#### Duration Dependence and Business Cycles

Ismail Baydur $^1$  Jianhuan Xu $^2$ 

<sup>1</sup>Singapore Management University <sup>2</sup>Singapore Management University

February 2018

## Motivation

 Fact: Unemployment duration shows strong negative duration dependence in the US data. Job Finding Rates by Unemployment Duration



▲ロト ▲圖 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ▲ 国 ▶ ● 国 ● のへ(で)

# Motivation

- Fact: Unemployment duration shows strong negative duration in the US data.
- What explains this feature?
  - Composition effect or Unobserved Heterogeneity: Good types find work quickly and leave the unemployment.
  - Skill depreciation: Workers lose their skills while unemployed.
  - Signal extraction: Firms infer about an applicant's ability by looking at his/her unemployment duration.

• Our goal is to decompose these potential channels.

# Our Goal

- Decompose these channels in a random matching model with aggregate shocks and learning about the type of unemployed.
- Identification:
  - 1. Skill depreciation is independent of the state of the economy.
  - 2. Signal extraction requires some sort of unobserved heterogeneity and is weaker in recessions (Kroft et al. (2014)).

Many struggle to find a job during a recession.

$$\mathsf{resume}_{t+1} = \mathsf{resume}_t - \gamma - \Delta h_t$$

- $\gamma$ : state independent: skill depreciation.
- $\Delta h_t$ : cyclical: difference in job finding rates of high and low ability workers

### From Recession to Boom: Comparison of Two Cohorts

hazard rate



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

## Preview

- Random matching model with aggregate shocks and learning about the type of unemployed.
  - Is matching efficiency pro-cyclical? Trending downward?
    - Barnichon and Figura (2017): Unemployment duration explains much of the fluctuations in matching efficiency (relative to a standard matching function).
    - Hall and Schulhofer-Wohl (2017): Matching efficiency is trending downward.
    - Sources of duration dependence?
  - Ross (2017) studies Bayesian updating in a (steady-state) directed search model.
  - Alvarez, Borovicka, and Shimer (2017): Decompose duration dependence in an optimal stopping time model.
- Counter-factual analysis:
  - 1. Shutting down statistical discrimination improves average job finding rate substantially.
  - 2. Job finding rates improve for long term unemployed only if both statistical discrimination and skill decay are eliminated.

## Model: Overview

- Set up in continuous time.
- Labor market is frictional and segmented (denoted by i), e.g. by occupation.
- ► Worker types (observable) are denoted by *j*, e.g. age, education, gender etc. No on-the-job-search.
- ► (Random) Matching technology: total matches are equal to m(v<sub>it</sub>, u<sub>it</sub>) = η<sub>i</sub>v<sup>1-σ</sup><sub>it</sub>u<sup>σ</sup><sub>it</sub>.
  - Define market tightness:  $\theta_{it} = \frac{v_{it}}{u_{it}}$ .
  - Contact rate for workers:  $\theta_{it}q(\theta_{it}) = \eta_i \theta_{it}^{1-\sigma}$
  - Contact rate for firms:  $q(\theta_{it}) = \eta_i \theta_{it}^{-\sigma}$ .
- Aggregate shocks,  $z_t$ , follow a first-order Markov process.

# Model: Employment Decisions

- ► Two types of workers (unobservable) in each segment i: s<sub>ji</sub> = {H, L}, e.g. skill.
- Idiosyncratic productivity shocks, ω<sub>jit</sub>, follow a first-order Markov process and are skill dependent.
- $\Omega_H(\omega',\omega)$  first order stochastically dominates  $\Omega_L(\omega',\omega)$ .
- Firms observe the workers' resume: r<sub>jit</sub>, probability of being a high type.
- ▶ Upon matching, worker-firm pair draws a match specific quality, q<sup>c</sup><sub>ji</sub>, that remains constant over the course of employment.
- q<sup>c</sup>∼N(µ, 1) for the high productive worker and q<sup>c</sup>∼N(−µ, 1) for the low productive worker: High productive workers draw match specific shocks from a distribution that first-order stochastically dominates the one for low productive workers.

- ロ ト - 4 回 ト - 4 □ - 4

• Idiosyncratic productivity realizations:  $q_{jit} = q_{ji}^c + \omega_{jit}$ .

# Model: Employment Decisions

- Denote the match surplus for a given  $q_{jit}$  at time t with  $W_{jit} = W_{q,r,z}$ .
  - ▶ We assume worker's have no bargaining power. Hence, the surplus function is independent of the distribution of r<sub>ijt</sub> across workers.

$$\tilde{r}W_{q,r,z} = \max(0, [y_{q,z,r} - b] \\ -\lambda W_{q,r,z} + \rho_z \mathbb{E}_z \max(0, W_{q,r,z'} - W_{q,r,z}) \\ +\rho_q \mathbb{E}_q \max(0, W_{q',r',z} - W_{q,r,z}))$$

- Output,  $y_{q,z,r}$ , increases in all of its arguments.
- Shocks arrive at a Poisson rate ρ<sub>z</sub>. Firms update resumes for the employed when q changes at rate ρ<sub>q</sub>.
- Employment decision has a cut-off property: hiring occurs if  $q \geq \tilde{q}$ .

#### Model: Hazard Rates

► The hazard rates for moving out of unemployment, respectively for *H* and *L* types, are equal to:

$$h_{jit}^{H} = \eta_i \theta_{it}^{1-\sigma} Pr(W_{q,r,z} \ge 0 \mid +\mu)$$
  
$$h_{jit}^{L} = \eta_i \theta_{it}^{1-\sigma} Pr(W_{q,r,z} \ge 0 \mid -\mu)$$

- ▶ Job acceptance probability:  $Pr(W_{q,r,z} \ge 0 \mid \pm \mu)$
- High r workers (given true type) find jobs more quickly: their (expected) surplus is higher.
- ► High productive workers (given r) find jobs more quickly: they draw q<sup>c</sup> from a more favorable distribution.

# Model: Resume Updating

- Based on the differences in job finding rates, firms can infer about the true type of a worker and update the resumes accordingly.
- ▶ Define ∆h<sub>jit</sub> as the hazard rate differences between high and low type workers for a given resume, r̂ as the log of the odds ratio, r̂ as its time derivative. Then, **Bayesian** updating implies:

$$\dot{\hat{r}}_{jit} = -\gamma_i - \Delta h_{jit}$$

- Some high type workers become low type at Poisson rate γ<sub>i</sub>, e.g., skill depreciation.
- Resumes are downgraded based the differences in hazard rates between high and low type workers.
  - Stronger in booms because  $\theta_{it}$  is high.
  - Increases in z<sub>t</sub> may dampen this effect: job acceptance probability may increase more for the low type workers.

### Model: Free Entry

•  $\theta_{it}$  is determined in equilibrium via a free-entry condition:

$$\kappa_i = \eta_i \theta_{it}^{-\sigma} \mathbb{E}_{q,z,\Gamma_i(r)} W_{q,r,z}$$

Note that equilibrium market tightness is a function of the distribution of resumes even though the surplus function does not depend on it: θ<sub>it</sub> = θ<sub>z,Γi</sub>(r).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Finally,  $\Gamma_i(r)$  evolves endogenously over time.

#### Data

- We use basic *monthly* files from CPS downloaded from IPUMS-CPS.
- Currently, we cover the period from Sep 95 to Dec 16. (Extend later to Jan 76).
- Individuals are interviewed on a 4-8-4 rotation system.
- Employment status (E,U,N) is reported. Unemployed individuals report their unemployment duration.
- Four occupation groups: based on IPUMS-CPS 1990 classification.
- Individual characteristics: age, education, gender, reason for unemployment, region, marital status, class of worker, race.

### Data

- We measure aggregate fluctuations as log-deviations of quarterly GDP from its HP trend. (FRED)
- Market tightness: HWOL series from Barnichon (2010) updated to Dec 16. Available only at aggregate level.
- Productivity difference: proxy with the residuals from wage regressions obtained from ASEC Supplement.
  - Use the same individual characteristics.
  - Calculate 90-10 percentiles in residuals and set as high-low productivity.

- Run separately for each occupation group for every year.
- Available annually.
- Role of skill-biased technological shocks?

#### Estimation

Þ

► We start by defining the *flow* value of surplus, w<sub>jit</sub>, conditional on observables as follows:

$$w(q,r,z,x) = \exp(q + x\beta_x + z\beta_z + g(r)) - b,$$
  
where  $g(r) = \log(r \exp(\omega^H) + (1 - r) \exp(\omega^L)).$   
We approximate the total surplus value as follows:

$$W(q,r,z,x) = [w(q,r,z,x) - \mathrm{cons}]\,\psi(q,r,z,x)$$

Standard DMP model: cons = 0 and  $\psi = \frac{1}{\tilde{r} + \lambda}$ .

#### Estimation

Job acceptance probability becomes a linear function:

$$Pr(W(q.r.z.x) \ge 0) = Pr(w(q,r,z,x) \ge \text{cons})$$
$$= F(x\beta_x + z\beta_z + g(r) + \text{cons}_2 \pm \mu)$$

- F is the standard normal cdf.
- The hazard rates are:

$$h(q,r,z,x) = \eta_i \theta_{it}^{1-\sigma} F(x\beta_x + z\beta_z + g(r) + \operatorname{cons}_2 \pm \mu)$$

Given (the estimate) initial resume, r<sub>0</sub>, and other parameter values we can calculate the resume values for every individual at each point in time using the updating formula.

We estimate this model with MLE.

# Identification and Some Other Issues

- 1. Data is discrete. We update resumes every month using a discrete version of the updating formula.
- 2. Matching efficiency and the constant term are not identified together. We set the constant term equal to zero (calibrate?).
- 3. We allow  $r_0$  to be cyclical, i.e. it depends on z.
- 4. Seasonal adjustment on individual weights.
- Weights are not longitudinally consistent. Use histories only to calculate resume values. Then, treat each individual independently (logit/probit like estimation).

#### Identification and Some Other Issues

- 6. We do not observe  $\theta_{it}$ .
  - Assuming that κ<sub>i</sub> is proportional to the long run average of the surplus function, W<sub>i</sub>, the free entry conditions imply:

$$\theta_t = \sum_{I} \left( \frac{\eta_i}{\bar{\kappa}} \frac{W_{it}}{W_i} \right)^{\frac{1}{\sigma}} \frac{u_{it}}{u_i}$$

► We cannot calculate W<sub>jit</sub>'s, but only follow values, w<sub>jit</sub>. We assume:

$$W_{jit} = w_{jit}^{\alpha}$$

- Run the regression on this equation (in logs) and choose α so that the slope is equal to 1. Calculate θ<sub>it</sub>.
- Error terms? Interpret as fluctuations in  $\bar{\kappa}$ .

Model Fit



・ロト・雪ト・雪ト・雪・ 今日・

### Counterfactual Analysis



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 三臣 - のへで

# Conclusion

- Statistical discrimination alone has a relatively bigger impact on job finding rates of short-medium term unemployed: due to increase in market tightness before skilled workers lose their skills.
- Parametrize Bayesian updating?
- Job finding rates of the long term unemployed substantially increases only if both statistical discrimination and skill decay channels are shut down.