

Production Constraints and the NAIRU

Ciaran Driver

Tanaka Business School, Imperial College, University of London

S.G.Hall

Department of Economics, University of Leicester

Abstract

This paper argues that the production constraints in the basic NAIRU model should be distinguished by type: capital constraints and labour constraints. It notes the failure to incorporate this phenomenon in standard macro models. Using panel data for UK manufacturing over eighty quarters it is shown that capital constraints became relatively more important during the 1980s as industry failed to match the increase in labour flexibility with rising capital investment.

KEYWORDS:

CAPITAL LABOUR CONSTRAINTS NAIRU PANEL_DATA STRUCTURAL_BREAKS

JEL CODES: C23 D24 E22 E24

Corresponding author: Ciaran Driver, Tanaka Business School, Imperial College, South Kensington, London, SW7 2AZ. (c.driver@imperial.ac.uk)

Stephen Hall gratefully acknowledges the support of the ESRC under Grant No. L138250122. Ciaran Driver would like to thank the Research School of Social Sciences, ANU for research facilities during initial work on this paper. Final responsibility for the contents of this paper rests solely with the authors

Production Constraints and the NAIRU

Introduction

There has been a growing literature in recent years that attempts to model directly the time variation that may exist in the NAIRU. Notable contributions to this literature include Ball and Mankiw (2002), Staiger, Stock and Watson (2001) and Gordon (1998). These papers attempt to identify the time variation in the NAIRU by making a simple a-theoretical decomposition. Specifically, Staiger *et.al* and Gordon both assume that the NAIRU is a random walk while the other shocks affecting unemployment are stationary and thus they extract the non-stationary component and regard this as the NAIRU. Ball and Mankiw on the other hand apply a simple Hodrick-Prescott filter which again amounts to extracting the trend component of unemployment but in a slightly different way. Our contribution addresses the same issue but from a more theoretical perspective. In particular, we advance a theory of why the NAIRU in the UK may have experienced a structural break during the 1980s.

Following the authors cited above we too relax the assumption that the NAIRU is time invariant. Our rationale, however, is more radical than the existing literature. Whereas the traditional NAIRU model (Layard et al 1991) focuses on the single factor labour in determining equilibrium unemployment, we widen the scope to include capital constraints on production. This broader approach has found some support in the literature (Cecchetti 1995) but the implications for the NAIRU model have not been fully developed as of now. One important point that follows from a consideration of multiple

input constraints is that time variation in the NAIRU can be induced by a structural shift in the relationship between these constraints.

The rationale behind an exclusive focus on labour constraints in the literature arises from the (often implicit) assumption that factor substitution allows full employment to be reached with any capital stock. Under these conditions, the availability of labour does indeed determine whether firms have the capacity to meet the current level of demand and the size of the capital stock exercises its influence primarily via the marginal product of labour which determines the feasible path of real wages. However, insofar as opportunities for capital substitution are limited, e.g. in much of manufacturing industry, productive potential may be constrained independently by capital and labour constraints. Survey evidence (see the data appendix for source) shows a low correlation between perceived labour constraints and capital constraints in manufacturing with an average correlation coefficient of about 0.5 using quarterly data in the decade up to 2006. It has also been demonstrated that perceived capital shortage is surprisingly persistent. Using the methods in Clements and Hendry (1998) with the same data source, it has been shown that perceived capital shortage in the ten major sectors of manufacturing are predictable up to ten quarters ahead (Driver and Meade 2001).

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 1 below advances a rationale for expecting a structural break to have occurred between labour and capital constraints in the UK in the 1980s. In Section 2 we develop a formal model where the output gap in the economy reflects both the constraints on labour supply and capital shortages. Section 3 describes the data and tests for structural breaks between the constraint series. We use a panel data set of business survey data for individual industries in the UK and particularly make use of unique (CBI) estimates of labour, capital and total output

constraints in the economy at a sectoral level. The results, discussed in Section 4 confirm the existence of the hypothesised structural break. The implications are discussed in the concluding sections.

1. Shareholder value and increased capital constraints

There may be several reasons for expecting structural breaks in the relationship between labour and capital constraints. Immigration and changes in labour participation rates are possible candidates, though we would expect these to be more characterised by slow moving trends. Perhaps the most important reason for a sharp break in respect of capital constraints is the increased emphasis on shareholder value that shifted managerial behaviour in shareholder-oriented economies in the 1980s.

Following financial deregulation in the US and elsewhere at that time, managerial autonomy was circumscribed by greater pressure from investors resulting in stringent profitability requirements in capital investment appraisal and a greater tendency to return capital to shareholders. In countries characterised by a reliance on equity finance there was, from the 1980s, an increased managerial focus on short-term performance (Nolan 2002). This was fuelled partly by a defensive reaction to takeovers and partly by the degree to which managerial compensation was increasingly linked to the current share price. Some have also argued that the increased gearing that accompanied this phenomenon reduced free cash flow and managerial autonomy. Whether this was the case or not, the obligation to pay future debt will have focused attention on the scope for cost-cutting and the elimination of excess capacity.

The effect of these processes on capital investment in Anglo-American economies is controversial (Shleifer and Vishny 1997; Stockhammer 2004a) but one view is that that they contained capital expenditure and reduced the degree of slack in capital stock use. It has been argued that the “ultimate purpose “ of the restructuring of the 1980’s was to improve performance by “reducing investment...” (Donaldson 1994). This is underscored in writings such as Jensen (1997) where it is claimed that widespread overcapacity was partly eliminated in the 1980s. The retrospective conclusion also appears to be that increased institutional investment “helped to eliminate excess capacity” (Holmstrom and Kaplan 2001, p.122). For the case of the UK, there is also evidence of an upward shift in manufacturing capacity utilisation from the mid 1980s, suggesting a more cautious capital investment stance or a greater tendency to retire surplus capital (Driver and Shepherd 2005).

There is, therefore, plausible theory and some empirical support for expecting structural breaks in the relationship between labour and capital constraints though this has not been addressed in the existing theory. Some authors do give attention to the distinction between labour and capital constraints but these are exceptions.¹ For the most part the standard theory tends to eliminate the role of capital from the NAIRU completely, often explicitly so, concentrating instead on the role of the labour market and labour market institutions (Belot and Van Ours 2004).

Identifying structural shifts in the NAIRU is important both for theoretical and policy reasons. In macroeconomic theory, the exogeneity or otherwise of the determinants of

¹ We include here Blanchard (1990), Rowthorn (1995); Malinvaud (1977); Arestis and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal (2000); Malley and Moutos (2001); and Arestis and Sawyer (2005). There has also been some discussion of the role of capacity utilisation in the determination of macroeconomic pricing pressure -see Wolfgang and Gordon (1993), Cecchetti (1995), Corrado and Matthey (1997) and Kennedy (1998).

equilibrium unemployment (the natural rate) feed into controversies over the nature of the Phillips Curve (Akerlof 2002; Franz 2000) and in particular whether there is a long-run trade off between inflation and unemployment (Mankiw 2001; Karanassou and Snower 2004; Karanassou et al 2005). In relation to labour market policy, research on time variation in the NAIRU has tended to focus either on hysteresis in labour market variables or shifts in other variables, such as taxes and import penetration. Here we argue that the NAIRU is dependent on capital accumulation. One mechanism for this is that higher investment relieves capacity constraints and lowers inflationary pressure. It follows that the existing policy focus on labour market institutions alone is inadequate and needs to be complemented by attention to public and private capital investment (See also, Stockhammer 2004b). Our approach is also consistent with those who have argued that the (secular) price markup in the NAIRU system of equations is affected by investment (Pickelman and Shuh 1997; Rowthorn 1995; Shepherd and Driver 2003); or by new entry induced by demand (Snower 1983).

2. The NAIRU with capital and labour constraints

The standard NAIRU model may be represented (without dynamics or error terms) as:²

$$\begin{aligned} p_t - w_t^e &= b_0 - b_1 u_t^k \\ w_t - p_t^e &= g_0 - g_1 u_t^l \end{aligned} \quad \dots(1)$$

where p is output price, w is nominal wage, u^k is plant capacity slack, u^l is unemployment and superscript e represents expectations. We are of course abstracting from a number of other factors, which may also affect the NAIRU in the real world.

² Good introductory or intermediate level accounts of the NAIRU model may be found in Carlin and Soskice (2006, Chapter 4), Blanchard (1990) and Meliss and Webb (1997).

These would include such things as the tax and benefit system, union strength and the legal bargaining framework in the labour market amongst others, these are all assumed to be part of the two constant terms above (b_0 g_0). The inclusion of these terms in the constants will not affect our investigation of the implications of the production constraints as we pursue a direct analysis of the constraint relationship rather than estimating a conventional wage equation which would be severely affected by an omitted variable problem. We are not therefore denying the importance of these other factors but rather we are focusing more directly than usual on the constraint issue.

Consider first the labour market constraint. Although the standard model would, as above, often be simply written with unemployment it should more correctly be a general measure of labour market disequilibrium, maybe the deviation of actual unemployment from the NAIRU or a direct measure (as we will use). Similarly u^k is a measure of the constraints facing the firm on the capital side and it is this factor that affects the firms pricing behaviour in the bargain. An equilibrium solution to equation (1), where actual and expected values are equal implies a relationship between the cyclical variables u_t^l and u_t^k .

The variables u_t^l and u_t^k may differ in levels or growth. As our concern here is with long-run solutions, we focus on the case where the levels of the series differ by a multiple that is subject to a random break. Thus,

$$u_t^k / u_t^l = \eta_t \tag{2}$$

where $\eta_t \geq 0$ and

$$\eta_t = \eta_0 \text{ for } t < t_b$$

$$\eta_t = \eta_0 + \delta\eta_0 \text{ for } t \geq t_b$$

and where t_b is the time of a random shift break in the relationship between u_t^l and u_t^k

Thus, the initial state has $u_t^k / u_t^l = \eta_0$ and the NAIRU may be expressed as:

$$u^* = (b_0 + g_0) / (b_1 \eta_0 + g_1) \quad \dots(3)$$

Clearly, the bigger the relative degree of plant capacity slack, the lower the NAIRU. To see the response of the NAIRU to a change in η_0 , we may differentiate $\log u^*$ with respect to η_0 to obtain a semi-elasticity:

$$\partial \log u^* / \partial \eta_0 = -b_1 / (b_1 \eta_0 + g_1) \quad \dots(4)$$

Where the adjustment coefficients of price and wages are approximately equal, we have

$b_1 \approx g_1$ giving:

$$\partial \log u^* \approx -\partial \eta_0 / (1 + \eta_0) \quad \dots(5)$$

Almost invariably the practice in the literature is to impose the restriction $\eta_t = 1$ for all t so that there is no distinction drawn between the two cyclical measures of unemployment and plant capacity slack. It is somewhat surprising that these variables are conflated because they correspond to two different sets of literatures. The unemployment variable relates to the labour market literature on the Phillips curve (See for example Blanchard and Katz 1977 for a survey), or the “wage curve” that is said to underpin the labour supply function (Blanchflower and Oswald 1994). The indicator of capacity slack refers to the literature on mark-up pricing and its cyclical or anti-cyclical behaviour (Bloch and Olive 2001, Small 1998, Lee 1993) that determines the labour demand equation in the NAIRU model.

To motivate the empirical work that follows we may note that discontinuities between the two cyclical measures can have reasonably large effects. For example, a 10% increase in η_0 from an initial value of unity would increase the NAIRU to 1.05 of its value while a

50% increase in η_0 would raise the NAIRU by a quarter. In the next section we show how it is possible empirically to test for breaks between the cyclical variables.

3. Data and Estimation

As argued above the standard model of the NAIRU yields a relationship between labour and capital constraints, which, for stable parameters (which includes a range of other factors that may affect the NAIRU) will give rise to a constant NAIRU. But if there are breaks in these parameters then the NAIRU will itself break. In this section we evaluate the stability of the relationship between the constraints in the economy.

The variables u_t^l and u_t^k in the previous section may be proxied in a number of ways. Here we propose to measure them (inversely) by indicators of skilled labour constraint and by plant capacity constraints. We investigate the degree of labour constraint and capital constraint in a large set of UK manufacturing industries over a long data period using panel methods. We use panel data on three key variables defined as:³

CU capacity utilisation

LC labour constraints

KC capital constraints

Our primary interest is to look for structural shifts in the way labour and capital constraints affect capacity utilisation. We are therefore searching for a structural break at some unknown point in the sample in a panel data context. Moreover the issue is to find a specific break in the relationship between capacity utilisation and either labour constraints or capital constraints so we are concerned with a parameter shift in this relationship rather than the more usual mean shift. To derive reliable estimates of these

³ See the data appendix for exact definitions. The use of the manufacturing sector seems apposite as it shares the characteristics of the “primary” sector that the NAIRU model was originally designed for (Layard, Nickell and Jackman 1991).

breaks it is also important to have a model, which is in all other respects a good description of the data. So the model must be reasonably rich in terms of both dynamic specification and its use of other explanatory effects. As is well known dynamic panel data models can often lead to biased parameter estimates and so we will employ the Generalised Methods of Moments estimator for dynamic panel data models developed by Arellano and Bond (1991). The problem then is to test for a structural break in the parameters at some unknown break point. The basic methodology we use rests on Andrews (1993) who defines the asymptotic distribution theory of sequential structural break tests. We apply this framework to our GMM panel data estimators. Similar techniques which extend the testing to the case of non-stationarity include Zivot and Andrews (1992) and Banerjee, Lumsdaine and Stock (1992) although our case is a little simpler as non-stationarity is not an issue here. These techniques conventionally use a sequential dummy variable approach *i.e.* a sequence of full sample estimates are undertaken where a constant shift is allowed for through a zero-one dummy and the timing of the shift in the dummy is sequentially moved through the complete sample. Formal tests of the structural break are then conducted by taking supremum of a relevant test statistic (in our case the largest 't' statistic) observed in the sample and this then indicates both the significance of the break and its timing. The tests are generally non-standard ones due to the presence of a structural break parameter in the alternative, which is not present under the null. Andrews (1993) tabulates appropriate asymptotic critical values for this test. These critical values vary with the proportion of the sample which is being searched over, and are strictly undefined if the whole sample is being used for the structural break test. We will search over a range that excludes the first and last 10% of the observations. The appropriate 5% critical value for a 't' distributed Wald test is then approximately 3. In our application we have chosen to interact the dummy variable with the labour and capital constraint variables. This then

implies a sequence of shifting parameter values on the two constraints and we can graph both the implied total parameter value and the associated ‘t’ statistic based on robust standard errors (Arellano1987) for the break point.

In order to ensure a sufficiently rich model we run a dynamic two-way fixed effects panel with CU as the dependent variable and with the sequential dummy variables interacted for both LC and KC. In addition to control for any general cyclical effects we include the growth rate of the aggregate economy. This model is then run sequentially, updating the time dummy for each run.

The exact specification for the panel estimation is:

$$CU_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CU_{i,t-1} + \beta_2 LC_{i,t} + \beta_3 KC_{i,t} + \beta_4 LCDUM_{i,t} + \beta_5 KCDUM_{i,t} + \beta_6 DUK_{t-1} + e_i + u_t + e_{i,t} \quad \dots(6)$$

where the labour and capital constraint time dummy interactive terms are termed respectively as LCDUM, KCDUM and where DUK is the change in the log of UK GDP. e_i is the industry specific effect while u_t is the time specific effect and e_{it} is the residual. The sample period is 1978Q1 to 1998Q4 and the panel is unbalanced, the longest time series comprises 84 observations, there are 48 industries covered and the total sample size is 3,800 observations.

4. Results

The coefficients on KC and LC are 0.4 (robust ‘t’=14.2) and 0,17 (robust ‘t’=3.75) when the model is run without sequential dummies. This is not surprising as previous studies by CBI data managers have suggested that the utilisation variable primarily reflects the

incidence of plant constraints (Junankar 1990). The model is reasonably well specified showing no signs of serial correlation and the instrument set is accepted by the Sargan test of instrument validity.

We now turn to the main results, the investigation of the possibility of a structural break. We performed a sequence of 84 regressions⁴ where the interacting dummy variables were switched on at every possible break point. The graphs of the basic coefficients with and without the dummy effect included are shown in Figure 1. The significance of the dummy effects are given in Figure 2 for both LC and KC.

The interpretation of these graphs needs some explanation. The sequential estimation takes place many times over, with the interacting dummy variables switching on together at every possible point in time. We then use the 't' statistics in figure 2 to judge the most likely break point for each parameter, this is detected by selecting the largest 't' value over the whole sample. This occurs in 1987 for Labour and 1982 for capital. To judge whether this is a significant structural break we note that the appropriate critical value is roughly 3 and we can see that both of the maximum 't' stats exceed this value. However we know that the test does not perform well at periods close to the end of the sample and so we have some doubts about its reliability for the timing of a capital break, which occurs very close to the beginning of the sample. Nevertheless, we believe that the timing is plausible because the recession of the early 1980s impacted severely on the

⁴ GMM was used with the following set of instruments LC_{t-1} LC_{t-2} KC_{t-1} , KC_{t-2} , DUK_{t-1} , DUK_{t-2} . These instruments passed the tests for independence with the error term and relevance, so the problem of weak instruments does not seem to be relevant here. The estimation included time dummies and cross section dummies and robust standard errors were calculated

output of old capital intensive industries⁵ which will likely have reduced the weight of capital as a component of capacity constraints.

Note that our testing procedure is a slight elaboration over the standard Andrews one as we are allowing either coefficient to break at a particular time independently of whether or not there is a break in the other parameter. Further down we will discuss a restriction (Figure 3) which imposes a common break on both parameters at the same time.

Figure 1 then shows the value of the coefficient for labour and capital, (β_2, β_3) . These coefficients are always derived over the whole sample but are changing over time as the interacting dummy terms are switching on sequentially, these parameters would be the effect before the break. Figure 1 also shows the combined effect of the variable with the interacting dummy effect $(\beta_2 + \beta_4; \beta_3 + \beta_5)$, which is the total effect of the variable in the equation estimated after the break has occurred. The difference between each pair of lines then shows the size of the break assuming the break occurs at that point in time.

Focusing first on the LC variable, the coefficient on the dummy becomes negative and significant some time after the start of 1985 with a maximum t-value occurring in 1987Q2. The results of the KC variable are different. As noted earlier, there is some indication of positive t-statistics on the dummy in the early years but these must be treated with caution given that the coefficients on the dummy here are estimated with a small number of observations. Figure 1 shows that there was a gradual rise in the combined capital constraint plus dummy effect from the mid 1980s.

⁵ The fastest growing sector of manufacturing in the first half of the 1980s was light engineering while the largest decline occurred in capital intensive transport equipment (Green ed. 1989)

Overall, the results are consistent with a downward break in the effect of LC in the latter half of the 1980s and stable or slightly rising effect of KC. From Figure 1 it can be seen that any breaks were concentrated in the 1980s. The general picture that emerges is of a failure to capitalise on improved labour practices by complementing them with rising capital investment sufficient to contain capital constraints on output. Rather, the opposite seemed to happen as capital constraints began to rise after an early break which probably reflects restructuring after the 1980s recession.

A number of plausible patterns may be advanced for the reduced relative importance of labour constraints at this time. First, the labour market legislation will have reduced restrictive practices. Secondly, tax and benefit changes, along with other social changes such as increased female participation will have increased the availability of flexible labour (Rubery 1989). However these reforms were not accompanied by increased rates of capital formation in this period, resulting in higher capacity utilisation from the mid 1980s (Driver and Shepherd 2005).⁶

Finally, for completeness, it may be of interest to perform a further test on the model to see if *simultaneous* structural breaks occur in the two parameters. Figure 3 shows a joint F test of the hypothesis that both parameters break at the same point in time. This figure also shows the standard asymptotic 5% critical value for the test. This critical value should of course be larger than the standard one for a sequential testing procedure like this. Given our earlier results in Figure 2 it would be surprising to obtain a significant joint break and the results indicate no support for it. Although the test value is highest in the late 1980s, the null of no common structural break cannot be not rejected.

⁶ . This focus on cost reduction reflected in part the increased power and influence of institutional investors and the erosion of managerialism (Chandler 1994; Stockhammer 2004a). See also the discussion in Holmstrom and Kaplan (2001) in respect of the US economy.

This suggests, in keeping with the discussion above that labour and capital constraints are determined by separate economic and institutional factors that operate independently..

5. Implications for the NAIRU

The implications for the NAIRU of the findings in Section 3 are quite straightforward. A structural break in the relationship between the constraints has been identified and this in itself is sufficient to introduce time-variation in the NAIRU. We find that the ratio of the capital coefficients to the labour coefficient (taking account of the time dummy effect) more than doubled from the mid to the late 1980s to the late 1990s. In the simple model of Section 2 that would have increased the NAIRU substantially unless mediated by other reforms. It seems surprising that the sensitivity of NAIRU estimates to such a plausible phenomenon as a structural break between factor constraints has not emerged so far in the theoretical literature.

In some respects our conclusions and implications are similar to those of other authors, cited in the introduction, who have addressed the question of a time-varying NAIRU. Certainly, our approach shares with other recent treatments a concern with productivity variables that were omitted from earlier models (Layard, Nickell and Jackman 1991). Productivity variables will affect the NAIRU in the standard theory only if the labour share is affected by investment or if there is a lag in the adjustment of real wage to productivity. The latter issue has formed the centrepiece of recent critiques of standard NAIRU theory (Ball and Moffitt 2001; Ball and Mankiw 2002).⁷ The underlying argument

⁷ Until recently, these issues have been sidelined in the literature. The former effect was generally circumvented in the standard model by using a Cobb-Douglas Production function: see Rowthorn (1999) for a critique. The importance of productivity growth was noted in Dreze and Sneessons (1995).

here relies on sluggish wage adjustment to higher productivity growth. If the equations in (1) are differentially affected by productivity growth, say because the outside wage is linked to productivity or more generally because of unspecified “real wage resistance”, then the numerator of (3) contains a term in productivity growth and the NAIRU itself will be negatively related to that growth.⁸

While accepting that wage adjustment lags can help to explain time-variation in the NAIRUs, we have in this paper pursued a distinct productivity-related approach to explain why the UK NAIRU may not have responded as hoped to the labour market reforms of the 1980s. Our account is based on an observed break in the balance of capital and labour constraints in UK manufacturing, reflecting perhaps a combination of labour legislation and the impact on capital investment of increased financial discipline during the 1980s. Whereas authors such as Ball and Moffet analyse effects occurring through the wage equation, we focus on effects occurring through the price mark-up on wages. In essence, we suggest that weak capital investment in the UK, or tighter capacity utilisation, may have contributed to maintaining equilibrium unemployment higher than necessary.⁹

Finally, we may note that our contribution provides another explanation for expecting hysteresis in the NAIRU. A number of explanations for persistence in the NAIRU have been discussed in the literature e.g. insider-outsider models; models based on the

⁸ OECD studies have tended to find lagged wage adjustment for European countries but not for the US. However, recent empirical results for the United States seem to confirm that ‘changes in productivity growth appear to shift the inflation-unemployment tradeoff... In the future, (macroeconomists) should expand their scope to build and test models of inflation, unemployment and productivity’ (Ball and Mankiw 2002).

⁹ While the US also experienced a pruning of excess capacity in the 1980s this appears to have been compensated by new entry, unlike the experience in the UK (Holmstrom and Kaplan 2001; Driver and Shepherd 2005)

atrophying skills of the unemployed and more recently the interaction of shocks and institutions (Blanchard and Wolfers 2001). Empirically there is strong support for persistence, especially in some European countries.¹⁰ Our contribution provides another explanation for this, given that a break in the NAIRU is easily conflated with a unit root.

6. Conclusions

Our focus in this paper has been quite specific. Rather than estimating and testing a model based on the NAIRU framework that would be subject to several criticisms (Pichelmann and Schuh 1997; Akerlof 2002) we have chosen a more direct test on one of the maintained hypotheses of the theory viz. that the same cyclical variable can be used in the pricing and the wage equations. We find evidence for a structural break between these cyclical series over the period studied in line with a priori beliefs on the role of managerial incentives and corporate behaviour in reducing available slack in the capital stock.

As shown in the paper, the NAIRU is affected by the relationship between the degrees of slack in the supply of labour and capital. A rising relative influence of capital constraints can offset a potential fall in the NAIRU caused by increased labour market flexibility. We find that the ratio of the capital coefficients to the labour coefficient (taking account of the time dummy effect) more than doubled from the mid-1980s to the late 1990s. This is quite a sizeable shift and thus any attempt to base policy on a NAIRU estimated simply from unemployment or other index of labour market tightness may be more than usually misguided.

¹⁰ Using a standard ADF test, stationarity in the NAIRU is accepted at 10% only for the US, Finland and Sweden. Using a test that individually tests the null of non-stationarity in the SURE framework, hysteresis is still found in half the countries studied. (Camarero and Tamarit 2004).

If, as argued here, capital investment is important for the NAIRU, it brings into question the single-minded focus on labour market institutions in addressing employment creation that has characterised UK policy in recent years. This policy approach stems from the theoretical work of Layard and Nickell in the 1980s and 1990s (Layard et al 1991). While there is nothing wrong with an institutional approach to unemployment, the error in our view has been to focus only on labour market institutions at the expense of other important influences such as productivity that require an integrated understanding of factor and product markets.

References

- Akerlof G. A. (2002) "Behavioral Macroeconomics and Macroeconomic Behavior" *American Economic Review*, 92(3) 411-433
- Andrews D.W.K (1993) "Tests for Parameter Instability and Structural Change with Unknown Change Point", *Econometrica*, 61,4, 821-856
- Arellano, M. (1987). "Computing robust standard errors for within-groups estimators" *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, **49**, 431--434
- Arellano, M., and Bond, S. R. (1991). "Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations" *Review of Economic Studies*, **58**, 277—297
- Arestis, P. and Biefang-Frisancho Mariscal, I. (2000), 'Capital stock, unemployment and wages in the UK and Germany', *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, vol., 47(5), pp.487-503
- Arestis, P and Sawyer, M, "Aggregate demand, conflict and capacity in the inflationary process" *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 29: 959-974.
- Ball L. and Mankiw N.G. (2002) "The NAIRU in Theory and Practise", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol 16 no 4, 115-136
- Ball L. and Moffitt R. (2001) "Productivity growth and the Phillips Curve", *NBER Working Paper # 8421*, Cambridge MA
- Banerjee, A., Lumsdaine, R.L. and Stock, J.H. (1992) "Recursive and sequential tests of the unit root and trend-break hypothesis" *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, **10**, 271-288
- Belot, M and van Ours, J.C (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 (2004), 621-642

- Blanchard O.J. (1990) "Unemployment: getting the questions right - and some of the answers" in J. Dreze and C. Bean (eds) *Europe's Unemployment Problem*, London MIT Press, 66-89
- Blanchard O. and Katz L. F. (1997) "What we know and what we do not know about the Natural Rate of Unemployment", *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11, 51-72
- Blanchard O. and Wolfers J. (2000) "The role of shocks and institutions in the rise of European unemployment: the aggregate evidence", *Economic Journal* 110, C1-C10
- Blanchflower, D. G. and A. J. Oswald (1994) *The Wage Curve*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press
- Camarero M. and Tamarit C. (2004) "Hysteresis vs. natural rate of unemployment: new evidence for OECD countries", *Economics Letters* 84(3), 413-417
- Carlin W and D Soskice (2006) *Macroeconomics: Imperfections, Institutions and Policies*, Oxford, OUP
- Cecchetti S G (1995) "Inflation indicators and inflation policy", NBER *Macroeconomics Annual* 189-219
- Chandler, Sir Geoffrey (1994) "The Political Handicap" in Buxton T, Chapman P and Temple P, *Britain's Economic Performance*, Routledge
- Clements M P and Hendry D F (1998) *Forecasting Economic Time Series*, Cambridge, CUP
- Corrado C. and Matthey, J. (1997) "Capacity utilisation", *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11,1, 151-68
- Donaldson, G. (1994). *Corporate Restructuring: Managing the Change Process from Within*, Harvard University Press
- Dreze J.H. and Sneesons H. (1995) "Technological development, competition from low-wage economies and low-skilled unemployment", Chapter 8 of Snower D.J and G. de la Dehesa (1995) *Unemployment Policy: government options for the labour market*, Cambridge, CUP
- Driver C. and Meade N. (2001) "Persistence of capacity shortage and the role of adjustment costs" *Scottish Journal of Political Economy* 48(1), 27-47

- Driver C. and Shepherd D. (2005) "Capacity Utilisation and Corporate Restructuring: a comparative study of the US, UK and other European countries", *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 29, 119-140
- European Commission (1997) "The joint harmonised EU programme of business and consumer surveys" *European Economy*, 6.
- Franz W "Will the (German) NAIRU please stand up?", *German Economic Review* 6(2), 131-153
- Gordon R.J.(1998) "Foundations of the Goldilocks Economy: Supply Shocks and the time varying NAIRU" *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2, 297-333
- Green F. (Ed 1989) *The Restructuring of the UK Economy*, Harvester
- Holmstrom B. and Kaplan S.N. (2001) "Corporate Governance and Merger Activity in the United States: Making Sense of the 1980s and 1990s", *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 15(2), 121-144
- Jensen, M. (1997). "The modern industrial revolution, exit and the failure of internal control systems", pp18-37 in D.H. Chew (ed), *Studies in International Corporate Finance and Governance Systems*, Oxford University Press
- Junankar, J. (1990), 'How do companies respond to the CBI's Industrial Trends Survey?' *Economic Situation Report*, pp. 26-32 and 59-67.
- Karanassou, M and D. J. Snower (2004) "Unemployment invariance" , *German Economic Review*, 5(3), 297-317
- Karanassou, M, Sala H and D.J. Snower (2005) A reappraisal of the Inflation-Unemployment tradeoff", *European Journal of Political Economy*, 21,1, 1-32
- Kennedy, J.E. (1998). "An analysis of time-series estimates of capacity utilisation", *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 20, 1, 169-87
- Layard R., Nickell J. , Jackman R. (1991) *Unemployment: Macroeconomics and the Labour Market*, Oxford, OUP

- Lee K. (1993) "Formation of price and cost inflation expectations in British manufacturing industries: a multi-sectoral analysis", *Economic Journal* 104, 372-85
- Malinvaud, E. (1977). *Profitability and Unemployment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Malley J and Moutos T (2001) Capital Accumulation and Unemployment: A Tale of Two "Continents" *Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 103(1) 79-99
- Mankiw, N.G. (2001), The Inexorable and Mysterious Tradeoff_ between Inflation and Unemployment, *The Economic Journal* 111 (471), C45 -C61.
- C Melliss and A.E. Webb (1997) "The United Kingdom Nairu: Concepts, Measurement And Policy Implications" *OECD Working Paper* 182 OCDE/GD(97)152
- Nickell, S. J. (1981). "An investigation of the determinants of manufacturing employment in the United Kingdom" Discussion paper 105, Center for Labour Economics, London School of Economics.
- Nolan, D. (2002) "Capital structure and short-term decisions", *Oxford Economic Papers* 54, 470-89
- Phelps E S (1994) *Structural Slumps: the modern equilibrium theory of unemployment , interests and assets*, Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press
- Pichelmann K. and A.U.Schuh (1997) "The NAIRU Concept: a few remarks", *OECD Working Paper* 178 OCDE/GE(97)89
- Rowthorn, R.E. (1995). "Capital formation and unemployment", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy* vol.1, pp.26-39.
- Rowthorn, R.E. (1999) "Unemployment, capital-labour substitution and economic growth", International Monetary Fund, WP 99/43, Washington
- Rubery, J.(1989) "Labour market flexibility in Britain", Chapter 8 in F. Green (ed, 1989)
- Shepherd, D and C Driver (2003) "Inflation and capacity constraints in Australian manufacturing industry", *The Economic Record*, Vol: 79, Pages: 182 - 195

Small I. (1998) "The cyclicity of mark-ups and profit margins: some evidence for manufacturing and services", *Bank of England Quarterly Review*, August, 267-73

Snower D J (1983) "Imperfect competition, under-employment and crowding out" *Oxford Economic Papers* 35, 245-270

Staiger D., Stock J.H. and Watson M.W. (2001) "Prices Wages and the US NAIRU in the 1990's" in A.B. Krueger and R. Solow (eds) *The Roaring Nineties: Can Full Employment be Sustained?*, New York, The Russell Sage foundation and Century Press

Stockhammer E. (2004a) "Financialisation and the slowdown of accumulation" *Cambridge Journal of Economics* 2004 28(5):719-741

Stockhammer E (2004b) "Explaining European Unemployment: Testing the NAIRU Hypothesis and a Keynesian Approach," *International Review of Applied Economics*, 18(1), 1-26

Wolfgang F. and Gordon R.J. (1993) "German and American wage and price dynamics", *European Economic Review*, May, 719-62

Zivot, E. and Andrews, D.W.K. (1992). "Further evidence on the great crash, the oil price shock and the unit root hypothesis", *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 10, 251-270

Figure 1: Sequential coefficients on KC and LC




Figure 2: Absolute 't' Statistics on the sequential breaks in KC and LC





Figure 3: A Joint F test of simultaneous breaks in Both Series



Data Appendix

Most of the data used comes from the survey questions designed by the Confederation of British Industries (CBI). This survey has an excellent reputation, having run continuously since 1958. It feeds into the EU official data series and it is regularly used in academic and policy studies. The sample size is large with over 1000 returns, quarterly (European Commission 1997)

The CBI variables are defined as follows:

LCU is the percentage of respondents replying “NO” to the question “are you working below a satisfactory full rate of operation” (Q4B).

LC and KC are the percentage replies “Skilled labour” and “plant capacity” to the question “What factors are likely to limit your output over the next four month”(Q14B and Q14D)

The DUK variable is taken from the UK National Accounts