Labor Market Transitions over the Business Cycle: Gender Differential in the United States from 2001 to 2020

> Huanan Xu Indiana University South Bend

Federal Reserve Virtual Conference Uneven Outcomes in the Labor Market Understanding Trends and Identifying Solutions February 2024



Gender Differential in Cyclical Sensitivity

- The gender differential in cyclical sensitivity is attributable to several reasons.
 - Sectoral gender segregation
 - Flexible reserve
 - Segmentation and added worker
 - Substitution

٠

- There exists gender differential in labor market performance across countries and over the business cycle.
 - There has been sustained rises in female participation and systematic falls in male participation from 1970-1995 in OECD: Japan, France, Sweden, and U.S.
 - Labor force participation in developing countries were altered by the cyclical shock of the 1997-1998 Asian crisis.
 - The effect of cyclical shocks is more intense on male unemployment than for female unemployment over the decades before 2008 in UK and US.

Data and Methodology

- Data
 - Individual-level CPS data matched across adjacent months from January 2001 to January 2020, all males and females aged 25-64.
- Transition rate

 $Prob\left\{L_{i,t+1} \mid L_{i,t}\right\}$

• Business cycle measure

BC = the State-level Unemployment Rate – the National Natural Rate of Unemployment

- Empirical strategy
 - Flows among employment, unemployment, and nonparticipation
 - Heterogeneous test
 - Great Recession test

 $P_{ist} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Female_{ist} + \beta_2 BC_{st} + \beta_3 Female_{ist} \times BC_{st} + \chi_{ist} \delta + \alpha_s + \gamma_t + \varepsilon_{ist}$

Transitions to Employment over the Business Cycle

| | Transitions to Employment | | Transitions to | | | Transitions to | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|----------------|------------|--|------------------|------------|--|
| | | | Unemployment | | | Nonparticipation | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | (5) | (6) | |
| | U-to-E | NILF-to-E | E-to-U | NILF-to-U | | E-to-NILF | U-to-NILF | |
| Female | -3.6962*** | -2.4917*** | 0.3995*** | -0.4447*** | | 1.3743*** | 6.7153*** | |
| | (0.4883) | (0.1238) | (0.0280) | (0.1002) | | (0.0381) | (0.4496) | |
| BC | -1.9738*** | -0.2303*** | 0.1430*** | 0.4964*** | | -0.0272*** | -0.7889*** | |
| | (0.0509) | (0.0170) | (0.0038) | (0.0155) | | (0.0038) | (0.0412) | |
| Female x BC | 0.0961 | 0.0640*** | -0.0773*** | -0.1914*** | | -0.0242*** | 0.0132 | |
| | (0.0655) | (0.0189) | (0.0047) | (0.0171) | | (0.0060) | (0.0614) | |
| Family and Job Characteristics | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| State Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| Month Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| Observations | 433,238 | 2,525,587 | 9,000,566 | 2,525,587 | | 9,000,566 | 433,238 | |
| Mean of Dependent Variable | 0.2259 | 0.0569 | 0.0108 | 0.0313 | | 0.0195 | 0.1879 | |

• Women are *more likely to transit into employment (NILF-to-E)* for each percentage point increase in local unemployment rate.

- Added worker effect: women tend to compensate household income as a second earner as the economy worsens.
- Substitution hypothesis: women become attractive workers to substitute for men during economic downturns.

Transitions to Unemployment over the Business Cycle

| | Transitions to Employment | | | Transitions to Unemployment | | | Transitions to | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|--|--------------------------------|------------|--|------------------|------------|--|
| | | | | | | | Nonparticipation | | |
| | (1) (2) | | | (3) | (4) | | (5) | (6) | |
| | U-to-E | NILF-to-E | | E-to-U | NILF-to-U | | E-to-NILF | U-to-NILF | |
| Female | -3.6962*** | -2.4917*** | | 0.3995*** | -0.4447*** | | 1.3743*** | 6.7153*** | |
| | (0.4883) | (0.1238) | | (0.0280) | (0.1002) | | (0.0381) | (0.4496) | |
| BC | -1.9738*** | -0.2303*** | | 0.1430*** | 0.4964*** | | -0.0272*** | -0.7889*** | |
| | (0.0509) | (0.0170) | | (0.0038) | (0.0155) | | (0.0038) | (0.0412) | |
| Female x BC | 0.0961 | 0.0640*** | | -0.0773*** | -0.1914*** | | -0.0242*** | 0.0132 | |
| | (0.0655) | (0.0189) | | (0.0047) | (0.0171) | | (0.0060) | (0.0614) | |
| Family and Job Characteristics | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| State Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| Month Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| Observations | 433,238 | 2,525,587 | | 9,000,566 | 2,525,587 | | 9,000,566 | 433,238 | |
| Mean of Dependent Variable | 0.2259 | 0.0569 | | 0.0108 | 0.0313 | | 0.0195 | 0.1879 | |

• Women are *less likely to transit into unemployment* for each percentage point increase in local unemployment rate.

 Segregation hypothesis: the sectoral and occupational structures provide women with relative protection in downturns.

Transitions to Nonparticipation over the Business Cycle

| | Transitions to Employment | | Transitions to Unemployment | | | Transitions to Nonparticipation | | |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|------------------------------------|------------|--|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | | (5) | (6) | |
| | U-to-E | NILF-to-E | E-to-U | NILF-to-U | | E-to-NILF | U-to-NILF | |
| Female | -3.6962*** | -2.4917*** | 0.3995*** | -0.4447*** | | 1.3743*** | 6.7153*** | |
| | (0.4883) | (0.1238) | (0.0280) | (0.1002) | | (0.0381) | (0.4496) | |
| BC | -1.9738*** | -0.2303*** | 0.1430*** | 0.4964*** | | -0.0272*** | -0.7889*** | |
| | (0.0509) | (0.0170) | (0.0038) | (0.0155) | | (0.0038) | (0.0412) | |
| Female x BC | 0.0961 | 0.0640*** | -0.0773*** | -0.1914*** | | -0.0242*** | 0.0132 | |
| | (0.0655) | (0.0189) | (0.0047) | (0.0171) | | (0.0060) | (0.0614) | |
| Family and Job Characteristics | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| State Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| Month Fixed Effects | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | | Yes | Yes | |
| Observations | 433,238 | 2,525,587 | 9,000,566 | 2,525,587 | | 9,000,566 | 433,238 | |
| Mean of Dependent Variable | 0.2259 | 0.0569 | 0.0108 | 0.0313 | | 0.0195 | 0.1879 | |

• Women are *less likely to leave the labor force (E-to-NILF)* for each percentage point increase in the state unemployment rate.

- Female workers are becoming more strongly attached to the labor force than men are over the business cycle.

Heterogeneity by Family and Job Characteristics

| Number of children | Marital status | Educational attainment | Major industry |
|--------------------|------------------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|
| No child | Married, spouse present | High school or less | Agriculture |
| One | Married, spouse absent | High school degree | Construction |
| Two | Widowed, divorced, separated, never married | Bachelor's degree | Manufacturing |
| Three or more | | Graduate degree | Wholesale and retail trade |
| | | | Information |
| | | | Financial activities |
| | | | Professional and business services |
| | | | Educational and health services |
| | | | Public administration |

- Impacts are found strongest among women with relatively *lower educational attainment*. Women's cyclical sensitivity is also greater when their *first child* enters the household and when the number of children in the household increases to *three or more*.
 - Flexible reserve and added worker: female workers, especially those with lower human capital endowments, serve as a flexible reserve and their labor market behavior over the cycle depends on the organization of the family.

Structural Change Brought by the Great Recession

| | Transitions to | o Employment | Transitions to l | Jnemployment | Transitions to Nonparticipation | | |
|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-----------|--|
| | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | |
| | U-to-E | NILF-to-E | E-to-U | NILF-to-U | E-to-NILF | U-to-NILF | |
| Post-2007 x Female x BC | -0.3215 | 0.0105 | -0.0027 | -0.0122 | -0.0385** | 0.4605* | |
| | (0.2763) | (0.0681) | (0.0139) | (0.0522) | (0.0190) | (0.2607) | |
| Controls and other regressors | Υ | Υ | Y | Υ | Y | Y | |
| Observations | 433,238 | 2,525,587 | 9,000,566 | 2,525,587 | 9,000,566 | 433,238 | |
| Mean of dependent variable | 0.2259 | 0.0569 | 0.0108 | 0.0313 | 0.0195 | 0.1879 | |

- With the onset of the 2007 Great Recession, there is a *secular increase in women's employment*.
 - Women were less likely to transition from employment to not in the labor force following the onset of the Great Recession.
 - Women demonstrate a stronger pattern in terms of not exiting the labor market.

Conclusions and Discussion

- Over the business cycle, female workers are *more likely to transit into employment (from NILF)* and *less likely to transit into unemployment and nonparticipation* as the economic condition becomes worse.
- The impacts are found strongest among women with relatively *lower educational attainment* and *substantial childcare responsibility*.
- The test of structural change of the Great Recession indicates that there is a *secular increase in women's employment* and that women experienced a lower probability of transitioning from employment to not in the labor force in the post-2007 period.

Conclusions and Discussion

Differences between the Great Recession ("Man-cession") and the COVID-19 pandemic recession ("She-cession").

- The most recent COVID-19 related downturn (<u>NOT</u> covered by the sample period of this study) is different than previous recessions and might result in a different gendered impact.
- Due to government mandated business closure policies, workers in non-essential industries such as leisure and hospitality were hit hardest by the pandemic recession.
- Women's labor market outcomes in the pandemic recession may be disproportionally affected.
 - Increased child caregiving demands.
 - Being more concentrated in service-type jobs that cannot be performed remotely.

Thank You.

