Comments on "Time for a Supply Side Boost? The Macroeconomic Effects of Labor and Product Market Reforms in Advanced Economies" Ch. 3, WEO, April 2016, presented by Romain Duval

Kenichi Ueda

Faculty of Economics
The University of Tokyo

IMF – PARI (UTokyo) Conference on Global Economy and China: Urgency of Structural Reforms June 2, 2016, at the University of Tokyo

Overview

- ♣ Structural reform is the most important policy for most advanced economies, where the fiscal space is limited and the monetary policy is constrained by the zero interest rate.
- This WEO chapter provides a birds-eye view on the frontier of structural reform analysis, utilizing a wide range of long historical data for labor and product market reforms.
- Unfortunately, results are a bit mixed, calling for supplementary monetary and fiscal policies.
 - ♣ The theoretical model shows long-run gains with short-run pains.
 - Regressions show many positive effects during economic booms but some negative effects during recessions.

Reverse Causality: Recession → Reform?

- ♣ Political economy suggests that recession / crisis is the key driver for past reforms (Box 3.1, Abiad and Mody (2005)).
- Then, regression results of
 [Reform → Slow economic growth]
 may be actually representing
 [Recession → Reform → Slow economic growth]
- To be precise, better to have counterfactuals, which are not available. The second best is theoretical model predictions, which indeed show positive long-run effects of reforms.
- Why not reporting more on model-based empirical studies (e.g., Townsend and Ueda (2010))?

Credit Constraint Matters

- Credit constraint matters in both theoretical model and regression studies.
- ♣ Then, why not include financial sector structural reform, often known as financial liberalization? There is a long history of such studies at the IMF RES and MCM, including myself.
- ♣ During financial crisis periods, credit constraints are tightened and, your theory keeping credit constraint same (I think), would not describe the reality well.

Should China be praised as a country having minimal protection of workers?

- ♣ Labor protection is likely minimal. Rather the problem is prevalence of sweat shops.
- ♣ Claessens and Ueda (2016, early version IMFWP 08) show that employment protection may have inverse-U shape effects on economic growth.
 - ♣ Basic worker rights protection is good for both firms and workers because some level of job security provides workers for incentives to build (firm-specific) skills.
 - Generous employment protection seen in continental Europe and Japan is detrimental to growth.