

How does New Zealand's construction productivity growth measure up?

Progress update on September 2022 Research Insights

Disclaimer - This presentation contains general information and is not formal advice. It is recommended that you seek independent advice on any matter relating to the use of the information. We will not be liable for any loss or damage whatsoever arising from the use of the information.

Our interest in this area

Growth in output prices, 2000-2020





Our interest in this area



Source: Adapted from Sense Partners (2021)



Aim of this research

Our aim: Understand and benchmark the economic performance of New Zealand's construction industry, and in particular heavy/civil construction

Key research questions:

- What has productivity ever done for us, anyway?
- How has (labour) productivity evolved in different parts of the construction industry between 2000 and 2020?
- How does our construction productivity growth measure up to other OECD countries (and can we explain cross-country differences)?
- How has the construction sector fared through the early stages of the Covid-19 pandemic? [in progress not complete]



Some initial hypotheses

Everyone starts with some assumptions. Here were some of mine:

- Productivity growth is likely to be faster in heavy / civil construction than in building construction due to higher capital intensity, larger project size, and larger, more internationalised firms.
- Boom-bust cycles reduce construction productivity growth by reducing incentives to invest in equipment and training.
- New Zealand is likely to experience comparatively weak construction productivity growth relative to other OECD countries, consistent with our overall productivity growth performance.



Why do we care about productivity?

Labour productivity growth vs price growth in NZ industries





Baumol's unbalanced growth model in NZ

Impacts of 1% labour productivity growth at the industry level:



Notes:

- 1. Effects are estimated from five reduced-form econometric models with changes in outcome variables (price growth, RGDP growth, etc) on the left hand side and changes in productivity on the right hand side
- 2. Models are estimated using SNZ industry productivity and industry wage data for 2000-2020 period
- 3. Annual difference and business cycle difference models include time and industry random effects; long term model is estimated with OLS
- 4. Results are similar if MFP growth is substituted for LP growth

Baumol's unbalanced growth model in NZ Impacts of 1% labour productivity growth at the industry level: Business cycle Annual ■ Long term (2000-2020) **Implication 1**: Output price growth Cost disease Real GDP growth Nominal GDP growth Labour inputs Average hourly wage -1.0% 0.5% 1.0% -0.5% 0.0%









Findings (1)

- Baumol's unbalanced growth model holds for the New Zealand economy
- Faster industry productivity growth reduces output price inflation, increases real output, and reduces workforce requirements



Past research on construction productivity





Past research on construction productivity





Labour productivity trends for sub-industries

SNZ publishes productivity statistics for the aggregate construction industry (ANZSIC06 E)

What's happening in different parts of the industry?

- Building construction (E30)
- Heavy and civil engineering construction (E31)
- Construction services (E32)

We constructed labour productivity estimates for sub-industries using methods and data that are consistent with SNZ's published industry productivity statistics

• Noting Jaffe, Le and Chappell (2016) did this with microdata!



Labour productivity trends for sub-industries



Real output growth trends

Growth in real output, 2000-2020





Labour input growth trends

Growth in labour inputs, 2000-2020



NEW ZEALAND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION Te Waihanga





Labour productivity growth over business cycles

Labour productivity growth over business cycles





Changes in the capital/labour ratio Growth in capital-labour ratio, 2000-2020 Building Construction Heavy and Civil Engineering Construction Total construction industry Construction Services 2200 2000 1800 1600 1400 1200 1000 800

 $2000\ 2001\ 2002\ 2003\ 2004\ 2005\ 2006\ 2007\ 2008\ 2009\ 2010\ 2011\ 2012\ 2013\ 2014\ 2015\ 2016\ 2017\ 2018\ 2019\ 2020$





2006

2008

2010

2012

2014

Source: Productivity Commission, "Competition Explorer"

Textile, Leather, Clothing and Footwear Manufacturing

Petroleum, chemical, machinery and equipment manufacturing Non-Metallic Mineral Product Manufacturing

Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing Support Services and Hunting

Heavy and Civil Engineering Construction Health Care and Social Assistance

Transport Equipment Manufacturing

Rental and Hiring Services (except Real Estate)

Arts and Recreation Services

Information Media Services

Education and Training

Other Services

Mining

https://www.productivity.govt.nz/competition explorer/measure

10 20 30 NFW 7FALAND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION Te Waihanaa

30

40

2016

Findings (2)

- Heavy and civil construction productivity grows more slowly than building construction productivity
- Construction productivity growth accelerated after the GFC
- These differences seem to reflect multifactor productivity growth rather than capital deepening



International comparisons

We compare *growth* in construction labour productivity rather than *levels* to avoid obvious issues with currency conversions and differing definitions of hours worked and capital stock

We gathered industry productivity data for 34 OECD countries from several sources:

- National statistics agencies (NZ, Aus)
- OECD.Stat (30 countries)
- EU-KLEMS (2 countries; consistent with OECD.Stat)

We focused on comparisons over the last two business cycles (2000-2008; 2008-2020)



Neither exceptional nor dismal



NEW ZEALAND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION Te Waihanga

Neither exceptional nor dismal





The post-GFC productivity acceleration?

Changes between 2000-2008 and 2008-2020 periods





Why such large variations?

Why does (measured) construction productivity growth vary so dramatically across the OECD?

We considered three types of potential explanations:

- **Market characteristics**: Catch-up growth opportunities; market size; regulation of construction [labour market regulation?]
- **Construction market dynamics**: Changes in demand or composition of construction output; boom-bust cycles
- **Methodology**: Differing approaches to measuring quality/price changes may produce different productivity growth estimates



Correlates of faster labour productivity growth

Model		Long difference (2000-2020)	Business cycles (2000-2008 and 2008-2020)
Outcome variable		Average annual change in labour productivity	Average annual change in labour productivity
Explanatory variables			
Market	Per-capita GDP at start of period	-0.017***	-0.023***
characteristics	(natural log)	(0.004)	(0.006)
	Population at start of period (natural	-0.005***	-0.004***
	log)	(0.001)	(0.001)
	World Bank construction permit score,	0.0005**	0.0007***
	averaged over period (0-100)	(0.0002)	(0.0002)
Construction	Average annual change in real house	-0.072	-0.103**
market	price	(0.090)	(0.050)
dynamics	Construction output growth volatility	-0.042	-0.032
	(standard deviation)	(0.045)	(0.056)
	Average annual change in road	-0.227	-0.862***
	investment share	(0.297)	(0.325)
Methodology	Number of PPI methods in line with	-0.002***	-0.002***
	OECD preferred approach (0-8)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Constant		0.241***	0.274***
		(0.052)	(0.071)
Observations		31	56
R2		0.672	0.464



Impact of a move across interquartile range



NEW ZEALAND INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION Te Waihanga









 $-2.5\% - 2.0\% - 1.5\% - 1.0\% - 0.5\% \ 0.0\% \ 0.5\% \ 1.0\% \ 1.5\%$

Impact of a move across interquartile range



Regulation and productivity growth

FIGURE 4. SPENDING PER MILE AND HIGHWAY WAGE AND MATERIALS PRICES



Notes: This figure shows Interstate spending per mile from our 6-year periods, along with the construction hourly wage (in blue; BLS), construction compensation per full time employee (dashed blue; BEA), and materials prices (yellow; BLS). We index all figures to 100 in 1962.



Sources: Brooks and Liscow (2019)

Regulation and productivity growth





Notes: This figure shows Interstate spending per mile from our 6-year periods, along with the construction hourly wage (in blue; BLS), construction compensation per full time employee (dashed blue; BEA), and materials prices

(vellow; BLS). We index all figures to 100 in 1962.



98



Sources: Brooks and Liscow (2019) https://slideplayer.com/slide/5984668/

Regulation and productivity growth

AND AMENDMENTS

LAWS

OF NUMBER

CUMULATIVE

1890

1900

1910

1920

1930

1940





Notes: This figure shows Interstate spending per mile from our 6-year periods, along with the construction hourly wage (in blue; BLS), construction compensation per full time employee (dashed blue; BEA), and materials prices (vellow; BLS). We index all figures to 100 in 1962.

Federal Environmental Laws & **Executive Orders Affecting** 70 -**Transportation** 60 50 40 CERCI 4 30 20 10

1950

YEAR

1960

1970

1980

1990

2000

2010

98

Sources: Brooks and Liscow (2019) https://slideplayer.com/slide/5984668/



Findings (3)

- New Zealand's construction labour productivity growth performance is middling by OECD standards
- Many OECD countries experienced faster construction productivity growth after the GFC
- Cross-country regressions highlight some factors that might matter for construction productivity growth – and others we can probably ignore



Conclusion: More questions than answers

- Since the GFC, construction productivity growth has accelerated in many OECD countries, including NZ. **Why?**
- New Zealand appears to be an above-average performer on construction productivity growth. **Does this seem right?**
- Infrastructure construction appears to be the worst-performing part of the construction sector. What could be causing this?



Thank you for your time

peter.nunns@tewaihanga.govt.nz

