

# **DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES**

DP13428

**THE FALL IN UK POTENTIAL OUTPUT  
DUE TO THE FINANCIAL CRISIS: A  
MUCH BIGGER ESTIMATE**

Nicholas Crafts

**ECONOMIC HISTORY AND  
MACROECONOMICS AND GROWTH**

# THE FALL IN UK POTENTIAL OUTPUT DUE TO THE FINANCIAL CRISIS: A MUCH BIGGER ESTIMATE

*Nicholas Crafts*

Discussion Paper DP13428  
Published 04 January 2019  
Submitted 02 January 2019

Centre for Economic Policy Research  
33 Great Sutton Street, London EC1V 0DX, UK  
Tel: +44 (0)20 7183 8801  
[www.cepr.org](http://www.cepr.org)

This Discussion Paper is issued under the auspices of the Centre's research programme in **ECONOMIC HISTORY AND MACROECONOMICS AND GROWTH**. Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of the Centre for Economic Policy Research. Research disseminated by CEPR may include views on policy, but the Centre itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Centre for Economic Policy Research was established in 1983 as an educational charity, to promote independent analysis and public discussion of open economies and the relations among them. It is pluralist and non-partisan, bringing economic research to bear on the analysis of medium- and long-run policy questions.

These Discussion Papers often represent preliminary or incomplete work, circulated to encourage discussion and comment. Citation and use of such a paper should take account of its provisional character.

Copyright: Nicholas Crafts

# THE FALL IN UK POTENTIAL OUTPUT DUE TO THE FINANCIAL CRISIS: A MUCH BIGGER ESTIMATE

## Abstract

Conventional estimates suggest that the 2007-9 financial crisis reduced UK potential output by 3.8 to 7.5 per cent of GDP. This implied a need for fiscal tightening as the structural budget deficit had increased considerably. The austerity that followed led to the rise of UKIP, the EU referendum and the vote for Brexit. Brexit will reduce potential output by somewhere between 3.9 and 8.7 per cent of GDP. Thus, it can be argued that the total fall in UK potential output due to the banking crisis is approximately double the conventional estimate.

JEL Classification: F15, G01, H12, O47

Keywords: austerity, Brexit, financial crisis, Potential Output

Nicholas Crafts - n.crafts@warwick.ac.uk  
*University of Warwick and CEPR*

# **The Fall in UK Potential Output due to the Financial Crisis: a Much Bigger Estimate**

**Nicholas Crafts**

**CAGE, University of Warwick**

**January 2019**

## **Abstract**

Conventional estimates suggest that the 2007-9 financial crisis reduced UK potential output by 3.8 to 7.5 per cent of GDP. This implied a need for fiscal tightening as the structural budget deficit had increased considerably. The austerity that followed led to the rise of UKIP, the EU referendum and the vote for Brexit. Brexit will reduce potential output by somewhere between 3.9 and 8.7 per cent of GDP. Thus, it can be argued that the total fall in UK potential output due to the banking crisis is approximately double the conventional estimate.

Keywords: austerity, Brexit, financial crisis, potential output.

JEL Classification: F15, G01, H12, O47.

## **I. Introduction**

Economists generally believe that both the banking crisis of ten years ago and the impending Brexit will damage the UK's productive capacity relative to the counterfactual that neither happened. These shocks are analysed as unfortunate but separate events. This paper argues that far from being unrelated the banking crisis and Brexit are intimately connected with the fiscal costs of the former precipitating the vote in favour of the latter. If this claim is accepted, it is reasonable to suppose that the total impact of the financial crisis on potential output is of the order of twice the conventional estimate.

It is widely accepted that banking crises have a lasting negative impact on the level of GDP that the economy can produce at full capacity, i.e., on potential output. This effect comes through decreases in capital, human capital and total factor productivity. A conventional estimate might be that the crisis of ten years ago probably reduced the level of potential output in the UK by somewhere between 3.8 and 7.5 per cent. This would account for part, but by no means all, of the 'productivity puzzle'.

There are typically severe fiscal implications of a banking crisis which will be reflected in a significant rise in the structural budget deficit and in the public debt to GDP ratio; by 2010 the UK was in just this position. Damage will be done in the short term by the impact of recession on the public finances and by the costs of rescuing the banks, and in the long term by lower tax revenue consequent on the fall in productive potential. A period of painful fiscal consolidation ('austerity') will typically be required to restore fiscal sustainability.

Prolonged austerity is likely to have political ramifications. Losers can be expected to protest. After the UK fiscal squeeze began in 2010 it seems that a large part of the protest vote went to UKIP and then continued into voting Leave in the EU referendum in June 2016. Without this protest vote, Leave would not have won and without the surge in support for UKIP there would not have been a referendum. So Brexit can be seen as a consequence of the fiscal costs of the financial crisis.

There is a near consensus that Brexit will adversely affect the level of potential output compared with the counterfactual of remaining in the EU. The size of this effect depends on the type of Brexit that takes place and is quite difficult to estimate. That said, the mainstream literature suggests that it could easily be of a similar magnitude to the impact of the banking crisis, perhaps within the range 3.9 to 8.7 percent of GDP. If it seems reasonable to see Brexit as an outcome of the financial crisis, then the total (direct and indirect) loss in the level of potential output from that crisis would be between 7.7 and 16.2 per cent of GDP.

This argument is developed in the paper, as follows. In section II, the direct effect of the banking crisis on potential output is quantified using the best available estimates from the literature. In section III, the fiscal consequences of the crisis as seen at the time and the associated changes in fiscal policy compared with pre-crisis expectations are reviewed. The case for considering post-crisis austerity as a crucial factor in the victory of Leave in the EU referendum is developed in section IV. Estimates of the impact of Brexit on the level of potential output are discussed in section V. Section VI concludes.

## **II. Estimates of the Impact of the Banking Crisis on UK Potential Output**

Banking crises can be expected to have an adverse impact on productive capacity such that the level of potential output is permanently reduced compared with a business-as-usual counterfactual. Thinking in terms of a production function or growth accounting, there may be direct adverse effects on capital inputs as investment is interrupted, on human capital if skills are lost or restructuring makes them redundant, on labour inputs through increases in equilibrium unemployment, and on TFP if R & D is cut back or innovative firms cannot get finance. It is, of course, possible that the trend rate of growth is adversely affected but the general assumption is that this is not the case.<sup>1</sup>

In Table 1 several estimates of the impact of the banking crisis on the level of potential output are reported.<sup>2</sup> The papers by Furceri and Mourougane (2012) and by Oulton and Sebastia-Barriel (2017) contain econometric estimates of the average effect of past banking crises. The number in the table from the former authors is for a ‘severe crisis’ in an OECD country while that from the latter is derived from their estimate that the level of potential GDP per capita is reduced by 1.8 per cent for each year that the crisis lasts.

The papers by Dicks (2010) and by Ollivaud and Turner (2015) relate specifically to the UK. Dicks based his estimate on research by the IMF which tried to identify the circumstances in which a banking crisis would have a relatively large effect. He developed a scorecard which suggested that the UK would experience an above average hit. Ollivaud and Turner obtain their estimate by comparing potential output in 2014 with what would have been expected on the pre-crisis trend in labour productivity with some adjustments to allow for factors affecting equilibrium employment. Their approach takes account of a marked slowing in trend labour productivity growth prior to the crisis but is probably an upper bound since factors other than the banking crisis may have played a part.<sup>3</sup>

The range of the estimates in Table 1 is from 3.8 to 7.5 per cent of GDP. Each of them has to be viewed with some caution but nevertheless they probably represent the best guesses that can be taken from recent research. As will be seen in the next section, the fiscal response to the crisis made similar assumptions.

### **III. Fiscal Implications of the UK Banking Crisis**

If the level of potential output falls and in future will be permanently lower than previously expected, then the structural budget deficit as a share of GDP increases because tax revenues will be lower and government outlays will be higher. In the UK case, the structural budget deficit probably increased as a percentage of GDP by slightly more than the level of potential output fell as a result of the banking crisis. In the absence of a policy response, public borrowing will rise permanently

---

<sup>1</sup> See, for example, OECD (2012) which gives projections for post-crisis growth in OECD economies. The assumption explicitly stated was that the crisis would reduce the level of potential output by 2.5 per cent on average but have no effect on the post-crisis trend rate of growth.

<sup>2</sup> It should be noted that these are comparisons based on a zero output gap in each case. These do not include the actual GDP losses which accrue during the post-crisis recession before the output gap is closed.

<sup>3</sup> In a companion paper, it is reported that trend productivity growth estimated using an HP-filter method was only 0.7 per cent in 2007 compared with 2.1 per cent in 2000 (Ollivaud et al., 2016). Discussions of the ‘productivity puzzle’, for example by ONS (2018), typically measure the shortfall in actual labour productivity compared with an assumption that pre-crisis trend productivity growth was around 2 per cent per year. In any case, the levels adjustment in potential output may be a contributing factor to this puzzle but is far from a complete explanation.

relative to GDP and this may imply a loss of fiscal sustainability with the public debt to GDP ratio rising steadily over time.

This analysis was echoed in the 2010 IFS Green Budget in which it was suggested that the post-crisis increase in the structural budget deficit might be around 7 per cent of GDP and a projection of the public debt to GDP ratio in the absence of policy action showed it increasing from below 40 per cent pre-crisis to 120 per cent in the mid-2020s and 160 per cent by 2040 (Chote et al., 2010). HM Treasury accepted that the structural budget deficit had increased markedly and that there was a need for fiscal tightening, as is reported in Table 2. Both the outgoing Labour government and the incoming Coalition government accepted the case for serious fiscal consolidation to maintain fiscal sustainability although the parties differed somewhat on its composition, size and timing.

Austerity was a bi-partisan policy response to the fiscal implications of the banking crisis without which it would not have been instigated by either party. In the event, the austerity programme relied very heavily on cuts to public expenditure which comprised 89 per cent of the fiscal consolidation. In turn, a substantial part of these cuts were implemented through reductions in grants to local authorities which fell by 36.3 per cent on average between 2009/10 and 2015/16. Across local authorities the reductions in public spending per person ranged from 46.3 to 6.2 per cent with the most deprived areas experiencing relatively large cuts (Innes and Tetlow, 2015).

#### **IV. Austerity and Votes for Leave**

The announcement that there would be a referendum on EU membership if the Conservatives won the 2015 General Election was made in January 2013. It was a response to the perceived threat posed by UKIP to the Conservatives that by taking votes disproportionately from them rather than Labour or the Liberal Democrats a significant number of their seats would be lost. At the time, almost 20 per cent of those who had voted Conservative in 2010 were supporting UKIP and over 60 per cent of UKIP supporters had voted Conservative in 2010 (Clarke et al., 2017). A survey of Conservative Party members revealed that 58 per cent were possible or likely UKIP voters (Webb and Bale, 2014).

The starting point for an analysis that links austerity to voting for Leave in the referendum is the observation that across districts the vote share for Leave is closely correlated with the share of the vote for UKIP in the 2014 European elections. A simple regression line has an intercept of about 25 per cent and a slope close to 1 with an  $R^2$  of 0.75 (Becker et al., 2017). This suggests that an investigation of the growth in support for UKIP over time might be instructive not only in explaining why there was a referendum but also why Leave won.

The rise of populist-right parties like UKIP is often theorized to come either from grievances about economic marginalization and immigration or from disillusionment with the performance of mainstream political parties (Clarke et al., 2017). The analysis in Fetzer (2018) neatly combines these claims by finding that the latter interacted with the former. He notes that, after flat-lining for some years, support for UKIP in local council elections rose strongly after 2010 in areas with weak socio-economic fundamentals. His pooled difference-in-differences analysis of UKIP's vote share in elections between 2000 and 2015 shows a strong impact from post-2010 local austerity which hit deprived areas with high receipts of benefits relatively hard. When the analysis is repeated using year fixed effects the impact of austerity rises steeply between 2011 and 2015. The effects are

sizeable: for a district experiencing the average austerity shock UKIP's vote share would rise by 3.58 percentage points based on the pooled estimate and 11.51 percentage points based on the estimate for 2015. Given the tight relationship between the vote shares of UKIP and Leave, these results suggest that Remain would probably have won in the absence of austerity.<sup>4</sup>

This inference is strengthened by two further findings. First, similar results for the impact of local austerity are found for an individual-level analysis of support for UKIP based on survey data; also 87 per cent of the individuals who expressed support for UKIP in the most recent survey before the referendum would support Leave (Fetzer, 2018). Second, a recent opinion poll with a large (20,000) sample shows a significant swing from Leave to Remain (6.3 percentage points) since the referendum. The single most important correlate of geographic variation in this swing away from Leave is exposure to austerity post 2010 (Alabrese and Fetzer, 2018). This suggests that marginal Leave supporters in 2016 were protest voters motivated by austerity rather than committed Eurosceptics.

Clearly, in principle, fiscal consolidation could have been designed differently; for example, increased taxation could have played a much bigger part. Also, the Conservatives winning a majority in 2015 as fiscal consolidation was still ongoing was something of a surprise. As it turned out, however, the sequence of events seems clear – the financial crisis led to an austerity programme which boosted support for UKIP enough to make the Conservatives promise a referendum and antagonized left-behind voters whose protest votes were enough to tip the balance for Leave. So, Brexit is a legacy of the banking crisis although it was not an inevitable consequence.

## **V. Mainstream Estimates of the Effect of Brexit on Potential Output**

The general assumption in studies of the economic impact of Brexit is that it will entail an increase in trade costs for the UK. In turn, this will imply a reduction in trade volumes and, accordingly, an adverse impact on the level of productivity and thus on the level of GDP relative to the counterfactual of staying in the EU.<sup>5</sup> The magnitudes of these effects depend on the details of the new trading arrangements that are assumed to supersede EU membership and on model specifications. A 'soft Brexit', for example, the UK leaving the EU but staying in the European Economic Area would be expected to have a smaller negative effect than a 'hard Brexit', for example leaving without a deal and trading on a WTO-rules basis.

Three caveats should be borne in mind when considering the estimates in Table 4. First, a standard way to estimate the impact on trade volumes is to use a gravity model and to compare trade flows between pairs of countries which are EU members and pairs which are non-members. This method does not allow separate estimates for an ex EU member so, strictly speaking the impact on trade of leaving the EU is not known. Second, no allowance is made for the effects of post-Brexit reforms to

---

<sup>4</sup> Table 3 shows that the 20 districts most affected by cuts in tax credits generally gave big support to Leave – more than 60% vote shares in 15 of the 20. Tax credits are a benefit that matters a lot to areas with weak socio-economic fundamentals. This illustrates Fetzer's argument.

<sup>5</sup> These are the assumptions made by the vast majority of studies. Erken et al. (2018) argue that Brexit would reduce the rate of growth (rather than the level) of GDP by 0.8 per cent per year and thus have a much bigger long run impact. Minford (2015) predicts a positive impact on GDP largely because Brexit will mean escaping onerous future regulation which would lower GDP substantially if the UK stayed in. I disregard both these estimates.



supply-side policies once freed from the constraints of EU membership. The direction of any such effect is not clear but might even be to exacerbate the output losses from Brexit by facilitating a return to the damaging interventionist policies of the 1970s (Crafts, 2018). Third, of course, many permutations of the design of a trade agreement are possible so the range of estimates in column (2) is perhaps too narrow.

Membership of the EEA seems unlikely under the present government. In that case, the TA and WTO columns of Table 4 can be seen as representative of mainstream estimates of the impact of Brexit on the level of UK potential output when adjustment is complete perhaps after 10 years or so. The range is from -3.9 to -8.7 per cent of GDP.

This implies that a new structural budget deficit would emerge even allowing for the ending of the UK's net budgetary contribution to the EU. Based on the arithmetic in Emmerson et al. (2016) this would amount to about 5.7 per cent of GDP if a hard (WTO) Brexit reduced potential GDP by 8.7 per cent.<sup>6</sup> This would bring a whole new dimension to the concept of 'self-defeating austerity'. A quest to eliminate a structural deficit estimated by HM Treasury at around 5 per cent of GDP in 2010 would have given rise to an even bigger one down the line.

## **VI. Conclusions**

The 2007-9 banking crisis had an adverse impact on the level of UK potential output. A survey of the literature suggests that the magnitude was probably in the range 3.8 to 7.5 per cent of GDP. Brexit is also generally predicted to have a negative effect on the level of potential output relative to the counterfactual of staying in the EU. Here the impact will depend on the details of new trade arrangements with a trade agreement expected to be less damaging than a hard Brexit. The range suggested in the literature is from 3.9 to 6.2 per cent of GDP for the former and from 5.5 to 8.7 per cent of GDP for the latter.

These two misfortunes are usually seen as unrelated. In fact, there is a close connection between them which runs through the fiscal consolidation that had to be undertaken in the wake of the financial crisis. The pain of austerity promoted the rise of UKIP, a referendum on EU membership, and a win for Leave. None of these outcomes was by any means certain ex ante but they were the realised results of the policy response to the banking crisis. If Brexit is seen as an outcome of the banking crisis, then the total loss of potential output from that debacle is approximately doubled and lies in the range 7.7 to 16.2 per cent of GDP.

The implication is that, if the risks of unfortunate policy responses following a crisis are taken into account, there are even stronger reasons to regulate the banking system strictly, in particular to ensure that it has adequate levels of loss absorbing equity capital. Miles et al. (2013) show that the social benefit-cost ratio of reducing leverage substantially is high in any case. The events of the last 10 years indicate that it is even higher than they thought.

---

<sup>6</sup> Emmerson et al. (2016) estimated that a decline of 1 per cent in GDP due to Brexit would increase new public sector borrowing by 0.7 per cent of GDP and that a reduction of 0.6 per cent in GDP would approximately cancel out the improvement in the public finances from ending the UK's net budgetary contribution. So, the net effect of 'hard Brexit' would be  $(8.7 - 0.6) \times 0.7 = 5.67$  per cent of GDP.

## References

- Alabrese, E. and Fetzer, T. (2018), 'Who is NOT voting for Brexit anymore?', University of Warwick CAGE Working Paper No. 394.
- Beatty, C. and Fothergill, S. (2016), *The Uneven Impact of Welfare Reform*. Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research, Sheffield Hallam University.
- Becker, S. O., Fetzer, T. and Novy, D. (2017), 'Who voted for Brexit? A comprehensive district-level analysis', *Economic Policy*, vol. 39, pp. 601-650.
- Chote, R., Crawford, R., Emmerson, C. and Tetlow, G. (2010), 'Fiscal tightening: why and how?', in R. Chote, C. Emmerson and J. Shaw (eds.), *The IFS Green Budget: February 2010*, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.
- Clarke, H. D., Goodwin, M. and Whiteley, P. (2017), *Brexit: Why Britain Voted to Leave the European Union*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crafts, N. (2018), 'Industrial policy in the context of Brexit', *Fiscal Studies*, vol. 39, pp. 685-706.
- Dicks, M. (2010), 'The UK's productive capacity: surveying the damage', in R. Chote, C. Emmerson and J. Shaw (eds.), *The IFS Green Budget: February 2010*, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.
- Ebell, M. and Warren, J. (2016), 'The long-term economic impact of leaving the EU', *National Institute Economic Review*, vol. 236, pp. 121-138.
- Emmerson, C., Johnson, P., Mitchell, I. and Phillips, D. (2016), *Brexit and the UK's Public Finances*, Report No. 116, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.
- Emmerson, C. and Tetlow, G. (2015), 'Public finances under the coalition', in C. Emmerson, P. Johnson and R. Joyce (eds.), *IFS Green Budget 2015*, London: Institute for Fiscal Studies.
- Erken, H., Hayat, R., Prins, C., Heijmerikx, M. and de Vreede, I. (2018), 'Measuring the permanent costs of Brexit', *National Institute Economic Review*, vol. 244, pp. R46-R55.
- Fetzer, T. (2018), 'Did austerity cause Brexit?', University of Warwick CAGE Working Paper No. 381.
- Furceri, D. and Mourougane, A. (2012), 'The effect of financial crises on potential output: new empirical evidence from OECD countries', *Journal of Macroeconomics*, vol. 34, pp. 822-832.
- Hantzche, A., Kara, A. and Young, G. (2018), *The Economic Effects of the Government's Proposed Brexit Deal*, London: NIESR.
- HM Government (2018), *EU Exit: Long-Term Economic Analysis*. Cm 9742.
- HM Treasury (2016), *HM Treasury Analysis: the Long-Term Economic Impact of EU Membership and the Alternatives*. Cm 9250.
- Innes, D. and Tetlow, G. (2015), 'Delivering fiscal squeeze by cutting local government spending', *Fiscal Studies*, 36, 303-325.

- Levell, P., Sampson, T., Menon, A. and Portes, J. (2018), *The Economic Consequences of the Brexit Deal*, London: UK in a Changing Europe.
- Miles, D., Yang, J. and Marcheggiano, G. (2013), 'Optimal bank capital', *Economic Journal*, vol. 123, pp. 1-37.
- Minford, P. (2015), *Should Britain Leave the EU?*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- OECD (2012), *Economic Outlook*.
- Office for National Statistics (2018), *Labour Productivity UK: January to March 2018*.
- Ollivaud, P., Guillemette, Y. and Turner, D. (2016), 'Links between weak investment and the slowdown in productivity and potential output growth across the OECD', OECD Economics Department, Working Paper No. 1304.
- Ollivaud, P. and Turner, D. (2015), 'The effect of the global financial crisis on OECD potential output', *OECD Journal: Economic Studies*, Volume 2014, pp. 41-60.
- Oulton, N. and Sebastia-Barriel, M. (2017), 'Effects of financial crises on productivity, capital and employment', *Review of Income and Wealth*, vol. 63, pp. S90-S112.
- Rojas-Ramagosa, H. (2016), *Trade Effects of Brexit for the Netherlands*, CPB: The Hague.
- Webb, P. and Bale, T. (2014), 'Why do Tories defect to UKIP? Conservative Party members and the temptation of the populist radical right', *Political Studies*, vol. 62, pp. 961-970.

**Table 1. Estimates of the Impact of the Banking Crisis on the Level of UK Potential Output (%GDP)**

Furceri & Mourougane (2012)	-3.8
Oulton & Sebastia-Barriel (2017)	-5.4
Ollivaud & Turner (2015)	-6.9
Dicks (2010)	-7.5

*Sources:* see text.

**Table 2. Fiscal Implications of the Banking Crisis (%GDP)**

	Increase in Structural Deficit since Pre-Crisis	Planned Fiscal Tightening
March 2010 Budget	5.7	5.8 (by 2016/17)
November 2010 Autumn Statement	6.0	7.0 (by 2015/16)
December 2014 Autumn Statement	8.4	10.7 (by 2019/20)

*Source:* Emmerson and Tetlow (2015)

**Table 3. Districts Which Experienced Largest Cuts in Tax Credits per Person**

Districts	Leave Vote (%)
Blackpool	67.46
Blackburn with Darwen	56.34
Barking and Dagenham	62.44
Peterborough	60.89
Bradford	54.23
Burnley	66.61
Knowsley	51.56
Sandwell	66.72
Oldham	60.86
Hull	67.62
Pendle	63.15
Thanet	63.85
Middlesbrough	65.48
Leicester	48.92
Boston	75.56
Birmingham	50.42
Hyndburn	66.19
Rochdale	60.07
Corby	64.25
Stoke-on-Trent	69.36

*Note:* districts are listed in rank order of cuts. Tax credits are an important part of total cuts and are strongly associated with weak fundamentals.

*Source:* Beatty and Fothergill (2016)

**Table 4. Estimates of the Long-Term Impact of Brexit on the Level of UK Potential Output (%GDP)**

	WTO	TA	EEA
Ebell and Warren (2016)	-7.8		
Hantzsche et al. (2018)	-5.5	-3.9	
Levell et al. (2018)	-8.1	-4.9	
Rojas-Ramagosa (2016)	-8.7	-5.9	
HM Treasury (2016)	-7.5	-6.2	-3.8
HM Government (2018)	-7.6	-4.9	-1.4

*Note:* all estimates include long-term impact on level of productivity but do not take account of any impact from migration.

*Sources:* as listed above.