

# The Labor Demand and Labor Supply Channels of Monetary Policy

Sebastian Graves<sup>1</sup>, Christopher Huckfeldt<sup>2</sup>, and Eric Swanson<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Cambridge

<sup>2</sup>Federal Reserve Board

<sup>3</sup>UC Irvine & NBER

November 28, 2024

Macroeconomic Modelling Frontiers for Research and Policy  
European Central Bank

The views expressed in this paper/presentation are solely the responsibility of the authors and should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System or any other person associated with the Federal Reserve System.

## What we do

- ▶ Study response of **labor market flows** to identified **monetary policy shocks**
  - ▶ Estimate **impulse responses** from proxy SVAR with **HFI monetary policy shocks** à la Gertler and Karadi (2015)
  - ▶ Use shocks from Bauer and Swanson (2023) (necessary)

## What we do

- ▶ Study response of **labor market flows** to identified **monetary policy shocks**
  - ▶ Estimate **impulse responses** from proxy SVAR with **HFI monetary policy shocks** à la Gertler and Karadi (2015)
  - ▶ Use shocks from Bauer and Swanson (2023) (necessary)
- ▶ Focus on response of **supply-driven** labor market flows:
  - ▶ Flows between **unemployment (U)** and **nonparticipation (N)**
  - ▶ **Quits** from employment (E) to non-employment
    - ▶ **NEW decomposition** of E-to-N flows into **quits/layoffs**

## What we do

- ▶ Study response of **labor market flows** to identified **monetary policy shocks**
  - ▶ Estimate **impulse responses** from proxy SVAR with **HFI monetary policy shocks** à la Gertler and Karadi (2015)
  - ▶ Use shocks from Bauer and Swanson (2023) (necessary)
- ▶ Focus on response of **supply-driven** labor market flows:
  - ▶ Flows between **unemployment (U)** and **nonparticipation (N)**
  - ▶ **Quits** from employment (E) to non-employment
    - ▶ NEW decomposition of E-to-N flows into **quits/layoffs**
- ▶ After **contractionary monetary policy shock**:
  - ▶ Heightened **job-search** by non-employed: **U-to-N** rate ↓ & **N-to-U** rate ↑
  - ▶ **Quit rate to non-employment** ↓

## What we do

- ▶ Study response of **labor market flows** to identified **monetary policy shocks**
  - ▶ Estimate **impulse responses** from proxy SVAR with **HFI monetary policy shocks** à la Gertler and Karadi (2015)
  - ▶ Use shocks from Bauer and Swanson (2023) (necessary)
- ▶ Focus on response of **supply-driven** labor market flows:
  - ▶ Flows between **unemployment (U)** and **nonparticipation (N)**
  - ▶ **Quits** from employment (E) to non-employment
    - ▶ NEW decomposition of E-to-N flows into **quits/layoffs**
- ▶ After **contractionary monetary policy shock**:
  - ▶ Heightened **job-search** by non-employed: **U-to-N** rate ↓ & **N-to-U** rate ↑
  - ▶ **Quit rate to non-employment** ↓
- ▶ Apply standard accounting framework: Response of employment **twice as large** holding **supply-driven flows** fixed

## What we do (II)

- ▶ What do IRFs of supply-driven labor flows say about household labor supply response to a monetary policy shock?
  - ▶ Change in composition, or broad-based increase in labor supply?

## What we do (II)

- ▶ What do IRFs of **supply-driven labor flows** say about household **labor supply** response to a **monetary policy shock**?
  - ▶ Change in **composition**, or broad-based increase in **labor supply**?
- ▶ To answer, we study **heterogeneous agent model** with **labor market frictions** and **endogenous participation** à la Krusell et al. (2017)
- ▶ Estimate **key model parameters** to match response of **labor market flows** to contractionary monetary policy shock
  - ▶ Study by feeding in responses for layoff rate, job-finding rate, interest rate and wages

## What we do (II)

- ▶ What do IRFs of supply-driven labor flows say about household labor supply response to a monetary policy shock?
  - ▶ Change in composition, or broad-based increase in labor supply?
- ▶ To answer, we study heterogeneous agent model with labor market frictions and endogenous participation à la Krusell et al. (2017)
- ▶ Estimate key model parameters to match response of labor market flows to contractionary monetary policy shock
  - ▶ Study by feeding in responses for layoff rate, job-finding rate, interest rate and wages
- ▶ Model achieves close fit for aggregate labor market flows
- ▶ While also consistent with micro evidence on MPCs and MPEs
- ▶ Model implies quantitatively important labor supply response:  
Fix labor supply policy functions at steady-state: employment falls  $\approx 70\%$  more

## Why we do it

- ▶ Conventional wisdom: monetary policy affects employment through **labor demand**
  - ▶ Little role (if any!) for **labor supply**

## Why we do it

- ▶ Conventional wisdom: monetary policy affects employment through **labor demand**
  - ▶ Little role (if any!) for **labor supply**
- ▶ Typical NK models abstract from **labor supply** response to monetary policy
  - ▶ Sticky wages + neoclassical labor market clearing  $\Rightarrow$  labor is **demand-determined**
    - ▶ E.g. Gali, Smets, and Wouters (2011), Broer et al (2020), Wolf (2023)
  - ▶ NK + **search-and-matching**  $\Rightarrow$  labor supplied **inelastically**
    - ▶ E.g. Gertler, Sala, and Trigari (2008), Christiano, Eichenbaum, and Trabandt (2016)

## Why we do it

- ▶ Conventional wisdom: monetary policy affects employment through **labor demand**
  - ▶ Little role (if any!) for **labor supply**
- ▶ Typical NK models abstract from **labor supply** response to monetary policy
  - ▶ Sticky wages + neoclassical labor market clearing  $\Rightarrow$  labor is **demand-determined**
    - ▶ E.g. Gali, Smets, and Wouters (2011), Broer et al (2020), Wolf (2023)
  - ▶ NK + **search-and-matching**  $\Rightarrow$  labor supplied **inelastically**
    - ▶ E.g. Gertler, Sala, and Trigari (2008), Christiano, Eichenbaum, and Trabandt (2016)
- ▶ This paper: New evidence that decline in employment from a **contractionary monetary policy shock** significantly attenuated by **increase in labor supply**
- ▶ Potentially relevant for understanding **post-Covid period**: large fiscal transfers to households, quits  $\uparrow$ , labor force participation  $\downarrow$ , inflation  $\uparrow$

# Data & Methodology

## Labor Market Flows

- ▶ Time series data on labor market flows from CPS microdata
- ▶ Three states: employment (**E**), unemployment (**U**), nonparticipation (**N**)

## Labor Market Flows

- ▶ Time series data on labor market flows from CPS microdata
- ▶ Three states: employment (**E**), unemployment (**U**), nonparticipation (**N**)
- ▶ Interpret dynamics of **labor market stocks** through response of **flows**:

$$\begin{bmatrix} E \\ U \\ N \end{bmatrix}_{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - p_{EU} - p_{EN} & p_{UE} & p_{NE} \\ p_{EU} & 1 - p_{UE} - p_{UN} & p_{NU} \\ p_{EN} & p_{UN} & 1 - p_{NE} - p_{NU} \end{bmatrix}_{t+1} \begin{bmatrix} E \\ U \\ N \end{bmatrix}_t$$

# Labor Market Flows

- ▶ Time series data on labor market flows from CPS microdata
- ▶ Three states: employment (E), unemployment (U), nonparticipation (N)
- ▶ Interpret dynamics of **labor market stocks** through response of **flows**:

$$\begin{bmatrix} E \\ U \\ N \end{bmatrix}_{t+1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - p_{EU} - p_{EN} & p_{UE} & p_{NE} \\ p_{EU} & 1 - p_{UE} - p_{UN} & p_{NU} \\ p_{EN} & p_{UN} & 1 - p_{NE} - p_{NU} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} E \\ U \\ N \end{bmatrix}_t$$

- ▶ Particular focus on response of **supply-driven flows** to monetary policy
  - ▶ Decision to search from non-employment, e.g. **U-to-N** and **N-to-U**
  - ▶ Quits to unemployment and nonparticipation (**new!**)

## Estimating the Effects of Monetary Policy

- Begin with reduced-form VAR:

$$Y_t = \alpha + B(L)Y_{t-1} + u_t \quad (1)$$

- Six monthly variables for baseline specification: two-year Treasury yield, unemployment rate, participation rate, log CPI, log IP, excess bond premium

## Estimating the Effects of Monetary Policy

- ▶ Begin with reduced-form VAR:

$$Y_t = \alpha + B(L)Y_{t-1} + u_t \quad (1)$$

- ▶ Six monthly variables for baseline specification: two-year Treasury yield, unemployment rate, participation rate, log CPI, log IP, excess bond premium
- ▶ Assume structural shocks:

$$u_t = S\varepsilon_t \quad (2)$$

where the first structural shock is a “monetary policy shock”,  $\varepsilon_t^{mp}$

- ▶ First column of  $S$ , denoted  $s_1$ , describes the impact effect of the structural monetary policy shock  $\varepsilon_t^{mp}$  on  $u_t$  and  $Y_t$ .
- ▶ Use an external instrument  $z_t$  to identify  $s_1$

## External Instrument

- External instrument  $z_t$  needs to satisfy:

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ z_t \varepsilon_t^{mp} \right\} \neq 0 \quad (\text{relevance})$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left\{ z_t \varepsilon_t^{-mp} \right\} = 0 \quad (\text{exogeneity})$$

- Use HFI changes in interest rate futures as external instrument in VAR
  - e.g., Stock and Watson (2012), Gertler & Karadi (2015)

## External Instrument

- External instrument  $z_t$  needs to satisfy:

$$\mathbb{E} \{ z_t \varepsilon_t^{mp} \} \neq 0 \quad (\text{relevance})$$

$$\mathbb{E} \{ z_t \varepsilon_t^{-mp} \} = 0 \quad (\text{exogeneity})$$

- Use HFI changes in interest rate futures as external instrument in VAR
  - e.g., Stock and Watson (2012), Gertler & Karadi (2015)
- Implement methodology from Bauer & Swanson (2023)
  - Use interest rate changes around FOMC announcements and Fed Chair speeches
  - Orthogonalized with respect to recent macro/financial news
- Both speeches and orthogonalizing necessary for accurate estimates of flow IRFs

## External Instrument

- ▶ External instrument  $z_t$  needs to satisfy:







$$\mathbb{E}\{z_t \varepsilon_t^{mp}\} \neq 0 \quad (\text{relevance})$$

$$\mathbb{E}\{z_t \varepsilon_t^{-mp}\} = 0 \quad (\text{exogeneity})$$

- ▶ Use HFI changes in interest rate futures as external instrument in VAR
  - ▶ e.g., Stock and Watson (2012), Gertler & Karadi (2015)
- ▶ Implement methodology from Bauer & Swanson (2023)
  - ▶ Use interest rate changes around FOMC announcements and Fed Chair speeches
  - ▶ Orthogonalized with respect to recent macro/financial news
- ▶ Both speeches and orthogonalizing necessary for accurate estimates of flow IRFs
- ▶ Labor market flows added one-by-one to the main VAR

# Estimates


# Baseline VAR




Robust  $F$ -statistic: 13.05

- ▶ Monthly data, 1978:M1–2019:M12
- ▶ Dark and light shaded regions report **68%** and **90%** confidence intervals

# Response of Labor Market Flows




# Response of Labor Market Flows




- $pEU \uparrow$ ,  $pUE \downarrow$ , &  $pNE \downarrow \Rightarrow$  Consistent with narrative of decline in labor demand

# Response of Labor Market Flows




- $pEU \uparrow$ ,  $pUE \downarrow$ , &  $pNE \downarrow \Rightarrow$  Consistent with narrative of decline in labor demand
- $pNU \uparrow$ ,  $pUN \downarrow$ , &  $pEN \downarrow$  (via quits)  $\Rightarrow$  Consistent with increase in labor supply

# Response of Labor Market Flows



- $p_{EU} \uparrow$ ,  $p_{UE} \downarrow$ , &  $p_{NE} \downarrow \Rightarrow$  Consistent with narrative of **decline in labor demand**
- $p_{NU} \uparrow$ ,  $p_{UN} \downarrow$ , &  $p_{EN} \downarrow$  (via quits)  $\Rightarrow$  Consistent with **increase in labor supply**

# Response of EU & EN Flows: Quits vs Layoffs



- ▶ Increase in layoffs explains rise in EU rate
- ▶ Decline in quits explains fall in EN rate

## Additional Results

After contractionary monetary policy shock we also find:

1. Increase in “intensive margins” of search from non-employment 
2. Cyclical composition plays limited role in shaping response of aggregate flows 
3. Larger response of supply-driven flows among less-educated 
4. Decline in participation driven by labor force exit (through increase in unemployment); attenuated by increase in labor force entry 
5. Significant decline in vacancies 
6. Nominal wages decline slowly 
7. No response of job-to-job transitions 

# Using Flows to Account for Dynamics of Labor Market Stocks

## Flow-Based Accounting for Dynamics of Stocks

- ▶ Assess role of **supply-driven flows** (e.g., *pNU*) in shaping response of **employment**

## Flow-Based Accounting for Dynamics of Stocks

- ▶ Assess role of **supply-driven flows** (e.g.,  $p_{NU}$ ) in shaping response of **employment**
- ▶ Recall **law of motion** for **stocks** in terms of **transition probabilities** (i.e., flows)

$$\begin{bmatrix} E \\ U \\ N \end{bmatrix}_{t+1} = \underbrace{\begin{bmatrix} 1 - p_{EU} - p_{EN} & p_{UE} & p_{NE} \\ p_{EU} & 1 - p_{UE} - p_{UN} & p_{NU} \\ p_{EN} & p_{UN} & 1 - p_{NE} - p_{NU} \end{bmatrix}}_{\equiv P_{t+1}} \begin{bmatrix} E \\ U \\ N \end{bmatrix}_t$$

## Flow-Based Accounting for Dynamics of Stocks

- ▶ Assess role of supply-driven flows (e.g.,  $p_{NU}$ ) in shaping response of employment
- ▶ Recall law of motion for stocks in terms of transition probabilities (i.e., flows)

$$\begin{bmatrix} E_{t+k} \\ U_{t+k} \\ N_{t+k} \end{bmatrix} = \left( \prod_{j=1}^k P_{t+j} \right) \begin{bmatrix} E_t \\ U_t \\ N_t \end{bmatrix}$$

## Flow-Based Accounting for Dynamics of Stocks

- ▶ Assess role of **supply-driven flows** (e.g.,  $p_{NU}$ ) in shaping response of **employment**
- ▶ Recall **law of motion** for **stocks** in terms of **transition probabilities** (i.e., flows)

$$\begin{bmatrix} E_{t+k} \\ U_{t+k} \\ N_{t+k} \end{bmatrix} = \left( \prod_{j=1}^k P_{t+j} \right) \begin{bmatrix} E_t \\ U_t \\ N_t \end{bmatrix}$$

- ▶ Construct **hypothetical** IRF of **employment** holding response of  $p_{NU}$  constant
- ▶ Substitute  $\{p_{NU}\}_{t+j}$  in  $P_{t+j}$  with steady-state value  $\bar{p}_{NU}$ , then solve forward
- ▶ Difference of **hypothetical** and **actual** response of **employment** reflects role of  $p_{NU}$

## Flow-Based Accounting for Dynamics of Stocks

- ▶ Assess role of **supply-driven flows** (e.g.,  $p_{NU}$ ) in shaping response of **employment**
- ▶ Recall **law of motion** for **stocks** in terms of **transition probabilities** (i.e., flows)

$$\begin{bmatrix} E_{t+k} \\ U_{t+k} \\ N_{t+k} \end{bmatrix} = \left( \prod_{j=1}^k P_{t+j} \right) \begin{bmatrix} E_t \\ U_t \\ N_t \end{bmatrix}$$


- ▶ Construct **hypothetical** IRF of **employment** holding response of  $p_{NU}$  constant
- ▶ Substitute  $\{p_{NU}\}_{t+j}$  in  $P_{t+j}$  with steady-state value  $\bar{p}_{NU}$ , then solve forward
- ▶ Difference of **hypothetical** and **actual** response of **employment** reflects role of  $p_{NU}$
- ▶ Repeat for all supply-driven flows, in various combinations

▶ Ins and Outs of Employment


▶ Ins and Outs of Unemployment

▶ Ins and Outs of Participation


## Decomposing Employment Response to a Monetary Policy Shock




## Decomposing Employment Response to a Monetary Policy Shock



## Decomposing Employment Response to a Monetary Policy Shock



# Decomposing Employment Response to a Monetary Policy Shock



- ▶ Holding supply-driven flows fixed  $\Rightarrow$  Employment falls twice as much

▶ Controls for composition

▶ Participation

▶ Unemployment

# Model

## Model

- ▶ What do IRFs of **supply-driven labor flows** say about household **labor supply response** to a monetary policy shock?

## Model

- ▶ What do IRFs of **supply-driven labor flows** say about household **labor supply response** to a monetary policy shock?
- ▶ To answer, we study **heterogeneous agent model** with **labor market frictions** and **endogenous participation** à la Krusell et al (2017)
  - ▶ Households face **employment risk** (job-finding/layoff) + shocks to **labor productivity**
  - ▶ Choose **consumption/savings** and **labor supply** (quit, search, accept)

## Model

- ▶ What do IRFs of **supply-driven labor flows** say about household **labor supply response** to a monetary policy shock?
- ▶ To answer, we study **heterogeneous agent model** with **labor market frictions** and **endogenous participation** à la Krusell et al (2017)
  - ▶ Households face **employment risk** (job-finding/layoff) + shocks to **labor productivity**
  - ▶ Choose **consumption/savings** and **labor supply** (quit, search, accept)
- ▶ Estimate **key model parameters** to match response of **labor market flows** to contractionary monetary policy shock
  - ▶ Study by feeding in responses of job finding and layoff rates, interest rate and wages
  - ▶ Overall **response of labor market flows** also determined by endogenous changes in **policy functions** + **distribution** of households across labor market states
  - ▶ Impulse response matching à la Christiano, Eichenbaum, Evans (2005)

## Value Functions

Let  $V_E(a, z)$ ,  $V_U(a, z, \kappa)$ , and  $V_N(a, z, \kappa)$  represent the values of being employed, UI-eligible non-employed, and UI-ineligible non-employed:

Defined over

- ▶  $a$  = assets
- ▶  $z$  = idiosyncratic productivity:  $\log z' = \rho_z \log z + \varepsilon_z$  ,  $\varepsilon_z \sim N(0, \sigma_z^2)$
- ▶  $\kappa$  = cost of job search, iid from logistic distribution: mean =  $\mu_\kappa$ , scale =  $\sigma_\kappa$

## Value Functions

Let  $V_E(a, z)$ ,  $V_U(a, z, \kappa)$ , and  $V_N(a, z, \kappa)$  represent the values of being employed, UI-eligible non-employed, and UI-ineligible non-employed:

$$V_E(a, z) = \max_{c, a'} \left\{ u(c) + \beta \max \left\{ \underbrace{\mathbb{E} V_N(a', z', \kappa')}_{\text{Quit}}, \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [\delta_L V_U(a', z', \kappa') + (1 - \delta_L) V_E(a', z')]}_{\text{Do Not Quit}} \right\} \right\}$$

subject to

$$c + a' = Ra + (1 - \tau)wz + T, \quad a' \geq 0$$

## Value Functions

Let  $V_E(a, z)$ ,  $V_U(a, z, \kappa)$ , and  $V_N(a, z, \kappa)$  represent the values of being employed, UI-eligible non-employed, and UI-ineligible non-employed:

$$V_U(a, z, \kappa) = \max_{c, a'} \left\{ u(c) + \max \left\{ \underbrace{(1 - \kappa)\psi + \beta V_U^s(a', z)}_{\text{Search}}, \underbrace{\psi + \beta V_U^{ns}(a', z)}_{\text{Do Not Search}} \right\} \right\}$$

subject to

$$c + a' = Ra + (1 - \tau) \min\{\phi w z, \bar{\phi}\} + T, \quad a' \geq 0$$

## Value Functions

Let  $V_E(a, z)$ ,  $V_U(a, z, \kappa)$ , and  $V_N(a, z, \kappa)$  represent the values of being employed, UI-eligible non-employed, and UI-ineligible non-employed:

$$V_U(a, z, \kappa) = \max_{c, a'} \left\{ u(c) + \max \left\{ \underbrace{(1 - \kappa)\psi + \beta V_U^s(a', z)}_{\text{Search}}, \underbrace{\psi + \beta V_U^{ns}(a', z)}_{\text{Do Not Search}} \right\} \right\}$$

subject to

$$c + a' = Ra + (1 - \tau) \min\{\phi w z, \bar{\phi}\} + T, \quad a' \geq 0$$

where

$$V_U^s(a', z) = f_s \cdot \max \overbrace{\{ \mathbb{E} V_E(a', z'), \mathbb{E} \tilde{V}_U(a', z', \kappa') \}}^{\text{Accept or Reject Job Offer}} + (1 - f_s) \mathbb{E} \tilde{V}_U(a', z', \kappa')$$

$$V_U^{ns}(a', z) = f_{ns} \cdot \max \{ \mathbb{E} V_E(a', z'), \mathbb{E} V_N(a', z', \kappa') \} + (1 - f_{ns}) \mathbb{E} V_N(a', z', \kappa')$$

$$\tilde{V}_U(a, z, \kappa) = \delta_{UI} V_N(a, z, \kappa) + (1 - \delta_{UI}) V_U(a, z, \kappa).$$

## Value Functions

Let  $V_E(a, z)$ ,  $V_U(a, z, \kappa)$ , and  $V_N(a, z, \kappa)$  represent the values of being employed, UI-eligible non-employed, and UI-ineligible non-employed:

$$V_N(a, z, \kappa) = \max_{c, a'} \left\{ u(c) + \max \left\{ \underbrace{(1 - \kappa)\psi + \beta V_N^s(a', z)}_{\text{Search}}, \underbrace{\psi + \beta V_N^{ns}(a', z)}_{\text{Do Not Search}} \right\} \right\}$$


subject to

$$c + a' = Ra + T, \quad a' \geq 0$$

where


$$\begin{aligned} V_N^s(a', z) &= f_s \cdot \max \left\{ \overbrace{\mathbb{E} V_E(a', z'), \mathbb{E} V_N(a', z', \kappa')}^{\text{Accept or Reject Job Offer}} \right\} + (1 - f_s) \mathbb{E} V_N(a', z', \kappa') \\ V_N^{ns}(a', z) &= f_{ns} \cdot \max \left\{ \mathbb{E} V_E(a', z'), \mathbb{E} V_N(a', z', \kappa') \right\} + (1 - f_{ns}) \mathbb{E} V_N(a', z', \kappa') \end{aligned}$$

## Results: Steady State



1. Model almost exactly fits steady-state transition rates between E, U and N
2. Model produces quarterly MPC of 7-8%, annual MPE of 2-3%  
In line with (recent) literature

# Response of Labor Market Flows: Model vs Data



- ▶ Labor market flows from model (magenta lines) largely fall within 68% CI's


## The Role of Labor Supply

- ▶ Ability of model to match response of labor market flows could reflect endogenous changes in **composition** or household **labor supply**
- ▶ For example, **decrease in UN** flows could reflect
  - ▶ Greater mass of “likely searchers” in non-employment, or
  - ▶ Higher propensity to search for employment of all workers

## The Role of Labor Supply

- ▶ Ability of model to match response of labor market flows could reflect endogenous changes in **composition** or household **labor supply**
- ▶ For example, **decrease in UN** flows could reflect
  - ▶ Greater mass of “likely searchers” in non-employment, or
  - ▶ **Higher propensity to search** for employment of all workers
- ▶ To assess relative importance of two channels, simulate model holding labor supply policy functions at steady state
  - ▶ If changes in **labor supply** do not matter, **employment** should be **unaffected**

## The Role of Labor Supply: Employment Response



- ▶ **Finding:** Employment drops by additional  $\approx 70\%$ 
  - ▶ Indicates broad-based increase in labor supply to contractionary monetary shock

# Conclusion

## Conclusion

- ▶ New evidence from labor market flows consistent with **substantial increase in labor supply** to a **contractionary monetary policy shock**
  - ▶ Increase in **search** activity + **decline in quits** to non-employment
  - ▶ Holding response of **supply-driven flows** constant, decline in employment **doubles**
- ▶ Interpret findings through estimated heterogenous agent model with **frictional labor markets** and **participation margin**
  - ▶ Model matches response of labor flows through **broad-based increase** in labor supply
- ▶ Empirical evidence + model findings consistent with important role of **labor supply** in **monetary transmission mechanism**
- ▶ Future/ongoing work: study labor supply response to Covid-era transfers (e.g., “**Great Resignation**”) and evaluate role in for subsequent inflation

# Extra Slides

# Cyclical Properties of Labor Market Stocks and Flows

## Cyclicality of Labor Market Stocks

	Employment- Population Ratio	Unemployment Rate	Participation Rate
mean( $x$ )	61.14	6.19	65.16
std( $x$ )/std( $Y$ )	0.72	8.25	0.23
corr( $x, Y$ )	0.83	-0.85	0.35

Note:  $x$  denotes the variable in each column,  $Y$  denotes HP-filtered log real GDP. Standard deviations and correlations are computed for HP-filtered quarterly averages. The sample is 1978-2019.

## Cyclicality of Labor Market Flows

	EU	EN	UE	UN	NE	NU
mean( $x$ )	0.014	0.030	0.255	0.226	0.046	0.025
std( $x$ )/std( $Y$ )	5.20	2.46	5.69	4.14	3.00	5.22
corr( $x, Y$ )	-0.83	0.49	0.78	0.71	0.65	-0.68

Note:  $x$  denotes the variable in each column,  $Y$  denotes HP-filtered log real GDP. Standard deviations and correlations are computed for HP-filtered quarterly averages. The sample is 1978-2019.

# New Decomposition of Flows From Employment to Non-Employment

- ▶ Previous work: EU flows dominated by layoffs (Elsby et al. 2009, Ahn, 2023)

	Total	Quits	Layoffs	Other
mean( $x$ )	0.014	0.002	0.008	0.004
std( $x$ )/std( $Y$ )	5.20	8.11	8.03	5.43
corr( $x, Y$ )	-0.83	0.60	-0.83	-0.54



Note:  $x$  denotes the variable in each column,  $Y$  denotes HP-filtered log real GDP. Standard deviations and correlations are computed for HP-filtered quarterly averages.

- ▶ This paper: EN flows show larger role for quits

	Total	Quits	Layoffs	Other
mean( $x$ )	0.030	0.012	0.003	0.015
std( $x$ )/std( $Y$ )	2.46	5.88	14.42	4.80
corr( $x, Y$ )	0.49	0.53	-0.44	0.25

Note:  $x$  denotes the variable in each column,  $Y$  denotes HP-filtered log real GDP. Standard deviations and correlations are computed for HP-filtered quarterly averages.

# Decomposition of EU Flows



## Relevance of Distinction Between Quits and Layoffs

Post-EU Transition Rates: Quits vs Layoffs

From	To		
	E	U	N
E – U(Quit)	0.448	0.399	0.153
E – U(Layoff)	0.426	0.468	0.106

Note: Transition rates are shown for individuals that are in their first month of unemployment following an employment spell, split by reason for unemployment.

◀ Back

## Relevance of Distinction Between Quits and Layoffs

	Average Probability
Want Job   E-N(Quit)	0.224
Want Job   E-N(layoff)	0.528
NE   Want Job	0.152
NE   Do Not Want Job	0.039
NU   Want Job	0.177
NU   Do Not Want Job	0.013

*Note:* The top section shows the probability that individuals want a job, split by the reason for leaving to nonparticipation. The bottom section shows the probabilities of moving to employment, split by whether or not nonparticipants report wanting a job.

◀ Back

# Robustness of Quit/Layoff Distinction

## Sequences of Reasons for U among E-U-U Individuals

<i>Sample period</i>	$\Pr(\text{Quit} \mid \text{Layoff})$	$\Pr(\text{Layoff} \mid \text{Quit})$
pre-Redesign	0.039	0.208
post-Redesign	0.007	0.026


*Note:* The first row shows the probability of individuals switching their reason for unemployment from layoff to quit (in the first column), or from quit to layoff (in the second column), prior to the 1994 CPS redesign. The second row shows the same, but for the period following the redesign.

## Transition Rates Across E-U-U Individuals

	<i>From</i>	<i>To</i>		
		E	U	N
(a)	E – U(Quit) – U(Layoff)	0.339	0.553	0.108
(b)	E – U(Quit) – U(Quit)	0.343	0.536	0.121
(c)	E – U(Layoff) – U(Quit)	0.352	0.557	0.091
(d)	E – U(Layoff) – U(Layoff)	0.264	0.667	0.068


*Note:* Transition rates are shown for individuals that are in their second month of unemployment following an employment spell, split by reason for unemployment. The rates are computed for the period prior to the 1994 CPS redesign.

## Fraction of EN Transitions with Missing Reason



*Note:* The red line shows the proportion of individuals making an EN transition for which there is missing data on the reason for leaving the last job. The blue line shows the same calculation for individuals that were employed in each of the first three months before moving to nonparticipation. Series are smoothed using a centered 5-month moving average.


# Labor Market Flows: No Speeches (Not Orthogonalized)



- ▶ High-frequency shocks from FOMC announcements only
- ▶ Dashed red lines report our **baseline** estimates

◀ Back

# Labor Market Flows: No Speeches (Orthogonalized)




Robust  $F$ -statistic from Baseline VAR: 0.48

- ▶ FOMC announcements only, orthogonalized as in Bauer & Swanson (2023)
- ▶ Dashed red lines report our **baseline** estimates


◀ Back

# Labor Market Flows: Holding Composition Fixed




- ▶ Composition-adjusted flows by ex-ante characteristics, à la Elsby et al. (2015)
- ▶ Fix shares using bins for age  $\times$  gender  $\times$  education  $\times$  reason for unemployment
- ▶ Dashed red lines report our **baseline** estimates

## Decomposing Employment Response: Holding Composition Fixed









# Labor Market Flows: Holding Composition Fixed (Full Controls)



- ▶ Fix shares using bins for age  $\times$  gender  $\times$  education  $\times$  reason for unemployment  $\times$  labor market status one year ago
- ▶ Dashed red lines are responses for unadjusted flows with the same sample

# Labor Market Flows: Corrected for Time-Aggregation





◀ Back


# Intensive Margins of Labor Supply

Intensive margins of job search consistent with behavior of NU/UN flows:

- ▶ For N: share that want a job
- ▶ For U: number of search methods






## Intensive Margins: Time-Series









◀ Back

# Heterogeneity in Labor Market Responses: Education









◀ Back

# Labor Market Flows: Higher-Educated




◀ Back

# Labor Market Flows: Lower-Educated



◀ Back

## Participation: Response of Labor Force Entry and Exit




- ▶ Participation falls due to higher exit rate, offset by rise in entry
- ▶ Increase in exits driven by  $u_t$ , attenuated by  $EN_t$  and  $UN_t$

$$(\text{Labor Force Entry Rate})_t = NU_t + NE_t,$$


$$(\text{Labor Force Exit Rate})_t = u_{t-1} \cdot UN_t + (1 - u_{t-1}) \cdot EN_t,$$

where  $u_{t-1}$  denotes the unemployment rate

## Response of Job-to-Job Flows (1995-2019)




Robust  $F$ -statistic from Baseline VAR: 5.44



- ▶ Use measures from Fujita, Moscarini, Postel-Vinay (2024)
- ▶ No response of EE rate to contractionary MPS
- ▶ Cyclicalities of EE series from CPS likely muted by workers who “jump ship”

# Response of Labor Market Flows (1995-2019)





Robust  $F$ -statistic from Baseline VAR: 5.44

- Dashed red lines report impulse responses using full sample

◀ Back


## Response of Wages




- ▶ Nominal wages decline more slowly than CPI
- ▶ So real wages rise slightly in the short-run

◀ Back

## Response of Vacancies




## Participation Response to a Monetary Policy Shock



- With response of supply-driven flows fixed  $\Rightarrow$  Participation far more procyclical

◀ Back



## Unemployment Response to a Monetary Policy Shock



- ▶ Response of quits not important for unemployment dynamics


◀ Back

# Time Series of Labor Market Flows



◀ Back


# The Ins and Outs of Participation



- ▶  $E \rightarrow U$  and  $U \rightarrow E$  are important for participation cycle

◀ Back


# The Ins and Outs of Unemployment



- ▶  $E \rightarrow U$  and  $U \rightarrow E$  roughly equally responsible for rise in unemployment

◀ Back

# The Ins and Outs of Employment



- $N \rightarrow U$  more important than  $U \rightarrow N$  for supporting employment

◀ Back

## Timing within a Model Period

1. All individuals draw a new value of **productivity**,  $z$ . Non-employed individuals draw an **i.i.d. search cost**,  $\kappa$ .
2. Employed individuals make **consumption/saving** decisions and choose whether or not to **quit their job**. Non-employed individuals make **consumption/saving** decisions and choose whether or not to **search for a job**.
3. Employed individuals who do not quit are exogenously **laid off** with probability  $\delta$ . Non-employed individuals receive **job offers** with probabilities  $f_s$  of  $f_{ns}$ , depending on whether or not they actively search.
4. Non-employed individuals who receive job offers **decide whether or not to accept** such offers.
5. UI-eligible non-employed individuals who search and either do not receive a job offer or do not accept an offer are subject to **UI expiry** with probability  $\delta_{UI}$ .

◀ Back

## Estimation: A Monetary Policy Shock in the Model

- ▶ Feed in response of job-finding rate, layoff rate, real interest rates and wages from the data
- ▶ Overall response of labor market flows also determined by endogenous changes in policy functions + distribution of households across labor market states

## Estimation: A Monetary Policy Shock in the Model

- ▶ Feed in response of job-finding rate, layoff rate, real interest rates and wages from the data
- ▶ Overall response of labor market flows also determined by endogenous changes in policy functions + distribution of households across labor market states
- ▶ Calibrate a number of parameters,  $\theta_{EXT} \equiv \{\beta, \gamma, \bar{R}, \delta_{UI}, w, \alpha, \phi, \bar{\phi}, \tau, T\}$ 
  - ▶ Assume  $u(c) = \frac{c^{1-\gamma}-1}{1-\gamma}$ ,  $f_{ns} = \alpha f_s$

## Estimation: A Monetary Policy Shock in the Model

- ▶ Feed in response of job-finding rate, layoff rate, real interest rates and wages from the data
- ▶ Overall response of labor market flows also determined by endogenous changes in policy functions + distribution of households across labor market states
- ▶ Calibrate a number of parameters,  $\theta_{EXT} \equiv \{\beta, \gamma, \bar{R}, \delta_{UI}, w, \alpha, \phi, \bar{\phi}, \tau, T\}$
- ▶ Estimate remaining parameters to match IRFs of labor market flows
  - ▶ À la Christiano, Eichenbaum, Evans (2005) or Auclert, Rognlie, Straub (2020)

$$\theta_{EST} \equiv \{\rho_z, \sigma_z, \mu_\kappa, \sigma_\kappa, \psi, \delta_L, f_s\}$$

$$\hat{J} = \{EU_t, EN_t, UE_t, UN_t, NE_t, NU_t\}_{t=0}^{50}$$

$$\hat{\theta}_{EST} = \arg \min_{\theta_{EST}} (J(\theta_{EST}) - \hat{J})' \Sigma^{-1} (J(\theta_{EST}) - \hat{J})$$

# Model Parameters

Calibrated			
Parameter	Description	Value	Source/Target
$\beta$	Discount Factor	0.988	Quarterly MPC of 7-8%
$R$	Steady-State Real Interest Rate	1.001	1% Annual
$\gamma$	Risk Aversion Coefficient	2	Standard value
$\delta^{UI}$	Benefit Exhaustion Probability	0.167	Expected duration of UI
$w$	Steady-State Wage	1	Normalization
$\alpha$	Efficiency of Passive Search	0.6	Job-finding rate from N
$\phi$	UI Replacement Rate	0.50	Graves (2023)
$\bar{\phi}$	Maximum UI Payments	1.85	Graves (2023)
$\tau$	Labor Income Tax Rate	0.33	Auclert et al. (2021)
$T$	Lump-sum Transfer	0.24	Auclert et al. (2021)

Estimated			
Parameter	Description	Value	Standard Error
$\rho_z$	Persistence of Labor Productivity	0.960	(0.004)
$\sigma_z$	Standard Deviation of Labor Productivity	0.362	(0.023)
$\mu_\kappa$	Mean Value of Search Cost	0.783	(0.105)
$\sigma_\kappa$	Dispersion of Search Cost	0.167	(0.022)
$\psi$	Value of Leisure	0.421	(0.107)
$\delta$	Steady-State Layoff Rate	0.019	(0.002)
$f_s$	Steady-State Job-Finding Rate	0.273	(0.028)


◀ Back

## Steady-State Labor Market Flows




Transition Rate	Model	Data
EU	0.0143	0.0143
EN	0.0297	0.0296
UE	0.2547	0.2547
UN	0.2260	0.2262
NE	0.0462	0.0461
NU	0.0253	0.0252

◀ Back

## Response of Quits and Layoffs: Model vs Data



# Response of Labor Market Stocks: Model vs Data



◀ Back

