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“A neighborhood in which people are poor but employed is different from a neighborhood in which people are poor and jobless. Many of today’s problems in the inner-city ghettos—crime, family dissolution, welfare, low levels of social organization, and so on—are fundamentally a consequence of the disappearance of work.”
“Wilson’s book spoke to me. I wanted to write him a letter and tell him that he had described my home perfectly. That it resonated so personally is odd, however, because he wasn’t writing about the hillbilly transplants from Appalachia—he was writing about black people in the inner cities.”
Becker ‘73

- Gains to marriage arise (partly) from spousal earnings differences, spurring household specialization
- If males specialize in market work, adverse shock to male earnings reduces marriage and (if children a normal good) fertility

William Julius Wilson ’86, ’87, ’96 (draws on Becker)

- Decline of U.S. blue-collar jobs has shrunk pool of economically secure young adult men
- Implication: Reduced women’s gains from marriage, eroded traditional parental roles, imperiled children

These hypotheses are partly distinct

- Becker model—relative economic stature and specialization
- Wilson further—holding relative gender earnings diffs constant, absolute falls in male economic stature reduce value of marriage
- Hard to disentangle (we don’t solve this problem). But fascinating...
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In 1970, $\frac{2}{3}$ of Young Manuf Workers Were Men
In 2014, $\frac{3}{4}$ of Young Manuf Workers Were Men
Manufacturing Jobs Offered High Earnings to Low Education Men: Estimates of ‘Premium’ in Year 2000 Census Data

Estimates based on Census 2000 data are conditional on age, education, race, ethnicity, and CZone fixed effects.
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8. Conclusions
In 2009, 40% of U.S. Births Were Out of Wedlock, More than Twice as Prevalent as 1980 (Steady through 2016)

2016 data: Overall 39.8%; Whites 28.5%; Blacks 69.8%; Hispanics 52.6%

Percentage of Births to Unmarried Women, by Race

Autor & Wasserman, 2013
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When Work Disappears: Manufacturing Decline and the Falling Marriage-Market Value of Young Men
Steep Rise in Fraction of Children < 18 in Single-Headed Households

U.S. Children < 18 Living with Mother Only: 1970 & 2010

Autor and Wasserman, 2013
Single & Poor: Poverty Far Higher Among Single-Headed HHs at Every Education Level (2008 data)
Evidence

- Blau, Kahn, Waldfogel ‘00; Ellwood, Jencks ‘04; Murray ‘12; Shenhav ‘16; Shaller ‘16
- Black, McKinnish, Sanders ‘03, ‘05: Using coal and steel shocks, find effects on welfare receipt, single-headedness
- Bertrand, Kamenica, Pan ‘15: Marriages in which wife earns more than husband appear to form less frequently, dissolve more frequently
- Kearney, Wilson ‘17: Fracking booms increase incomes and fertility but do not affect marriage
- Page, Huff Stevens, Lindo ‘09; Lindo, Hansen, Schaller ‘16: Parental job loss and adverse outcomes for children
- Charles and Luoh ’10: Incarceration as a shock to supply of marriageable males
- Charles, Hurst, and Schwartz ’18: Declining manufacturing → falling employment among young non-college males
State of Knowledge

What’s missing from extant evidence?

1. Large, well-identified labor market shocks

2. Large, gender-specific shocks—affecting relative M v. F earnings
   - Shenhav ’16 similar approach at state-level
   - Shenhav’s approach based in part on earlier version of this work

3. High resolution data—linking labor market shocks to gender earning status, fertility, marriage, kids’ outcomes
What We Add

Exploit well-ID’d trade shocks to manufacturing
- Sizable, sustained effects at local labor market (CZ) level
- Identifiable gender-specific component

Measure direct labor market consequences
- Employment: manufacturing, non-manufacturing, unemployment, NILF
- Distributional effects on earnings (esp. relevant to marriage market)

Explore decline of ‘marriageable’ men
- Idleness
- Sex ratio
- Mortality

Assess downstream effects on marriage/ fertility/ childhood poverty
- Marriage, cohabitation, fertility
- Fertility, children’s household structures, childhood poverty

Consider implications for Becker + Wilson
Identifying Sex-Specific Employment Shocks
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China’s Historic Rise as a World Manufacturing Power

Shares of world manufacturing exports

- China
- USA
- Other emerging economies
- Germany
Sizable impact of ‘China shock’ on U.S. employment, wages

- Bernard, Jensen, Schott ‘06; Autor, Dorn, Hanson ‘13; Ebenstein, Harrison, McMillan, Phillips ‘14; Autor, Dorn, Hanson, Song ‘14; Pierce, Schott ‘16
- Explains 30-40% of the decline in manufacturing employment from 1990 to 2007 (Caliendo, Dvorkin, Parro ‘15; Acemolgu et al. ‘16)

Impacts concentrated in

1. Import-exposed industries: Pierce, Schott ’16; Acemolgu et al. ’16
2. Workers employed in exposed firms: Autor, Dorn, Hanson, Song ’14
3. Import-exposed local labor markets: Autor, Dorn, Hanson ’13
Data

Trade exposure

- County Business Patterns 1980, 1990: employment in 397 industries in 722 Commuting Zones (CZs)

Outcome variables


Focus on population age 18-39

- Focused on the young b/c of marriage/children outcomes
- Races + ethnicities combined for statistical power
Measuring Local Labor Market Import Exposure

1. Compute change in manufacturing import penetration by industry $j$ (397 industries)

$$
\Delta IP_{j, \tau} = \frac{\Delta M_{j, \tau}^{ch, us}}{Y_{j, 91} + M_{j, 91} - X_{j, 91}},
$$

where $\tau \in \{1991 - 2000; 2000 - 2014\}$

2. Compute change in import penetration by Commuting Zone (CZ) $i$ based on $i$’s initial industry employment mix across industries $j$

$$
\Delta IP_{i, \tau} = \sum_{j} \frac{L_{ij, 90}}{L_{i, 90}} \Delta IP_{j, \tau}
$$
Instrumental Variables Strategy

Source of endogeneity
- US imports from China not only affected by Chinese productivity growth and falling trade costs, but also by US demand shocks

Instrumental variables approach
- Instrument for US imports from China using other developed countries, imports from China (and lags of all other variables)

\[ \Delta IP_{j,\tau}^{oth} = \frac{\Delta M_{j,\tau}^{ch,oth}}{Y_{j,88} + M_{j,88} - X_{j,88}}, \quad \Delta IP_{i,\tau}^{oth} = \sum_j \frac{L_{ij,80}}{L_{i,80}} \Delta IP_{j,\tau}^{oth} \]

Variation in industry-level trade shocks has well-specified origin
- Δ’s in China productivity and market access, causing Chinese exports to many countries to surge simultaneously
- As per Goldsmith-Pinkham et al. ’17, use fixed weights for industry shares, test for pre-trends
- We are thinking of this as Bartik in the spirit of Borusyak et al. ’18: ‘treatment’ is the trade shock not the industry structure per se
Geographic Dispersion of Exposure to Chinese Import Competition

**Most-affected areas of the U.S.**

Colors show which areas were most affected by China’s rise, based on the increase in Chinese imports per worker in each area from 1990 to 2007. Hovering over each area on the map will show a demographic breakdown of that area, below, and its most-affected industries, at right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most-affected 20%</th>
<th>Second-highest 20%</th>
<th>Middle 20%</th>
<th>Second-lowest 20%</th>
<th>Least-affected 20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Most-affected industries**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most-affected industries, based on number of areas*</th>
<th>Impact per worker†</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and fixtures</td>
<td>196 areas $44k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Games, toys, and children’s vehicles</td>
<td>114 areas $488k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting and athletic goods</td>
<td>106 areas $82k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic components</td>
<td>87 areas $65k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plasotics products</td>
<td>84 areas $11k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor-vehicle parts and accessories</td>
<td>79 areas $12k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic computers</td>
<td>63 areas $203k</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WSJ 2016, Autor, Dorn and Hanson 2013
### Pooled (M+F) Trade Shocks: Employment-Weighted Δ’s in CZ’s Import Penetration per Decade (≈ % of CZ GDP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Period</th>
<th>P25</th>
<th>P50</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>P75</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990-2000</td>
<td>0.54%</td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>0.95%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2014</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Autor, Dorn & Hanson*
Gender-specific trade shocks

- Trade shocks differentially affect males or females depending on industries exposed

Instrumental variables approach

- Multiply CZ-by-industry exposure measure by initial period male or female share of employment in each industry-CZ cell

\[
\Delta IP_{i, \tau}^m = \sum_j \frac{m_{ij, 90} L_{ij, 90}}{L_{i, 90}} \Delta IP_{j, \tau},
\]

\[
\Delta IP_{i, \tau}^f = \sum_j \frac{(1 - m_{ij, 90}) L_{ij, 90}}{L_{i, 90}} \Delta IP_{j, \tau},
\]

where \( m_{ij, 90} \) is the male employment share in industry \( j \) in CZ \( i \) in 1990
Employment-Weighted Δ’s in CZ’s Import Penetration per Decade by Sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Men</th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P25</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P50</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P75</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autor, Dorn & Hanson
When Work Disappears: Manufacturing Decline and the Falling Marriage-Market Value of Young Men
Man Down: Employment & Earnings
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Main Estimating Equations

Estimated by 2SLS

\[
\Delta Y_{i,\tau} = \alpha_t + \beta_1 \Delta IP_{i,\tau} + X_{i,t}\delta + e_{it},
\]

\[
\Delta Y_{i,\tau} = \alpha'_t + \beta'_1 \Delta IP_{m}^{i,\tau} + \beta'_2 \Delta IP_{f}^{i,\tau} + X_{i,t}\delta' + e'_{it}
\]

Control vector includes...

- Population shares in 5 race/ethnicity, 2 education, and 2 nativity groups
- Share of employment in manufacturing, ‘routine-intensive’ occupations, ‘offshorable’ occupations
- Female employment share
- Census division dummies

Other specification features

- Wage quantile estimates apply Chetverikov, Larsen, Palmer ’16 grouped quantile IV estimator
- CZ’s weighted by population, SEs clustered on states

Effect on Manufacturing Emp/Pop, Ages 18 - 39

-1.09%  -1.69%  -1.64%  -1.05%  -0.91%  -1.06%  -2.00%  -1.75%  -1.50%  -1.25%  -1.00%  -0.75%  -0.50%  -0.25%  0.00%  0.25%
Reduced Form Test for Pre-Trends: 1970-80, 1980-90, 1990-00, 2000-14

Effect on Manufacturing Emp/Pop, Ages 18 - 39

1.69%
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-1.09%
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-2.00%
-1.50%
-1.00%
-0.50%
0.00%
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2.50%


Effect of Gender Trade Shocks on LF Status by Sex, Ages 18 - 39
Effect of Manufacturing Shock on M-F Gap in Employment Status/Pop, 1990-2014

Effect of Pooled Trade Shock on M-F $\Delta$ in LF Status, Ages 18 - 39
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Effect of Sex-Specific Shocks on Emp/Pop by Sex, 1990-2014

Emp/Pop Men
-1.5%
-3.1%

Emp/Pop Women
0.2%
-0.9%
-2.0%

Overall shock
Male shock
Female shock
Effect of Pooled Manufacturing Shock on CZ-Level Male and Female Annual Earnings, 1990 - 2014 (in 2015$)

Effect of Overall Trade Shock on Change in Earnings by Gender
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Effect of Manufacturing Shock on CZ-Level Male-Female Annual Earnings Gap as a Pct of Male Earnings in 1990

Effect of Overall Trade Shock on Change in M–F Earnings Gap

Autor, Dorn & Hanson
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What Do Non-Employed Young Adults Do?

**Employment opportunities, educational investments, and idleness**

- Trade booms and busts: Atkin ’16; Greenland, Lopresti ’16
- Housing booms and busts: Charles, Hurst, Notowidigdo ’18; Aparicio Fenoll ’16

**Growing demand for leisure**

- Young men increasingly devote time to video games: Aguiar, Bils, Charles, Hurst ’16
Focusing on *Young Adults* 18-25, a Sharp Rise in Male ‘Idleness’ in Trade-Exposed CZs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>In School, Not Employed</th>
<th>Not in School, Not Employed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>-1.50%</td>
<td>0.72%</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td>-0.87%</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
<td>0.13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Autor, Dorn & Hanson

*When Work Disappears: Manufacturing Decline and the Falling Marriage-Market Value of Young Men*
Effect of Manufacturing Shock on ‘Idleness’ Gap Among Young Adults 18-25: Males - Females

- Employed
- In School, Not Employed
- Not in School, Not Employed

-0.64%
0.66%
-1.50%
-1.25%
-1.00%
-0.75%
-0.50%
-0.25%
0.00%
0.25%
0.50%
0.75%
1.00%
1.25%
Effect of Manufacturing Shock on Ratio of Males/Females Ages 18 - 25/39, 1990-2014

Effect of Trade Shocks on M/F Gender Ratio in CZ, Ages 18 - 25/39

![Graph showing the effect of manufacturing and trade shocks on the ratio of males to females in CZ, ages 18-39 and 18-25. The graph shows a decrease in the ratio for both age groups, with values of -1.02 for Age 18-39 and -1.28 for Age 18-25.]
Why Does the M/F Ratio Fall in Trade-Exposed CZs?

1. **Differential male migration**
   - Bartik ’17 finds small negative overall pop inflow response, no outflow response
   - No evidence on gender-specific migration patterns

2. **Military enlistment**
   - Using Army records: sharp rise in enlistments of young, unmarried men
   - Can explain about 10% of M/F decline

3. **Incarceration**
   - Deiana ‘15, Feler-Senses ‘15: increase in property crime
   - Difficult to translate into population effects w/o incarceration data

4. **Mortality**
   - Case & Deaton ‘15,’16: Rise in mortality among middle-age, non-Hispanic whites 1998-2015. See also Pierce-Schott ‘17
   - *We focus on young adults 20-39, by sex and cause*
Effect of Manufacturing Shock on Cumulative Decadal Male-Female Mortality Differential per 100K Adults Ages 20-39, 1990–2015

Mean decadal mortality among ages 20-39 over 1990-2015:
Men 1,645/100K, Women 709/100K, M-F gap 936/100K
Effects of Sex-Specific Shocks on Male Mortality per 100K Ages 20-39

Mean male decadal mortality ages 20-39, 1990-2015: 1,645/100K
Effects of Sex-Specific Shocks on Female Mortality per 100K Ages 20-39

Mean female decadal mortality ages 20-39, 1990-2015: 709/100K
Summary of Outcomes at Individual (not Family) Level for Young Adults

At the CZ level, trade shocks...

1. Differentially reduce male employment
2. Differentially reduce male earnings, esp. below the median of the annual earnings distribution
3. Raise ‘idleness’ among young men but not young women
4. Reduce the ratio of young adult men to young adult women
5. Induce differential rise in male mortality from D&A, HIV, Homicide
6. Induce rise in local crime (mostly committed by young men), Feler & Senses ’17

Young men faring differentially poorly in trade-impacted CZs
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Effect on Marital Status, HH Structure, Women Ages 18 - 39

- Married
- Widowed/ Divorced/ Separated
- Never Married

Male shock
-5.0%
-4.0%
-3.0%
-2.0%
-1.0%
0.0%
1.0%
2.0%
3.0%
4.0%
5.0%
6.0%

Female shock
-3.6%
-2.3%
-2.0%
-1.0%
0.0%
1.0%
2.0%
3.0%
4.0%
5.0%
6.0%
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Effect of Manufacturing Shock by Sex on Cohabitation of Women Ages 18 – 39, 1990-2014

-3.2% 0.0% 3.2%
1.9% 0.0% -0.5%
1.9% -0.5% -1.4%
## Agenda

2. Context: The Retreat from Marriage (but not Childbearing)
3. Identifying Sex-Specific Employment Shocks
4. Man Down: Employment & Earnings
5. Man Out: Idleness, Absence, and Death
6. Testing Becker: Marriage and Cohabitation
8. Conclusions

- Birth Rate per 1000 Women Age 15-39:
  - Pooled shock: -1.54%
  - Male shock: -0.66%
  - Female shock: 0.52%
- % of Women w/Children:
  - Pooled shock: -4.65%
  - Male shock: -1.79%
  - Female shock: 0.62%
- % Mothers Unmarried:
  - Pooled shock: -2.62%
  - Male shock: -1.79%
  - Female shock: 0.52%
Shocks to Manufacturing Shift Composition of Children’s HH Living Arrangements

Fraction of Children <18 Living in Different HH Arrangements

- Poor HH: 0.61%
- Married Parents: -0.35%
- Parent w/ Partner: -0.11%
- Single Parent: 0.30%
- Grandparents: 0.19%
- Any Other: -0.03%
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Shocks to Manufacturing Raise Childhood Poverty

Fraction of Children <18 Living in Poverty: Overall and by HH Arrangement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HH Arrangement</th>
<th>All HH's</th>
<th>Married Parents</th>
<th>Parent + Unmarried Partner</th>
<th>Parent w/o Partner</th>
<th>Grand-Parent</th>
<th>Any Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.61%</td>
<td>0.19%</td>
<td>-0.03%</td>
<td>0.29%</td>
<td>0.12%</td>
<td>0.04%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shocks to Male vs. Female Earnings Have Countervailing Effects on Children’s HH Living Arrangements

Fraction of Children <18 Living in Different HH Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Married Parents</th>
<th>Parent + Non-Married Partner</th>
<th>Parent w/o Partner</th>
<th>Grandparents</th>
<th>Any Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male Shock</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Shock</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-0.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shocks to Male Earnings Raise Childhood Poverty by Raising Lone Parenting; Shocks to Female Earnings Reduce Lone Parenting

**Fraction of Children <18 Living in Poverty: Overall and by HH Arrangement**

![Bar chart showing the percentage of children living in poverty by household arrangement and gender shock.](image-url)
Conclusions
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Conclusions

When Work Disappears: Worse than Becker Would Have Predicted?

1. **China Shock to U.S. manufacturing in 1990s and 2000s**
   - Sharp contraction in manufacturing employment without precedent in U.S. post-war history
   - Esp. consequential for males because
     - Men overrepresented in manufacturing
     - Young non-college men had relatively high wages+hours in manufacturing
   - Shocks lowered relative employment and earnings of young men, esp. in lower quartile of earnings distribution

2. **Broader consequences for young male economic (dys)function**
   - Rise in male idleness
   - Reduced male/female presence in non-institutional population
   - Differential rise in male mortality (not exclusively deaths of despair)

3. **Understanding Becker + Wilson**
   - Reduced marriage rates and cohabitation
   - Fall in fertility, yet rise in single motherhood
   - Sharp rise in children in poverty, partly due to fall in two-parent HH’s
   - Becker didn’t write about fertility and single-parenting, but...
   - Male dysfunction offers a Becker-Wilson link, rationalizes broader consequences