



**HAL**  
open science

# The dynamics of job creation and destruction for University graduates: why a rising unemployment rate can be misleading

Ana Rute Cardoso, Priscila Ferreira

► **To cite this version:**

Ana Rute Cardoso, Priscila Ferreira. The dynamics of job creation and destruction for University graduates: why a rising unemployment rate can be misleading. *Applied Economics*, 2009, 41 (19), pp.2513-2521. 10.1080/00036840802293339 . hal-00581860

**HAL Id: hal-00581860**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00581860v1>**

Submitted on 1 Apr 2011

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



**The dynamics of job creation and destruction for University graduates: why a rising unemployment rate can be misleading**

Journal:	<i>Applied Economics</i>
Manuscript ID:	APE-04-0036.R1
Journal Selection:	Applied Economics
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Jan-2005
Complete List of Authors:	Cardoso, Ana Rute; IZA Bonn; University of Minho; CEPR Ferreira, Priscila; University of Minho
JEL Code:	J21 - Labor Force and Employment, Size, and Structure < , J60 - General < , J63 - Turnover Vacancies Layoffs <
Keywords:	gross job flows, aggregate, sectoral, idiosyncratic shocks



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9 The dynamics of job creation and destruction for University  
10 graduates: why a rising unemployment rate can be  
11 misleading \*  
12

13  
14  
15 Ana Rute Cardoso

16 IZA Bonn, University of Minho and CEPR †

17 and

18 Priscila Ferreira

19 University of Minho  
20  
21

22 January 2005  
23  
24  
25

26 **Abstract**

27 A large matched employer-employee dataset on the Portuguese economy is used to an-  
28alyze gross job creation and job destruction for university graduates, compared to other  
29groups of workers. Standard measures of gross job flows are computed, and variance decom-  
30position is used to check whether idiosyncratic shocks or aggregate and sectoral shocks can  
31account for the time variation in gross job flows, for schooling groups separately. Results  
32indicate that the market for university graduates has expanded much more than that for  
33undergraduates, and that idiosyncratic shocks are more relevant driving job flows for uni-  
34versity graduates than for non-graduates. No support is therefore found for the pessimistic  
35view that states that the expansion of higher education may have gone too far.

36 KEYWORDS: gross job flows; aggregate, sectoral, idiosyncratic shocks

37 JEL: J21, J60, J63  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

---

52 \*This study was prepared under project PRAXIS/P/ECO/13014/1998 funded by *Fundação para a Ciência e*  
53 *a Tecnologia*. We are grateful to the Ministry of Employment, Department of Statistics, for access to the dataset  
54 *Quadros de Pessoal* and to Vítor Andrade from newspaper *Expresso* for the data on announced job offers.

55 †Corresponding author: Ana Rute Cardoso, IZA, P.O.Box 7240, 53072 Bonn, Germany. E-mail: car-  
56 doso@iza.org  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 1 Introduction

Higher education has been expanding in most countries, with enrollment rates and the number of students rising sharply. This trend was particularly pronounced during the first half of the 1990s. For example, between 1990 and 1996 total enrollment in tertiary education more than doubled in Poland and Portugal, having increased by over 80 percent in the UK and Hungary (OECD 1999). Several reasons have combined for this outcome. Changes in the funding system of higher education, steered to rely increasingly on market mechanisms, have led institutions into intense competition to attract students. Rising private returns to higher education, pointed out in studies of wage dispersion for several countries, may have played a role motivating the continuation of studies beyond high school. Also, the widespread perception of the impact of higher education on development has pushed some countries, in particular developing ones, into expanding their higher education systems.

However, as higher education degrees became more widespread and less exclusive, fears started spreading as to the capacity of the labour market to absorb the newly-graduates. Throughout, employers have been claiming that the higher education system is not providing the necessary skills and it is often advocated that the external efficiency of universities should be evaluated, monitoring the jobs and earnings of graduates. Most often, the unemployment rate has been implicitly set as the criterion to assess employment prospects for graduate workers. As the unemployment rate for this group of workers increased in several countries, the high expectations of the 80s gave place to concern in the 90s. An extreme view seems to be popular nowadays, stating that the expansion of higher education may have gone too far and that investment in a higher education degree has become too risky, possibly not worthwhile, as employers are no longer keen on recruiting newly graduate workers (Teichler (1999) provides a clear analysis of these trends).

Such statements are usually not backed up by empirical analysis of sound data, and in this paper we argue that a more balanced view is called for. Relying on

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 systematic information on job creation and job destruction for higher education  
6 graduates compared to other groups of workers, we find that the unemployment  
7 rate can provide a misleading idea of the dynamics in labour demand and of the  
8 employment prospects for university graduates. What has indeed been the pace  
9 of job creation and job destruction for university graduates hiding behind their  
10 unemployment rate? Which have been the most dynamic sectors? What is the  
11 role of aggregate and sectoral shocks, as opposed to idiosyncratic shocks, driving  
12 gross job flows for university graduates?  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 The study uses a very rich longitudinal data set matching workers and employers  
20 in the Portuguese economy, with information on over two million workers and  
21 approximately 200 thousand firms each year.  
22  
23

24 Section 2 describes the evolution of employment prospects for university grad-  
25 uates when compared to other groups of workers in Portugal, as traditionally  
26 captured by their unemployment rates and by the job offers advertised nationally  
27 over two decades. Section 3 describes the data set and concepts used. In section  
28 4, the results on job creation and job destruction are presented. Section 5 checks  
29 the role of aggregate and sectoral shocks versus firm-level shocks driving gross job  
30 flows, and concluding comments are presented in the last section.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

## 37 **2 Higher education and the labour market in Portugal**

38  
39

40 The schooling achievement of the working population is remarkably low in Portugal  
41 when compared to its OECD partners. Indeed, only 11% of the labour force holds  
42 a tertiary education diploma, the lowest value reported by the OECD (2002); on  
43 the other hand, 45% of the Canadian labour force holds one such degree (42% in  
44 Ireland and 36% in Japan).  
45  
46  
47

48 Nevertheless, the possibility of integrating university graduates into the labour  
49 market started to be an issue of concern in Portugal in the early 90s and the claim  
50 that employers were no longer interested in hiring university graduates, in par-  
51 ticular young ones, and were demanding instead experienced workers, was widely  
52 believed upon. Such claim was backed up by the evolution of the unemployment  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 rate by schooling levels and by the requirements advertised in job openings.

7 A certain convergence of unemployment rates across schooling levels can be  
8 identified in figure 1. Whereas the unemployment rate of university graduates in-  
9 creased from around 1% in 1981 to 3% two decades later, for lower schooling levels  
10 it showed signs of declining. This convergence of unemployment rates by schooling  
11 level led to the idea that a university diploma was no longer a safe passport out  
12 of unemployment and raised doubts about the capacity of the labour market to  
13 absorb the newly-graduates. Slack labour demand for university graduates was  
14 often identified as the source of the problem.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 —————figure 1 about here—————  
23

24 Analysis of the requirements imposed by job offers would apparently lend sup-  
25 port to this claim. Between 1989 and 1995, the share of job announcements requir-  
26 ing a university diploma declined sharply, from around 50% to 5%. On the other  
27 hand, the share of ads requiring previous labour market experience remained high,  
28 though declining from 50% to 20%. By mid 90s, a higher education diploma was  
29 back in high demand, and the number of employers advertising jobs for graduates  
30 was close to the number of those requiring previous experience. However, the trend  
31 in late 90s was not enough to overcome the concerns that meanwhile had grown,  
32 especially as the graduates unemployment rate failed to decline.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 —————figure 2 about here—————  
42

43 Relevant questions are therefore: To what extent did the economy indeed reduce  
44 its pace of job creation for graduate workers? Which were the most and the least  
45 dynamic sectors? To what extent does the evolution of the unemployment rate  
46 provide relevant clues for a decision on whether to invest in university education?  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### 3 Data set and concepts used

#### Data set

This study relies on *Quadros de Pessoal*, a longitudinal data set matching workers and their employers in the Portuguese private sector, from 1985 to 1999. The data are gathered annually by the Ministry of Employment, based on an inquiry that every establishment with wage-earners is legally obliged to fill in. Reported data cover all the personnel working for the establishment in a reference week (in March until 1993, and in October from 1994 onwards). Public administration and domestic service are not covered, and the coverage of agriculture is low given its low share of wage-earners. For manufacturing and the services, given the mandatory nature of the survey, the population of firms with wage-earners is in fact covered. Reported data include the firm's location, industry, employment, sales, ownership, legal setting, and the worker's gender, age, skill, occupation, schooling, admission date, earnings, and duration of work. Jobs filled by full-time wage earners were considered in the analysis.

The Ministry assigns a unique identification number to each company when it first reports to the database, and it is thus possible to track firms. Extensive control procedures are implemented to guarantee that a firm is not assigned a different number later on. Such procedures are based in particular on the location of the firm and its official identification codes.

In 1990 no worker data were reported and therefore it is not possible to compute the flows for the periods 1989-90 and 1990-91. Since the date of inquiry changed from March to October in 1994, a wider time frame is covered that year, rendering the flows not comparable to the other years, and therefore that period will not be used in the computations. Tables 3 and 4 in appendix describe the sample sizes and the structure of employment by industry, respectively.

## Job creation and job destruction

Aggregate employment figures provide no information concerning the expansion or contraction of employment taking place at the firm level. The study of gross job flows at the firm level has therefore deserved increasing attention in the literature, as it provides a more accurate picture of the dynamics in the labour market (see for example Davis *et al* (1996) or Garibaldi and Mauro (2000) for a highlight of its advantages).

The methodology and the concepts used follow Davis *et al* (1996). Gross job creation and destruction are computed at the firm level as the change in employment from period  $t - 1$  to period  $t$ .

$$\Delta X_{f,t} = X_{f,t} - X_{f,t-1}$$

where  $X$  stands for the employment level,  $f$  refers to the firm and  $t$  to the moment in time (year). If employment increases, job creation is said to have taken place, while job destruction occurs when employment in the firm decreases.

Aggregating from the firm to the level of the sector or the industry  $s$ , gross job creation (*pos*) equals the sum of employment changes over all firms that expanded its employment or were set up during the period, and similarly, job destruction (*neg*) is the sum of employment changes over all firms that contracted or shut down.

$$pos_{s,t} = \sum_{+} \Delta X_{f,t} \quad \text{and} \quad neg_{s,t} = \sum_{-} |\Delta X_{f,t}|$$

Net job creation (*net*) is the difference between gross job creation and gross job destruction and gross job reallocation is the sum of job creation and job destruction over a certain period for sector  $s$ :

$$net_{s,t} = pos_{s,t} - neg_{s,t}$$

$$sum_{s,t} = pos_{s,t} + neg_{s,t}$$

Job reallocation is the maximum amount of worker reallocation required to accommodate the change in employment opportunities across firms. Note that, if no



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

worker switched from a contracting to an expanding company, then the amount of worker reallocation would correspond to the job reallocation, as *pos* workers would move from out of employment into employment, while *neg* workers would move in the opposite direction. This measure therefore provides an indication of the overall degree of rotation in the labour force resulting from changing job opportunities across firms.

However, certain workers may be counted twice in the gross reallocation measure, if they switch from a contracting to an expanding company. The measure of minimum worker reallocation (*m*) aims precisely at eliminating the problem of double counting involved in summing gross job creation and gross job destruction. It is computed as the larger of gross job creation and gross job destruction:

$$m_{s,t} = \max(pos_{s,t}, neg_{s,t})$$

It reports the minimum worker reallocation required to account for the changes in job opportunities across firms.

Finally, excess job reallocation (*exc*) is computed as the difference between gross reallocation and the absolute value of net employment change.

$$exc_{s,t} = sum_{s,t} - |pos_{s,t} - neg_{s,t}|$$

It evaluates the amount of job reallocation that took place beyond what would be strictly necessary to accommodate the net job change. This is considered the best indicator of simultaneous job creation and job destruction, capturing the heterogeneity among firms – whereas some are expanding, others are contracting.

Job flows can be expressed as rates, dividing through by a measure of firm size, *z*, which is the average employment in periods *t* and *t* – 1.

$$Z_{f,t} = \frac{X_{f,t} + X_{f,t-1}}{2}$$

The rate of employment growth in the firm is thus computed as:

$$g_{f,t} = \frac{\Delta X_{f,t}}{Z_{f,t}}$$

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 The use of this size measure is preferred over the traditional size measure (em-  
6 ployment in the base period), because the rate of employment change now ranges  
7 over a bounded and symmetrical interval,  $-2$  to  $+2$ .<sup>1</sup>  
8  
9

#### 10 11 **4 Coexistence of high rates of job creation and job de-** 12 **struction** 13 14

15  
16 High rates of job creation coexisted with high rates of job destruction for university  
17 graduates, with a net positive impact on overall employment. Indeed, out of 100  
18 jobs existing in the economy performed by university graduates, 23 new ones were  
19 created on average each year between 1986 and 1999, whereas 15 were destroyed  
20 (table 1). These values suggest that a high job rotation prevails for university  
21 graduates in the Portuguese economy, strictly due to heterogeneity in the firms'  
22 recruitment behavior. According to Caballero and Hammour (1996), a positive  
23 correlation between job creation and destruction would be indicative of a market  
24 operating efficiently, with matches being destroyed to yield better matches. Sev-  
25 eral authors have reported the coexistence of high rates of job creation and job  
26 destruction for different countries (see for example Davis and Haltiwanger (1992)  
27 for the USA, Baldwin *et al* (1998) for Canada and the USA, Blanchflower and  
28 Burgess (1996) and Konings (1995) for the UK, Tsou *et al* (2002) for Taiwan, or  
29 Vainiomaki and Laaksonen (1999) for Finland).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 High job creation and simultaneous job destruction is also a characteristic of  
41 the labour market for workers with lower levels of schooling, but the rates are  
42 lower. Out of 100 existing jobs performed by undergraduates, 13 were created and  
43 12 were destroyed on average each year during the period under analysis.  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 —————table 1 about here—————  
49

50 The trends in net job creation rates for graduate workers and for those not  
51 holding a university diploma diverged after 1988 (figure 3), as the variable tended  
52

53 <sup>1</sup>It is therefore possible to compute the measure for new firms and for those going out of business (achieving  
54 the values  $+2$  and  $-2$ , respectively). Values between  $-1$  and  $1$  correspond approximately to the traditional percent  
55 increase in employment.  
56

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 to move in the same direction, but at different paces, for the two groups of workers.  
6 Net job creation for workers not holding a university diploma follows more closely  
7 the business cycle. During the second half of the 80s, the Portuguese economy  
8 has grown sharply and employment expanded at a fast pace, with the rate of net  
9 job creation being similar for the two groups of workers. By the end of the 1980s,  
10 however, net job creation for workers holding a university diploma was already  
11 taking place at a faster pace than for workers with lower schooling levels. The  
12 contrast became more pronounced in the 90s, when employment opportunities for  
13 graduates were expanding faster than for non-graduates. In 1993, negative rates of  
14 job creation for undergraduates contrasted with a positive 4% net job creation for  
15 graduates. Since 1993, employment for undergraduates has grown very modestly,  
16 whereas for university graduates it has been expanding strongly, reaching 13% a  
17 year in 1997 and 1998.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28 —————figure 3 about here—————  
29  
30

31 Concerns about the employment prospects for university graduates therefore  
32 begun spreading in Portugal precisely when their employment opportunities were  
33 expanding the most and in sharpest contrast with the employment prospects for  
34 undergraduates. Thus, the rising unemployment rate did not result from a slack  
35 labour demand by employers no longer trusting the higher education system and  
36 the skills it provides. Instead, demand kept expanding. The employment prospects  
37 of university graduates should be compared to those of undergraduates in the same  
38 period, and not to those of graduates who left the educational system a decade  
39 before.  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Figure 4 presents other measures of rotation of job opportunities among compa-  
47 nies (gross job reallocation and excess job reallocation). It reveals that the pace of  
48 change in the labour market for university graduates is faster than for other work-  
49 ers. In fact, approximately 40% of the existing jobs for higher education graduates  
50 are either created or destroyed each year, whereas for undergraduates that value is  
51 around 20-25%. The reallocation beyond what would be strictly necessary to ac-  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

commodate the net employment change (excess job reallocation) reveals a similar pattern. Such turbulence results from the contrasting behaviour of the different companies, which is more pronounced for jobs held by university graduates than for the rest of the labour force. For undergraduates, the economy is closer to a situation where all the companies either contract or expand their employment level.<sup>2</sup>

—————figure 4 about here—————

Figure 5 reports, for each industry, the average yearly rate of job creation and job destruction for university graduates and workers holding lower schooling levels. In each of those graphs, industries located on the diagonal did not change their overall employment level for that category of workers, since the rate of job creation was offset by an equal rate of job destruction. Industries located above the diagonal were net job creators and, symmetrically, industries below the diagonal were net job destructors. Industries closer to the origin present lower rates of job reallocation, as both job creation and job destruction were low. The farther away from the origin, the higher the rate of gross job reallocation in the industry.

—————figure 5 about here—————

Employment expansion for university graduates took place across industries, with the exception of base metals, where employment declined. The services have shown the largest expansion of graduate jobs. Note however that, whereas in banking and insurance the expansion of employment took place with low reallocation of jobs across firms, in the remaining services high job creation coexisted with high job destruction. The most stable industries, apart from banking and insurance, were electricity, gas and water, chemicals and transportation and communications.

<sup>2</sup>Part of the detected homogeneity in firm behaviour when it comes to job changes for the undergraduates may result from the fact that we are dealing with a broader group of workers, and therefore mechanisms of compensation within the firm may operate. Note the example of a firm that may contract its employment level for workers holding 4 years of education, while expanding it for workers with 9 years of education. In such a case, overall employment for undergraduates could remain stable, and neither job creation nor destruction would be captured.

The contrast with workers holding lower schooling levels stands out. Note first of all the higher concentration of industries close to the diagonal, indicating low rates of net job creation for undergraduate workers. In electricity, gas, water, base metals, and chemicals, job destruction has surpassed job creation. On the contrary, in services to companies and other services, job creation took place at a fast pace, just like for graduate workers. Job reallocation was considerably lower for workers with lower levels of schooling, indicating that net job expansion or contraction resulted from a more uniform trend across firms than it has been the case for university graduates.

## 5 Decomposition of employment changes into idiosyncratic, sectoral and aggregate shocks

This section analyses the time variation in job creation and job destruction. It checks the role of idiosyncratic shocks against sectoral and aggregate shocks as forces driving job flows, using variance decomposition analysis. Following Davis and Haltiwanger (1992), the firm growth rate of employment is decomposed into a firm-specific part, a sector-specific part and an aggregate part, by estimating:

$$g_{ft} = \tilde{g}_{ft} + g_{st} + g_t, \quad (1)$$

where  $g_{ft}$  is the firm employment growth rate between years  $t - 1$  and  $t$ ,  $\tilde{g}_{ft}$  is the residual or idiosyncratic component of firm-level employment growth,  $g_{st}$  is the sector-time specific component and  $g_t$  is the aggregate-time component. The job creation associated with idiosyncratic shocks is then computed as:

$$P\tilde{O}S_t = \sum_{\tilde{g}_{ft} > 0} \tilde{g}_{ft} \frac{z_{ft}}{z_t} \quad (2)$$

where  $z_{ft}$  stands for the firm size and  $z_t$  for overall employment in the economy, both defined, as previously described, as the average of the current and previous periods. The following identity holds:

$$POS_t = P\tilde{O}S_t + (POS_t - P\tilde{O}S_t) \quad (3)$$

and therefore

$$Var(POS_t) = var(\widetilde{POS}_t) + Var(POS_t - \widetilde{POS}_t) + 2Cov(\widetilde{POS}_t, (POS_t - \widetilde{POS}_t)). \quad (4)$$

The first term on the right-hand side is the effect of idiosyncratic shocks on job creation, the second term gives the impact of sectoral and aggregate shocks, whereas the third term provides the interaction between those two types of shocks, revealing whether the two effects reinforced each other or operated in different directions. Dividing each of these terms by the left-hand side, yields their relative importance in accounting for time variation in job creation. Similar computations were made for job destruction and job reallocation, with equation 2 adapted to become:

$$NEG_t = \sum_{\tilde{g}_{ft} < 0} |\tilde{g}_{ft}| \frac{z_{ft}}{z_t} \quad (5)$$

$$SUM_t = \sum |\tilde{g}_{ft}| \frac{z_{ft}}{z_t} \quad (6)$$

————— table 2 about here —————

From table 2 it is noticeable, first of all, that aggregate and sectoral shocks are the main force driving changes over time in job flows. Using the same methodology on different samples, Davis and Haltiwanger (1990, 1992) found slightly higher contributions of the idiosyncratic component to job creation and destruction in the USA; Gautier and Broersma (2001) found much higher contributions in The Netherlands; in the UK, the contribution reported by Konings (1995) for job creation is higher than in Portugal, whereas that for job destruction is similar to the Portuguese. A regulated labour market and stiff employment protection legislation could in Portugal leave little scope for firms to adjust their employment level when faced with firm-specific shocks. It has been documented that higher employment protection has an impact, not just on job destruction flows, but as well on job creation (see Blanchard and Portugal (2001)); similarly, Broersma (1996) found that regulations leading to wage restraint or the generosity of the social security

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 system had an impact on flows in the labour market. It should however be noted  
6 that idiosyncratic shocks reinforce in Portugal the impact of sectoral and aggregate  
7 shocks, for most of the cells reported in table 2. Job destruction increases during  
8 recessions and this effect is amplified by firm-level effects; similarly, job creation  
9 increases during expansions, an effect reinforced by firm-level shocks.

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 The relevance of aggregate and sectoral shocks may also have resulted from the  
15 pace of change taking place in the economy. During the period under analysis,  
16 the Portuguese economy underwent structural adaptation, partly driven by the  
17 accession to the European Union that had taken place in 1986. The growth in  
18 GDP per capita (see table 5 in appendix) illustrates the speed of change, as it  
19 increased from 40 percent to 50 percent of the USA level between 1985 and 2000.  
20 The composition of employment changed, with the relevance of manufacturing  
21 declining (specially in the case of textiles, clothing, and heavy manufacturing), in  
22 favour of the services (table 4 in appendix). Under this framework, demand for a  
23 qualified labour force increased, reflected in rising wage premia (Cardoso, 1999).  
24 Though demand for workers holding a university degree kept expanding, in certain  
25 scientific areas it did not match the rise in supply resulting from the expansion of  
26 higher education. Table 6 in appendix reports by age group the share of population  
27 attaining tertiary education. Whereas just 3 percent of the cohort aged 55-64 in  
28 2001 held a university diploma, 11 percent of the cohort aged 25-34 held one. The  
29 latter cohort of university graduates entered the labour market during the 1990s,  
30 bringing about the sharpest increase in schooling achievement ever registered in  
31 the country's labour market.

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Table 2 indicates moreover that the impact of the different shocks is similar for  
university graduates and non-graduates, when considering just continuing firms.  
However, when progressing to analyse all firms in the economy, different patterns  
can be detected for university graduates and non-graduates. The different action  
taking place in terms of job creation or job destruction for university graduates  
and non-graduates results from the behaviour of new firms and those going out  
of business. Idiosyncratic shocks play a larger role for university graduates than

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 non-graduates.

6  
7 Results highlight a much more flexible and flowing labour market for higher  
8 education graduates than for non-graduates, and a more relevant impact of id-  
9 iosyncratic shocks driving job flows for the most schooled labour force.  
10  
11

## 12 13 **6 Conclusion**

14  
15  
16 Analysis of gross job creation and destruction at the firm level provides systematic  
17 information on job dynamics that cannot be captured by the evolution of aggregate  
18 employment or unemployment rates.  
19  
20

21 It is interesting to note that the rising unemployment rate for university grad-  
22 uates and its decline for undergraduates over the 80s and 90s provide a misleading  
23 idea of the dynamics of job creation in the Portuguese economy, as net job creation  
24 rates point precisely in the opposite direction —net job creation took place at a  
25 much faster pace for higher education graduates than for the rest of the labour  
26 force. The rise in the unemployment rate for graduate workers did not result from  
27 declining demand for that group of workers, and support is thus not found for the  
28 simplistic view that seems to be widespread nowadays, according to which employ-  
29 ers would no longer be willing to recruit university graduates, given the inability  
30 of the system to provide workers with adequate skills.  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36  
37  
38 The labour market for graduate workers is more flexible and flowing than that  
39 for workers with lower schooling levels. On average, one in four graduate workers  
40 will have to switch employer or employment status each year, just to respond to  
41 the reallocation of job opportunities across firms. That ratio is one in seven for  
42 the undergraduate labour force. Irrespective of the type of contract the worker  
43 holds, individuals holding a higher education diploma are asked to switch jobs more  
44 frequently, simply as a result of the reshuffling of employment opportunities across  
45 firms, and will thus have to adapt more frequently to changing work environment.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Using variance decomposition to check whether idiosyncratic or sectoral and  
53 aggregate shocks drive the time variation in job flows further highlights that the  
54 graduate labour market is more volatile. The impact of idiosyncratic shocks is more  
55  
56  
57



1  
2  
3  
4  
5 relevant driving job flows for higher education graduates than for non-graduates.  
6  
7 The contrasts between the two labour markets results mostly from the behaviour  
8  
9 of new firms and those going out of business, most likely because continuing firms  
10  
11 are subject to employment protection legislation that is applied irrespective of the  
12  
13 worker schooling level.  
14

## 15 References

- 16  
17  
18 BALDWIN, J., DUNNE, T. AND HALTIWANGER, J. (1998) A comparison of  
19  
20 job creation and job destruction in Canada and United States, *Review of*  
21  
22 *Economics and Statistics*, 80, 347-356.  
23  
24 BLANCHARD, O. AND PORTUGAL, P. (2001) What hides behind an unemploy-  
25  
26 ment rate: comparing Portuguese and U.S. labor markets, *American Eco-*  
27  
28 *nomics Review*, 91, 187-207.  
29  
30 BLANCHFLOWER, D. G. AND BURGESS, S. M. (1996) Job creation and job  
31  
32 destruction in Great Britain in the 1980's, *Industrial and Labor Relations*  
33  
34 *Review*, 50, 17-38.  
35  
36 BROERSMA, L. (1996) The effect of wage restraint on labour market flows, *Applied*  
37  
38 *Economics*, 28, 999-1007.  
39  
40 CABALLERO, R. J. AND HAMMOUR, M. L. (1996) On the timing and efficiency  
41  
42 of creative destruction, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 111, 805-852.  
43  
44 CARDOSO, A. R. (1999) Firm's wage policies and the rise in labor market in-  
45  
46 equality: the case of Portugal, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 53,  
47  
48 87-102.  
49  
50 DAVIS, S. J. AND HALTIWANGER, J. (1990) Gross job creation and destruction:  
51  
52 Microeconomic evidence and macroeconomic implications, *NBER Macroeco-*  
53  
54 *nomics Annual*, 5, 123-168.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 DAVIS, S. J. AND HALTIWANGER, J. (1992) Gross job creation, gross job de-  
6 struction, and employment reallocation, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107:  
7 819-863.  
8  
9  
10  
11 DAVIS, S. J., HALTIWANGER, J. C. AND SCHUH, S. (1996) *Job Creation and*  
12 *Destruction*, MIT Pres, Cambridge, Massachusetts.  
13  
14  
15 GARIBALDI, P. AND MAURO, P. (2000) Job creation: why some countries do  
16 better, International Monetary Fund Working Paper WP/99/109.  
17  
18  
19 GAUTIER, P. A. AND BROERSMA, L. (2001) The timing of labour reallocation  
20 and the business cycle: evidence for the Netherlands, *Labour*, 15, 663-684.  
21  
22  
23 KONINGS, J. (1995) Job creation and job destruction in the UK manufacturing  
24 sector, *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 57, 5-24.  
25  
26  
27 OECD (1999 and 2002) *Education at a Glance Database 1999, and 2002*, OECD,  
28 Paris.  
29  
30  
31 OECD (2002a) *Science, Technology and Industry Outlook 2002*, online at <http://www.oecd.org>.  
32  
33  
34 PORTUGAL, INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE ESTATÍSTICA (1981, 1991, 2001) *Re-*  
35 *censeamentos da População e da Habitação*.  
36  
37  
38 PORTUGAL. MINISTÉRIO DO TRABALHO E DA SOLIDARIEDADE (1985-1999)  
39 Quadros de Pessoal, data in magnetic medium.  
40  
41  
42 TEICHLER, U. (1999) Higher education policy and the world of work: conditions  
43 and challenges, *Higher Education Policy*, 12, 285-312.  
44  
45  
46 TSOU, M., LIU, J. AND HAMMITT, J. K. (2002) Worker turnover and job  
47 reallocation in Taiwanese manufacturing, *Applied Economics*, 34, 401-411.  
48  
49  
50 VAINIOMAKI, J. AND LAAKSONEN, S. (1999) Technology, job creation and job  
51 destruction in Finnish manufacturing, *Applied Economics Letters*, 6, 81-88.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 1: UNEMPLOYMENT RATE BY SCHOOLING LEVEL. Sources: Portugal, INE (1981, 1991, 2001).




Figure 2: REQUIREMENTS IMPOSED BY JOB OFFERS ADVERTISED AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL, 1989-2000. Source: Newspaper *Expresso*. Notes: This newspaper is the major means for advertising job offers at the national level for qualified workers. The graph reports moving averages, with a smoothing window of 13 weeks (approximately one trimester).

year	higher education graduates		schooling below higher education	
	creation	destruction	creation	destruction
1986	0.207	0.148	0.129	0.075
1987	0.204	0.159	0.132	0.084
1988	0.223	0.175	0.134	0.100
1989	0.279	0.190	0.149	0.102
1992	0.229	0.148	0.127	0.112
1993	0.218	0.182	0.113	0.138
1995	0.223	0.137	0.124	0.111
1996	0.238	0.123	0.121	0.116
1997	0.263	0.131	0.140	0.107
1998	0.271	0.137	0.131	0.128
1999	0.182	0.140	0.100	0.142
mean	0.231	0.152	0.127	0.110

Table 1: RATES OF GROSS JOB CREATION AND DESTRUCTION BY SCHOOLING LEVEL, 1986-1999. Source: Computations based on Portugal, MTS (1985-1999).




Figure 3: RATE OF NET JOB CREATION BY SCHOOLING LEVEL, 1986-1999. Sources: Computations based on Portugal, MTS (1985-1999).




Figure 4: RATE OF GROSS JOB REALLOCATION AND EXCESS JOB REALLOCATION BY SCHOOLING LEVEL, 1986-1999. Sources: Computations based on Portugal, MTS (1985-1999).




Figure 5: GROSS JOB FLOWS BY INDUSTRY AND SCHOOLING LEVEL, 1986-1999. Sources: Computations based on Portugal, MTS (1985-1999). Codes: A: Food, beverages, tobacco; B: Textiles, clothing, leather; C: Wood, cork; D: Paper; E: Chemicals; F: Non-metallic mineral prod; G: Base metals; H: Metal prod; I: Elect., gas, water; J: Building; K: Trade; L: Restaur., hotels; M: Transport, communic; N: Banking, insurance; O: Serv. to companies; P: Social, cultural and personal serv.

	Continuing firms		All firms	
	uni grads	non-grads	uni grads	non-grads
<i>Job creation</i>				
idiosyncratic component	0.01	0.03	0.13	0.08
sector and aggregate component	0.89	0.81	0.75	1.19
interaction	0.10	0.16	0.12	-0.27
<i>Job destruction</i>				
idiosyncratic component	0.01	0.02	0.25	0.03
sector and aggregate component	1.05	0.91	0.65	0.79
interaction	-0.06	0.07	0.10	0.17
<i>Job reallocation</i>				
idiosyncratic component	0.02	0.07	0.32	0.21
sector and aggregate component	0.81	0.65	0.47	0.57
interaction	0.17	0.27	0.21	0.22

Table 2: RELATIVE IMPACT OF IDIOSYNCRATIC SHOCKS AND SECTORAL PLUS AGGREGATE SHOCKS ON GROSS JOB FLOWS. Source: Computations based on Portugal, MTS (1985-1999). Note: *All firms* includes new and exiting firms; continuing firms are the ones remaining in business between two periods.

year	firms	workers
1985	82 957	1 431 112
1986	87 339	1 436 487
1987	91 777	1 484 690
1988	100 543	1 500 771
1989	112 841	1 613 063
1991	123 534	1 675 050
1992	132 398	1 704 686
1993	137 963	1 670 933
1995	160 065	1 721 608
1996	163 875	1 712 677
1997	180 040	1 823 672
1998	186 555	1 854 468
1999	202 522	1 959 354

Table 3: SIZE OF SAMPLE UNDER ANALYSIS. Source: Computations based on Portugal, MTS (1985-1999).

	1985	1991	1995	1999
food, beverages, tobacco	5.5	4.5	4.5	3.8
textiles, clothing, leather	16.6	18.1	15.1	12.4
wood, cork	3.9	3.6	4.1	3.7
paper	2.7	2.4	2.2	2.0
chemicals	4.4	3.1	2.5	2.1
non-metalic mineral prod	3.6	3.3	3.1	2.8
base metals	1.4	0.9	0.5	0.5
metal prod	10.5	9.3	9.0	8.6
elect., gas, water	1.6	1.3	1.0	0.8
building	8.4	9.2	9.4	10.1
trade	15.9	16.7	19.9	20.4
rest., hotels	4.5	5.2	6.2	6.4
transp, communic	9.3	7.8	6.9	6.7
banking, insurance	4.6	4.7	4.8	4.2
social, cultural and personal serv.	7.3	9.9	10.9	15.3

Table 4: STRUCTURE OF EMPLOYMENT BY INDUSTRY (MANUFACTURING AND SERVICES), PORTUGAL. Source: Computations based on Portugal, MTS (1985-1999).

year	GDP per capita					GDP per person employed				
	1981	1985	1990	1995	2000	1981	1985	1990	1995	2000
thousand 1995 USD	9.3	9.5	12.7	13.8	16.4	23.8	23.6	28.2	30.4	33.6
as % of USA		40			50		45			50

Table 5: GDP PER CAPITA AND PER PERSON EMPLOYED, PORTUGAL. Source: OECD, 2002a.

age	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64
Portugal	11	7	5	3
OECD mean	18	16	14	10

Table 6: PERCENTAGE OF THE POPULATION THAT HAS ATTAINED TERTIARY EDUCATION, BY AGE GROUP, 2001. Source: OECD, 2002.