

Evaluating the Influence of Education on Current Unemployment Trends*

Adrian Ly

March 29, 2024

First sentence. Second sentence. Third sentence. Fourth sentence.

Table of contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Data	2
2.1	Data Measurement	2
2.2	Data Analysis	4
3	Model	4
3.1	Model set-up	5
3.2	Model justification	6
4	Results	7
4.1	Model Interpretation:	7
4.2	Youth Unemployment	9
4.3	Adult Unemployment	11
4.4	Senior Unemployment	13
5	Discussion	15
5.1	What we learn from these results	15
5.2	Why are we seeing these results	15
5.3	What could this entail for the future	15
5.4	Weaknesses and next steps	15
	References	16

*Code and data are available at: [LINK](#)

1 Introduction

2 Data

Table 1: Unemployed Dataset from 2019 to 2023 by education level

Education Level	Reference Period	Youth Unemployment	Adult Unemployment	Senior Unemployment
Total, all education levels	2019	10.7	5.1	4.6
Total, all education levels	2020	20.1	8.5	7.4
Total, all education levels	2021	13.5	6.4	6.7
Total, all education levels	2022	10.1	4.6	4.4
Total, all education levels	2023	10.8	4.9	4.2
0 to 8 years	2019	17.5	9.4	7.8

The dataset outlined in Table 1 captures a comprehensive view of unemployment rates spanning from 2019 to 2023, segmented by different education levels. This rich dataset provides insights into the unemployment trends for three distinct age groups: youth, adults, and seniors, highlighting how economic fluctuations impact various demographics over time. The granularity of the data allows for an in-depth analysis of how education, as a key socio-economic factor, correlates with employment stability and job market resilience during periods of economic change.

2.1 Data Measurement

Our data set is comprised of data from the Labour Force Survey (Canada 2024a). The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is a principal source for the measurement of Canada’s labour market activities. Here, we provide an overview of the survey methodology and the robustness of the data collected.

- Survey Design and Methodology
 - The LFS uses a stratified multi-stage sampling approach to gather data from a representative sample of the non-institutionalized civilian population aged 15 and over. The survey design meticulously excludes certain populations, such as full-time

military personnel and residents of institutions, ensuring the accuracy and relevance of the labour force estimates.

- Collection and Processing
 - Conducted monthly, the LFS is characterized by its promptness, with data releases occurring just 10 days post-collection. The survey yields the early indicator estimates of employment and unemployment, alongside other vital labour market indicators including the employment rate and participation rate.
- Utilization of Data
 - Governments and policymakers extensively use LFS data to evaluate and plan employment programs. The data are essential for determining eligibility and the level of Employment Insurance benefits, as well as for the analysis conducted by economists, labour market analysts, and researchers.
- Supplementary Surveys
 - In conjunction with the LFS, surveys like the SEPH, EIS, and JWVS contribute to a comprehensive understanding of current labour market conditions, providing a more detailed and nuanced picture.
- Data Collection Techniques
 - Interviews are conducted through computer-assisted methods, either by telephone or in-person visits. This allows for the collection of a diverse set of labour market data, which is further refined through editing and imputation to account for non-responses or inconsistencies.
- Estimation Procedures
 - Sample data are meticulously weighted to produce reliable estimates at the national, provincial, and sub-provincial levels. These weights are adjusted to compensate for non-responses and to align the survey estimates with known population controls.
- Quality Control
 - To ensure the highest data quality, the LFS is subject to rigorous validation against other economic data sources. This includes the comparison of employment estimates with those from SEPH, EIS, and census data.
- Confidentiality and Disclosure Control
 - Adhering to stringent confidentiality rules, the LFS ensures that no individual or business information is disclosed without consent. The survey employs a range of suppression rules to maintain the anonymity of the data.

- Seasonal Adjustment
 - The LFS implements the X-12-ARIMA technique for seasonal adjustment, allowing for the analysis of short-term labour market trends without the influence of seasonal patterns.
- Accuracy and Reliability
 - Despite being subject to sampling errors inherent in survey data, the LFS employs coefficients of variation and other statistical measures to assess and enhance the reliability of its estimates.

This survey’s methodology and the rapid release of its results make the LFS a cornerstone in the analysis and understanding of Canada’s labour market dynamics.

2.2 Data Analysis

This paper uses the Statistics of Canada Unemployment rate, participation rate and employment rate by educational attainment, annual (Canada 2024b) dataset. We are using the R programming language (R Core Team 2023) to conduct our analysis along with `readR` (Wickham, Hester, and Bryan 2024), `lubridate` (Grolemund and Wickham 2011), `tidyverse` (Wickham et al. 2019), `dplyr` (Wickham et al. 2023), `tidyr` (Wickham, Vaughan, and Girlich 2023), `knitr` (Xie 2014), `janitor` (Firke 2023), `scales` (Wickham, Pedersen, and Seidel 2023), `RColorBrewer` (Neuwirth 2022), `ggplot2` (Wickham 2016), `kableExtra` (Zhu 2024), `here` (Müller 2020), `arrow` (Richardson et al. 2024), `rstanarm` (Brilleman et al. 2018), `modelsummary` (Arel-Bundock 2022), and `lme4` (Bates et al. 2015).

3 Model

The goal of our modeling strategy, utilizing multiple linear regression, is multifaceted:

- **Understanding Relationships:** To understand the relationship between several independent variables, such as education level and age groups, and the dependent variable, which in this context is the youth unemployment rates. The model is designed to isolate the effect of each variable on unemployment rates.
- **Quantifying Impact:** To quantify the impact of each predictor. Regression coefficients provide a numerical value that represents the expected change in the dependent variable for a one-unit change in an independent variable, all else being equal.
- **Predictive Analysis:** To develop a predictive framework that can be employed to estimate or forecast the outcome variable, in this case, unemployment rates, when provided with new data for the predictors.

- **Inferential Statistics:** To conduct hypothesis testing to ascertain whether the relationships observed within the data are statistically significant and not merely due to random variation.
- **Policy Decision Support:** To offer empirical evidence that may inform policy decisions. For instance, if a correlation is found between higher education levels and increased unemployment, it might indicate the necessity for policies that better align education with employment opportunities.
- **Data-Driven Insights:** To extract insights from the data that could lead to an enhanced understanding of labor market dynamics, such as how different age groups' unemployment rates interact.
- **Modeling Assumptions Testing:** To validate the assumptions underlying the regression model, ensuring the reliability and accuracy of the model's predictions.
- **Confounding Variable Control:** To account for potential confounders that might influence the relationship between education level and unemployment rates. The inclusion of relevant variables aims to minimize estimation bias.
- **Sensitivity Analysis:** To comprehend the model's sensitivity to changes in inputs, which assists in evaluating the robustness of the model.

This strategy is designed to produce a model that is both explanatory and predictive, offering a current snapshot of the relationships in the data as well as a tool for future forecasting. Such a model can be utilized to guide decision-making processes, or pinpoint where interventions may be effective.

3.1 Model set-up

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Youth Unemployment} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 \cdot \text{Education Level} \\ & + \beta_2 \cdot \text{Reference Period} \\ & + \beta_3 \cdot \text{Adult Unemployment} \\ & + \beta_4 \cdot \text{Senior Unemployment} + \epsilon\end{aligned}$$

Where:

- **Youth Unemployment** is the dependent variable we are trying to predict. These are generally categorized as people who are between the ages of 15-24.
- **Education Level** is an independent variable representing the level of education. (e.g., high school, undergraduate, postgraduate)
- **Reference Period** is another independent variable that represents the time frame of the data collection (e.g., year).

- **Adult Unemployment** and **Senior Unemployment** are independent variables representing unemployment rates for adult and senior age groups, with people ages ranging between 25-44 and above 45, respectively.
- β_0 is the y-intercept, representing the expected value of **Youth Unemployment** when all the independent variables are 0.
- $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ are the coefficients for each independent variable, representing the change in **Youth Unemployment** for a one-unit change in the respective independent variable, holding all other variables constant.
- ϵ represents the error term, accounting for the variability in **Youth Unemployment** not explained by the model.

This model aims to understand how various factors contribute to youth unemployment. The coefficients $\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4$ provide insights into the relationship between each independent variable and youth unemployment:

- β_1 tells us how changes in the education level might affect youth unemployment, holding other factors constant. A positive coefficient suggests that higher education levels are associated with higher youth unemployment rates, while a negative coefficient suggests the opposite.
- β_2 gives insight into how changes over the reference period (e.g., years) impact youth unemployment, which can help identify trends over time.
- β_3 and β_4 help understand how unemployment rates in other age groups (adults and seniors) are related to youth unemployment. This can reveal whether higher unemployment rates in these groups are associated with higher or lower youth unemployment rates.

The intercept β_0 provides the baseline level of youth unemployment when all other variables are zero, which may not always be a practical scenario but is necessary for the model's mathematical formulation. The error term ϵ captures the model's limitations and any random factors affecting youth unemployment that aren't included in the model.

3.2 Model justification

The utilization of a multiple linear regression model for analyzing the relationship between people's unemployment status, age groups, and education level over time is substantiated by various rationales. Primarily, the model adeptly accommodates multiple independent variables such as education level and age group, each potentially exerting influence on the dependent variable, unemployment status. This capacity allows for an assessment of the individual impact of each predictor while simultaneously controlling for the influence of others. Such a model not only facilitates the quantification of the relationships between these factors and unemployment—via coefficients that express the extent of change in response per unit change in a predictor (with other variables held constant)—but also enables hypothesis testing on

the parameters. This testing is instrumental in determining whether the associations between predictors and the response are statistically significant, thereby offering insights into the meaningfulness of these relationships.

4 Results

4.1 Model Interpretation:

Based on the regression model output, as seen in Table 2, several interpretations can be drawn:

- **Baseline Unemployment:** The intercept of 328.01 suggests a baseline youth unemployment level, conditional on all other predictor variables being zero.
- **Impact of Higher Education:**
 - *Above Bachelor's Degree:* The coefficient 5.14*** indicates a significant and positive association with youth unemployment rates, implying potential overqualification or job market mismatches.
 - *Bachelor's Degree:* Similarly, a coefficient of 4.14** suggests that a bachelor's degree is associated with higher unemployment.
 - *University Degree:* With a coefficient of 4.27**, university graduates also face higher unemployment rates.
- **Some Postsecondary Education:** A negative coefficient of -2.20+ for those with some postsecondary education indicates a decrease in unemployment compared to the reference group.
- **Adult Unemployment:** The significant positive coefficient 2.19*** for adult unemployment implies a correlation with youth unemployment rates.
- **Time Factor:** The non-significant coefficient for the reference period suggests that time does not significantly alter youth unemployment rates when holding other factors constant.
- **Goodness of Fit:**
 - The high R-squared value of 0.923 indicates that the model explains much of the variance in youth unemployment rates.
 - The Adjusted R-squared value of 0.898 takes into account the number of predictors and suggests a good fit to the data.
- **Significance Levels:**

Table 2: Regression Analysis: Impact of Education Level and Age on Youth Unemployment

Baseline Model for Youth Unemployment	
(Intercept)	328.01 (368.38)
Above Bachelor's	5.14 (1.40)
Bachelor's	4.14 (1.37)
High School Grad	−0.41 (1.16)
Postsec. Cert/Dip	1.24 (1.29)
Some High School	−0.95 (1.10)
Some Postsec.	−2.20 (1.28)
All Levels	4.55 (1.25)
University	4.27 (1.37)
Reference Period	−0.16 (0.18)
Adult Unemployment	2.19 (0.31)
Senior Unemployment	−0.20 (0.37)
Num.Obs.	45
R2	0.923
R2 Adj.	0.898
AIC	182.4
BIC	205.9
Log.Lik.	−78.222
RMSE	1.38

- The asterisks (***, **, *) represent the level of statistical significance, with more stars denoting stronger evidence against the null hypothesis.

These findings underscore the complexity of youth unemployment and the varied impact of educational attainment on job market outcomes.

4.2 Youth Unemployment

The results presented in Table 3 and Table 4 shows the percentage change of youth unemployment rates over the years by education level for 2019-2023 and 2022-2023 respectively. The column on the far right shows the net percentage change for that time period. The following formula was used to calculate the net percentage change in the unemployment rate:

$$\text{Net Percentage Change} = \left(\frac{\text{Value at End Period} - \text{Value at Start Period}}{\text{Value at Start Period}} \right) \times 100\%$$

Table 3: Percentage Change in Youth Unemployment by education level (2019-2023)

Education Level	Unemployment Rate (2019)	Unemployment Rate (2023)	Percentage Change (%)
0 to 8 years	17.5	18.6	6.29
Above bachelor's degree	10.3	9.3	-9.71
Bachelor's degree	7.7	8.5	10.39
High school graduate	10.9	11.2	2.75
Postsecondary certificate or diploma	6.7	6.4	-4.48
Some high school	16.8	16.8	0.00
Some postsecondary	9.8	9.1	-7.14
Total, all education levels	10.7	10.8	0.93
University degree	8.0	8.6	7.50

Table 4: Percentage Change in Youth Unemployment by education level (2022-2023)

Education Level	Unemployment Rate (2022)	Unemployment Rate (2023)	Percentage Change (%)
0 to 8 years	15.0	18.6	24.00
Above bachelor's degree	8.8	9.3	5.68
Bachelor's degree	7.6	8.5	11.84
High school graduate	10.6	11.2	5.66

Table 4: Percentage Change in Youth Unemployment by education level (2022-2023)

Education Level	Unemployment Rate (2022)	Unemployment Rate (2023)	Percentage Change (%)
Postsecondary certificate or diploma	6.7	6.4	-4.48
Some high school	14.9	16.8	12.75
Some postsecondary	8.5	9.1	7.06
Total, all education levels	10.1	10.8	6.93
University degree	7.7	8.6	11.69




Figure 1: Youth Unemployment Rates

Looking at Figure 1, it gives us a visualization of the youth unemployment rates for varying education levels across the years. We then used the following formula to calculate the overall percentage change between years:

$$\text{Overall Percentage Change} = \left(\frac{\text{Sum of Rates in X Year} - \text{Sum of Rates in Y Year}}{\text{Sum of Rates in Y Year}} \right) \times 100\%$$

The overall percentage change for the youth unemployment rate is $\approx 0.92\%$ increase between 2019 and 2023 and $\approx 10.45\%$ increase between 2022 and 2023.

The figures and tables from our analysis present a nuanced picture of youth unemployment across different educational strata over a period extending from 2019 to 2023.

- **Trends Over Time:** A clear pattern of fluctuation is evident in the unemployment rates. The peak observed in 2020 may correlate with the economic downturn caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, affecting youth employment disproportionately.
- **Impact of Education:** The variation in unemployment by education level underscores the importance of educational attainment. Notably, higher levels of education such as “Above Bachelor’s” and “Bachelor’s” do not necessarily correlate with lower unemployment rates, suggesting a potential oversupply of higher education qualifications or mismatches between education and job market needs.
- **Percentage Changes:**
 - *Net Percentage Change:* Individual educational levels show diverse trends, with some experiencing increases in unemployment, while others show decreases over the four-year span.
 - *Overall Percentage Change:* The aggregate data reveals a modest uptick in youth unemployment rates, which may reflect broader economic and societal shifts.

4.3 Adult Unemployment

Table 5: Percentage Change in Adult Unemployment by education level (2019-2023)

Education Level	Unemployment Rate (2019)	Unemployment Rate (2023)	Percentage Change (%)
0 to 8 years	9.4	11.3	20.21
Above bachelor’s degree	4.4	4.0	-9.09
Bachelor’s degree	4.1	4.2	2.44
High school graduate	7.1	7.1	0.00
Postsecondary certificate or diploma	4.4	4.3	-2.27
Some high school	9.9	9.6	-3.03
Some postsecondary	7.1	6.7	-5.63
Total, all education levels	5.1	4.9	-3.92
University degree	4.2	4.1	-2.38

Table 6: Percentage Change in Adult Unemployment by education level (2022-2023)

Education Level	Unemployment Rate (2022)	Unemployment Rate (2023)	Percentage Change (%)
0 to 8 years	8.5	11.3	32.94
Above bachelor's degree	3.5	4.0	14.29
Bachelor's degree	3.8	4.2	10.53
High school graduate	6.5	7.1	9.23
Postsecondary certificate or diploma	4.1	4.3	4.88
Some high school	9.9	9.6	-3.03
Some postsecondary	6.5	6.7	3.08
Total, all education levels	4.6	4.9	6.52
University degree	3.7	4.1	10.81




Figure 2: Adult Unemployment Rates

Similar to the youth unemployment, Table 5 and Table 6 show the net percentage change in the adult unemployment for the years 2019-2023 and 2022-2023 respectively.

The analysis of adult unemployment rates from 2019 to 2023 uncovers distinct trends across education levels. Notably, individuals with “0 to 8 years” of education show a marked increase

in unemployment rates, which could indicate that lower educational attainment is a significant risk factor for adult unemployment.

Conversely, adults with education “Above bachelor’s degree” experienced a decrease in unemployment rates, suggesting that higher education may offer better protection against job market downturns. This trend aligns with the expectation that higher qualifications translate to greater employment stability.

For other education categories, such as “Bachelor’s degree” and “High school graduate,” the changes are relatively moderate, indicating a more nuanced relationship between education and job market outcomes for these groups.

Overall, the adult unemployment rate shows an approximately $\approx 0.89\%$ increase from 2019 to 2023, which might reflect the lingering effects of economic events or shifts in the labor market dynamics. However, the period from 2022 to 2023 sees a more pronounced increase of approximately $\approx 9.98\%$, highlighting the potential for rapid changes in unemployment within a single year.

These patterns underscore the importance of ongoing education and training throughout one’s career, as well as the need for targeted support for adults with lower levels of education.

Figure 2 illustrates the fluctuation in unemployment rates across different education levels. It reveals that unemployment is not uniform across the educational spectrum, which has implications for policymakers and educators alike.

4.4 Senior Unemployment

Table 7: Percentage Change in Senior Unemployment by education level (2019-2023)

Education Level	Unemployment Rate (2019)	Unemployment Rate (2023)	Percentage Change (%)
0 to 8 years	7.8	7.1	-8.97
Above bachelor’s degree	3.2	3.6	12.50
Bachelor’s degree	3.8	3.7	-2.63
High school graduate	4.8	4.4	-8.33
Postsecondary certificate or diploma	4.6	4.0	-13.04
Some high school	7.0	6.8	-2.86
Some postsecondary	4.8	4.0	-16.67
Total, all education levels	4.6	4.2	-8.70
University degree	3.6	3.7	2.78

Table 8: Percentage Change in Senior Unemployment by education level (2022-2023)

Education Level	Unemployment Rate (2022)	Unemployment Rate (2023)	Percentage Change (%)
0 to 8 years	8.0	7.1	-11.25
Above bachelor's degree	3.3	3.6	9.09
Bachelor's degree	3.7	3.7	0.00
High school graduate	4.9	4.4	-10.20
Postsecondary certificate or diploma	4.3	4.0	-6.98
Some high school	7.6	6.8	-10.53
Some postsecondary	4.4	4.0	-9.09
Total, all education levels	4.4	4.2	-4.55
University degree	3.6	3.7	2.78




Figure 3: Senior Unemployment Rates

The study of senior unemployment sheds light on the intricate interplay between education levels and job market viability. Key observations include:

- **Divergent Patterns:** A pronounced decrease in unemployment rates was observed among seniors with vocational training as seen from Table 7 and Table 8, while those with

higher academic degrees saw an uptick, raising questions about the alignment between higher education and job opportunities in the market.

- **Consistency Among University Graduates:** Seniors holding university degrees experienced a marginal increase in unemployment, suggesting a relative consistency within this group compared to others.
- **Overall Shifts:** There was an overall reduction in senior unemployment from 2019 to 2023 with a decrease of approximately $\approx 13.54\%$ and a decrease of approximately $\approx 6.11\%$ from 2022 to 2023, pointing towards potential shifts in retirement age, economic recoveries, or evolving job opportunities for seniors.
- The overarching trends in senior unemployment call for strategic educational planning and job placement efforts tailored to the nuanced needs of the aging workforce.
- The plotted data shown in Figure 3 provides a visual narrative of unemployment trends among seniors, highlighting that educational achievements translate differently into job security for the senior population.

5 Discussion

Given the results, it is important for us to discuss why we are seeing such results, and what they actually mean moving forward.

5.1 What we learn from these results

5.2 Why are we seeing these results

5.3 What could this entail for the future

5.4 Weaknesses and next steps

Weaknesses and next steps should also be included.

References

- Arel-Bundock, Vincent. 2022. “modelssummary: Data and Model Summaries in R.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 103 (1): 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v103.i01>.
- Bates, Douglas, Martin Mächler, Ben Bolker, and Steve Walker. 2015. “Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 67 (1): 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v067.i01>.
- Brilleman, SL, MJ Crowther, M Moreno-Betancur, J Buros Novik, and R Wolfe. 2018. “Joint Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Models via Stan.” https://github.com/stan-dev/stancon_talks/.
- Canada, Statistics. 2024a. *Labour Force Survey (LFS)*. <https://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=3701>.
- . 2024b. *Unemployment Rate, Participation Rate and Employment Rate by Educational Attainment, Annual*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/cv.action?pid=1410002001>.
- Firke, Sam. 2023. *Janitor: Simple Tools for Examining and Cleaning Dirty Data*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=janitor>.
- Grolemund, Garrett, and Hadley Wickham. 2011. “Dates and Times Made Easy with lubridate.” *Journal of Statistical Software* 40 (3): 1–25. <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v40/i03/>.
- Müller, Kirill. 2020. *Here: A Simpler Way to Find Your Files*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=here>.
- Neuwirth, Erich. 2022. *RColorBrewer: ColorBrewer Palettes*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=RColorBrewer>.
- R Core Team. 2023. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Richardson, Neal, Ian Cook, Nic Crane, Dewey Dunnington, Romain François, Jonathan Keane, Dragoş Moldovan-Grünfeld, Jeroen Ooms, Jacob Wujciak-Jens, and Apache Arrow. 2024. *Arrow: Integration to ‘Apache’ ‘Arrow’*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=arrow>.
- Wickham, Hadley. 2016. *Ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag New York. <https://ggplot2.tidyverse.org>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Mara Averick, Jennifer Bryan, Winston Chang, Lucy D’Agostino McGowan, Romain François, Garrett Grolemund, et al. 2019. “Welcome to the tidyverse.” *Journal of Open Source Software* 4 (43): 1686. <https://doi.org/10.21105/joss.01686>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Romain François, Lionel Henry, Kirill Müller, and Davis Vaughan. 2023. *Dplyr: A Grammar of Data Manipulation*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Jim Hester, and Jennifer Bryan. 2024. *Readr: Read Rectangular Text Data*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=readr>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Thomas Lin Pedersen, and Dana Seidel. 2023. *Scales: Scale Functions for Visualization*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=scales>.
- Wickham, Hadley, Davis Vaughan, and Maximilian Girlich. 2023. *Tidyr: Tidy Messy Data*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr>.

- Xie, Yihui. 2014. “Knitr: A Comprehensive Tool for Reproducible Research in R.” In *Implementing Reproducible Computational Research*, edited by Victoria Stodden, Friedrich Leisch, and Roger D. Peng. Chapman; Hall/CRC.
- Zhu, Hao. 2024. *kableExtra: Construct Complex Table with 'Kable' and Pipe Syntax*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=kableExtra>.