A list of Working Papers on
the last pages

No. 73
**MEASURING THE DURATION OF
UNEMPLOYMENT: A NOTE***
by
Anders Björklund

I   INTRODUCTION

Ever since the early seventies, when labour econo-
mists became interested in "unemployment dynamics",
a lot has been written about pure measurement
problems in this field. The background to this
literature is, shortly, the following: The only
easily available unemployment duration statistics
in the beginning of the seventies were the duration
of uncompleted spells i.e. the time the unemployed
had been unemployed until the time of the survey.

Most researchers found this statistic insuffi-
cient, and sometimes even irrelevant. Therefore
a lot of work has been devoted to get data and
measurement methods which provide statistics on
especially the duration of the completed spells
for those who become unemployed. In many countries
the Bureaus responsible for unemployment statis-
tics have made significant efforts to produce and
publish the more detailed data that were needed
for these purposes.

Recently Akerlof and Main[1] and Clark and Summers[2]
have suggested additional statistics which high-
light the total unemployment experiences for those
currently unemployed. In particular Akerlof and
Main suggest an "experience-weighted measure of
unemployment duration", which is the average time
those now unemployed will be unemployed until they
eventually get a job (or leave the labour force).

In a note in this journal, written as an answer to
Main, Layard[3] advocates the "traditional statis-
tics", the duration of uncompleted spells, availa-
ble already in the early seventies both for posi-
tive and normative purposes. Consequently one can

believe that all the work on measurement problems
and all the money spent on production of more
detailed data have been wasted. Furthermore, there
is a high risk that Layards paper is taken as an
excuse for not going on and producing more detai-
led unemployment data than are available today in
many countries.

Even though I think that Layards paper in one
respect contains a very constructive approach for
further research in this field, I want to stress
that the traditional statistics are not the only
relevant measure of unemployment duration. Other
measures are also needed both for positive and
normative purposes.

II   POSITIVE ANALYSIS

Suppose we are interested in positive analysis of
unemployment, i.e. we want to explain why we have
the stock of unemployment which we have. For this
purpose Layard argues that the traditional statis-
tics, i.e. the average uncompleted spell until the
time of the survey, should be used. The reason is
that, in a steady state, this measure also has
another interpretation; it tells us how long time
the average unemployed will remain unemployed from
the time of the survey onwards.[4] Consequently it
is a measure of the prospects facing the existing
stock of unemployment. The experience-weighted mea-
sure proposed by Main and Akerlof does not have
such a useful interpretation for positive analy-
sis.

However, this is not all that can be said about
positive analysis. The familiar decomposition of

unemployment into an inflow and a duration component

Stock = Inflow · Expected duration of those flowing in   (1)

is also useful for such purposes. In my view (1) is useful because it is a way <u>to decompose the stock of unemployment into different determinants.</u> The reason is that the decisions by the actors in the labour market which influence, on the one hand, the inflow of new unemployed (or the probability of becoming unemployed) and, on the other hand, the expected duration of unemployment spells (or the inverse of the probability of leaving unemployment) are likely to differ substantially. For example the determinants of the probability of being laid off are likely to differ from the determinants of the probability of getting a new job given that unemployment already has occurred. Therefore it is a fruitful approach to apply different explanatory models to the two unemployment components. However, to become a really useful approach for positive analysis one also has to disaggregate the unemployment stock according to reason for having become unemployed; entrance and reentrance to the labour force, quits, temporary and permanent lay-offs are candidates in this respect.[5]

III NORMATIVE ANALYSIS

Layard develops a very constructive device for normative analysis of unemployment, namely a cost function for unemployment. If the compensated labour supply schedule of yearly hours is linear

it can be argued that the cost of unemployment as a function of duration is linear too. By applying a little simpler notation than Layard, the cost of unemployment in week t can be written

$$c_t = a \cdot t \qquad\qquad (2)$$

If the number of unemployed is denoted U and the number who have been unemployed t weeks is denoted U_t, the total unemployment costs in a certain week becomes

$$TC = \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} U_t \cdot a \cdot t = U \left(\sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \frac{U_t}{U} \cdot a \cdot t \right) = U \cdot \bar{t} \cdot a$$

$$(3)$$

Consequently the total unemployment costs are proportional to the stock of unemployment and to the traditional duration statistics, the average length of unemployment until the time of the survey for those currently unemployed (here denoted $\bar{t}$). On the other hand the costs are proportional to the experience-weighted measure of unemployment duration too, since this is (in a steady state) twice as high as $\bar{t}$.

Of course, Layards conclusion relies on the assumption made about the cost function. Even though it is important to stress that more research is needed to find out the exact nature of this cost function, the one adopted by Layard seems to be reasonable as a first approximation to the problem.

However, Layard does not take into account that some individuals experience repeated spells with rather short intervals which must be taken into

account within the theoretical framework that is
used.[6] To provide a simple counter-example to
Layards proposition that the traditional statis-
tics are the most important for normative purposes
I will present another duration measure which prob-
ably is superior for groups who suffer from repeat-
ed spells.

Suppose we have data about the total number of
persons who have been unemployed during a whole
year (denoted N) and the number of unemployment
weeks per person during the year. Such data are
available in the U.S. and in Sweden since retro-
spective questions about the preceding year are
asked in the labour force surveys in March and
February respectively in these countries. The ad-
vantage with such data is that all unemployment
spells during the calendar year are included. On
the other hand it is a disadvantage that a spell
which covers two calendar years is truncated and
hence underestimated in such data. With this disad-
vantage in mind let us none the less see how such
data can be used to estimate total unemployment
costs.

First, note that the average stock of unemploy-
ment, U, with such data will be:

$$U = \frac{1}{52} \sum_{t=1}^{52} N_t \cdot t \qquad (4)$$

Let us next define a measure of unemployment dura-
tion which answers the following question: What
are the expected unemployment weeks during a calen-
dar year for a person, who is unemployed at a
randomly chosen time during the year. This is in a
sense an experience-weighted measure of duration

since persons with many unemployment weeks have
higher weights. By our notation the measure be-
comes:

$$EW = \sum_{t=1}^{52} \left(\frac{N_t \cdot t}{52 \cdot U}\right) t \qquad (5)$$

The term within brackets represents the weight
given to individuals with t weeks of unemployment
during the year.

Next, we derive the total unemployment costs per
week if the cost function (2) is applied to the
total unemployment weeks during a year.

$$TC = \frac{1}{52} \sum_{t=1}^{52} N_t \cdot \frac{a}{2} \cdot t^2 \qquad (6)$$

To see this, note that the total unemployment
costs for t weeks equals

$$\frac{a \cdot t^2}{2}.$$

From (5) and (6) we can see that total costs
equals:

$$TC = U \cdot \frac{a}{2} \cdot EW \qquad (7)$$

Consequently it is proportional to the duration
measure defined above.

Because of the truncation problem mentioned above
this formula will underestimate the true costs.
Still it captures repeated spells within a year
which is an advantage for groups who usually suf-
fer from this.

In Table 1 estimates of EW in (5) and the experience-weighted duration proposed by Akerlof and Main are presented using Swedish data. It appears that EW most years is higher for youth indicating that repeated spells are common for this group. In Table 2 corresponding data for the U.S. are presented. The same pattern appears for the U.S. However, the difference between EW and $2 \cdot \bar{t}$ is even higher for American youth, indicating that recurrent spells are more common in this country.

IV   CONCLUSION

In this note it has been argued that the traditional duration measure - the average duration of incompleted spells until the time of the survey - is not sufficient for positive and normative analysis of unemployment.

The familiar "unemployment = inflow • duration" decomposition is useful for positive analysis and information about recurrent spells of unemployment is needed for normative analysis especially for youth.

Too little is known about the "cost function" for unemployment. Much more research is needed on this in the future. This research in turn will require detailed data about unemployment histories for individuals.

Consequently Layard's article cannot be taken as an excuse for not producing and presenting more detailed unemployment data than was done until the beginning of the seventies in most countries.

Table 1   Experience-weighted measures of unemployment duration in Sweden

	16-24 years		16-74 years	
	EW^a	$2 \cdot \bar{t}^b$	EW^a	$2 \cdot \bar{t}^b$
1971	22.9	18.2		
1972	26.2	23.0		
1973	22.9	23.4		
1974	21.6	19.6		
1975	22.3	20.0		
1976	20.8	20.0	24.9	30.4
1977	22.4	23.0	27.4	30.6
1978	23.5	22.8	28.1	32.4
1979	21.3	21.0	27.0	33.6
1980	24.1	20.6	26.8	31.0

[a] Estimated from the yearly retrospective survey, Central Bureau of Statistics. (See appendix.)

[b] Estimated from the regular labour force survey, Central Bureau of Statistics

Table 2   Experience-weighted measures of unemployment in the U.S.

	16-24 years		16 years and over	
	EW^a	$2 \cdot \bar{t}^b$	EW^a	$2 \cdot \bar{t}^b$
1978	24.1	18.4	24.5	23.8
1979	25.0	17.0	24.5	21.6
1980	27.0	19.2	27.0	23.8

[a] Source: Work Experience of the Population in 1978, Bureau of Labor Statistics. (See appendix.)

[b] The regular labor force surveys, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

NOTES:

1 G Akerlof and B Main, "An Experience-Weighted
Measure of Employment and Unemployment Durations",
American Economic Review, December 1981 and B Main
"The Length of Employment and Unemployment in
Great Britain", Scottish Journal of Political Econ-
omy, June 1981.

2 K Clark and L Summers, "Labor Market Dynamics
and Unemployment: A Reconsideration", Brookings
Papers, Washington 1979, 1.

3 R Layard, "Measuring the Duration of Unemploy-
ment: A Note", Scottish Journal of Political Econ-
omy, November 1981.

4 This result is explained by Layard op.cit. in
note 3 and in Akerlof and Main op.cit. page 1005.

5 See A Björklund, "Studies in the Dynamics of
Unemployment", Stockholm School of Economics,
1981, chapter 2, for such a look at Swedish unem-
ployment.

6 Actually Layard is more explicit about this in
his article "Youth Unemployment in Britain and the
United States Compared" in R Freeman and D Wise
(eds), "The Youth Labor Market Problem", Universi-
ty of Chicago Press, 1982.

7 R D Morgenstern and N S Barrett, "The Retrospec-
tive Bias in Unemployment Reporting by Sex, Race
and Age", Journal of the American Statistical Asso-
ciation, June 1974.

8 A Björklund, "The Development of Unemployment
in Sweden During the 1970s According to a New
Measure", Statistisk Tidskrift 1981:3 (in Swedish
with an English Summary).

APPENDIX

Some approximations were needed to compute EW. In both countries only frequency intervals are available for t.

The most detailed information is available for Sweden, namely 1, 2-4, 5-13, 14-26, 27-39, 40-49, 50-52 weeks. The midpoints in the intervals were used.

For the U.S. different information is available for those with and those without any work experience during the year. For the first group the following intervals are available: 1-4, 5-10, 11-14, 15-26, 27-39, 40-52. The midpoints were used for this group. For the group without work experience the following intervals are available: 1-4, 5-14, 15-26, 27-52. The midpoints were used except for the last interval for which a higher figure (44 weeks) was used. The reason is that the observations are likely to be concentrated on 52 weeks.

The use of these data are not without problems. In particular, there might be bias because of the retrospective nature of the questions. The study by Morgenstern and Barrett[7] indicates that this problem might be serious for the U.S., whereas the study by Björklund[8] for Sweden indicates the reverse for Sweden.

However, this problem is not at variance with the main point made in this paper, namely that more detailed data about unemployment durations are needed.

WORKING PAPERS (Missing numbers indicate publication else-
where)

1976

1. Corporate and Personal Taxation and the Growing Firm
    by Ulf Jakobsson

7. A Micro Macro Interactive Simulation Model of the Swedish
    Economy.
    Preliminary model specification
    by Gunnar Eliasson in collaboration with Gösta Olavi

8. Estimation and Analysis with a WDI Production Function
    by Göran Eriksson, Ulf Jakobsson and Leif Jansson

1977

11. A Comparative Study of Complete Systems of Demand
    Functions
    by N Anders Klevmarken

12. The Linear Expenditure System and Demand for Housing
    under Rent Control
    by Per Högberg and N Anders Klevmarken

14. Rates of Depreciation of Human Capital Due to Nonuse
    by Siv Gustafsson

15. Pay Differentials between Government and Private Sector
    Employees in Sweden
    by Siv Gustafsson

1979

20. A Putty-Clay Model of Demand Uncertainty and Investment
    by James W. Albrecht and Albert G. Hart

1980

25. On Unexplained Price Differences
    by Bo Axell

26. The West European Steel Industry - Structure and
    Competitiveness in Historical Perspective
    by Bo Carlsson

27. Crises, Inflation and Relative Prices in Sweden 1913-1977
    by Märtha Josefsson and Johan Örtengren