

Flaig, Gebhard; Rottmann, Horst

Working Paper

Labour market institutions and the employment intensity of output growth: an international comparison

CESifo Working Paper, No. 2175

Provided in Cooperation with:

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Flaig, Gebhard; Rottmann, Horst (2007) : Labour market institutions and the employment intensity of output growth: an international comparison, CESifo Working Paper, No. 2175, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/26219>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

LABOUR MARKET INSTITUTIONS AND THE
EMPLOYMENT INTENSITY OF OUTPUT GROWTH.
AN INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

GEBHARD FLAIG
HORST ROTTMANN

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2175
CATEGORY 4: LABOUR MARKETS
DECEMBER 2007

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- *from the SSRN website:* www.SSRN.com
- *from the RePEc website:* www.RePEc.org
- *from the CESifo website:* www.CESifo-group.org/wp

LABOUR MARKET INSTITUTIONS AND THE EMPLOYMENT INTENSITY OF OUTPUT GROWTH. AN INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON

Abstract

This paper deals with the effects of labour market institutions on labour market performance. We analyse as an indicator for the labour intensity of output growth the employment threshold (the minimum growth rate of output necessary to keep employment constant). We show for a sample of 17 OECD countries for the period 1971 to 2002 that the strictness of employment protection raises the employment threshold in all econometric specifications. A higher wage bargaining coordination and a higher tax wedge reduce also the labour intensity of production, although the effects are not significant in all econometric specifications.

JEL Code: J23, E24, J50.

Keywords: employment protection, labour market institutions, labour demand, international comparison, employment threshold.

Gebhard Flaig
University of Munich
Department of Economics
Schackstr. 4
80539 Munich
Germany
gebhard.flaig@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

Horst Rottmann
University of Applied Sciences Amberg-
Weiden
Hetzenrichter Weg 15
92637 Weiden
Germany
h.rottmann@fh-amberg-weiden.de

December 2007

The research in this paper is part of the project “Zukunft der Arbeit”, sponsored by funds of the “Pact for Research and Innovation”. The financial support is gratefully acknowledged. We thank participants at a seminar at the ifo Institute and the congress of the Verein für Socialpolitik for useful comments on an earlier version.

1 Introduction

Labour market institutions play a key role in explaining international differences in labour market performance. The most important labour market institutions considered in previous research are the unemployment benefit system and active labour market policy, the system of wage determination (wage bargaining co-ordination, union density, collective bargaining coverage), labour taxes including contributions to the social security system and employment protection (see Nickell/Nunziata/Ochel 2005).

There are a great number of studies which explore the implications of institutions for the unemployment rate (see Nickell 1997, Blanchard/Wolfers 2000, Nickell/Layard 1999, Bertola/Blau/Kahn 2001, Berthold/Fehn 2002, Nickell 2003, Belot/van Ours 2004, Griffith/Harrison/Macartney 2007). Although the results are still somewhat mixed (OECD 2004), there seems to emerge a consensus that labour market institutions are an important determinant of unemployment. For instance, Nickell (2003) reports that shifts in labour market institutions explain a great part of movements in unemployment across OECD countries. Employment protection, labour taxes and the unemployment benefit system increases unemployment and especially unemployment persistence.

The unemployment rate is only one among a greater list of indicators of labour market performance. In a study for 60 countries, Caballero et al. (2004) find that job security regulation reduces the speed of adjustment of employment to shocks and lowers the growth rate of total factor productivity. The results in Gomez-Salvador, Messina and Vallanti (2004) show that the strictness of employment protection, the extent of wage bargaining co-ordination and the generosity of unemployment benefits have a negative effect on job creation and the pace of job reallocation. Messina (2004) finds that more unionized and coordinated wage-setting structures as well as employment protection imply a lower employment share in the service industry that is the most expanding sector in modern economies.

In the following, we analyse the effects of labour market institutions on the labour intensity of output growth. To be concrete, we use the concept of the employment threshold as the variable to be explained. The employment threshold represents the growth rate of production which is necessary for keeping employment constant. We show how this concept is related to the elasticities of labour demand and to the development of input prices and how various labour market institutions may affect it. If a specific regulation increases the employment threshold, a country needs a higher growth rate in order to keep employment constant. This increases the likelihood of a weak employment performance and of a higher unemployment rate.

The paper is organised as follows. In section 2 we discuss the theoretical foundations of the concept of the employment threshold. In section 3 we present the empirical model for the estimation of the employment thresholds and the empirical analysis of the effects of different labour market institutions. Section 4 summarises and draws some conclusions

2 Theoretical foundations

2.1 Labour demand and the employment threshold

In the following we assume that output y is produced by employing the input factors labour L and capital K . If firms minimize their production costs at given input prices and for a given level of output, there exists under weak assumptions with regard to production technology a dual cost function (see e.g. McFadden, 1976, or Chambers, 1988):

$$(1) \quad C = C(l, q, y, T),$$

where C indicates the minimum costs of producing output y at the wage rate l and the user cost of capital q . The variable T represents the state of technology. In order to be able to represent all economically relevant information of the underlying technology, the cost function must meet certain regularity conditions: C must be increasing in l, q and y and has to be concave and linearly homogenous in l and q .

The demand for labour is derived via Shephard's Lemma:

$$(2) \quad L(l, q, y, T) = \frac{\partial C}{\partial l}.$$

After totally differentiating equation (2) with respect to time and some manipulations we get the growth rate of labour input:

$$(3) \quad w_L = \varepsilon_{L,l} w_{l/q} + \varepsilon_{L,y} w_y + \varepsilon_{L,T} w_T,$$

where w_x denotes the growth rate of variable x and $\varepsilon_{L,l}$, $\varepsilon_{L,y}$ and $\varepsilon_{L,T}$ are the elasticities of labour demand with respect to the wage rate, output and the state of technology, respectively. It should be stressed that all elasticities are typically not constant and depend on output, factor prices and technology (for a more intensive discussion of these topics see Flaig/Rottmann, 2001). Thus, they are varying over time and across countries.

The employment threshold is defined as the growth rate of output which is necessary to keep employment constant (Flaig/Rottmann, 2001). By setting w_L in equation (3) equal to zero and solving for w_y , we get the employment threshold w_y^{ET} :

$$(4) \quad w_y^{ET} = -(\varepsilon_{L,l} w_{l/q} + \varepsilon_{L,T} w_T) / \varepsilon_{L,y}.$$

Since $\varepsilon_{L,l}$ is negative, a higher growth rate of the relative wage (l/q) leads to an increase of the employment threshold. A higher pace of technical progress increases the employment threshold since $\varepsilon_{L,T}$ is typically negative in a cost minimising approach.

2.2 Effects of labour market institutions on the employment threshold

As can be seen from equation (4), the effects of labour market institutions on labour demand and the employment threshold can work via different channels. The first channel concerns the effects on growth rates of input prices, the second channel on the elasticities. For example, tighter employment protection may deteriorate the flexibility of an economy and may thus lower the growth rate of total factor productivity (Caballero et al. 2004). This would decrease the employment threshold by reducing w_T . However, it should be kept in mind that $\varepsilon_{L,T}w_T$ not only captures total factor productivity growth but also the effect of biased technical change. A higher wage rate induced by a higher employment protection of insiders may lead to a technology-driven reduction in labour demand (increasing the absolute value of $\varepsilon_{L,T}$) which increases the employment threshold. In addition, a tighter employment protection reduces probably the elasticity of labour demand with respect to output and therefore increases the employment threshold. For all these reasons, the magnitude and even the sign of the effect of a more stringent employment protection on the employment threshold is theoretically unclear. In the end, this is an empirical question.

Similar reasoning applies for other labour market institutions. Institutions may affect factor prices, elasticities of labour demand, adjustment costs and the growth rate and the bias of technical change and thereby labour demand and employment (for a discussion of this topic see Nickell/Layard, 1999). Due to the complex nature of these effects, in the following we do not estimate a structural model but try to investigate the relationships between institutions and labour demand in a reduced form framework which is explained in the next section.

3 Empirical results

3.1 The employment threshold across countries and over time

Since we do not have international comparable data for the user costs of capital, we do not estimate the structural labour demand equation (3), but a reduced form where we treat the sum of $\varepsilon_{L,l} w_{l/q}$ and $\varepsilon_{L,T} w_T$ as an unobserved variable (for simplicity of notation we omit the country index). Under this assumption we get the following estimation equation:

$$(5) \quad w_{L,t} = \beta_{1,t} + \beta_{2,t} w_{y,t} + u_t .$$

The possibly time-varying parameters $\beta_{1,t}$ and $\beta_{2,t}$ are defined as $\beta_{1,t} = \varepsilon_{L,l} w_{l/q} + \varepsilon_{L,T} w_T$ and $\beta_{2,t} = \varepsilon_{L,y}$. The variable u_t is a white noise error term. The employment threshold defined in equation (4) is now given by the expression $-\beta_{1,t}/\beta_{2,t}$.

For the specification of β_1 and β_2 we choose alternatively two different statistical models: A first order random walk process (RW1) and a second order random walk process (RW2):

$$(6a) \quad (1-L) \beta_{i,t} = v_{i,t}$$

$$(6b) \quad (1-L)^2 \beta_{i,t} = v_{i,t}$$

with L as the lag operator. The model (equations (5) and (6)) is set in a state-space-form and is estimated for each country individually by maximum likelihood using the Kalman filter (for details on the Kalman filter see Harvey 1989). According to different test statistics (Akaike information criterion, Ljung-Box statistic for testing the white noise properties of the recursive residuals, Jarque-Bera statistic for testing the normal distribution of recursive residuals) the first order random walk model outperforms for most countries slightly the second order specification. The disadvantage is that in some cases the first order random walk model produces some erratic movements of the employment threshold. We check the robustness of our results by modelling the time varying parameters alternatively as a second order random walk. Second order random walks can accommodate complex time series properties of variables but produce a “smooth” development. Preliminary tests in both specifications showed that β_2 varies between countries but is constant or almost constant over time within a country. In our final model for which we present the results below, for each country β_2 is therefore modelled as a constant parameter. In contrast, β_1 varies both between countries and over time.

We estimate the model for each of 17 OECD countries individually (see table 1), using yearly data from 1971 to 2002. The dependent variable is the growth rate of labour input in the private sector. Labour input is measured as total hours worked. The explanatory variable is the growth rate of real value added in the private sector (Source for both variables: OECD, Economic Outlook). Production and employment in the public sector are not included. The data for Germany refer to West Germany until 1990 and to unified Germany from 1991 onwards. In order to eliminate the “outlier” in the growth rates for 1991, we include a dummy variable, which takes the value one in 1991 and zero in all other years.

In table 1, we present the average values of the estimated employment thresholds for both specifications in the private sector in the 17 countries for different sample periods. Independently of the random walk specification, the employment threshold declined during the sample period in most countries. The unweighted mean of the employment thresholds was 3.8 % (3.9 %) during the seventies, 2.4 % (2.4 %) during the eighties and 1.4 % (1.5 %) in the years after 1990 for the RW1 (RW2) specification of the employment threshold, respectively. In Germany, Japan and the USA the employment thresholds increased by about 1 percentage point from the eighties to the nineties. It should be noted that, compared with the first two countries, the employment threshold is still relatively low in the USA. It is remarkable that especially in the continental European countries the employment threshold is relatively high, compared with Australia, Canada, Sweden, the UK and the United States. A very special case is New Zealand: The employment threshold is in many years negative. During the nineties the labour volume would have increased even in a recession.

Table A1 in the Appendix contains the minima, maxima, means and the standard deviations of RW1 and RW2. Additionally to the overall standard deviations (OV) the table shows the standard deviations within countries (WI) and between countries (BE). The overall standard deviation for the RW2 is slightly smaller than that of the RW1, where the between standard deviations are the same for both specifications. The RW1 varies more about time as the higher within standard deviation reveals.

Table 1: Employment thresholds (RW1, RW2) in OECD countries

Country	Mean of RW1			
	1980	1990	2002	1971-2002
Aus	0.013	0.013	0.013	0.013
Bel	0.063	0.032	0.020	0.037
Can	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
Dnk	0.042	0.026	0.025	0.030
Fin	0.038	0.037	0.037	0.037
Fra	0.046	0.038	0.021	0.034
Ger	0.053	0.017	0.024	0.031
Ire	0.059	0.041	0.016	0.037
Ita	0.072	0.014	0.019	0.034
Jpn	0.039	0.022	0.033	0.032
Nld	0.037	0.036	0.014	0.028
Nzl	-0.013	0.015	-0.037	-0.013
Nor	0.061	0.027	0.028	0.038
Esp	0.050	0.032	0.008	0.029
Swe	0.031	0.021	0.022	0.024
Gbr	0.032	0.022	0.019	0.024
USA	0.012	0.007	0.014	0.011
Total	0.038	0.024	0.017	0.026

Country	Mean of RW2			
	1980	1990	2002	1971-2002
Aus	0.014	0.012	0.011	0.012
Bel	0.060	0.039	0.015	0.036
Can	0.017	0.010	0.013	0.013
Dnk	0.046	0.025	0.023	0.030
Fin	0.042	0.038	0.033	0.037
Fra	0.047	0.035	0.022	0.034
Ger	0.054	0.016	0.024	0.031
Ire	0.065	0.039	0.010	0.036
Ita	0.066	0.022	0.013	0.033
Jpn	0.040	0.021	0.033	0.032
Nld	0.042	0.030	0.016	0.028
Nzl	-0.014	0.016	-0.040	-0.014
Nor	0.061	0.027	0.028	0.038
Esp	0.047	0.030	0.012	0.028
Swe	0.034	0.021	0.020	0.024
Gbr	0.034	0.023	0.016	0.024
USA	0.014	0.005	0.015	0.011
Total	0.039	0.024	0.015	0.026


3.2 The effects of labour market institutions on the employment threshold

In the second step of our study we use the estimated employment thresholds for each year in the sample period 1971 to 2002 for each of the 17 OECD countries as an indicator for the labour intensity of production and study its relationship to labour market institutions. We concentrate our interest on the effects of employment protection, labour taxes (measured by the tax wedge), union density and the degree of co-ordination in wage negotiations.

Every country in the world has established a complex system of laws and institutions (so-called “case law” and collective agreements) intended to protect the interests of workers. We use the Employment Protection Index (EP) from the Labour Market Institutions Database of Nickell and Nunziata (2001) as a measure of the strictness of this system. This series was built chaining OECD data (Employment Protection Legislation Index Version I) with data from Lazear (1990). For the recent years we use the information of Nickell (2003) and the OECD (2004) by linearly interpolating the missing years and connecting with the series of the just mentioned database. The variable in the range $\{0, 2\}$ is increasing with the strictness of employment protection.

The OECD indicator takes into account regulations concerning individual dismissals, collective dismissals and the temporary employment forms such as fixed-term employment and the supply of labour by temporary work agencies. Although the OECD has elaborated, with the country ranking, the most highly differentiated evaluation scheme made so far, there are still some restrictions with regard to the reliability of the indicators. The EP covers a set of different types of labour market institutions and obviously, the aggregate level can hide some internal movements which neutralise each other. Therefore, one difficult problem is the weighting of the evaluated aspects of regulation. Therefore, we compare EP with another index of employment regulation, recently introduced by the World Bank (2005). The Rigidity of Employment Index (REI) of the World Bank for the year 2004 is based on a detailed study of employment laws and regulations, as well as relevant constitutional provisions. This index takes into consideration information about hiring and firing of workers and the rigidity of working hours. In figure 1 we compare the World Bank index for the year 2004 with the OECD index (EPI) for the year 2003. Both institutions assess the regulations of the employment protection very similar in the different countries. The rank correlation coefficient between the two variables is 0.79 and is highly significant.

Figure 1: The World Bank and the OECD indices of Employment Protection



We take the tax wedge (TW), union density (UDNET) and the co-ordination index (COW) from Nickell (2001, 2003). TW (in decimal notations) measures the total tax rate on labour and contains payroll taxes, income taxes and consumption taxes. UDNET is calculated as the percentage of employees who are union members. Another aspect of wage bargaining is the extent to which bargaining is co-ordinated. COW is an index with range $\{0, 2\}$ constructed as an interpolation of OECD data by Nickell. It is increasing in the degree of co-ordination in the bargaining process on the employers' as well as on the unions' side. Table A2 in the Appendix contains the minima, maxima, means and the standard deviations of these variables. Additionally to the overall standard deviations (OV) the table incorporates the standard deviations within countries (WI) and between countries (BE). In contrast to the estimated employment thresholds the within standard deviations for the variables of the labour market institutions are much smaller than the overall standard deviations, because the most part of variation in the labour market institutions is between countries.

Table 2 presents the OLS results for the estimation period 1971 to 2000 and the dependent variable RW1.¹ Explanatory variables are the employment protection index (EP), union density (UDNET), the tax wedge (TW) and the wage bargaining co-ordination index COW. The two models differ with respect to the modelling of time effects. Model 1 contains a linear time trend, model 2 includes in addition a squared time trend. In order to compare the fit of the models we report the values of the Adjusted R^2 . Because the left hand side variable is a generated variable, we show additionally to

¹ We must restrict our estimation period, because we can observe some of the explanatory variables only until 2000.

the normal also the robust standard errors, but this makes no difference. Simple tests prefer clearly the model 2 against model 1, but the results are very similar.²

Table 2: OLS Regression for RW1

	model 1			model 2		
	parameter	standard error	standard error robust	Parameter	standard error	standard error robust
EP	.0085	.0023***	.0024***	.0099	.0023***	.0024***
UDNET	-.0045	.0051	.0046	-.0024	.0051	.0045
TW	.0183	.0094*	.0105*	.0170	.0092*	.0104
COW	.0048	.0019**	.0018**	.0039	.0019**	.0019**
Trend	-.0010	.0001***	.0001***	-.0026	.0004***	.0005***
Trend^2	-----	-----	-----	.0001	.0000***	.0000***
constant	.0218	.0040***	.0043***	.0296	.0044***	.0051***
Adj. R ²	0.26			0.29		

Significance levels: * 10%; ** 5%; *** 1%

In both specifications, the employment protection index exerts a highly significant positive effect on the employment threshold. An increase in the EP index by one point increases the employment threshold by 1 percentage point (Model 2). During the period 1992 to 2002 Germany had on average an employment threshold of 2.4 %, whereas the actual output growth rate in the business sector during this period was only 1.7 %. If there were a regime with an employment protection comparable to the UK, the employment threshold would be only 1.4 %. The tax wedge TW increases the employment threshold, but the effect is only weakly significant. The degree of co-ordination COW has a positive effect on the threshold. If in Germany there were a regime with a degree of co-ordination comparable to the UK, the employment threshold would be lower by 0.4 percentage points.³ The effect of union density UDNET is always insignificant.

The reason for the insignificance of UDNET may be that not union density per se but the coverage of workers by collective bargaining provisions is the more important factor. In some countries there are extremely large differences between these two variables. For example, in France the union density was about 10 percent in the last decade, but the coverage by collective bargaining provisions is assessed to be about 90 percent. In sectoral bargaining systems employer behaviour combined with

² In order to check the stability of the results, we have also included dummies for each year. This has no effects on the interpretation of the results in all estimations. Detailed results are not shown, but are available from the authors upon request.

³ We have also included COW squared in our estimations, but COW squared was always insignificant. The reason for including COW2 is that labour market performance may not be a monotonic but a U-shaped or hump-shaped function of the co-ordination index. (see, e.g., Calmfors/Driffill 1988).

administrative governance of collective contracts may be more important for the coverage rates than union membership (OECD, 2004). As an indicator of collective bargaining coverage we could use the Collective Bargaining Coverage Index (CBC), which stems from the OECD (2004). We show no results with this index, because there are information on CBC only for the years 1980, 1990 and 2000. Therefore, we would have to neglect many observations of our data and crudely interpolate CBC for the remaining years in order to estimate the effect of CBC.⁴

There is some concern that the results are influenced by the method estimating the employment thresholds. Table 3 shows the OLS results with RW2 as the dependent variable. It makes no difference with respect to the interpretation of the results, whether we calculate normal or robust standard errors and whether we use a linear time trend, a squared time trend or time dummies. Comparing the estimates with that of table 2 we find on average very similar parameter estimates with a little bit smaller standard errors. In addition, the adjusted R² in table 3 are higher than in table 2. In our perspective these results are not surprising. The random walk of second order generates a smoother development of the employment thresholds than the random walk of first order. Therefore the standard deviation within countries is smaller for RW2 than for RW1, but the standard deviation between the countries doesn't change.⁵ Giving more weight to the between variation it is not surprising that the labour market institutions can better explain the RW2, because the variations of the labour market institutions within countries are also small (see table A2).

Table 3: OLS Regression for RW2

	model 1			model 2		
	parameter	standard error	standard error robust	parameter	standard error	standard error robust
EP	.0071	.0019***	.0019***	.0088	.0018***	.0018***
UDNET	-.0054	.0041	.0041	-.0027	.0040	.0040
TW	.0201	.0076***	.0091**	.0185	.0073**	.0089**
COW	.0051	.0015***	.0016***	.0040	.0015***	.0015***
Trend	-.0011	.0001***	.0001***	-.0031	.0003***	.0004***
Trend^2	-----	-----	-----	.0001	.0000***	.0000***
constant	.0237	.0032***	.0038***	.0337	.0034***	.0043***
Adj. R ²	0.37			0.42		

Significance levels: * 10%; ** 5%; *** 1%

4 If we neglect the seventies and linearly interpolate CBC for the remaining years, the indicator for collective bargaining coverage has no effect on the employment threshold in all specifications.

5 As the means of RW1 and RW2 are very similar, there is no problem comparing the standard deviations of the variables.

There are some reasons why our explaining variables may be endogenous. Labour market institutions can be thought of as instruments that correct for market failures, which make up for the absence of a complete set of contingent markets for risk sharing (Agell 2002, Greg/Manning 1997, Saint-Paul 1996)). This suggests that many of the labour market rigidities originally emerged as a defensive reaction to the threat of unemployment. This poses the following question: Are the labour market institutions also endogenous in respect to the employment thresholds? This seems to be less likely, because the employment thresholds are not directly observable and can be estimated only with a time lag. However, the endogeneity of the labour market institution cannot be excluded by theoretical arguments. In order to control the robustness of our results, we execute instrumental variable estimations. To avoid a possible estimation bias due to correlations of the labour market institutions with the contemporary error terms, we instrument all labour market institutions by their lagged and second lagged observations. Table 4 presents the results for RW1 and RW2 each with a quadratic trend and robust standard errors.

Table 4: IV-Estimation for RW1 and RW2

	RW1		RW2	
	parameter	standard error robust	parameter	standard error robust
EP	.0092	.0023***	.0086	.0017***
UDNET	.0002	.0042	-.0001	.0036
TW	.0106	.0099	.0125	.0081
COW	.0040	.0018**	.0038	.0015**
Trend	-.0025	.0005***	-.0031	.0004***
Trend^2	.0000	.0000***	.0001	.0000***
constant	.0318	.0050***	.0358	.0042***

Significance levels: * 10%; ** 5%; *** 1%

Comparing the results with their respective OLS estimates we find only minor differences. The coefficients of TW are now a little bit smaller and get insignificant. In both specifications test statistics support the validity of our estimations. The Hansen J statistics of overidentifying restrictions take the values 3.39 (RW2) and 5.80 (RW1) each with four degrees of freedom and so do not reject the validity of the instruments used. The C test⁶, (Eichenbaum/Hansen/Singleton 1988) shows that

⁶ The test is computed as the difference between two J statistics where the first is computed from the efficient estimation method using the full set of overidentifying restrictions (including the regressors as instruments) and the second is calculated from the inefficient but consistent regression using a smaller set of identifying restrictions (without the regressors as instruments). In our case OLS is the efficient model under the H_0 that the institutions are exogenous regressors and the IV estimation is the consistent but inefficient estimation method under H_0 . The degrees of freedom for the J-tests are respectively eight and four.

the labour market institutions can be treated as exogenous.⁷ Therefore, we prefer the OLS-estimates in tables 2 and 3 to the IV estimates in table 4.

Our IV estimations and the tests are only valid if there are no unobserved country effects which are correlated with the labour market institutions. To get a grip on this problem we can in principle estimate a fixed effects model. But as we have already seen, the labour market institutions vary not very much within countries. Together with potential measurement errors this could lead to more biased estimates for the fixed effects estimator than the simple OLS estimator (Hsiao 2003, Ch 10). Table 5 shows the results of the fixed effects estimations (with the within transformation.) The only labour market institution with a significant influence is now EP. To treat the measurement problem we can estimate a fixed effects model with instrumental variables. In our case it is not possible to estimate the fixed effects model with the within transformation, because there are no strictly exogenous instruments available. Assuming no autocorrelation in the measurement errors and using the first difference transformation we estimate the models with the second and third lag of all labour market institutions variables as instruments (Wooldridge 2002, Ch. 11). As with the comparison between OLS and IV estimations the fixed effects estimations and the unobserved component model with IV estimation differ only slightly.

Table 5: Fixed-effects Regression for RW1 and RW2

	RW1		RW2	
	parameter	Robust standard error	parameter	Robust standard error t
EP	.0203	.0056***	.0145	.0041***
UDNET	.0199	.0167	.0089	.0109
TW	.0138	.0282	.0198	.0151
COW	.0024	.0027	.0012	.0018
Trend	-.0028	.0005***	-.0032	.0003***
Trend ²	.0001	.0000***	.0001	.0000***
constant	.0131	.0121	.0264	.0082***

Significance levels: * 10%; ** 5%; *** 1%

In the fixed effects model, the only significant institutional factor for explaining the development of the employment threshold in the different countries over time is employment protection. However, as already mentioned, although using a fixed effects specification may solve the problem of a correlation between unobserved country individual effects and explaining variables, it may aggravate the problem of measurement errors (also by IV estimation if the measurement errors are autocorrelated) and ignores totally the information between countries.

⁷ The C tests do not reject the null of the exogeneity of the labour market institutions with the p-values of 93% (RW2) and 97% (RW1).

Taking all estimation results together, the very robust result is that a more stringent employment protection reduces the labour intensity of production and may contribute to a higher unemployment rate. Although not in every specification significant, a higher tax wedge and a higher wage bargaining co-ordination are also factors that reduce labour demand and therefore increase the employment threshold.

4 Summary and Conclusions

Labour market institutions affect labour demand via many channels. They may have an effect on the level and the growth rate of real wages, they influence the pace and the bias of technical progress and they are a major determinant of the flexibility of firms in adapting to various shocks. Due to the very complex nature of the interrelationships among all these factors we don't estimate a structural model but – in analogy to the common practice in the literature – a reduced form with a special index of labour intensity of output growth as the dependent variable and various measures of labour market institutions as the explaining variables. The index for labour intensity used in this paper is the so-called employment threshold. The employment threshold is the growth rate of production that is necessary to keep employment constant. Theoretically, the employment threshold depends on various elasticities of the labour demand function and the growth rates of real factor prices and technical progress. A higher employment threshold reduces the probability that employment is increasing and thus raises the likelihood of a higher unemployment rate.

In this paper we have shown that the employment threshold is not only a possibly time-varying parameter but also depends on labour market institutions. A more restrictive employment protection, a higher tax wedge and a higher extent of wage bargaining co-ordination all lead to a less labour-intensive production and require a higher growth rate of output in order to keep employment constant. The effect of employment protection is highly significant in all econometric specifications; the effects of a higher tax wedge and a higher extent of wage bargaining co-ordination are always positive, but in some specifications not significant. The likely economic reasons for these effects are the induced pressure on wages and higher direct costs of using labour instead of capital and other factors as production inputs.

Literature:

Agell, J. (2002), On the Determinants of Labour Market Institutions: Rent Seeking vs. Social Insurance. *German Economic Review* 3 (2), 107 – 136.

- Belot, M. and J. C. van Ours (2004) Does the Recent Success of Some OECD Countries in Lowering their Unemployment Rates Lie in the Clever Design of their Labour Market Reforms?, *Oxford Economic Papers*, 56, 621 - 642.
- Berthold, N. and R. Fehn (2002), Arbeitsmarktpolitik in der Europäischen Währungsunion. *Perspektiven der Wirtschaftspolitik* 3, 317-345.
- Bertola, G., Blau, F. D. and L. M. Kahn (2001) Comparative Analysis of Labor Market Outcomes: Lessons for the US from International Long-Run Evidence, NBER Working Paper, 8526.
- Blanchard, O. and J. Wolfers (2000), The Role of Shocks and Institutions in the Rise of European Unemployment: The Aggregate Evidence. *Economic Journal* 110, C1-C33.
- Caballero, R.J., Cowan, K., Engel, E.M.R.A. and A. Micco (2004), Effective Labor Regulations and Microeconomic Flexibility. MIT Working Paper No. 04-30.
- Calmfors, L. and J. Driffill (1988), Bargaining Structure, Corporatism and Macroeconomic Performance. *Economic Policy*, 14-61
- Chambers, R.G. (1988), *Applied Production Analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Eichenbaum, M., Hansen, L. P. and K. J. Singleton (1988), A Time Series Analysis of Representative Agent Models of Consumption and Leisure. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 103, 51 – 78.
- Flaig, G. and H. Rottmann (2001), Input Demand and the Short- and Long-Run Employment Thresholds: An Empirical Analysis for the German Manufacturing Sector. *German Economic Review*, 2 (4), 367-384.
- Gomez-Salvador, R. Messina, J. And G. Vallanti (2004), Gross Job Flows and Institutions in Europe. ECB Working Paper No. 318.
- Gregg, P. and A. Manning (1997), Labour Market Regulation and Unemployment. In D. Snower and G. de la Dehesa (eds.), *Unemployment Policy – Government Options for the Labour Market*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Griffith, R., Harrison, R. and G. Macartney (2007), Product Market Reforms, Labour Market Institutions and Unemployment. *Economic Journal* 117, C142-C166.
- Harvey, A. (1989), *Forecasting, Structural Time Series Models and the Kalman Filter*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Hsiao, C. (2003), *Analysis of Panel Data*. 2nd ed., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- McFadden, D.L. (1978), Cost, Revenue and Profit Functions. In: M. Fuss and D.L. McFadden (eds.), *Production Economics: A Dual Approach to Theory and Applications*. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Messina, J. (2004), Institutions and Service Employment: A Panel Study for OECD Countries: ECB Working Paper No. 320.
- Nickell, S. (1997), Unemployment and Labour Market Rigidities: Europe versus North America. *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11, 55-74.
- Nickell, S. (2003), Labour Market Institutions and Unemployment in OECD Countries. CESifo DICE Report 1(2), 13-26.

Nickell, S. and R. Layard (1999), Labour Market Institutions and Economic Performance In: O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds.), Handbook of Labor Economics, Vol.3. North Holland, Amsterdam.

Nickell, S. and L. Nunziata (2001), Labour Market Institutions Database. Version 2. [www://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/data0502.zip](http://cep.lse.ac.uk/pubs/download/data0502.zip)

Nickell, S., Nunziata, L. and W. Ochel (2005), Unemployment in the OECD since the 1960s. What do we Know? Economic Journal 115, 1-27.

OECD (2004), OECD Employment Outlook. Paris.

Saint-Paul, G. (1996), Exploring the Political Economy of Labour Market Institutions. Economic Policy 23, 265 – 315.

World Bank (2005), Doing Business, Hiring and Firing Workers.

<http://rru.worldbank.org/DoingBusiness/ExploreTopics/HiringFiringWorkers/>

Appendix

Table A1: Descriptive statistics

	mean	min	max	std. dev. (OV)	std. dev. (BE)	std. dev. (WI)
RW1	.0258	-.0921	.1525	.0237	.0134	.0198
RW2	.0256	-.0923	.1167	.0217	.0134	.0174

Table A2: Descriptive statistics

	mean	min	max	std. dev. (OV)	std. dev. (BE)	std. dev. (WI)
EP	1.0568	.1	2	.5145	.5037	.1598
UDNET	.4314	.09	.9112	.2025	.1985	.0644
TW	.4999	.2431	.8314	.1248	.1233	.0467
COW	1.1011	0	2	.6234	.5287	.3536

CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see www.cesifo-group.org/wp

(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, office@cesifo.de)

- 2112 Mark Mink, Jan P.A.M. Jacobs and Jakob de Haan, Measuring Synchronicity and Co-movement of Business Cycles with an Application to the Euro Area, October 2007
- 2113 Ossip Hühnerbein and Tobias Seidel, Intra-regional Tax Competition and Economic Geography, October 2007
- 2114 Christian Keuschnigg, Exports, Foreign Direct Investment and the Costs of Corporate Taxation, October 2007
- 2115 Werner Bönnte, Oliver Falck and Stephan Heblich, Demography and Innovative Entrepreneurship, October 2007
- 2116 Katrin Assenmacher-Wesche and M. Hashem Pesaran, Assessing Forecast Uncertainties in a VECX Model for Switzerland: An Exercise in Forecast Combination across Models and Observation Windows, October 2007
- 2117 Ben Lockwood, Voting, Lobbying, and the Decentralization Theorem, October 2007
- 2118 Andrea Ichino, Guido Schwerdt, Rudolf Winter-Ebmer and Josef Zweimüller, Too Old to Work, too Young to Retire?, October 2007
- 2119 Wolfgang Eggert, Tim Krieger and Volker Meier, Education, Unemployment and Migration, October 2007
- 2120 Stefan Napel and Mika Widgrén, The European Commission – Appointment, Preferences, and Institutional Relations, October 2007
- 2121 Bertil Holmlund and Martin Söderström, Estimating Income Responses to Tax Changes: A Dynamic Panel Data Approach, October 2007
- 2122 Doina Maria Radulescu, From Separate Accounting to Formula Apportionment: Analysis in a Dynamic Framework, October 2007
- 2123 Jelle Brouwer, Richard Paap and Jean-Marie Viaene, The Trade and FDI Effects of EMU Enlargement, October 2007
- 2124 Kurt R. Brekke, Luigi Siciliani and Odd Rune Straume, Competition and Waiting Times in Hospital Markets, October 2007
- 2125 Alexis Direr, Flexible Life Annuities, October 2007
- 2126 Johannes Becker and Clemens Fuest, Quality versus Quantity – The Composition Effect of Corporate Taxation on Foreign Direct Investment, October 2007

- 2127 Balázs Égert, Real Convergence, Price Level Convergence and Inflation Differentials in Europe, October 2007
- 2128 Marko Koethenbueger, Revisiting the “Decentralization Theorem” – On the Role of Externalities, October 2007
- 2129 Axel Dreher, Silvia Marchesi and James Raymond Vreeland, The Politics of IMF Forecasts, October 2007
- 2130 Andreas Knabe and Ronnie Schöb, Subsidizing Extra Jobs: Promoting Employment by Taming the Unions, October 2007
- 2131 Michel Beine and Bertrand Candelon, Liberalization and Stock Market Co-Movement between Emerging Economies, October 2007
- 2132 Dieter M. Urban, FDI Technology Spillovers and Wages, October 2007
- 2133 Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro, Emanuele Massetti and Massimo Tavoni, Optimal Energy Investment and R&D Strategies to Stabilise Greenhouse Gas Atmospheric Concentrations, October 2007
- 2134 David-Jan Jansen and Jakob de Haan, The Importance of Being Vigilant: Has ECB Communication Influenced Euro Area Inflation Expectations?, October 2007
- 2135 Oliver Falck, Heavyweights – The Impact of Large Businesses on Productivity Growth, October 2007
- 2136 Xavier Freixas and Bruno M. Parigi, Banking Regulation and Prompt Corrective Action, November 2007
- 2137 Jan K. Brueckner, Partial Fiscal Decentralization, November 2007
- 2138 Silvia Console Battilana, Uncovered Power: External Agenda Setting, Sophisticated Voting, and Transnational Lobbying, November 2007
- 2139 Alan J. Auerbach, Michael P. Devereux and Helen Simpson, Taxing Corporate Income, November 2007
- 2140 Lorenzo Cappellari, Paolo Ghinetti and Gilberto Turati, On Time and Money Donations, November 2007
- 2141 Roel Beetsma and Heikki Oksanen, Pension Systems, Ageing and the Stability and Growth Pact, November 2007
- 2142 Hikaru Ogawa and David E. Wildasin, Think Locally, Act Locally: Spillovers, Spillbacks, and Efficient Decentralized Policymaking, November 2007
- 2143 Alessandro Cigno, A Theoretical Analysis of the Effects of Legislation on Marriage, Fertility, Domestic Division of Labour, and the Education of Children, November 2007

- 2144 Kai A. Konrad, Mobile Tax Base as a Global Common, November 2007
- 2145 Ola Kvaløy and Trond E. Olsen, The Rise of Individual Performance Pay, November 2007
- 2146 Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Yannis Georgellis, Nicholas Tsitsianis and Ya Ping Yin, Income and Happiness across Europe: Do Reference Values Matter?, November 2007
- 2147 Dan Anderberg, Tax Credits, Income Support and Partnership Decisions, November 2007
- 2148 Andreas Irmen and Rainer Klump, Factor Substitution, Income Distribution, and Growth in a Generalized Neoclassical Model, November 2007
- 2149 Lorenz Blume, Jens Müller and Stefan Voigt, The Economic Effects of Direct Democracy – A First Global Assessment, November 2007
- 2150 Axel Dreher, Pierre-Guillaume Méon and Friedrich Schneider, The Devil is in the Shadow – Do Institutions Affect Income and Productivity or only Official Income and Official Productivity?, November 2007
- 2151 Valentina Bosetti, Carlo Carraro, Emanuele Massetti and Massimo Tavoni, International Energy R&D Spillovers and the Economics of Greenhouse Gas Atmospheric Stabilization, November 2007
- 2152 Balázs Égert and Dubravko Mihaljek, Determinants of House Prices in Central and Eastern Europe, November 2007
- 2153 Christa Hainz and Hendrik Hakenes, The Politician and his Banker, November 2007
- 2154 Josef Falkinger, Distribution and Use of Knowledge under the “Laws of the Web”, December 2007
- 2155 Thorvaldur Gylfason and Eduard Hochreiter, Growing Apart? A Tale of Two Republics: Estonia and Georgia, December 2007
- 2156 Morris A. Davis and François Ortalo-Magné, Household Expenditures, Wages, Rents, December 2007
- 2157 Andreas Haufler and Christian Schulte, Merger Policy and Tax Competition, December 2007
- 2158 Marko Köthenbürger and Panu Poutvaara, Rent Taxation and its Intertemporal Welfare Effects in a Small Open Economy, December 2007
- 2159 Betsey Stevenson, Title IX and the Evolution of High School Sports, December 2007
- 2160 Stergios Skaperdas and Samarth Vaidya, Persuasion as a Contest, December 2007

- 2161 Morten Bennedsen and Christian Schultz, Arm's Length Provision of Public Services, December 2007
- 2162 Bas Jacobs, Optimal Redistributive Tax and Education Policies in General Equilibrium, December 2007
- 2163 Christian Jaag, Christian Keuschnigg and Mirela Keuschnigg, Pension Reform, Retirement and Life-Cycle Unemployment, December 2007
- 2164 Dieter M. Urban, Terms of Trade, Catch-up, and Home Market Effect: The Example of Japan, December 2007
- 2165 Marcelo Resende and Rodrigo M. Zeidan, Lionel Robbins: A Methodological Reappraisal, December 2007
- 2166 Samuel Bentolila, Juan J. Dolado and Juan F. Jimeno, Does Immigration Affect the Phillips Curve? Some Evidence for Spain, December 2007
- 2167 Rainald Borck, Federalism, Fertility and Growth, December 2007
- 2168 Erkki Koskela and Jan König, Strategic Outsourcing, Profit Sharing and Equilibrium Unemployment, December 2007
- 2169 Egil Matsen and Øystein Thøgersen, Habit Formation, Strategic Extremism and Debt Policy, December 2007
- 2170 Torben M. Andersen and Allan Sørensen, Product Market Integration and Income Taxation: Distortions and Gains from Trade, December 2007
- 2171 J. Atsu Amegashie, American Idol: Should it be a Singing Contest or a Popularity Contest?, December 2007
- 2172 Patricia Apps and Ray Rees, Household Models: An Historical Perspective, December 2007
- 2173 Ben Greiner, Axel Ockenfels and Peter Werner, The Dynamic Interplay of Inequality and Trust – An Experimental Study, December 2007
- 2174 Michael Melvin and Magali Valero, The Dark Side of International Cross-Listing: Effects on Rival Firms at Home, December 2007
- 2175 Gebhard Flaig and Horst Rottmann, Labour Market Institutions and the Employment Intensity of Output Growth. An International Comparison, December 2007