Chapter 2

Reform priorities
in a difficult macro context

This chapter reviews the main issues related to the short-term impact of structural reforms in different macroeconomic contexts and takes stock of existing theoretical and empirical studies. Taking reforms introduced in "normal" times as a benchmark, it reviews the available evidence on the impact of reforms that are implemented in "bad" times – i.e. in the presence of a sizeable negative output gap and persistently weak demand – as well as under different assumptions regarding the availability or effectiveness of macroeconomic policies in supporting the reforms. In doing so the chapter focuses on the key channels through which different reforms influence short-term activity via the main components of demand and discusses how these channels operate under different macro conditions.

The statistical data for Israel are supplied by and under the responsibility of the relevant Israeli authorities. The use of such data by the OECD is without prejudice to the status of the Golan Heights, East Jerusalem and Israeli settlements in the West Bank under the terms of international law.

Reform priorities in a difficult macro context

Main Findings

- In a context of weak demand, structural reform strategies should put more weight on measures that in addition to stimulating medium-term employment and productivity can best support demand in the short term. The reforms most likely to achieve this include:

  - ❖ *Shift in the composition of public spending towards investment*: More specifically, public infrastructure investment that effectively increases the growth potential in the medium term (e.g. high-speed broadband network) can stimulate private investment in the short term.

  - ❖ *Product market reforms in specific service sectors:* Reforming rules restricting the entry of new suppliers (exclusive rights) and the capacity of existing suppliers to compete (fees control) in services characterised by relatively low entry costs (e.g. professional services, taxis, etc.) can yield positive short-term gains in employment and domestic demand.

  - ❖ *Reforms of benefit entitlements in the areas of pension or health:* Reforming pension or health systems to contain future ageing-related costs can create the space for short-term stimulus measures and raise their effectiveness, notably through increased confidence in the sustainability of public finances. The gains from such reforms can exceed the cost in the short term to the extent that only future benefits are reduced.

  - ❖ *Reforms easing frictions in the reallocation of resources*: Reducing barriers to geographic or jobs mobility can increase the speed of employment gains in difficult times. Housing market policies that promote residential mobility include the lowering of transaction taxes or costs on buying properties as well as the reduction of the stringency of rental regulation.

- In contrast, the risks that reforms fail to lift activity in the short run – or that they even further depress demand – are highest in the case of reforms that initially put downward pressures on wages or mark-ups, such as reforms of employment protection legislation, minimum wages or product market regulation in network industries. A number of measures could help mitigate those risks:

  - ❖ *Reform packaging*: Simultaneous reforms of labour and product markets may reduce the risk or extent of contractionary effects. First, the price reduction resulting from product market reforms will ease the downward pressure on the real wage from labour market reforms. Second, labour market reforms will facilitate the necessary reallocation of workers arising from product market reforms as rents are redistributed across firms and sectors.

  - ❖ *Reform synchronisation*: In the case of the euro area, a greater synchronisation of reforms will also help reduce the transition costs by giving greater scope to monetary policy to mitigate the potential rise in real interest rates.

● Increasing the short-term payoff from structural reforms also calls for measures that shift the relative strength of the transmission channels from supply-side reforms to demand components.

❖ *Addressing financial sector dysfunctions to improve the credit flow:* Significant progress has been achieved in cleaning the banking sector balance sheet following the crisis. However, the share of non-performing loans in the banking system remains relatively high in a number of euro area countries. In fact, the relative speed at which banks' balance sheets were consolidated in the United States may have helped support the faster recovery.

❖ *Reducing policy uncertainty:* Reform strategies that are well communicated and sufficiently comprehensive to create synergies may also provide clearer guidance and confidence about the direction and sustainability of policy decisions.

Introduction

Quantifying the long-term gains from structural reforms with some degree of precision is not straightforward but there is at least broad consensus on the direction of impact and the main channels of transmission. Assessing the short-term effects is more challenging: not only are the various channels of influence more difficult to disentangle but the macro context in which the reforms are introduced raises ambiguity as to the direction of the impact.

Progress has been made in better understanding how reforms of product and labour markets affect the main components of supply and demand in the short term and hence how they impact on output gaps, external accounts and relative prices.[1] While a further understanding of the short-run dynamic effects of reforms is still needed, it is particularly so in the case where reforms are introduced in a context of persistently weak demand, deflationary pressures, sizeable negative output gaps, and with only a partial support from demand-management policies. One concern is that some reforms may have a short-term contractionary effect on activity, prices or employment.

For instance, such concern has been raised and debated in the context of reforms introduced at a time when monetary policy is constrained due to nominal interest rates hitting the zero lower bound (Eggertson, Ferrero and Raffo, 2014; Fernández-Villaverde, 2014; Vogel, 2014). More generally, the experience of southern euro area countries, which have implemented significant reforms in a context of aenemic domestic and external demand as well as without the support of macro policies, has led to renewed interest in better understanding the links between reforms and demand and raised questions about the timing, sequencing and packaging of reforms.

Against this background, this chapter reviews the main issues related to the short-term impact of structural reforms in different macroeconomic contexts and takes stock of existing theoretical and empirical studies. An effort is made to assess the extent of knowledge about the short-term demand effect of specific structural reforms. This impact can have a huge bearing on political feasibility, as transitional losses are likely to erode popular support for reforms.

To set the scene, the next section lays out the case of reforms introduced in "normal" times, i.e. with the economy operating close to potential and with available support of macroeconomic policies. It identifies the main channels through which structural reforms influence short-term activity through consumption, investment and net exports. The

subsequent section then focuses on the case where reforms are introduced in "bad" times, i.e. with a sizeable negative output gap and persistently weak demand, and examines how the more adverse environment influences the relative strengths of the main channels. The final section goes one step further and considers cases where reforms are implemented in a weak conjuncture and under constrained macro policies.

Structural reforms in normal times

The speed at which gains from structural reforms can be achieved depends on several factors, even in normal times, that is when cyclical factors are not at play. First, the credibility of announced reform packages plays a key role. Households and firms are more likely to act early in response to reforms if they believe in the implementation and the sustainability of the policy measures as a permanent change. Second, structural characteristics of the economy, including the structural policy settings in place will shape the speed at which a reform yields benefits. For instance, stronger price or wage stickiness is likely to delay the long-term benefit of reform, *ceteris paribus,* by constraining the scope and speed of real variables to adjust to the policy change. Third, well-functioning financial markets play a key role in bringing forward the gains from reforms by funding the necessary investment and allowing for income smoothing both in anticipation of future gains and to offset temporarily income loses (OECD, 2012).

Mainstream models predict a number of channels of transmission through which structural reforms affect the main components of demand. The key channels include i) *wealth* or *permanent income* effects which bring forward future reform-driven income gains in current consumption and investment, notably through rising asset prices and positive confidence channels, ii) *disposable income and cash-flow effects* for households and firms that are liquidity or cash-flow constrained, i.e. that do not have access to borrowing from banks or other financial institutions iii) *uncertainty or negative confidence* effects arising from households' and firms' perception of heightened (or diminished) income and profit insecurity, which come through the precautionary motive for saving and iv) a *real interest rate channel* which captures inter-temporal substitution effects: by making the holding of financial assets more attractive, a rise in the real interest rate induces a decline in current consumption in favour of higher savings. In addition, some reforms have budgetary implications when not introduced in a budget-neutral way and will affect demand through a fiscal multiplier effect. In what follows, the discussion considers mainly budget-neutral reforms.

What does the evidence tell us about the short-run impact of reforms in normal times?

A more detailed analysis of the impact of different types of reforms on short-term demand and activity through these channels is reported in Appendix 2.1. This analysis essentially comes from studies that simulate the impact of reforms, in particular based on dynamic stochastic general equilibrium (DSGE) models. There are also a few empirical studies looking at changes in policy indicators to define structural reform episodes and to estimate their short-term effects (Bouis et al., 2012). In any case, the empirical literature looking at the short-term effect of reforms mostly refer to normal times, that is when macro policies can react to short-term demand developments. Therefore, when macro

stimulus is not available, demand effects are likely to be stronger than in normal times after a reform. The main results from model-based and empirical analysis can be summarised as follows:

- Reforms of wage bargaining institutions, minimum wages and employment protection legislation generally increase wage flexibility and can improve competitiveness through downward pressures on labour costs.

  - ❖ Model-based analysis of this class of reforms generally indicate positive, albeit moderate, short-term impacts on consumption and output (Cacciatore, Duval and Fiori, 2012; Barkbu et al., 2012). One study shows that in the case of reform to employment protection legislation, the lower firing costs may lead to an increase in unemployment and a reduction in demand in the initial year after the reform but this effect is quickly reversed in subsequent years (Cacciatore, Duval and Fiori, 2012).[2]

  - ❖ In contrast, the evidence from reduced-form empirical analysis points to the absence of significant positive impacts on demand from reforms to employment protection legislation or wage bargaining in the first few years (Bouis et al., 2012).

- Reforms of the tax and transfer systems, including the tax structure, unemployment benefits and pension systems can boost both employment in general and the labour force participation of specific groups:

  - ❖ The evidence from reduced-form analysis indicates that reducing the share of direct taxes in overall tax revenue is found to quickly reduce unemployment, particularly for youth, to boost female and youth participation and private investment growth (Bouis et al., 2012). A special case of a growth-enhancing tax reform for countries in a monetary union is the so-called fiscal devaluation, which typically takes the form of a reduction in employer's social security contributions combined with an increase in the value-added tax rate. Empirical evidence points to a positive, but short-lived effect, on employment and net exports, with long-term GDP gains reflecting essentially productivity improvements (Johansson et al., 2008; Koske, 2013).

  - ❖ The evidence from both model-based simulations (e.g. Cacciatore, Duval and Fiori, 2012) and reduced-form estimates (Bouis et al., 2012) suggests that lowering unemployment benefits in normal conditions yields positive gains in consumption and overall demand within 2-3 years. In most studies, reforms of unemployment benefits are found to have a significantly stronger positive short-term impact on demand and output than reforms to wage bargaining and employment protection legislation.

  - ❖ Model-based evidence indicates that an increase in retirement age is most likely to have a positive effect on demand in the short run via lower private saving due to life-cycle motives (Karam et al., 2010; Barrell et al., 2009). This is corroborated by reduced-form analysis, which shows a positive impact on consumption, investment and GDP (Bouis et al., 2012).

  - ❖ The evidence on the impact of pension reforms is less clear in the cases of benefit reductions or increases in contribution rates as their effect is similar to a fiscal contraction, albeit a deferred one. They are found to stimulate private saving in the short run, but may also boost investment through anticipation of reduced public debt (Karam et al., 2010).

● Measures to improve job-search assistance and training for the unemployed or childcare services can raise labour force participation and address labour market frictions. However, these typically have implications for public spending and should be carefully assessed on a budget-neutral basis to capture the effects coming from the structural changes:[3]

 ❖ In the case of a budgetary-neutral reform of active labour market policies (ALMPs), the effect is found to be similar to that of a tightening of unemployment benefits (Cacciatore, Duval and Fiori, 2012), except that by lowering firms' search costs or the costs of initial training, they may stimulate labour demand somewhat more rapidly.

● Product market reforms comprise essentially reductions in regulatory barriers to competition which can lead to lower mark-ups and export prices, lower input prices (and production costs) for downstream industries, and higher productivity through efficiency gains and improved product quality and variety through higher investment in innovation.

 ❖ By and large, model-based evidence points to modest short-term GDP gains from product market reforms, with more visible impacts appearing after 2-3 years (Anderson et al., 2014); (Barkbu et al., 2012).

 ❖ Evidence from reduced-form empirical analysis based on aggregate data shows no significant short-term impact on GDP, except for a decline in the initial year, due to a temporary drop in investment (Bouis et. al., 2012). Evidence based on sector-level data indicates that productivity gains can be achieved after 2-3 years (Bourlès et al., 2013; Dabla-Norris et al., 2015).

 ❖ The overall results at the aggregate level may mask very different outcomes depending on whether barriers to competition are lowered in manufacturing or service sectors, and within services whether the reforms affect primarily network industries (e.g. energy, telecoms and transport) or professional services, where regulatory barriers to entry and strict conduct regulation may create strong latent demand.

Overall, the bulk of evidence suggests that the gains from pro-growth structural reforms introduced in normal times generally exceed the potential losses even in the short run. This is generally the case including with reforms aimed at restoring competitiveness through lower relative production costs and prices. However, the positive effect is in many cases modest, especially in the three-year horizon. The aggregate benefits from reforms to unemployment benefits or pension systems (retirement age) tend to accrue more rapidly than those from other types of reforms, in particular the ones primarily focused on raising wage flexibility and facilitating resource reallocation. Furthermore, the modest net effect of reforms often masks more substantial shifts in the composition of demand, not only between domestic and foreign, but also within domestic demand, reflecting the opposite impact that reforms have on investment and consumption in the case of some reforms.

Initial conditions and reform implementation play a role

The short-term effects of structural reform in one area may depend in part on initial policy and institutional settings in other areas. However, the evidence is inconclusive to the extent that it is difficult to empirically identify how interactions between policy settings and reforms affect outcomes (e.g. Bassanini and Duval, 2009; Bouis et al., 2012). For instance, model-based simulations by Cacciatore et al. (2012) find that gains in the aftermath of product market reforms would be quicker if initially job protection is less

stringent and unemployment benefits are low. That is because when entry barriers fall, new jobs are filled more quickly, minimising the risks of lengthy unemployment spells for laid-off workers. On the other hand, findings from reduced-form empirical analysis show that under initially weak job protection a relaxation of product market regulation leads to higher unemployment and lower employment (Bouis et al., 2012).

How reform is implemented also matters as there can be material interaction effects between policies:

- *Reform packages:* a package of labour and product market reforms that is sufficiently broad can induce a faster adjustment and alleviate the transitional costs of certain reforms (Anderson Hunt and Snudden, 2014; Cacciatore et al., 2012; Everaert and Schule, 2008, Gomes et al., 2013). For instance, (Cacciatore et al., 2012) find that a combination of product market, job protection and unemployment benefit reforms boosts GDP, employment and wages immediately, in contrast with the effects of some of these reforms taken in isolation.

- *Reform credibility:* Early announcement and credible commitment to future reforms can help bring forward the gains from reforms by fostering investment and consumption today. Adjémian et al., (2007) find that announcing product market reforms in advance can trigger an immediate response by firms, accelerating the upside adjustment in investment and output even before the reform is actually implemented.

- *Pace of reforms:* theoretical studies suggest that outcomes might be better if reforms were sequenced, with product market reforms preceding labour market reforms (Blanchard and Giavazzi, 2003). Reforming product markets first can also lower the resistance to labour market reforms by reducing rents and facilitate their subsequent implementation. Another political argument for gradualism is that as governments have a fixed amount of political capital, it is best if they allocate their scarce resources to one set of reforms at a time (Coeuré, 2014). However, too long a time lag between reforms might not be desirable. For instance, in the case of New Zealand's reforms in the 1980s a significant time lag (about five years) between the liberalisation of product markets and labour market reforms mitigated the potential overall gains from reforms (Caldera Sánchez, de Serres and Yashiro, 2016).

- *Boldness of reforms:* Recent empirical analysis has found that incremental labour market reforms tend to raise household income instability while bolder reforms do not, increasing the risk of resistance and reversal in the former case (Cournède et al., 2015).

Structural reforms under weak demand conditions

The previous section has shown that the short-term impact of reforms on the main components of demand often depends on the net outcomes of conflicting channels. The short-term impact from many types of reforms depends notably on the net effect on disposable income and cash-flow as well as the relative strength of the wealth effect versus the precautionary motive for savings. While the bulk of evidence indicates that positive channels dominate the negative ones in normal times, it may no longer be true when reforms are introduced at an unfavourable stage in the business cycle.

Several factors shift the relative strengths of these channels in downturns. First, the proportion of households and firms facing liquidity constraints can be expected to rise along with unemployment and the tightening of credit conditions, which are often features of downturns (Bernanke and Gertler, 1989; Fissel and Jappelli, 1990). Second, even for

households or firms that are not liquidity-constrained, the positive wealth effect of reforms is likely to be weaker, especially if the downturn is associated with dysfunctions in financial markets or the need for private-sector deleveraging. Conversely, the precautionary motive for saving in the face of reforms is likely to be higher in a bad conjuncture. Heightened macro-economic and policy uncertainty can lead households and firms to postpone spending and investment "to wait and see". Finally, the efficiency of job matching may deteriorate in periods of persistent unemployment, given a rising share of long-term unemployed and declines in housing prices. Some of these factors may also condition the effectiveness of fiscal and monetary policies in supporting demand.

Reforms reducing the cost of labour and mark-ups are more likely to depress demand during downturns

Reforms entailing a bigger risk of further depressing demand in downturns include those whose most immediate impact is to put downward pressures on wages or mark-ups.

- Product market reforms that enhance competition in formerly protected sectors usually lead to incumbents to engage in restructuring as they seek efficiency gains to preserve mark-ups in the face of downward pressures on prices. In turn, this leads to the displacement of workers and capital in the short run (Blanchard, 2006). Stronger competition also leads to the exit of least productive firms. In normal economic conditions, displaced resources are absorbed eventually by new entrants, more competitive firms that are expanding production or by other sectors. As a result of more efficient resource allocation, aggregate productivity increases and as lower prices stimulate demand employment is also expected to increase. However, when the economy is in a slump, demand may respond less to the lower prices resulting from competition. In such context, displaced resources are expected to remain unemployed for longer as a bleaker profit outlook and credit constraints slows the entry of new firms or the expansion of incumbent firms (Lee and Mukoyama, 2015; Barlevy, 2003; EC, 2013).

- Reforms of wage bargaining institutions or the minimum wage have an uncertain effect on demand in the short term during a downturn. The downward pressures on wages may not be as rapidly compensated by employment gains and the prospects of future productivity-related income gains as they would in normal times. This will weaken consumer demand in the short term by lowering disposable income and strengthening precautionary savings. An easing of employment protection legislation may lead to a similar outcome, as the outflow from unemployment may take more time to exceed the rise in the inflow rate than in normal times.

- Reforms that drive wages down and increase product market competition can boost competitiveness and net exports but their ultimate impact on aggregate demand may be muted in an environment of weak external demand, such as a global downturn. Conversely, Canada, Germany and Sweden have in the past introduced major reforms in a context of weak domestic demand but benefited from robust global trade growth helping to revive their economies relatively quickly (Caldera Sánchez, de Serres and Yashiro, 2016).

Reforms raising incentives to take-up work may be contractionary during downturns

Reforms reducing the generosity of unemployment benefits (replacement rate and duration) are effective in reducing unemployment in the short run by encouraging the unemployed to intensify job search and accept existing offers, thereby increasing outflows

from unemployment. However, when labour demand is weak reducing unemployment insurance could lower disposable income if no jobs are available in the short run, negatively impacting demand. Indeed, evidence shows that when unemployment benefit reforms are undertaken during a typical economic upturn employment increases after two or three years (Figure 2.1). In contrast, if it is undertaken during a typical downturn, the gain in employment is muted and even turns negative from the third year after the reform.

Figure 2.1. **The gains in employment of an unemployment benefit reform can turn negative during a downturn**

1. The lower (upper) line corresponds to the impact of the reduction in the initial unemployment benefit replacement rate during economic downturn (upturn), where the economic cycle is measured through the level of the pre-reform unemployment gap (i.e. the difference between the structural unemployment rate and the unemployment rate). The economic downturn (upturn) corresponds to the case where the unemployment gap is set to the minimum (maximum) value within the sample.

Source: Bouis et al. (2012).

StatLink ⬛ *http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933323963*

Other reforms aimed at increasing labour supply are also likely to be less effective in boosting employment and may even be contractionary when labour demand is weak. For instance, tax reforms to remove the fiscal disincentives to second earner's labour participation (such as reduction of spousal tax credits) or reforms that tighten access to disability benefits may not increase employment much if implemented in a context of weak demand, given that the targeted groups may face even more difficulties in finding work than the other unemployed. Instead, they may lower private consumption by reducing household disposable income, if the measure is introduced also to generate budgetary savings.

Indeed, one factor contributing to the higher risk of a negative impact of reforms is the potential increase in skills and geographical mismatches, combined with the heightened pressures on resources devoted to job-search assistance and training programmes. Even though evidence on mismatches is not always easy to interpret, increasing mismatches are a recurrent concern during cyclical downturns insofar as the impact differs across industries and regions (OECD, 2011). In such a case, a depressed housing market may slow geographical mobility, in particular where mobility is already hampered by housing and rental market policies that create high transaction costs (Andrews et al., 2011). Also, active labour market policies that focus on the least employable workers may be less effective in

downturns. Reinforcing job-search assistance may not help in this case as the probability of reemployment does not depend so much on search efforts when there is a lack of jobs (Boeri et al., 2015). Hence, there may be a case for shifting the focus on workers early in the unemployment spells as the chances to find a job are higher. [4]

Demand-side policies mitigate a negative impact from reforms in the short run when demand is weak

The short-term effect of reforms in downturns and the extent to which adverse effects can be quickly over-turned also depends on the timeliness and effectiveness of macro policies. As regards, monetary policy, its effectiveness in stimulating aggregate demand in the short run will in part depend on how well the financial market is functioning and on the share of liquidity constrained households and firms. A dysfunctional financial sector makes it harder for funds to flow to new investment opportunities, which is critical for reforms to pay off. On the other hand, a higher share of liquidity constrained agents may make monetary policy more effective by reducing the cost of debt services, leaving the net effect unclear.

The effectiveness of fiscal policy may be enhanced during recessions due to higher multiplier effects (Auerbach and Gorodnichenko, 2013; Blanchard and Leigh, 2013). During a recession government spending is less likely to cause an increase in the interest rate and crowd out private consumption and investment, provided long-term fiscal sustainability is not at risk. Similarly, the increase in the proportion of liquidity-constrained firms and households who have a higher propensity to consume out of their income makes fiscal policy more effective during a downturn (Galí et al., 2007), especially during a financial crisis or when the financial sector is weak (Corsetti et al., 2012).

The largest short-run impact on aggregate demand is likely to come from government spending measures rather than from tax cuts (e.g. Mineshima et al., 2014). This is largely because spending measures have a direct impact on aggregate demand while tax reductions will have a muted effect if they are saved because of, for instance, high uncertainty. In practice, fiscal stimulus measures can be designed on both the spending and tax side to have a rapid and substantial multiplier effect.

Among spending measures, public investment is usually found to be the most powerful instrument (Röhn, 2010). Boosting investment in public infrastructure is a typical way to boost demand during a downturn, as it pulls demand today, as opposed to other investments (e.g. R&D or education) that need longer to pay off. An increase in public infrastructure investment boosts aggregate demand via two channels, first, through the short-term fiscal multiplier, and second, by crowding in private investment. Indeed, evidence suggests that the positive short-term effect on demand is even stronger when there is economic slack – less crowding out of private investment –, and monetary policy is accommodative IMF (2014). Furthermore, the productivity gains from infrastructure shocks are significantly higher during downturns (Dabla-Norris et al., 2015). In the European Union, removing financial barriers and harmonising regulations, in particular in the area of network industries, would help achieve a higher return on investment.[5]

Some tax reductions can also be put in place to increase household disposable income and boost spending in the short term. While in theory consumption should not respond much to temporary changes in taxes, as consumers are likely to spread out their consumption over their lifetimes, evidence suggests that in some cases temporary tax reductions can be

effective in boosting consumption spending in the short term. For instance, the income tax rebates the US federal government enacted in 2001 and 2008 as part of its economic stimulus packages significantly boosted spending in the short term, especially for households with low liquid wealth or low income (Johnson et al., 2006; Parker et al., 2013).[6]Reductions in labour taxes or social security contributions targeted to lower-income workers, can also increase aggregate demand in the short term, as spending by this group is closely tied to their disposable income (De Mooij and Keen, 2013).

The scope for expansionary fiscal policy may, however, be limited when long-run fiscal constraints are significant. An increase in government spending (or tax cuts) in countries with high debt levels may act as a signal that fiscal tightening will be required in the near future. The anticipation of such adjustment could have a contractionary effect – through for instance adverse effects on financial markets, interest rates and consumer spending – that would offset the short-term expansionary effects. Ricardian behaviour, implying that fiscal stimulus is at least partly offset through an increase in private sector savings, is stronger the higher the level of government debt (Röhn, 2010). Moreover, in a financial crisis, debt financed spending expansions might reinforce a negative feedback loop between bank and government balance sheets when government debt is high.

Structural reforms under weak demand and constrained macroeconomic policies

Monetary and fiscal policies may be limited in various ways in practice, making it difficult to smooth the transitional dynamics associated with structural reforms. This section discusses the short-run impacts of structural reforms when weak demand is compounded by three types of constraints: monetary policy has hit the zero lower bound and has to rely on unconventional monetary tools; participation in a monetary union; and fiscal policy is constrained by consolidation requirements or legislated bounds on the fiscal deficit.

Reforms at the Zero Lower Bound (ZLB)

The zero lower bound (ZLB) brings an additional channel through which structural reforms may lower demand and output in the short run, namely an increase in the real interest rate. In principle, structural reforms that boost aggregate supply can, in a weak demand environment, have a negative impact in the short run by putting downward pressures on prices and inflation expectations if the monetary policy stimulus cannot be increased. The inability of the monetary authority to adjust nominal interest rates in response to falling expectations would push up the real interest rate, further depressing rather than stimulating aggregate demand (Eggertsson et al., 2014; Fernández-Villaverde, 2014).

In practice, this may be an issue only for a relatively limited set of reforms, mostly those that enhance competitiveness through downward pressures on domestic production costs and mark-ups. In the case of reforms that boost productivity through innovation and the reallocation of resources, it is less clear how much of an increase in production capacity can be achieved in the presence of anaemic demand, given the more limited incentives to make the necessary investments. Even if firms do invest, given the time required for these investments to translate into higher supply and downward pressures on inflation expectations, economies may have moved away from the ZLB, hence allowing

monetary policy to react by lowering nominal interest rates. In any case, structural reforms that raise future potential growth will also increase the natural real interest rate, thereby reducing the stringency of the ZLB.

Furthermore, other factors will contribute to mitigate the potential adverse real interest rate effect, even in the case of reforms that do result in rising real interest rates. First, liquidity-constrained households will not be very sensitive to the real interest rate increases but will benefit from falling price levels (Vogel, 2014). Second, insofar as the reforms yield competitiveness gains, increases in net exports will help mitigate the downward pressures on domestic demand, although this may not be sufficient to offset the impact of higher real interest rates (Eggertsson et al., 2014). Third, reforms leading to a price level adjustment need not create disinflationary expectations if the change is bold and implemented in a short time period rather than incremental and introduced gradually (Coeuré, 2014).[7]

Finally, in a country with its own currency, the presumption that monetary policy is incapable of responding to a deflationary shock at the ZLB is debatable given the now widespread use of unconventional monetary policies and their effectiveness in boosting demand up to a point. However, there is concern that unconventional tools could be insufficient in a context of falling real neutral interest rates and persistent negative output gaps, raising the risk of a downward spiral in output and inflation. In such a context, it is *a priori* unclear whether structural reforms would reduce the risks by raising the long-term real neutral rate or increase the risks by temporary increasing deflationary pressures. Such concerns are of particular importance in countries that do not have their own monetary policy, where cost-cutting structural reforms should be considered with particular attention and be part of wider policy packages.

Reforms in a monetary union

The real interest rate channel that plays a role at the zero lower bound also operates in a monetary union, even in normal times. With nominal rates set at the union-wide level, reforms undertaken by one member alone to reduce relative wages and prices could lead to a higher real interest rate. In such a case, internal devaluations can be contractionary in the short term, especially during a period of weak demand, as the positive gains on competitiveness and growth through a reduction in labour costs and domestic prices can be outweighed by the negative effects from higher real interest rates.[8] Furthermore, for countries in a monetary union, changes in the real exchange rate must come through adjustments in relative labour costs and prices. In the case of reforms that lead to a real exchange rate depreciation, such adjustment can be costly. This is especially the case when inflation in the union as a whole is near zero, as real depreciation would require reductions in nominal wages and prices.

On the other hand, fiscal devaluations – a reduction of employer's social security contributions combined with an increase in value-added (VAT) tax rate – is a type of measure that may have more traction for countries in a monetary union, in particular as a means to boost competitiveness and exports in the short run. As mentioned above, a fiscal devaluation is a special case of a reform that shifts taxation from more distortive (direct) sources to less distortive (indirect) ones. Such shifts have been found to yield permanent gains in output and productivity levels in the longer run. An additional competitiveness channel operates in the short term in the case of a monetary union, as long as not too many members introduce a similar reform at the same time, in which case the impact on net exports of each is

diminished. With nominal wages fixed in the short run, a reduction in social security contributions rates lowers labour costs. If the fall in labour costs is passed on into prices, both export and domestic good prices fall leading to a boost in competitiveness. By contrast, the higher VAT only bears on domestic and import goods, but not on exports and, therefore will not dampen the positive effect on competitiveness and net exports.

The magnitude of the short-run benefits of a fiscal devaluation is, however, uncertain. Model-based simulations suggest that fiscal devaluations have beneficial, but moderate, short-term effects on net exports, output and employment (Koske, 2013). For instance, for Portugal, a fiscal devaluation of 1% of GDP would lift net exports by 0.1% of GDP in the first year of the reform (EC, 2011). By contrast, econometric estimates for the euro area show much larger effects in the short run, of an immediate impact on net exports of up to 4% of GDP for a 1% GDP shift in revenues (De Mooij and Keen, 2013). Given the uncertainty surrounding the short-term benefits, a fiscal devaluation cannot thus be a substitute for more fundamental reforms of labour and product markets to sustainably boost competitiveness, but can help sustain demand in the short term.

Reforms under budgetary constraints and public finance consolidation

An expansionary fiscal policy can compensate the lack of support from monetary policy in addressing the demand shortfall, especially for euro area countries which cannot expect an expansionary monetary policy by the ECB to accommodate their individual reforms. However, the fiscal space in many OECD countries has been limited either because they have to engage in fiscal consolidation, face high debt financing costs or their fiscal balances are bound by rules. Indeed, for several countries needing to put public finances on a sustainable path, fiscal policy has been contractionary until recently. Negative impacts of fiscal consolidation are likely to be more pronounced during weak demand times as fiscal multipliers are significantly larger during economic recessions than expansions (Auerbach and Gorodnichenko, 2013).

Tight fiscal conditions and a limited ability of the government to cushion the transitory costs for losers may increase some of the contractionary effects of structural reforms in the short run (Duval, 2008). For instance, reforms that increase flexibility in employment protection and wage formation can negatively impact private consumption if governments cannot mitigate the increase in income risks with an expansion of unemployment benefits or active labour market policies (ALMPs). Fiscal constraints are particularly a concern if they undermine the ability of countries to carry out structural reforms that entail higher spending (e.g. in ALPMs, R&D or childcare), less revenue (e.g. labour taxes), or up-front public spending, for instance through transfer schemes, to compensate reform losers. Furthermore, they can also reduce the feasibility of growth-enhancing structural policies that could enhance short-term as well as long-term growth, such as high-quality infrastructure investment.

The urgency in the fiscal situation may bias structural reforms toward those that realise fiscal savings rapidly, but may be contractionary in the short run. An example of such reforms is a reduction in welfare expenditure that for example took place in New Zealand in the early 1990s amid the strong need for fiscal consolidation (Caldera Sánchez, de Serres and Yashiro, 2016). While a strong pressure to reduce public spending may facilitate the implementation of reforms to public-sector administration and services, the success of the reforms in terms of raising cost-effectiveness and quality may be undermined if priority needs to be given to immediate budgetary savings.

Reforms likely to boost short-run demand when demand is weak and macroeconomic policies are constrained.

Some reforms can be expansionary even under relatively weak demand and constrained macroeconomic policies if they encourage investment or generate rapid job gains:

● *Product market reforms that ease supply constraints.* Reducing entry barriers in service sectors with large pent-up demand and low entry costs can unleash the entry of new firms, boosting investment and job creation relatively fast. Simulations for Italy show that half of the gains of reforms that facilitate the entry of new firms in the service sector would be realised within three years (Forni et al., 2010). Case studies have also found that liberalisation in sectors such as retail trade and telecommunications often resulted in fast decreases in prices and increases in output and employment (Bertrand and Kramarz, 2002; Faini et al., 2006; Skuterud, 2005). Another example is professional services that remain heavily regulated in many countries (i.e. legal, accounting, engineering and architecture professions), especially as regards entry regulations (Figure 2.2). As such reforms reduce the relative price of non-tradables, their impact on net exports will be similar to that of an internal devaluation, with additional positive effects due to the fact that non-tradables are a major input into tradables.

● *Reforms that improve confidence or reduce uncertainty regarding future economic conditions*: By improving the sustainability of public finances, credible reforms in pensions and healthcare systems can boost consumption today through wealth effects and reduced need for precautionary saving. Empirical studies have, indeed, shown that the risk of unexpected healthcare expenditure is an important motive of precautionary saving, and policies that improve access to medical insurance increase consumption (Gruber and Yelowitz, 1999; Jappelli et al., 2007; Bai and Wu, 2014). However, such reforms may be less effective in reducing precautionary saving if the volatility of income and the risk of unemployment is very high (Mody et al., 2012). Product market reforms that reduce the economy-wide administrative burdens on firms and reduce the initial cost of starting-up a business can also improve expectations on future business conditions. For instance, simulations suggest that reforms to reduce the initial costs of starting-up a business implemented during the crisis in Italy, Portugal and Spain have significantly raised the birth rate of firms in those countries (Ciriaci, 2014).

Overall, the review of the evidence on the effects that specific reforms can have on demand when introduced in a difficult macro context allows for a tentative hierarchy of reforms to be drawn based on their likely effectiveness (Table 2.1). The measures most likely to bring short-term benefits even in a bad conjuncture are those aimed at raising investment in knowledge-based capital, including through infrastructure spending and tax structure reforms, as well as those focusing on helping unemployed workers to find jobs, including through higher mobility. In fact, the effectiveness of these measures even tends to be stronger in a difficult context than in normal times. In the specific case of the euro area, one reform that is likely to pay-off in a bad conjuncture is the shift in the tax composition from direct to indirect sources.

Other reforms may have effects that do not necessarily differ much when introduced in a context of weak demand as compared to a normal conjuncture, which means in most cases modest short-term benefits. These include measures to raise competition in professional services sectors or to increase the retirement age. On the other hand, an

easing of employment protection on regular contracts or reforms of collective wage bargaining arrangements are more likely to entail short-term costs if introduced in a difficult context. The same is true for reforms of pension systems, if they involve reductions in benefits or increases in contributions.

Figure 2.2. **Regulation in professional services**

Index scale of 0-6 from least to most restrictive

1. 2008 data instead of 2013.

Source: OECD, *Product Market Regulation Database.*

StatLink ⧉ *http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/888933323978*

Table 2.1. **Expected short-term effects of specific reforms on demand**

	Effect on demand in normal times (1)	Change in effect relative to (1) due to downturns but with support from macro policies (2)	Change in effect relative to (2) due to constrained macro policies (3)
Reduction in regulatory barriers to competition in network industries	Increase	Weaker	Weaker
Reduction in regulatory barriers to entry in professional services and retail trade	Increase	Equal	Equal
Shift in tax composition from direct to indirect sources	Small increase	Weaker	Stronger in EMU
Reform of collective wage bargaining arrangement and minimum wages	Small increase	Weaker	Weaker
Easing of employment protection legislation on regular contracts	No effect or small decrease	Weaker	Weaker
Reform of unemployment benefits	Increase	Weaker	Weaker
Strengthening of job search assistance, training and wage subsidy programmes	Increase	Stronger	Stronger
Reforms of pension systems: Increasing retirement ages	Increase	Equal	Equal
Reforms of pension systems: Reducing benefits or raising contributions	No effect or small decrease	Weaker	Equal
Raising incentives for investment in knowledge-based capital, including through infrastructure spending	Increase	Stronger	Stronger

Notes

1. A large number of studies looking at the short-term effect of structural reforms using either a model-based or reduced-form empirical analysis are reported in Appendix 2.1. More complete information, including the review of case studies, can be found in Caldera Sánchez, de Serres and Yashiro (2016).

2. The latter owes to the fact that while the destruction of jobs is immediate, job creation tends to be gradual as time is needed to match firms and available workers.

3. Model-based simulations indicate that unfunded increases in spending on active labour market policies or childcare services have stronger positive effects on demand within the first two years than after five years (Barkbu et al.; 2012).

4. Insofar as competition for jobs is fiercer in weaker labour markets, active labour market programmes that focus on some workers may improve the search ability of those workers by reducing the relative job-search success of others (Crépon et al. 2013; Michaillat, 2012). A meta-analysis of impact estimates of studies of active labour market programmes by Card, Kluve and Weber (2015) suggests that they are more likely to show positive impacts in a recession.

5. Evidence by Fournier (2015) finds that lower heterogeneity in product market regulations between two countries leads to greater bilateral FDI.

6. The Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001 gave tax rebates to most US households over a ten-week period from late July to the end of September 2001. The Economic Stimulus Act of 2008 consisted primarily of a USD 100 billion programme of tax rebates to approximately 130 million US tax filers.

7. Indeed, using model-based simulations, a number of studies have found that the short-run negative impact of product and labour market reforms can be fairly small (or non-existent) and short-lived (only one year after reforms) (Gomes, 2014; Vogel, 2014).

8. In the case where private sector debt deleveraging is a major factor contributing to the weakness of demand, it has been shown that under the presence of collateral constraints and long-term debt contracts product market reforms may have a positive impact on output and employment even in the short run despite their deflationary effect (Andrés, Arce and Thomas, 2014). However, the effect of labour market reforms in the same circumstances are less favourable.

Bibliography

Adjémian, S. et al. (2007), "Variantes en Univers Incertain", Économie et Prévision, Special Issue.

Anderson, D., B. Hunt, and S. Snudden, (2014), "Fiscal Consolidation in the Euro Area: How Much Pain Can Structural Reforms Ease?" Journal of Policy Modelling 36 (2014) 785-799.

Anderson, D., B. Barkbu, L. Lusinyan and D. Muir (2014), "Assessing the Gains from Structural Reforms for Jobs and Growth", Chapter 7 of Jobs and Growth: Supporting the European Recovery, IMF.

Andrés, J., O. Arce and C. Thomas (2014), "Structural Reforms in a Debt Overhang", Documentos de Trabajo, No. 1421, Banco de Espana.

Andrews, D., A. Caldera Sánchez and Å. Johansson (2011), "Housing Markets and Structural Policies in OECD countries", OECD Economics Department Working Papers, No. 836, OECD Publishing, Paris, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kgk8t2k9vf3-en.

Anton, J. and R. Muñoz de Bustillo (2011), "The Impact of the Minimum Wage on Spanish Youth: Evidence From A Natural Experiment", Technical report, Munich Personal RePEc Archive Paper 33488.

Arpaia, A., W. Roeger, J. Varga and J. in't Veld (2007), "Quantitative Assessment of Structural Reforms: Modelling the Lisbon Strategy" European Economy Economic Papers 282, European Commission.

Auerbach, A.J., Y. Gorodnichenko (2013), "Fiscal Multipliers in Recession and Expansion", in Alberto Alesina and Francesco Giavazzi edited Fiscal Policy after the Financial Crisis, University of Chicago Press.

Bai, C. and B. Wu (2014), "Health Insurance and Consumption: Evidence from China's New Cooperative Medical Scheme", Journal of Comparative Economics, 42 450-469.

Barlevy , G. (2003), "Credit Market Frictions and the Allocation of Resources Over the Business Cycle" Journal of Monetary Economics, 50, 1795-1818

Barkbu, B., J. Rahman and R. Valdés (2012), "Fostering Growth in Europe Now" IMF Staff Discussion Note SDN/12/07. IMF. Washington.

Barrell, R., I. Hurst and S. Kirby (2009), "How to Pay for the Crisis or Macroeconomic Implications of Pension reforms" Discussion paper No. 333, National Institute of Economic and Social Research.

Bassanini, A. and R. Duval (2009), "Unemployment, Institutions, and Reform Complementarities: Re-Assessing the Aggregate Evidence for OECD Countries", Oxford Review of Economic Policy, Vol. 25, No. 1, pp. 40-59.

Bernanke, B. and M. Gertler (1989), "Agency Costs, Net Worth and Business Fluctuations" *American Economic Review*, 79, March 1989, 14-31.

Bertrand, M. and F. Kramarz (2002), "Does Entry Regulation Hinder Job Creation? Evidence from the French Retail Industry", *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 117(4), pp. 1369-1413.

Blanchard, O. (2006), "Comments" in T. Boeri, M.Castanheira, R. Faini, and V. Galasso edited *Structural Reforms Without Prejudices*, Oxford University Press.

Blanchard, O. and D. Leigh (2013), "Growth Forecast Errors and Fiscal Multipliers" *NBER Working Paper* 18779.

Boeri, T., P. Cahuc and A. Zylberberg (2015), "The Costs of Flexibility-Enhancing Reforms for Individuals: a Literature Review," *OECD Economics Department Working Papers* No. 1227, OECD publishing, *http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jrs558c5r5f-en*.

Bouis, R., O. Causa, L. Demmou, and A. Zdzienicka (2012), "The Short-Term Effects of Structural Reforms: An Empirical Analysis", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers,* No. 949, OECD Publishing, *http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k9csvk4d56d-en*.

Bouis, R., O. Causa, L. Demmou, and R. Duval (2012),"How quickly Does Structural Reform Pay Off? An Empirical Analysis of the Short-Term Effects of Unemployment Benefits Reform", *IZA Journal of Labor Policy* 2012, 1:12.

Bourlès, R., G. Cette, J. Lopez, J. Mairesse, and G. Nicoletti (2013), "Do Product Market Regulations In Upstream Sectors Curb Productivity Growth? Panel Data Evidence for OECD Countries", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 95(5), pp.1750-1768.

Cacciatore, M., R. Duval and G. Fiori (2012), "Short-Term Gain or Pain? A DSGE Model-Based Analysis of the Short-Term Effects of Structural Reforms in Labour and Product Markets", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 948, OECD Publishing, Paris, *http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k9csvkkr3xn-en*.

Caldera Sánchez, A, A. de Serres and N. Yashiro (2016), "Reforming in a difficult macro context: what should be the priority", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 948, OECD Publishing, Paris, forthcoming.

Card, D. J. Kluve, and A. Weber (2015), "What Works? A Meta Analysis of Recent Active Labour Market Program Evaluations", IZA Discussion Papers No. 9236.

Ciriaci, D. (2014), "Business Dynamics and Red Tape Barriers", *Economic Paper* No 532, European Commission.

Coeuré, B. (2014), "Structural Reforms: Learning the Right Lesson from the Crisis", Speech given at the Economic conference, Latvijas Banka, Riga, 17 October 2014.

Corsetti, G., A. Meier and G. Müller (2012), "What Determines Government Spending Multipliers?", *CEPR Discussion Papers* No. 9010.

Cournède, B., P. Garda, P. Hoeller and V. Ziemann (2015), "Effects of Pro-Growth Policies on the Economic Stability of Firms, Workers and Households", *OECD Economic Policy Papers*, No. 12, OECD Publishing, Paris.

Crépon, B., M. Dejemeppe and M. Gurgand (2005), "Counseling the Unemployed: Does It Lower Unemployment Duration and Recurrence?" IZA DP No. 1796.

Crépon, B., E. Duflo, M. Gurgand, R. Rathelot and P. Zamora (2013), "Do Labour Market Policies have Displacement Effects? Evidence from a Clustered Randomized Experiment", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 128 (2): 531-580.

Cribb, J., Emmerson, C. and G. Tetlow, (2014), "Incentives, Shocks or Signals: Labour Supply Effects of Increasing the Female State Pension Age in the UK", *IFS Working Paper* W13/03.

Dabla-Norris, E., S. Guo, V. Haksar, M. Kim, K. Kochhar, K.Wiseman, and A. Zdzienicka (2015), "The New Normal: A Sector-Level Perspective on Growth and Productivity Trends in Advanced Economies", *IMF Staff Discussion Note* SDN/15/03. IMF. Washington.

de Mooij, R. and M. Keen (2013), "Fiscal Devaluation and Fiscal Consolidation: The VAT in Troubled Times" in A. Alesina and F. Giavazzi edited *Fiscal Policy after the Financial Crisis*, University of Chicago Press.

Duval, R. (2008), "Is There a Role For Macroeconomic Policy in Fostering Structural Reforms? Panel Evidence from OECD Countries Over the Past Two Fecades", *European Journal of Political Economy* 24 (2008) 491-502.

Eggertsson, G., A. Ferrero, and A. Raffo, (2014),"Can Structural Reforms Help Europe?" *Journal of Monetary Economics* 61(2014)2-22.

European Commission (2013), "The Growth Impact of Structural Reforms", *Quarterly Report on the Euro Area,* Vol. 12, No. 4.

ECB (2015), "Progress with structural reforms across the Euro Area and their possible impacts", Economic Bulletin, Issue 2 / 2015, European Central Bank, Frankfurt. European Commission (2011), "The Economic Adjustment Programme for Portugal, First Review – summer 2011", *European Economy Occasional Papers*, No. 83.

Everaert, L. and W. Schule (2008), "Why It Pays to Synchronize Structural Reforms in the Euro Area Across Markets and Countries". *IMF Staff Papers* 55(2).

Faini, R., J. Haskel, G. Navaretti, B., C. Scarpa and C.Wey(2006), "Contrasting Europe's Decline: Do Product Market Reforms Help?", in Boeri, T., M. Castanheira, R. Faini, and V. Galasso edited *Structural Reforms Without Prejudices*, Oxford University Press.

Fernández-Villaverde, J. (2014), "Discussion of "Can Structural Reforms Help Europe?" by Gauti Eggertsson, Andrea Ferrero and Andrea Raffo", *Journal of Monetary Economics* 61(2014), 23-31.

Fiori, G., G. Nicoletti, S. Scarpetta and F. Schiantarelli (2012), "Employment Effects of Product and Labour Market Reforms: Are There Synergies?", *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 122 (558), February. Fissel, G.S. and T. Jappelli (1990), "Do Liquidity Constraints Vary over Time? Evidence from Survey and Panel Data: Note" *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, Vol. 22, No. 2 (May, 1990), pp. 253-262.

Forni, L., A. Gerali and M. Pisani. (2010), "Macroeconomic Effects of Greater Competition in the Service Sector: the case of Italy", *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 2010, 1-32.

Fournier, J.M. (2015), "The Negative Effect of Regulatory Divergence on Foreign Direct Investment", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers, http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5jrqgvg0dw27-en*.

Galí, J., J. D. López-Salido and J. Vallés (2007), "Understanding the Effects of Government Spending on Consumption", *Journal of the European Economic Association*, Vol. 5(1), pages 227-270.

Gruber, J. and A. Yelowitz (1999), "Public Health Insurance and Private Savings", *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 107, No. 6 (December 1999), pp. 1249-1274.

Goolsbee, A. and C. Syverson (2008), "How do Incumbents Respond to the Threat of Entry? Evidence from the Major Airlines", *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 123(4), pp. 1611-1633.

Gomes S., P. Jacquinot, M. Mohr and M. Pisani (2013), "Structural Reforms and Macroeconomic Performance in the Euro Area Countries: A Model-Based Assessment", *International Finance* 16(1), 23-44.

Gomes, S. (2014), "Euro Area Structural Reforms in Times of a Global Crisis", *Banco de Portugal Working Paper* 2014.

IMF (2014), *The World Economic Outlook*, October 2014, IMF, Washington.

Jappelli, T., L. Pistaferri and G.Weber (2007), "Health Care Quality, Economic Inequality and Precautionary Saving", *Health Economics.* 16: 327-346.

Johansson, Å., et al. (2008), "Taxation and Economic Growth", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 620, OECD Publishing, Paris, *http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/241216205486*.

Johnson, D.S., J.A. Parker and N.S. Souleles (2006), "Household Expenditure and the Income Tax Rebates of 2001", *American Economic Review* 96 (5): 1589-610.

Karam, P.D., D. Muir, J. Pereira and A. Tuladhar (2010), "Macroeconomic Effects of Public Pension Reforms" *IMF Working Paper* No. 10/297, IMF.

Koske, I. (2013), "Fiscal Devaluation – Can it Help to Boost Competitiveness?", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 1089, OECD Publishing, Paris, *http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k3z2dckn2bw-en*.

Kluve J. (2010), "The effectiveness of European active labour market programs", *Labour Economics*, 17, pp. 904-918.

Kramarz, F. and T. Philippon (2001), "The Impact of Differential Payroll Tax Subsidies on Minimum Wage Employment", *Journal of Public Economics*, 82, pp. 115-146.

Kugler, A. and G. Pica (2008), "Effects of Employment Protection on Worker and Job Flows: Evidence from the 1990 Italian Reform", *Labour Economics*, 15, pp. 78-95.

Lee, Y. and T. Mukoyama (2015), "Entry and Exit of Manufacturing Plants over the Business Cycle" *European Economic Review,* Vol. 77, issue C, pp. 20-27.

Martins, P. (2014), "30.000 Minimum Wages: The Economic Effects of Collective Bargaining Extensions", *IZA Discussion Paper* No. 8540.

Michaillat, P. (2012), "Do Matching Frictions Explain Unemployment? Not in Bad Times", *American Economic Review* 102(4): 1721-1750.

Mineshima, A., M. Poplawski-Ribeiro and A. Weber (2014), "Size of Fiscal Multipliers", in Cottarelli, C., P. Gerson and A. Senhadji (eds.), *Post-crisis Fiscal Policy*, The MIT Press.

Mody, A., F. Ohnsorge and D. Sandri (2012), "Precautionary Savings in the Great Recession" *IMF Working Paper* 12/42.

Mourougane, A. and L. Vogel (2008), "Speed of Adjustment to Selected Labour Market and Tax Reforms"*, OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 647, OECD Publishing, Paris, *http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/234217500715.*

Neumark, D., I. Salas, and W. Wascher (2013), "Revisiting the minimum wage-employment debate: Throwing out the baby with the bathwater?" *NBER Working Paper* No. 18681.

OECD (2011), *Economic Outlook May 2011*, OECD Publishing, Paris

OECD (2012), *Economic Surveys: Euro Area 2012*, OECD Publishing. Paris

Orsini, K. and S. Vila Nunez (2014), "The Impact of The Spanish Labour Market Reform on the On-The-Job Search Rate", *ECFIN Country Focus* Vol. 11 (7).

Parker, J.A., N.S. Souleles, D.S. Johnson and R. McClelland (2013), "Consumer Spending and the Economic Stimulus Payments of 2008", *American Economic Review 2013*, 103(6): 2530-2553.

Röhn, O. (2010), "New Evidence on the Private Saving Offset and Ricardian Equivalence", *OECD Economics Department Working Papers***,** No. 762, OECD Publishing, Paris, *http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5kmft7qb5kq3-en.*

Rosholm, M. and M. Svarer, (2008), "The Threat Effect of Active Labour Market Programmes", *Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 110(2), pp. 385-401.

Skuterud, M. (2005), "The Impact of Sunday Shopping on Employment and Hours of Work in the Retail Industry: Evidence from Canada", *European Economic Review*, 49(8), pp. 1953-78.

Uusitalo, R. and J. Verho (2010), "The Effect of Unemployment Benefits on Re-Employment Rates: Evidence from the Finnish Unemployment Insurance Reform" *Labour Economics* 17: 643-654.

Van Ours, J.C. and M. Vodopivec (2006),"How Shortening the Potential Duration of Unemployment Benefits Entitlement Affects the Duration of Unemployment: Evidence from a Natural Experiment", *Journal of Labor Economics* 24: 351-378.

Varga, J., W. Roeger, and J. in't Veld (2013), "Growth Effects of Structural Reforms in Southern Europe: the Case of Greece, Italy, Spain and Portugal", *European Economy Economic* Papers 511. European Commission.

Varga, J. and J. in't Veld (2014), "The Potential Growth Impact of Structural Reforms in the EU: A Benchmarking Exercise", *European Economy Economic Papers* 541, European Commission.

Vogel, L. (2014), "Structural Reforms at the Zero Bound" *European Economy Economic Papers* 537, European Commission.

Von Below, D. and P. Thoursie (2010), "Last in, First Out? Estimating the Effect of Seniority Rules in Sweden", *Labour Economics*, 17, pp. 987-997.

APPENDIX 2.1

Detailed analysis on the impact of reforms in normal times

This appendix provides a summary of the expected effects of specific reforms on short-term activity and a review of the findings from selected studies. The information is reported in the table below, which describes some of the channels through which reforms affect the main components of demand and reports the results obtained from DSGE-type model-based analyses and empirical analyses. The specific reforms considered in the overview are the following:

Labour market reforms to enhance wage flexibility and facilitate labour resource reallocation: They include reforms of **wage-bargaining institutions** to raise the responsiveness of wage adjustments to local labour market conditions; reductions in **minimum wages** to improve the jobs prospect of low-skilled workers; reforms of **employment protection legislation** again to facilitate relative wage adjustments as well as the reallocation of resources across firms and industries; By and large, they can also be thought of as measures to boost competitiveness through downward pressures on domestic production costs, in particular labour costs.

Reforms to stimulate labour force participation and improve matching: This covers essentially **reforms of the transfer systems**, including **unemployment benefits** and other forms of income support for non-working individuals, but also measures to reduce the financial disincentive to labour force participation of specific groups such as women (including childcare support) and older workers (**pension systems**). Also covered are measures to increase the scope and effectiveness of **active labour market policies**, in particular job-search assistance and training programmes.

Reforms to boost product market competition: This comprises essentially **reductions in regulatory barriers to competition** which operates through state control of business operations, various legal and administrative barriers to start-ups, protection of incumbents as well as via obstacles to foreign trade and investment.

Reforms aimed directly at enhancing the productive capacity and productivity of the business sector: These cover **tax structure reforms** that encourage corporate activity, financial incentives for business innovation and investment in public infrastructure.

Model-based assessments

The model-based simulations covered in the table are taken from studies that make use of Dynamic Stochastic General Equilibrium (DSGE) models for the analysis of specific

reforms. In particular, many studies have been conducted by international organisations on the basis of their core DSGE models.

- *European Central Bank*: Studies based on the Euro Area and Global Economy model (EAGLE) include ECB (2015) **[1]** and Gomes et al. (2013) **[2]**.
- *European Commission:* Studies based on different versions of the QUEST model include EC (2013) **[3]**; Vogel (2014) **[4]**, Varga and in't Veld (2014) **[5]**, Varga, Roeger and in't Veld (2013) **[6]** and Arpaia et al.,(2007) **[7].**
- *IMF:* Studies based on the Global Integrated Monetary and Fiscal model (GIMF) include Anderson et al.,(2014), **[8]** Barkbu et al., (2012) **[9]**, Everaert and Schule (2008) **[10]**, Karam et al., (2010) **[11]**.
- *OECD*: Studies using a DSGE-type model include Cacciatore, Duval and Fiori (2012) **[12]** and Mourougane and Vogel (2008) **[13]**.

The DSGE approach has the advantage of describing the response of the macro-economy to reforms within a consistent general equilibrium framework and to illustrate the transmission channels. DSGE model-based simulations also allow for assessing issues that are relevant today, but have little historical precedent, such as the zero lower bound on nominal interest rates in many advanced economies.

A direct comparison of model-based results across studies requires caution given that the same structural reform can be captured in different ways depending on the characteristics of the model. For instance, a reform of employment protection can be captured by a simultaneous reduction in firing costs and in the bargaining power of individual workers in one model, while it is captured as an increase in total factor productivity in another model. Important channels may also be missing in the modelling framework. In particular, the precautionary motive for saving and hence the adverse confidence effects arising from higher job and income volatility cannot be easily featured in such frameworks. Finally, to ensure models are tractable, analyses are typically limited to a small set of structural reforms, (most often product and labour market reforms that reduce price and wage mark-ups), which remains highly stylised.

Empirical analysis based on aggregate or sectoral data

- There have been very few empirical studies that have used reduced-form equations to estimate the impact of reforms with a focus on the short-run effect using cross-country aggregate data or sectoral data:
- *Studies using aggregate data* include Bouis et al., (2012) **[14]**, Fiori et al., (2012) **[15]**, de Mooji and Keen (2012) **[16]**. For example, Bouis et al., (2012) estimate average impulse responses in terms of employment and output after one to five years following different types of structural reforms (e.g. product market reforms), based on a panel data of OECD countries over the period 1983 to 2007.
- *Studies using sectoral data* include Bourlès et al., (2013) **[17]** and Dabla-Norris et al., (2015) **[18]**. The latter estimates the impulse response mostly in terms of productivity after three years and five years following several types of structural reforms, based on a panel data of 23 industries in 11 advanced economies over the period 1970-2007.

While the estimation of reduced-form equations allows for a flexible empirical specification and the assessment of the impact of a wide array of reforms, it does not identify the channels through which reforms affect output or employment. Furthermore,

the often incremental nature of reforms makes it difficult to clearly identify the short-run impacts. Estimations are also prone to specification error. For instance, a failure to control for the possible complementarity across reforms can bias the estimated impacts of a given reform (Bassanini and Duval, 2009 **[19]**).

Empirical analysis based on micro studies

Another branch of studies infers the impacts of structural reforms by investigating and looking at event studies and assessing the change in the variables of interest before and after a specific episode of reforms. Such event studies often employ a difference-in-difference or regression discontinuity estimation approach that exploits a micro panel dataset covering the periods before and after the reforms. Some studies also infer general tendencies on the effectiveness of specific reforms from a meta-analysis of the existing empirical evidences.

- *Studies on wage bargaining/minimum wage reforms* include Neumark et al., (**2013**) **[20]**, Anton and Muñoz de Bustillo (2011) **[21]** and Martins (2014) **[22]**.

- *Studies on EPL reforms* include Kugler and Pica (2008) **[23]**, Von Below and Thoursie (2010) **[24]** and Orsini and Vila Nunez (2014) **[25]**. Kugler and Pica (2008) assess the consequences of Italy's legislation that strengthened the protection of regular employment for firms with less than 19 employees.

- *Studies on unemployment benefits reforms* include van Ours and Vodopivec (2006) **[26]** and Uusitalo and Verho (2010) **[27]** studying the effect of duration and replacement rate on unemployment duration from the reforms in Slovenia and Finland, respectively.

- *Studies on ALMPs* include Crépon et al., (2005) **[28]**, Rosholm and Shaver (2008) **[29]** which report significant impact on unemployment duration. Less favourable finding is reported for instance by Crépon et al., (2013) **[30]**. Kleuve (2010) **[31]** provide a meta-analysis of previous assessments.

- *Studies on pension reforms* include Cribb et al., (2014) **[32]** that observed the consequences of a UK reform raising women's pension eligibility age on their labour supply and unemployment rate.

- *Studies on product market reforms* include Golsbee and Syverson (2008) **[33]**, Bertrand and Kramarz (2002) **[34]** and Skuterud (2005) **[35]**. Also, Faini et al., (2006) **[36]** provide case studies of liberalisation and privatisation in different sectors in three European countries.

While event studies allow for richer and more rigorous inference on reform impacts than the two previous methods, their focus on a specific policy in a given time and a country makes it difficult to generalise their findings. Also the aggregate macroeconomic implications are not always clear when the analysis focuses on very specific reforms and markets.

Table A2.1. **The impact of structural reforms in normal times: a synthesis**

Reform area	Channels of transmission	Evidence on short-term impacts
Collective wage bargaining arrangement and minimum wages	• Raises responsiveness of wages to local labour and product markets. • Puts downward pressures on real wages, in particular for low-skilled workers but raises labour demand with an ambiguous effect on aggregate disposable income and consumption. • If reduced costs lead to higher mark-ups for firms, this may raise investment among firms dependent on internal financing. • If the lower costs are largely and quickly passed through lower prices, then net exports may contribute to short-term demand gains.	**Model-based evidence**: • Employment gains exceed short-term real wage losses. Small and temporary negative impact on inflation (**[1]**, **[2]**). • Moderate increase in consumption, investment and GDP. Small net effect on the current account. (**[1]**, **[2]**). **Evidence from empirical analysis**: • **Aggregate data**: Empirical analysis confirms short-term gains in employment, consumption and GDP of reduction in the excess coverage of collective wage agreements. Less evidence of impact on investment.(**[14]**) • **Micro studies**: Most studies find negative employment effects of minimum wages, especially for youth and low-skilled (**[20]**, **[21]**). Effect of extending collective wage bargaining is found to be similar to minimum wage.(**[22]**)
Employment protection legislation on open-ended contracts	• Reduces wage bargaining power of employees on regular contracts. Increases both hiring and lay-off rates by reducing expected costs of terminating a match. Boosts long-run productivity by encouraging job-to-job mobility and facilitating reallocation of workers across firms and sectors. • Net impact on **consumption** ambiguous: Impact on disposable income depends on employment and wages. Higher wealth through future productivity and income gains but potentially higher precautionary saving if increased instability in employment. • Impact on **investment** and on **net export s**imilar to that of reform of wage bargaining. Potential wage moderation effect of reform reflected in improved competitiveness and/or higher mark-ups.	**Model-based evidence**: • Small positive effect on consumption despite initial and short-lived rise in unemployment. More rapid positive effect on investment and GDP. No visible effect on net exports.(**[12]**) **Evidence from empirical analysis**: • **Aggregate data**: No evidence of significant impacts on consumption or GDP but mild positive effect on private investment (**[14]**). No evidence of significant positive effect in the five-year horizon. Some evidence of negative effects on productivity and output at the 2-3 years horizon (**[18]**). • **Micro studies**: Increase in lay-off rates is generally found to exceed the rise in hiring rates in the short term leading to higher unemployment (**[23]**,**[24]**). Some evidence of increase in on-the-job search by employees on open-ended contracts following recent reform in Spain (**[25]**).
Unemployment benefits: Extension of the benefit coverage, stronger conditionality and tapering of benefits along the spell	• Lowers benefits and the reservation wage of the unemployed and puts downward pressures on wages. • Raises incentives to take-up jobs and labour demand. Stimulates job creation without affecting job destruction. • Net effect on disposable income and **consumption** depends on speed of employment gains and strength of wealth effect arising from higher future income. • Speed of rise in employment depends on extent of vacancies left unfilled due to high reservation wage. Employment gains further accelerated if reform is accompanied by lower social security contributions. • Households not directly involved by the reform may raise precautionary savings to compensate for reduced generosity of benefits.	**Model-based evidence**: • Positive gains GDP, investment and to a lesser extent consumption. Decline in consumption for LC-households more than offset by increases for others through wealth effects (**[5]**). Unemployment falls as employment rises more rapidly than labour force. Small positive contribution from net exports (**[12]**). **Evidence from empirical analysis**: • **Aggregate data**: Positive impact on employment across all age and gender groups, as well as on consumption and GDP (**[14]**). • **Micro studies**: Reduction in replacement rates and/or duration lead to a short-term increase in employment among those closer to benefit exhaustion (**[26]**, **[27]**).
Active labour market policies: Job search assistance, training programmes and hiring or wage subsidies	• Improves matching efficiency and facilitates reallocation of labour; raises employment in the short run and productivity in the long run. • If unfunded, raises disposable income and can be perceived by firms as a reduction in non-wage costs. Effect on consumption and investment works like fiscal expansion and depends on size of multiplier.	**Model-based evidence**: • Impact of budgetary neutral reforms of ALMPs is similar to that of reduction in unemployment benefit, except for more rapid increase in labour demand (**[5]**, **[12]**). • Unfunded increases in ALMP spending have stronger positive effects on demand in the first two years than after five years (**[8]**, **[9]**). **Evidence from empirical analysis**: • **Aggregate data**: Increases in ALMP spending, after controlling or cyclical influences, are found to raise aggregate employment but not consumption or GDP (**[14]**). • **Micro studies**: Most studies (though not all) find evidence that active job search assistance and mandatory participation to programmes help reduce the duration of unemployment in the short term (**[28]**, **[29]**, **[31]**).

Table A2.1. **The impact of structural reforms in normal times: a synthesis** *(cont.)*

Reform area	Channels of transmission	Evidence on short-term impacts
Pension systems: Increase in the retirement age, reduction in pension benefits or rise in contributions	• Raising the retirement age increases pension wealth by extending working lives. Raises **consumption** for non-liquidity constrained households, if confident about prospects of keeping jobs at age close to pension. • Reducing pension benefits has the opposite effect if workers seek to maintain pension wealth and retirement age. Negative effect on **consumption** amplified if benefit reductions applied to all current pensioners. • Increasing contribution rates reduces disposable income and/or mark-ups depending on whether measure is borne by workers or firms. May be partly offset by a positive wealth effect if contributes to future pension funding.	**Model-based evidence**: • Positive effect on consumption and GDP in the case of increases in the retirement age. Evidence less clear in the case in the cases of benefit reductions or rises in contributions as their effect is similar to a (deferred) fiscal contraction. They are found to lower consumption and investment but to have a positive effect on net exports, with a net small or negative impact on GDP (**[11]**). **Evidence from empirical analysis**: • **Aggregate data**: An increase in the retirement age has a positive impact on consumption, investment and GDP (**[14]**). • **Micro studies**: Some studies find a non-negligible positive short-term impact on employment rates of affected population but also a rise in unemployment (**[32]**).
Product market: Reduction in regulatory barriers to competition	• Stronger competition reduces mark-ups and export prices, lowers input prices and production costs in downstream industries and raises productivity through process (efficiency gains) and product innovation. • Upward pressures on investment through future profitability gains and entry of new firms but also downward pressures through lower mark-ups (for cash-flow-constrained incumbents). • Upward pressures on consumption through positive disposable income (lower prices and gains in employment) and wealth effects. Downward pressures if lower mark-ups and prices lead to high real interest rates (e.g. in monetary union) or if business restructuring initially lead to high job turnover and income instability and hence higher precautionary saving. • Rapid employment gains in sectors with strong pent-up demand and low entry costs.	**Model-based evidence**: • Modest short-term GDP gains with more visible impacts after 2-3 years (**[8]**,**[9]**). Slowly rising gains in investment and (to a lesser extent) consumption (prompted by real wage gains) and negative contribution from net exports. Employment rises in services but falls in manufacturing. One study finds consumption falling in the 2-3 years horizon due to higher real interest rate (**[12]**). **Evidence from empirical analysis**: • **Aggregate data**: No significant short-term impact on GDP **[14]**. Evidence from sector-level data indicates productivity gains within 2-3 years on average **[17]** but one study finds that the impact on productivity in professional services is negative in the first 2-3 years but turns positive after 5 years **[18]**. • **Micro studies**: Industry-specific analyses provide evidence of rapid price declines in response to reduction in entry barriers (**[33]**). Rapid gains in productivity, employment and output are found in industries such as retail trade or telecommunication (**[34]**, **[35]**, **[36]**). In other industries, a significant productivity gain but a decrease in employment is reported, as firms enhance competitiveness by reducing initial over-manning (**[36]**).
Tax structure: Shift in the composition of taxation from direct (capital, labour) to indirect sources (VAT, property, inheritance)	• Reductions in capital and labour taxation raise employment and **investment** until initial return to both production factors is restored. • Positive impact of employment gains and lower income taxes on disposable income offset by higher price level from increased VAT. Higher price effect likely to dominate in the short run, entailing a reduction in **consumption**. • Shift in relative price of domestic and foreign goods will boosts **net exports** unless quickly offset by nominal exchange rate adjustment.	**Model-based evidence**: • Increases in investment and net exports only partly offset by a decline in consumption, leading to moderate short-term gains in GDP (**[6]**). Since the gains in employment due to competitiveness are temporary, the increase in employment is stronger in the short than long term (**[8]**). **Evidence from empirical analysis**: • **Aggregate data**: A decline in the share of income tax in total tax revenues is found to have a positive impact on investment but no significant effect on consumption or GDP (**[14]**). Strong positive impact found on net exports in euro area countries but smaller effect in non-euro area OECD countries (**[16]**).

Note: The numbers in brackets in bold script indicate the studies cited earlier in the Appendix 2.1. For instance, [1] corresponds to ECB (2015).