Decomposition of Hours Based on Extensive and Intensive Margins of Labor[1]

Yongsung Chang

Department of Economics

University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, PA 19104

Noh-Sun Kwark[2]

Department of Economics

Texas A&M University

College Station, TX 77843

November 21, 1999

[2]Correspondence to: Noh-Sun Kwark, telephone: (409) 845-7384, fax: (409) 847-8757, e-mail: kwark@tamu.edu, Chang: yohg@ssc.upenn.edu.

Abstract

We decompose underlying disturbances in total hours into three kinds: disturbances that shift the steady-state level of hours, those that change the sectoral composition of employment in the long-run, and those that cause temporary movement of hours around the steady-state. Our identifying restriction exploits the distinctive nature of the two margins of labor: employment and hours per worker. According to the variance decompostion from a VAR based on Post-War U.S. monthly data, we find that disturbances which eventually shift the steady-state level of hours account for three-quarters of cyclical fluctuation in aggregate hours. This challenges the commonly used restriction of constant hours along the balanced growth path in the business cycle literature. Further, we do not find a significant role for sectoral reallocation shocks in the cyclical fluctuation of hours.

Key Words: Decomposition of hours, Permanent shocks, Temporary shocks, Sectoral reallocation.

JEL classification: E32, E24, J2.

1 Introduction

While the implications of a unit root in aggregate output have been studied widely in business-cycle analysis [e.g., Nelson and Plosser (1982), Cochrane (1988), Watson (1986), Blanchard and Quah (1989), King, et al. (1991)], the existence of a unit root in aggregate hours has not been seriously addressed in the literature.[1] This is probably due to the fact that prototype aggregate business-cycle models [e.g., Kydland and Prescott (1982), and King, Plosser, and Rebelo (1988)] restrict hours to be a stationary process around the steady state by imposing restrictions on preference or disturbances.[2] Yet the existence of a unit root in aggregate hours seems apparent in the data.

How should the …nding of stochastic trends in hours a¤ect business cycle analysis? Had the presence of a unit root little to do with the movement of hours at the business-cycle frequency, then imposing stationarity on hours in business cycle analysis might be acceptable. However, given that the success of models of business cycles is often measured by their ability to match the cyclical behavior of the labor market, if the unit root component in hours plays a signi…cant role in the ‡uctuation of hours at business cycle frequencies, then the common practice of ruling out the possibility of stochastic trends in hours may be misleading.

In particular, the existence of a unit root in hours is incompatible with business cycle models that rely on persistent productivity shocks. For example, a permanent increase in productivity, under the commonly used preferences in the literature, ends up with little variation in hours as the income e¤ect o¤sets the substitution e¤ect in labor supply.[3,4]

Another common abstraction in the analysis of the aggregate labor market is "sectoral shifts." The idea that sectoral reallocation of labor, due to a permanent shift in technology

---

[1]An exception to this convention is Shapiro and Watson (1988) who explicitly allow a stochastic trend in labor supply in their structural VAR model.

[2]For example, with utility separable in consumption and leisure, log utility in consumption guarantees the stationarity of hours despite stochastic or deterministic trend in technology.

[3]It generates only a small increase in hours through interest rate channel as the inherited capital stock is below the steady-state. Yet this increase in hours is short-lived.

[4]Unit root tests may not provide a sharp discrimination between a unit root and a highly persistent stationary process. However, highly persistent hours is still incompatible with a highly persistent stationary productivity shifts because such a shift accompanies a sizable income e¤ect.

or demand, could be an important cause or contributor to cyclical ‡uctuations in aggregate hours has been debated since David Lilien (1982)'s seminal paper. While many researchers [e.g., Davis (1987), Rogerson (1987), Phelan and Trejos (1996), and Swanson (1999)] investigate various economic mechanisms through which sectoral disturbances manifest themselves as an aggregate recession, its empirical importance seems still far from sensible consensus. For instance, Abraham and Katz (1986) argue that the statistical …nding of a positive correlation between the dispersion index and aggregate unemployment by Lilien (1982) does not even require workers to be changing sectors. Murphy and Topel (1987), based on the March CPS on prime-age males, report that only 24% of the total incidence of unemployment is explained by sectoral shifts. Yet Davis and Haltiwanger (1990) report that frictions involved in sectoral reallocation of workers are important sources of aggregate employment ‡uctuation. Loungani and Rogerson (1989), based on PSID, report that permanent job switchers may account for about 40% of the total weeks of unemployment during recessions.

In this paper, based on the vector autoregressive (VAR) method, we propose a simple way of decomposing the underlying disturbances of total hours into three types of shocks: disturbances that shift the steady-state aggregate hours (permanent aggregate disturbances), disturbances that change the sectoral composition of employment in the long run (sectoral reallocation disturbances), and disturbances that cause temporary movement of hours around the steady-state (temporary disturbances). We then ask whether permanent components in hours, either aggregate or sectoral, have a signi…cant impact on aggregate hours at business cycles frequencies.

Our identifying restrictions rely on the distinctive nature of the two margins of total hours, employment (the extensive margin) and hours per worker (the intensive margin): While employment exhibits strong nonstationarity, average hours per worker tends to be a stationary process around a deterministic trend. Figure 1 shows the two measures of total hours (divided by population) over the period from 1947 to 1997 (the Establishment Survey and the Household Survey).[5] Both measures of hours show very persistent movement during the post-war period. Total hours based on establishment survey data even shows a positive

_____

[5] We normalize the series by dividing by the annual total available hours per household (= [population over age 16] £ [365 days] £ [16 hours]).

trend. In Figure 2, we decompose hours from the Establishment Survey into extensive and intensive margins. Employment is shown as a ratio of the total number of workers on non-agricultural payrolls to the population of 16 years and over and hours per worker is calculated as weekly hours per worker. While employment exhibits strong persistence, hours per worker appears to be a stationary process around a deterministic trend. According to the unit root test in Section 3 below, employment both at the aggregate and at the one-digit level contains a stochastic trend, and average hours per worker both at the aggregate and industry level exhibits stationarity around a deterministic trend.

Although most aggregate macroeconomic models dismiss one margin or the other, this distinction reveals useful information regarding the nature of underlying changes in the economic environment. For example, in need of a permanent increase in labor input, ...rms ...nd it optimal to increase employment rather than hours per worker in the long-run because they face an upward sloping hourly wage schedule due to the overtime wage premium. This justi...es our ...rst identifying restriction that temporary disturbances do not a¤ect employment levels in the long-run. Similarly, a permanent increase in the demand for labor in one sector relative to the others, possibly due to a permanent shift in technology or demand, will show up as a change in the long-run ratio of sectoral to aggregate employment. This allows us to identify the sectoral reallocation shocks.

According to the variance decomposition from a VAR model based on monthly data for employment and average hours per worker for 1947:1-1997:07 for seven industries in the U.S. (durables, non-durables, construction, transportation and utilities, wholesale and retail trade, ...nance-insurance & real estate, and services), we ...nd that most variation of total aggregate hours at business cycle frequencies are due to disturbances that shift the long-run level of hours. For instance, at a 6-month to 2-year horizon, aggregate permanent disturbances account for 70-85% of the variation in aggregate hours. This implies that potentially about three-quarters of the cyclical variation in hours is due to the economy-wide disturbances that eventually shift the steady-state level of hours. Disturbances responsible for sectoral reallocation account for 7-12% of the variation in aggregate hours at a 6-month to 2-year horizon. The disturbances that cause temporary movement of hours account for only 8-18% of variation of aggregate hours at a 6-month to 2-year horizon.

Our ...nding of a remarkably important role for stochastic trends in hours is consistent with Shapiro and Watson (1988) who found a signi...cant role of permanent labor supply shifts in the cyclical movement of output. Our ...nding may be interpreted in favor of models that include persistent preference shocks [e.g., Bencivenga (1992), or Baxter and King (1991)] or models with an explicit non-market sector where productivity shifts in the non-market sector play a signi...cant role [e.g., Benhabib, Rogerson, and Wright (1991), or Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991)]. Alternatively, it challenges the validity of a utility function that imposes constant hours along the balanced growth path.

Our work is in line with previous VAR analyses on the decomposition of aggregate employment into aggregate versus sectoral [e.g., Campbell and Kuttner (1996), and Clark (1998)] and on the decomposition of output into permanent versus temporary [e.g., Blanchard and Quah (1989), Shapiro and Watson (1988), and King, et al. (1991)]. While previous studies investigate the aggregate/sectoral or permanent/temporary decomposition, we propose a uni...ed framework for the decomposition of permanent/temporary and aggregate/sectoral shocks.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, to illustrate our identifying restrictions, the distinctive nature of employment and hours per worker in the demand and supply sides of labor market is described. Section 3 presents the econometric model and results. Section 4 is the conclusion.

2 Economic Background

2.1 Demand for Employment and Hours

We ...rst illustrate our identifying restrictions based on simple pro...t maximization by ...rms. Consider the following pro...t-maximization problem of a representative ...rm in a competitive industry:

$$\mid t = \max_{fH_{\imath};N_{\imath}g_{\imath=t}^1} E_t \sum_{\imath=t}^{X} Z_{t;\imath} \left[Y_{\imath} \mid W_{\imath}(H_{\imath})N_{\imath} \right] : \tag{1}$$

E_t is a mathematical expectation based on the information available at period t. $Z_{t;\imath}$ is the discount factor for pro...t at $\imath$ as of t: $Z_{t;\imath} = 1=(1 + r_{t+1}) \, ¢¢¢ \, (1 + r_{\imath})$ if $\imath \, ¸ \, t + 1$; and

4

$Z_{t;t} = 1$, where r_t is the real interest rate. Y_t denotes output net of adjustment cost of changing employment:

$$Y_t = A_t[F(N_tH_t) - C(N_t - N_{t-1})]; \qquad (2)$$

where N_t, H_t; A_t are employment, hours per worker, and the shift factor of the production function, respectively. The gross-production function is concave in total labor: $F' > 0$; $F'' < 0$. The adjustment cost $C( )$ represents costs in changing the level of employment. Such a cost may include hiring and training costs [e.g. quasi-…xed labor illustrated by Oi (1962)], …ring costs, or search/matching frictions. The adjustment cost is a convex function: $C(0) = 0$; $C'(0) = 0$; $C'(") > 0$; for $" > 0$; $C'(") < 0$; for $" < 0$; and $C''(\mathcal{c}) > 0$: For simplicity, the price of output is normalized to one so that W_t represents the real cost of labor (the real wage). This implies that shifts in A_t may represent productivity shifts, changes in input prices other than labor, or changes in the nominal price of output relative to the wage.

The …rm faces an overtime premium for extra hours of work. Speci…cally,

$$\hat{W}_t(H_t) = W_t[\overline{H}_t + {}^{\circ}(H_t - \overline{H}_t)]; \qquad (3)$$

where W_t is the market wage rate for the straight time $\overline{H}_t$ and ${}^{\circ}$ (>1) represents the wage premium for overtime. $\overline{H}_t$ may vary over time and across sectors.[6] In fact, we will allow a linear time trend in $\overline{H}_t$ in both unit root tests and the VAR analysis below to capture a deterministic time trend in hours in our sample.

The …rst order conditions for the optimal hours and employment are

$$A_tF'(N_tH_t) = W_t \text{ when } H_t = \overline{H}_t; \qquad (4)$$
$$= {}^{\circ}W_t \text{ when } H_t > \overline{H}_t;$$

$$A_tF'(N_tH_t)H_t + E_t[(1 + r_{t+1})^{-1}A_{t+1}C'(N_{t+1} - N_t)] = \hat{W}_t(H_t) + A_tC'(N_t - N_{t-1}): \qquad (5)$$

---

[6] $\overline{H}_t$ is not necessarily a 40 hours per week. For example, if the …rm …nds it optimal to have 25% of workers in part-time with 20 hours per week and 75% of workers in full-time in the long run, $\overline{H}_t$ for this …rm will be 35 hours. In this generalized setup, the wage schedule can be well approximated by a continuous function (See Bils (1987)) $\hat{W}_t(H_t) = W_t(H_t)H_t$; $W_t'(H_t) > 0$: That is, the average wage rate increases in average hours as more employee are on the overtime schedule. As long as hourly wage rate increases with average hours per worker, our indentifying restriction that permanent increase in the demand for labor is re‡ected in an increase in employment will be valid.

Due to the overtime premium, the ...rm would increase the employment in response to a permanent increase in A_t (given W_t) in the long run. In a steady-state where $N_{t+1} = N_t = N_{t_i\ 1}$; equation (5) becomes

$$A_t F^0(N_t H_t) H_t = W_t [\overline{H}_t + °(H_t \text{ ¡ } \overline{H}_t)]: \tag{6}$$

>From (3), the demand for hours per worker in the steady-state is

$$H_t = \overline{H}_t. \tag{7}$$

This justi...es our identifying restriction that permanent shifts in labor demand are re‡ected in the level of employment rather than hours per worker. As described below in detail, this accords with the stochastic properties of employment and hours per worker in the data. However, in transition, due to the convex adjustment cost, the ...rm would want to smooth its employment path over time. This creates temporary ‡uctuations of hours per worker during the transition. In response to temporary disturbances, the ...rm adjusts both margins considering the trade-o¤ between the adjustment cost in employment and the increasing wage due to the overtime premium.

In addition to the distinction between permanent and temporary disturbances in aggregate hours, we decompose the permanent disturbances into those that cause shifts in aggregate employment (permanent aggregate shocks) and those that change the sectoral composition in employment in the long run (sectoral reallocation shocks). Sectoral reallocation shocks are identi...ed by the long run employment ratios. This can be described as di¤erent shifts in the shift factor such as A across sectors without a change in the aggregate employment. That is, sectoral reallocation shocks are those that changes the ratio of sectoral employment to aggregate employment without changing the aggregate employment level in the long-run.

2.2 Supply of Employment and Hours

The supply side of the labor market also provides a clear distinction between employment and hours. Suppose a typical worker i maximizes her expected discounted utility:

$$\max_{fH_\iota(i);C_\iota(i);B_{\iota+1}(i)g_{\iota=t}^1} E_t \sum_{\iota=t}^{\mathbf{X}} {}^{-\iota i\ t}[u(C_\iota(i)) \text{ ¡ } q_\iota(i)v(H_\iota(i))]; \tag{8}$$

$$\text{subject to } C_t(i) + B_{t+1}(i) = \hat{W}_t(H_t(i)) + (1 + r_t)B_t(i):$$

The worker derives utility from consumption, $u(C_t(i))$, and disutility from working, $v(H_t(i))$: $(u' > 0; u'' < 0; v' > 0; v'' > 0)$. Convexity in the disutility from hours of work, $v''(H) > 0$, implies that workers ask for a higher wage rate for longer hours of work. The term $q_t(i)$ represents individual i's value of time in nonmarket activities: It varies across workers and is the source of heterogeneity among workers. Asset holdings at time t are $B_t(i)$ and yield a return r_t.

The ...rst order conditions are

$$W_t u'(C_t(i)) < q_t(i) v'(\overline{H}_t) \text{ and } H_t(i) = 0; \tag{9}$$

$$\circ W_t u'(C_t(i)) \, , \, q_t(i) v'(H_t) \text{ and } H_t(i) \, , \, \overline{H}_t; \tag{10}$$

$$u'(C_t(i)) = {}^{-}E_t[(1 + r_{t+1})u'(C_{t+1}(i))]: \tag{11}$$

The ...rst order condition for labor supply illustrates how to interpret stochastic trends in hours. Suppose the cross-sectional distribution of $q_t(i)$ in the economy at time t is denoted by $\mu_t(q)$. The supply of workers in the labor market (or the labor market participation rate) is

$$N_t = 1 \, \text{¡} \int_{W_t u'(C_t(i)) < q_t(i) v'(\overline{H}_t))} d\mu_t(q_t(i)): \tag{12}$$

Any stochastic shift in the distribution of $q_t(i)$; would create changes in labor market participation rate. Therefore, a permanent shift in the distribution of $q_t(i)$; possibly due to changes in demographic structure or shifts in relative productivity between market and non-market activities, will generate a permanent shift in N_t. Such a shift has been introduced in the literature in the form of preference shocks or in the form of productivity shifts in a non-market sector.

An alternative way to generate stochastic trends in hours is just to give up the conventional restriction on preferences that imposes constancy of hours along the balanced growth path. For example, with a unit-elastic constant relative risk aversion in consumption, $u(C) = \log C$, as is assumed in standard models of business cycles, a permanent shift in the wage does not induce a change in hours, H, as income e¤ects o¤set substitution

7

e¤ects.[7] Deviation from log utility allows a stochastic trend in hours in the presence of stochastic trends in productivity. Otherwise, stochastic trends in total hours have to be attributed to permanent shifts in labor supply.[8] In general, the supply of hours of a worker is a¤ected by a permanent shift in preferences. However, in equilibrium, hours per worker remains stationary because the long-run demand for hours per worker is independent of wage rates.

3   Econometric Model

3.1   Data

We use seasonally adjusted monthly U.S. data for 1947:01-1997:07 based on Citicorp's Citibase data. The seven sectors analyzed are durable goods, nondurable goods, construction, transportation & public utilities, wholesale & retail trade, …nance-insurance & real estate, and services. The mining and government sectors are excluded. A detailed explanation of the data is provided in the Appendix. Each of the VAR models includes three variables: aggregate employment, sectoral employment, and aggregate hours per worker.[9] All employment variables are divided by the civilian noninstitutional population of 16 years old and over. Aggregate average hours per worker is constructed by dividing total employee hours in nonagricultural establishments by the total number of workers on non-agricultural payrolls. To check the stationarity of average hours per worker in each sector, we use average hours of production workers. Logarithms of all variables are used.

---

[7] Under log utility $W_t u'(C_t)$ $(= W_t/C_t)$ remains the same as consumption moves with the same magnitude as wage in response to a permanent shift in wage.

[8] Although we discuss the utility that is additively separable between consumption and work e¤ort here, the same argument is true for the multiplicatively separable utility.

[9] To control for a strike by the Communications Workers and Telecommunications International Union against AT&T (a drop of 640,000 in the employment) in August 1983, we included a dummy variable when we ran a VAR using the transportation and utilities as a sector.

3.2 Stationarity of Employment and Hours

We investigate the existence of permanent shifts in hours based on unit root tests. According to Table 1, we cannot reject the existence of a unit root in the employment series, both at aggregate and one-digit industry level, except for the construction industry. Because most of the series show signi...cant time trends, we include a time trend in unit root tests and VAR's. In contrast, unit roots in average hours per worker are strongly rejected except for the wholesale and retail trade industry and the service industry. In the VAR's below, employment is treated as nonstationary and average hours per worker as stationary. The employment ratios show unit roots as well except for construction, suggesting the existence of permanent sectoral shifts in most industries.[10] The nonstationarity found in the employment variables also makes total aggregate hours nonstationary, which is con...rmed by the existence of a unit root in the total employee hours worked in nonagricultural establishments (the Phillips-Perron test statistic is ¡ 2:88 with 5 truncation lags suggested by Newey and West. see Phillips (1987), Phillips and Perron (1988), or Hamilton (1994), pp. 506-516). Following Stock and Watson (1988), in the three variable VAR model with two nonstationary variables and a stationary variable, we can identify two stochastic trend shocks and a temporary shock with the identifying restrictions described below.

3.3 Econometric Model and Identifying Restrictions

Consider a structural VAR with three variables, composed of aggregate employment growth $\Phi \log N_t$, sectoral employment growth $\Phi \log N_t^S$, and the log of aggregate hours per worker, $\log H_t$. Time trends are included in all equations.

$$X_t = \begin{bmatrix} \Phi \log N_t & \Phi \log N_t^S & \log H_t \end{bmatrix}' : \tag{13}$$

Because all variables are now stationary, we can represent X_t by a Wold moving average:

$$X_t = A(L)^\circ{}_t; \tag{14}$$

---

[10] The existence of unit roots in the sectoral employment ratios implies that aggregate employment and sectoral employment do not have a cointegrating vector of (¡ 1; 1), if any. In fact, there are two VAR systems that have cointegrating relations. The transportation & utilities industry and the service industry show the existence of cointegrating relations, suggesting that during the sample period permanent sectoral shifts did not play a signi...cant role in these sectors.

where

$$A(L) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} A_i L^i; \quad E[\circ_t] = 0; \quad E[\circ_t \circ_t^0] = I; \quad \circ_t = [\tilde{A}_t^A \ \tilde{A}_t^S \ \acute{A}_t]^0: \tag{15}$$

L is a lag operator, $\circ_t$ is a vector of white noise structural shocks including two stochastic trend shocks, aggregate ($\tilde{A}_t^A$) and sectoral ($\tilde{A}_t^S$), and one transitory shock ($\acute{A}_t$), and I is an identity matrix. The response matrices for the structural shocks can be identi...ed starting from a ...nite-order VAR as follows.

$$B(L)X_t = {}^2{}_t; \tag{16}$$

where

$$B(L) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} B_i L^i; \quad B_0 = I; \quad E[{}^2{}_t] = 0; \quad E[{}^2{}_t {}^{20}{}_t] = \S: \tag{17}$$

Then we invert the estimated coe¢cient matrices B_i's to get

$$X_t = C(L)^2{}_t; \tag{18}$$

where

$$C(L) = B^{i\ 1}(L) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} C_i L^i: \tag{19}$$

From ${}^2{}_t = A_0 \circ_t$, $A_j = C_j A_0$, and $A(1) = C(1)A_0$, it su¢ces to get A_0. The $3 \pounds 3$ matrix A_0 has nine unknowns and can be recovered from the covariance matrix of the ...nite VAR, $A_0 A_0^0 = \S$ (6 equations) and the following three identifying restrictions. We require three restrictions on $A(1)$ to identify the three structural shocks: aggregate permanent, sectoral permanent, and temporary shocks.

The following identifying restriction provides a distinction between permanent distur-bances and temporary disturbances.

Identifying Restriction (I) Temporary shocks have no e¤ect on employment, both aggre-gate and sectoral, in the long run.

Identifying restriction (I) imposes two restrictions on the long-run matrix $A(1)$. That is, if the long-run multipliers of the structural shocks can be described as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{¢} \log N \\ \text{¢} \log N^S \\ \log H \end{bmatrix} = A(1)\circ = C(1)A_0 \circ = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11}^l & c_{12}^l & c_{13}^l \\ c_{21}^l & c_{22}^l & c_{23}^l \\ c_{31}^l & c_{32}^l & c_{33}^l \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a_{11}^0 & a_{12}^0 & a_{13}^0 \\ a_{21}^l & a_{22}^l & a_{23}^0 \\ a_{31}^0 & a_{32}^0 & a_{33}^0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A}^A \\ \tilde{A}^S \\ \acute{A} \end{bmatrix}; \tag{20}$$

10

the identifying restriction can be summarized as

$$c_{11}^I a_{13}^0 + c_{12}^I a_{23}^0 + c_{13}^I a_{33}^0 = 0; \tag{21}$$

and

$$c_{21}^I a_{13}^0 + c_{22}^I a_{23}^0 + c_{23}^I a_{33}^0 = 0: \tag{22}$$

The two stochastic trend shocks named as aggregate and sectoral permanent shocks are identi...ed by the restriction (II).

Identifying Restriction (II) Sectoral reallocation shocks change the employment ratios without changing aggregate employment in the long-run.

This identifying restriction is given as the following equation.

$$c_{11}^I a_{12}^0 + c_{12}^I a_{22}^0 + c_{13}^I a_{32}^0 = 0: \tag{23}$$

Then, the long-run matrix A(1) becomes a lower-triangular matrix, in which the matrix A_0 can be recovered by $A_0 = C^{i\ 1}(1)A(1)$, where A(1) is the Cholesky factor of the covariance matrix, §, following $A(1)A(1)^0 = §$. It is well-known that structural shocks with a lower-triangular long-run matrix can be identi...ed with the Cholesky factor, which is unique up to the signs of the diagonal elements.

3.4   Variance Decomposition of Aggregate Hours

Our primary interest is whether disturbances responsible for the shift in steady-state level of hours plays a signi...cant role in the variation of aggregate hours at business cycle frequencies. Table 2-A shows the k-month ahead forecast-error variance decomposition (k =1, 6, 12, 24, 60, 120) of aggregate hours for each of the VAR's and their weighted average. The weights are calculated from the sample average of employment shares in aggregate employment.[11] According to the weighted average of variance decomposition at 6-month to 2-year horizon,

---

[11] The employment shares or the ratios of total sectoral hours to aggregate hours have changed over the sample period (1947 to 1997). We tried other weights calculated as the sub-sample period averages (the ...rst 16 years and the last 16 years) and shares in total hours (employment £ hours per worker). We did not ...nd any signi...cant di¤erences in the results.

aggregate permanent shocks account for 70-85% of variation in total hours. About three-quarters of the cyclical variation in aggregate hours is due to disturbances that change hours in the long-run. As will be discussed below, this may present a potentially serious problem for the current convention in business-cycle research of not allowing for a stochastic trend in hours.

We ...nd that the contribution of sectoral reallocation shocks to the cyclical variation of aggregate hours is moderate. At a 6-month to 2-year horizon, sectoral shocks explain 7-12% of ‡uctuations in aggregate hours. This is somewhat smaller than the estimate reported in the literature [e.g., Campbell and Kuttner (1996)].[12] The contribution of disturbances that cause stationary variation around the steady-state is 8-18% at a 6-month to 2-year horizon.

While we ...nd a dominant role of permanent components in the ‡uctuation of hours even at the very short-run, it may have little to do with business cycles. To investigate this, we examine the cyclicality of three structural shocks identi...ed from the VAR. Table 2-B shows the correlations of three structural shocks with growth rate of monthly output measure, industrial production, at various leads and lags. Total hours exhibits strong procylicality. The correlation between the growth rate of total hours and that of industrial production is 0.54. Permanent components of hours are also quite procyclical. Its correlation with growth rate of industrial production is 0.44. While the sectoral reallocation shocks exhibit procyclicality —its correlation with output growth is 0.47, temporary shocks are not highly procyclical —its correlation with output growth is only 0.18.

We interpret our ...ndings from the variance decomposition as follows. With utility that assumes constant hours along the balanced growth path, in order to explain the persistent cyclical variation in hours, one needs a model with persistent preference shocks [e.g., Ben-

---

[12] The decompostion of aggregate versus sectoral shocks we use is di¤erent from that in Campbell and Kuttner (1996). Our sectoral reallocation shocks are those that change the employment ratio without a¤ecting aggregate employment in the long run (pure allocation shocks). In contrast, in Campbell and Kuttner sectoral shocks are allowed to a¤ect aggregate employment in the long-run and the aggregate shocks not to a¤ect employment ratios. When we adopt their identifying restriction, the contribution of aggregate sectoral disturbances increases to 41-45% at business cycle frequencies. Yet given the orthogonal property in our identifying restrictions on permanent and temporary disturbances, the role of temporary disturbances in aggregate total hours remains the same.

civenga (1992), or Baxter and King (1991)] or a model with an explicit non-market sector in which productivity shifts in the nonmarket sector play a signi...cant role [e.g., Benhabib, Rogerson, and Wright (1991), or Greenwood and Hercowitz (1991)]. And those shocks have to be fairly highly correlated with output growth. This is consistent with earlier ...ndings by Shapiro and Watson (1988) who ...nd that more than half the cyclical variation of output is due to permanent shifts in labor supply. Alternatively, the conventional restriction on the preferences that rules out shifts in steady-state hours in the presence of permanent or persistent shifts in productivity may have been misplaced.

3.5   Long-run Multipliers

To gauge the importance of permanent aggregate shocks and sectoral allocation shocks in the long run, the long-run multipliers for disturbances are calculated in Table 3. The numbers represent long-run responses of percentage changes in aggregate employment and sectoral employment to a one percent standard deviation increase in the aggregate perma-nent shock and in the sectoral reallocation shock, respectively, from each VAR composed of the three variables described above. For example, when there is a one percent standard de-viation increase in the aggregate permanent shock, aggregate employment increases by 0.66 percent in the long-run and sectoral employment in the durable goods industry increases by 1.31 percent. A one percent standard deviation increase in the sectoral allocation shock which changes sectoral composition of employment has a long-run e¤ect of 0.59 percent on the sectoral employment with no change in aggregate employment as imposed in the identifying restriction. The numbers in parentheses provide the 95 % con...dence intervals calculated from 1000 simulations. The long-run multiplier for aggregate disturbances to aggregate employment is very similar (0.57 to 0.68 percent increase in the long-run) across the seven di¤erent VAR's even though we do not impose any restriction. This implies that we have identi...ed the aggregate disturbances consistently across sectors. We ...nd that aggregate permanent disturbances dominate sectoral-shift shocks in the long-run behavior of sectoral employments. Except for construction industry and ...nance, insurance and real estate industry, the long-run multiplier of aggregate disturbances is greater than that of sectoral shift disturbances.

13

3.6 Impulse Responses

We investigate the impulse responses for aggregate employment, sectoral employment, and aggregate hours per worker from the estimated VAR. Figure 3 shows the responses to a one percent standard deviation innovation in the three shocks from the VAR using durable goods as a sector. Solid lines are responses to aggregate permanent shocks, dash-dotted lines are responses to sectoral shocks in the durable goods industry, and dashed lines are responses to temporary shocks. Aggregate employment shows a large and hump-shaped response to aggregate shocks. However, the response of aggregate employment to the sectoral shocks is relatively small. The response to temporary disturbances is also small. Employment in durable goods shows similar responses to the two permanent shocks. The aggregate shock has a large e¤ect on sectoral employment, which implies that much of the ‡uctuation in sectoral employment is due to aggregate shocks. Temporary shocks have a relatively small e¤ect on sectoral employment. However, hours respond very strongly to temporary shocks.

Another interesting …nding in the impulse response analysis is the timing of the response of hours per worker and employment. In response to all three shocks, but most strikingly to temporary shocks, hours per worker strongly lead employment. This is consistent with Table 4, which shows the lead-lag cross correlations between employment and hours per worker with the HP-…ltered data. Hours lead employment by at least one quarter except for the construction industry. Our impulse responses also suggest that the persistence in hours is not likely a consequence of labor market frictions. Employment approaches the new steady-state level within a year in most industries responding to both aggregate and sectoral reallocation shocks.

Impulse responses from the VAR's for other industries show similar behavior to the impulse responses from the VAR with durable goods. In particular, the impulse responses of aggregate employment to the aggregate permanent shock and the temporary shock are consistent in terms of size and shape of the response across the seven VAR's for each sector.[13] Thus, we do not report impulse responses from the VAR's for other industries.

---

[13] We found that sectoral reallocation shocks in some sectors such as construction, wholesale & retail trade, and …nance-insurance & real estate have a negative e¤ect on aggregate employment in the short-run. This …nding may be consistent with the idea of "sectoral shifts" in the previous literature, that sectoral

14

4 Concluding Remarks

This paper proposes a simple way to decompose total aggregate hours into the disturbances that cause shifts in the steady-state level of aggregate hours, those that change the sectoral composition of employment in the long run, and those that cause temporary movement around the steady-state. Our identifying restrictions exploit the distinctive nature of the two margins of labor: employment and hours per worker. Based on VAR analysis using U.S. monthly data for 1947:01-1997:06, we ...nd that even at the business cycle frequency, about three-quarters of the variation in aggregate total hours are explained by disturbances that eventually shift the steady-state level of hours. Pure sectoral reallocation shocks account for only 7–12% of the cyclical variation of total hours. Only 8-12% of the variation in aggregate hours is a¤ected by disturbances that cause the transitory movement of hours around the steady-state.

We interpret the above ...ndings as follows. In order to explain ‡uctuations in the aggregate labor market, one needs a model that allows a permanent shift, or at least a high persistence, in hours. With conventional preferences that impose constant hours along the balanced growth path, one needs highly persistent preference shocks or productivity shifts in the non-market sector. Alternatively, the conventional restriction on preferences that rules out shifts in steady-state hours along the balanced growth path may have been misplaced.

---

reallocation may create unemployment.

References

Abraham, Katharine G. and Katz, Lawrence F. (1986), "Cyclical Unemployment: Sectoral Shifts or Aggregate Disturbances?" Journal of Political Economy 94 (3), 507-22.

Baxter, M. and King, R. (1991), "Productive Externalities and Cyclical Volatility," Discussion paper No. 53, Minneapolis: Federal Reserve Bank, Institute for Empirical Macroeconomics.

Bencivenga, V. (1992), "An econometric study of hours and output variation with preference shocks," International Economic Review 33, 449-71.

Benhabib, J., Rogerson, R., Wright, R. (1991), "Homework in macroeconomics: household production and aggregate ‡uctuations," Journal of Political Economy 6, 1166-81.

Bils, Mark (1987), "The Cyclical Behavior of Marginal Cost and Price, American Economic Review 79 (4), 655-73.

Blanchard, Olivier J. and Quah, Danny (1989), "The Dynamic E¤ects of Aggregate Supply and Demand Disturbances," American Economic Review 79 (4), 655-73.

Campbell, Je¤rey R. and Kuttner, Kenneth N. (1996), "Macroeconomic E¤ects of Employment Reallocation," Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy 44, 87-116.

Clark, Todd E. (1998), "Employment Fluctuations in U.S. Regions and Industries: The Role of National, Region-Speci…c, and Industry-Speci…c Shocks," Journal of Labor Economics 16 (1), 202-29.

Cochrane, J. (1988), "How Big Is the Random Walk in GNP?," Journal of Political Economy 95 (5), 893-920.

Cogley, T., and Nason, J. (1995) "Output Dynamics in Real Business Cycle Models," American Economic Review, 85, 492-511.

Davis, S. (1987), "Fluctuations in the Pace of Labor Reallocation," Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy 27, 335–402.

Davis, S. and Haltiwanger, J. (1990), "Gross Job Creation and Destruction: Microeconomic Evidence and Macroeconomic Implications, NBER Macroeconomics Annual V, 123-68.

Greenwood, J. and Hercowitz, Z. (1991), "The allocation of capital and time over the business cycle," Journal of Political Economy 99, 1188-1214.

Hamilton, James D. (1994), Time Series Analysis, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

King, Robert G., Plosser, Charles I., and Rebelo, Sergio T. (1988), "Production, Growth, and Business Cycles: I. The basic Neoclassical Model," Journal of Monetary Economics 21 (2,3), 195-232.

King, Robert G., Plosser, Charles I., Stock, James H., and Watson, Mark W. (1991), "Stochastic Trends and Economic Fluctuations," American Economic Review 81 (4), 819-40.

Kydland, Finn and Prescott, Edward C. (1982), "Time to Build and Aggregate Fluctuations," Econometrica 50, 1345-70.

Lilien, David M. (1982), "Sectoral Shifts and Cyclical Unemployment," Journal of Political Economy 90 (4), 777-93.

Loungani, P. and Rogerson, R. (1989), "Cyclical Fluctuations and Sectoral Reallocation: Evidence from the PSID," Journal of Monetary Economics 23, 259-73.

Murphy, Kevin M. and Topel, Robert H. (1987), "The Evolution of Unemployment in the United States: 1968-85, in Stanley Fisher ed., NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2, 11-58.

Nelson, C. R. and Plosser, C. I. (1982), "Trends and Random-Walks in Macroeconomic Time-Series: Some Evidence and Implications, " Journal of Monetary Economics 10 (2), 139-62.

Oi, W. (1962) "Labor as a quasi-...xed factor," Journal of Political Economy 70, 538-555.

Phillips, P. C. B. (1987), "Time Series Regression with a Unit Root," Econometrica 55 (1), 277-301.

Phillips, P. C. B. and Perron, Pierre (1988), "Testing for a Unit Root in a Time Series Regression," Biometrica 75, 335-46.

Phelan, C. and Trejos, A. (1996), "On the Aggregate E¤ects of Sectoral Reallocations," Mimeo, Northwestern University.

Rogerson, Richard (1987), "An Equilibrium Model of Sectoral Reallocation," Journal of Political Economy 95, 824–34.

Shapiro, M. and Watson, M. (1988), "Sources of Business Cycle Fluctuations," NBER Macroeconomics Annual 3, 111-47.

Stock, James H. and Watson, Mark W. (1988), "Testing for Common Trends," Journal of the American Statistical Association 83, 1097-1107.

Swanson, Eric (1999), "Models of Sectoral Reallocation," mimeo, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

Watson, Mark W. (1986), "Univariate Detrending Methods with Stochastic Trends," Journal of Monetary Economics 18 (1), 49-76.

Appendix ¡ Data Description

The following describes all the data used in this study and the names of variables from the Citicorp's Citibase data set over the period from 1947:01 to 1997:07.

Aggregate Employment = (LPNAG/P16SA), where LPNAG is the total number of workers on non-agricultural payrolls by the establishment survey and P16SA is the seasonally adjusted P16 (the civilian noninstitutional population of 16 years and over) with the X-11 procedure in the SAS.[14]

Aggregate Average Hours = (LPMHU/LPNAG), where LPMHU is the total employee hours worked in nonagricultural establishments.

Sectoral Employment
1. Durable Goods (LPED/P16SA)
2. Nondurable Goods (LPEN/P16SA)
3. Construction (LPCC/P16SA)
4. Transportation and Public Utilities (LPTU/P16SA)
5. Wholesale and Retail Trade (LPT/P16SA)
6. Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate (LPFR/P16SA)
7. Services (LPS/P16SA)

All variables are taken logarithm before the VAR's are run.

---

[14] The civilian noninstitutional population of 16 years and over is not available as seasonally adjusted. It is seasonally adjusted by the X-11 procedure in the SAS. The other seasonally adjusted variable for population is the noninstitutional population of 16 years and over but it lasts a shorter period from 1950:01 to 1993:12.

TABLE 1. Unit Root Tests[1), 2)]

Variables	Employment	Employment ratio	Hours per worker
Aggregate	− 2.63		− 4.40*
Durable Goods	− 2.24	− 1.84	− 4.53*
Nondurable Goods	− 2.17	− 1.62	− 5.33*
Construction	− 3.54*	− 4.10*	− 11.91*
Transportation & Utilities	− 1.51	− 1.20	− 4.57* [3)]
Wholesale & Retail Trade	− 2.06	− 1.76	− 0.17 [3)]
Finance & Insurance	0.03	− 0.49	− 14.20* [3)]
Services	− 2.11	− 2.40	− 2.16 [4)]

1) Each test is based on the Phillips-Perron Test (5 truncation lags suggested by Newey-West) with a linear trend.

2) The sample period is from 1947:1 to 1997:08, unless otherwise specified.

3) 1964:1− 1997:8.

4) 1964:1− 1996:2.

5) Asterisk (*) indicates a rejection of a unit root at the 5 percent significance level (the critical value: − 3.42).

20

TABLE 2-A. Variance Decomposition of Total Aggregate Hours (log NH)
for Each Pair of VAR's

Variable	Shock	1	6	12	24	60	120
Durables	$\tilde{A}_A$	0.20	0.62	0.73	0.79	0.85	0.90
	$\tilde{A}_S$	0.12	0.15	0.13	0.08	0.05	0.03
	$\acute{A}$	0.68	0.23	0.15	0.13	0.03	0.07
Nondurables	$\tilde{A}_A$	0.31	0.80	0.90	0.93	0.94	0.96
	$\tilde{A}_S$	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
	$\acute{A}$	0.68	0.19	0.09	0.07	0.05	0.04
Construction	$\tilde{A}_A$	0.23	0.69	0.82	0.87	0.91	0.94
	$\tilde{A}_S$	0.38	0.21	0.13	0.07	0.04	0.03
	$\acute{A}$	0.39	0.10	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.04
Transportation & utilities	$\tilde{A}_A$	0.37	0.82	0.92	0.95	0.97	0.98
	$\tilde{A}_S$	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00
	$\acute{A}$	0.56	0.14	0.06	0.04	0.03	0.02
Wholesale & Retail Trade	$\tilde{A}_A$	0.19	0.63	0.71	0.76	0.82	0.87
	$\tilde{A}_S$	0.34	0.24	0.22	0.17	0.11	0.08
	$\acute{A}$	0.47	0.13	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.05
Finance, Insur., Real Estate	$\tilde{A}_A$	0.44	0.77	0.88	0.93	0.96	0.98
	$\tilde{A}_S$	0.27	0.18	0.11	0.06	0.03	0.02
	$\acute{A}$	0.29	0.04	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Services	$\tilde{A}_A$	0.27	0.74	0.85	0.88	0.91	0.94
	$\tilde{A}_S$	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00
	$\acute{A}$	0.72	0.25	0.15	0.12	0.09	0.06
Weighted Average	$\tilde{A}_A$	0.26	0.70	0.80	0.85	0.89	0.92
	$\tilde{A}_S$	0.16	0.12	0.10	0.07	0.04	0.03
	$\acute{A}$	0.58	0.18	0.10	0.08	0.07	0.05

$\tilde{A}_A$: aggregate permanent shock
$\tilde{A}_S$: sectoral reallocation shock
$\acute{A}$: temporary shock

Table 2-B. Cross-Correlation with Growth Rate of Industrial Production (Δy_t)

$$\text{corr}(\Delta y_t, x_{t-j})$$

leads and lags	x_{t-4}	x_{t-3}	x_{t-2}	x_{t-1}	x_t	x_{t+1}	x_{t+2}	x_{t+3}	x_{t+4}
Industrial Production	0.11	0.18	0.25	0.40	1.00	0.40	0.25	0.18	0.11
Growth rate of Aggregate Hours	0.08	0.08	0.15	0.21	0.54	0.24	0.19	0.23	0.16
Aggregate Permanent Shocks	0.14	0.12	0.08	0.20	0.44	0.13	0.08	0.02	−0.01
Sectoral Reallocation Shocks	0.00	−0.01	0.04	0.12	0.47	0.12	0.02	0.01	−0.02
Temporary Shocks	−0.03	−0.02	0.04	0.07	0.18	0.08	−0.01	0.02	0.01

TABLE 3. Long-Run Effects of Permanent Shocks

Variable	$\Phi \log N$		$\Phi \log N^S$	
Shock	$\tilde{A}_A$	$\tilde{A}_S$	$\tilde{A}_A$	$\tilde{A}_S$
Durable Goods	0:66	0	1:31	0:59
	(0:39; 1:05)	¡	(0:75; 2:25)	(0:34; 0:77)
Nondurable Goods	0:0057	0	0:43	0:28
	(0:37; 0:88)	¡	(0:23; 0:71)	(0:20; 0:44)
Construction	0:60	0	1:04	1:28
	(0:39; 0:94)	¡	(0:40; 2:07)	(0:71; 1:70)
Transportation & Utilities	0:61	0	0:65	0:22
	(0:38; 0:93)	–	(0:38; 1:06)	(0:12; 0:35)
Wholesale & Retail Trade	0:60	0	0:49	0:39
	(0:39; 0:96)	¡	(0:25; 0:93)	(0:17; 0:49)
Finance, Insur., Real Estate	0:68	0	0:24	0:64
	(0:40; 1:03)	¡	(¡ 0:13; 0:80)	(0:29; 0:87)
Services	0:62	0	0:36	0:23
	(0:39; 0:91)	¡	(0:18; 0:59)	(0:16; 0:33)

$\tilde{A}_A$: aggregate shock
$\tilde{A}_S$: sectoral reallocation shock
Numbers in parentheses indicate 95% confidence intervals calculated from 1000 simulations.

TABLE 4. Leads and Lags between Employment and Hours

$$\text{corr}(N_t, H_{t+i}) \text{ (HP filtered)}$$

leads & lags (i)	-12	-8	-4	0	4	8	12
Aggregate	0.28	0.46	0.59	0.46	0.06	-0.27	-0.42
Durable Goods	0.31	0.57	0.69	0.51	-0.03	-0.42	-0.54
Nondurable Goods	0.06	0.32	0.47	0.35	-0.08	-0.37	-0.47
Construction	-0.09	-0.02	0.10	0.32	0.06	0.02	0.02
Transportation & Utilities	0.20	0.24	0.28	0.21	0.01	-0.13	-0.20
Wholesale & Retail Trade	0.16	0.19	0.23	0.13	-0.10	-0.28	-0.31
Finance & Insurance	0.06	0.05	0.12	0.04	0.04	-0.01	-0.02
Services	0.06	0.09	0.15	0.11	0.10	-0.06	-0.11

24

Figure 1: Total Aggregate Hours

Establishment Survey

Household Survey

Figure 2: Aggregate Employment and Weekly Hours

Aggregate Employment

Aggregate Weekly Hours

Figure 3: Impulse Responses: Aggregate vs Durables (Aggregate Permanent —— , Sectoral Permanent -¢-¢-, Temporary - - -)