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Creating a Pluralist Paradigm: An Application to the Minimum Wage Debate

Bernhard Schütz

Abstract: The article offers a pluralist route along which different theoretical approaches can be integrated into a common framework. It proposes to use causal mapping and combine it with a micro-meso-macro architecture to get well-structured descriptions of different economic theories and to provide a good foundation for integrating these theories. In order to illustrate this point and to shed some new light on a contested economic issue, the article applies this strategy to the minimum wage debate. It follows from the analysis that from a theoretical viewpoint, the effect of the minimum wage on employment is indeed ambiguous, which is perfectly in line with the existing empirical evidence.
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“A pluralist explanation may be indefinite, lacking elegance and refinement. But it is better to be approximately and inexacty right than to be perfectly and precisely wrong.”

Richard A. Lester (1953, 199)

The domination of economics by a neoclassical mainstream has left other schools of economic thought increasingly marginalized. This state is problematic when we agree with Kurt W. Rothschild (1999, 5) that “plurality in economic and in social sciences in general is not only an obvious fact but also a necessary and desirable phenomenon in a very complex and continually changing subject.” If this plurality is denied or ignored, it undermines the general quality of analysis, since “[d]epending on circumstances and the problem to be tackled, different approaches, or a combination of them, have to be used in order to be able to get nearer to the far-away ‘truth’” (1999, 5). While the idea, that a plurality of paradigms is required within economics, receives great support outside of the mainstream, there seems to be less of a consensus on how such a state should look.
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In this context, Jakob Kapeller and Leonhard Dobusch (2012) have recently proposed in this journal three ways of how to understand pluralism in economics: according to them, “selfish pluralism” takes place when scholars think of their preferred paradigm as superior to other schools of thought, but support calls for pluralism because it helps the survival of their own paradigm. Another version would be so-called “disinterested pluralism,” which means that scholars show more tolerance for different theoretical and analytical approaches, but shy away from applying these concepts or engaging in interdisciplinary discussion. The key difference between these two is that the latter would be compatible with a coexistence of different paradigms in the long run, while the former would not. Eventually, the authors propose a third, superior type of pluralism, called “interested pluralism.” This form of pluralism requires that scholars actively engage across different schools of thought and are able to choose from a broad set of theories and methods without being limited by a certain paradigm.

While the latter understanding of pluralism is surely demanding, it also seems very promising. Kapeller and Dobusch (2012, 1054) suggest that a “pluralist paradigm” based on such an understanding “could help synthesize the ‘solved puzzles’ of different economic traditions in a single corpus—and such a competitor to neoclassical economics could build on a greater potential for empirical explanation than any strand of dissenting thought could come up with in isolation.” Besides collecting and integrating identical, convergent, or compatible theories, such a paradigm would also involve testing conflicting hypotheses in case of divergent or contradictory theories.1

Once we subscribe to the idea of a pluralist paradigm, the practical question becomes one of operationalization. Here the researcher will often face the obstacle that different schools use different methods (formal models, econometric evidence, simulations, case studies, etc.). Coming up with a framework for the synthesis is therefore not straight forward: Integrating them within one mathematical framework can be a difficult task, since formal models originating from different schools usually start from very different axiomatic and methodological foundations. Hence, trying to integrate them might create logical inconsistencies on the way, while integrating non-formalized theories into such a framework would almost surely involve sacrificing part of their content.

Therefore, a better way to move forward might be to use verbal exposition as a preferred tool. This way the researcher can avoid over-simplifying certain theories and can retain a pragmatic stance on differences in axiomatic foundations. A potential shortcoming of verbal

---

1 It is worth mentioning that neoclassical economics would of course also play a part, though its role would be significantly diminished compared to its present position of dominance. Some authors have advocated for a pluralist paradigm that excludes neoclassical economics (e.g., Dow 2008; Lawson 2006; Lee 2012). These arguments are based on a critique of its methodology (i.e., mathematical formalism) and its unrealistic axiomatic foundations (for a classic critique of these foundations, see Lester 1946). However, the understanding of pluralism used in this article is not only interested in improving economic theory by combining compatible concepts, but also in testing divergent or contradictory theories. Excluding neoclassical theories a priori would conflict with this idea. See on this also John King (2012), who argues that since neoclassical ideas have been shaping economic debates and policies for quite some time, any critique of the social and economic status quo has to be presented with a critique of the underlying theory. Omitting neoclassical arguments from the discourse would therefore be strategically misguided. Moreover, he argues that entirely excluding them would mean denying that some concepts (like the law of supply and demand) do have some merit and are fairly used in everyday life. Rothschild (1989, 5; italics in original) also argues that neoclassical theories can be useful as long as one keeps aware of their limitations: “One may very well regard neoclassical economics as an interesting and useful partial theory as long as it is clearly restricted to its original research program: the study of the workings of a market economy with (in principle) flexible prices in a relatively simple and stable setting. In this respect the theory with its numerous modifications and developments can throw considerable light on the intricacies of such a system. The point here is that this theory with its strict axioms adapted to its specific research subject is hardly capable to deal with the diverse and complicated questions which turn up when we want to give more weight to the neglected political and sociological elements.”
exposition is, however, that it may lack the precise structure that can be provided by a formal model. This article argues that such potential disadvantage can be overcome by representing economic theories in terms of causal maps and by embedding these causal maps within a micro-meso-macro structure. In order to illustrate this point, the article applies this method to the topic of the minimum wage in economics.

Causal Maps and the Micro-Meso-Macro Architecture

In order to integrate economic theories that originate from different schools of thought, this article proposes to focus on the causalities assumed by the respective models and represent them within structured causal maps. Causal mapping is a popular technique in the field of management studies, where interview data is turned into causal maps in order to reveal common patterns of entrepreneurial intentions (see e.g., Jenkins and Johnson 1997). Within economics, Michael Margolis (2017) has recently proposed using such graphs to represent econometric models. He shows how using causal maps makes it easier to spot contradictions in identification strategies. While Margolis illustrates how graphical representations can contribute to a pluralist paradigm by testing conflicting hypotheses, I will argue that they can also be used to provide a platform for the integration of different theories.

Causal maps are a convenient tool for reducing complex content down to its essentials. In order to apply them to the complex matter of economic theories however, the article proposes to augment them with a micro-meso-macro structure. Micro-meso-macro frameworks have initially been proposed by evolutionary economists in order to analyze evolutionary economic dynamics. Here the meso-level contains existing institutions, whereas the micro-level refers to the individual carriers of these institutions and the macro-level represents their aggregation (see Dopfer, Foster, and Potts 2004; Dopfer 2012; Elsner 2007). The emphasis within mainstream economics on the necessity of “microfoundations,” in other words, that macroeconomic phenomena be derived from individual behavior, has led to the prevalence of bottom-up explanations (King 2008). In contrast, many heterodox economists have argued that causality is not only a bottom-up, but also a top-down phenomenon (Dopfer, Foster, and Potts 2004; Lee 2011; King 2012). In order to reflect that within our framework, causality is allowed to take place bottom-up, bottom-down as well as within levels (see Bunge 1996; Kapeller and Schütz 2013; Gräbner and Kapeller 2017).

The next section applies this method of using structured causal maps to the minimum wage discourse. This serves two purposes: On the one hand it illustrates how such a pluralist research agenda could look like, while on the other hand it sheds light on one of the most contested issues within economics.

An Application to Existing Minimum Wage Theories

Not many subjects seem to be able to provoke such intense academic debate within economics in the way that the minimum wage does. While some regard it as an appropriate tool to protect those who struggle to protect themselves, others insist that it harms exactly those it wants to help by taking away their jobs. While some have attributed the intensity of the debate to its political significance, others claim that it is due to the potential implications it holds for neoclassical economic theory: if higher wages do not lead to lower employment, this would be at odds with the core economic principles that the vast majority of mainstream economic models are built upon nowadays (Leonard 2000; Kaufman 2010).
On a theoretical level the mainstream debate in economics has more or less been narrowed down to a controversy about whether the so-called “competitive” or the “monopsonistic” labor market view is more accurate (Dube, Naidu, and Reich 2007; Neumark and Wascher 2007; Kaufman 2010). While the former represents the standard neoclassical view, the latter allows the explanation of the—to some at least—more counter-intuitive result of positive or zero employment effects within the narrow boundaries of neoclassical theory. The monopsonistic labor market view does so by changing one key assumption (i.e., existence of market power by firms), but derives its legitimacy from the empirical part of the dispute: though some studies find evidence for negative employment effects, others find insignificant or slightly positive effects of the minimum wage on employment.2 It is therefore not surprising that metastudies conclude that once publication bias is controlled for, the employment effect across studies is close to zero (see Belman and Wolfson 2014; De Linde Leonard, Stanley, and Doucouliagos 2014; Doucouliagos and Stanley 2009). Due to the narrow state of the theoretical debate, it is also not surprising that studies that find negative results interpret them as evidence for the validity of the competitive labor market view (e.g., Neumark and Wascher 2007), while those who find zero or positive results attribute it to the validity of the monopsonistic labor market view (e.g., Card and Krueger 1995; Giuliano 2013).1 Reducing the mainstream theoretical debate to a struggle between the competitive and the monopsonistic labor market view of course represents an unjustified simplification that omits post-Keynesian, institutionalist, and evolutionary concepts that also shed some important light on the minimum wage issue.

The fact that the impact of the minimum wage is theoretically as well as empirically contested makes it an ideal candidate for pluralist economic analysis. In the following I will discuss each of the existing theories by using the method described in the previous section.

The Neoclassical Standard Model of the Firm

I start with what can easily be called the most influential theoretical approach concerning the general minimum wage debate—the neoclassical model of the firm. Its textbook version is usually the first—and often also the last—model along which students are taught to think about the minimum wage. Accordingly it also has an enormous weight in public discussions. It exists in several versions, which differ from each other in the type of product market (competitive vs. monopolistic) and substitution possibilities between capital, high skilled and low skilled labor assumed.

Competitive and Monopolistic Firms

The model takes the single firm as its point of departure. This firm can either operate on a competitive or a monopolistic market.4 In the first case, the firm is assumed to be small and not to have any kind of market power. This means that the firm is able to sell any amount of its products as long as it charges the prevailing market price. Since it is small, its supply will not affect the market price and since it does not have any market power, charging above the market price would leave it unable to sell its products. In the second case the firm is assumed to have some kind of market power. On the one hand this can be the case when the firm has a significant market share, which means that a change in its supply of products has

---

2 For a review of the literature see Laura Giuliano (2013).
3 Hirsch, Kaufman, and Zelenska (2015), who draw on an institutionalist framework, recently provided a notable exception.
4 For a more detailed discussion see e.g., Robert Pindyck and Daniel Rubinfeld (2013) and Hal Varian (2010).
an effect on the market price. On the other hand it could mean that the firm’s products have some kind of unique feature which give them a competitive edge and allows the firm some autonomy in setting its prices.

In both cases it is assumed that the firm can hire any amount of workers as long as it pays the market wage, where it is assumed that the individual firm takes the market wage as given (i.e., the firm does not have the market power to influence this wage rate). This is a crucial assumption, since it distinguishes the current approach from the model of the monopsonistic labor market, which arrives at different conclusions regarding the employment effect of the minimum wage.5

Within this context it is assumed that the capital stock is given and cannot be changed (changing it would require a longer time period) and that the marginal product of labor is declining (i.e., the additional output that can be gained by adding an additional worker to a machine or another piece of capital is declining). Firm management is assumed to constantly optimize in order to maximize profits. The latter is obtained at the point where the cost for employing an additional unit of labor (the marginal cost of labor, MCL) is equal to the additional revenues related to hiring this unit of labor (the marginal revenue product of labor, MRPL).6

Let us now illustrate these two versions of the neoclassical model by using the representation described in the previous section: Figure 1 shows the impact of the minimum wage according to the model of the competitive firm. The minimum wage represents an institution and is therefore located at the meso-level. Once it is raised (indicated by the upward-pointing arrow inside the box), it directly raises the real market wage at the micro-level. Employment is determined by the MCL (i.e., how much it would cost to hire an additional unit of labor or, vice versa, by how much costs would decline if the firm got rid of one unit of labor) and the MRPL, where an increase in the MCL would have a negative influence on employment and a rise in the MRPL a positive one (the respective negative and positive correlations indicated by the “−” and “+” next to the arrows representing the causal links). The rise in the market wage leads to a rise in the MCL. With the MCL higher than before (suddenly exceeding the MRPL, since profit maximization meant that they were initially equal to each other), the firm reacts by reducing employment. Reducing employment increases the MRPL, which brings MCL and MRPL in line with each other again. With employment being reduced, output declines, which ends up in reduced sales.

The model of the monopolistic firm (Figure 2) looks pretty similar, except for the fact that due to the firm’s market power, the fall in output increases the market price, which has positive influence on the MRPL and real revenue.7

The conclusion drawn from this standard neoclassical model is that a rise in the minimum wage leads (since all firms are assumed to behave similarly) to a fall in employment and, depending on the structure of the market, maybe a rise in prices. Crucial assumptions behind this result are that firms always maximize profits and that the MRPL rises as employment falls. Both of them will be challenged once we turn to institutionalist theory.

---

5 While a “monopolistic market” describes a situation in which sellers have market power, a “monopsonistic market” depicts the circumstance in which buyers have that market power.

6 For the competitive firm the marginal revenue product of labor (MRPL) is equal to the marginal product of labor multiplied by the price that the firm receives on the market. In case of the monopolistic firm one has to additionally factor in the drop in the market price that follows from increasing the market supply by the respective amount.

7 The net effect on revenue nevertheless has to be negative, otherwise the profit maximizing firm would have already reduced output independently of the rise in the minimum wage.
In the short run, the neoclassical model assumes that the firm is unable to change the stock of capital and therefore has to take it as given. This assumption is justified by reference to the fact that installing additional capital takes some time. In the long run, however, the capital stock is variable. It follows that in the long run the firm gains additional flexibility in dealing with the minimum wage as it can substitute capital for labor.\footnote{See again for example Pindyck and Rubinfeld (2013) or Varian (2010).}

The respective structured causal map is displayed in Figure 3. Here a rise in the real market wage implies that the relative cost of using capital as opposed to labor has declined. Firms react to it by using more capital instead of labor. While decisions to acquire additional capital can be made in the short run, its effects only become active in the long run, since it takes time to make this change to the production structure. These long run relationships are represented by dashed arrows within the causal map. Once the capital is acquired and installed, it causes a reduction in employment. Just like before, reduced employment goes along with a reduction of output, though this time this is partly compensated by the
additional contribution of capital. We omit the impact on sales and revenue (which is similar to before) for reasons of exposition.

Figure 3. The Neoclassical Model of the Competitive Firm in the Long Run, with Dashed Arrows Expressing Long Run Effects

Concluding, the long run version of the neoclassical model predicts a fall in employment accompanied by an increasing capital intensity of the production process. A crucial assumption behind this result is that this capital is readily available (i.e., already existing). Once we turn to Keynesian and post-Keynesian theory we will see how it could change the results if we took into account that these units of capital (machines, etc.) have to be actually produced by someone.

Skill Substitution and Relative Wage Considerations

Furthermore it has been suggested that the minimum wage leads to substitution not only between labor and capital, but also between different kinds of labor (e.g., Gramlich 1976). More precisely, workers whose wages increased due to the minimum wage might be substituted with workers whose skill sets allow them to earn wages above the minimum wage. In the literature, the latter are often called “high skilled” workers, whereas the former are referred to as “low skilled.” If these two types of workers are imperfect substitutes, employment of low skilled workers will decrease, while employment of high skilled workers will increase (see Card and Krueger 1995, 360). Assuming that the productivity of high-skilled workers exceeds the productivity of low-skilled workers, fewer workers will be needed in total. Substitution will also go along with rising wages of high skilled workers as the demand for the service of the latter increases. Furthermore the wages of workers above the minimum wage may also increase because of relative wage concerns voiced in wage negotiations (see e.g., Gramlich 1976).

9 The net change in output must be negative, since the total marginal cost of production has increased. If this was not the case, it would have already been optimal for the firm to pay higher wages and employ more capital prior to the rise in the minimum wage.
Let us again look at it by using a structured causal map (Figure 4), where we distinguish between the group of “low wage workers” and the remaining group of “other workers” (the latter earning above the minimum wage): the minimum wage increases the real market wage of low wage workers, which not only increases the marginal cost of labor, but also raises the wage of low wage workers relative to the other workers. The firm reacts to it by reducing the proportion of low wage workers in their workforce by replacing them with other workers. Since those other workers are assumed to possess superior skills, the firm needs less workers in total, leading to a reduction in employment. However, wages of those other workers are also expected to increase. First, if firms want to hire more of the other workers, it will increase their wage demands. Second, their wages may also go up directly as a reaction to the initial wage increase of low wage workers (e.g., fairness concerns). Higher wage demands will increase their market wages and in turn reduce the relative wage of low wage workers compared to other workers. Depending on the size of this reaction, the proportion of low wage workers might in the end also remain unchanged (indicated by the “–” next to the –). The rest is similar to before: reducing the units of labor employed in production reduces output and increases the MRPL.

Figure 4. Skill Substitution and Relative Wage Considerations in the Neoclassical Model of the Competitive Firm

In sum, the model predicts that the market wages of both group of workers go up, which is accompanied by a fall in employment that is more likely to affect low skilled workers.

The Neoclassical Model of the Monopsonistic Labor Market and Efficiency Wage Theory

The neoclassical model of the monopsonistic labor market is often given less prominence than the models of the competitive/monopolistic firms. However, whenever students are introduced to the possibility of minimum wages having a positive effect on employment, the
topic is usually conveyed in terms of the monopsonistic model. Correspondingly, it is this model that researchers usually refer to when they find zero or positive employment effects of the minimum wage. The textbook version of the model can be described as follows:\textsuperscript{10} the previous models assumed that the individual firm could hire any amount of workers it needs as long as it offers the prevailing market wage. This followed from the initial assumption that the individual firm’s labor demand is very small compared to the total size of the labor market. The current model drops this assumption and assumes instead that in order to attract additional workers, the individual firm has to increase the wage that it offered previously. Moreover, it is assumed that offering new entrants a higher wage means that the wages being paid to the previously hired workers have to be adjusted to that higher level.\textsuperscript{11} In such a setting, the total cost related to hiring an additional unit of labor (MCL) exceeds the wage that has to be paid to that additional worker, since one has to add the wage increase that consequently has to be given to all the previously hired workers. When taking that into account, a firm could abstain from hiring additional workers even if their wage demands fall below the MRPL that they would bring to the firm. In this setting a situation could arise in which the introduction of a minimum wage reduces the marginal cost related to hiring an additional worker. Thus, when the firm has to pay their other workers the higher wage anyway, then hiring an additional worker at a higher wage no longer has an effect on the remaining wage bill.\textsuperscript{12}

Figure 5. The Neoclassical Model of the Monopsonistic Labor Market

We can illustrate this concept in the familiar environment (Figure 5): As before, the minimum wage raises the real market wage, which has a positive impact on the MCL.

\textsuperscript{10} See again for example Pindyck and Rubinfeld (2013) or Varian (2010).

\textsuperscript{11} This follows logically from the axiomatic structure of the model: as soon as one firm pays above the previously existing market wage, the remaining firms would have to follow. If they did not do so, some of their workers would want to join competing firms. If all firms switched to paying higher wages, the firm that increased its wage offer in the first place would also have to offer their previously hired employees that higher wage. Another, less technical, justification that one could think of would be that firms fear that not granting that higher wage to their other employees would raise severe fairness concerns within their workforce.

\textsuperscript{12} See for example Card and Krueger (1995, Ch. 11) or Varian (2010, Ch. 26). The original concept goes back to Robinson (1933).
However, this time there is also a counteracting direct influence from the minimum wage on the MCL. This link exists because the minimum wage raises the wages of those already employed and therefore reduces the increase in wages that would have to be paid to them when the firm decided to hire an additional worker. Depending on the particular situation, the overall impact on the MCL can be positive or negative. If the MCL rises, we get the result from the competitive model. If it falls, however, employment and output will increase, while the MRPL will subsequently decrease.

Furthermore, monopsony theory can be complemented by efficiency wage theory. The latter assumes that workers have an incentive to provide less effort if the probability of detection or the implicit cost of losing a job is small. In this context, a higher wage would decrease the incentive for workers to display this kind of shirking behavior, since in case of being detected their loss (represented by a well-paid job) would be higher.

Efficiency wage theory establishes an additional link between the market wage and the MRPL (see Figure 6): while the rise in the market wage due to the minimum wage still has the familiar effect on the MCL, it now also has a positive direct impact on the MRPL (because it leads to a rise in worker effort). Depending on which of those two effects dominates, employment might either increase or decrease—a situation similar to the monopsonistic model.

Figure 6. Neoclassical Efficiency Wage Theory

We can conclude that following monopsony and efficiency wage theory, the minimum wage could increase employment if either the labor market can be seen as monopsonistic or wages have a strong effect on worker performance.

---


14 In this model the worker would not be able to find immediate employment elsewhere, since it follows from the model of the competitive firm that if firms pay these higher wages, some level of unemployment would emerge as the supply of labor would exceed the demand (see e.g., Pindyck and Rubinfeld 2013, Ch. 17).
The Institutionalist Theory of the Firm and Evolutionary Dynamics

The next two subsections discuss approaches that are much less represented in the academic and public debate. The first of these alternative perspectives is provided by the school of institutionalist and evolutionary economics. Institutionalist economists reject the “marginalist” foundations on which neoclassical economics is based. In their view, firm decisions are not well described by the principle of profit maximization and employment and prices are not determined by the interplay of marginal costs and marginal revenues. As an alternative to the strict axiomatic foundations of neoclassical economics, institutionalist economics provides a detailed assessment of internal decision making processes of business enterprises and how the latter shape industrial structures and markets (see e.g., Jo 2018): Economies are not dominated by small firms reacting to market signals, but by large business enterprises that act strategically to increase their market power (Veblen [1904]1994). These enterprises are complex organizations led by “captains of industry” (Veblen [1904]1994), “controllers” (Berle and Means 1933), “technostructure planners” (Galbraith 1967) or conglomerate managers (Dugger 1988), where management is more often than not separated from ownership (Eichner 1976). Giant corporations create and control markets and exercise power over employees. Moreover, in contrast to the neoclassical notion that firms always maximize profits, institutionalist theory acknowledges that corporations are subject to more than one goal at a time (e.g., short term vs. long term profits, growth, long term survival, independence etc.).

Other institutionalist authors have pointed out that, in contrast to neoclassical economics, managers cannot be viewed as agents who maximize profits at any time (see Lester 1946; Hirsch Kaufman, and Zelenska 2015). Instead they emphasize that managers are constrained by time and cognitive capacity. In such an environment, managers can be better described as “satisficers” rather than optimizers. This has widespread implications for how managers are supposed to react to a higher minimum wage. As Barry Hirsch, Bruce Kaufman and Tetyana Zelenska (2015, 231) put it with reference to survey results: “managers are overloaded with daily operation issues and work long weekly hours (often 50–55) and, hence, cannot devote the time to actively address important but longer-run or secondary operational issues. Second, a principle-agent problem is present to the extent that owners cannot fully monitor salaried managers who may therefore satisfice rather than fully cost minimize.” Under these circumstances “[a] [minimum wage] hike thus acts as a catalyst or shock that forces managers to step out of the daily routine and think about where extra savings can occur.” In other words, since managers neither have the time nor the incentive to constantly optimize, a sudden shock to profits (like a minimum wage) leads to a reassessment of the production process, at the end of which they often find some possibility to compensate for the cost increase. In those common cases in which business enterprises control the market, the increase in wages can act as a common signal for each firm in the industry to raise prices (Galbraith 1967).

---

15 See the seminal article of Lester (1946) as well as the resulting controversy taking place in the American Economic Review (Machlup 1946, 1947; Stigler 1946, 1947; Lester 1947). For a summary of this controversy see Prasch (2007). See also Lee (1984) and Jo (2016).
16 For a more detailed discussion see Jo (2018).
17 See on this also Penrose (1995).
18 The term satisficing goes back to Herbert Simon (1955, 1956) and is a combination of the words “satisfy” and “suffice.” It basically states that in a complex environment people stop searching for a solution as soon as they find one that fulfills some threshold aspirations.
19 See on this also Galbraith (1967, 249): “In the mature corporation the technostructure sets prices not
The labor market, on the other hand, is not viewed as just another market that clears and allocates according to a market price. Instead institutionalists emphasize that the employment decision is an administered selection process during which workers are “filtered” into their positions according to their formal qualifications, where higher formal qualifications provide people with higher entry slots. Once granted access, it is up to the employed to adjust to the demands of their role within the corporation and prevail (Dugger 1981).

It follows from these foundations that institutionalist theory is very critical about the neoclassical concept of employment being determined by marginal cost and revenue and rather sees actual and expected sales as dominant determinants. We look at the determinants of the latter in more detail once we come to the post-Keynesian view in the next section.

Moreover, institutionalist economic thought challenges the idea that the marginal revenue product of labor is declining as the number of workers increases. See on this for example Lester (1947, 138): “employers generally seem to believe that unit variable cost (and, judging from numerous interviews, particularly unit labor cost) increases significantly as the scale of operations of a plant declines from 100 per cent of plant capacity.” Taking additionally into account that a firm usually has to cover substantial (non-labor related) fixed costs, reducing output by reducing the amount of employed workers just would not make sense unless wages have increased to such a level that the margin to cover these fixed costs has become negative.

Besides these institutionalist insights into the nature of firms, a complete picture of the minimum wage should also take into account the evolutionary nature of the labor-saving process: while the neoclassical economic approach assumes that the technology which can be used to substitute labor in the production process is already available, evolutionary economists would argue that firms attempting to save labor in the production process will not always be able to draw on pre-existing technical solutions. Instead, some will find it necessary to look for tailor-made solutions. If this process succeeds, it will not only add to the demand for goods at the macro-level (we will come to this point once we discuss the post-Keynesian perspective), but will also lead to the origination of an innovative technology that adds to the realm of technological possibilities at the meso-level. As a consequence, other firms might also adopt that new technology, leading to a further rise in labor-substituting capital at the micro-level until it has become the new production standard. These phases in turn correspond to the standard trajectories of economic evolution (origination, adoption, retention) (Schumpeter [1934]1987).
We can now look at these concepts in terms of a structured causal map (Figure 7): as just mentioned, we add to the framework that attempts to substitute capital for labor should be accompanied by the origination of new technologies. Therefore, in the long run increases in capital will add to the realm of technological possibilities at the meso level. Other firms are expected to follow suit, leading to a prolonged rise in capital accumulation at the micro level for this period of adaptation.

However, the most important difference to the figures discussed previously is that the impact of a higher minimum wage, and thus higher real wages, does not come through the MCL. Instead, higher real wages act through their impact on total real labor costs, which in turn have a direct negative effect on actual and expected profits. This shock to profits can trigger a number of adjustment strategies: One of the strategies with which management can react to a sudden drop in actual/expected profits consists of reducing real non-labor costs (e.g., looking for ways to save energy or to reduce waste). If successful, this has a positive influence on the profits of the individual corporation. On the revenue side, the most obvious strategy is to pass on these higher costs to higher prices. The latter is an attempt to raise revenues, but might come at the cost of reducing actual sales. In order to increase sales (a sensible strategy when the corporation has to cover fixed costs), the firm can also respond by increasing quality or sales effort. Whatever happens to sales determines the outcome on employment: less expected/actual sales will lead to less employment, less output, and correspondingly a reduction in labor costs, whereas a rise in sales would be accompanied by more employment, higher output, and a rise in labor costs.

Figure 7. The Institutionalist Theory of the Firm and Evolutionary Dynamics

Macro
This represents a key difference to the neoclassical models discussed before: the latter see the level of employment as the result of an interplay between the MCL and the MRPL. Due to its lack of importance to the institutionalist framework, the MCL is missing from the figure. In contrast the MRPL does feature in it, but only to highlight the difference in assumptions: whereas neoclassical economics assumes a negative causal effect of employment on the MRPL, institutionalists assume that it is positive (see the “+” next to the linking arrow in Figure 7, which stands in contrast to the “–” in Figures 1–6).

This section highlighted the importance of actually observed behavioral patterns as well as the significance of actual and expected sales. The next section discusses the latter aspect in more detail.

**Keynesian and Post-Keynesian Perspectives**

Keynesian and post-Keynesian economic theories offer a macroeconomic perspective on the minimum wage. John M. Keynes (1936) famously argued that higher wages, contrary to the standard neoclassical notion, do not necessarily lead to a loss of employment. He rather argued that firms produce the amount of goods they think they will be able to sell for a profitable price and that, under normal circumstances, this quantity is lower than what they would like to sell. Employment decisions are hence based on these actual and expected sales, which in turn depend on aggregate demand (principle of effective demand). Within this setting the wage obtains the double character of being a cost to production on the one hand, and a source for consumption demand on the other hand. Aggregate demand consists of the already mentioned demand for consumption goods and the demand for capital goods. While the former depends on people’s incomes and their propensities to consume (with workers’ propensity to consume exceeding the one of entrepreneurs or rentiers), the latter depends on expected future profits and the “animal spirits” of the entrepreneurs (Keynes 1936). On the one hand, a rise in the minimum wage can depress these expectations by increasing labor costs. On the other hand the minimum wage could also increase profit expectations, as higher wages would increase labor income and increase expected sales. If the latter effect is significant, firms might even increase production and employment levels.

According to Keynes, these investment decisions however also depend on meso-level factors such as the political and social atmosphere: The introduction of a minimum wage could influence this atmosphere in a manner which could be congenial (e.g., if business perceives it as a necessary measure to preserve social cohesion and consumer demand) or detrimental (e.g., if business perceives it as part of an agenda against the rich) to investment.

In line with neoclassical economists, Keynes (1936) assumed that the marginal product of labor declines as employment increases. Though, contrary to the latter, he did

---

24 See on this Keynes (1936, 162): "It is safe to say that enterprise which depends on hopes stretching into the future benefits the community as a whole. But individual initiative will only be adequate when reasonable calculation is supplemented and supported by animal spirits, so that the thought of ultimate loss [...] is put aside as a healthy man puts aside the expectation of death. [...] This means, unfortunately, [...] that economic prosperity is excessively dependent on a political and social atmosphere which is congenial to the average business man. If the fear of a Labour Government or a New Deal depresses enterprise, this need not be the result either of a reasonable calculation or of a plot with political intent;—it is the mere consequence of upsetting the delicate balance of spontaneous optimism. In estimating the prospects of investment, we must have regard, therefore, to the nerves and hysteria and even the digestions and reactions to the weather of those upon whose spontaneous activity it largely depends." On the role of expectations with regard to the impact of changes in the wage rate see also chapter 19 in Keynes (1936).

25 See again the quote in the previous footnote.
not think of the wage and the marginal product of labor as the determinants of employment, since the latter was ultimately determined by the level of aggregate demand. In this respect the post-Keynesian school has developed a different view: since originating from the works of Keynes, Kalecki, Kaldor, Robinson, and others, it has incorporated many contributions from institutionalist economics (e.g., Means 1936; Eichner 1986; Lee 1984). Thus post-Keynesian economics argues, in line with institutionalist economics, that most firms face a constant or increasing MRPL (i.e., the MRPL is unaffected or increases as employment rises; see e.g., Lavoie 2014) until the plant reaches full capacity, which rules out the possibility of the MRPL being an effective constraint: a firm facing an increasing MRPL would want to produce as many goods as possible given existing production capacities. Based on empirical evidence post-Keynesians assume that firms usually operate below their full capacity.

Generally, post-Keynesian and institutionalist economic approaches show many overlaps and similarities, especially when it comes to the nature of the firm and the role of aggregate demand, which make them ideal candidates for integrating them within a pluralist paradigm. We can illustrate these Keynesian and post-Keynesian views in Figure 8: as the minimum wage drives up the real market wage, labor costs increase at the firm level, thereby influencing expected profits negatively. If firms only reacted to this particular information, they would probably raise prices in an effort to cover some of the cost increase and reduce investment. However, the inclusion of aggregate demand provides a further dimension to the analysis: higher wages also mean that employed workers will earn more than before and aggregate labor income would increase, implying more demand for consumption goods. However, while rising labor incomes would increase workers’ purchasing power at the aggregate level, rising prices tend to do the opposite: here individual firm decisions to increase prices add up to the aggregate price level, which in turn negatively affects the real market wage. As long as the increase in prices does not fully match the rise in labor cost however, aggregate demand for goods would go up as a result.

The second component of aggregate demand is summarized under non-labor costs in Figure 8. Its main component here is production capital: any additional investment into production capital would not only have an impact on profits, but would directly contribute to the aggregate demand for goods. This means that whenever the rise in the demand for consumption goods is not offset by an equal decline in investment, sales would increase. On the one hand, such a rise in sales would result in higher employment and higher output. Higher employment simultaneously means higher labor costs, with the latter being again a source of aggregate income (therefore feeding back into the system) and a burden to profits at the same time. On the other hand, higher sales result in higher revenues, which in turn affect profits positively. Due to these counteracting influences, the total impact on profits can be positive or negative. In the end, whatever happens to actual profits influences investment (i.e., the demand for capital goods), which has the familiar repercussion effects through aggregate demand.

Moreover, the minimum wage can exhibit a meso-level effect by influencing the political and social atmosphere. The direction of this impact depends on the wider circumstances,
but exerts an influence on employment through its impact on profit expectations. Whatever happens to profit expectations at the micro-level of course also feeds back to the meso-level as individual entrepreneur’s expectations contribute to shaping collective sentiments (i.e., causality runs both ways).

Finally, we add that some of the elements introduced in the previous section (quality and sales effort, real non-labor cost) exert different impacts when seen from such a Keynesian/post-Keynesian perspective: quality and sales effort as well as changes in real non-labor cost have an effect on the aggregate demand for goods, just as real non-labor cost and real revenues are, by definition, also affected by changes in the aggregate price level.

Finally, we see that Keynes and post-Keynesians disagree on what happens to the MRPL once employment increases: Keynes argued, in a Marshallian fashion, that it should decline, whereas post-Keynesians, in line with institutionalists, assume a rising MRPL (hence both “+” and “-” in Figure 8). However, both agree that the MRPL is not the determinant of employment (hence no link back to employment), since that role is taken by aggregate demand.

**Figure 8. Keynesian and Post-Keynesian Perspective**

Concluding, whether the positive or the negative effects prevail depends on the reaction of corporations in the short run: if the rise in expected labor costs causes a strong negative reaction (i.e., sharp increase in prices and/or large reductions in investment), the above mentioned positive effects on aggregate demand would be outweighed by negative ones and employment would decline. If, on the other hand, firms act reluctantly (i.e., not much change in investment behavior) or even positively (e.g., firms anticipating positive future effects on consumer spending), positive effects on employment would prevail.
Towards a Pluralist Understanding of the Minimum Wage Debate

Having discussed these different approaches, we can integrate them to get the general picture. Figure 9 combines the information gathered in the previous section: it contains every box and every causal link included in Figures 1–8. On the one hand, Figure 9 shows the large variety of variables one has to take into account if one really wants to adopt a pluralist perspective on the effects of the minimum wage. On the other hand, it reveals interesting complementarities and contradictions between theories.

Let us take a closer look at it. It all starts with a change in the minimum wage.²⁹ According to our previous discussion a rise in the minimum wage can have three direct effects: First of all it increases the real market wage of those workers earning a low wage. This can have a number of potential consequences: it can increase the MCL, reduce the cost of capital vs. labor, increase the relative cost of low wage workers vs. the other workers, increase the marginal revenue product of labor and increase the total cost of labor. Each one of these comes with its own consequences:

- According to neoclassical theory, a rise in MCL goes along with a reduction of employment (for some workers the cost of employing them suddenly exceeds the revenue expected from keeping them).
- Also according to neoclassical theory, a fall in the relative cost of capital vs. labor will lead to additional investment into capital, which allows the firm to reduce employment in the long run without sacrificing too much in terms of output.
- Similarly, the rise in the relative wage of low wage workers vs. other workers reduces the share of low wage workers, which reduces the number of employed workers, but also potentially increases the wage demands and the real wage of the other workers. The consequences of the rise in these other wages are similar to the rise in those lower wages.
- Neoclassical theory has it that a rise in the MRPL increases employment (additional revenue expected from hiring new workers suddenly exceeds the cost of employing them).
- The rise in total labor costs has a negative effect on actual and expected profits as well as a positive impact on aggregate labor income. The former triggers a couple of adjustment strategies at the firm level (institutionalist theory) and has a negative impact on capital formation (Keynesian and post-Keynesian theory). The latter contributes positively to the aggregate demand for goods.

The second direct effect of the minimum wage concerns the MCL, where according to neoclassical theory a rise in the minimum wage could actually reduce this marginal cost if we have monopsonistic firms: if firms fear that hiring an additional worker would drive up current wages, then the introduction of a minimum wage could mean that this threat ceases to exist, since under the minimum wage these wages have already gone up anyway. The declining marginal cost in turn has a positive impact on employment.

The third direct effect concerns the political and social atmosphere: According to the Keynesian view, the latter has an impact on entrepreneurs’ profit expectations, which subsequently influence their investment decisions. The precise impact can be positive or negative, depending on whether firms focus on the negatives (higher costs) or positives.

²⁹ The arrows within the boxes have been dropped in this exposition, since in the general picture practically everything could either increase or decrease, which dramatically reduces the additional information that can be gained by adding these arrows.
(creation of potential consumer demand). Moreover, causality goes in both directions, as individual expectations at the micro-level shape the collective sentiment at the meso-level.

Figure 9. A Pluralist Framework to Assess the Minimum Wage—Employment Relationship

Whatever happens to actual/expected profits and capital accumulation comes along with further consequences: According to institutionalist theory, a fall in actual/expected profits can lead to a couple of coping strategies, which involves increasing prices, quality or sales effort (especially important in those cases where corporations are effectively controlling the market) or reducing non-labor cost. While the former represents attempts to raise revenues (which is important when the firm has to cover substantial fixed costs), the latter tackles the problem of reduced profits from the cost side. Each of these strategies has an impact at the macro-level: when firms raise prices, it raises the aggregate price level, which subsequently affects real wages and real labor costs (which is important for consumer demand), real profits, and real non-labor costs. Attempts to raise sales have a positive impact on aggregate demand, while successful steps to reduce non-labor costs reduce the aggregate demand for goods. Capital is part of non-labor costs, so whatever happens to capital accumulation has an important impact on aggregate demand (see the Keynesian and post-Keynesian perspective). Furthermore, according to evolutionary theory the acquisition of new capital can, in the long run, lead to the origination of new technologies at the meso-level. When these technologies are subsequently adopted by competing firms, it leads to more capital accumulation.

Finally, this kind of analysis also allows us to spot potential contradictions across the different approaches. One such case in Figure 9 is the effect of employment on the MRPL, which can be positive or negative (indicated by the “−/+”). While neoclassical economists (and Keynes) assume a negative relationship (each additional worker contributes less than the worker hired before), institutionalists and post-Keynesians argue in favor of a negative relationship (i.e., unit variable costs increase as the scale of operation of a plant declines).
Creating a Pluralist Paradigm: An Application to the Minimum Wage Debate

This has rather interesting implications: in the neoclassical case it makes logical sense for the firm to react to a rise in the MCL by reducing employment and output, since doing so would increase the MRPL (i.e., unit variable costs should decline). In the other case, such a marginal reduction of employment and output does not make sense: lower employment would be associated with a lower MRPL and would therefore make the situation even worse for the firm. Therefore, the neoclassical story in Figure 9 (MCL → employment → MRPL → employment) only makes sense when the effect of employment on the MRPL is negative, since otherwise the theory would contradict itself. Indeed, when the effect is positive, a firm would always want to produce at the highest possible scale, which in turn fits nicely with the institutionalist/post-Keynesian story that employment is essentially determined by the amount of actual/expected sales (sales → employment): if firms could increase the MRPL by producing more (i.e., hiring more workers) but refrain from doing so, what is it that holds them back? The institutionalist/post-Keynesian answer to that question would be that it is the amount of goods they expect to be able to sell.

Conclusion

The discipline of economics usually offers multiple explanations for economic phenomena, where each of these explanations potentially captures important arguments. From this perspective, restricting the analysis to a narrow set of theoretical approaches will almost inevitably lead to premature conclusions. However, incorporating all relevant insights into one’s thinking can be quite difficult, since first of all one has to be aware of all of these, and secondly one has to be able to think of them in an integrated way. Especially the latter can be quite hard as different fragments of economic analysis can differ substantially in their degree of formal treatment and their axiomatic foundations.

The article offers a pluralist route along which different theoretical approaches can be compared and integrated within a common framework. Causal mapping has the advantage that due to its simple nature, the essence of economic theories can be presented quite easily without considering all detailed issues of different specifications. When this method is combined with a micro-meso-macro architecture, we get well-structured descriptions of theoretical frameworks.

The analysis exposes compatible as well as conflicting patterns amongst the theories. Whereas institutionalist and post-Keynesian theories are very compatible with each other, neoclassical theories more often show features conflicting with the other theories. This type of analysis facilitates exposing the origins of this conflict. In the case at hand, the conflict boils down to the question whether employment is determined by marginal cost and revenue, or by expected sales. The former rests on the assumptions that firms maximize profits, face a declining MRPL, and are subject to rather competitive markets, whereas the latter is built on an institutionalist assessment of the nature of corporations and markets.

The analysis also exposes the various building blocks upon which these arguments are based on and how these elements are compatible or conflicting with each other at times. An example for a potential complementarity is capital accumulation, where the neoclassical theory of the firm would become more general if it took into account that adding to the capital stock means that other firms have to produce that capital (i.e., capital accumulation adds to aggregate demand) or that introducing labor-saving capital can involve the origination of new technologies. A direct conflict in terms of assumptions made concerns the link between employment and the marginal revenue product of labor. Whereas neoclassical economic
analysis rests on the assumption that the MRPL rises as employment falls, institutionalist and post-Keynesian analysis claims the opposite.

Although the analysis throws considerable light on the theoretical debate, it falls short of solving the question of whether or not minimum wages reduce employment. However, this should not come as a surprise to anyone, since this reflects the results gained in empirical studies. Ultimately, the integrated model provides an excellent justification for this mixed empirical evidence, since it indicates that there are many potential channels (compatible as well as conflicting ones) through which the minimum wage can affect employment, so that the idea that they roughly cancel each other out does not seem to be far off. In this sense our pluralist analysis provides a much more comprehensive answer than the mainstream focus on the “competitive” vs. “monopsonistic” labor market argument could ever provide.

This does not mean that the method displayed here should replace the ways in which economic theories are currently developed and presented by different schools of thought. Structured causal maps are not able to capture the full spectrum of underlying assumptions and conceptual differences (e.g., the nature of corporations, markets, decision making, time etc.) that characterize these different schools. However, what it can contribute to is to create an understanding of those theories’ compatibilities and conflicts, which ultimately leads to a better informed public discourse.
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