Volume Title: Labor in the New Economy

Volume Author/Editor: Katharine G. Abraham, James R. Spletzer, and Michael Harper, editors

Volume Publisher: University of Chicago Press

Volume ISBN: 978-0-226-00143-2; 0-226-00143-1

Volume URL: http://www.nber.org/books/abra08-1

Conference Date: November 16-17, 2007

Publication Date: October 2010

Chapter Title: Introduction to "Labor in the New Economy"

Chapter Author: Katharine G. Abraham, James R. Spletzer, Michael J. Harper

Chapter URL: http://www.nber.org/chapters/c10811

Chapter pages in book: (1 - 13)

Introduction

Katharine G. Abraham, James R. Spletzer, and
Michael J. Harper

The structure of the economy has changed a great deal in recent decades. Both researchers and policymakers have been concerned with how workers are faring in today's new economy. Themes explored in popular press accounts on this subject include the changing demographics of the labor force, the increased prevalence of flexible and alternative employment arrangements, declining job stability, increased wage inequality, and, more generally, the fear that good jobs are disappearing. This volume contains twelve chapters, prepared by leading economists in both academia and government and presented at a conference held in Bethesda, Maryland on November 16 and 17, 2007, that examine the evidence on these topics.

One motivation for the conference was simply to review what we know and don't know about the labor market trends that matter to American families—trends in the inequality of earnings and other forms of labor compensation, trends in job security and the dynamics of employment more generally, trends in employer reliance on temporary and contract workers, trends in hours of work, and trends in workplace safety and health—and to update and extend findings about these trends reported in previous studies.

A second objective of the conference was to bring together and foster discussions among a set of scholars concerned with the *measurement* of labor market activity. The authors of the volume's chapters tackle a host of measurement issues—from the treatment of outliers, imputation methods and

Katharine G. Abraham is a professor in the Joint Program in Survey Methodology, adjunct professor of economics, and faculty associate of the Maryland Population Research Center, University of Maryland, and a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research. James R. Spletzer is a senior research economist at the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Michael J. Harper is associate commissioner for productivity and technology at the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

weighting in the context of specific surveys to evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of data from different sources. Especially in the case of surveys that researchers have not used extensively, the documentation provided by the statistical agencies often provides a somewhat limited treatment of these topics. The chapters' discussion of important measurement issues should be helpful to other researchers working with the same data, as well as helping to frame the proper interpretation of findings based on these different sources.

Since the date of the conference, the U.S. economy has experienced a severe recession from which, as of this writing, it is showing only the first signs of recovery. Though the recent period has without question been a highly significant economic event, it is still too early to say how its effects will play out in the labor market. Many of the trends the volume documents and discusses—for example, the long-term growth in contract employment arrangements and the changing demographics of the U.S. labor force—seem unlikely to be much affected by recent developments. In any case, rather than attempt to speculate about the labor market effects of these developments, we simply acknowledge the fact that the recent period has been tumultuous and leave the evaluation of this period and its labor market implications for the future.

New Evidence on Recent Labor Market Trends

One of the most important labor market developments of recent decades has been the long-term growth in earnings inequality, a subject that is the topic of Thomas Lemieux's chapter, "What Do We Really Know about Changes in Wage Inequality?" Among other findings based on a careful analysis of data from the Current Population Survey (CPS), Lemieux reports that, despite a slowdown in the growth of male wage inequality overall, the gap between the 90th percentile and the 50th percentile of the male wage distribution grew faster between 1989 and 2005 than it had between 1974 and 1989. In contrast, after having risen during the late 1970s and 1980s, the gap between the 50th percentile and the 10th percentile of the male wage distribution actually fell between 1989 and 2005. The very different recent trends in dispersion in the different parts of the wage distribution seem difficult to square with simple explanations based solely on supply and demand. Lemieux's findings lead him to the conclusion that any plausible explanation for the behavior of wage inequality over time must combine the effects of multiple influences, including not only supply and demand forces but also institutional factors such as changes in the level of the minimum wage.

Additional evidence about changes in labor market inequality is offered by Brooks Pierce in his chapter, "Recent Trends in Compensation Inequality," which looks at the value of employment-related benefits such as health insurance, pensions, and paid vacation leave, in addition to the wages and salaries that employers pay. It is not obvious ex ante whether accounting for

the value of nonwage compensation should attenuate or amplify observed trends in wage inequality. On the one hand, because health insurance is so important and most plans offer similar coverage, one might expect growing health insurance costs to flatten proportional differences in compensation across workers. On the other hand, high-wage workers are more likely to receive employer-provided health insurance, and the value of benefits such as paid leave and employee pensions clearly rises with employee wages. Pierce's results establish that, taking everything into account, the growth in compensation inequality actually exceeded the growth in wage inequality over the twenty years from 1987 to 2007.

Henry Farber's chapter, "Job Loss and the Decline in Job Security in the United States," includes a careful examination of trends in job tenure. Looking at the most recent CPS data, Farber finds clear evidence that older men have experienced a marked decline in job tenure. For men aged fifty, for example, he shows that mean tenure has fallen by more than two years, from an average of 13.5 years in the 1973 to 1983 period to 11.4 years in the 1996 to 2006 period, and the declines for men aged sixty are even larger. Interestingly, the declines in male job tenure have been restricted to the private sector, and no similar decline in average job tenure is observed for women.

The chapter by Matthew Dey, Susan Houseman, and Anne Polivka, "What Do We Know about Contracting Out in the United States? Evidence from Household and Establishment Surveys," offers a systematic review of evidence on contracting out and the use of temporary help service workers. One of this paper's innovations is to generate new information on the types of work performed by contract workers based on data from the Occupational Employment Statistics (OES) survey. The OES is a large employer survey that provides detailed data on employment by occupation within industries. Dey, Houseman, and Polivka identify selected occupations with significant employment in which there is reason to think that contract firms may account for a sizeable share of employment—for example, janitors and school bus drivers—and examine data on the industries in which these workers are employed. They are able to document the growing share of employment in several of these large occupations that is accounted for by contract firms. Their chapter provides concrete evidence of the growth in contracting out that is only hinted at by more anecdotal sources of information.

Measurement Themes

While the substantive insights to be gleaned from the chapters are valuable—and the examples cited in the preceding paragraphs of the interesting findings the chapters report are intended only to be illustrative—the volume also seeks to shed light on the *measurement* of labor market activity. In addition to the discussion of measurement issues specific to each chapter's topic, three recurring measurement themes cut broadly across the chapters.

First, several of the chapters highlight the value of using data from multiple sources to learn about a phenomenon or trend. Among other considerations, whether the estimates from multiple surveys are consistent with one another can be enormously helpful both for deciding how much confidence to place in the estimates obtained and for diagnosing the source of possible problems with the data. A second and overlapping theme concerns the strengths and limitations of employer-reported as compared to household-reported data. The preponderance of U.S. labor market research has rested on data from the CPS and other household surveys, but this volume's chapters make clear the value of data collected from employers for answering many questions about the labor market. Finally, several of the chapters address the ways in which changing workforce demographics may affect key measures of labor market activity and the conclusions to be drawn from those statistics.

Value of Data from Multiple Sources

The first of the recurring measurement themes threaded through the volume is the value of having data from multiple sources for learning about a trend or phenomenon. Especially in the survey methodology literature, evaluations of the quality of survey estimates often focus on indicators such as the size of the survey sample, unit response rates, the findings from response analysis studies that examine how well respondents understand the survey questions, and so on. In addition to looking at information that is internal to the survey in question, however, it can be informative to look at the consistency of the survey estimates with related estimates from other sources. There may be reasons for two seemingly similar measurements to diverge, but such divergences also may indicate that there are problems with one or more of the measurements. In a world of ever-tightening budgets, statistical agencies are under continuing pressure to streamline and consolidate the collection of information. Although the reasons for this pressure are entirely understandable, an unintended consequence of going down this path could well be to undermine our ability to evaluate the quality of the data collected and, thus, ultimately users' confidence in our data system.

To take one example of the value of having related data from multiple sources, consider the chapter by Steven Davis, Jason Faberman, John Haltiwanger, and Ian Rucker, "Adjusted Estimates of Worker Flows and Job Openings in JOLTS," which examines estimates based on the Job Openings and Labor Turnover survey (JOLTS). On their face, the JOLTS estimates seem reasonable enough, but a more careful comparison of these estimates to those from other sources suggests there is a serious problem: the difference between the JOLTS job accession and job separation rates should yield a net employment growth rate that is comparable to that in the monthly Current Employment Statistics (CES) survey, but, in fact, it is consistently higher. Comparison of the cross-sectional distribution of month-to-month employment changes in the JOLTS sample to that in the Business Employment

Dynamics (BED) database reveals that JOLTS respondents include too few establishments that have experienced sharp employment declines, with the result that employment separations are understated. This, in turn, suggests a method, described in greater detail in the chapter, for producing more accurate JOLTS estimates by reweighting the responses received to reproduce the cross-sectional employment growth rate distribution. Neither the diagnosis of the problem with the JOLTS estimates nor the development of the suggested remedy would have been possible absent multiple sources of information on business employment dynamics.

The chapter by Harley Frazis and Jay Stewart, "Why Do BLS Hours Series Tell Different Stories about Trends in Hours Worked?," examines estimates of weekly work hours from several different sources. The chapter seeks to understand why estimates of work hours based on the CPS are so much higher than work hours estimates based on the CES survey, the monthly Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) survey of employer payrolls, and why CPS hours have not shown the steady decline that is so apparent in the CES hours data. One common speculation is that household survey respondents systematically exaggerate the number of hours they work (Robinson and Bostrom 1994; Abraham, Spletzer, and Stewart, 1998, 1999), leading to an overstatement in reported CPS hours. To learn whether this is so, Frazis and Stewart compare CPS hours estimates to estimates from the American Time Use Survey (ATUS). Because they are based on contemporaneous reports of how people spent their time on a specific day, time diary data often are presumed to provide highly reliable measures of how individuals allocate their time. The fact that CPS estimates of hours of work exceed the ATUS estimates seems at first blush to lend credence to the idea that the CPS hours estimates are too high. When attention is restricted to ATUS data collected during CPS reference weeks, however, so that the ATUS and the CPS respondents are reporting for the same time periods, the estimates of hours from the two sources are very similar. The difference between the published CPS and ATUS estimates appears instead to reflect the fact that, by design, the CPS reference weeks avoid major holidays and hours of work tend to be lower, on average, during the excluded weeks. Again, having data from multiple sources proves to be of value, this time for an improved understanding of the CPS average weekly hours data.

The chapter by Kevin Hallock and Craig Olson, "New Data for Answering Old Questions Regarding Employee Stock Options," carries out a different sort of exercise. As its title suggests, this chapter focuses on employee stock options, which have become a more important component of employee compensation in recent decades. Unlike benefits such as health insurance and pensions, however, government surveys collect little information about employee stock options, largely because there is no consensus about how they should be valued. How to value employee stock options is the central question that motivates the empirical analysis reported in the Hallock and

Olson chapter. Their results make clear that the standard Black-Scholes valuation theorem frequently applied to market-traded options is not applicable to nonmarketable employee stock options. In addition to reporting new empirical evidence, the Hallock and Olson chapter also reviews the various sources of existing data on stock options and their utility for addressing different sorts of research questions. Compared to some of the other topic areas addressed by chapters in the volume, the literature on stock options is less well developed. In this case, exploratory analyses using a variety of data sources not only should add to our understanding of stock options and their effects but also should inform how any eventual data collection activity that is undertaken by the federal statistical system might most usefully be structured.

Strengths of Household-Based versus Employer-Based Estimates

A second measurement theme addressed by several of the chapters in the volume is the distinctive contributions of household-based versus employer-based data. Household surveys are the best source of many sorts of information about both individuals and their families. On the other hand, certain types of information may be difficult to collect from household survey respondents—for example, information about the characteristics of employer-provided benefit plans or other details of individuals' employment arrangements. Further, household survey respondents' reports may be susceptible to bias resulting from the desire to put themselves or other household members in a favorable light (Tourangeau, Rips, and Rasinski 2000). Employers are more likely than workers to possess accurate information on many workplace-related topics. Moreover, there is less reason to fear that employer reports will be subject to social desirability bias of the sort that is a concern with household surveys. At the same time, there is a great deal of information about workers and their families that an employer simply does not possess. To give a simple illustration of the practical implications of these considerations, household surveys are needed to learn about the personal characteristics of those with and without health insurance coverage or whether those who lack health insurance coverage through their job have coverage through another source. On the other hand, detailed information about health plan provisions generally must be collected from employers or plan providers.

As already noted, labor economists have devoted considerable attention to the growth in the inequality of labor market earnings since the 1970s. Most of this research, including the Lemieux chapter in the present volume, has been based on data from the CPS. The CPS data have many advantages for studying this topic—they provide annual information on earnings for a large sample of individuals together with a considerable amount of demographic information for the same individuals, allowing comparisons to be made across population subgroups and permitting researchers to quantify

the contributions of potential experience, education, and other factors to overall inequality trends. An important limitation of the CPS data, however, is the lack of information about employee benefits. This is not a trivial omission—as of June 2008, employer data from the National Compensation Survey (NCS) carried out by the BLS show that benefits accounted for about 30 percent of the value of total compensation. Unfortunately, reliable information about the value of employer-provided benefits would be difficult to collect from CPS respondents, most of whom would be hard pressed to report accurately about their own work-related benefits much less about those of other employed persons in their households. It is only by examining employer-reported data on benefit costs, collected through the NCS, that Pierce is able to say how trends in compensation inequality have compared to trends in wage inequality and, further, to document the contributions of different components of the compensation package to the overall growth in inequality.

Differences between household-reported and employer-reported data are the explicit focus of the chapter by Katharine Abraham and James Spletzer, "Are the New Jobs Good Jobs?," which compares estimates of employment in higher-paying and lower-paying industry/occupation cells from the CPS to similar estimates based on the OES survey, a large employer survey. Even after every effort has been made to put the two sets of estimates on the same footing—restricting attention in both cases to wage and salary positions in the nonagricultural private sector and modifying the CPS data so that they count number of jobs rather than number of employed people—there are far more management jobs in the CPS than in the OES. Abraham and Spletzer hypothesize that the discrepancy between the two data sources reflects a tendency on the part of household informants to describe their work to the CPS interviewer in ways that exaggerate its significance. If this is correct, analysts would be well advised to rely where possible on employer reports rather than household reports of occupational information.

In their chapter on the measurement of contracting activity, Dey, Houseman and Polivka present evidence that points toward a similar conclusion regarding the best source of information on the arrangements under which individuals are employed. In every year the authors examine, employment in the employment services industry, which consists primarily of temporary help firms and professional employer organizations (PEOs), is more than twice as large in data from the BLS payroll survey (employer reported) than in data from the CPS (household reported). Further, the large increase in employment in the employment services industry that is apparent in payroll survey data between 1995 and 2001 does not register in the CPS data available for the same period. Even when more explicit questions are asked in periodic CPS supplements to determine whether an individual worked for a temporary help firm rather than being paid directly by the firm on whose premises their job duties are performed, the number of temporary

help workers in the CPS falls far short of the number in the CES. These discrepancies suggest that, for whatever reason, individuals find it difficult to report accurately the arrangements under which they or other members of their households are employed. To the extent they are available, employer-provided data thus may be a better source of information about trends in temporary help employment and, more broadly, employment under other alternative work arrangements.

A related measurement theme concerns the use of information on job tasks rather than worker qualifications to characterize the labor market. Existing research has paid much more attention to worker characteristics than to the characteristics of the jobs that workers perform, but there are a range of questions that can best be addressed using the latter type of information. One such question is addressed by Bradford Jensen and Lori Kletzer in their chapter, "Measuring Tradable Services and the Task Content of Offshorable Services Jobs." Because both skilled and unskilled jobs may be outsourced, information on workers' qualifications is of little direct relevance to determining whether a job is vulnerable to outsourcing. The nature of the work performed, however, may be highly relevant. In their chapter, Jensen and Kletzer use data on the tasks associated with different services jobs from the Occupation Information Network (O*Net) database to infer whether incumbents in these jobs need to be located in physical proximity to the service recipients. O*Net was developed by the U.S. Department of Labor as a replacement for the Dictionary of Occupation Titles. The extensive information on the responsibilities and other characteristics of more than 1,000 distinct occupations included in the O*Net database derives primarily from surveys of incumbents in these jobs. Though it has been used widely by researchers in other fields, few economists are familiar with the O*Net database, and one of the contributions of the Jensen and Kletzer chapter is to raise the visibility of O*Net within the economics profession.

Effects of Changing Demographics on Labor Market Statistics

A third and final measurement theme that is manifest in a number of the chapters concerns the effects of changing demographics on labor market statistics. As is well known, the U.S. workforce is aging—the oldest baby boomers, those born in 1946, will turn sixty-five in 2011, and by 2029, the last of the baby boomers will have reached that age. Workers aged fifty-five and older accounted for 12.9 percent of the labor force in 2000, and that share is projected to rise to 20.3 percent by 2020 before beginning to fall. Female labor force participation grew rapidly during the 1960s and 1970s and has remained high, raising the share of the workforce that is female from 33.4 percent in 1960 to 42.5 percent in 1980 and 46.3 percent in 2006. And the workforce has become more ethnically and racially diverse—in 1980, 81.9 percent of the labor force were non-Hispanic whites, but by 2006, that

share had fallen to 69.7 percent and continued declines are forecast (Toossi 2002, 2007).

The policy implications of these demographic changes—for Social Security and Medicare, for private pensions, for K-12 and higher education, and for a range of other matters—have been widely discussed, but it has been less recognized that they also have important implications for the measurement of labor market activity. Economists long have recognized, for example, that changes in the age structure of the labor force may have an effect on measured unemployment that is independent of underlying labor market conditions (see, for example, Perry [1970] and, more recently, Shimer [1999]). Young people are more likely to enter and exit the labor force and also to change from one job to another. Despite the fact that they tend to have unemployment spells that are relatively short, because of their higher turnover rates, young workers have unemployment rates that are very high compared to the rates for older workers. It is important, therefore, to take the age structure of the workforce into account in interpreting the unemployment rate—if unemployment is lower because the share of young workers in the labor force has fallen, as has occurred since the mid-1970s, for example, one should not necessarily conclude that labor market performance has improved.

In their chapter titled "The Effect of Population Aging on the Aggregate Labor Market," Bruce Fallick, Charles Fleischman, and Jonathan Pingle extend this line of argument, arguing that other measures of labor market activity, including the labor force participation rate and measures of labor market flows and earnings, also are likely to be affected by the changing age structure of the population. Consider, for example, the effects of recent shifts in the age distribution of the workforce on average hourly earnings. Fallick, Fleischman, and Pingle report that average hourly earnings rose from $16.19 per hour (in 2005 dollars) in 1979 to $18.17 per hour in 2005. In part, however, this growth reflects the fact that the workforce has gotten older and thus, on average, more experienced. By comparing actual hourly wages with an alternative fixed-weight measure that uses the 2005 age-by-sex workforce shares to reweight the data for other years, Fallick, Fleischman, and Pingle conclude that about half of the observed increase in average real wages is a direct result of the aging of the workforce. These results suggest that the hourly earnings trend is less favorable than might on the surface appear to be the case.

Lemieux's chapter on trends in earnings inequality also makes the case for a focus on measures that have been adjusted for changes in the composition of the labor force so that underlying trends in inequality are not confounded by the effects of changing demographics on the dispersion of workers' earnings. Lemieux looks separately at men and women and considers measures that are adjusted both for changes in potential experience

(age minus estimated age at completion of schooling) and for changes in educational attainment. Lemieux's adjustment for composition effects has a noticeable dampening effect on the long-run trend growth in the variance of wages both for men and for women. While there was some disagreement among participants in the conference at which the volume's chapters were presented about whether it is appropriate to adjust for changes in educational attainment in studying trends in wage inequality, there was strong agreement that some age-related adjustment is desirable to produce more meaningful trend estimates.

Farber also is sensitive to the potential impact of changing demographics and, especially, the changing age distribution of the labor force, on labor market statistics. The first section of his chapter, "Job Loss and the Decline in Job Security in the United States," seeks to document changes in job tenure and the incidence of long-term employment. Because job tenure tends to rise with age, simple statistics on average job tenure may give a misleading picture of changes in job attachment. For these reasons, Farber focuses on measures of job attachment at particular ages, analyzing men's and women's experiences separately, rather than looking at measures for the labor force as a whole. Previous studies commonly have treated age as a control variable, regressing measures of job tenure on year and age dummies, and then examining the behavior of the year dummy coefficients. While for many purposes this may be a reasonable representation of the data, Farber's careful examination of age-specific trends illuminates important changes in the pattern of job attachment that have been less apparent in previous analyses.

Nicole Nestoriak and John Ruser, authors of "Emerging Labor Market Trends and Workplace Safety and Health," study the effects of changes in the composition of the workforce on measures of workplace safety and health. As with other measures of labor market outcomes, there is value in knowing the extent to which observed increases or decreases in injury and illness rates are the result of demographic factors as opposed to other factors. The incidence and severity of workplace-related injuries and illnesses show clear differences by age and sex. Looking forward, however, Nestoriak and Ruser's modeling efforts show that expected changes in the demographic composition of the workforce are likely to have relatively small effects on the aggregate number of injuries and illnesses. As noted by discussant Jeff Biddle, most of the dramatic decline in injury and illness rates since 1992 appears to reflect changes in "how work is done within particular industries and firms," a development Biddle suspects is related to the incentives created for employers by rising medical costs and the resulting growth in the cost of workers' compensation claims, rather than to demographic changes. On a related note, Nestoriak and Ruser speculate that changes in how employment is structured—for example, the growing use of leased employees who may not be integrated into the workplace in the same way as regular employ-

ees—may have important implications for future trends in safety and health. This is something that, unfortunately, existing data systems are not well designed to capture and to which greater thought ideally should be given.

In her chapter titled "Measuring Labor Composition: A Comparison of Alternate Methodologies," Cindy Zoghi focuses on the measures of labor input that are used in productivity calculations. If labor productivity—output per hour worked—is rising, a natural next question is whether this is because the quality of labor has improved, because each unit of labor has more capital to work with, or for other reasons. As Zoghi explains, those attempting to account for changes in labor quality typically treat workers' relative wages as indicative of their relative quality. Between 1984 and 2004, data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) show that the share of hours worked by individuals with twenty-five or more years of experience increased by nearly 20 percentage points. In addition, the share of hours worked by persons with at least some education beyond high school rose by about 15 percentage points. Zoghi experiments with a variety of approaches to accounting for the effects of these and other changes in labor composition on labor productivity. Although there is some variation across the different specifications, the basic conclusion that changes in experience and education added roughly 10 percent to output per hour over the 1984 to 2004 period is robust to the different specifications Zoghi examines. In a comment on this chapter, Stephanie Aaronson urges the BLS to retain a measure of experience, rather than using age as a proxy for experience, in their labor composition model. Aaronson points out that experience is the correct concept from the standpoint of the human capital model and that women's experience, relative to age, has changed substantially over recent decades.

Improving the Data Infrastructure for Labor Economics Research

As noted, until quite recently, most empirical labor economics research has relied on data from large household surveys conducted either by the federal government or with federal government support. Several of the chapters analyze data from large *employer* surveys that to this point have been little exploited by researchers. The surveys analyzed include the National Compensation Survey (Pierce), the Occupational Employment Statistics survey (Abraham and Spletzer; Dey, Houseman, and Polivka), the Job Openings and Labor Turnover Survey (Davis, Faberman, Haltiwanger, and Rucker) and the Survey of Occupational Injuries and Illnesses (Nestoriak and Ruser). Although these employer survey data have great research potential, unlocking that potential is not a trivial task. It is to be hoped that a final contribution of the volume will be to encourage further work that makes use of these interesting data.

One logistical challenge to working with employer survey data collected by the federal government is that the need to protect the confidentiality of individual employer records generally precludes the release of public use data files of the sort that are common for household surveys. Though still not fully worked out, mechanisms for providing researcher access to these data are evolving (see Abraham [2005] for a discussion). More fundamental challenges arise as a consequence of the fact that none of the employer surveys used in the chapters we are discussing was designed with research uses in mind. Rather, each exists for the purpose of producing a particular set of published estimates. The design of the survey sample, the way in which the survey data are processed once they have been collected, the structure of the databases in which the survey responses are stored, and other aspects of the survey operations all are designed to support the survey's publication goals. In addition, written documentation of the sort that would enable an outside researcher to understand exactly how the survey data are collected and processed may be absent or difficult to obtain. In the same way that the community of scholars working with household survey data over a period of many years has produced a better understanding of these data and how they should be analyzed, it is to be hoped that the development of a community of scholars working with data from the various employer surveys will help to create the same sort of understanding about these data over time.

The chapters that follow are organized according to the substance of the topics with which they are concerned. The volume begins with four chapters that are focused on trends in compensation and job quality—Lemieux's chapter on wage inequality, Pierce's chapter on compensation inequality, Abraham and Spletzer's chapter on trends in job quality, and Hallock and Olson's chapter on the valuation of stock options. These are followed by four chapters that, in different ways, are concerned with labor market dynamics, job security and job attachment—the Davis, Faberman, Haltiwanger, and Rucker chapter on accessions and separations; the Farber chapter on job tenure and job loss; the Dey, Houseman, and Polivka chapter on contracting out; and the Jensen and Kletzer chapter on the potential susceptibility of different jobs to offshoring. Frazis and Stewart's chapter examines trends in hours of work. And the remaining three chapters have in common an interest in the effects of changing demographics on the labor market—Fallick, Fleischman, and Pingle's chapter looking at how demographic changes affect various labor market statistics; the Nestoriak and Ruser chapter focused on occupational injury and illness measures; and the Zoghi chapter concerned with productivity measurement. In addition to its twelve chapters, the volume includes written comments from a distinguished set of discussants who provide valuable perspectives on the research that is reported.

References

Abraham, Katharine G. 2005. Microdata access and labor market research: The U.S. experience. *Allgemeines Statistisches Archiv* 89 (12): 121–39.

Abraham, Katharine G., James R. Spletzer, and Jay C. Stewart. 1998. Divergent trends in alternative wage series. In *Labor statistics measurement issues,* ed. John C. Haltiwanger, Marilyn E. Manser, and Robert Topel, 292–324. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

———. 1999. Why do different wage series tell different stories? *American Economic Review* 89 (2): 34–39.

Perry, George. 1970. Changing labor markets and inflation. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity,* Issue no. 3:411–41. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Robinson, John, and Ann Bostrom. 1994. The overestimated workweek? What time-diary measures suggest. *Monthly Labor Review* 117 (8): 11–23.

Shimer, Robert. 1999. Why is the U.S. unemployment rate so much lower? In *NBER macroeconomics annual 1998,* ed. Ben S. Bernanke and Julio J. Rotemberg, 11–61. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Toossi, Mitra. 2002. A century of change: The U.S. labor force, 1950–2050. *Monthly Labor Review* 125 (May): 15–28.

———. 2007. Labor force projections to 2016: More workers in their golden years. *Monthly Labor Review* 130 (November): 33–52.

Tourangeau, Roger, Lance J. Rips, and Kenneth Rasinski. 2000. *The psychology of survey response.* Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.