

Bachmann, Ronald; Burda, Michael C.

Working Paper

Sectoral transformation, turbulence, and labor market dynamics in Germany

IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3324

Provided in Cooperation with:

IZA – Institute of Labor Economics

Suggested Citation: Bachmann, Ronald; Burda, Michael C. (2008) : Sectoral transformation, turbulence, and labor market dynamics in Germany, IZA Discussion Papers, No. 3324, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/34941>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

IZA DP No. 3324

Sectoral Transformation, Turbulence, and Labor Market Dynamics in Germany

Ronald Bachmann
Michael C. Burda

January 2008

Sectoral Transformation, Turbulence, and Labor Market Dynamics in Germany

Ronald Bachmann

RWI Essen

Michael C. Burda

*Humboldt University of Berlin,
CEPR and IZA*

**Discussion Paper No. 3324
January 2008**

IZA

P.O. Box 7240
53072 Bonn
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0
Fax: +49-228-3894-180
E-mail: iza@iza.org

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit organization supported by Deutsche Post World Net. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its international network, workshops and conferences, data service, project support, research visits and doctoral program. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

Sectoral Transformation, Turbulence, and Labor Market Dynamics in Germany^{*}

This paper analyzes the interaction between structural change and labor market dynamics in West Germany, during a period in which industrial employment declined by more than 30% and service sector employment more than doubled. Using transition data on individual workers, we document a marked increase in structural change and turbulence, in particular since 1990. Net employment changes resulted partly from an increase in gross flows, but also from an increase in the net transition "yield" at any given gross worker turnover. In growing sectors, net structural change was driven by accessions from nonparticipation rather than unemployment; contracting sectors reduced their net employment primarily via lower accessions from nonparticipation. While gross turnover is cyclically sensitive and strongly procyclical, net reallocation is countercyclical, meaning that recessions are associated with increased intensity of sectoral reallocation. Beyond this cyclical component, German reunification and Eastern enlargement appear to have contributed significantly to this accelerated pace of structural change.

JEL Classification: J63, J64, J62

Keywords: gross worker flows, sectoral and occupational mobility, turbulence

Corresponding author:

Michael C. Burda
Department of Economics
Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin
Spandauer Str. 1
D-10178 Berlin
Germany
E-mail: burda@wiwi.hu-berlin.de

^{*} We thank participants at the EALE 2007, the EEA 2007 and the CAPE 2007 meetings, the 2007 annual meeting of the Verein für Socialpolitik, the 2nd Data User Conference of the IAB, and seminar participants of the Berlin Network of Labour Market Research (BeNA) and at Bergische Universität Wuppertal for helpful comments. We also gratefully acknowledge the support of the German Science Foundation (DFG) and of the Collaborative Research Centre SFB 649 at Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.

1 Introduction

Modern market economies are constantly subject to structural change. Some sectors shrink, while others grow. Some of these changes are of short duration, reflecting fads, terms of trade, or temporary shifts of technology, while others appear more or less permanent. The most important common long-run trend for developed economies has been a marked shift of employment away from production towards service activities, as predicted by the “three-sector hypothesis” (for the classic references, see Fisher, 1935, Clark, 1940, and Fourastié, 1949). Indeed, with the exceptions of Finland, Ireland, and Sweden, the share of manufacturing in total GDP has declined throughout the European Union over the past quarter century.

It is natural to associate structural change with pervasive gross and net movements of workers between the different sectors of the economy. This expectation is borne out in economic research on labor market flows, and is especially relevant for Germany, in which the share of manufacturing in total GDP declined from 28% in 1980 to 21% in 2005.¹ This development has not been an even one. From 1970 to 1990, manufacturing employment declined from 10.1m to 9.1m, i.e. by 1m or 10%. From 1990 to 2005, it fell further to 6.8m, which corresponds to a drop of 2.3m, or 25%. The growth of service sector employment, by contrast, was much more steady, rising from 6.1m in 1970, to 10.6m in 1990, to 14.5m in 2005. At the same time, unemployment rose from below 2% to over 10%. The German case is important not only because of Germany’s size in the European Union and Euro area, but also because of its highly industrialized initial conditions and the marked delay of its transformation when compared with other EU economies.

Research on the roles of gross and net flows in structural change has been limited by the availability of detailed data on individual workers’ employment histories.² In this paper, we are able to assess both the extent and the dynamics of structural change by using data on individual worker transitions in West Germany during the time period 1975-2001. We do this by computing gross and net worker flows from a large panel data set which covers 2% of the German social security workforce, and by evaluating the extent of occupational and sectoral mobility over this period. We are thus able to identify precisely where structural change is most prevalent in the economy, which workers are most affected, which worker flows contribute most to it, *and how they do so*. We also analyze which differences exist between growing and shrinking sectors in this context. Furthermore, we emphasize the role the business cycle plays for sectoral and occupational worker reallocation.

¹The data in this section are from the OECD STAN Database and Statistische Ämter der Länder (2006).

²As discussed in the next section, the few studies taking a similar approach to ours are Fallick (1996), Golan, Lane, and McEntarfer (2007), and Greenaway, Upward, and Wright (2000).

2 Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives on Structural Change

2.1 Long-run Trends and Structural Change

The long-run evolution of economies from agricultural, then to industrial, and finally to service-based structure is the key prediction of the “three-sector-hypothesis” associated with Fisher, Clark, and Fourastié. Central to most theoretical explanations is an exogenous, persistent divergence in labor productivity growth rates in manufacturing and services, as well as a relatively inelastic demand for services.³ At the sectoral level, it is natural to think of an economy buffeted by idiosyncratic disturbances which reflect changes in tastes, terms of trade, technologies, or institutional interventions, and empirical evidence tends to support the view that these factors are responsible for long-term movements in unemployment.⁴ One of the first models to consider this in general equilibrium was Lucas and Prescott (1974). Rogerson (1987, 2005) extended this analysis to include multi-sectoral models. In the former, a two-period, two-sector model with permanent sectoral shocks is analyzed. Rogerson (2005) proposes a variant of the Lucas-Prescott model which allows for finitely lived agents and sector-specific human capital. In contrast to Lucas and Prescott (1974), where workers always move from declining to expanding sectors, workers from a declining sector might well end up non-employed. This analysis thus allows for a richer set of worker histories. More recently, Lee and Wolpin (2006) investigate the importance of the costs workers face when switching their sector of employment, as well as the role of labor supply and demand factors in the growth of the service sector. In order to do so, they estimate a two-sector growth model with aggregate and idiosyncratic shocks for the US economy. They find that these mobility costs are large, and that demand side factors, namely technical change and movements in product and capital prices, were responsible for the growth of the service sector.

2.2 Turbulence and Labor Market Dynamics

Structural change and worker mobility is related to the recent discussion of *turbulence* in the labor market.

It must be stressed that there exist a number of different notions of turbulence. First, following Lilien (1982),

³See Baumol (1967) for theoretical linkages of labor productivity growth differences to the secular development of the size of the service sector. Balassa (1964) discussed these developments in terms of nontraded output. Fuchs (1980) linked these developments to increasing female labor force participation. More recently, Ngai and Pissarides (2005) have studied a multi-sector model of growth with differences in TFP growth rates between sectors to derive conditions for balanced growth. For empirical assessments see Layard, Nickell, and Jackman (2005), and the recent report by the European Central Bank (van Riet, Ernst, Madaschi, Orlandi, Rivera, and Benoît, 2004).

⁴Marimon and Zilibotti (1998) decompose employment and labor costs in 11 European countries into country, industry, and temporal influences, and attribute 80% of the long-run differentials across countries and industries in employment growth to sectoral effects. They argue that Spain’s very high unemployment in the 1990s was mainly due to the difficulties this economy had with reallocating workers from agriculture to industry. van Riet, Ernst, Madaschi, Orlandi, Rivera, and Benoît (2004) review the main stylized facts concerning sectoral specialization in the European Union, as well as the changes that have taken place over time. One of their findings is that some countries (notably Finland, Germany, and Sweden) experienced above-average rates of sectoral reallocation in the early 1990s. In their analysis of the service sector employment in the EU-15, D’Agostino, Serafini, and Ward-Warmedinger (2006) conclude that an efficient sectoral reallocation of labor has been hindered by the inflexibility of the labor market and by the mismatch between workers’ skills and job vacancies.

turbulence could be defined as the increased *net* reallocation of workers between sectors during a period. Second, turbulence may be defined as an increasing instability of employment relationships, i.e. an increase in *gross* worker flows (cf. Farber, 1999). Third, one can define turbulence as an increase in mismatch on the labor market. Layard, Nickell, and Jackman (2005) look at the mismatch between labor demand and labor supply across economic sectors. This can be measured by examining either sectoral market tightness or sectoral unemployment rates. Similarly, Marimon and Zilibotti (1999) construct a theoretical model where workers have specific skills and firms have specific skill requirements. An increase in the mismatch between skills and skill requirements can be seen as an increase in turbulence. In a related vein, Ljungqvist and Sargent (2004) equate turbulence to the increased loss of human capital while workers are unemployed, which reduces the incentive to take up a new job. This is especially the case when unemployment benefits are high. Note that this definition only posits a reduced outflow rate from unemployment, but remains silent about all other worker flows.

While there is thus a large literature on the causes and the effects of sectoral change, there seems to be a lack of analyses which specifically look at the dynamics of this change. One exception is Greenaway, Upward, and Wright (2000), who examine the behavior of net and gross worker flows in the UK over the time period 1950-2000. Their key findings are, first, that gross worker flows do not display a secular trend, and second, that net worker flows, i.e. sectoral reallocation, was higher in the 1970s and 1980s than in any other post-war decade. They also argue that gross worker flows are not indicative of the amount of sectoral reallocation occurring. Instead, they are best seen as an indication of the cost of sectoral reallocation. For the US labor market, Fallick (1996) finds that workers hired into relatively fast-growing industries are mostly drawn from the ranks of new entrants and re-entrants to the labor force. Golan, Lane, and McEntarfer (2007) document the magnitude of worker reallocation between and within industries, as well as differences between demographic groups, and show that old workers are much less likely to reallocate than younger workers. Furthermore, they find that firm-level job and worker reallocation increases the transition probabilities of even the most stable groups of workers.

2.3 The Business Cycle and Structural Change

Another, somewhat unsuccessful strand of the macroeconomic literature has linked structural change to business cycle fluctuations. In his seminal contribution, Lilien (1982) associated downturns with periods of high sectoral desynchronization, arguing that sectoral shocks require the reallocation of workers between sectors. Because of the time-consuming nature of the labor reallocation process, frictional unemployment arises, which raises the overall unemployment rate. This hypothesis did not hold up to subsequent analyses.

Abraham and Katz (1986) and Blanchard and Diamond (1989) show that the evolution of vacancies is not consistent with the sectoral-shocks explanation. In particular, vacancy data do not suggest large differences in labor demand between sectors. Without very strong complementarities across sectors, such sectoral shocks cannot be seen as a cause of higher unemployment; rather, sectors merely differ in their sensitivity to aggregate shocks. Despite a lack of empirical support, the “Lilien Hypothesis” gave rise to further attempts to study sectoral complementarities and their role in the cycle. In a related vein, Caballero and Hammour (1994) endogenized the restructuring decision to allow for endogenous scrapping of capital, implying that recessions are better times for firms to “clean house” and shed unproductive capacity.

While this paper is mainly concerned with sectoral flows, it is related to a more general literature on mobility in the labor market, looking especially at the consequences of worker mobility for individual workers and for the economy as a whole.⁵ Voluntary job mobility by individual workers has been extensively analyzed in the job search literature (for an overview of job search, see Rogerson, Shimer, and Wright, 2005). One of the conclusions related to our investigation is that young workers follow a two-stage search strategy: they first try to find a job in a preferred occupation, and only afterwards decide on which sector they want to work in (see, for example, Neal, 1999). Involuntary job mobility, on the other hand, has been studied extensively in the displaced workers literature (see, for example, Hamermesh, 1989, Burda and Mertens, 2001, Kuhn, 2002, and Bender and von Wachter, 2006). Displacement has implications both for future wages and for the subsequent labor market history of workers. These consequences are likely to be more negative when a worker has to change sector or occupation, as this implies the loss of sector- or occupation-specific human capital. Worker mobility thus plays a role for the evolution of the wage structure.⁶ Worker mobility is of central importance for allocating workers to their most productive use in the economy.

2.4 Empirical Evidence for Germany

The dynamics of the German labor market were analyzed by Bachmann (2005) using the IAB Regional File 1975-2001. This data set consists of registry data provided by the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) of the German Federal Employment Agency. He finds that worker flows do not display a marked trend over the time period considered, but that there is an acceleration in gross flows in the second half of the 1990s. This is consistent with the evidence presented by Winkelmann and Zimmermann (1998), who find no evidence of increased job instability in Germany for the time period 1974-94. Similar findings are reported by Farber (1999) for the US. As for the cyclical features of worker flows, Bachmann (2005) shows that while

⁵Jovanovic and Moffitt (1990) estimate a structural model with both idiosyncratic and sectoral productivity shocks. They find that, for the US between 1966-1980, while having a lower impact than idiosyncratic factors, sectoral shocks play an important role for gross worker mobility.

⁶This issue is also analyzed by Kambourov and Manovskii (2004) and Vella and Moscarini (2004).

separations are relatively flat over the business cycle, accessions are procyclical. This points to the fact that hirings, i.e. inflows into employment, play a key role for the dynamics of the labor market. In the US context, this point has been stressed by Hall (2005) and Shimer (2005). Velling and Bender (1994) analyze the cross-sectional properties of occupational mobility for employment covered by social security legislation for the year 1989. They also use registry data provided by the IAB. Their main findings are as follows: occupational mobility depends on worker characteristics such as age, education, and sex. Furthermore, the labor market history of a worker, in terms of both wages and previous transitions, has an important impact on the probability of a change of occupation. Bender, Haas, and Klose (1999b) provide descriptive evidence on both types of mobility for the time period 1985-1995 using the same data set. From this, they conclude that the influence of the business cycle on both series is strong. Furthermore, unemployed workers are found to have become more mobile over the time period considered. Gathmann and Schoenberg (2006) analyze the transferability of specific skills across occupations using the IAB employment sample (IABS) 1975-2001. They find that movers can transfer between 20 and 33% of the value of occupational tenure across occupations. Isaoglu (2006) explicitly analyzes occupational mobility of male employed workers in Germany for the time period 1985-2003 using the German Socio-Economic Panel Study (SOEP). She estimates probit transition models and concludes that occupational mobility is strongly procyclical and dependent upon individual characteristics.

2.5 This Study

Our study is explorative in nature and meant to aid the inductive search process from a wide class of existing models. To do so, we use information on individual transitions in the IAB employment sample (IABS) for the time period 1975-2001 to study aggregate gross and net sectoral worker flows over the period 1975-2001. The main advantages of the IAB data set, which is described in detail below, are that the information is relatively accurate, that the sample size is very large, and that the same workers are followed over a long period of time. Using different concepts and definitions, we first investigate the extent of structural change and turbulence in West Germany. We then analyze sectoral and occupation worker mobility in more detail.⁷ Our results show which worker flows are most prevalent in the economy as a whole, and which worker flows contribute most to structural change. Furthermore, we investigate whether differences in sectoral employment growth rates can be attributed to workers leaving shrinking sectors (sectoral outflows) or to workers entering growing sectors (sectoral inflows). We also show that the adjustment processes leading to changes in sectoral employment stocks depend very much on the growth rate of the sectors under investigation. Finally, we investigate the

⁷The results presented in this paper focus on sectoral change. More results on occupational change are in Bachmann and Burda (2007).

role of the business cycle for the pace of structural change.

3 Data and Measurement Issues

3.1 The IAB Regional File

The data set used is the IAB Regional File 1975-2001 (IABS-R01), which is generated by the Institute for Employment Research (IAB) of the German Federal Employment Agency. The data base covers 2% of all the persons who worked in an employment covered by social security between the 1st January 1975 (for western German employees) or the 1st January 1992 (for eastern German employees) and the 31st December 2001. The data source consists of notifications made by employers to the social security agencies, which include health insurances, statutory pension schemes, and unemployment insurance.⁸ These notifications are made on the behalf of workers, employees and trainees who pay contributions to the social insurance system. This means that, for example, civil servants and self-employed are not included. Overall, the subsample includes roughly 1.3 million people, of which 1.1 million are from western Germany. For 1995, the employment statistics, from which the IAB Regional File is drawn, cover roughly 80% of the employed persons in western Germany, and 86% of all employed persons in eastern Germany. Of the unemployed, only those entitled to unemployment benefits are covered. This means that the unemployment stock is about one third lower than the one reported in official labor statistics.⁹ Data observations are generated by notifications which are made at the beginning and at the end of an employment or unemployment spell. Furthermore, there is an annual report which updates some of the information. The information provided is the following: sex, year of birth, and degree of education/training. Also, information on the occupation and the gross earnings of workers, an establishment number, and the economic sector is available on a daily basis. Our notion of a job is based on establishments, not firms, which means that a change of establishment within the same firm will also be recorded as a job change. Employers do not have to notify the social security agency if *only* the sector or the occupation of an employee changes. However, this information must be reported in every mandatory notification, i.e. at the beginning of an employment spell, and at the beginning of every calendar year. As a change of sector always involves a new employment relationship, and thus a new notification, every such change is recorded. This is not true for changes of occupation, as this might well change for an employee while he remains in the same establishment. Therefore, a change of occupation on the same job will only be recorded at the end of the year. This means that some occupational mobility is not recorded, for example when the reported occupation of an employee changes and the match is destroyed before the next

⁸For a complete description of the data set, see Bender, Haas, and Klose (2000).

⁹See Bender, Haas, and Klose (1999a).

annual notification. Thus, we have exact information on sectoral mobility, and a lower bound on occupational mobility. The empirical analysis considers 16 broad economic sectors; 128 different occupations are recorded.

Two states of the labor market can be directly derived from the data set: employment covered by social security, and unemployment, if the worker is receiving some form of unemployment compensation. The third state that we consider, “nonparticipation”, is not directly recorded but is defined as those individuals of working age who do not pay social security contributions while employed, and do not receive unemployment benefits. This means that nonparticipation includes the state “out-of-the-labor-force”, but also self-employment, civil service employment, retirement, or marginal employment.¹⁰

This data set has a number of unique advantages. First, it does not suffer from the problems inherent in most panel data sets, e.g. there is no sample attrition, and it follows workers over a long period of time as opposed to rotation-based samples such as the CPS.¹¹ Given the length of our times series, the evidence here is likely to be more conclusive than the US studies cited above, which observe only one episode of labor market tightening (1994-2000) and slowdown (2000-2003). Our data set covers two decades and two full business cycle swings. Second, it offers observations at a very high frequency, which means that every actual transition is observed. This is a distinct advantage over survey data like the CPS or the SOEP, which does not record multiple transitions that take place between two interview dates and, in the case of the SOEP, uses retrospective data. Two limitations of the data are noteworthy. First, it is representative for the working population covered by social security legislation, and not the entire working population. Second, it only covers unemployed who receive unemployment benefits. Therefore, this special structure of the data set should be taken into account when interpreting the different flows, especially the ones into and out of nonparticipation.

3.2 Construction of Worker Flows

In order to fully exploit the daily structure of the data set at hand, we calculate flows cumulatively, i.e. counting every transition between labor market states that takes place within a given month, even if there are several changes of state within this time period. Thus, we take into account short spells as well, which are generally not recorded in other data sets.¹² Commensurately, we need to address the possibility of measurement errors in the data. In particular, workers’ notifications of leaving the state of unemployment might not always correspond exactly to the actual change of labor market state. We correct for this latter potential measurement error in the following way: If the time interval between an unemployment and an employment record is smaller than 30 days, we count it as a direct transition between the two states

¹⁰Cf. Fitzenberger and Wilke (2004) for an in-depth analysis of this issue.

¹¹Technically attrition is possible in the sense of non-benefit recipients and labor force activity in the underground economy.

¹²In the CPS, for example, workers are rotated out of the sample after 4 months.

recorded.¹³ If the gap between two notifications is larger than 30 days, we count this as an intervening spell of nonparticipation. As for job-to-job flows, records that are from the same person and the same establishment are counted as one single spell as long as the time between two consecutive employment notifications does not exceed 7 days.

As we are interested in consistent time series that go back as far as possible, the empirical analysis is restricted to workers from western Germany. As there is no information on the place of residence in the data set, we discard observations on employees that at some point have worked in eastern Germany. We also drop some observations, such as artists, who feature an implausibly high number of spells.¹⁴ As these observations are due to administrative rules, they are not interesting from an economic point of view. The number of people receiving unemployment benefits is measured with significant error before 1980; consequently, the stock of those workers, as well as the flows from that state, are not used. As employment is correctly measured, we obtain reliable estimates for direct job-to-job transitions for the entire time period 1975 to 2001.

4 Findings: Sectoral Employment and Structural Change

4.1 The Sectoral Structure of the German Economy

We begin by examining trends in the allocation of dependent status, socially-insured employment across six main sectors of the economy: agriculture, production, energy and mining, trade and transport, services and government. Dependent-status employment is defined for each year in our sample (1975-2001) as the average of the employment levels on the 15th of every month of that year.¹⁵ The results are displayed in Figure A.1, which conveys the quantitative importance of the different sectors. For the time period considered, most workers were employed in production, in the service sector, and in trade and transport; construction, agriculture, energy, and mining, and the public sector are quantitatively much less important. The three latter sectors, as well as trade and transport, are relatively stable over time and show little if any pronounced trend. The most striking evolution in the graph is the reduction of the employment share in the production sector, and a concomitant, sharp increase in the size of the service sector. The employment share of services rises by more than 10 percentage points, matched by an equal decline in the production sector's share.

Sectoral shares of full-time and part-time employment for a finer breakdown of 16 sectors are presented in Table A.1 in the appendix. Over the time period 1975-2001, household-related services remained relatively

¹³Recalculation of spells for shorter intervals does not change the results significantly.

¹⁴"Implausibly high" is defined as 200 employment spells or more per year.

¹⁵Ideally, one would use beginning or end of year figures. However, due to the particular way in which the data are collected in the IAB-data set, we are unable to do so.

stable; the employment share of social services, however, increased by over 80%, and the share of business related services more than doubled. As for shrinking sectors, the decline in the employment share is strongest for primary and intermediate goods production (-40%), consumption goods (-41%), and construction (-45%). The main message of this analysis is that over the last decades, an ongoing process of structural change in the German economy has reallocated workers from the production sector to the service sector. Within the service sector, business-related services have increased most, while the share of household-related services has remained relatively constant. Moreover, this process seems to have accelerated since 1990. A natural question to address is whether the reallocation of workers from shrinking to expanding sectors has been smooth, or whether the pace of structural change has accelerated over time. This is the topic of the next section.

4.2 Net Structural Change and Turbulence

As a measure of the pace of structural change, we follow Layard, Nickell, and Jackman (2005) in calculating a Lilien (1982)-type index which takes the form¹⁶

$$\lambda_{d,t} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \Delta_d \frac{E_{j,t}}{E_t} \right|. \quad (1)$$

Here, J denotes the number of economic sectors considered, $E_{j,t}$ is employment in sector j in period t , E_t is total employment in period t , Δ is the difference operator, and d indicates the number of years over which the difference is taken. Thus, for example, $\lambda_{1,t}$ measures the turbulence at time t as half the sum of changes in sectoral shares from year $t - 1$ to year t . The evolution of the turbulence index is depicted in Figure A.2 for six main economic sectors and three differences, namely 1-, 5-, and 8-year differences. As one can see, the indices rise with the time interval considered, i.e. the λ_5 -index is larger than the λ_1 -index, and the λ_8 -index is larger than the λ_5 -index. This could have been expected as the λ_1 -index captures short-run changes (from one year to the next), while the other indices capture more long-run trends. What is striking however, is that all three measures indicate a marked increase in the 1990s, especially the first part of that period. This is in all likelihood due to the impact that German reunification had on the labor market of the entire country. But even in the second half of the 1990s, the indices do not return to the previous, lower levels of the 1980s. Neglecting the jump in the early 1990s and comparing the time periods 1985-89 and 1995-99, the means of the three indices increase by at least 85%. This means that this type of turbulence

¹⁶For more discussion and use of this index, see Layard, Nickell, and Jackman (2005). The original Lilien (1982) index is defined as $\sigma = \left[\sum_{j=1}^J \left(\frac{E_{jt}}{E_t} \right) (\Delta \log E_{jt} - \Delta \log E_t) \right]^{1/2}$. The reason for calculating a modified index is that it provides a more natural point of comparison for the flow analysis we are conducting. The two indices yield very similar results.

did not abate even more than five years after German reunification. This finding is robust to using a finer division of sectors, and also holds for occupational turbulence (cf. Table A.2).

To investigate why turbulence increased in the early 1990s, and why it has remained high thereafter, we rewrite the modified Lilien index in the following way:

$$\lambda_t = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \Delta \frac{E_{j,t}}{E_t} \right| \approx \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{E_{j,t} - E_{j,t-1}}{E_t} \right| = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^J \left| \frac{i_{j,t} - x_{j,t}}{E_t} \right|$$

where $i_{j,t}$ are inflows into and $x_{j,t}$ are outflows from sector j during time period $[t-1, t]$. The approximation holds if the changes in the employment stocks are not too large from one year to the next. Evidently, the Lilien index increases when inflows and outflows diverge. This can occur for two reasons: first, if the short-run variations of inflows and/or outflows increase, and, second, if long-run trends accelerate. In order to examine the second possibility, we run regressions of the form

$$y_t = c + at + by_{t-1} + \epsilon_t,$$

where $y_t \equiv \frac{E_{j,t}}{E_t}$ is the employment share of sector j at time t , c is a constant, t a time trend, and ϵ_t an error term.¹⁷ We analyzed these series for structural breaks using the Chow forecast, the Chow sample split, and the Chow breakpoint tests. Using these tests, we analyzed the stability of the above regression for every year from 1980. As the tests are known to have substantially distorted size if the number of observations is small, we use bootstrap versions of the tests in order to size-adjust them (cf. Candelon and Lütkepohl, 2001). The p-values of the three tests for the employment share of the productive sector are in Figure A.3. Given that low p-values indicate instability, there is weak evidence for instability in the mid-1980s, and strong evidence for a structural break in the early 1990s, especially for the years 1991 and 1992. The results for the service sector (not reported here) are very similar, with signs of instability already occurring in the late 1980s. We conclude that the year 1990 marks a watershed for the West German labor market: After reunification, the structural change in the economy, i.e. the sectoral reallocation of workers, accelerated significantly.

5 More Detail: A Dissection of Mobility and Structural Change

The last section documented significant sectoral shifts in the structure of German socially-insured employment since 1990, but was silent about how structural change actually occurred. For example, from 1990 to 2000, the number of dependent-status workers in the West German manufacturing sector declined from

¹⁷The great majority of employment share series proved to be trend-stationary at least at the 5% level of significance. Because of this, and because of the low power of unit root tests, we treated all time series as trend-stationary.

8.5m to 6.5m.¹⁸ How was this reduction achieved? To answer this question, we use our data set to compute individual gross worker flows, exploiting longitudinal information on the workers in question.

Gross flows can occur for several reasons. A change in labor demand of one economic sector relative to the others gives rise to flows from one sector to another; here, gross flows of workers are associated with net sectoral reallocation. Changes in idiosyncratic productivity of a match can also result in worker flows which at some later date lead to matches in a different economic sector. It is possible to imagine workers “trading places” between sectors - without changing relative sectoral employment levels, or young workers replacing retirements. Here, a worker flow in one direction implies another in the reverse direction. These two worker movements thus lead to gross reallocation of labor while leaving net reallocation and the distribution of workers across sectors unchanged.

5.1 Gross Sectoral and Occupational Mobility

We first consider employment inflows: newly formed employment relationships (accessions) involving a change of sector, or occupation, or both, and distinguish between three different states of origin: employment, unemployment, and nonparticipation. Effectively, we are looking at flows entailing a change of sector/occupation with workers moving from one employer to another (EE flow) and from unemployment to employment (UE flow). Furthermore, transitions from the state of nonparticipation (technically, non-registration) to employment (NE flow) are analyzed.¹⁹ The analysis is conducted separately for men and women, and for three different age groups, 16-29, 30-49 and 50-65.

The central statistic for our analysis is the rate of incidence of a transition expressed as a ratio to the stock of the originating state at the beginning of the period (employment, unemployment and nonparticipation), measured over a fixed period of time. While these rates are expressed on a cumulative monthly basis (i.e. all transitions are recorded on a daily basis), they will be generally presented as annual averages or averaged over several years. This rate captures the overall level of sectoral or occupational mobility, respectively. As both types of mobility are likely to be related to the type of transition a worker experiences at the same time, we also study the sectoral and occupational transition rates *conditional on* one particular employment transition occurring. The rates generated in this way are meant to capture sectoral and occupational mobility *over and above* the movements in worker flows.

¹⁸Cf. Statistische Ämter der Länder (2006).

¹⁹Note that the data set does not contain any information on workers when they are neither in dependent-status employment nor receive unemployment compensation. We are therefore not able to report changes of sector or occupation for EN and NE transitions.

5.1.1 Cross-Sectional Results

Table A.3 provides an overview of different labor force transition rates on an annual basis for the time periods 1981-1990 and 1991-2000. Note that the transition rates to a new employer or to a new sector are calculated in the cumulative way described above. This means that all transitions are taken into account, also when a worker has multiple transitions within one year. The results show that transitions from employment are most likely to lead to nonparticipation or to unemployment. The annual rate at which workers experience a direct job-to-job transitions is lower, and these transitions more often take place within the same sector rather than involving a change of sector. Workers leaving unemployment are most likely to transit to the state of nonparticipation. Furthermore, when a worker leaves unemployment, he is more likely to find a job in the sector where he has worked previously rather than in a different sector. Exits from nonparticipation usually lead to employment, and not to unemployment. Finally, note that these transition rates have changed over time, as a comparison between the two time periods considered shows. This issue will be considered in the next section.

Next, we analyze differences between age cohorts, and men and women. Table A.4 shows the unconditional incidence, for dependent status employees, of moving into employment and changing sector at the same time, as well as the rate of sectoral change conditional on making a certain type of transition. The corresponding results for occupational changes are presented in Table A.5. The rates of incidence are very similar with respect to sectors and occupations. Looking at the differences between age cohorts, one can see that the incidence rates are all strongly falling with age, which is similar to evidence presented by Golan, Lane, and McEntarfer (2007) for the United States. This finding can be rationalized by the fact that young workers, who have only relatively recently entered the labor market, are engaging in job shopping in order to look for the sector and the occupation that suits them best (cf. Neal, 1999). For older workers, this effect is of less importance. Also, older workers have accumulated more sector/occupation-specific human capital. Changing sector or occupation therefore entails a larger loss of human capital for older workers than for younger workers. Hence, the propensity to change sector and occupation is falling with age.²⁰

In general, women exhibit lower rates of sectoral and occupational change. This finding is in line with the evidence presented in Fitzenberger and Kunze (2005), who argue that female workers are often locked in low wage careers, characterized by low mobility and for which job changes only lead to small wage gains. The measure of sectoral and occupational mobility is higher when a worker has been unemployed previously than when he experiences a direct job-to-job transition. This implies that direct job-to-job transitions generally take place between jobs involving the same sector and occupation. These results are quite similar for women,

²⁰Because sectors are more broadly defined than occupations, the rate of sectoral change is generally lower than that for occupational change.

with one exception: for young women, direct job-to-job transitions are much less likely to involve a change of occupation than for young men.

5.1.2 Long-Run Trends

Let subscript j and t denote an economic sector and time period $[t, t+1]$, respectively. Then, we can compute a measure of gross worker flows normalized by the labor force as follows:

$$gross_t/L_t = \left[\sum_{j=1}^J 0.5 \cdot (EEI_{j,t} + EEX_{j,t}) + UE_{j,t} + EU_{j,t} + EN_{j,t} + NE_{j,t} \right] \cdot \frac{1}{L_t}$$

where $EEI_{j,t}$ are inflows into and $EEX_{j,t}$ outflows out of a sector j in period $[t, t+1]$ associated with a direct job-to-job transition; UE , EU , EN , and NE are the transitions between the states of employment E , unemployment U , and non-registration N . The “dependent-status (and socially-insured) labor force” is defined as $L_t \equiv E_t + U_t$. This measure of gross flows gives an impression of the overall amount of sectoral worker reallocation in the economy. The resulting time series is in Figure A.4, and averages for different time periods are in Table A.6 in the appendix. Apart from business cycle fluctuations, the series is quite stable until the mid-1990s, after which it rises sharply.

Next, we analyze the evolution of transition rates introduced in the previous section over time. In particular, we are interested in whether a certain type of transition displays a clear trend. This will cast further light on the questions of whether one can see more turbulence in the labor market as well as inform with respect to the source of turbulence. The analysis is now more detailed and can reveal whether employment relationships have become less stable, whether the unemployed have become more or less mobile over time - an indication of Ljunqvist-Sargent type turbulence - or whether there have been more or less direct job-to-job transitions involving a change of sector and/or occupation.

Table A.3 in the previous section showed that there are clear differences between the transition rates in the 1980s and the 1990s. First, employment became slightly less stable, with the annual measure of job stability falling from 74.5% to 72.9%. Second, the exit rate out of unemployment to employment fell strongly. In particular, the transition rate from unemployment to the previous sector of employment dropped dramatically from 46.1% to 30.3%. The transition rate from unemployment to employment in another sector also fell, but by less (from 34.4% to 28.2%). Finally, the exits from nonparticipation did not change significantly between the two decades.

We now look at the different time series in detail. The evolution of the joint incidence of experiencing a sectoral change together with a job-to-job transition is in Figure A.5 in the appendix. The left panel displays

these rates for different age groups of male workers, while the right panel shows the same for female workers. While there is no long-term trend in the data, the series are strongly procyclical. Furthermore, the cyclicality is falling with age. In order to keep the analysis tractable, in the remainder of this section, we only discuss the results for men aged between 30 and 49.²¹

Figure A.6 depicts different measures of flows between sectors.²² The left panel shows the fraction of new employment relationships which involve a worker who has changed sector, and who has made either a direct job-to-job transition, or who has been previously unemployed, or not in the data set. The right panel displays the fraction of new employment relationships which involve a worker who has changed sector *conditional on* a certain labor market transition. The latter transition thus abstracts from movements in the number of labor market transitions, and focuses on the fraction of labor market transitions which lead to a change of sector in the total number of a certain labor market transition. As for trend behavior, none of the series features a strong long-run trend, with one exception: The conditional incidence measure of changing sector after an unemployment spell has been strongly rising since the early 1980s. Thus, the unemployed seem to have become more mobile across sectors during the last two decades. This might be an indication for Ljungqvist-Sargent type turbulence: If the skills of the unemployed started depreciating more quickly from the early 1980s, then it is likely that the unemployed will have a lower propensity to return to their sector and/or occupation in later periods.

5.1.3 Gross Sectoral Flows and Outsourcing

Structural change does not only occur because workers are moving from one economic sector to another. Organizational changes within firms can also play an important role. In particular, firms might split up along their business divisions. As an example, a car manufacturer might create a subsidiary firm dealing uniquely with the logistics of the manufacturer. In the extreme case, the subsidiary firm will employ exactly those workers that were previously employed by the manufacturer, and perform exactly the same tasks. This case of “outsourcing” would show up as a sectoral employment shift, although the tasks performed in the economy have not changed. In order to test whether outsourcing is driving our results, we employ the following strategy:²³ Outsourcing as in the case described above would involve a sectoral transition of an individual worker, but not a change of occupation. We therefore analyze which percentage of sectoral transitions involve a change of occupation as well. As direct job-to-job transitions are likely to play the most important role in this respect, we concentrate on these flows. The result is in Table A.7.

²¹The results for all age groups, and men and women, are similar with respect to long-run trends and cyclicalities. They are available from the authors upon request.

²²Cf. Bachmann and Burda (2007) for evidence on occupational mobility.

²³If there was firm information in the data set we use, we could analyze this issue in greater detail. However, this is unfortunately not the case, i.e. we only dispose of information on individual workers.

It becomes apparent that in all time periods considered, the majority of direct job-to-job transitions across sectors go together with a change of occupation. Furthermore, the percentage of sectoral EE flows involving a change of occupation has not fallen dramatically, as would have been the case if outsourcing had been a major driving force behind structural change. We see these results as evidence that outsourcing could have played some role, but certainly not an overwhelming one.

5.2 Net Flows

Having examined gross flows and sectoral inflows and outflows, we now turn to the analysis of net sectoral flows, i.e. changes in sectoral employment stocks. We calculate two different measures of net reallocation: the first measure has a net effect on sectoral employment stocks on a monthly basis, the second has a net effect on a yearly basis. Note that these two measures can move independently from each other, depending on which proportion of short-run turbulence is canceled out over the year.

Both time series are in Table A.8 and in the left panel of Figure A.4. The results show a marked difference between the two time series computed. Net flows on an monthly basis display a relatively small, but clear downward trend. This implies that the short-run variation in net changes has declined over time. Calculating net flows from seasonally adjusted worker flows reveals that this decline is entirely due to seasonal factors. Net flows on a yearly basis, on the other hand, increased over the same time period, and especially in the early 1990s. Given the results obtained for the modified Lilien index in Section 4.2, the latter result is not surprising. However, the fact that at the same time seasonally-induced short-run variations declined is somewhat of a puzzle.

5.2.1 Accounting for Changes in Employment Stocks: The Role of Different Labor Market Transitions

Having found that the evolution of employment stocks changed significantly from the beginning of the 1990s, we now want to analyze in more detail where these changes come from. In order to do so, we calculate the flow components of changes in stocks. Note that sectoral reallocation can be expressed in terms of flows:

$$net_t/L_t = \left[\sum_{j=1}^J |EEI_{j,t} - EEX_{j,t} + UE_{j,t} - EU_{j,t} + NE_{j,t} - EN_{j,t}| \right] \cdot \frac{1}{L_t}$$

We calculate both the differences $EEI - EEX$, $NE - EN$, $UE - EU$, and the individual flows.

Net Flows: Aggregate Evidence

The results for the economy as a whole are in Table A.8. Several features are noteworthy. First, direct job-to-job transitions only play a minor role for structural adjustment. Not only is their level low relative to the other flows, but their net impact, measured by the difference between EEI and EEX , is low as well. Furthermore, their net effect over the time period considered is relatively stable. Second, both according to their level and their net effect, the flows between employment and unemployment are much more important. The level of these flows is relatively stable until the mid-1990s and increases thereafter. Finally third, the flows between employment and non-registration play the most important role. This is both true for the level of the gross flows, and for the net effect, which peaked in the second half of the 1990s.

The analysis in this section up to now was for the economy as a whole. However, given the divergence in the evolution of employment between sectors, one would presume that there are also important differences in the way these net changes come about. In order to investigate this matter further, we again look at the differences between flows, as well as at individual flows. This time, however, we do so for two sectors: first, the consumption goods sector, which lost 35% of its employment share between 1975 and 2001, and second, the business-related service sector, whose employment share grew by 75% during the same period.

Net Flows: Growing vs. Shrinking Sectors

The results for the consumption goods sector are in Table A.9, and those for the business-related service sector are in Table A.10 in the appendix. Direct job-to-job transitions are higher in the growing sector. The net contribution of these transitions to employment change ($|EEI - EEX|$) is very small in both sectors though.

Two noteworthy aspects differentiate the two sectors. First, the outflow rates are not appreciably different, and the one for the growing sector is even higher (22.9% for the service sector and 20.7% for the consumption goods sector). Higher growth of the service sector can be attributed to its higher inflow rate (25.7%, vs. 18.7% in the consumption goods sector). Second, there is a large difference in the net contribution of the flows between employment and unemployment. For the shrinking sector, these flows are relatively high (with flows from unemployment accounting for nearly one third of sectoral employment inflows), and they play by far the most important role for net sectoral employment changes. This is not the case for the business-related service sector, where unemployment flows play a much smaller role (one fifth of sectoral inflows). By contrast, the gross transitions between non-registration and employment are lower for the declining sector than for the growing sector (53% vs. 62% of sectoral inflows, respectively). Furthermore, these

flows are of minor importance for changes in the sectoral employment share in the declining sector. The opposite is true in the growing sector: here, the flows between employment and nonparticipation are by far the most important contributor to changes in the employment share. We conclude that direct job-to-job transitions only play a minor role for net worker reallocation in both sectors, flows between unemployment and employment are most important for this purpose in the shrinking sector, which is the case for transitions between non-registration and employment in the growing sector. The results featured by the consumption goods sector and the business-related services sector can be found for the other sectors of the economy as well, depending on their respective growth performance. In other words, the features of the consumption goods sector are shared by the other shrinking sectors in the economy, and those of the business-related services sector are shared by the other growing sectors.

5.2.2 Accounting for Changes in Net Flows: The Persistence of Sectoral Flows and Sectoral Recalls

As shown above, net sectoral worker flows have increased mainly in the early 1990s, while gross sectoral worker flows only started to increase from the mid-1990s. This points to the issues of the *persistence* of sectoral flows, as well as of sectoral recalls. In this section, we try to measure the persistence of both. First, as a measure of the persistence of sectoral worker flows, we calculate which percentage of those workers who start employment in a new sector at a given point in time are still employed in this sector in the next year. Second, in order to analyze which role temporary movements play, we also calculate sectoral recalls. In particular, we quantify the percentage of workers who start employment in a new sector and who take up an employment again in the sector they were previously employed in one year later. We calculate these two time series both for workers who were employed, and for workers who were unemployed, before their sectoral switch. The results are summarized in Table A.11. Neither the persistence of sectoral flows coming from employment, nor the persistence of sectoral flows coming from unemployment, has increased significantly since the early 1980s. However, the inclination of workers to return to their previous sector has clearly declined. This is true both for workers coming from employment and from unemployment. The latter fact speaks in favor of sectoral shocks having become more permanent.

We conclude that direct job-to-job transitions play only a minor role for new worker reallocation in both sectors. In shrinking sectors, it appears that worker flows between unemployment and employment are most important for this purpose, while in growing sectors, this is true for transitions between non-registration and employment. This means that, in reality, we observe elements of the Lucas and Prescott (1974) vision of the world, namely employment-unemployment transitions; the pervasiveness of worker flows to and from nonparticipation, however, points to features stressed by Rogerson (2005). The relative importance of

transitions for worker reallocation appears to depend on the growth rate of a given sector.

5.3 Worker Reallocation Over the Business Cycle

The effect of the business cycle on the economy as a whole and on the labor market in particular has been a contentious issue at least since the times of Schumpeter (1942). On the one hand, recessions can be seen as being “cleansing”, because they are times when outdated techniques and products are squeezed out of the market (Caballero and Hammour, 1994). On the other hand, recessions coincide with sharp declines in job-to-job transitions, which generally improve the quality of worker-firm matches (Barlevy, 2002). Recessions can thus lead to a reduction in the average quality of newly created matches, i.e. they can have a “sully” impact.

We add a new dimension to this debate by looking at the cyclical nature of sectoral and occupational changes. The cyclical nature of gross flows and sectoral mobility can be seen in Figure A.6, which examines both transitions going together with a change of sector (left panel in the figures), and changes of sector conditional on a certain transition (right panel in the figures).²⁴ The state of origin clearly matters. In a recession, fewer workers enter a new employment involving a different sector directly from another job or from nonparticipation. Furthermore, given a transition from those two states of origin, the rate of sectoral change goes down in a recession as well. Workers take advantage of favorable business cycle conditions in order to engage in on-the-job search, which then often results in a change of sector or occupation. On the contrary, in a recession, workers search less on-the-job, and even if they are successful in finding a new job, this transition is less likely to involve an occupational or sectoral change than in a cyclical upswing.²⁵

The picture looks different for workers coming from unemployment. In a downturn, the number of workers making a transition from unemployment to employment and switching sector *increases*. However, the rate of sectoral change conditional on having made a transition from unemployment to employment is falling. In other words, flows from unemployment to employment are generally going up in a recession.²⁶ This also raises the number of UE transitions which coincide with a change of sector, but the share of UE transitions involving a sectoral switch is falling. Therefore, in a recession, the rate at which unemployed workers find a new job in the sector they were previously working in is going up. This is in all likelihood due to the fact that, in a recession, the proportion of workers who have only very recently joined the pool of the unemployed, is rising. These workers usually command more than average sector-specific human capital and will be rehired quickly in their sector of origin.

²⁴We only present the evidence on sectoral mobility here. Occupational mobility displays similar cyclical features, cf. Bachmann and Burda (2007).

²⁵The pro-cyclical nature of on-the-job search has been established by a number of researchers, including Burgess (1993) for the UK, and Fallick and Fleischman (2004) for the United States.

²⁶The finding of procyclical exits from unemployment to employment is consistent with Burda and Wyplosz (1994).

It is also instructive to analyze the behavior of net and gross sectoral mobility, depicted in Figure A.4. In a recession, gross employment flows fall, which is also due to a reduction in the number of job-to-job transitions (cf. Bachmann, 2005). This is the “sullyng” aspect of recessions. On the other hand, net flows go *up* in a downturn. This means that sectoral reallocation increases in bad times, i.e. recessions in Germany appear to be times of economic restructuring. In an upswing, the labor market is relatively tight, leading workers to engage in on-the-job search. Direct job-to-job transitions are a consequence. However, workers appear reluctant to change sector or occupation as this involves the loss of at least some sector- or occupation-specific human capital. Therefore, net employment changes are relatively low. In a downturn, the reverse is true: firms’ hiring activity is low, and more workers have to change sector in order to find a job at all, even if this involves the loss of some specific human capital. In recessions, gross worker flows decline, even while net worker flows are increasing.

6 Conclusion

Like all industrial countries, Germany has experienced at least two decades of considerable structural change. This paper set out to document the extent to which the labor market developments have mirrored the structural change in output composition. In particular, are gross and net labor market flows into and out of employment informative about the way structural change occurred? Was the decrease in employment in shrinking sectors a result of an increase in separations or a decrease in accessions? Was the increase in employment in growing sectors a result of an increase in accessions or a decrease in separations? Did the newly hired in growing sectors originate from outside the labor force, or were they unemployed, or even already employed? Have workers become more prone to switch occupational and industrial attachment? Are these processes sensitive to the business cycle? Has there been a recognizable change in recall behavior of firms, that is, to reemploy those with previous experience in the sector? In order to analyze the dynamics of structural change in more detail, we constructed aggregate worker flows from a micro employee data set covering 2% of the socially insured labor force spanning the time period 1975-2001.

At the outset, we documented an important fact which has gone virtually unnoticed in the literature: the pace of structural change in socially insured employment in the *west* German economy accelerated sharply after 1990, i.e. the manufacturing sector began shrinking more quickly, and the growth rate of the service sector increased significantly. While the employment share of the service sector rose by six percentage points in the period 1976-1990, that pace of change quickened to ten percentage points over the period 1991-2000. This development was accompanied by a significant increase in “turbulence” or variance of net employment

changes, as measured by the dispersion or variance of k -period growth rates. In contrast to phenomena stressed by Lilien (1982), the changes we find in Germany appear to be of longer term nature. Cyclical movements appear to mask low-frequency structural change which is more evident when differencing is performed on longer intervals. Interestingly, we found that gross worker (employment) flows and net worker flows - flows having a net impact on sectoral employment stocks - have not always moved together. In particular, net worker flows increased dramatically in the early 1990s, while gross worker flows only started to increase in a significant way after 1995. Put differently, the net sectoral “yield” from gross worker flows increased sharply since 1990.

We then investigated net worker flows in more detail. We found that job-to-job flows play only a minor role for net changes in sectoral employment, followed by transitions between employment and unemployment. Most important are flows between employment and nonparticipation (defined as being outside the group of employed or unemployed dependent-status employment). At the same time, gross flows can vary significantly between sectors, as seen by a comparison of a sharply contracting sector (e.g. consumer goods) with a strongly growing sectors (e.g. business-related services). In particular, we showed that the differences in employment growth between the two sectors were due to the low inflow rate of the consumer goods sector and the high inflow rate of the business-related services sector. By contrast, the outflow rates were relatively similar between the two sectors. These results resemble the findings by Shimer (2005) using aggregate time series data. We documented furthermore that, for the shrinking sector, flows to and from the state of unemployment were most important for net flows. By contrast, hirings from, and separations to nonparticipation were most important in the business services sector, which is similar to the findings of Fallick (1996), who focused on the behavior of hirings in the US.

Finally, we investigated the behavior of net and gross flows over the business cycle for the time period 1980-2001. Net reallocation was found to be counter-cyclical, and gross reallocation to be pro-cyclical. We interpret this as an indication of both clogging and cleansing effects of recessions: job-to-job transitions involving a change of sector decline sharply in economic downturns; workers are forced to change sectors, which leads to rising net reallocations. The mechanisms by which structural change occurs shed light on the effects of active and passive labor market policies. In general, economies can achieve structural change either by forcing costly mid-career industrial and occupational changes, or by “attrition”, i.e. parking displaced workers in long-term unemployment, early retirement or disability pension, using retirements and voluntary separations where possible to reduce workforces, while relying on labor force entrants as a source of new workers. Thus while we refrained in this paper from modeling structural change explicitly, our findings have implications for the relevant class of models which can help understand structural change

in Germany. Consistent with the recent contribution by Rogerson (2005), we find that German workers - especially older ones - who lose their jobs in shrinking sectors tend to leave the labor force after extended spells in unemployment. Growing sectors tend to recruit new employees from outside the socially insured labor force. We do not find a significant component of net employment growth originating in transitions through unemployment, as in Lucas and Prescott (1974).

The weight of the evidence presented in this paper supports the proposition that structural change accelerated in Germany around 1990. Our analysis is silent on causes, however. The structural break could be related to the significant appreciation of an undervalued real exchange rate, which resulted from higher inflation and the collapse of the European Monetary System in the early 1990s. At the same time, German unification unlocked new sources of production factors as well as new market opportunities, and will continue to spur both structural change as well as institutional reform. Eastern enlargement of the European Union represents much the same process, with much larger long-term impact, yet at a much lower pace. To understand better the root causes of the shifts we have identified, research will need to focus on more detailed data, i.e. geographically-based, matched firm-employee datasets.

References

- ABRAHAM, K. G., AND L. F. KATZ (1986): “Cyclical unemployment: Sectoral shifts or aggregate disturbances?,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 94(3), 507–22.
- BACHMANN, R. (2005): “Labour market dynamics in Germany: Hirings, separations, and job-to-job transitions over the business cycle,” Collaborative Research Center 649 Discussion Paper 2005-45, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin.
- BACHMANN, R., AND M. C. BURDA (2007): “Sectoral Transformation, Turbulence, and Labor Market Dynamics in Germany,” Ruhr Economic Papers 5, Rheinisch-Westfälisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Universität Dortmund, Universität Duisburg-Essen.
- BALASSA, B. (1964): “The purchasing power parity doctrine: A reappraisal,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 72, 584–596.
- BARLEVY, G. (2002): “The sullyng effect of recessions,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 69(1), 65–96.
- BAUMOL, W. (1967): “Macroeconomics of unbalanced growth: The anatomy of urban crisis,” *American Economic Review*, 57, 415–26.
- BENDER, S., A. HAAS, AND C. KLOSE (1999a): “Die IAB-Beschäftigtenstichprobe 1975-1995,” *ZA-Information*, 45, 104–115.
- (1999b): “Mobilität allein kann Arbeitsmarktp Probleme nicht lösen,” *IAB kurzbericht*, 2.
- (2000): “IAB employment subsample 1975-1995. Opportunities for analysis provided by the anonymised subsample,” IZA Discussion Paper 117, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- BENDER, S., AND T. VON WACHTER (2006): “In the right place at the wrong time - The role of firms and luck in young workers’ careers,” *American Economic Review*, 96(5), 1679–1705.
- BLANCHARD, O., AND P. DIAMOND (1989): “The Beveridge Curve,” *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1, 1–76.
- BURDA, M. C., AND A. MERTENS (2001): “Estimating wage losses of displaced workers in Germany,” *Labour Economics*, 8(1), 15–41.
- BURDA, M. C., AND C. WYPLOSZ (1994): “Gross worker and job flows in Europe,” *European Economic Review*, 38(6), 1287–1315.

- BURGESS, S. M. (1993): “A model of competition between unemployed and employed job searchers: An application to the unemployment outflow rate in Britain,” *Economic Journal*, 103(420), 1190–1204.
- CABALLERO, R. J., AND M. L. HAMMOUR (1994): “The cleansing effect of recessions,” *American Economic Review*, 84(5), 1350–1368.
- CANDELON, B., AND H. LÜTKEPOHL (2001): “On the reliability of Chow-type tests for parameter constancy in multivariate dynamic models,” *Economics Letters*, 73(2), 155–160.
- CLARK, C. (1940): *The conditions of economic progress*. London: Macmillan.
- D’AGOSTINO, A., R. SERAFINI, AND M. WARD-WARMEDINGER (2006): “Sectoral explanations of employment in Europe - the role of services,” ECB Working Paper Series 625, European Central Bank.
- FALLICK, B. (1996): “The hiring of new labor by expanding industries,” *Labour Economics*, 3, 25–42.
- FALLICK, B., AND C. A. FLEISCHMAN (2004): “Employer-to-employer flows in the U.S. labor market: the complete picture of gross worker flows,” Finance and Economics Discussion Series 2004-34, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (U.S.).
- FARBER, H. S. (1999): “Mobility and stability: The dynamics of job change in labor markets,” in *Handbook of Labor Economics*, ed. by O. Ashenfelter, and D. Card, vol. 3, pp. 2439–2483. Elsevier.
- FISHER, A. G. (1935): *The clash of progress and security*. London: Macmillan.
- FITZENBERGER, B., AND A. KUNZE (2005): “Vocational training and gender: Wages and occupational mobility among young workers,” *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 21(3), 392–415.
- FITZENBERGER, B., AND R. WILKE (2004): “Unemployment durations in West-Germany before and after the reform of the unemployment compensation system during the 1980s,” ZEW Discussion Paper 04-24, Zentrum für Europäische Wirtschaftsforschung.
- FOURASTIÉ, J. (1949): *Le grand espoir du XXe siècle; progrès technique, progrès économique, progrès social*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- FUCHS, V. R. (1980): “Economic growth and the rise of service employment,” NBER Working Paper 486, National Bureau of Economic Research.
- GATHMANN, C., AND U. SCHOENBERG (2006): “How general is specific human capital? Using mobility patterns to analyse skill transferability in the labour market,” IZA Discussion Paper 2485, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).

- GOLAN, A., J. LANE, AND E. MCENTARFER (2007): “The dynamics of worker reallocation within and across industries,” *Economica*, 74, 1–20.
- GREENAWAY, D., R. UPWARD, AND P. WRIGHT (2000): “Sectoral transformation and labour-market flows,” *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 16(3), 57–75.
- HALL, R. E. (2005): “Job loss, job finding, and unemployment in the U.S. economy over the past fifty years,” in *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, ed. by M. Gertler, and K. Rogoff. The MIT Press.
- HAMERMESH, D. S. (1989): “What do we know about worker displacement in the United States?,” *Industrial Relations*, 28(1), 51–9.
- ISAOGLU, A. (2006): “Occupational mobility in Germany,” mimeo, European University Institute.
- JOVANOVIĆ, B., AND R. MOFFITT (1990): “An estimate of a sectoral model of labor mobility,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(4), 827–52.
- KAMBOUROV, G., AND I. MANOVSKII (2004): “Occupational mobility and wage inequality,” IZA Discussion Paper 1189, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- KUHN, P. J. (ed.) (2002): *Losing work, moving on: International perspectives on worker displacement*. W. E. Upjohn Institute, Kalamazoo, Michigan.
- LAYARD, R., S. NICKELL, AND R. JACKMAN (2005): *Unemployment. Macroeconomic performance and the labour market*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, Second edition.
- LEE, D., AND K. I. WOLPIN (2006): “Intersectoral labor mobility and the growth of the service sector,” *Econometrica*, 74(1), 1–46.
- LILIEN, D. (1982): “Sectoral shifts and sectoral unemployment,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 90(4), 777–93.
- LJUNGQVIST, L., AND T. J. SARGENT (2004): “European unemployment and turbulence revisited in a matching model,” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2, 456–468.
- LUCAS, R., AND E. PRESCOTT (1974): “Equilibrium search and unemployment,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 7, 188–209.
- LÜTKEPOHL, H., AND M. KRÄTZIG (eds.) (2004): *Applied time series econometrics*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

- MARIMON, R., AND F. ZILIBOTTI (1998): “‘Actual’ versus ‘virtual’ employment in Europe. Is Spain different?,” *European Economic Review*, 42, 123–153.
- (1999): “Unemployment vs. mismatch of talents: Reconsidering unemployment benefits,” *Economic Journal*, 109, 266–291.
- NEAL, D. (1999): “The complexity of job mobility among young men,” *Journal of Labor Economics*, 17(2), 237–61.
- NGAI, L. R., AND C. A. PISSARIDES (2005): “Structural change in a multi-sector model of growth,” IZA Discussion Paper 1800, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA).
- ROGERSON, R. (1987): “An equilibrium model of sectoral reallocation,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 95(4), 824–34.
- (2005): “Sectoral shocks, specific human capital and displaced workers,” *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 8(1), 89–105.
- ROGERSON, R., R. SHIMER, AND R. WRIGHT (2005): “Search-theoretic models of the labor market: A survey,” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 43(4), 959–988.
- SCHUMPETER, J. (1942): *Capitalism, socialism and democracy*. New York: Harper & Row.
- SHIMER, R. (2005): “The cyclical behavior of equilibrium unemployment and vacancies,” *American Economic Review*, 95(1), 25–49.
- STATISTISCHE ÄMTER DER LÄNDER (2006): *Volkswirtschaftliche Gesamtrechnungen der Länder: Bruttoinlandsprodukt, Bruttowertschöpfung in den Ländern und Ost-West-Großraumregionen Deutschlands 1991 bis 2005*. Stuttgart: Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg.
- VAN RIET, A., E. ERNST, C. MADASCHI, F. ORLANDI, A. S. RIVERA, AND R. BENOÎT (2004): “Sectoral specialisation in the EU a macroeconomic perspective,” Occasional Paper Series 19, European Central Bank.
- VELLA, F., AND G. MOSCARINI (2004): “Aggregate Worker Reallocation and Occupational Mobility in the United States: 1976-2000,” 2004 Meeting Paper 183, Society for Economic Dynamics.
- VELLING, J., AND S. BENDER (1994): “Berufliche Mobilität zur Anpassung struktureller Diskrepanzen am Arbeitsmarkt,” *Mitteilungen aus der Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung*, 3.

WINKELMANN, R., AND K. F. ZIMMERMANN (1998): “Is job stability declining in Germany? Evidence from count data models,” *Applied Economics*, 30(11), 1413–20.

Appendix A Results

Table A.1: The sectoral structure of socially insured employment in Germany, 1976-2000

| | 1976-2000 | 76-80 | 81-85 | 85-90 | 91-95 | 96-00 |
|---|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Agr., En., Min. | 2.7 | 3.1 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.5 | 2.3 |
| Primary, intermediate good production | 7.8 | 9.1 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 7.1 | 6.2 |
| Production: investment goods 1 | 10.1 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 10.7 | 10.0 | 9.4 |
| Production: investment goods 2 | 9.3 | 9.6 | 9.4 | 9.9 | 9.0 | 8.4 |
| Consumption goods | 7.4 | 8.9 | 8.1 | 7.5 | 6.8 | 5.8 |
| Food, beverages, tobacco | 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 2.9 |
| Main construction trade | 4.2 | 5.2 | 4.7 | 3.9 | 3.8 | 3.4 |
| Construction (upgrading) | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| Distr. services 1, e.g. wholesale trade | 6.1 | 6.1 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 6.3 |
| Distr. services 2, e.g. retail trade | 8.7 | 8.7 | 8.8 | 8.5 | 8.8 | 8.9 |
| Transport and communication | 4.5 | 4.6 | 4.5 | 4.3 | 4.4 | 4.5 |
| Services, business-related | 10.3 | 7.9 | 8.8 | 9.8 | 11.4 | 13.5 |
| Services, household-related | 3.7 | 3.5 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 3.7 | 3.9 |
| Services: social 1, e.g. hospitals | 8.3 | 6.8 | 7.5 | 8.1 | 9.1 | 10.1 |
| Services: social 2, e.g. organisations | 4.1 | 3.0 | 3.5 | 4.0 | 4.6 | 5.5 |
| Government services, social insurance | 6.9 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 6.7 | 6.4 |

Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Note: Figures in per cent.

Table A.2: Lilien index for sectors and occupations, different time periods

| | 1976-2000 | 76-80 | 81-85 | 85-90 | 91-95 | 96-00 |
|-------------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Occupational turbulence, J=10 | 0.55 | 0.49 | 0.56 | 0.44 | 0.74 | 0.57 |
| Sectoral turbulence, J=6 | 0.71 | 0.52 | 0.60 | 0.49 | 1.07 | 0.87 |
| Sectoral turbulence, J=16 | 0.81 | 0.62 | 0.72 | 0.65 | 1.11 | 0.94 |

Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Note: The Lilien index is defined in equation 1. Results are for $d = 1$.

Table A.3: Labor force transition rates

| | | Destination | | | |
|--------|---|----------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| | | Employment, Same Sector | Employment, Different Sector | U | N |
| Origin | E | 4.1 <i>5.2</i> | 3.4 <i>4.0</i> | 7.3 <i>6.5</i> | 10.6 <i>11.4</i> |
| | U | 46.1 <i>30.3</i> | 34.3 <i>28.2</i> | - - | 56.9 <i>54.8</i> |
| | N | - - | 5.5 <i>5.8</i> | 1.6 <i>1.6</i> | - - |

Sources: Statistisches Bundesamt, IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Notes: Figures report transition rates for the time period 1981-1990 (first figure for each transition) and for 1991-2000 (second figure for each transition, in italics) in % per annum. E and U stand for the labor market states of dependent-status employment and unemployment. All stocks and flows are computed from the IABS-R01, with the exception of the state of nonparticipation (N), which is taken from Statistische Ämter der Länder (2006).

Table A.4: Sectoral transition rates and fraction of transitions involving a change of sector by age and sex

| | Men | | | Women | | |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|
| | EE | UE | NE | EE | UE | NE |
| Age 16-29 | 6.8 <i>35.3</i> | 57.0 <i>50.2</i> | 11.0 - | 5.8 <i>31.5</i> | 41.9 <i>51.0</i> | 9.8 - |
| Age 30-49 | 3.8 <i>31.6</i> | 40.0 <i>44.7</i> | 4.2 - | 3.0 <i>30.6</i> | 31.9 <i>47.1</i> | 5.1 - |
| Age 50-64 | 1.5 <i>34.5</i> | 11.6 <i>29.7</i> | 2.1 - | 1.4 <i>26.1</i> | 9.8 <i>33.7</i> | 1.5 - |

Sources: Statistisches Bundesamt, IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Notes: EE, UE, and NE are transitions from employment, unemployment, and nonparticipation, respectively, to employment. For EE and UE transitions, the first figure for a cohort reports the average transition rate associated with a change of sector; the second figure (in italics) reports which fraction of a given transition is associated with a change of sector. For NE transitions, information on sectoral mobility is not available; the average transition rate is reported. All figures in % per annum, averages for 1980-2000.

Table A.5: Occupational transition rates and fraction of transitions involving a change of occupation by age and sex

| | Men | | | Women | | |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|---------------------|----------|
| | EE | UE | NE | EE | UE | NE |
| Age 16-29 | 6.2 <i>31.9</i> | 58.6 <i>51.7</i> | 11.0 - | 4.9 <i>26.5</i> | 41.2 <i>50.1</i> | 9.8 - |
| Age 30-49 | 3.1 <i>25.8</i> | 41.9 <i>46.1</i> | 4.2 - | 2.3 <i>23.1</i> | 30.9 <i>45.6</i> | 5.1 - |
| Age 50-64 | 0.9 <i>20.4</i> | 12.5 <i>31.9</i> | 2.1 - | 0.8 <i>14.6</i> | 9.7 <i>33.6</i> | 1.5 - |

Sources: Statistisches Bundesamt, IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Notes: EE, UE, and NE are transitions from employment, unemployment, and nonparticipation, respectively, to employment. For EE and UE transitions, the first figure for a cohort reports the average transition rate associated with a change of occupation; the second figure (in italics) reports which fraction of a given transition is associated with a change of sector. For NE transitions, information on occupational mobility is not available; the average transition rate is reported. All figures in % per annum, averages for 1980-2000.

Table A.6: Flows as share of the socially insured labor force

| | 1981-2000 | 1981-85 | 1985-90 | 1991-95 | 1996-2000 |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Sectoral inflows | 20.3 | 19.1 | 21.6 | 18.5 | 21.9 |
| 0.5*(EEI+EEX) | 3.6 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.0 |
| UE | 5.3 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 4.6 | 5.1 |
| NE | 11.3 | 10.4 | 11.8 | 10.2 | 12.8 |
| Sectoral outflows | 20.2 | 20.1 | 19.8 | 19.2 | 21.6 |
| EU | 6.4 | 7.4 | 6.1 | 5.7 | 6.3 |
| EN | 10.2 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 9.7 | 11.3 |

Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Notes: EEI and EEX are direct job-to-job transitions associated with a sectoral inflow and outflow, respectively. UE and NE are sectoral employment inflows from unemployment and nonparticipation, respectively. EU and EN are sectoral employment outflows to unemployment and nonparticipation, respectively. Annual figures in per cent.

Table A.7: Percentage of sectoral EE flows involving a change of occupation for different time periods

| 1976-2000 | 1976-80 | 1981-85 | 1985-90 | 1991-95 | 1996-2000 |
|-----------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| 58.3 | 62.3 | 55.9 | 61.8 | 57.4 | 54.0 |

Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Table A.8: Yearly net and gross flows across sectors as share of the social security workforce, and ratio of net to gross flows

| | 1981-2000 | 81-85 | 85-90 | 91-95 | 96-00 |
|---|-----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| Gross flows | 36.8 | 36.5 | 37.4 | 34.0 | 39.5 |
| 0.5*(EEI+EEX) | 3.6 | 2.8 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 4.0 |
| UE+EU | 11.7 | 13.3 | 12.0 | 10.3 | 11.4 |
| NE+EN | 21.5 | 20.3 | 21.5 | 19.9 | 24.1 |
| Net flows, yearly basis | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 1.9 |
| $ EEI - EEX $ | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 |
| $ UE - EU $ | 1.3 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 1.3 |
| $ NE - EN $ | 1.8 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 1.9 |
| Net flows, yearly basis, to gross flows | 5.5 | 4.8 | 5.7 | 6.7 | 4.8 |
| Net flows, monthly basis | 10.6 | 11.1 | 11.1 | 9.7 | 10.6 |

Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Notes: EEI and EEX are direct job-to-job transitions associated with a sectoral inflow and outflow, respectively. UE and NE are sectoral employment inflows from unemployment and nonparticipation, respectively. EU and EN are sectoral employment outflows to unemployment and nonparticipation, respectively. All figures in per cent.

Table A.9: The consumption goods sector: Different flow measures as share of employment

| | 1981-2000 | 1981-85 | 1985-90 | 1991-95 | 1996-2000 |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Sectoral inflows | 18.7 | 17.3 | 21.0 | 16.9 | 19.4 |
| EEI | 3.4 | 2.3 | 3.9 | 3.5 | 3.8 |
| UE | 5.4 | 5.5 | 6.0 | 5.0 | 5.1 |
| NE | 9.9 | 9.5 | 11.1 | 8.5 | 10.5 |
| Sectoral outflows | 20.7 | 20.4 | 20.4 | 20.8 | 21.4 |
| EEX | 3.7 | 2.7 | 4.1 | 4.0 | 3.8 |
| EU | 7.6 | 8.5 | 6.9 | 7.5 | 7.5 |
| EN | 9.5 | 9.2 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 10.1 |
| Gross flows | 35.9 | 35.2 | 37.4 | 34.0 | 37.0 |
| 0.5*(EEI+EEX) | 3.5 | 2.5 | 4.1 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| UE+EU | 13.0 | 14.1 | 12.9 | 12.5 | 12.5 |
| NE+EN | 19.4 | 18.6 | 20.4 | 17.8 | 20.6 |
| Net flows, yearly basis | 2.5 | 3.1 | 1.3 | 3.8 | 1.9 |
| $ EEI - EEX $ | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.2 |
| $ UE - EU $ | 2.3 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 2.4 |
| $ NE - EN $ | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.8 |

Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Notes: EEI and EEX are direct job-to-job transitions associated with a sectoral inflow and outflow, respectively. UE and NE are sectoral employment inflows from unemployment and nonparticipation, respectively. EU and EN are sectoral employment outflows to unemployment and nonparticipation, respectively. Annual figures in per cent.

Table A.10: The business-related service sector: Different flow measures as share of employment

| | 1981-2000 | 1981-85 | 1985-90 | 1991-95 | 1996-2000 |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| Sectoral inflows | 25.7 | 21.3 | 26.9 | 24.3 | 31.4 |
| EEI | 4.8 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 5.1 | 5.4 |
| UE | 5.0 | 4.4 | 5.1 | 4.5 | 6.0 |
| NE | 15.9 | 13.2 | 15.9 | 14.7 | 20.0 |
| Sectoral outflows | 22.9 | 20.6 | 21.7 | 21.8 | 27.4 |
| EEX | 4.7 | 3.4 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 5.6 |
| EU | 5.1 | 5.5 | 4.6 | 4.6 | 5.7 |
| EN | 13.1 | 11.8 | 12.0 | 12.4 | 16.0 |
| Gross flows | 43.8 | 38.4 | 42.6 | 41.1 | 53.3 |
| 0.5*(EEI+EEX) | 4.7 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.5 |
| UE+EU | 10.1 | 9.9 | 9.7 | 9.1 | 11.8 |
| NE+EN | 29.0 | 25.0 | 27.9 | 27.1 | 36.0 |
| Net flows | 2.9 | 0.7 | 4.2 | 2.5 | 4.0 |
| $ EEI - EEX $ | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.3 |
| $ UE - EU $ | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| $ NE - EN $ | 2.9 | 1.5 | 3.9 | 2.2 | 4.0 |

Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Notes: EEI and EEX are direct job-to-job transitions associated with a sectoral inflow and outflow, respectively. UE and NE are sectoral employment inflows from unemployment and nonparticipation, respectively. EU and EN are sectoral employment outflows to unemployment and nonparticipation, respectively. Annual figures in per cent.


Table A.11: The persistence of sectoral flows

| | 1975/1980-1999 | 1975-79 | 1980-84 | 1985-89 | 1990-94 | 1995-99 |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Mover-stayers, prev. employed | 73.0 | 72.0 | 71.7 | 73.7 | 73.9 | 73.8 |
| Mover-returners, prev. employed | 7.5 | 8.4 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 6.5 | 7.1 |
| Mover-stayers, prev. unemployed | 75.5 | — | 75.9 | 75.0 | 77.0 | 74.1 |
| Mover-returners, prev. unemployed | 4.5 | — | 4.8 | 4.6 | 4.1 | 4.5 |

Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.


Notes: Percentage of sectoral changers who are still in the new sector one year after the switch ("Mover-stayers"), and percentage of sectoral changers who return to their previous sector within one year ("Mover-returners"). "Employed" and "unemployed" refers to the state before the move.

Figure A.1: Sectoral employment shares.



Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.


Figure A.2: Turbulence index for different time lags, J=6



Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Note: The Lilien index is defined in equation 1.


Figure A.3: p-values of Chow-type stability tests for the productive sector



Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Notes: p-values are bootstrapped and computed with JMulTi 4.15 (cf. Lütkepohl and Krätzig, 2004) using 1000 replications.


Figure A.4: Gross and net flows across sectors



Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.


Notes: Net flows on a monthly and a yearly basis normalized by the labor force (left panel), and the ratio of net to gross flows (right panel).

Figure A.5: Job-to-job transition rates condition on a change of sector for different age groups and men (left panel) and women (right panel)



Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Figure A.6: Labor market transitions normalized by the employment stock (left panel), and fraction involving a change of sector conditional on a certain labor market transition (right panel)



Source: IABS-R01 and authors' calculations.

Notes: EE are all direct job-to-job transitions, UE and NE all transitions from unemployment and nonparticipation to employment, respectively. EEOS and UEOS are the direct job-to-job transitions and transitions from unemployment to employment associated with a sectoral change. Yearly figures for male employees aged 30-49.