Vacancy-Seeker Mismatch in Japan

Keisuke Kawata

2021 - 05 - 01

Contents

1	Summary	5
2	Method	7
3	Result	9
library(knitr)		

4 CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Summary

This page reports the mismatch index (Şahin et al., 2014) in Japanese job-search market. We use the Referentials and Placements by Prefecture, Employment Referral Statistics, which reports monthly numbers of vacancy, job seekers, and new employment.

Chapter 2

Method

- Apply the mismatch index proposed by
- The mismatch index, M_t , is defined as

$$M_t = \frac{h_t^* - h_t}{h_t},$$

where h_t and h_t^* are actual and counter-factual numbers of new employment, respectively.

- The counter-factural numbers is a solution of planner problem. The planner problem is to maxmize the number of new employment, given the maching function $\mu_{jt}(u_{jt},v_{jt})$, the number of vacancy v_{jt} , and the total number of job seeker u_t .
- Formally,

$$h_t^* = \max_{u_{jt}} \sum_{i} h_{jt},$$

subject to

$$h_{jt} = \mu_{jt}(u_{jt}, v_{jt}), \hspace{0.5cm} (matching \ function)$$

and

$$\sum_{j}u_{jt}=u_{t}.~~(Resource~constrint)$$

- The estiamtion process is follows
- 1. Suppose a parametric specification on the matching function as $\mu_{jt}(u_{jt},v_{jt})=A_{jt}u_{jt}^{1-\beta}v_{jt}^{\beta}$, where $A_{jt}=exp(f_t,f_j,\epsilon_{jt})$, f_t and f_j are time and sector fixed-effects, respectively. The parametric assumption obtains the closed solution of the planner problem;

$$h_t^* = \max_{u_{jt}} \sum_j exp(f_t, f_j, \epsilon_{jt}) \times v_{jt}^\beta \times (u_{jt}^*)^{1-\beta},$$

where

$$u_{jt}^* = \frac{A_{jt}^{1/\beta}v_{jt}}{\sum_{j'}A_{j't}^{1/\beta}v_{j't}}u_t. \quad (optimal \ allocation)$$

2. Estimate the log-transfer matching function


$$\log(h_{jt}/u_{jt}) = f_j + f_t + \beta \times \log(v_{jt}/u_{jt}) + \epsilon_{jt}.$$

3. Calculate the mismatch index with estimated parameters in Step 2.

Chapter 3

Result

• Occupational mismatch by March, 2021.



Bibliography

Şahin, A., Song, J., Topa, G., and Violante, G. L. (2014). Mismatch unemployment. American Economic Review, 104(11):3529-64.