# Youth Unemployment and Employment Protection Legislation

#### Pierre Cahuc, Franck Malherbet and Julien Prat

CREST

January 2016

<ロト < 回 > < 目 > < 目 > 目 2000 1/23

# Introduction

- Young French workers
  - find jobs at least as fast as prime age workers
  - but their job separations are much more frequent



• Unemployment is higher for young workers mostly because they find **unstable** jobs (Shimer, 1999)

# Motivation

- Lowering youth unemployment is more a matter of increasing job stability than improving job search.
- We evaluate the negative effect of labor market duality on job stability:
  - Many employers decide to fire workers before they have to transform their jobs into permanent ones,
  - This transformation ceiling raises job turnover, especially for young workers.

# Introduction

- We provide a framework useful to evaluate the impact of employment protection legislation (EPL) on youth unemployment.
  - we build and estimate a search and matching model that
    - reproduces the negative relation between job separation and tenure

<ロ > < 回 > < 直 > < 直 > < 直 > 三 2000 4/23

- identifies the red-tape layoff costs
- The model is estimated for the labor market of unskilled workers in France over the period 2003-2012

# Outline

1. Institutional background and identification of layoff costs

<ロト < 副 ト < 直 ト < 亘 ト 三 2000 5/23

- 2. The model
- 3. The estimation
- 4. Counterfactual analysis

- In France, job protection becomes really stringent after two years of tenure:
  - Then employers have to pay at least 6 months' salary to their employees in case of unfair dismissal on a permanent job
  - Before this threshold, no minimum amount is required. In practice, the severance is much lower: about 2 months's salary on average

<ロ > < 回 > < 国 > < 国 > < 国 > 目 2000 6/23

- To avoid the cost of breach of permanent contracts, employers make an extensive use of temporary contracts:
  - In principle, temporary contracts may be used in special circumstances only:
    - to replace an employee who is absent
    - to cover changes in business activity
    - for seasonal work
  - Nevertheless, more than 80% of hires are on temporary contracts
  - Employers use this strategy to avoid permanent contracts

- This strategy becomes unprofitable when tenure exceeds two years
  - the employee whose temporary contract is not renewed can always go to court to ask a requalification into a permanent contract
  - If the request is successful, the job separation induced by the non renewal of the temporary contract is interpreted as a layoff by the court
    - $\rightarrow$  a severance of at least 6 months' salary if the tenure is beyond two years

• Before this threshold, the severance is about 2 months

- After the two-year threshold, employees have strong incentives to go to court if job separation is due to the termination of a temporary or permanent contract
- This context induces a strong potential increase in red-tape dismissal costs at the two-year threshold.

#### Job separation rates and job tenure



Figure: Quarterly hazard rate for employment to unemployment transitions. Individuals working in the private sector, aged 15 to 54, with at most high school degree. Apprentices and subsidized jobs are excluded.

#### Model's set-up

- Overlapping generations model in continuous time where people are born and die at rate  $\chi$
- 2 goods: output (numéraire), labor, sole production factor
- Individuals are risk neutral and discount the future at rate r
- They are either employed or unemployed.
- Unemployed individuals sample job offers at exogenous rate  $\lambda$

<ロト < 副 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 2000 11/23

• Take wage as exogenous because, in our sample, the vast majority of workers are paid the minimum wage

# Technology

- Jobs produce x units of output per unit of time
- Output x starts at value x<sub>0</sub> ~ H(x), and follows a Geometric Brownian Motion (GBM):

$$\ln(x_t) = \ln(x_0) + \left(\mu - \sigma^2/2\right)t + \sigma z_t$$

 μ : drift; σ<sup>2</sup>: variance; z: standard Brownian motion of zero mean and unit variance (dz = ε<sub>t</sub>√dt, ε<sub>t</sub> → N(0, 1))

<ロ > < 回 > < 目 > < 目 > < 目 > 目 2/23

- Why GBM? Generate decreasing hazard rate (Jovanovic, 1979)
- Jobs are also exogenously destroyed at rate  $\delta$

## Employment protection legislation

- Starting jobs are not covered by job protection, they can be destroyed at zero (red-tape) cost
- They have to be transformed into protected jobs at tenure T
- At the instant when the job has to be transformed, it can be decided
  - either to destroy the non protected job at zero cost
  - or to continue and keep the job that becomes protected

• Protected jobs are destroyed at (red-tape) cost F

#### Model's solution

- Proceed by backward induction
- Value of permanent job J(x; R) is a function of productivity x and reservation productivity R that has a closed-form expression (Prat, 2007)
- Value of non-permanent job J<sub>n</sub>(x, t; R<sub>n</sub>(t)) cannot be expressed analytically because its reservation productivity R<sub>n</sub>(t) is not anymore stationary. J<sub>n</sub> solves the SDE

$$(r+\delta) J_n(x,t) = x - w + \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ dJ_n(x,t) \right]}{dt}$$

with the boundary conditions:

$$J_n(R_n(t), t) = 0 \text{ and } \lim_{x \to R_n(t)} \frac{\partial J_n(x, t)}{\partial x} = 0 \quad \text{for } t < T$$
  
$$J_n(x, T) = \max[J(x) - F, 0] \quad \text{for } t = T$$

<ロト < 団 > < 臣 > < 臣 > 三 2000 14/23

### Reservation output



12/22

#### Impact of firing costs on reservation output



< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

- French Labor Force Survey over the period 2003-2012
  - Rotative panel
  - Quarterly data: every individual is interviewed during 6 consecutive quarters
- Focus on unskilled workers, who have not completed their high school degree and who have no vocational qualification

#### Estimation

We first use off-the-shelf values for a subset of the parameters.

Par.	Value	Interpretation	Moment
r	0.0125	Discount rate	Standard
$\chi$	0	Death rate	Death rate
$\lambda$	0.165	Job finding rate	Unemp. duration
$\delta$	0.007	Exogenous job sep. rate	Job sep rate for long tenure

#### Estimation

- Four parameters to estimate:  $\theta = \{w, F, \sigma, \gamma\}$ .
- Empirical moments

$$\hat{h}_t \equiv \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{t_i=t\}} d_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \mathbf{1}_{\{t_i=t\}}},$$

where  $d_i = 1$  if job is destroyed, 0 otherwise.

• Minimum Distance estimator:

$$\min_{\theta} \left\{ h(\theta) - \hat{h} \right\}' \hat{\Omega}^{-1} \left\{ h(\theta) - \hat{h} \right\},\,$$

where  $\hat{\Omega}$  is a consistent estimator of the asymptotic var. of  $\hat{h}$ .

<ロト < 回 ト < 臣 ト < 臣 ト 三 2000 19/23

#### Estimates

Par.	Value	Interpretation
σ	0.23 (1e-04)	Std. dev. of GBM
$\gamma$	0.23 (2e-04)	Std. dev. of initial Prod.
w	1.25 (1e-04)	Exogenous wage
F	0.03 (1 <i>e</i> -05)	Firing costs

・ロト・日本・モート・モーンの(2)

#### Model vs. data



<ロト < 副 ト < 直 ト < 直 ト 三 2000 21/23

#### Effect of firing costs on job separation



<ロト<回ト<三ト<三ト<三、22/23

## Conclusion

- Document the effect of a discontinuity in French EPL on the rate of job separation.
- Build a model that match data and use discontinuity to identify size of expected firing costs (around 3% of yearly productivity).
- Structural model allows us to simulate impact of EPL on unemployment: yields a very small elasticity.
- Effect on unemployment is a lower bound since we still have to endogenize job creation.