

# McCall Model

Prof. Lutz Hendricks

Econ720

November 22, 2017

# Motivation

- ▶ We would like to study basic labor market data:
  - ▶ unemployment and its duration
  - ▶ wage heterogeneity among seemingly identical workers
  - ▶ job to job transitions
  - ▶ how do policies affect those variables?
- ▶ Frictionless models of the labor market cannot talk about these issues.
- ▶ We need models in which workers must search for jobs.

# Search Models

- ▶ Unemployment is a productive activity: search for a new job.
- ▶ Types of models:
  1. Decision theoretic (McCall model).
  2. Matching: A matching function creates new jobs.
  3. Search: Random encounters and bargaining.

# McCall Model

- ▶ A partial equilibrium model of a worker searching for a job.
- ▶ The worker lives forever, in discrete time.
- ▶ Preferences:

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t y_t$$

- ▶  $y_t$  is income.
- ▶ When employed:  $y = w$ . When unemployed:  $y = c$ .

# Timing

- ▶ Enter the period as unemployed worker.
- ▶ Draw a wage offer  $w$  from the distribution  $F(W) = \Pr(w \leq W)$ .
- ▶ Support:  $[0, B]$ .
- ▶ Choose whether to accept or reject.
- ▶ If accept: work forever at wage  $w$  with lifetime income  $\frac{w}{1-\beta}$ .
- ▶ If reject: start over next period.

## Bellman equation

**Before** knowing today's wage offer: value is a constant  $Q$

After learning the wage offer  $w$ , value is  $v(w)$

Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned} Q &= c + \beta \mathbb{E}v(w') \\ &= c + \beta \int_0^B v(w') dF(w') \end{aligned}$$

Value **after** learning wage offer:

$$v(w) = \max \left\{ \frac{w}{1 - \beta}, Q \right\}$$

## Reservation wage property

Accept all offers with

$$\frac{w}{1-\beta} \geq Q \quad (1)$$

The reservation wage makes the worker indifferent between accepting and rejecting:

$$v(\bar{w}) = \max \left\{ \frac{\bar{w}}{1-\beta}, Q \right\} = \frac{\bar{w}}{1-\beta} = Q \quad (2)$$

Note: For  $w < \bar{w}$  the worker still gets  $v(\bar{w}) = Q$ .

## Reservation wage

Write the reservation wage as (proof below):

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{w} - c &= \beta \int_{\bar{w}}^B \frac{w' - \bar{w}}{1 - \beta} dF(w') \\ &= \beta E \left\{ \frac{w' - \bar{w}}{1 - \beta} \mid w' \geq \bar{w} \right\} \Pr(w' \geq \bar{w})\end{aligned}$$

In words:

- ▶ the surplus from working now ( $\bar{w} - c$ ) equals
- ▶ the surplus from searching: the expected lifetime wage gain from perhaps finding a better job



## Proof

Write the indifference condition as

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\bar{w}}{1-\beta} - c &= Q - c = \beta \int_0^B v(w') dF(w') \\ &= \underbrace{\beta \int_0^{\bar{w}} \frac{\bar{w}}{1-\beta} dF(w')}_{\text{reject}} + \underbrace{\beta \int_{\bar{w}}^B \frac{w'}{1-\beta} dF(w')}_{\text{accept}}\end{aligned}$$

Simplify:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\bar{w}}{1-\beta} - c &= \beta \int_0^B \frac{\bar{w}}{1-\beta} dF(w') + \beta \int_{\bar{w}}^B \frac{w' - \bar{w}}{1-\beta} dF(w') \\ &= \beta \frac{\bar{w}}{1-\beta} + \beta \int_{\bar{w}}^B \frac{w' - \bar{w}}{1-\beta} dF(w')\end{aligned}$$

## Implications: Unemployment Benefits

What is the effect of more generous unemployment benefits (higher  $c$ )?

Optimality:  $c = \bar{w} - \text{expected surplus}$  or

$$c = \bar{w} - \beta \mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{w' - \bar{w}}{1 - \beta} \mid w' \geq \bar{w} \right\} \Pr(w' \geq \bar{w}) \quad (3)$$

Expected surplus shrinks when  $\bar{w}$  rises.

RHS increases in  $\bar{w}$ .

Higher  $c \rightarrow$  higher reservation wage  $\rightarrow$  longer unemployment.

## More dispersed wage offers

- ▶ Result: A mean preserving spread in the wage offer distribution raises the reservation wage and ex ante utility.
- ▶ Intuition:
  - ▶ Making bad wage offers worse is costless - they are rejected anyway.
  - ▶ Making good wage offers better is valuable.
- ▶ Proof: Ljunqvist & Sargent.

## Extension: Job separations

Each period the worker is fired with probability  $\alpha$ .

A fired worker must wait 1 period before drawing a new wage.

Now we have 3 states the worker can be in:

1. unemployed, waiting for a wage offer:  $v_U$
2. unemployed with a wage offer:  $v(w)$
3. employed:  $v_E(w)$

## Value functions

Value when unemployed without offer:

$$v_U = c + \beta \int v(w') dF(w')$$

- ▶ unemployed today; eat  $c$
- ▶ get an unknown wage offer tomorrow

Value when unemployed with an offer:

$$v(w) = \max \{v_E(w), v_U\}$$

- ▶ all of this is the same as in basic McCall model

Value when employed at wage  $w$ :

$$v_E(w) = w + \beta(1 - \alpha)v_E(w) + \beta\alpha v_U$$

## Firing: Reservation wage

Reservation wage makes the worker indifferent between accepting an rejecting an offer:

$$\begin{aligned}v(\bar{w}) &= \max \{v_E(\bar{w}), v_U\} = v_E(\bar{w}) = v_U \\ \bar{w} + \beta(1 - \alpha)v_E(\bar{w}) + \beta\alpha v_U &= v_U\end{aligned}$$

With  $v_E(\bar{w}) = v_U$ :

$$\frac{\bar{w}}{1 - \beta} = v_U = c + \beta \int v(w') dF(w')$$

## Firing: Implications

- ▶ How does the firing probability affect unemployment?
- ▶ The reservation wage equations are the “same” with and without firing:

$$\frac{\bar{w}}{1-\beta} = c + \beta \int v(w') dF(w')$$

- ▶ The value function is lower with firing
  - ▶ because quitting is never optimal
- ▶ Therefore  $\bar{w}$  is lower with firing.
- ▶ If jobs do not last as long, there is no point holding out for the perfect offer.

# Stochastic Wages



# Model With Stochastic Wages

Based on Rogerson et al. (2005).

## Timing:

Enter the period either as

- ▶ unemployed: value  $V_U$  or as
- ▶ employed: value  $V(w)$ .

## If unemployed:

- ▶ earn  $c$  today
- ▶ draw a wage offer  $w'$  for next period with probability  $\alpha$
- ▶ if accept: get  $V(w)$  tomorrow
- ▶ if reject: get  $V_U$  tomorrow

# Timing

If **employed**:

- ▶ earn  $w$  today and eat it
- ▶ draw a new wage  $w'$  for tomorrow with probability  $\lambda$ .
- ▶ if accept:  $V(w')$
- ▶ if reject (or no offer): unemployed tomorrow

All wage offers are drawn from the same distribution:

$F(W) = \Pr(w' \leq W)$  with support  $[0, B]$ .

## Value of a wage offer

Consider an unemployed (or employed) worker who is about to receive a wage offer.

His value is

$$\hat{Q} = \int \max \{ V(w'), V_U \} dF(w') \quad (4)$$

Independent of current  $w$  (in case of employed)

- ▶ because that offer is lost

Call the reservation wage  $\bar{w}$ .

- ▶ it is the same for employed or unemployed

## Value of a wage offer

$$\hat{Q} = \int \max \{ V(w'), V_U \} dF(w') \quad (5)$$

$$= \int \max \{ V(w') - V_U, 0 \} dF(w') + V_U \quad (6)$$

$$= \underbrace{\int_{\bar{w}}^B \{ V(w') - V_U \} dF(w')}_{Q} + V_U \quad (7)$$

In words:

- ▶ you always get at least  $V_U$  (because you can always take that option)
- ▶ if  $w' > \bar{w}$ , you also get a surplus  $Q$

## Unemployed Worker

Before receiving offer

$$V_U = c + \beta \left[ \alpha \hat{Q} + (1 - \alpha) V_U \right] \quad (8)$$

$$= c + \beta \left[ \alpha (Q + V_U) + (1 - \alpha) V_U \right] \quad (9)$$

$$= c + \beta \alpha Q + \beta V_U \quad (10)$$

Get  $c$  today.

With probability  $\alpha$  get to choose between work and unemployment tomorrow.

Therefore

$$(1 - \beta) V_U = c + \beta \alpha Q \quad (11)$$

## Employed Worker

Bellman equation for a worker with wage  $w$ :

$$V(w) = w + \beta \left[ \lambda \hat{Q} + (1 - \lambda)V(w) \right] \quad (12)$$

Get  $w$  today.

With probability  $\lambda$ , face the same choice as an unemployed worker with offer  $w'$ .

Simplify:

$$V(w) = w + \beta \lambda (Q + V_U) + \beta (1 - \lambda)V(w) \quad (13)$$

## Reservation Wage

Evaluate  $V(w)$  at  $w = \bar{w}$  and use  $V(\bar{w}) = V_U$ :

$$V(\bar{w}) = \bar{w} + \beta\lambda(Q + V_U) + \beta(1 - \lambda)V_U \quad (14)$$

Therefore

$$(1 - \beta)V_U = \bar{w} + \beta\lambda Q \quad (15)$$

## Reservation Wage

We now have

$$(1 - \beta)V_U = \bar{w} + \beta\lambda Q \quad (16)$$

$$= c + \beta\alpha Q \quad (17)$$

Perhaps easier:

$$\bar{w} - c = \beta(\alpha - \lambda)Q \quad (18)$$



# Reservation Wage

If  $\alpha = \lambda$ :  $\bar{w} = c$ .

- ▶ Accept any job that pays more than unemployment benefits
- ▶ The reason is that the continuation value does not depend on employment status.

If  $\alpha > \lambda$ :  $\bar{w} > c$ .

- ▶ Being unemployed has a search value. So the agent holds out for better wage offers.

## Reservation Wage

Add and subtract  $V_U - V(w)$  in equation for  $V(w)$ :

$$(1 - \beta)V(w) = w + \beta\lambda Q + \beta\lambda[V_U - V(w)] \quad (19)$$

Substitute out  $Q$  from equation for reservation wage

$$(1 - \beta)V_U = \bar{w} + \beta\lambda Q \quad (20)$$

to obtain

$$(1 - \beta)[V(w) - V_U] = w - \bar{w} + \beta\lambda[V_U - V(w)] \quad (21)$$

Solve for

$$V(w) - V_U = \frac{w - \bar{w}}{1 - \beta + \beta\lambda} \quad (22)$$

If we specified the distribution  $F$ , we could use this to evaluate  $Q$  and solve for everything else.

# Applications

Life-cycle earnings profiles and occupational mobility:

- ▶ Kambourov and Manovskii (2009, 2008)

Business cycle models that match labor market facts:

- ▶ Jovanovic (1987)

# What is missing?

- ▶ Not satisfactory: The job finding rate / wage offer distribution should be endogenous.
  - ▶ Think about analyzing policies...
- ▶ Matching and search models address this.
  - ▶ by introducing endogenous supply of jobs
  - ▶ and wage bargaining.

# Reading

- ▶ Ljungqvist and Sargent (2004), ch. 6.3
- ▶ Krusell (2014), ch. 11
- ▶ Williamson (2006), "Notes on macroeconomic theory," ch. 7, works out a similar model with exogenous job separations.

## References I

- Jovanovic, B. (1987): "Work, Rest, and Search: Unemployment, Turnover, and the Cycle," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 131–148.
- Kambourov, G. and I. Manovskii (2008): "RISING OCCUPATIONAL AND INDUSTRY MOBILITY IN THE UNITED STATES: 1968–97\*," *International Economic Review*, 49, 41–79.
- (2009): "Occupational mobility and wage inequality," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 76, 731–759.
- Krusell, P. (2014): "Real Macroeconomic Theory," Unpublished.
- Ljungqvist, L. and T. J. Sargent (2004): *Recursive macroeconomic theory*, 2nd ed.
- Rogerson, R., R. Shimer, and R. Wright (2005): "Search-Theoretic Models of the Labor Market: A Survey," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 43, 959–988.