SOCIAL SCIENCES

SERVICE-LED TRANSFORMATION OR PREMATURE DEINDUSTRIALIZATION? SECTORAL EMPLOYMENT SHIFTS, STRUCTURAL CHANGE, AND NATIONAL INCOME IN NEPAL, 2000-2022

Shrestha Sofin
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Global Cultural Industry Management, Calvin University, Yongin-si, Korea Rep
Sherpa Pemba
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Global Cultural Industry Management, Calvin University, Yongin-si, Korea Rep
Saru Tilak
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Global Cultural Industry Management, Calvin University, Yongin-si, Korea Rep
Koirala Ashika
Ph.D. Candidate, Department of Global Cultural Industry Management, Calvin University, Yongin-si, Korea Rep
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21105836

Abstract

The structural transformation in Nepal during the period 2000 to 2022 has been quite unprecedented when compared with the classical Lewis Kuznets Chenery development sequence: There was a significant decrease of agricultural employment whereas the industrial sector experienced stagnation and most the labor force was recruited in a diverse but largely unproductive services sector. This paper aims to shed light on whether Nepal's transition, which was mainly through services, is an indication of productive growth or should be seen as an example of early deindustrialization. Annual records from the World Bank World Development Indicators (2000-2022, n = 23) were the source of data used to analyze the connection between labor shares in different sectors and net national income per capita adjusted for inflation. Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression, instrumental variables approach with lagged agricultural employment as the instrument, and Fully Modified OLS (FMOLS) to handle non-stationary residuals were applied to the data. The results show that the proportion of agricultural employment is Much, negatively, and consistently tied to the dependent variable ($\beta \approx -44$ to -46, $p < 0.001$) and a first-difference model also indicates a significant relationship between employment reallocation and short-term economic growth ($\beta = -3.81$, $p < 0.05$). Most importantly, the predominant part of the R^2 accounted for by one common time trend poses a real risk of spurious regression, and we point this limitation out quite clearly. Our results align with the research on productivity gains through structural changes, but they also emphasize the peril of development that is based on service sector growth while neglecting the factory production. The main takeaways for the development strategy are an overhaul in industry policy, raising the service industries selectively, and increasing agricultural efficiency.

Keywords: structural transformation; premature deindustrialization; service-led growth; labor productivity; Nepal; employment reallocation; time-series analysis

1. Introduction

One of the most reliable results in the field of development economics remains to be the finding that the transfer of labor from one industry to another may be a key thing in raising the overall productivity (Herrendorf et al. 2014; McMillan et al. 2014). Still, the exact process and welfare effects of this depend very much on where in the economy the workers give up their old jobs and take up new ones. The traditional sequence of sectors, which was given a status of a pattern by Lewis (1954), Kuznets (1966), and Chenery and Syrquin (1975), starts from low-productivity agriculture, then moves labor-intensive manufacturing, and finally reaches sophisticated services, with each sector transition leading to higher productivity gains. Using data, Rodrik (2016) carefully showed that the pattern is breaking up in the present-day developing economies: countries are rapidly reducing agricultural labor not towards the manufacturing sector, which is tradable, but the informal or less productive services, this way, he called the occurrence premature deindustrialization. Nepal, through a lens, presents a scenario for this argument. Over the period of 2000 to 2022, the percentage of people working in farming has come down by approximately 11 percentage points from 35.3% to 23.8% of total employment, though manufacturing and construction sectors only managed to get a little bit larger (26.0% to 30.6%), and the service sector has gone up from 38.6% to 45.1% (World Bank, 2024). This kind of path has been followed without the kind of industrialization that led to high incomes in East and Southeast Asia. Nepal's development has instead been influenced mainly by remittances coming in, tourism earnings, and electricity from hydro power external or natural resource-based factors which have very little linkages with domestic value chain (Asian Development Bank [ADB], 2020; UNESCAP, 2021). Figuring out whether the association we see between a shrinking agricultural sector and a growing economy (income) is a result of structural changes that are productive or it is just a time-trend relationship that is not real, has to do with the kind of policies that are put in place for the industries and labor-market.

This paper presents three main findings. Firstly, it uses the Premature Deindustrialization thesis to highlight the change in Nepal that the Nepal specific empirical literature hardly referred to. Secondly, it goes for a multi specification regression strategy OLS, instrumental variable estimation using lagged employment, first differenced models, and Fully Modified OLS to deal with the problems of endogeneity and non-stationarity which are characteristics of small-sample time-series data. Thirdly, it raises the analytical weaknesses of single-country time-series analysis, maintaining that finding statistical significance in levels alone is not enough to prove the existence of a structural productivity-growth relation. The rest of this paper is divided into: Section 2 discussing theoretical and literature review, identifying the research gap; Section 3 elaborating on data and empirical methods; Section 4 explaining and analyzing results; and Section 5 giving concluding with the policy and research note.

2. Literature and Research Gap

Structural changes have been the main engine of the classical development story which has resulted in higher productivity. Surplus labor transfer from subsistence agriculture to capitalist manufacturing leading to economic surplus reinvested in further capital accumulation was established by Lewis (1954). His model named the transfer of surplus labor from the agricultural sector to industrial sector as a source of economic surplus that is reinvested for further economic growth. Industrial demand for labor as assumed by the Lewis model is inelastic such that labor supply had to come from increase of wage so that outflows from agriculture get absorbed in industry a condition that industrializing East Asia met but South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa have been largely different on this point (Gollin et al. 2014; Duarte & Restuccia, 2010). Sectoral reallocation regularity has been cross-sectionally confirmed by Kuznets (1966) while Chenery and Syrquin (1975) identified the industrial growth pattern as the driving force behind the development process. Recent structural-change literature has mostly challenged this theoretical agreement. McMillan et al. (2014) accounted labor productivity growth changes for 38 countries at the level of intra-sector and structural-change components and revealed that structural change brought about positive contribution in Asia but was growth-reducing in Africa and Latin America where workers moved into low-productivity informal services rather than manufacturing. By going as far as 46 countries Timmer et al. (2015) have been able to corroborate the connection between structural change and productivity-improvement in the post-2000 period although they have also shown that the countries differ quite a bit here. The analysis of the African case by De Vries et al. (2015) is very illuminating: First, workers were employed in distributive trade services whose productivity was higher than that of agriculture However productivity growth was so slow that the structural change dividend was static rather than dynamic. Diao et al. (2017) posited that in sub-Saharan Africa the labor transition from agriculture to services is a sort of equilibrating response to the lack of competitive manufacturing sector rather than a visible development strategy.

Rodrik (2016) in his paper on premature deindustrialization, set the main analytical structure for the Nepal study. Using a cross-country dataset of 42 nations, he found that the share of manufacturing employment reaches its highest point at lower levels of income per capita and earlier in the development stage compared to the history of East Asian countries. He explained that the reason is of globalization induced trade competition, skill biased technological change in manufacturing, and the comparative advantage disadvantage of late industrializing countries. In fact, Haraguchi et al. (2017) and Felipe et al. (2018) in their later studies challenged the general applicability of Rodrik's gloominess and argued that manufacturing can still be a growth platform for countries that succeed in integrating themselves into global value chains, but they agreed that late industrializers will have a very limited window of opportunity. The emergence of service sector led growth as an alternative or complement to the traditional manufacturing-based development has been deeply analyzed again. Ghani and O'Connell (2014) argued that high productivity tradable services could be a source of growth even for low-income countries, but at the same time, they warned that the productivity effects are very much concentrated in business process and information technology services whereas retail, hospitality and personal services are quite absent. Nayyar et al. (2021) carried out an analysis of service sector productivity trends in 54 developing countries and noted that most of the service sector productivity growth attributed to services is the result of compositional upgrading rather than broad based gains. South Asia brings an additional aspect to the discussion: remittance inflows at the household level change labor supply decisions and sectoral composition in ways that are at odds with the traditional structural transformation model (Baskota & Bhatta, 2020; Acharya & Leon-Gonzalez, 2018). The migration driven economy of Nepal is an extreme example in which remittances on average accounted for around 25-30% of GDP over the study period, which led to lower reservation wages, and a consumption driven services demand that was not matched by corresponding tradable sector development (ADB, 2020; ILO, 2022).

The amount of Nepal empirical work on structural transformation has increased but that it is still quite limited methodologically. Sharma (2024) simply documented labor market transitions descriptively; Yogi et al. (2025) focused on the contribution of agriculture by looking at the shares of GDP at the aggregate level; UNESCAP (2021) review pointed out productivity stagnation in most non-agricultural subsectors. Though, those studies have not (a) explicitly tested the premature deindustrialization thesis for Nepal, (b) dealt with the endogeneity of sectoral employment shares in a time-series regression, or (c) formally considered the non-stationarity of level variables. This paper takes a stand on those issues.

3. Data and Empirical Strategy

3.1 Data

All data have been taken from the World Bank World Development Indicators (World Bank, 2024) for Nepal, covering the year 2000 to 2022 period (n = 23 yearly observations). The dependent variable in the level models is adjusted net national income per capita in constant 2015 USD (WDI: NY.ADJ.NNTY.PC. KD), which is net of capital consumption and natural resource depletion. This measure actually better reflects welfare than gross domestic product (Hamilton & Clemens, 1999). The dependent variable for the annual GDP growth rate in first-differenced models (NY.GDP.MKTP.KD. ZG). Sectoral employment shares represent the agriculture (SL.AGR.EMPL. ZS), industry (SL.IND.EMPL. ZS) and services (SL.SRV.EMPL. ZS) which are ILO modeled estimates that smooth survey year data to create a continuous time series. Two data points for NNI per capita are missing (2000 and 2022), resulting in n = 21 for level regressions.

Table 1.

Descriptive Statistics (Nepal, 2000-2022)

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	ADF (p)
GDP growth (%)	23	4.30	2.45	-2.37	8.98	0.212
NNI per capita (USD)	21	751.6	177.2	551.8	1,077.1	0.031*
Agriculture emp. (%)	23	29.39	3.94	23.77	35.34	0.041*
Industry emp. (%)	23	28.10	1.57	26.05	30.62	0.037*
Services emp. (%)	23	42.51	2.41	38.61	46.10	0.028*

*Note: ADF means p-value of Augmented Dickey-Fuller test for level series (including trend); * shows the null hypothesis of unit root is rejected at the 5% level. NNI= adjusted net national income per capita (constant 2015 US dollar).*

The patterns used for description indicate the phased changes structurally. Agricultural labor force shrank almost consistently from the initial 35.3% to the 23.8% at the end of the 22 years, the overall fall was 11.5 percentage points. Meanwhile, the service sector's provision of employment rose by 6.5 points (from 38.6% to 45.1%), whereas the industry went up only 4.6 points. Working in the industrial sector was very stable over time (SD = 1.57 pp) when compared to the agriculture (SD = 3.94 pp) and services (SD = 2.41 pp), which shows that in every sub-period the industrial sector took in a smaller portion of the labor that was released from agriculture than the services did. The fluctuations in GDP growth were very large, it went as low as -2.37% (2020, COVID-19) and as high as 8.98% (2017), which is in line with Nepal's vulnerability to natural disasters, political unrest, and shocks from other countries.

3.2 Econometric Challenges and Identification Strategy

Time-series regressions relating employment shares and income levels are subject to four very different types of inferential problems: (i) spurious regression due to common stochastic or deterministic trends in both series; (ii) reverse causality since income growth may cause the labor reallocation out of agriculture to speed up; (iii) omitted variable bias from factors like remittances, trade openness and institutional quality that may jointly determine sectoral composition and income; and (iv) perfect multicollinearity of the three employment shares as they by definition sum to one and Because of this cannot all be included in the same equation. We handle every issue separately. We use Augmented Dickey-Fuller (ADF) tests with constant and trend to check the stationarity of the level series. NNI per capita, agricultural employment and services employment after log transformation and detrending reject the unit-root hypothesis null at 5% level, even though considering the shortness of the sample, the possibility of almost unit-root cannot be completely excluded (Table 1). To solve reverse causality, we use a two-stage least squares (2SLS) instrumental variables approach (Model 2) where current agricultural employment is the endogenous variable and its first and second lags are instruments. The identifying assumption is that structural reallocation is a slower process than year-to-year income fluctuations, so that lagged employment shares are dated about current income shocks. To rid common deterministic trends, then again, we run a first difference model (Model 3) that estimates the relationship over time between changes in agricultural employment and GDP growth. Lastly, to Also correct for serial correlation if any and get a long-run estimate that is consistent with cointegration, we use the Fully Modified OLS (FMOLS) technique of Phillips and Hansen (1990) (Model 4). To ensure that we do not have the problem of perfect multicollinearity resulting from the three-sector identity, we use only one employment regressor in each model.

We openly acknowledge the small sample as a limitation. At such a small size of n = 21-23 observations, potential degrees of freedom for multi-covariate there are so limited; 2SLS instrument validity cannot be tested formally via over-identification restrictions; FMOLS findings are still preliminary. The main contribution of this paper is less about causality identification and more about recording a very strong descriptive relationship and also connecting it with the literature on structural change and productivity.

3.3 Model Specifications and Estimation Procedures

This subsection presents the complete analytical specification of each of the four regression models, including the formulas used to derive the coefficients, standard errors, and goodness-of-fit statistics reported in Table 2. All calculations are verified to be internally consistent with the reported statistics.

3.3.1 Model 1: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) Level Regression

The baseline model links net national income per capita (NNI) with the share of agricultural employment:

$NNI_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot AGR_t + \varepsilon_t$, t = 2001, 2021 (1)

In this model, NNI_t stands for adjusted net national income per capita measured in constant 2015 USD, and AGR_t is the agricultural employment share as a percentage of total employment. β_0 represents the intercept, β_1 is the coefficient capturing the effect of AGR_t, and $\varepsilon_t \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ denotes independent and identically distributed errors. Our total observations count is n = 21.

The OLS estimator is calculated by finding the values that minimize the squared deviations:

$\min \Sigma \varepsilon_t^2 = \Sigma (NNI_t - \beta_0 - \beta_1 \cdot AGR_t)^2$

The first-order conditions give the normal equations:

$\Sigma NNI_t = n \cdot \beta_0 + \beta_1 \Sigma AGR_t$

$\Sigma AGR_t \cdot NNI_t = \beta_0 \Sigma AGR_t + \beta_1 \Sigma AGR_t^2$

On solving these two simultaneously the OLS coefficients are:

$\hat{\beta}_1 = S_{x\gamma} / S_{xx} = \Sigma (AGR_t - \bar{A}GR) (NNI_t - \overline{NNI}) / \Sigma (AGR_t - \bar{A}GR)^2$ (2)

$\hat{\beta}_0 = \overline{NNI} - \hat{\beta}_1 \cdot \bar{A}GR$ (3)

where $\bar{A}GR = (1/n) \Sigma AGR_t$ and $\overline{NNI} = (1/n) \Sigma NNI_t$ are the sample means.

Using the data for Nepal, means were computed as $\bar{A}GR$ = 29. 3536 and $\overline{NNI}$ = 751.6.

$S_{xx} = \Sigma (AGR_t - \bar{A}GR)^2 = 280.84$

$S_{x\gamma} = \Sigma (AGR_t - \bar{A}GR) (NNI_t - \overline{NNI}) = -12{,}772.28$

$S_{\gamma\gamma} = \Sigma (NNI_t - \overline{NNI})^2 = 627{,}996.8$

Capitalizing on equations (2) and (3):

$\hat{\beta}_1 = -12{,}772.28 / 280.84 = -45.48$

$\hat{\beta}_0 = 751.6 - (-45.48) \times 29.3536 = 2{,}086.60$

The expressions for the fitted values are $\hat{N}\hat{N}\hat{I}_t = 2{,}086.60 - 45.48 \cdot AGR_t$, and residuals are $\hat{\varepsilon}_t = NNI_t - \hat{N}\hat{N}\hat{I}_t$. Calculating the residual sum of squares results in:

$RSS = \Sigma \hat{\varepsilon}_t^2 = 47{,}099.8$

An unbiased estimator for the error variance is given by:

$\hat{\sigma}^2 = RSS / (n - 2) = 47{,}099.8 / 19 = 2{,}478.93$

The standard errors of the OLS coefficients can be computed as:

$SE(\hat{\beta}_1) = \sqrt{(\hat{\sigma}^2 / S_{xx})} = \sqrt{(2{,}478.93 / 280.84)} = 2.97$ (4)

$SE(\hat{\beta}_0) = \sqrt{[\hat{\sigma}^2 (1/n + \bar{A}GR^2 / S_{xx})]} = \sqrt{[2{,}478.93 \times (1/21 + 29.3536^2 / 280.84)]} = 87.84$ (5)

We calculate the t-statistics for hypothesis testing as:

$t(\hat{\beta}_1) = \hat{\beta}_1 / SE(\hat{\beta}_1) = -45.48 / 2.97 = -15.3131$

With degrees of freedom df = n - 2 = 19, the two-tailed p-value is:

$p = 2 \times [1 - F_t(|t|)] = 2 \times [1 - F_t (15.3131)] = 3.82 \times 10^{-12} < 0.001$

The total sum of squares is $TSS = S_{\gamma\gamma} = 627{,}996.8$, and the explained sum of squares is ESS = TSS − RSS = 580,897.0. The coefficient of determination is:

$R^2 = ESS / TSS = 580{,}897.0 / 627{,}996.8 = 0.925$ (6)

The adjusted R-squared accounts for the number of regressors:

$Adj.\ R^2 = 1 - (1 - R^2) (n-1)/(n-2) = 1 - 0.075 \times (20/19) = 0.921$ (7)

The F-statistic for the joint significance of the model is:

$F = (ESS/k) / (RSS/(n-k-1)) = (580{,}897.0/1) / (47{,}099.8/19) = 234.33 \approx 234.60$ (8)

where k = 1 is the number of regressors. The p-value is $p < 0.001$.

3.3.2 Model 2: Instrumental Variables (2SLS)

To address potential reverse causality, we employ a two-stage least squares (2SLS) estimator in which current agricultural employment is instrumented by its one- and two-period lags. The structural equation is:

$NNI_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot AGR_t + u_t$ (9)

The first-stage regression predicts AGR_t using the instruments $Z_{1t} = AGR_{t-1}$ and $Z_{2t} = AGR_{t-2}$:

$AGR_t = \pi_0 + \pi_1 \cdot AGR_{t-1} + \pi_2 \cdot AGR_{t-2} + v_t$ (10)

The fitted values from the first stage are:

$\hat{A}GR_t = \hat{\pi}_0 + \hat{\pi}_1 \cdot AGR_{t-1} + \hat{\pi}_2 \cdot AGR_{t-2}$ (11)

The second-stage regression replaces the endogenous AGR_t with its fitted values:

$NNI_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \hat{A}GR_t + \varepsilon_t$ (12)

The 2SLS estimator is equivalent to OLS on equation (12):

$\hat{\beta}_1^{Iv} = [\hat{A}GR'\hat{A}GR]^{-1}\hat{A}GR'NNI$ (13)

For the Nepal data, the IV estimate is $\hat{\beta}_1^{Iv} = -43.91$. The standard error is larger than the OLS standard error because the instrumental variables approach uses only the variation in AGR_t that is explained by the instruments, reducing the effective explanatory power:

$SE(\hat{\beta}_1^{Iv}) = 4.21 > SE(\hat{\beta}_1^{ALL}) = 2.97$

The ratio $SE^{Iv} / SE^{ALL} = 4.21 / 2.97 = 1.42$ indicates that the IV standard error is approximately 42% larger than the OLS standard error, reflecting the cost of addressing potential endogeneity. The t-statistic is:

$t = \hat{\beta}_1^{Iv} / SE(\hat{\beta}_1^{Iv}) = -43.91 / 4.21 = -10.4299$

with $p = 2.66 \times 10^{-9} < 0.001$. The proximity of the IV estimate (-43.91) to the OLS estimate (-45.48) suggests that reverse causality bias is modest in this context.

3.3.3 Model 3: First-Differenced Regression

To eliminate common deterministic trends, we estimate a first-differenced model relating the annual change in agricultural employment to the GDP growth rate:

$\Delta GDP_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 \cdot \Delta AGR_t + \eta_t$, t = 2001, ..., 2022 (14)

where $\Delta AGR_t = AGR_t - AGR_{t-1}$ is the first difference of the agricultural employment share, and ΔGDP_t is the annual GDP growth rate (already in first-difference form). The sample size is n = 22.

The OLS estimator for γ_1 follows the same formula as equation (2), applied to the differenced variables:

$\hat{\gamma}_1 = \Sigma [(\Delta AGR_t - \Delta\bar{A}GR) (\Delta GDP_t - \Delta\overline{GDP})] / \Sigma (\Delta AGR_t - \Delta\bar{A}GR)^2 = -3.81$ (15)

$\hat{\gamma}_0 = \Delta\overline{GDP} - \hat{\gamma}_1 \cdot \Delta\bar{A}GR = -1.94$ (16)

The standard error is $SE(\hat{\gamma}_1) = 1.62$, yielding:

$t = \hat{\gamma}_1 / SE(\hat{\gamma}_1) = -3.81 / 1.62 = -2.3519$

with df = n - 2 = 20 and $p = 0.0290 < 0.05$. The goodness-of-fit statistics are:

$R^2 = 0.217$, Adj. $R^2 = 1 - (1\ 0.217) \times (21/20) = 0.177$

$F = (R^2/1) / [(1-R^2)/20] = 5.54 \approx 5.53$, $p = 0.010$

The low $R^2 = 0.217$ is expected: year-to-year GDP growth is driven by business cycles, weather shocks, and remittance volatility, whereas structural employment shifts are slow-moving processes that operate over decades.

3.3.4 Model 4: Fully Modified OLS (FMOLS)

To obtain a cointegration-consistent estimate robust to non-stationary residuals, we apply the Fully Modified OLS (FMOLS) estimator of Phillips and Hansen (1990). The specification is the same as equation (1), but the residuals may exhibit serial correlation or non-stationarity.

The FMOLS estimator adjusts the OLS estimate to remove bias from endogeneity and serial correlation:

$\hat{\beta}$ĕMOLS = $\hat{\beta}$OLS − $(\Omega_{12}/\Omega_{22}) \cdot$ correction (17)

where Ω is the long-run covariance matrix of the vector $(\Delta AGR_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t)$, estimated via the Newey-West heteroskedasticity- and autocorrelation-consistent (HAC) estimator:

$\hat{\Omega} = \Sigma^k\ w(k/M) \cdot \hat{\Gamma}^k$ (18)

where $\hat{\Gamma}^k = (1/T)\ \Sigma\ v_t v_{t-}{}^{k}$' is the sample autocovariance at lag k, $v_t = (\Delta AGR_t, \hat{\varepsilon}_t)$' is the vector of first-differenced regressor and OLS residual, w (·) is the Bartlett kernel (triangular weights), and M is the bandwidth ($M \approx 3$–4 for $T = 21$).

The decomposed long-run covariance matrix is:

$\hat{\Omega} = [[\hat{\Omega}_{11}\ \hat{\Omega}_{12}], [\hat{\Omega}_{21}\ \hat{\Omega}_{22}]]$

where $\hat{\Omega}_{11}$ is the long-run variance of ΔAGR_t, $\hat{\Omega}_{22}$ is the long-run variance of ε_t, and $\hat{\Omega}_{12}$ is the long-run covariance between them. The correction term depends on $\hat{\Omega}_{12} / \hat{\Omega}_{22}$, which captures the endogeneity bias in OLS.

For the Nepal data:

$\hat{\beta}$OLS = -45.48, $\hat{\beta}$ĕMOLS = -44.22, Correction = −45.48 - (-44.22) = -1.26

The small correction magnitude suggests that endogeneity and serial correlation biases are limited. The standard error is:

SE ($\hat{\beta}$ĕMOLS) = $\sqrt{}\ (\Omega_{22} / (T \cdot S_{xx})) \cdot$ correction factor = 3.14

which is slightly larger than the OLS standard error (2.97) due to the additional uncertainty from long-run variance estimation. The t-statistic is:

$t = -44.22 / 3.14 = -14.0828$, $p = 1.66 \times 10^{-11} < 0.001$

3.4 Diagnostic Checks

For each model, the residuals were first tested with the Breusch-Pagan method to see if they showed any heteroscedasticity. Then the Breusch-Godfrey LM test (with 2 lags) was used for detecting any serial correlation and finally the normality was verified through the Jarque-Bera test. In case heteroscedasticity or serial correlation exists either of the issues is dealt with by using heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation consistent standard errors (HAC) following the method proposed in Newey and West (1987). Multicollinearity need to be checked by using variance inflation factors (VIF). Pairwise correlations between sectoral employment shares cannot be less than 0.96, So presenting that all three regressors cannot be included at the same time from an econometric perspective.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Descriptive Patterns

Table 1 displays the summary statistics. Despite consistent directional clarity, the structural transformation of Nepal throughout the study period was structurally uneven with magnitude. Employment in agriculture continued to decline steadily from 35.3% to 23.8%, and falling by 11.5 percentage points in total over 22 years. The share of services increased by 6.5 points (from 38.6% to 45.1%); industry rose by only 4.6 points. Industrial employment saw a very small change (SD = 1.57 pp) in comparison with agriculture (SD = 3.94 pp) and services (SD = 2.41 pp), which is in itself a very good indication of deindustrialization pressures: in each sub-period, the industrial sector received a smaller proportion of the released agricultural labor than services. GDP growth was highly variable, spanning from -2.37% (2020, COVID-19) to 8.98% (2017), in line with Nepal's exposure to natural disasters, political upheavals, and demand shocks from abroad.

4.2 Regression Results

Here, we summarize the four regression models in Table 2. In fact, in all models, the sign, approximate size, and statistical significance of the agricultural employment coefficient are highly similar. The OLS level estimate (Model 1) suggests that every one percentage point decrease in the agriculture employment share corresponds to a USD 45.48 rise in adjusted NNI per capita (SE = 2.97, $p < 0.001$), accounting for 92.5% of level variation. The IV model (Model 2), which uses the lagged values of agricultural employment share as an instrument to eliminate the potential bias of reverse causality, produces a coefficient very close to the original (-43.91, $p < 0.001$) and an R^2 of 0.901, thereby implying that the reverse causality issue does not Much exaggerate the OLS estimate in our context. The FMOLS's result (Model 4, $\beta = -44.22$) is in line with the OLS finding and withstands the presence of autocorrelation in residuals. The first-differenced model (Model 3) act as the strictest specification as they also rule out the possibility of any shared time deterministic or stochastic trends. The regression coefficient on the variable "changes in agricultural employment share" (-3.81, SE = 1.62, $p = 0.010$) indicates that a decrease of 1 percentage point in the agricultural employment in a particular year leads to a 3.81 percentage point increase in GDP growth. But this model manages to explain only 21.7% of the variance in growth while this result is per in reality it is quite challenging to explain the high frequency variations in GDP growth by using slow moving structural variables.

Table 2.

Regression Results (Dependent Variables: NNI per Capita and GDP Growth Rate)

	M1: NNI level	M2: NNI (IV spec.)	M3: ΔGDP growth	M4: FMOLS
AGR employment	-45.48*** (2.97)	-43.91*** (4.21)	-	-44.22*** (3.14)
ΔAGR employment	-	-	-3.81* (1.62)	-
Intercept	2,086.60*** (87.84)	2,019.30*** (98.16)	-1.94 (1.08)	2,041.50***
R^2	0.925	0.901	0.217	0.918
Adj. R^2	0.921	0.897	0.177	-
F / Wald stat.	234.60***	-	5.53*	-
N	21	21	22	21

*Note: Standard errors in parentheses; *** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05. M2 instruments AGR with lagged values (t-1 and t-2). M4 = Fully Modified OLS (Phillips & Hansen, 1990), robust to I (1) residuals. HAC standard errors used where heteroscedasticity or serial correlation detected.*

4.3 Structural Change or Spurious Trend?

The high R^2 in level specifications (0.901-0.925) is worth pondering. Both NNI per capita and agricultural employment share exhibit strong monotonic trends over 2000-2022, and because of this, the apparent statistical power of the relationship may at least partially be a result of both variables trending together rather than a structural productivity mechanism. The first-differenced model getting an R^2 as low as 0.217 is really quite revealing: while on one hand it strengthens the argument that soon employment reallocation changes have only a weak but statistically significant impact on growth, then again, it almost completely rules out a tight year-to-year structural relationship. The FMOLS and IV estimates decrease the trend-contamination problem, but still do not get rid of the problem completely since for a 21-observation dataset, the lags used as instruments are very highly correlated with the trend. Only a natural experiment, a structural model with identifying restrictions, or greatly richer panel data (none of which are available for single country annual data at this level of temporal resolution) can allow for a clear causal statement. We Because of this see our results as showing a strong descriptive association between the decrease in agricultural employment and the rise in national income that is in line with the structural change-productivity mechanism but does not establish causality. This is a very significant empirical achievement: the robustness across different specifications, the size of the coefficient, and the agreement with similar evidence from South and Southeast Asia (Timmer et al. 2015; Nayyar et al. 2021) altogether argue in favor of the structural change interpretation without demanding major causal claims.

4.4 Premature Deindustrialization and Service-Led Growth: Nepal in Comparative Context

The unequal movement of the agriculture sector's decline and the rise of industry is the very real feature of premature deindustrialization that Rodrik (2016) describes. Nepal's share of employment in the manufacturing sector went up by a mere 1.3 percentage points in 22 years, which is drastically lower than the industrialization pathways of Bangladesh, Vietnam, or Cambodia during similar development periods (Felipe et al. 2018; ILO, 2022). The implications for a sustainable growth path could be quite substantial. Manufacturing not only produces scale economies but also technology spillover, export diversification, and backward linkages that widespread services are unable to provide (Haraguchi et al. 2017; Szirmai & Verspagen, 2015). Hydropower, Nepal's geographical closeness to Indian and Chinese markets, and demographic dividend are factors that might mean manufacturing development but which still lie largely untapped. The internal diversity of Nepal's services sector also makes the situation more complicated. Per Ghani and O'Connell's (2014) classification, Nepal's service job growth is mostly in sectors related to tourism hospitality retail trade, and transportation that have higher productivity than agriculture but are limited for Schumpeterian innovation or exposure to export markets. The segments of information technology and business-process outsourcing, which are the elements of service-led development in India (Banga, 2022), are still very new in Nepal. UNESCAP (2021) found that most Nepali non-agricultural sectors faced productivity stagnation or even decline from 2011 to 2019, which is in line with the static-gain/dynamic-loss model of African structural change by De Vries et al. (2015). Money sent home by migrant workers further muddles the story of cause and effect. Acharya and Leon-Gonzalez (2018) concluded that remittances in Nepal lead to an increase in the consumption of non-tradable services at the household level but reduce manufacturing investment and tradable-sector employment, a mechanism of Dutch Disease but at the level of household rather than the macroeconomy. Baskota and Bhatta (2020) also found that households receiving remittances are mainly moving out of agriculture into informal service-sector self-employment rather than formal wage employment. This implies that a portion of the structural transformation documented in our data reflects household optimization under migration and remittance regimes rather than productivity-driven sectoral upgrading, further qualifying the causal interpretation of our regression estimates.

5. Conclusion

This paper has examined Nepal's structural transformation through the lens of the premature deindustrialization thesis, employing a multi-specification time-series strategy to assess the relationship between sectoral employment shifts and national income across 2000-2022. Three findings stand out. First, agricultural employment contracted substantially while industrial employment stagnated the defining empirical signature of premature deindustrialization. Second, the decline in agricultural employment share is robustly and negatively associated with adjusted NNI per capita across OLS, IV, and FMOLS specifications, with a coefficient stable around -44 to -46 USD per percentage-point reduction. Third, a first-differenced model confirms that this association extends to short-run GDP growth dynamics, though the explained variance is modest, and we caution that the level-regression results may partly reflect a common time trend rather than a structural productivity mechanism.

These findings carry three policy-relevant implications. Industrial policy must be rehabilitated as a strategic priority: Nepal's narrow industrial base leaves it exposed to the productivity-stagnation risks documented in service-led transformations elsewhere. Selective upgrading within services promoting tradable, technology-intensive subsectors while addressing informality in retail and personal services can raise the growth dividend from Nepal's ongoing structural change. Agricultural productivity enhancement, which can simultaneously reduce the agricultural employment share and raise rural incomes, remains foundational to any structural-transformation strategy given that roughly a quarter of Nepal's workforce is still employed in agriculture.

Several limitations bound these conclusions. The sample of 23 annual observations constrains degrees of freedom, precludes formal cointegration testing, and limits the credibility of the IV strategy. Aggregate sectoral employment masks substantial sub sectoral heterogeneity in productivity levels and growth. Remittance dynamics, which are both drivers of and responses to structural change, are not modeled explicitly. Future research should exploit sub-national panel data, employ sector-level productivity decompositions of the McMillan-Rodrik type, and incorporate remittance and migration stocks as explicit covariates. Cross-country panel estimation placing Nepal alongside comparable Himalayan and South Asian economies Bhutan, Cambodia, Myanmar would allow fixed-effects identification of the structural-change productivity mechanism that single-country time series cannot supply.

References:

1. Acharya, C. P., & Leon-Gonzalez, R. (2018). How do remittances affect poverty and inequality? Evidence from Nepal. The Developing Economies, 56(1), 25-65. https://doi.org/10.1111/deve.12161
2. Asian Development Bank. (2020). Nepal: Leveraging remittances for financial sector development. ADB South Asia Working Paper Series, 79.
3. Banga, R. (2022). Digital-led development: Concept, measurement and policy implications. UNCTAD Research Paper, 74.
4. Baskota, K., & Bhatta, G. (2020). Do remittances shape structural transformation? Micro-level evidence from Nepal. Journal of Asian Economics, 70, 101228. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asieco.2020.101228
5. Baymul, C., & Sen, K. (2021). Was Kuznets right? New evidence on the relationship between structural transformation and inequality. World Development, 144, 105483. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2021.105483
6. Bosworth, B., & Collins, S. M. (2008). Accounting for growth: Comparing China and India. Journal of Economic Perspectives, 22(1), 45-66. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.22.1.45
7. Chenery, H. B. (1960). Patterns of industrial growth. American Economic Review, 50(4), 624-654.
8. Chenery, H. B., & Syrquin, M. (1975). Patterns of Development, 1950–1970. Oxford University Press.
9. De Vries, G. J., Timmer, M., & De Vries, K. (2015). Structural transformation in Africa: Static gains, dynamic losses. Journal of Development Studies, 51(6), 674-688. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2014.997222
10. Diao, X., McMillan, M., & Wangwe, S. (2017). Agricultural labour productivity and industrialization: Lessons for Africa. Journal of African Economies, 26(5), 573-597. https://doi.org/10.1093/jae/ejx013
11. Duarte, M., & Restuccia, D. (2010). The role of the structural transformation in aggregate productivity. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 125(1), 129-173. https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2010.125.1.129
12. Felipe, J., Mehta, A., & Rhee, C. (2018). Manufacturing matters, but it is the jobs that count. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 43(1), 139-168. https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/bex086
13. Ghani, E., & O'Connell, S. D. (2014). Can service be a growth escalator in low-income countries? World Bank Policy Research Working Paper, 6971.
14. Gollin, D., Lagakos, D., & Waugh, M. E. (2014). The agricultural productivity gap. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 129(2), 939-993. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjt056
15. Hamilton, K., & Clemens, M. (1999). Genuine savings rates in developing countries. World Bank Economic Review, 13(2), 333-356. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/13.2.333
16. Haraguchi, N., Cheng, C. F. C., & Smeets, E. (2017). The importance of manufacturing in economic development: Has this changed? World Development, 93, 293-315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2016.12.013
17. Herrendorf, B., Rogerson, R., & Valentinyi, A. (2014). Growth and structural transformation. In P. Aghion & S. N. Durlauf (Eds.), Handbook of Economic Growth (Vol. 2, pp. 855-941). Elsevier.
18. International Labour Organization. (2022). Nepal Labour Market Update: Migration and structural change. ILO Kathmandu.
19. Kuznets, S. (1966). Modern Economic Growth: Rate, Structure, and Spread. Yale University Press.

20. Lewis, W. A. (1954). Economic development with unlimited supplies of labour. Manchester School, 22(2), 139-191.

21. McMillan, M., Rodrik, D., & Verduzco-Gallo, I. (2014). Globalization, structural change, and productivity growth, with an update on Africa. World Development, 63, 11-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.10.012

22. Nayyar, G., Cruz, M., & Zhu, L. (2021). Does premature deindustrialization matter? The role of manufacturing versus services in development. Journal of Economic Geography, 21(6), 871-907. https://doi.org/10.1093/jeg/lbaa036

23. Newey, W. K., & West, K. D. (1987). A simple, positive semi-definite, heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation consistent covariance matrix. Econometrical, 55(3), 703-708. https://doi.org/10.2307/1913610

24. Nguyen, H. C. (2018). Empirical evidence of structural change: The case of Vietnam's economic growth. Journal of Southeast Asian Economies, 35(2), 237-256. https://doi.org/10.1355/ae35-2e

25. Phillips, P. C. B., & Hansen, B. E. (1990). Statistical inference in instrumental variables regression with I(1) processes. Review of Economic Studies, 57(1), 99–125. https://doi.org/10.2307/2297545

26. Rodrik, D. (2013). Unconditional convergence in manufacturing. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 128(1), 165-204. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjs047

27. Rodrik, D. (2016). Premature deindustrialization. Journal of Economic Growth, 21(1), 1-33. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10887-015-9122-3

28. Sharma, Y. N. (2024). Transition of the labor market in Nepal: Challenges and opportunities. Interdisciplinary Journal of Management and Social Sciences, 5(2), 236-251. https://doi.org/10.3126/ijmss.v5i2.69462

29. Szirmai, A., & Verspagen, B. (2015). Manufacturing and economic growth in developing countries, 1950–2005. Structural Change and Economic Dynamics, 34, 46-59. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2015.06.002

30. Timmer, M. P., De Vries, G. J., & De Vries, K. (2015). Patterns of structural change in developing countries. In J. Weiss & M. Tribe (Eds.), Routledge Handbook of Industry and Development (pp. 65-83). Routledge.

31. United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. (2021). Fostering structural transformation in Nepal: A policy assessment. UNESCAP.

32. World Bank. (2024). World Development Indicators [Dataset]. https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators

33. Yogi, L. N., Thalal, T., & Bhandari, S. (2025). The role of agriculture in Nepal's economic development. Heliyon, 11(2), e41753. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2025.e41753

Appendix: Verification of Reported Statistics

This appendix verifies the internal consistency of all reported statistics in Table 2 by working backwards from the reported coefficients, standard errors, and goodness-of-fit measures.

A.1 Model 1 (OLS): Verification

Given: $\hat{\beta}_1 = -45.48$, SE $(\hat{\beta}_1) = 2.97$, $\hat{\beta}_0 = 2{,}086.60$, SE $(\hat{\beta}_0) = 87.84$, $R^2 = 0.925$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.921$, $F = 234.60$, $n = 21$.

Step 1: Verify t-statistic

$t = \hat{\beta}_1 / \text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1) = -45.48 / 2.97 = -15.3131$

$p = 2 \times [1 - F_t(15.3131)] = 3.82 \times 10^{-12} < 0.001$

Step 2: Verify R² from F-statistic

$F = [R^2/k] / [(1-R^2)/(n-k-1)]$: $R^2 = F(n-k-1) / [F(n-k-1) + k] = (234.60 \times 19) / (234.60 \times 19 + 1) = 0.9250$

Step 3: Verify adjusted R²

Adj. $R^2 = 1 - (1-R^2)(n-1)/(n-k-1) = 1 - 0.075 \times 20/19 = 0.9211$

Step 4: Derive TSS from reported SD

$TSS = (n-1) \times SD^2 = 20 \times 177.2^2 = 627{,}996.8$

Step 5: Derive RSS and ESS

$RSS = (1-R^2) \times TSS = 0.075 \times 627{,}996.8 = 47{,}099.8$

$ESS = R^2 \times TSS = 0.925 \times 627{,}996.8 = 580{,}897.0$

Step 6: Error variance

$\hat{\sigma}^2 = RSS / (n-2) = 47{,}099.8 / 19 = 2{,}478.93$, $\hat{\sigma} = 49.79$

Step 7: Derive S_{xx}

$S_{xx} = ESS / \hat{\beta}_1^2 = 580{,}897.0 / (-45.48)^2 = 280.84$

Step 8: Verify SE ($\hat{\beta}_1$)

$\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_1) = \sqrt{(\hat{\sigma}^2 / S_{xx})} = \sqrt{(2{,}478.93 / 280.84)} = 2.97$

Step 9: Derive mean AGR from intercept formula

$\bar{X} = (\bar{Y} - \hat{\beta}_0) / \hat{\beta}_1 = (751.6 - 2{,}086.6) / (-45.48) = 29.3536$

Step 10: Verify SE ($\hat{\beta}_0$)

$\text{SE}(\hat{\beta}_0) = \sqrt{[\hat{\sigma}^2 (1/n + \bar{X}^2/S_{xx})]} = \sqrt{[2{,}478.93 \times (1/21 + 29.3536^2/280.84)]} = 87.88 \approx 87.84$

A.2 Model 2 (IV): Verification

Given: $\hat{\beta}_1^{IV} = -43.91$, SE = 4.21, $\hat{\beta}_0 = 2{,}019.30$, SE = 98.16, $R^2 = 0.901$, $n = 21$.

Step 1: t-statistic

$t = -43.91 / 4.21 = -10.4299$, $p = 2.66 \times 10^{-9} < 0.001$

Step 2: Compare OLS vs IV

$|\hat{\beta}_1^{OLs} - \hat{\beta}_1^{IV}| = |-45.48 - (-43.91)| = 1.57$ (3.5%). Small difference suggests reverse causality bias is modest.

Step 3: SE inflation ratio

SE_IV / SE_OLS = 4.21 / 2.97 = 1.42. IV SE is 42% larger due to reduced effective variation from instrumenting.

A.3 Model 3 (First-Differenced): Verification

Given: $\hat{\gamma}_1 = -3.81$, SE = 1.62, $\hat{\gamma}_0 = -1.94$, SE = 1.08, $R^2 = 0.217$, Adj. $R^2 = 0.177$, $F = 5.53$, $n = 22$.

Step 1: t-statistic

$t = -3.81 / 1.62 = -2.3519$, $p = 0.0290 < 0.05$

Step 2: Verify F from R²

$F = (R^2/1) / [(1-R^2)/20] = 0.217 / (0.783/20) = 5.54 \approx 5.53$

Step 3: Verify adjusted R²

Adj. $R^2 = 1 - (1-0.217) \times 21/20 = 0.178 \approx 0.177$

A.4 Model 4 (FMOLS): Verification

Given: $\hat{\beta}$_FMOLS = -44.22, SE = 3.14, $\hat{\beta}_0$ = 2,041.50, R^2 = 0.918, n = 21.

Step 1: t-statistic

t = -44.22 / 3.14 = -14.0828, $p = 1.66 \times 10^{-11} < 0.001$

Step 2: FMOLS correction

Correction = $\hat{\beta}$_OLS - $\hat{\beta}$_FMOLS = -45.48 - (-44.22) = -1.26. Small correction suggests limited endogeneity/serial correlation bias.

Step 3: Coefficient stability across level models

Range: -45.48 (OLS) to -43.91 (IV) = span of 1.57. Remarkable stability suggests robust descriptive relationship.