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Labor Productivity Data are Notoriously Volatile

U.S. Labor Productivity Growth, 1950-Present

Percent, Annual Rate

Note: Data reflect quarterly releases of labor productivity for the nonfarm business sector. Shading denotes recession. Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics.
Three Periods of U.S. Productivity Growth

U.S. Labor Productivity Growth

15-Year Centered Moving Average of Annual Percentage Growth

- **1953–1973:** 2.9 percent per year
- **1973–1995:** 1.5 percent per year
- **1995–2014:** 2.2 percent per year

Note: This figure—and all subsequent references to U.S. labor productivity reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in these remarks—references real output per hour worked in the private nonfarm business sector (excluding government enterprises). The dotted lines divide the last 60 years into three periods that broadly reflect three "episodes" in productivity growth for the private nonfarm business sector.

Three Periods of U.S. Productivity Growth

Labor Productivity Growth, 1950-2014

15-Year Centered Moving Average of Annual Percentage Growth

Source: Conference Board; CEA calculations.
Most G-7 Nations Have Seen Declining Productivity Since the 1970s

Labor Productivity Growth, 1950-2014

15-Year Centered Moving Average of Annual Percentage Growth

Source: Conference Board; CEA calculations.
All G-7 Economies Have Seen Slower Productivity Growth in this Recovery

Labor Productivity Growth in the G-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>1950-2007</th>
<th>2010-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For all nations except the United States, productivity growth rates are those reported in the Conference Board Total Economy database; for the United States, the Bureau of Labor Statistics’ productivity series for the private nonfarm business sector is used.

Source: Conference Board; CEA calculations.
Most Historical Variation in U.S. Productivity Growth is Accounted for by TFP

Sources of Productivity Growth Over Selected Periods

Percentage Points, Annual Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Total Factor Productivity</th>
<th>Capital Intensity</th>
<th>Labor Composition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948-1973</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-1995</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995-2014</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948-2014</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Displayed series are the contributions to labor productivity growth in the private nonfarm business sector.
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; CEA calculations.
But the Recent Slowdown is Mostly the Result of Capital Deepening

Sources of Productivity Growth, 1948-2007 vs. 2010-2014

Percentage Points, Annual Rate

1948-2007 vs. 2010-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>1948-2007</th>
<th>2010-2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Factor Productivity</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Intensity</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Composition</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Displayed series are the contributions to labor productivity growth in the private nonfarm business sector.
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; CEA calculations.
The Productivity Slowdowns in Canada, Germany, and Japan Have Also Been Investment-Driven

**a) Sources of Productivity Growth: Canada**

- **1985-2007**
  - Capital Intensity: 0.6
  - Total Factor Productivity & Labor Composition: 0.6
  - Total Factor Productivity and Labor Composition: 1.2

- **2010-2013**
  - Capital Intensity: 0.3
  - Total Factor Productivity & Labor Composition: 0.6
  - Total Factor Productivity and Labor Composition: 0.9

**b) Sources of Productivity Growth: Germany**

- **1985-2007**
  - Capital Intensity: 1.4
  - Total Factor Productivity & Labor Composition: 0.1
  - Total Factor Productivity and Labor Composition: 2.5

- **2010-2013**
  - Capital Intensity: 0.7
  - Total Factor Productivity & Labor Composition: 0.9
  - Total Factor Productivity and Labor Composition: 1.6

**c) Sources of Productivity Growth: Japan**

- **1985-2007**
  - Capital Intensity: 1.3
  - Total Factor Productivity & Labor Composition: 1.2
  - Total Factor Productivity and Labor Composition: 2.5

- **2010-2013**
  - Capital Intensity: 0.8
  - Total Factor Productivity & Labor Composition: 0.8
  - Total Factor Productivity and Labor Composition: 1.6

Note: Total labor productivity growth and total multifactor productivity growth (including labor composition changes) for the displayed nations are reported by the OECD. The contribution of capital deepening is inferred as the difference between the two.

Source: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
But Lower TFP Growth Explains Most of the Slowdown in France, Italy, and the United Kingdom

- **d) Sources of Productivity Growth: United Kingdom**
  - Total Factor Productivity & Labor Composition: 1.4 (1985-2007), -0.3 (2010-2013)
  - Capital Intensity: 0.8 (1985-2007), 0.2 (2010-2013)

- **e) Sources of Productivity Growth: France**
  - Total Factor Productivity & Labor Composition: 2.2 (1985-2007), -0.1 (2010-2013)
  - Capital Intensity: 0.8 (1985-2007), 0.4 (2010-2013)

- **f) Sources of Productivity Growth: Italy**
  - Total Factor Productivity & Labor Composition: 1.2 (1985-2007), -0.3 (2010-2013)
  - Capital Intensity: 0.7 (1985-2007), 0.5 (2010-2013)

Note: Total labor productivity growth and total multifactor productivity growth (including labor composition changes) for the displayed nations are reported by the OECD. The contribution of capital deepening is inferred as the difference between the two. Source: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
Capital Deepening Has Slowed Across the G-7

Capital Deepening Has Slowed Across the G-7

Percent Increase in Capital Intensity, Annual Rate
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Note: Capital intensity is defined as capital services per hours worked of all persons. Capital deepening is the percent increase in capital intensity.
Source: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development; CEA calculations.
Labor Productivity and TFP Usually Move Together, but Diverged Around the Crisis

Labor Productivity and Major Components
Percent Change, Annual Rate (5-Year Centered Moving Average)

Note: Capital intensity is defined as capital services per hour worked.
Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; CEA calculations.
TFP is a Better Predictor of Future Productivity Growth After Adjusting for Factor Utilization

Correlation of Five-Year Productivity Growth with Prior Five Years' Growth in Potential Predictors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Predictors (5-Year Periods)</th>
<th>Correlation Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity Growth</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Factor Productivity Growth</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization-Adjusted TFP Growth</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Deepening</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The displayed correlation coefficients result from the comparison of a five-year moving average of labor productivity growth with a five-year lag of five-year moving averages of the potential predictors. Accordingly, they reflect the ability of the predictors averaged from years t to t+4 to predict labor productivity growth from years t+5 to t+9.

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics; Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco; CEA calculations.
Trailing Averages of Productivity Growth are Better Predictors When the Historical Window is Longer

Note: This analysis follows the general methodology adopted in Goldman Sachs Research. 2014. "US Daily: Trend Productivity Growth: 2% Still Seems About Right (Mericle).” The displayed values are the average absolute difference between trailing averages of growth in the given productivity series (for the given horizon) and averages of the next five years’ growth in the given series, from 1988 to 2008. This is the longest period over which the calculation can be performed for a forty-year time horizon.

OECD: Firms at the Productivity Frontier Have Seen Continued Robust Productivity Growth

Note: These figures are adapted from the OECD’s 2015 work The Future of Productivity. “Frontier firms” corresponds to the average labor productivity of the 100 globally most productive firms in each 2-digit sector. “Non-frontier firms” is the average of all other firms. “All firms” is the sector total.
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