partly because there may be a hierarchy of higher level markets for any given commodity. The guiding principle here should be to recognize a separate commodity market wherever distinct prices maintain. For example, the export and home markets for a commodity may require separate higher level accounts.

2.2 The classification of commodities

The schematic treatment of commodity and activity accounts as shown in Table I is implicit or explicit in the worksheets of national accountants using the commodity balance method. Primary data on final demand, $(f_p)$ and $(f_h)$, and intermediate purchases by industries, $(T_{ha})$, are obtained in purchaser prices. The proposal here, therefore, is to set out these data as such, distinguishing as separate commodities goods and services which are physically the same but sold at different prices in different markets. Similarly, import data can be obtained in standard ways, while the sales of output by production activities are naturally recorded at ex-factory prices, thus providing the details of the make matrix $T_{a,p}$. 
The various goods and services that the economy produces, as recorded in $T_{a,p}$ and those imported, $m'$, constitute total supplies of primary commodities, $y_p$. In general it is useful for subsequent domestic analysis and international comparisons if the classification of these supplies follows the SITC. Otherwise, use of standard international classifications is not at a premium in designing the SAM, relative to the importance of describing the domestic economy in ways that are useful for domestic analysis.

Within the primary commodity classification, the amount of detail which it is useful to retain must be a matter of judgment. However, it is helpful to distinguish goods and services which are only produced domestically, (non-traded goods), and those which have to be imported because there is no domestic production capacity. This leaves a third category of goods which are imported, but for which domestic substitutes are available. These need not be perfect substitutes, of course, and one of the important recent innovations in trade analysis has been to develop methods for handling various degrees of substitutability, thus breaking away from the straitjacket of extremes prescribed by the dichotomy between (perfect) complements and (perfect) substitutes.

Primary commodities are all sold to higher level commodity accounts except in so far as they are not subject to tax, packaging, transport, distribution, etc. Hence the final demand for primary commodities will be restricted to items such as rice which the grower retains for personal composition, or imports which simply add to stocks.

Footnote 1: The best known source for this is Armington (1969).
Typically, then, primary commodities are sold to higher level commodity markets where they are, in effect, assembled for sale to final buyers. This 'assembly' involves payment of any commodity taxes and the combination of primary goods, such as steel *ex-factory* and transport/services, to move the steel to the shipyard, where it is bought as a package, ready for use. Thus transport and distribution margins will all feature in the matrix $T_{p,h}$. The matrix $T_{h,h}$ is allowed to be non-zero in the system simply for generality, given the contingency that it may be useful to allow for a hierarchy of commodities, as when a commodity can be sold in one market or, by addition of further transport and distribution services, moved on to another.

The appropriate number and detail of the higher level accounts should derive from the number of primary commodities, statistical convenience, and otherwise from proximate adherence to the rule that different commodity markets should be distinguished as such when they reflect differences in market prices. This may imply a strong regional dimension, (or simply urban/rural), for the commodity classification. In general, a large number of commodity accounts may be indicated, and there is considerable scope without necessarily reaching the upper bound of several hundreded accounts which has been encouraged for many countries via the Japanese tradition in input–output.

The established argument again is: having large numbers of commodity accounts is in part a matter of what is manageable, and in part a question of the amount of information that can be fitted onto the printed page. Both aspects deserve reconsideration in the light of evolving data storage and processing capabilities, since more detail can now be managed, and the printed table is not the only means of conveying numerical information. To the extent
that the SNX reduced form of Table 1 is an ingenious solution to this problem of size, the argument for it is increasingly dated and runs against the emerging trend towards computer storage of micro data bases to be accessed directly for whatever purpose is at hand. In the absence of appropriate computing capability, the fact that the commodity balance approach to national accounts requires worksheets that correspond more or less to Table 1 may be sufficient to argue its technical feasibility at a useful level of disaggregation. The fact that the table may be too large to print does not seem sufficient reason for rejecting its preservation as the basic detail on commodity balances.

2.3 The classification of activities

By convention, the classification of activities is usually based on their principal products, and the detail of the principal products which are recognized corresponds to the detail of the primary commodities which are domestically produced. This has two implications. First, matrix $T_{a,p}$ will be square, (if there are no separate accounts for imported goods which are not produced domestically), and it will be dominated by elements on its main diagonal, since the off-diagonal elements will be non-zero only to the extent that an activity produces goods other than its principal product.

There is an important case for having a commodity dimension to the classification of activities. But there is only a weak case at best for carrying this to the extreme of precluding all other classification considerations. This point is conceded most often in allowing that activities might be classified by region as well as by principal product, although there has yet to be a move towards recognizing separately within the accounts those activities which take place offshore or within free trade zones. Yet to do so
would typically be convenient for statisticians since they correspond to separate data sources; and it would be most helpful to economists because the quite distinctive technologies and market relationships of such activities could then be recorded as such and analyzed.

More generally, in developing economies, the form of organization is at least as important as the product produced. Plantation rubber or coconuts are very different in their factor demands, input structures and yields when compared with the analogous small-holder sectors. The same can be said for sharecropping versus freehold fanning. In services, the modern, formal sector is again quite different from the traditional, informal sector, as it is in industry. The public sector differs from the private and, within the latter, technology often differs between domestically and foreign owned corporations. All these distinctions are easily recognized in primary data sets and therefore could be readily retained in national accounts tabulations. To do so would make the data much more useful and interesting to governments in monitoring development and for policy analysis. The main reason given for not doing so seems to be that it is not recommended in the SNA, which in turn invokes the theory of commodity technology in support of the exclusive use of the principal product criterion. Yet if there is a distinct branch of economics associated with the study of development, it owes much to the recognition of structural duality, which depends a good deal on differences in level of technology, and relatively little on whatever commodities are being produced.

Breaking away from the principal product basis for classification of activities implies that \( T_{a,p} \) will no longer be approximated by a square, diagonal matrix. Rather, it will now contain information on the vector of
goods produced by each of the plantation sector, modern private industry, public corporations, etc. Hence the role of each of these sectors in development, and in relation to imports, can now be quantified and analyzed. It is important for managing development to be able to do so, while the formal mathematical modeling of the gender of make-matrices that this implies is not a major difficulty. In the simplest case, it is probably less seriously wrong to assume fixed proportions for the outputs of activities defined according to their form of organization, than it is to assume a common input structure for production of a given commodity, irrespective of the form in which production is organized. Less extremely, a blend of commodity produced and organizational form as criteria for classifying activities is clearly superior to present practice, which essentially ignores the latter.

3. Reduced Forms of a SAM

The most common technique for reducing the size of a SAM is to consolidate some of the accounts. This technique has been adopted implicitly in Table 1 by consolidating the detail of all accounts other than those for activities, commodities and taxes on the letter. In this section an alternative way of reducing a SAM is to be explained, and then applied in section 4 to yield reduced form versions of Table 1. This alternative method can be applied quite generally. It formalizes the common accounting practice of apportioning elements of costs (i.e., of expenditures) to other accounts. The method is presented here in the context of Table 2.

Table 2 sets out a SAM with m+n accounts, partitioned into a set of m accounts which are to be retained, and n accounts to be eliminated by apportionment. Without loss of generality, the accounts are ordered so that
those to be retained are leading. It is also useful at this point to define matrices $A_{jk}$, corresponding to the $T_{jk}$, by the relationship

$$A_{jk} = T_{jk} y_k^{-1}$$  \(1\)

where $y_k$ is a diagonal matrix formed from the vector $y_k$. This implies that elements of $A_{jk}$ are proportions: an element of $A_{jk}$ is given by the corresponding element of $T_{jk}$, expressed as a proportion of the aggregate of all elements in the same column of the SAM, i.e. as a proportion of the corresponding column sum.

With this notation, the following result describes the reduced form SAM which can be obtained by apportionment:

**Result 1:** If $B = A_{12}(I - A_{22})^{-1}$ exists, then there exists a reduced form SAM, $T_{11}^*$, such that

$$T_{11}^* = T_{11} + BT_{21}$$

and (i) row (and column) totals of

$T_{11}^*$ are given by $y_1$ (and $y_1^*$); and

(ii) column sums of $B$ are all unity.

Proof is omitted in the interest of brevity.

In comment on this result, it is useful to consider first the case $n = 1$, i.e. the situation in which a single account is to be eliminated. In this case $A_{12}$ is a column vector, elements of which add up to $1 = a_{22}$, where matrix $A_{22}$ is now the scalar $a_{22}$. Hence $B$ is simply a column vector, elements of which add to unity (as required by (ii) of the result). Moreover, all elements of this vector will be positive if all elements of $A_{12}$ are positive. So $B$ is simply a vector of proportions in this case, and this vector is proportional to the vector $A_{12}$.
Similarly, with \( n = 1 \), \( T_{21} \) is a row vector. Hence \( BT_{21} \) is a matrix which apportions the elements of \( T_{21} \) to the first \( m \) rows of the SAM, according to the proportions specified in \( B \). Thus the first row of \( BT_{21} \) is the row vector \( T_{21} \), scaled by the first element of \( B \). The second row of \( BT_{21} \) is the same vector, but now scaled by the second element of \( B \). And so on. It is evident, then, that column sums of \( BT_{21} \) are given by \( T_{21} \), while row sums are given by the row sum of \( T_{21} \), multiplied by the appropriate element of \( B \), i.e. by \( B(1 - a_{22})y_2 = A_{12}y_2 = T_{12} \). It follows that row (and column) sums of \( T_{11} \) as defined in Result 1 will be \( y_1 \) (and \( y_1' \)). Matrix \( T_{11} \) is therefore a SAM.

The above scenario, eliminating a single account from a SAM by apportionment, can obviously be repeated several times so as to remove a set of accounts seriatum. The question now arises whether the order in which a set of accounts might be so eliminated makes any difference to the eventual answer. It turns out that it does not:

**Result 2:** If a given set of \( n \) accounts are eliminated from a SAM, then the reduced form SAM so obtained is independent of the sequence or number of steps involved.

The proof of this result is lengthy and the algebra tedious. It is therefore not presented. However, the result is important because it establishes that a series of \( n \) individual eliminations by apportionment yield a final result which is independent of the sequencing of the individual steps. It is this final result, which shows the consequences of apportioning out all \( n \) accounts, which is given by Result 1.
4. Reduced Forms of the Basic SAM

4.1 The SNA SAM

By applying the mathematics of the previous section to the SAM shown in Table 1 a reduced form SAM can be obtained in which the accounts for higher level commodity markets have been eliminated. This new SAM is shown in Table 3. It is important because the SAM in Table 3 corresponds to that recommended in UNSO (1968) as the basis for international standards, i.e. the SNA.

To interpret Table 3, comparison with Table 1 is useful. This shows that the elimination of the higher level commodity accounts has to involve some accommodation of the previous demands on these accounts, viz the final demands \( f_h \) and the intermediate demands \( T_{ha} \). The accommodation is via apportionment. Higher level commodities are shown in Table 1 as being combinations of primary commodities, (fish plus transport), commodity taxes, and themselves, i.e. other higher level commodities. Hence, on the basis of cost apportionment, with costs as recorded in Table 1, higher level commodities can be traced back to their primary commodity and tax components. These apportionments are given by \( A_{th}(I - A_{hh})^{-1} \) for the tax components and \( A_{ph}(I - A_{hh})^{-1} \) for the primary commodity components. Hence the final demands for higher level commodities, \( f_h \), are expressed in Table 3 as commodity taxes, \( A_{th}(I - A_{hh})^{-1}f_h \), and as final demands for primary commodities, \( A_{ph}(I - A_{hh})^{-1}f_h \). Intermediate demands \( T_{ha} \) are treated analogously.

This apportionment process necessarily retains accounting balances, since it is simply an application of Result 1 in the previous section: column sums of \( A_{th}(I - A_{hh})^{-1} \) plus those of \( A_{ph}(I - A_{hh})^{-1} \) are necessarily
equal to unity. A core interesting question is what it means in economic terms, especially since Table 3 is the SNA version of Table 1 and, without ancillary information, if only Table 3 is available, Table 1 cannot be resurrected.

4.2 The SNA model

The economic model underpinning the treatment of commodities in the SNA SAM assumes that the transactions in any commodity row take place at the same price. This, then, is the principle for defining the detail of commodity accounts which has been endorsed here. It implies that vectors of prices, \( P_p \) and \( p_h \), can be defined for the commodity accounts, and elements of these will apply uniformly across the individual commodity rows. It follows that the row balance equations for commodities can be deflated by prices to give commodity balances in quantity terms. These may be written as

\[
q_a = L_{ap} q_p \quad (2)
\]

and

\[
q_p = L_{pa}^* q_a + g_p \quad (3)
\]

where \( q_a \), \( q_p \) and \( g_p^* \) are the vectors of quantities obtained by deflating the vectors of financial flows \( y_a \), \( y_p \) and \( f_p^* \) in Table 3 by the appropriate prices. Similarly, matrices \( L_{ap} \) and \( L_{pa}^* \) are coefficient, (quantity ratio), matrices corresponding to \( T_{ap} \) and \( T_{pa}^* \). Thus a typical element of \( L_{ap} \) shows the quantity of domestic output of a particular activity per unit of total supplies of a particular primary commodity.

It is important to stress that these commodity balance equations are essentially (deflated) accounting balances: they say no more than that accounting balances can be interpreted as commodity balances if the assumption...
of uniform prices for all sales of a given commodity is justified. More interesting is the question of whether these balance statements are useful as a basis for analysis.

To pursue this question it can be noted that under the convention that the prices \( p_p \) and \( p_h \) are all unity, the elements of the above quantity balance equations are all observable from Table 3. Under this convention \( q_a = y_a \); \( q_p = y_p \); and \( g_p^* = f_p^* \). Similarly, \( L_{ap} = A_{ap} \) and \( L_{pa} = A_{pa}^* \). It follows that if prices change between two periods for each of which a SAM such as Table 3 is available, and these are the only changes, then the effect of the price changes on each of \( q_a \), \( q_p \), \( g_p^* \), \( L_{ap} \) and \( L_{pa}^* \) will be observable. This is because each of the two SAMs yields an observation of, say, \( y_a \) or \( A_{ap} \), and these observations would be the same in both cases if there had been no price change. Hence the consequences of changing prices on commodity balances may be analyzed. For example, if domestic prices rise relative to international prices, there will be a tendency to substitute foreign goods for domestic in meeting aggregate primary commodity requirements. The corresponding elements of \( L_{ap} \) will tend to fall accordingly, the extent of the fall depending on the elasticity of substitution between the domestic and imported varieties of particular goods.

While interpretation is certainly not trivial, the information provided by Table 3 on \( q_a \), \( L_{ap} \) and \( q_p \) does provide a basis for analyzing import substitution due to price effects or other mechanisms. However, the situation with respect to the second of the above commodity balance equations, (equation (3)), is less straightforward. To understand it, a useful starting point is to note that if Table 1, as opposed to Table 3, constituted the
available data base, then the information on commodity balances would correspond to
\[ q_a = L_{ap} q_p \]  \hspace{1cm} (4)
\[ q_p = L_{ph} q_h + g_h \]  \hspace{1cm} (5)
and
\[ q_h = L_{ha} q_a + L_{hh} q_h + g_h \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

The first of these equations is the same as the first commodity balance equation previously discussed, equation (2). Apportioning out the higher level commodity accounts therefore makes no difference to the information in the commodity balance equation for domestic production activities. The difference is rather that, after apportionment, there is only one further set of commodity balance equations, (equation (3)), while in Table 1, two such sets of balances are recorded as in equations (5) and (6).

To follow this difference further, it can be noted that by eliminating \( q_h \) from the remaining pair of balance equations from Table 1, i.e. from equations (5) and (6), the second of the two balance equations of Table 3 is obtained. Hence the two are consistent and, moreover, it follows that
\[ L_{pa} = L_{ph} (I - L_{hh})^{-1} L_{ha} \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)
and
\[ g_{p}^{*} = g_p + L_{ph} (I - L_{hh})^{-1} g_h \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)
These results imply that if \( L_{ph}, L_{hh} \) and \( L_{ha} \) are all constant, technologically determined matrices then \( L_{pa} \) is also a constant matrix, and the commodity balance equation (3), \( (q_p = L_{pa} q_a + z_p) \), as given by Table 3, is a useful way of describing how a change in the vector of activity outputs, consequent on, say, a change in prices, will generate changes in the demand for primary commodities. But if \( L_{pa} \) is not independent of the change in prices, then for analytic purposes this balance equation has to be complemented by some specification of the way in which price changes affect \( L_{pa} \). This is no simple matter. From equation (7), and assuming that \( L_{ph} \) and \( L_{hh} \) are matrices of technologically determined coefficients, changes in \( L_{pa} \) can be attributed to changes in \( L_{ha} \). For example, an increase in the price of imported fuel oil may cause some activities to switch to domestic coal, so that the coefficients in \( L_{ha} \) are changed by the price change. Such changes can, in principle at least, be monitored and modeled if \( L_{ha} \) is observed, as it is in Table 1. But if only \( L_{ha} \) is observed, then, from equation (7), it is apparent that even with \( L_{ph} \) and \( L_{hh} \) fixed, a change in any element of \( L_{ha} \) will change many elements of \( L_{pa} \). It is, therefore, extremely difficult, if not impossible, to model the effects of changes in prices on \( L_{pa} \), when its separate components \( L_{ph} (I - L_{hh})^{-1} \) and \( L_{ha} \) are not distinguished. The unfortunate consequence of this is that the SNA format discourages analysis of the effects of price changes on technology matrices and encourages the assumption that there are no changes, even though this may be known to be wrong.

While the argument above focuses on the commodity demands of activities, a similar case can be made in relation to final demands. Equation (8) shows how final demands for higher level commodities, \( e_h \), map into
final demands for primary commodities. The mapping is via the matrix 
$L_{ph} (I - L_{hh})^{-1}$, which is usually known as a classification converter, particularly in relation to that part of $g_h$ which refers to household consumption expenditure. Now the relationship between household consumption expenditures and market prices is well understood, so that if data on $g_h$ and market prices were given by the SNA, (which they are not), then the effects of prices on $g_h$, and hence $g_p$, can be formalized if the classification converter is also known, and itself independent of prices. Unfortunately, this last assumption will not always be reasonable, e.g. to the extent that households substitute 'do-it-yourself' for the purchase of services as the relative price of the latter increases.

The SNA recognizes this difficulty to the extent that it proposes supplementary data to that in Table 3 by suggesting that matrix $T_{ph}$ (or $A_{ph}$) should be recorded separately. But, ignoring $T_{hh}$ for the present, 1/ this is equivalent to recommending the full information set in Table 1. And in this event, there would seem to be little point, except for the size of paper required, to prefer Table 3, plus a supplementary table of $T_{ph}$, to simply having Table 1, especially since the derivation of Table 3

1/ Whether $T_{hh}$ is different from zero is a nice technical point. As noted earlier, the possibility of allowing non-zero elements of $T_{hh}$ is useful when commodities form a hierarchy, e.g. when goods are either sold in one market or, with the addition of some of the commodities transport and distribution services, can be moved on to another. It can be noted, however, that all the costs involved in such cases can be included in $T_{ah}$ if transport and distribution services can be uniquely identified with particular production activities. In this event, therefore, $T_{hh}$ is not required to be other than zero. If the condition that $T_{hh}$ is zero cannot be sustained, then SNA practice should be to recommend the supplementary information leading to $L_{ph} (I - L_{hh})^{-1}$, rather than just $L_{ph}$.
implicitly requires the detail of Table 1 as a starting point. Moreover, in practice, many countries produce Table 3 because that is what the SNA calls for, and omit to document the supplementary table T_{ph}. This means that the fixed technology assumptions under which Table 3 is useful are more or less forced on analysts and therefore circumscribe the usefulness of all the hard work that has to go into the table’s construction. This, plus the fact that Table 1 is far more readily understood than Table 3, would seem to establish a strong case for preferring the former as the basic presentation of commodity balances.

To complete this discussion of the SNA SAM format, it can be noted that the SNA refers to the prices p_p as approximate basic prices, defined as the unit costs of primary commodities, deriving from their import content and the ex-factory prices of domestically produced goods. These prices are, therefore, independent of domestic commodity taxes and the trade and transport margins which need to be incurred in translating primary goods into higher level commodities which can be purchased on the market. They are not true basic prices, however, because the cost structure of activities includes taxes and transport and distribution margins which are levied on inputs of intermediate goods into productive processes.

4.3 Simple input-output formats

While the SNA SAM in Table 3 is already too obscure for many economists, there is some demand for further reduced forms, the straightforward use of which is only legitimate under a further round of simplifying assumptions about the nature of cost structures and the independence of technology and prices. These concern more conventional input-output data tableaux in which the distinction between activities and
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commodities is not made. Clearly, there are two versions, one in which commodities do not feature at all, so that demands on primary commodity markets are expressed as demands on activities, and the other, in which activities do not feature, so that the cost structure of activities must be reformulated as cost structures for supplying primary commodities. In either case, the mathematics of a reduced form SAM apply.

Starting with Table 3 and using the notation $t^*$, $T^*_{ta}$, $f^*_p$ and $T^*_{pa}$ defined in that table, a new reduced form SAM can be obtained from which primary commodity accounts are eliminated. 1/ This new SAM is shown as Table 4. It introduces the notation $a^*_m$ for imports, $m^*$, expressed as proportions of primary commodity supplies $y^*_p$, i.e. $a^*_m = m^* y^*_p$.

In Table 4 the new entries in the outlay account for 'All Others' are $a^*_m f^*_p$ in the first row and $A_{ap} f^*_p$ in the rows for demands on activities. These reflect the apportionment of final demands on primary commodity accounts, $f^*_p$, in Table 3, as being partly a demand for imports, and partly a vector of demands on domestic activities. Similarly, the previous intermediate demands by activities for primary commodities, $T^*_{pa}$, are shown in Table 4 as demands by activities for imports $a^*_m T^*_{pa}$, (the import content of intermediate demands), and as demands by activities on each other, $A_{ap} T^*_{pa}$, i.e. inter-industry demands.

The commodity balance equations for Table 4 are in fact activity balances, and can be written as:

1/ In view of Result 2 of section 3 above it does not matter whether we start with Table 3 and eliminate the accounts for primary commodity markets, or start with Table 1 and eliminate all commodity market accounts simultaneously.
\[ q_a = L_{ap} L_{pa} q_a + L_{ap} g_p = (I - L_{ap} L_{pa})^{-1} L_{ap} g_p \] (9)

As a basis for modeling, equation (9) involves all the difficulties of moving from final demands at market prices, i.e., \( f_p \), to final demands at primary commodity or approximate basic prices, \( p_p \), even when \( L_{ap} \) is known. And if \( L_{ap} \) is not known then, given the matrix \( L_{ap} L_{pa} \), (which can be obtained from Table 4 via \( A_{apTpa} \)), there are considerable problems in modeling final demand in the form \( L_{ap} g_p \). These are hardly worth addressing if \( L_{ap} \) cannot be assumed to be more or less constant, for example, under the influence of price changes.

The assumption that \( L_{ap} \) is independent of relative prices may have approximate validity to the extent that the elements of \( L_{ap} \) reflect technologically fixed ratios. But for one set of cases, at least, the assumption that coefficients of \( L_{ap} \) are independent of relative prices is clearly not tenable. Such cases arise when domestically produced goods are substitutes, to some degree, for imported goods, as previously discussed. In such cases, primary markets will naturally switch ratios between domestic and foreign sources of supply in response to relative price changes. Accordingly, and because such cases are common and important, Table 4 is a very weak starting point for analysis and modeling.

As an alternative to Table 4, a second reduction of Table 3, in which the activity accounts are now eliminated, can be considered. This yields a SAM in which the remaining accounts are 'All other,' commodity and indirect tax accounts. In the interest of brevity, this is not presented here, nor is
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the derivation of the final commodity balance equation which replaces equation (9) in this case, viz.

\[ q_p = (I - L_{pa} L_{ap})^{-1} e_p \]  

(10)

To the extent that this is somewhat simpler than equation (7), the commodity \*commodity format may be preferred to that of activity \*activity. However, the fundamental difficulty remains that the coefficient matrix \( L_{ap} \) cannot reasonably be assumed to be independent of prices, so that data requirements for analysis include \( L_{ap} \), and hence imply a SAM format such as Table 1 or Table 3. Combining this with earlier arguments that Table 3 is an inadequate data base takes one back from the simple input-output SAM tableaux to the basic SAM form defined by Table 4.

5. Providing a Data Base for Policy Formulation

In this paper, as in others I have previously written, the basic concern has been to identify a data base in SAM format that is relevant and useful for economic analysis of those issues which concern people and governments, especially in developing countries, but by no means exclusively. It has generally turned out, and not least in this paper, that the attempt has yielded recommendations for the construction of SAMs which are not only intrinsically more interesting, but more easily understood and less demanding of sophisticated manipulation of primary source data. While my own previous writings have tended to concentrate on the accounts for factor markets and institutions others if have incorporated disaggregated financial

\[ \text{\textsuperscript{1}} \]

See for example Ron (1978) and Greenfield (1978).
flows in the SAM framework, for the most part adopting methods taken from UNSO (1968). Attention to the treatment of commodity accounts, and not least the conviction that market prices should be used to measure commodity transactions, is a more recent focus, which owes a great deal to collaboration with Jeffrey Round in constructing a SAM for Malaysia, aspects of which are discussed in Chander et. al. (1980). This conviction is supported by recent developments in macro-modeling for developing countries, as described in Taylor (1979) or Dervis, de Melo and Robinson (1982), for example. These models essentially build on Walrasian general equilibrium theory, in which prices play a crucial role in bringing about market equilibria, as opposed to the Leontief approach, in which prices are determined independent of production levels. Both models and SAM's are now closely integrated, not least through recent work of Grais and associates, to the point where the type of SAMs I have argued for here and elsewhere can be underpinned by a conceptual analytic framework which is more general than that which justifies the SNA. The SNA is accordingly now too special to support the analytic framework which is emerging.

At a more mundane level, the SNA is at best an inconvenient and incomplete scheme for describing those processes of change, and policy options, which are of concern to people and their governments in developing countries. It is for this reason that much attention has been given here not only to the treatment of commodities but also to the classification of production activities. It has been said that the Leontief approach of basing such classification solely on principal products is quite inappropriate in the

1/ See, for example, Grais (1981) or Drud, Grais and Pyatt (1983).
context of the dualities which characterize developing economies. Given an approach to activity classifications which recognizes the importance of the organization of production, a data framework such as Table 1 can provide a rich source of information on what is happening in an economy on a wide range of important issues. Evidently, from the analysis presented here, Table 1 is richer in this regard than Table 3.

Finally, but not least, Table 1 is basic to Table 3, so that no extra difficulty is involved in its compilation from primary sources. Since Table 3 can be obtained from it, while many would find Table 1 more useful, this may be a sufficient reason for urging Table 1 as the format for presentation of commodity balances.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th>Commodity markets</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All other accounts</td>
<td>All other accounts (consolidated)</td>
<td></td>
<td>y_o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(consolidated)</td>
<td>y'_t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect taxes on</td>
<td>y'_t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commodities</td>
<td>v'</td>
<td></td>
<td>m'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>T_{t,h}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commodity markets</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>y_t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>f_p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher level</td>
<td>f_h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>y'_t</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y'_a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y'_p</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y'_h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 2**

**Partitioning of a suitably ordered SAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Receipts</th>
<th>Accounts of immediate interest</th>
<th>Accounts of no immediate interest</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts of immediate interest</td>
<td>$T_{11}$ ($m \times m$)</td>
<td>$T_{12}$ ($m \times n$)</td>
<td>$y_1$ ($m \times 1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts of no immediate interest</td>
<td>$T_{21}$ ($n \times m$)</td>
<td>$T_{22}$ ($n \times n$)</td>
<td>$y_2$ ($n \times 1$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$y'_1$ ($1 \times m$)</td>
<td>$y'_2$ ($1 \times n$)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other accounts (consolidated)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$y'_t$</td>
<td>$y_o$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect taxes on commodities</td>
<td>$A_{th}(1-A_{hh})^{-1}f_k = t^*$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$A_{th}(1-A_{hh})^{-1}T_{ha} = T_{ta}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary commodity markets</td>
<td>$f_p + A_{ph}(1-A_{hh})^{-1}f_l = f_p^*$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$A_{ph}(1-A_{hh})^{-1}T_{ha} = T_{pa}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$y_o$</td>
<td>$y'_t$</td>
<td>$y'_a$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

SAM format for I-O on an activity x activity basis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All other accounts Consolidated</td>
<td>Indirect taxes on commodities</td>
<td>Production Activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receipts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other accounts Consolidated</td>
<td>$a'<em>{m} f'</em>{p}$</td>
<td>$y'_{r}$</td>
<td>$v'+a'<em>{m} T</em>{pa}$</td>
<td>$y_{o}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect taxes on commodities</td>
<td>$r^{*}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$T_{ra}^{*}$</td>
<td>$y_{r}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Activities</td>
<td>$A_{ap} f'_{p}$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$A_{ap} T_{pa}^{*}$</td>
<td>$y_{a}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$y_{o}$</td>
<td>$y_{r}$</td>
<td>$y_{a}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>