## Internal and External Labor Markets and Declining Dynamism

Sadhika Bagga University of Texas at Austin

October 19, 2022

### Background

1. Declining employer-to-employer transitions rate and labor reallocation rates across firms

### Declining Labor Market Dynamism



Source: Current Population Survey (Fujita, Moscarini and Postel-Vinay, 2022) and Quarterly Workforce Indicators

Bagga (UT Austin)

Internal and External Labor Markets

### Background

- 1. Declining employer-to-employer transitions rate and labor reallocation rates across firms
- 2. Employment composition has shifted towards large firms

### Shifting Worker Composition towards Large Firms



Source: Business Dynamics Statistics

### Background

- 1. Declining employer-to-employer transitions rate and labor reallocation rates across firms
- 2. Employment composition has shifted towards large firms
- 3. Large firms have internal job ladders

### Evidence of Internal Job Ladder in Large Firms

Show that job stayers in large firms realize:

- Increased likelihood of occupational switching
- Higher wage growth
- Higher wage growth, conditional on occupational switching
- Lower separation risk

### Background

- 1. Declining employer-to-employer transitions rate and labor reallocation rates across firms
- 2. Employment composition has shifted towards large firms
- 3. Large firms have internal job ladders

To what extent can accounting for *internal* labor market transitions offset or amplify the decline in *external* labor market dynamism?

### Outline







Decomposing True Dynamism to Internal and External Job Moves

### Internal Job Ladders in Large Firms

- Need: Wages and occupations of job stayers at different firm sizes
- Data: CPS Basic Monthly Survey



- Need: Wages and occupations of job stayers at different firm sizes
- Data: CPS Basic Monthly Survey
  - Job Tenure & Occupational Mobility Supplement (Jan/Feb, biennial)



- Need: Wages and occupations of job stayers at different firm sizes
- Data: CPS Basic Monthly Survey
  - Job Tenure & Occupational Mobility Supplement (Jan/Feb, biennial)



- Need: Wages and occupations of job stayers at different firm sizes
- Data: CPS Basic Monthly Survey
  - Job Tenure & Occupational Mobility Supplement (Jan/Feb, biennial)



- Need: Wages and occupations of job stayers at different firm sizes
- Data: CPS Basic Monthly Survey
  - Job Tenure & Occupational Mobility Supplement (Jan/Feb, biennial)



- Need: Wages and occupations of job stayers at different firm sizes
- Data: CPS Basic Monthly Survey
  - Job Tenure & Occupational Mobility Supplement (Jan/Feb, biennial)
  - Annual Social and Economic Supplement (March)



### Sample

- Period: Biennial, 1998 2020.
- Individuals: Full-time, privately employed with tenure  $\geq$  1 year.
- Sample size:
  - Job Stayer  $\cap$  Firm Size  $\approx$  120,000 individuals
  - Job Stayer  $\cap$  Firm Size  $\cap$  Wage Growth  $\approx$  25,000 individuals
  - Job Stayer  $\cap$  Firm Size  $\cap$  Wage Growth  $\cap$  Occupation Transition  $\approx$  1200 individuals
- Controls:
  - age, age<sup>2</sup>, log tenure, hours, married, male, marriedmale, three education categories, three race categories, whether Hispanic, whether paid hourly, state, unemployment rate.

### Higher Earnings Growth in Large Firms

	Growth in Real Weekly Earnings			Prob of Positive Weekly Earnings Growth		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.0160***	0.0158***	0.0148**	0.0318***	0.0312***	0.0303***
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Constant	0.0445***	0.0673***	0.0638***	0.5167***	0.5180***	0.5007***
	(0.014)	(0.018)	(0.022)	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.029)
Controls	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2-digit industry FE	Ν	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Ν
2-digit occupation FE	Ν	Y	Ν	Ν	Y	Y
4-digit occupation FE	Ν	Ν	Y	Ν	Ν	Y
Ν	25623	25623	25623	25623	25623	25623

 Job Stayers in large firms realize a 1.5 pp higher annual earnings growth, and are 3 pp more likely to realize an increase in earnings than job stayers in small firms.

Wage Growth 4-digit Occupations

### Higher Job-to-Job transitions within Large Firms

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.0192***	0.0173***	0.0148***
	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
Constant	0.0302***	0.0368***	0.0677***
	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.006)
Controls	Y	Y	Y
2-digit industry FE	Ν	Y	Y
2-digit occupation FE	Ν	Y	Ν
4-digit occupation FE	Ν	Ν	Y
Ν	120565	120565	120565

Dependent Variable: Whether the job stayer switched occupations over the year

 Job Stayers in large firms are 1.5 - 2 pp more likely to change their occupation over a year. Q Text

### Higher Earnings Growth | J-J trans. in Large Firms

Sample: Job stayers who switched occupations over the year

	Growth in R	eal Weekly Earnings	Prob of Positive Earnings Growth		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.0598**	0.0631**	0.0863**	0.0924**	
	(0.030)	(0.030)	(0.038)	(0.040)	
Constant	0.0181	0.1091*	0.5213***	0.5057***	
	(0.041)	(0.060)	(0.054)	(0.081)	
Controls	Y	Y	Y	Y	
2-digit Ind, Occ FE	Ν	Y	Ν	Y	
Ν	1198	1198	1198	1198	

- Job Stayers in large firms who switch occupations realize 6 pp higher earnings growth and are 9 pp more likely to receive an earnings increase.
- This accounts for about 15 percent of the overall wage growth of job stayers in large firms. Details Wage Growth

Bagga (UT Austin)

Internal and External Labor Markets

### Lower Separations Risk in Large Firms

### Dependent Variable: Tenure (in log years)

	(1)	(2)	(3)
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.152***	0.132***	0.123***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Constant	0.532***	0.434***	0.571***
	(0.012)	(0.015)	(0.018)
Controls	Y	Y	Y
2-digit occupation FE	Ν	Y	Ν
2-digit industry FE	Ν	Υ	Y
4-digit occupation FE	Ν	Ν	Y
Ν	136172	136172	136172

 Job Stayers in large firms realize a tenure that is 1.14 years higher than their small firm counterparts.

Bagga (UT Austin)

Internal and External Labor Markets

### Summary: Internal Job Ladder in Large Firms

Job stayers in large firms realize:

- Increased likelihood of occupational switching
- Higher pay growth, higher likelihood of realizing a pay increase
- Higher likelihood and realization of a pay growth, conditional on occupational switching
- Lower separation risk

How have these facts changed overtime?

### **Evolution of Internal Job Ladders**

Dependent Variable: Whether the job stayer switched occupations over the year

	2000-	-2004	201	4-18
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.0205***	0.0183***	0.0148***	0.0138***
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)
Constant	0.0208***	0.0332***	0.0263***	0.0315***
	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.008)
Controls	Y	Y	Y	Y
2-digit Ind, Occ FE	Ν	Y	Ν	Y
Ν	36833	36833	25386	25386

 The probability of making within-firm job-to-job transitions have declined overtime, more so for workers in large firms.

Bagga (UT Austin)





Bagga (UT Austin)

Dependent Variable: Probability of Positive Weekly Earnings or Hourly Wage Growth

	Prob of Posit	tive Earnings Growth	Prob of Positive Wage Growth		
	2000-04 (1)	2014-18 (2)	2000-04 (3)	2014-18 (4)	
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.0273*	0.0242	0.0532***	0.0277	
	(0.014)	(0.017)	(0.014)	(0.017)	
Constant	0.4058***	0.8686***	0.3924***	0.9473***	
	(0.048)	(0.214)	(0.048)	(0.215)	
Controls	Y	Y	Y	Y	
2-digit Ind, Occ FE	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ν	7674	5349	7674	5349	

 Large firm premium of probability of realizing a pay increase has vanished over time.

Dependent Variable: Growth in Real Weekly Earnings and Hourly Wages

	Growth in N	Neekly Earnings	Growth in Hourly Earnings		
	2000-04 2014-18		2000-04	2014-18	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.0103	0.0121	0.0179*	0.0056	
	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.010)	(0.013)	
Constant	0.0228	0.3444**	0.0009	0.3862**	
	(0.036)	(0.167)	(0.035)	(0.162)	
Controls	Y	Y	Y	Y	
2-digit Ind, Occ FE	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Ν	7674	5349	7674	5349	

• No evidence of changing large firm pay-growth premium in the CPS.

• Evidence of decreasing large firm pay-level premium relative to small firms by 7 pp between 2000-2013 (Bloom et. al., 2018 using data from US SSA).

Bagga (UT Austin)

## Decomposing True Dynamism to Internal and External Job Moves

### **Decomposition Framework**

- Let firm types be  $j \in \{s, l\}$ , and employment share of small firms be  $\omega$ .
- Let p<sup>k</sup><sub>j</sub> be the probability of making a k-type of job switch, where k ∈ {i, x} denotes an internal (i) or external (x) job switch by an employee of a given firm type j.
- Let the true measure of dynamism, jj\*, be the sum of all internal (jji) and external (jjx) job moves.

### Static Decomposition

$$jj_t^* = \omega_t(p_s^i + p_s^x) + (1 - \omega_t)(p_l^i + p_l^x)$$

$$= \underbrace{\omega_t p_s^i + (1 - \omega_t) p_l^i}_{=jj_t^i} + \underbrace{\omega_t p_s^x + (1 - \omega_t) p_l^x}_{=jj_t^x}$$

$$\frac{djj_t^*}{dt} = \frac{djj_t^i}{dt} + \frac{djj_t^x}{dt}$$

$$= \frac{d\omega_t}{dt}(p_s^i - p_l^i) + \frac{djj_t^x}{dt}$$

Between 2000-2004 and 2014-18:

• 
$$\frac{d\omega_t}{dt} = -0.03$$

- $(p_s^i p_l^i)$  ranges between 0.0147 to 0.0192
- $\frac{djj_t^x}{dt} = -1.45$  pp annual change
- Accounting for within-firm job switching *offsets* the decline in external job switching by about 0.06 pp.

Bagga (UT Austin)

### **Dynamic Decomposition**

$$\begin{split} jj_t^* &= \omega_t p_{st}^i + (1 - \omega_t) p_{lt}^i + jj_t^x \\ \frac{djj_t^*}{dt} &= \frac{d\omega_t}{dt} (p_{st}^i - p_{lt}^i) + \omega_t \frac{dp_{st}^i}{dt} + (1 - \omega_t) \frac{dp_{lt}^i}{dt} + \frac{djj_t^x}{dt} \end{split}$$

Between 2000-2004 and 2014-18:

•  $\omega_t = 0.34$ 

• 
$$\frac{dp_{st}^i}{dt}$$
 = - 0.17 pp

- $\frac{dp_{lt}^i}{dt} = -0.62 \text{ pp}$
- Accounting for the decline in within-firm job switching *amplifies* the decline in external job switching by 0.5 pp (28 percent).

### Conclusion

• Job stayers in large firms relative to small firms realize:

- Higher likelihood of occupational switching
- Higher wage growth
- Higher wage growth upon occupational switching
- Accounting for higher J2J transitions within firms partially offsets the decline in J2J transitions across firms
- However, J2J transitions within firms have declined over time
- Accounting for the declining nature of internal dynamism amplifies the overall decline in true dynamism
- Next: A model of internal and external job ladders to understand the determinants of declining internal dynamism

# **Thank You!**



### Higher Wage Growth in Large Firms

	Growth in Real Hourly Wages			Prob of Po:	sitive Hourly	Nage Growth
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.0125**	0.0138**	0.0130**	0.0378***	0.0378***	0.0351***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.008)
Constant	0.0369***	0.0554***	0.0512**	0.5062***	0.4953***	0.4940***
	(0.013)	(0.018)	(0.021)	(0.018)	(0.023)	(0.029)
Controls	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
2-digit industry FE	Ν	Y	Ν	Ν	Y	Ν
2-digit occupation FE	Ν	Y	Y	Ν	Y	Y
4-digit occupation FE	Ν	Ν	Y	Ν	Ν	Y
Ν	25623	25623	25623	25623	25623	25623

Back: Earnings Growth

About 450 codes based on Census' 2010 classification scheme.



### **Questionnaire Text**

Earlier you told me that you are now working as (fill: occupation from basic CPS). Were you doing the same kind of work a year ago, in January of (previous) year?

- Yes
- No
- Don't Know
- Refused
- No Response

### Higher Wage Growth | J-J trans. in Large Firms

Sample: Job stayers who switched occupations over the year

	Growth in	Real Hourly Wages	Prob of Positive Wage Growth		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.0494*	0.0574*	0.0929**	0.1028**	
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.039)	(0.041)	
Constant	-0.0200	0.0315	0.4755***	0.4109***	
	(0.040)	(0.062)	(0.054)	(0.080)	
Controls	Y	Y	Y	Y	
2-digit Ind, Occ FE	Ν	Y	Ν	Y	
Ν	1196	1196	1196	1196	

### Decomposing Growth in Real Weekly Earnings

	Earnings Growth (1)	Job Switch (2)	Earnings Growth Switch (3)
Firm Size: 100+ employees	0.0107** (0.00469)	0.0137*** (0.00196)	0.0548* (0.0306)
Constant	0.302*** (0.102)	0.114*** (0.0412)	0.117 (0.560)
Controls	Y	Y	Y
2-digit Ind, Occ FE	Y	Y	Y
Ν	46082	40070	1198
$R^2$	0.00997	0.0186	0.125

Fraction of Wage Growth account by Occupation Switching =
 (Earnings Growth | Switch) × Sample of Switchers Total Sample × 1/(Overall Earnings Growth)

