From bricklayers to waiters: Reallocation in a deep recession *

Henry Redondo[†]

September 2, 2024

Abstract

This paper explores the influence of local sectoral composition on workers' adjustment to a major economic shock. Specifically, I analyze the impact of the employment decline in the Spanish construction sector during the Great Recession. For identification, I exploit regional variation in the intensity of the employment decline across Spanish provinces and detailed longitudinal administrative data. The findings reveal that construction workers in heavily exposed provinces experienced a substantial drop in total earnings between 2007 and 2012, consistent with the workers experiencing long periods of unemployment rather than wage cuts. Additionally, the analysis indicates that short-term labor market adjustment was predominantly intersectoral rather than interregional, even under asymmetric exposure to the shock. Next, I construct a *reallocation index*. This index captures the degree to which workers from the construction sector can reallocate to other sectors. Then, I examine how sectoral composition contributes to ameliorating the shock's impact. I provide evidence that workers' likelihood of changing sectors depends on having better outside opportunities in other sectors, which varies across provinces and workers' characteristics. Individuals with more evenly distributed characteristics across sectors were less affected by the shock because they were more likely to change sectors. This implies that, on average, workers are less likely to adapt to shocks when a region has a high sectoral concentration.

Keywords: J23, J31, J61

^{*}I am indebted to Jan Stuhler for his guidance and advice throughout the project. I also would like to thank Jesus Fernandez-Huertas, Clara Santamaría, Marco Manacorda, Juan Dolado, María Castellanos, Alvaro Delgado, Lidia Cruces, and Camila Steffens for valuable discussions at different stages of the project. I thank seminar participants at Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, University College London, and Queen Mary University of London for valuable feedback and suggestions. All errors are my own.

[†]Universidad de Alicante. email: henry.redondo@ua.es

1 Introduction

In recent years, workers have faced the significant consequences of two major economic crises — the Great Recession and the COVID-19 pandemic — alongside large economic shocks that have reshaped entire occupations and sectors. A growing body of literature quantifies these shocks' impacts on the labor market, with well-known examples including Chinese import competition and industrial robots' effects on the U.S. manufacturing sector (Acemoglu and Restrepo, 2022; Autor et al., 2013, 2014). However, little is known about how workers' heterogeneity affects their ability to adapt to such shocks. To create effective policies that support workers in a job loss event, it is necessary to understand how to mitigate earnings and employment losses and develop methods to identify the most vulnerable workers during hard times.

This paper studies the massive decline of the Spanish construction sector during the Great Recession. The article is divided into two main sections. First, I study the impact of the shock on workers' earnings trajectories and employment. For identification, I leverage regional variation in the intensity of the employment decline and exploit detailed longitudinal administrative data, which allows me to disentangle the effect of the shock from other possible confounders. Second, I examine the role of sectoral composition in determining workers' mitigation responses. To analyze adjustment paths, I construct a *reallocation index* that incorporates two potential sources of friction in worker reallocation: differences in a sector's suitability based on worker characteristics and disparities in job availability across regions due to spatial specialization patterns of economic sectors.

A large and expanding body of economic literature has identified that workers respond to fluctuations in their labor market outcomes through multiple mechanisms, with geographical and sectoral mobility being two of the most significant. In a seminal paper, Blanchard et al. (1992) found that the effects of local labor demand shocks on unemployment and labor force participation disappear within a decade, indicating that geographical mobility is the primary labor market adjustment mechanism. However, more recent research challenges this view, showing that regional disparities persist much longer (Amior and Manning, 2018; Dao et al., 2017) and that workers' migration responses are often limited (Autor et al., 2014; Dix-Carneiro and Kovak, 2017).

Given the limited response to migration as a mitigation strategy, exploring alternative responses in greater depth is important. One such alternative, which has gained recent attention, is sectoral mobility. This mechanism can mitigate the individual-level impacts of negative economic shocks by allowing workers to transition to less affected or growing sectors. However, substantial shifts from the most affected sectors to others are still relatively rare. A key reason is that workers often accumulate sector-specific human capital, making it costly to transition to a different sector (Neal 1995; Rogerson 2005).¹ An expanding body of research examines sectoral mobility, especially concerning trade shocks.² For instance, studies by Yi et al. (2024), Artuç et al. (2010), and Dix-Carneiro (2014) indicate that workers who shifted from the manufacturing sector in response to trade shocks experienced fewer earnings disruptions than those who changed jobs but remained within the manufacturing sector. However, sectoral mobility may be a relevant adjustment mechanism in other contexts.

In the first part of the analysis, I explore how local labor demand changes, induced by the shrinking of the construction sector, affect workers' earnings and employment outcomes. To capture this economic shock, I exploit the variation in the severity of employment declines in the construction sector across Spanish provinces.³ I measure workers' exposure to this shock by calculating the relative change in the employment share of the construction sector between 2007 and 2012 in their initial province of residence. The identifying assumption is that local employment contraction of the construction sector is as good as randomly assigned, conditional on observable characteristics.

The second part of the paper examines how differences in shock intensity across provinces, combined with detailed administrative panel data tracking workers' labor market histories, can shed light on how local sectoral compositions mitigate the impacts of job loss. I developed a *reallocation index* that quantifies the likelihood of workers transitioning from the construction sector to other sectors. This index accounts for the imperfect substitutability of workers across sectors by leveraging variations in sectoral composition and worker characteristics specific to each province.

My analysis relies on longitudinal data covering a worker's entire labor market history and unique characteristics. I utilize the Continuous Sample of Working Lives (MCVL), which provides detailed records for 4% of workers affiliated with Spain's Social Security. This comprehensive dataset tracks earnings and contract changes before and after the crisis, enabling the comparison of the shock's impact on workers' pre-recession earnings and employment trajectories.

I contribute primarily to two key areas of the literature: research on the impact of job loss on workers' labor market outcomes and how outside options influence reemployment opportunities. Several studies have established that job losses can have long-term effects

¹Sectoral reallocation has been extensively discussed, particularly in the context of trade literature (Mayer 1974; Kambourov 2009), and also, though less frequently, as a response mechanism to significant economic shocks (Carrington 1996; Arntz et al. 2022).

²Sectoral mobility can alleviate the negative impacts on workers' labor market outcomes more effectively than staying within the same sector.

³This approach follows the methodologies used by Autor et al. (2014) and Yagan (2019), who examined the effects of the Great Recession and the China trade shock on workers' earnings and employment trajectories, respectively.

on workers' earnings and employment trajectories across various contexts, including mass layoffs (Jacobson et al. 1993; Neal 1995; Farber 2017; Gulyas et al. 2019), economic downturns (Yagan 2019; Mian and Sufi 2014; Bachmann et al. 2015; Nagore García and van Soest 2017), and increased import competition from developing countries (Autor et al. 2014; Dix-Carneiro and Kovak 2017; Dauth et al. 2014). Despite this extensive research, there still needs to be more understanding of why earnings differentials persist and how workers specifically respond to negative shocks.⁴

This paper aims to address the existing gap in the literature by analyzing the significant shock experienced by the Spanish construction sector. By focusing on a well-defined cohort of workers directly and indirectly affected by this shock, I compare the consequences and adjustment strategies employed by these individuals. Leveraging high-quality administrative data, I examine how varying exposure to the shock influenced workers' long-term prospects, tracking changes in earnings and employment before and after the Great Recession. This approach offers new insights into the heterogeneous effects of the shock, highlighting how worker and regional characteristics shape the dynamics of its impact.

Previous research has emphasized the equalizing effect of geographical mobility in reducing regional disparities. However, the effectiveness at the individual worker level is less clear. Specifically, studies comparing regions differently affected by economic shocks have found that the primary impact is a reduction in in-migration rates (Dustmann et al. 2017; Gathmann et al. 2020), despite classical references suggesting that increased out-migration rates serve as an equalizing force (Blanchard et al., 1992). Furthermore, Marinescu and Rathelot (2018) and Manning and Petrongolo (2017) discovered that the distance to available job vacancies discourages job searches, contributing to the low geographical mobility observed during economic downturns.

Given these findings, exploring additional adjustment mechanisms, such as sectoral mobility, is crucial, as it can significantly impact workers' ability to adapt. Studies by Utar (2018) in Denmark, Dix-Carneiro (2014) in Brazil, and Walker (2013) in the U.S. have shown that while sectoral mobility may be modest relative to the number of workers affected by a shock, it plays a crucial role in labor market adjustments, supporting earlier findings by Carrington (1996). By examining regional and detailed worker characteristics, my research adds to this discussion by assessing the importance of geographical and sectoral mobility in responding to a significant economic shock.

Additionally, I contribute to the expanding literature that estimates the similarity of job requirements across occupations or industries. Previous studies have examined this

⁴Certain groups, such as college graduates (Wozniak 2010) and foreign workers (Cadena and Kovak 2016), have been observed to respond more actively to adverse conditions by relocating to less affected regions.

by analyzing mobility flows among occupations or industries (Shaw 1987; Schubert et al. 2020), skill and task similarities (Macaluso et al. 2017; Gathmann and Schönberg 2010), and similarities in worker composition and qualifications (Caldwell and Danieli, 2024). Following that literature, I constructed a reallocation index that captures the most likely transitions by leveraging worker similarities between sectors. At the regional level, this measure helps estimate how changes in the composition of jobs influence employment opportunities.

Identifying the relevant labor market for each worker is essential for evaluating how job composition influences employment opportunities. Schubert et al. (2019) used worker flows to identify local job opportunities, finding that labor market concentration significantly affects wages. Their approach captures asymmetrical transition probabilities through worker flows but assumes stable job transitions between occupations and industries, an assumption that may not hold during recessions. To address this, I capture industry similarity by comparing sectoral workforces, following the approach of Caldwell and Danieli (2024), who developed an index to measure the value of workers' outside options in Germany. I extend this by creating a reallocation index that predicts the most likely transitions, accounting for sector suitability based on local specialization and worker characteristics.

Beaudry et al. (2012) showed that shifts in the availability of high-wage jobs within a region can have substantial wage spillover effects, impacting workers' outside options and influencing their compensation through wage bargaining. Building on this, I suggest that variations in local sectoral composition may also shape workers' adjustment opportunities, affecting wages in the short term and having a lasting impact as workers face challenges in regaining their previous earnings trajectories.

Two papers closely related to this are Macaluso et al. (2017), which explored how the outcomes of laid-off workers vary depending on the similarity of local occupations, and Yi et al. (2024), which used labor market transitions to show that workers in inflexible labor markets—regions where sectors with similar skill requirements are scarce—experience greater impacts from mass layoffs. The latter study developed an index to capture the potential reallocation of workers from a specific sector, emphasizing the importance of skill transferability across sectors. However, both studies focus on regional differences rather than how workers within the same labor market might respond differently to an identical shock. Contributing to this literature, I show that sector composition significantly influenced the likelihood of finding a suitable job match during the Great Recession, considering worker characteristics and other relevant regional factors.

My results show that individuals initially employed in the construction sector and working in more exposed provinces earned less and remained employed for fewer days between 2007 and 2012 compared to those in less exposed provinces. Conditional on the initial province of residence, the difference between the 75th and 25th percentiles of exposure results in an additional cumulative earnings loss of 20% of the initial annual earnings between 2007 and 2012. This impact is mainly due to a decline in employment rather than wages. Compared to those in the five most affected provinces, workers in the five least affected provinces accumulated, on average, 290 extra days of employment during the recession. Furthermore, the heterogeneity analysis indicates that young workers experienced the most significant declines in employment.

Moreover, my analysis reveals that workers adapted mainly through intersectoral mobility rather than geographical relocation. By 2015, the number of workers transitioning to different sectors was four times higher than those opting for a change in province of residence. In addition, workers in the worst-hit provinces were less likely to remain in the construction sector after the Great Recession. In contrast, there was no significant impact on their likelihood of moving into a new province. In line with the recent empirical literature, sectoral mobility tends to be more prevalent than geographical reallocation.

In light of this insufficient adjustment via geographical migration, I found a statistically significant relationship between exposure to the shock and the likelihood of reallocating to another sector. A worker with an average value on the *reallocation index* suffered a 40% weaker average impact on cumulative earnings between 2007 and 2012. Moving from the second to the third quartile of the *reallocation index* results in a 33% milder shock to earnings and employment. Sectoral composition plays an important role in explaining the heterogeneous impact of the employment decline on worker outcomes. Because the value of certain skills differs based on the sectoral composition of the local economy, it is important to consider the size and variance of the shock by worker and region.

Finally, the results in this paper are robust to several sensitivity tests. A falsification exercise indicates no relative downward employment trend in severely shocked areas before the recession, corroborating the identification. The results on the reallocation index are robust when using transition probabilities while constructing the index, as I find similar results compared to the main specification. Furthermore, the results remain mostly unaffected when the sector's cumulative growth before the recession instruments the shock.

I begin in Section 2 by providing background information on the contraction of employment in the construction sector. Section 3 details the Spanish data used in this article. In Section 4, I introduce the reallocation index. Section 5 presents the results, focusing on the impact of the employment decline in the construction sector at the worker level. Section 6 analyzes workers' adjustment mechanisms and the outcomes related to reallocation probabilities. Finally, Section 7 covers robustness checks, and Section 8 concludes.



Figure 1: Employment share of workers in the Spanish construction sector, 1995-2019

Notes: Presents the proportion of workers in Spain's construction sector from January 1995 to December 2017. The data is restricted to monthly observations of workers aged 20-60 employed during the referenced period. The shaded area comprises the years of the Great Recession in Spain, between 2008 and 2014.

2 Background

According to the Spanish Labor Force Survey, the construction sector employed 2.7 million workers during the first quarter of 2008. However, over the next four years, employment in this sector dropped by more than 50%, decreasing to 1.2 million by 2012. Figure 1, based on data from Spanish administrative records, illustrates this decline, showing the construction sector's employment share dropping from 13% to 6% of total employment between 2008 and 2012.⁵ Additionally, the figure shows no significant signs of recovery over the following nine years, with the employment share in 2019 remaining well below pre-recession levels. The trajectory of Spain's construction sector before and after the Great Recession is notably different from that of other countries. For example, Appendix Figure A5 illustrates the evolution of employment in the construction sector in the United States, demonstrating that the Spanish case is not merely an example of typical construction sector trends during the business cycle.

Table 1 provides descriptive statistics of construction workers before and after the Great Recession. For this sample of workers, fixed-term contract employees constituted

⁵In the appendix, Figures A1 and A2 present equivalent figures by restricting the sample to male and native workers, respectively. Additionally, Figure A3 compares employment in the construction sector to that in Spain's largest sector, manufacturing.

64.1% of total employment in 2007 but were down to 28.6% by 2012.⁶ According to Bentolila et al. (2012), fixed-term contracts' hiring flexibility promoted construction sector growth. The reason is that it simplifies hiring workers in an economic activity that relies on pre-specified contract time. In the Spanish labor market, the implementation of temporary contracts increased employer flexibility, a policy aimed to reduce the unemployment rate. However, as a side effect, the decline in employment shares of workers employed under such contracts during the Great Recession shows how vulnerable they are to economic fluctuations.

Additionally, Table 1 indicates that the proportion of young, low-skilled, and foreign workers decreased during the Great Recession. Does this evidence suggest that these workers were the most affected by the recession? Not necessarily. Although workers with these characteristics were indeed among the most vulnerable, as shown by the decline in employment within each group, the sector also underwent significant changes in the composition of both newcomers (Table A1) and leavers (Table A2). The number of young workers entering the sector diminished, and the demographic composition of those leaving evolved during that time.

Examining how workers adjusted to job loss is crucial to determining who was most affected. The following sections delve deeper into the employment changes within the sector, identifying the individuals most impacted by the employment contraction.

2.1 Employment decomposition

Over the last two decades, the construction sector has experienced significant employment fluctuations. To better understand the sector's evolution, I examined employment shifts from 2004 to 2017, categorizing the sector's inflows and outflows into non-employment, unemployment, and employment outside the sector.

I define the inflow rate to the construction sector at time t as follows:

$$Inflows_{k,t} = \frac{I_{k,t}}{N_{t-1}},$$

where $I_{k,t}$ denotes the number of individuals entering the construction sector from status k, whether inflows come from unemployment, non-employment, or other sectors at time t. Similarly, I define the outflow rate from the construction sector at time t as:

⁶The use of fixed-term contracts in Spain was liberalized early with the labor reform in 1984. Subsequently, it became usual for workers to follow a long sequence of temporary contracts in Spain.

	2004	2007	2012	2017
Age				
< 24	0.162	0.132	0.043	0.030
24-35	0.452	0.449	0.362	0.237
35-45	0.244	0.272	0.370	0.410
45<	0.143	0.147	0.225	0.323
Average age	33.6	34.3	38.1	40.7
Education				
Below secondary	0.764	0.753	0.661	0.675
Secondary	0.153	0.158	0.195	0.185
Tertiary	0.083	0.089	0.143	0.140
Type of contract				
Part-time	0.038	0.038	0.077	0.092
Fixed-term	0.727	0.666	0.478	0.508
Foreign born	0.157	0.270	0.187	0.191
Occupations				
Very-high skilled occupations	0.020	0.023	0.049	0.043
High skilled occupations	0.043	0.046	0.078	0.069
Medium-high skilled occupations	0.053	0.054	0.084	0.073
Medium-low skilled occupations	0.579	0.599	0.629	0.640
Low skilled occupations	0.305	0.278	0.161	0.175

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of workers in the construction sector

Notes: In the table above, we find the main characteristics of workers in the construction sector in 2004, 2007, 2012, and 2017.

$$Outflows_{k,t} = \frac{O_{k,t}}{N_{t-1}},$$

where, $O_{k,t}$ denote the number of individuals leaving the construction sector for status k at time t, where k indicates whether the worker is non-employed, becomes unemployed, or transitions to another sector. In both equations, N_{t-1} represents the total number of workers in the construction sector at time t - 1. For comparison, I present the yearly employment change in the construction sector. Defined as:

$$EmploymentChange_{t} = \frac{Empl.Construction_{t}}{Empl.Construction_{t-1}} - 1.$$

The results of this decomposition are illustrated in Figure 2. Panels (a) and (b) display the inflows and outflows, respectively. In both panels, the blue bars represent the relative changes in construction employment.

Panel (a) shows that inflows from unemployment, non-employment, and other sectors followed a similar trend during most years. During this period, inflows from nonemployment were the primary drivers of employment growth, particularly during the construction boom. Notably, in 2006, the proportion of inflows from non-employment surged from 15% to 22% of the construction sector's workforce, largely due to an increase in the migrant population. This spike can be attributed to the large-scale legalization of foreign-born workers in Spain in 2005 (Moraga et al., 2019), significantly boosting the number of immigrants registered with Social Security, thereby impacting employment in the construction sector. Table 1 shows that the proportion of foreign-born workers rose from 15.7% in 2004 to 27.9% just before the Great Recession. Additionally, during the expansionary period, relatively high wages were offered to low-educated workers, prompting many young individuals to leave education and enter the sector (Lacuesta et al., 2020), further contributing to the large inflows from non-employment before the Great Recession.

As illustrated in Figure 2, outflows to other sectors contribute only a small portion of the overall employment decline. However, aggregate flows mask the individual dynamics of workers' decisions, complicating the assessment of their adjustment processes. To address this, I focused the analysis on workers employed in the construction sector in 2007. I track their employment status annually and categorize their transitions into five scenarios: remaining with the same firm, moving to a different firm within the same sector and province, relocating to another region, transitioning to a different sector within the same region, or becoming unemployed/non-employed.

The results from this analysis are presented in Figure 3, highlighting three main ob-



Figure 2: Aggregate flows from/to the construction sector

(a) Inflows to the construction sector



Notes: Panel (a) Inflows to the construction sector: individuals that one year before were in another sector, non-employment or unemployment as a proportion of the workers in t-1. Panel (b) Outflows from the construction sector that one year before were in another sector, non-employment or unemployment as a proportion of workers in t-1. The sample is restricted to yearly observations between 2003 and 2017 of workers aged 18-60.



Figure 3: Working status of individuals employed in the construction sector in 2007

Notes: The shares are computed based on workers in the construction sector in 2007, and every year, I tracked their working status up to 2015. The sample is limited to native workers employed in the construction sector in 2007.



Figure 4: Characteristics of workers initially in the construction sector by employment status in 2013

Notes: Panel (a) Average age in 2007 of workers in the construction sector by status in 2013. Panel (b) Share of foreign workers in the construction sector by status in 2012. The sample is restricted to workers in the construction sector in 2007 aged 20-55 years old.

servations.⁷ First, most construction workers lost their jobs during the housing bubble collapse. By 2015, only 10 percent of these workers had retained their 2007 positions, and just 20 percent remained in the construction sector. Second, 42 percent of workers in the construction sector in 2007 were no longer employed by 2015. This group includes the unemployed, international migrants, individuals working in the informal sector, and those completely out of the workforce.

Finally, the results suggest that moving to another sector becomes more important as overall adjustment increases. By 2015, approximately 30% of former construction workers had secured employment outside the sector, compared to a smaller proportion who had migrated and remained employed in the construction sector. Shortly after the housing bubble burst, a substantial number of workers relocated to different provinces; in 2008, 5.5% of workers resided in a different province than in 2007. However, this percentage showed little change over the next three years, increasing by only three percentage points. In contrast, the proportion of workers who transitioned to different sectors rose significantly, from 9% to 30% of the reference population during the same period.

The decline in employment within the construction sector can be attributed to various factors. However, this analysis does not address long-term earnings or employment losses. It is well-documented that job loss has significant and enduring negative effects on workers' outcomes. Understanding which workers are most vulnerable and how they adjust is crucial for assessing the impact of such negative shocks. Consequently, it is important to

⁷Appendix A6 provides a similar graph for high-skill workers, who were largely unaffected by the shock. Additionally, Appendix A7 shows the same graph for construction sector workers in 2003, offering a comparison of employment status changes before the Recession.

determine which types of workers are most likely to occupy different employment statuses following the housing bust.

Figure 4 shows the average age and the proportion of foreign-born workers in the different categories of working status in 2013. As stated above, these results are based on the sample of workers employed in the construction sector in 2007. According to the results, workers who changed regions or sectors are younger than those who stayed in the construction sector or stayed unemployed. Over the past decade, a large fraction of workers have been employed in temporary contracts. The situation is much more prevalent among young workers waiting for permanent positions. Because of this, those workers are more vulnerable to job loss during a recession because they may be dismissed at a much lower cost than similar workers in permanent positions. Still, they also have more flexible human capital due to lower tenure and job-specific experience, which makes them optimal to change sector or region as the opportunity cost to change is smaller compared to workers with more specific human capital (Neal 1995; Gathmann and Schönberg 2010).

Panel (b) indicates that foreign workers are disproportionately represented among those in non-working conditions and those who changed regions. This aligns with the propensity for foreign workers to migrate more frequently (Cadena and Kovak, 2016). Additionally, the evidence in Appendix D.2 shows that foreign workers in the most affected regions are more likely to be missing from administrative records. Since Spain's data does not track workers who leave the country, this largely accounts for the higher proportion of unobserved foreign workers during this period, reflecting their return migration. After returning to their home countries, individuals may experience reduced cumulative earnings, not necessarily due to lower wages or reduced work hours, but because they are no longer captured in the data. To mitigate this measurement bias, the remainder of the analysis focuses exclusively on native workers.

Spain's economic expansion period was marked by significant changes, including a rise in temporary contracts, a substantial influx of foreign workers, and increased availability of land for construction, leading to a notable increase in construction employment. During this period, many workers transitioned to other sectors, as highlighted earlier. Panel (a) of Figure 5 illustrates the sharp decline in construction employment alongside growth in other sectors, such as the hospitality sector. In contrast, many other sectors experienced relative stability.

Is there a complete reallocation of workers from the shrinking construction sector to the growing hospitality sector? The short answer is no. While the contraction in construction employment impacted all Spanish provinces, the unique sectoral composition of each region meant that affected workers were influenced by local labor market conditions. This underscores the critical role of individual skills in sectoral reallocation. Adjustments



Figure 5: Cumulative employment growth and destination sector of switchers

Notes: Panel (a) Sector of destination as the proportion of total movers by year from the construction sector, 2004-2017. Panel (b) Cumulative yearly employment growth per sector, 2005-2017.

are not solely driven by the costs or likelihood of sector switching but also by the relative demand for specific skill sets. To explore this further, Panel (b) of Figure 5 shows how construction sector workers transitioned to various other sectors, revealing the heterogeneity that will be used to develop a reallocation index.

2.2 Province level impact

The initial employment share and the extent of employment contraction in the construction sector during the Great Recession varied significantly across Spanish provinces.⁸ My empirical analysis leverages these regional disparities in job opportunities to examine the asymmetric impact of the recession.

Figure 6 shows that the initial employment share of the construction sector across provinces ranged from 6.8% to 24.14%, with higher shares observed in southern provinces.⁹ For example, Gipuzkoa, Araba, and Barcelona had less than 10% construction employment shares, while southern provinces such as Ciudad Real, Huelva, and Malaga had shares exceeding 20%. The contraction in construction employment also varied significantly by province, with reductions ranging from 14.7% to 70.3% of 2007 employment levels.

⁸March 2006 is the baseline period because there were no signs of contraction then; the downturn only began to emerge in the fourth quarter of 2007 (see Figure 1).

 $^{^{9}}$ For easier interpretation, Figure A5 in the appendix presents the same data with the names of each province labeled.

Figure 6: The share of workers in the construction sector by province during the Great Recession.



Notes: Change in the employment share of the construction sector by province between 2007 and 2012 against employment share in 2006. The computation of employment shares is based on yearly data. The sample considers the 50 Spanish provinces and all workers employed each year in April.

3 Data

The primary data sources are the 2006 to 2021 editions of the *Muestra Continua de Vidas Laborales* (MCVL), best translated as "Continuous Sample of Working Lives." The raw data represents 4% of the Spanish population registered with Social Security (workers, recipients of unemployment benefits, and pensioners). The observational unit tracks any change in the individual's job status or variation in their characteristics.

This rich dataset is built from Spanish administrative files matching Social Security, income tax, and census records. The data has a longitudinal design: those initially sampled are also selected yearly, as long as they still have a relationship with Social Security. The benefit of using multiple waves of the MCVL is the expansion of the dataset. Each year, the sample is refreshed by replacing individuals who leave Social Security with new individuals, thus allowing the tracking of the new individuals' complete labor market history.

The MCVL provides detailed earnings information derived from Social Security and tax records. Earnings data from Social Security records are available from 1980 or the beginning of an individual's career for those who entered the workforce later. However, these records are subject to upper and lower limits adjusted yearly based on inflation and labor market conditions. In contrast, tax records offer more comprehensive earnings data and are available only between 2006 and 2021. Despite this limitation, it is a minor issue since my primary analysis focuses on earnings from 2007 to 2013. Therefore, I prioritize using tax record earnings when available. For regions like the Basque Country and Navarre, which manage income taxes independently from the Spanish government, tax records are not accessible. In these instances, I rely on Social Security earnings data.¹⁰

Using the MCVL, I build a monthly panel covering 2000 to 2019. This data combines individual, firm, and job characteristics. It includes information on the worker's gender, educational attainment, date of birth, activity sector at the two-digit level, province of the establishment, occupational contribution group, and monthly earnings or unemployment benefits. The raw data has information on each employment spell's entry and exit date, which I use to compute individual experiences and the number of monthly days employed. I use the number of employed days within the month to transform the yearly earnings from tax records into daily earnings, simplifying the comparison with the monthly earnings available from Social Security records.

3.1 Sample restrictions

I restricted my analysis to individuals registered in the general Social Security regime or the special regime for agrarian, seamen, and mining workers. This restriction excludes selfemployed workers due to the lack of reliable information on earnings and days worked. The regional information considers only the 50 Spanish provinces, excluding the two autonomous cities of Ceuta and Melilla, due to their limited size.

I created two sub-samples for analysis. The first, the Complete Sample, is used to construct all descriptive evidence. This is a monthly panel from January 2000 to December 2019, restricted to active workers aged 18 to 60. The second sub-sample, the Estimation Sample, focuses specifically on native workers who were employed in the construction sector before the Great Recession and follows their data from January 2007 to December 2013.

To estimate and analyze the impact of the shock, I focus on workers with a strong attachment to the construction sector, defined as those who were employed in the sector for at least one year between 2005 and 2006. These individuals are more likely to be affected by the sector's employment contraction than those with weaker ties. For the primary

¹⁰Bonhomme and Hospido (2017) compares earnings from tax and Social Security records, noting that discrepancies primarily affect the top end of the earnings distribution, around the 90th percentile. Since construction workers typically fall below the median of the earnings distribution, both sources of earnings data are deemed comparable.

analysis, I calculated cumulative earnings from 2007 to 2012. To ensure robustness, the sample was restricted to individuals aged 20 to 50 in 2007, minimizing potential bias from early retirements. Additionally, earnings data were adjusted using a price index to account for inflation, ensuring that price fluctuations over the business cycle do not distort the results.

4 Reallocation probabilities

I adopt a probabilistic approach to defining the relevant labor market, similar to the method used by Schubert et al. (2020). Job opportunities are determined by workers' matching probabilities with each sector and the local size of each sector. I assume that workers receive job offers based on how well their characteristics align with the requirements of other sectors' workforces.¹¹ This alignment is captured by the term:

$$p_{j,i} = \frac{P(X = X_i, J = j)}{P(X = X_i)P(J = j)}.$$
(1)

Equation (1) represents the likelihood that a worker i is hired in a firm in sector j. $P(X = X_i, J = j)$ is the probability of observing a match between a worker with characteristics X_i and a job in sector j. $P(X = X_i)P(J = j)$ is the product of the marginal distributions for worker characteristics and the firm sector. This product is the probability of observing a match with such characteristics under a random assignment. The basic intuition for this result is that the probability of observing i matched with j depends on the frequency and accountability for the total measure of workers and jobs with such observables.

I aggregate the propensities across all sectors, weighting them by each sector's employment share P(J = j | R = r). This weighting reflects the random matching aspect of the framework, where a worker's likelihood of receiving a job offer is influenced by the size of the sector relative to their characteristics X_i . Rearranging the terms, I derive the following expression for the reallocation index:

¹¹In Section 7, I employ an alternative measure that utilizes transition probabilities conditional on the worker's characteristics.

$$Reallocation(X_i, r) = \sum_j \frac{P(J=j, X=X_i)}{P(X=X_i)P(J=j)} P(J=j|R=r)$$
$$= \sum_j \frac{P(J=j, X=X_i)}{P(X=X_i)} \frac{P(J=j|R=r)}{P(J=j)}$$
$$= \sum_j P(J=j|X=X_i) \frac{Share_j^r}{Share_j}$$
(2)

4.1 Computation of the reallocation index

This section outlines the procedure for estimating the reallocation index, which is used to determine the job options available to each worker during the recession. This index leverages cross-sectional allocations of observably similar workers across sectors before the Great Recession. The baseline assignment, a key component, evaluates workers' suitability for positions in each sector based on their observable characteristics, as detailed in equation (3). To estimate the probability of employment in each sector, it is necessary to consider both the worker's characteristics and the relative employment size of each sector within each province. Consequently, the estimation process is divided into two steps.

First, I estimate the likelihood of observing a match between a worker and a firm in each sector based on a given set of worker characteristics X_i . The MCVL consists of pairs of matches between workers and employers, allowing me to approximate workers' employment probabilities in each sector. Second, I weigh the prior probabilities by the sector's employment share in the worker's province of residence before the shock. During the Great Recession, workers' geographical mobility was limited. As a result, the distribution of jobs in their province of residence before the recession is a good proxy for each individual's local labor market.

$$Reallocation(X_i, r) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} \mathbb{P}(J_f = j | X_i) \frac{EmplShare_j^r}{EmplShare_j}.$$
(3)

The two-step process is as follows. First, I use actual worker allocations in different sectors from 2000-2004, focusing on the entire population of workers not employed in the construction sector during those years.¹² I regress an indicator variable for the sector of the individual's firm on various worker characteristics, including skill level in the occupa-

¹²The results are not significantly different when I use different time windows.

tion, gender, foreign-born status, and interactions between age categories and educational attainment. From the estimated coefficients, I derive the predicted probabilities for the estimation sample. This step captures the likelihood of a plausible match between a worker i and a sector j, and is repeated for each sector.¹³

In the second step, I combine the predicted values using weights based on the ratio of the employment share of sector j in province r to the employment share of sector j in the entire economy. These weights were measured in 2006 to avoid potential biases from employment changes due to the Great Recession. Finally, to simplify interpretation, the reallocation index is standardized so that its mean is zero and unitary standard deviation.

Consider a scenario where jobs are randomly allocated across regions. In this situation, the sectoral composition of each region's local economy mirrors that of the aggregate economy. This means that similar workers would face an equivalent set of labor market options, regardless of their province of residence. In such a case, we expect heterogeneity in the shock's impact based on worker characteristics, but not between provinces. However, in practice, a significant impact heterogeneity is not explained by workers' characteristics. Workers may be more or less fortunate depending on how well their characteristics are valued in their region of residence. This variation in local sectoral composition, largely influenced by regional differences, means that workers might have more or fewer job options that match their observed characteristics. Consequently, even with identical exposure to the shock, similar workers can have vastly different prospects based on their region of residence, underscoring the urgent need to understand and address these disparities.

5 Worker level impact: Employment decline in the construction sector

5.1 Static analysis

This section explores the impact of the shock to the construction sector on workers' earnings and employment trajectories. The analysis is based on the estimation sample described in Section 3, which includes native workers with strong attachment to the construction sector before the Great Recession. These highly-attached workers were employed in the sector for at least 12 months between 2005 and 2006. The key assumption is that the local employment contraction in the construction sector is as good as random, conditional on observable characteristics. The estimated impact compares workers with similar characteristics, differing only by their province of residence before the Great Recession.

 $^{^{13}}$ I consider 13 sectors, which are enumerated in Appendix C.

The baseline specification in this section takes the form:

$$y_i = \theta Shock_i^r + \mathbf{X}_i'\beta + \epsilon_i, \tag{4}$$

where y_i represents the normalized cumulative earnings of individual *i*. Cumulative earnings are worker's earnings from January 2007 through December 2012, divided by the 2005-2006 average annual earnings. Normalizing by average earnings is equivalent to the approach by Autor et al. (2014) and Yagan (2019), which helps assess the shock's effect on the earnings evolution and interpret the future results in terms of pre-shock earnings.¹⁴

Shock_i^r is the change in the employment share in the worker's initial province of residence between 2007 and 2012.¹⁵ X_i represents individual worker and regional characteristics measured at baseline. The full set of controls includes gender, occupational skill level, tenure, experience, an indicator variable for fixed-term and part-time contracts, and interactions between age categories with educational attainment, all at the worker's 2007 values. Additionally, I consider regional controls measured in 2006, including the construction sector's employment share and the unemployment rate in the province of worker residence, a Bartik-type variable that accounts for differential demand shocks in the other sectors, used to capture the overall diversity of the local sectoral composition. The results will indicate whether these controls vary across different model specifications.

In Table 2, I present the baseline estimates of equation (4). Column (1) includes the shock variable and a complete set of age dummies, which interact with the worker's gender and educational attainment to account for variations in life cycle earnings. The results suggest that, on average, workers in the most exposed provinces who were initially employed in the construction sector experienced a greater reduction in cumulative earnings between 2007 and 2012 compared to their counterparts in the least exposed regions. Specifically, cumulative earnings for an average worker in the least affected provinces during the Great Recession decreased by approximately 0.75 times their initial annual earnings. In contrast, the decrease in the most affected provinces was around 2.62 times their initial annual earnings. In Column (2), baseline job characteristics such as occupation skill group, contract type, tenure, and experience fixed effects are added. The main coefficient in this regression is reduced by 35 percent compared to the results in Column (1), yet it is still evident the significant impact of the shock on worker's earnings.

¹⁴This approach also addresses the undefined log earnings in cases where earnings are zero.

 $^{{}^{15}}Shock_i^r = \frac{emplShare_{2012}^r}{emplShare_{2002}^r}$ -1, where $emplShare_t^r$ represents the employment share in the construction sector at region t in period t.

¹⁶The Bartik controls for differential employment trends in non-construction sectors. It is constructed as $\sum_{j=1}^{12} ln \left(\frac{Employment_{2012}^j}{Employment_{2007}^j}\right) Share_r^j$. Here, $Employment_t^j$ accounts for the number of workers in sector j at time t and $Share_r^j$ is the share of workers in sector j in region r.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)		
		0	OLS				
		Cumulativ	e earnings,	2007-2012			
Shock	-3.704***	-2.723***	-1.956***	-2.028***	-2.244***		
	(0.458)	(0.306)	(0.274)	(0.299)	(0.598)		
Constant	5.574***	6.692***	6.765***	6.810***	6.830***		
	(0.277)	(0.306)	(0.229)	(0.234)	(0.271)		
Observations	45,370	45,370	$45,\!370$	$45,\!370$	45,296		
R^2	.108	.197	.200	.201	.199		
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		

Table 2: Cumulative earnings impact from the employment decline of the construction sector, 2007-2012

Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the province level

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Column (1) adds interactions of age categories with gender and education. Column (2) adds occupational skill group categories, indicators for part-time and fixed-term contracts, tenure, and experience fixed effects. Column (3) adds regional controls: local unemployment rate and employment share of the construction sector in 2006, a Bartik-type shock, and the HHI index. Column (4) considers the shock of the change in total workers in the construction sector between 2007 and 2012 a shock. Column (5) instruments the decline of the employment share of the construction sector with the cumulative growth rate of the construction sector between 2000 and 2006.

Column (3) presents my preferred specification. In this model, I include regional controls and a Bartik-type shock to account for demand shocks in other sectors during the Great Recession. The Bartik-type variable captures variations in demand across sectors, ensuring that the coefficient for the construction sector shock is not confounded by positive or negative shocks in other sectors during the study period. This approach mitigates concerns about correlated shocks affecting other sectors and provides a more accurate estimate of the impact of the construction sector shock. To interpret the coefficient estimates of this specification, consider two workers residing in provinces in the 75th and 25th percentile of exposure, respectively: Valencia, where the employment decline in the construction sector was 59.34%, and Badajoz, where it was 45.53%. On average, workers experienced a greater impact due to higher exposure to the construction sector's employment decline. A construction worker in Valencia would accumulate 27% fewer earnings than a similar worker in Badajoz.

Finally, Columns (4) and (5) address potential sources of bias that could influence the results. One concern is that changes in the overall population of a province might distort the estimated employment share in the construction sector, leading to measurement bias. To mitigate this issue, I kept the number of workers employed in each province constant between 2007 and 2012. This adjustment ensures that the shock measure reflects changes in the number of workers employed specifically in the construction sector, independent of

employment shifts in other sectors.¹⁷

The results of this adjusted measure are presented in Column (4). After this adjustment, the main coefficient is slightly attenuated, with a 3.7% reduction in the estimated coefficient. This minor change suggests that while population dynamics may have influenced the original estimates, the overall impact of the construction sector shock remains robust. The adjusted specification further strengthens the validity of the findings by ensuring that the estimated effect is more accurately attributed to changes in construction sector employment rather than broader population or employment shifts.

Supply-side factors likely mitigate the contraction effects in the construction sector. When workers leave the province or exit the formal labor market, the overall decline in job opportunities for those who remain employed in the construction sector is reduced. In Column (5), I present results that employ an instrumental variable approach to capture the demand-side component of the shock on individual outcomes.

The instrument used in this analysis is based on the cumulative employment growth in the construction sector between 2000 and 2006 in the worker's province of residence. This approach takes advantage of the observation that regions that experienced significant growth during the housing boom are also more likely to face severe downturns. Notably, the cumulative growth in the construction sector before the Great Recession is uncorrelated with earnings during the recession, thus satisfying the exclusion restriction.

Column (5) shows a 14.7% increase in the coefficient of interest, indicating a stronger relationship between the demand-side shock and individual outcomes. However, I maintain the results from Column (3) as my preferred estimation since the findings are consistent across both models. This consistency reinforces the robustness of the conclusions drawn regarding the impact of the construction sector shock on workers' earnings while acknowledging the additional insights provided by the instrumental variable approach.

The observed impact on workers' cumulative earnings may arise from changes in the extensive margin, which reflects a reduction in years worked, or the intensive margin, which indicates a decrease in yearly earnings. This relationship is explored in Table 3, where all specifications control for the same variables as those in Column (3) of Table 2. Column (1) presents the impact on normalized cumulative earnings as in the previous results. Column (2) examines the total number of days a worker was formally employed between 2007 and 2012, converting this number into years for easier interpretation. Column (3) analyzes average annual earnings over the same period. To assess the relative magnitude of these effects, Panel (B) conducts similar analyses for a sample of workers

¹⁷The adjusted shock is calculated as: $Shock = \frac{Empl.CS_{2012}}{Empl.CS_{2007}} - 1$. As a result, the shock only captures changes in employment in the construction sector, independent of other sectoral variations in employment.

Figure 7: The cumulative growth in the construction sector and employment decline of the construction by province



Notes: Monthly share of construction workers, January 2004 to December 2017. The data is restricted to workers aged 20-60 employed during the reference period.

who were not employed in the construction sector, allowing for a comparison of how these dynamics differ across sectors and highlighting how much the burst in the construction sector affected worker's employment trajectories.

Column (2) from Panel (A) illustrates that the average worker in the construction sector at the 25th percentile of exposure accumulated 0.23 fewer years of employment than those in a province at the 75th percentile. Meanwhile, Column (2) of Panel (B) indicates that workers outside the construction sector experienced a slight decline in working days between 2007 and 2012 due to the shock. In Column (3), I find no significant difference in average earnings between workers in the construction sector and those in other sectors. This evidence suggests that the impact on workers' earnings trajectories is primarily driven by reduced employment opportunities, highlighting the significant role of non-employment in explaining the overall decline in cumulative earnings.

5.2 Dynamic analysis

Figure 8 illustrates the time series of estimated coefficients from to the decline in employment within the construction sector, highlighting its effects on workers' employment status and annual earnings. Each data point in year t represents the coefficients derived from equation (4) within the estimation sample:

	(1)	(2)	(3)		
	Cumulative earnings	Employment	Average earnings		
Panel A: Workers initially employed in the construction sector					
Shock	-1.956***	-1.672***	-0.00176		
	(0.274)	(0.177)	(0.00364)		
~					
Constant	6.765^{***}	5.235^{***}	0.105^{***}		
	(0.229)	(0.0967)	(0.00332)		
Observations	45370	45370	45370		
R^2	.2009	.2697	.0266		
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes		
Panel B: We	orkers initially not emp	loyed in the cor	nstruction sector		
Shock	-0.349	-0.557***	0.00597		
	(0.183)	(0.148)	(0.00419)		
C I I	F COF***		0.0000***		
Constant	5.605^{***}	4.575^{***}	0.0920***		
	(0.135)	(0.0851)	(0.00366)		
Observations	301229	301229	301229		
R^2	.1387	.2510	.0542		
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes		

Table 3: Worker's impact in earnings and employment from the decline in construction employment

Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the province level

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: In each regression, I control for gender, occupation skill level, education, age, and foreign-born status. (i) Odd columns present evidence for a sample of non-construction sector workers, while (ii) even columns are restricted to workers in the construction sector in 2007. I restricted the sample to workers less than 50 years old in 2007 to avoid complications from workers' early retirement before 2012. Shock measures the relative changes in the share of workers in the construction sector by province. Bartik shock measures trends in employment growth in non-construction sectors.

$$y_{it} = Shock_i^r \beta_0 + \mathbf{X}_i^\prime \Delta + \epsilon_{it}.$$
 (5)

 y_{it} represents the labor market outcome for worker *i* in year *t*, including the binary employment status and the annual earnings. $Shock_i^r$ denotes the local shock to the individual's *i* initial province of residence. \mathbf{X}_i is a vector of individuals' observable characteristics measured in 2007 and regional characteristics at their 2006 values. Comparing employment outcomes to pre-recession levels allows a transparent comparison of individual employment rate differentials. The sample and independent variable values are fixed across annual regressions; only the outcome varies yearly.

The estimating equations are identical to those used in the baseline regression (Table 2, Column (3)), except that instead of using workers' cumulative earnings over the entire period from 2007 to 2012, each equation now calculates yearly earnings and employment status. Given that this analysis tracks workers over a longer period, I restrict the estimation sample to those aged 29–45 at the baseline, ensuring that the 2000–2015 analysis is confined to individuals within the typical working age range.

The estimated coefficients are shown in Figure 8. First, the pre-recession estimates support the identifying assumption that the local shock was as good as randomly assigned, conditional on controls. Panel (a) shows how the shock affected the workers' annual earnings. The workers' earnings had a notable negative effect during the Great Recession, consistent with previous findings that workers in more exposed regions accumulated fewer earnings during this period. However, in the years following the recession, earnings in the most affected regions gradually caught up with those in less exposed regions, resulting in no significant differences between them later.

The previously documented consequences may stem from workers being unemployed or experiencing lower average earnings during the Great Recession. To disentangle these effects, Panels (b) and (c) investigate how the shock impacts employment probabilities and earnings among workers employed each year. Panel (b) examines the effect of the shock on yearly earnings for workers with non-zero earnings, while Panel (c) analyzes its impact on the probability of being employed. Most observed effects can be attributed to decreased employment probabilities during the Great Recession. Specifically, Panel (b) indicates a positive but statistically insignificant effect on yearly earnings, primarily driven by compositional changes. In contrast, Panel (c) reflects a pattern similar to that in Panel (a), revealing a negative impact of the shock on employment probability that diminishes in the later years after the Great Recession.



Figure 8: Impact of the contraction in the construction sector employment

Notes: Sample is restricted to workers aged 29-42 and working in the construction sector in 2007. Coefficients of the shock using an outcome variable indicate whether the worker has a valid employment spell each year. (1: the worker appears in the year, 0: the worker is not in the sample). The average earnings are calculated over the non-zero earnings of each year. Additional controls are initial share of construction sector employment, Bartik type variable, and demographic characteristics.

5.3 Heterogeneity of the shock by individual characteristics

As discussed in the previous section, the local employment contraction in the construction sector significantly affected workers' employment and earnings trajectories. In this section, I examine the heterogeneity of these impacts across different individual characteristics. Figure 9 illustrates the consequences of the local shock on cumulative earnings across worker types. Based on the sample of workers initially employed in the construction sector, the figure presents point estimates and 95 percent confidence intervals based on separate regressions for each group of workers. The findings indicate that young, low-tenured, and low-initial earners experienced a disproportionately more significant impact from the shock, suggesting that these shocks contributed to increased employment inequality among workers with varying skill levels.

Low initial earners, specifically those in the first two quartiles of the earnings distribution, faced a greater-than-average impact from the economic shock. In contrast, high initial earners experienced a better-than-average effect. This finding underscores the potential of economic shocks to exacerbate labor market inequalities. Additionally, there is a significant disparity in the economic consequences for young versus older workers linked to the inequality in employment opportunities across age groups. Most workers in Spain begin their careers with temporary contracts, which may eventually be upgraded to permanent positions. However, this practice creates disparities in job security and exposure to economic shocks between age groups, as younger workers in more unstable jobs are more susceptible to job loss during downturns. Contrary to findings by Yagan (2019) for the U.S., young workers in Spain appear to be less resilient to economic fluctuations.

During the Great Recession, earnings inequality in Spain increased significantly. Bonhomme and Hospido (2017) argues that this increase corresponds with employment cyclicality in the lower middle segment of the wage distribution, highlighting the crucial role of employment trends in the construction sector in this dynamic. As a contribution to this discussion, Figure 9 illustrates that workers initially employed in the construction sector exhibit considerable heterogeneity in their responses to the economic shock. Thus, even within a defined group of workers, economic shocks can exacerbate regional inequalities, as workers across the wage distribution are affected differently.

The following exercise categorizes workers into quartiles based on their earnings in 2007, quantifying the differential exposure to shocks according to their initial position in the earnings distribution. I examine the effects of these shocks on normalized cumulative earnings, employment, and average yearly earnings. The regressions control for all worker and regional characteristics used in the previous section.

The results are presented in Table 6. A test of equality among the four coefficients

Figure 9: Heterogeneity of the shock's impact on employment and earnings by characteristics



Notes: The sample is restricted to native workers aged 20-50 in 2007 and working in the construction sector; cumulative variables are computed between 2007 and 2012. Wage is standardized by the average wage in 2006 of months with non-zero earnings. Every regression controls by gender, age, education, skill group, foreign status, and interactions between age and education. Bartik is computed without considering the construction sector. Each coefficient is obtained from separate regressions for each subgroup.

rejects the null hypothesis that they are equal, indicating significant differences based on workers' initial earnings. The shock is particularly severe for those with low initial earnings, leading to an increase in national earnings inequality and a widening of regional disparities. Consequently, workers in the most affected regions experience differential impacts. Notably, there is a 20 percent difference in impact between workers starting in the third quartile of the earnings distribution and those in the fourth quartile.

A milder impact on employment or earnings may account for this difference, as explored in columns (2) and (3). Consistent with the findings from previous sections, a significant portion of the impact is attributed to workers in the most exposed provinces remaining employed for shorter durations during the Great Recession. Consequently, the recession substantially and significantly affects earnings distributions, exacerbating employment inequalities. According to Column (2), high-earning workers experience a 35

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Cumulative earnings	Employment	Average earnings
$Q_1^{earnings} \cdot Shock$	-2.659***	-2.111***	-0.0116**
	(0.267)	(0.186)	(0.00391)
$Q_2^{earnings} \cdot Shock$	-2.271***	-1.798***	-0.00723
	(0.262)	(0.181)	(0.00391)
$Q_3^{earnings} \cdot Shock$	-2.093***	-1.677***	-0.00531
	(0.267)	(0.183)	(0.00382)
$Q_4^{earnings} \cdot Shock$	-1.665***	-1.360***	0.00181
	(0.278)	(0.203)	(0.00380)
Constant	6.727***	5.212***	0.105***
	(0.214)	(0.135)	(0.00338)
Observations	40171	40171	40171
R^2	.2193	.2814	.0347
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 4: Heterogeneity of the shock's impact on employment and earnings

Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the province level

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Dependent variable: Standardized cumulative earnings, 2007–2012, cumulative days employed, 2007-2012, average monthly earnings, 2007-2012. All regressions include a constant and a full set of worker, job, and regional characteristics as additional controls. Demographic control interactions of age group, education, and gender. Initial occupational skill group, type of contract, tenure, experience, and experience squared. Regional characteristics: province-level unemployment rate in 2006, Bartik-type shock, and the employment share of the construction sector in 2006. All worker and job characteristics were measured in 2007, and regional controls were measured in 2006. The sample is restricted to workers in the construction sector before the shock, aged 20-50 years old.

5.4 Geographical vs. sectoral reallocation

Transitions between sectors and geographic locations serve as mechanisms for workers to adapt to negative shocks' impacts. However, evidence regarding the responsiveness of geographical mobility to such shocks is mixed. Worker adjustment across regions appears to be slow and incomplete (Autor et al., 2014; Dix-Carneiro, 2014). This sluggishness is more pronounced among less-educated workers, a subset of workers over-represented in the construction sector. Additionally, workers often have significant sector-specific human capital, hindering their ability to secure employment in other sectors. Consequently, a worker's adjustment is complex, motivating the need to explore both mechanisms further.

This section analyzes the mobility responses of construction workers to the employment shock resulting from the contraction in construction employment between 2007 and 2012 in their initial province of residence. Figure 10 illustrates how these shocks influence the probability of workers changing provinces or sectors. The results are derived from separate regressions of a binary variable indicating sector and regional changes, conditioned on the shock and a comprehensive set of individual and regional controls. A dynamic approach enables comparisons of coefficients before and during the Great Recession while also testing for the absence of differential pre-trends.

Figure 10 shows that workers in the most affected regions are more likely to change sectors, reflecting a decrease in construction employment opportunities. When comparing magnitudes, a worker at the 75th percentile of shock exposure is 4.03 percentage points more likely to change sectors than a worker at the 25th percentile. Conversely, there is no statistically significant relationship between the shock and the probability of changing one's province of residence.

According to Borusyak et al. (2022), the spatial correlation of demand shocks attenuates migration responses to negative shocks. Workers consider local shocks and their impacts on alternative locations, which can influence the estimates. An effective strategy is to incorporate shocks from interconnected locations. This concept of regional interconnectedness is also examined by Bertoli and Moraga (2013), who frame it as multilateral resistance to migration, a notion widely utilized in migration literature. Based on this understanding, I developed an adjusted shock measure that includes migration flows between provinces.

The adjusted shock is presented in equation (6). Here, $Shock_m$ denotes the decline in construction employment from 2007 to 2012 in province m, while $\mu_{r\to k}$ represents the probability that a worker from province r migrates to province k, conditional on a change of residence. I construct the adjusted measure in two steps. First, I estimate transition probabilities between provinces using migration data for observed workers from 2001 to



Figure 10: Adjustment to the employment contraction of the construction sector

Notes: The sample is restricted to workers aged 29-42 and working in the construction sector in 2007. Coefficients of the shock use an outcome variable indicating whether the worker changed residence province or sector on a rolling basis. a) Out of the construction sector; b) in a province different than the worker's residence in 2007. Additional controls are the initial share of construction sector employment, Bartik type variable, demographic characteristics, and interactions.

2006. In the second step, I create the shock variable by comparing the local shock to a weighted average shock across provinces, utilizing the previously estimated transition probabilities. When assessing the effect of a shock on a given province, I compare it to the shocks experienced by all other provinces, assigning greater weight to those provinces that are typical migration destinations.

$$Shock_r^{adj} = Shock_r - \sum_{k \neq r} \mu_{r \to k} Shock_k \tag{6}$$

Table 5 presents the effects of employment decline in the construction sector on the likelihood of individuals changing their sector or province of employment. The first three columns focus on the probability that an individual will be employed in a different province in 2012 compared to 2007. The fourth to sixth columns examine the likelihood of an individual transitioning to a sector other than construction by 2012. Notably, Columns (3) and (6) adjust the shock measure to account for shocks in other provinces.

According to Column (1), the employment shock in the construction sector has a negative but statistically insignificant effect on the probability of workers changing provinces. When individual and regional controls are added in Column (2), the relationship between the shock and migration turns positive, though it remains statistically insignificant. Column (3) further refines the analysis by considering the adjusted shock. Even with this adjustment, no significant relationship is found between the decline in the construction sector and interprovincial migration.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
	Ch	ange provi	nce	C	Change sector		
Shock	-0.0421	0.0097		0.3830^{***}	0.4070***		
	(0.0920)	(0.0561)		(0.0547)	(0.0472)		
AdjustedShock			0.0779			0.3490***	
			(0.0589)			(0.0769)	
Constant	0.2520***	0.1680***	0.1870***	0.3210***	0.2460***	0.3980***	
	(0.0477)	(0.0334)	(0.0398)	(0.0439)	(0.0399)	(0.0393)	
Observations	30,402	30,402	30,402	30,402	30,402	30,402	
R^2	.0365	.1786	.1788	.1405	.1884	.1870	
Controls	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	

Table 5: Geographical vs. sectoral reallocation due to the economic shock

Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the province level

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Controls: interactions of age categories with gender and educational attainment, occupational skill group categories, indicators for part-time and fixed-term contracts, tenure and experience fixed effects, local unemployment rate and employment share of the construction sector in 2006, a Bartik type shock, and the HHI index. The shock is the relative employment decline in the construction sector. Adjusted shock compares the shock in the province of residence to the shock in other provinces, weighted by the migration strength between the province and all potential provinces.

Column (4) shows that workers initially employed in the construction sector started transitioning to other sectors in response to declining job opportunities. Column (5), including individual and regional controls, slightly increases the coefficient, indicating that workers with higher exposure to the shock are more likely to transition to a different sector than those with lower exposure. Finally, Column (6) reveals that the adjusted shock has a positive and statistically significant effect on the probability of workers changing sectors.

6 Sectoral composition and the effect on workers' labor market adjustment

The availability of job opportunities and the ability to switch sectors play a crucial role in a worker's decision to leave an exposed sector. On average, individuals with more relevant job options can secure better job matches and experience shorter periods of unemployment. As a result, they are likely to face a smaller earnings penalty following a job loss.

The reallocation index reflects the job opportunities available to workers within their labor market. Typically, empirical studies define a local labor market as a specific geographic region.¹⁸ Alternatively, labor markets can be delineated by examining worker flows within a region (Nimczik, 2020). However, any binary definition that treats local jobs as close substitutes while excluding those outside the region fails to account that workers value jobs differently based on their preferences and circumstances. Therefore, I adopt a probabilistic definition of the labor market, as proposed by Schubert et al. (2020), which recognizes that even similar jobs may hold different values for different workers.

The next section incorporates the reallocation index into the analysis, exploring how sectoral composition impacts workers' job opportunities and influences their adjustment to negative shocks. The reallocation index, which reflects the job options available to workers, is constructed by comparing sectors based on the similarity of their workforce. This approach is consistent with the methodology used by Caldwell and Danieli (2024) and aligns with the framework outlined in Section 4. In the robustness section, I demonstrate that constructing the reallocation index using transition probabilities between sectors, rather than solely relying on workforce similarity, produces comparable results. This finding underscores the practical significance of this research for understanding workers' behavior in the labor market.

6.1 Reallocation index

This subsection builds on equation (4) by introducing the reallocation index as an additional control variable. The probability that a worker with characteristics X_i in region rsecures employment in a different sector influences the extent to which the impact of a shock is mitigated. Accordingly, a higher reallocation index will indicate a greater capacity for workers to offset the shock's effects on their earnings trajectories. I test and quantify this hypothesis by examining workers' adjustment to a significant shock, specifically the contraction in construction sector employment.

The results of this analysis are presented in Table 6. Column (1) shows that workers in provinces at the 25th percentile of shock exposure lost 1.19 times their initial average annual earnings (-2.35×0.5081). In comparison, those in provinces at the 75th percentile lost 1.51 times their initial earnings (-2.35×0.6463). This exercise indicates that the impact on annual earnings is nearly 21 percent greater for workers in high-exposure provinces than those in low-exposure provinces.

Additionally, the coefficient in Column (1) shows the effect of the reallocation index on workers' cumulative earnings. For ease of interpretation, the index was standardized to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. Consequently, a one standard

¹⁸Examples include states Acemoglu and Angrist (2000), metropolitan areas Moretti (2004), and commuting zones Autor et al. (2013).

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
	Cumulativ	Cumulative earnings		Employment		Average earnings	
Shock	-2.358***	-2.420***	-1.832***	-1.871***	-0.008*	-0.008*	
	(0.239)	(0.233)	(0.166)	(0.161)	(0.003)	(0.003)	
Reall.Index	0.059**	-0.183*	0.043***	-0.109*	0.0002	-0.003	
	(0.0171)	(0.0912)	(0.00950)	(0.0513)	(0.0003)	(0.001)	
$Shock \cdot Reall.Index$		0.432**		0.272**		0.005^{*}	
		(0.144)		(0.094)		(0.002)	
Constant	6.633***	6.674^{***}	4.998***	5.023***	0.117***	0.118***	
	(0.155)	(0.151)	(0.117)	(0.108)	(0.003)	(0.003)	
Observations	46,392	46,392	46,392	46,392	46,392	46,392	
R^2	.234	.234	.323	.323	.031	.031	
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	

Table 6: Labor market impact of the employment contraction in the construction sector, $2007\mathchar`-2012$

Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the province level

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Dependent variable: Standardized cumulative earnings, 2007–2012; cumulative days employed, 2007-2012; average monthly earnings, 2007-2012. All regressions include a constant and a full set of worker, job, and regional characteristics as additional controls. Demographic controls include interactions of age group, education, and gender, along with initial occupational skill group, type of contract, tenure, experience, and experience squared. Regional characteristics are the province-level unemployment rate in 2006, Bartik-type shock, and the employment share of the construction sector in 2006. All worker and job characteristics were measured in 2007, while regional controls were measured in 2006. The sample is restricted to workers in the construction sector before the shock, aged 20-50 years old.

deviation increase in the reallocation index is associated with a 6 percent increase in the initial annual earnings. Column (2) incorporates both the shock's impact and the reallocation index, capturing their interaction to evaluate the significant role of sectoral composition in worker adjustment. While the shock affects all workers within the same province, the results reveal a positive and statistically significant effect on cumulative earnings for those with higher reallocation index values. This result suggests that aligning with the regional sectoral composition can enhance the employment prospects of affected workers.

The interaction between the reallocation index and shocks reflects the mitigation of adverse conditions resulting from a better alignment between workers' characteristics and the local sectoral composition. The analysis reveals that a one standard deviation increase in the reallocation index results in a 17.9% reduction in the shock's impact (0.432/2.420). Consequently, workers are more likely to fare better in the event of a significant shock if it occurs in a region where their skills and attributes are highly valued.

Columns (3) and (4) present the effects of the shock and reallocation index on workers' employment between 2007 and 2012. The evidence indicates that exposure to the shock hurts workers' employment. However, having good prospects in other sectors can help mitigate the effects of such significant shocks. In other words, opportunities in other sectors can partially offset the decline in employment opportunities within the original sector.

Column (3) shows that the reallocation probabilities index had a positive and statistically significant impact on employment during the Great Recession. A one-standarddeviation increase in the index is associated with a 4% rise in employment during the reference period. Additionally, Column (4) indicates that workers with higher reallocation indexes were better able to mitigate the shock's impact, with the importance of this mitigation increasing with the shock's magnitude.

Finally, Columns (5) and (6) show that workers in more exposed areas did not experience a substantial decline in their average yearly earnings. The decrease in average earnings between 2007 and 2012 for a worker in a province at the 75th percentile of exposure amounts to 84 real Euros relative to their initial annual earnings in 2009.¹⁹ While this effect is statistically significant, its economic magnitude is relatively small.

 $^{^{19}\}text{Calculated}$ as $0.0857\times0.6463\times1596;$ the average monthly real earnings are 1596 real Euros.

6.1.1 Heterogeneous impact of the reallocation index

As highlighted in the previous section, the regional sectoral composition provides workers with varying opportunities to mitigate the effects of economic shocks. In this section, I expand on that analysis by examining how the impact of this shock varies across the distribution of the reallocation probability index, as captured by the following specification:

$$y_i = \sum_{k=1}^4 \beta_k Q_i^k \cdot Shock_i^r + X_i' \Delta + \epsilon_i.$$

The set of controls remains as in the previous specifications, with the addition of dummy variables for each quartile of the reallocation probabilities. The coefficients $\{\beta\}_{k=1}^4$ capture the differential effects of the shock across these quartiles. Consequently, the impact on a worker varies depending on the interaction between their characteristics and region.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Cumulativ	ve earnings	Emplo	oyment	Average	earnings
Shock	-2.006***		-1.891***		0.0005	
	(0.198)		(0.177)		(0.0009)	
$Q_1 \cdot Shock$		-2.569***		-2.417***		0.0003
		(0.318)		(0.297)		(0.0016)
$Q_2 \cdot Shock$		-2.038***		-1.867***		-0.00002
		(0.231)		(0.223)		(0.0012)
$Q_3 \cdot Shock$		-1.832***		-1.712***		-0.00001
		(0.214)		(0.204)		(0.0013)
$Q_4 \cdot Shock$		-1.666***		-1.645***		0.0008
		(0.246)		(0.253)		(0.0012)
	40.044	40.044	40.044	46.044	40.044	40.044
Observations	46,244	40,244	46,244	46,244	46,244	46,244
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 7: Sectoral composition and the consequences from the contraction of the construction sector

Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the province level

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Dependent variable: Standardized cumulative earnings, 2007–2012, cumulative days employed, 2007-2012, average monthly earnings, 2007-2012. All regressions include a constant and a full set of worker, job, and regional characteristics as additional controls. Demographic control interactions of age group, education, and gender. Initial occupational skill group, type of contract, tenure, experience, and experience squared. Regional characteristics: province-level unemployment rate in 2006, Bartik-type shock, the employment share of the construction sector in 2006. All worker and job characteristics were measured in 2007, and regional controls were measured in 2006. The sample is restricted to workers in the construction sector before the shock, aged 20-50 years old.

The results are presented in Table 7. Columns (1) and (3) show the impact of the

shock without including the reallocation index, revealing that the decline in construction employment between 2007 and 2012 had a significant effect on the cumulative earnings and employment of workers initially employed in that sector. Columns (2) and (4) explore how these effects vary based on the mismatch between workers' characteristics and job opportunities in other sectors within the region. As shown in Column (2), workers with a lower reallocation index—indicative of fewer high-quality or suitable jobs in the region —experience a more pronounced negative impact on their earnings trajectories. An equality test for the four coefficients is rejected at the 0.2% confidence level, underscoring the heterogeneity of the shock's effects.

In terms of economic significance, moving a worker from the first to the third quartile of the reallocation probability index reduces the intensity of the shock by 20

Next, I evaluate whether sectoral composition affects workers' willingness to switch sectors. Workers may relocate to less affected regions or transition to different sectors when adapting to economic shocks. In Section 5.4, I provide evidence that workers primarily adjusted through sectoral reallocation. Building on this, I present suggestive evidence that sectoral composition influences the likelihood of sectoral transitions, thereby shaping workers' labor market adjustments. The local economic activity mix plays a crucial role in determining reemployment prospects.

A relevant discussion is on how local economic performance is influenced by sectoral concentration, where two main theories arise. According to Marshall (1890), agglomeration forces enhance local economic performance by facilitating intra-industry knowledge transfer, reducing transportation costs, and creating more efficient labor markets through the proximity of related industries. On the other hand, Jacobs and Jane (1969) contends that economic diversity drives innovation and prosperity by fostering knowledge exchange across different industries. In this context, my research investigates how the composition of local economic activities impacts workers' labor market adjustments. Specifically, it examines how a diverse labor market offers a wider range of opportunities for workers facing negative shocks. By analyzing the influence of sectoral composition on labor market adjustments, I contribute to this ongoing debate between regional concentration and diversification.

In the aftermath of a major economic shock, workers are likely to have more options if the labor market is diverse. While the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) is a commonly used measure of sectoral and occupational diversity, it treats all sectors equally viable from the worker's perspective, regardless of individual characteristics. In contrast, the reallocation index emphasizes sectors that align closely with workers' skills and attributes. This measure more accurately reflects the relevance of local job opportunities to the worker, as it considers the alignment between the worker's characteristics and the available local sectors, thereby providing a more nuanced understanding of labor market diversity.

I estimate a probit regression model to analyze the probability that a worker will switch sectors, focusing on the reallocation index as my primary coefficient of interest. To provide a comparative perspective, I also include the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) to evaluate the impact of this conventional measure of diversity on sectoral mobility. Subsequently, I contrast the effects of local job opportunity diversity on sectoral transitions by examining both the reallocation index and the HHI, thereby assessing how each measure influences the likelihood of workers changing sectors.

Table 8 presents estimates of the probability that workers in the construction sector transitioned to other sectors between 2007 and 2012. The results reveal a statistically significant positive relationship between the decline in construction employment and the likelihood of workers leaving the sector. In contrast, the Herfindahl-Hirschman Index (HHI) does not show a statistically significant relationship between sectoral mobility and concentration.

Column (2) in Table 8 includes the reallocation index, which, as discussed earlier, measures the alignment between a worker's characteristics and the available job opportunities in other sectors. The results indicate a positive relationship between the probability of sectoral mobility and the reallocation index: workers are more likely to switch sectors in provinces where local job opportunities closely match their skills and attributes.

Column (3) decomposes the reallocation index into quartiles, allowing for a more detailed analysis of the heterogeneity and facilitating the interpretation of the coefficients. An equality test rejects the null hypothesis that the coefficients are equal across quartiles. Comparing the coefficients reveals that the highest quartile has the biggest influence on sectoral mobility. Workers moving from the third to the fourth quartile of reallocation probabilities are 10% more likely to change sectors. However, those in the first quartile are not more likely to leave the construction sector due to greater exposure to the decline in employment.

6.2 Residualized reallocation probabilities

The previous results prompt a concern that specific individual characteristics might have influenced the observed attenuation. This implies that the reallocation index might only be reflecting the effect of the worker's attributes on the adjustment. To alleviate this concern, I present the residualized reallocation index. This measure, derived from the residuals of a regression of the reallocation index on the characteristics used to compute it, effectively removes the influence of individual characteristics. By doing so, the residualized

	(1)	(2)	(3)
		Change sector	(-)
Shock	0.489^{*}	0.574^{**}	
	(0.219)	(0.198)	
HHI	2.642	4.492^{*}	4.391^{*}
	(2.275)	(1.998)	(1.993)
Reall. Prob.	× ,	0.0602**	
		(0.0197)	
$Q_1 \times Shock$. ,	0.371
			(0.212)
$Q_2 \times Shock$			0.543**
			(0.210)
$Q_3 \times Shock$			0.548^{**}
			(0.192)
$Q_4 \times Shock$			0.603**
			(0.192)
Constant	0.109	-0.114	-0.0546
	(0.193)	(0.180)	(0.177)
Observations	46,288	46,288	46,288
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 8: Sectoral composition and the probability of change sector

Robust standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the province level

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Coefficients from the probit model of indicator variables if workers changed province, sector, or firm within the same sector between 2008 and 2012. Each regression controls education, age, interactions between education and age, foreign status, occupational skill group, the decrease in the construction sector's local employment share, the initial employment share of the construction sector, the Bartik variable, and the Outside option measure. A sample was constrained to individuals in the construction sector in 2007 and was based on a yearly panel with observations from 2005 to 2017.

index isolates the interaction between individual traits and local conditions. This refined measure is designed to accurately capture the effect of local economic conditions on labor market adjustments, independent of individual attributes, thereby enhancing the validity of the previous results.

Table 9 provides the results of adding the residualized reallocation index into the estimating equation. Column (1) presents the results of the 2007-2012 worker's cumulative earnings as a function of the reallocation index and the full set of controls. I standardized the residualized reallocation index to have a zero mean and unitary standard deviation for ease of interpretation. As a result, an increase of one standard deviation in the reallocation index reduces the average shock's impact by 12.4%. Compared to the baseline results, the reallocation index coefficient is slightly attenuated, dropping by 9.8%. However, the magnitude remains statistically significant and economically relevant. Results in columns (3) and (4) indicate that a high reallocation probability positively affects workers' employment prospects during the Great Recession.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	Cumulativ	ve earnings	Emplo	yment	Average	earnings
Shock	-2.329***	-2.367^{***}	-1.819^{***}	-1.844***	-0.00736*	-0.00777*
	(0.240)	(0.232)	(0.162)	(0.159)	(0.00335)	(0.00323)
Resid.Reall	0.053***	-0.110	0.036***	-0.072	0.0003	-0.001
	(0.0128)	(0.0702)	(0.00872)	(0.0480)	(0.0003)	(0.001)
$Shock \times Resid.Reall.$		0.293^{*}		0.193^{*}		0.003
		(0.115)		(0.0884)		(0.002)
Constant	6.620***	6.636***	5.014^{***}	5.024***	0.116***	0.117***
	(0.147)	(0.143)	(0.116)	(0.109)	(0.00295)	(0.00312)
Observations	46,386	46,386	46,386	46,386	46,386	46,386
R^2	.2327	.2329	.3221	.3222	.0313	.0314
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 9: Residualized reallocation probabilities

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Dependent variable: Standardized cumulative earnings, 2007–2012, cumulative days employed, 2007-2012, average monthly earnings, 2007-2012. All regressions include a constant and a full set of worker, job, and regional characteristics as additional controls. Demographic control interactions of age group, education, and gender. Initial occupational skill group, type of contract, tenure, experience, and experience squared. Regional characteristics: province-level unemployment rate in 2006, Bartik-type shock, and the employment share of the construction sector in 2006. All worker and job characteristics are measured in 2007, and regional controls were measured in 2006. The sample is restricted to workers in the construction sector before the shock, aged 20-50 years old.

7 Basic robustness

7.1 Falsification of the decline in construction employment

In this section, I investigate whether the contraction in construction employment during the Great Recession can be attributed to the reallocation of jobs from regions that experienced more robust growth during the expansion period. Such a reallocation could potentially undermine the exogeneity assumption, making it challenging to argue that the contraction was entirely exogenous. To test this hypothesis, I assess whether the employment contraction from 2007 to 2012 could predict the worker outcomes before the Great Recession. Specifically, I constructed a sample of construction workers from 2003 and estimated their cumulative earnings from 2003 to 2007, which I will use as my dependent variable.

Table 10 provides evidence neglecting that the shock is related to the pre-recession outcomes. Column (1) shows the shock's positive but insignificant effect on employment and earnings.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Cumulative earnings	Employment	Average earnings
Shock	0.074	-0.108	0.002
	(0.206)	(0.147)	(0.003)
Constant	4.410***	3.447***	0.106***
	(0.143)	(0.073)	(0.002)
Observations	$25,\!455$	$25,\!455$	$25,\!455$
R^2	.067	.116	.063
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 10: Falsification test of the impact of the employment contraction in the construction sector on cumulative days worked from 2003-2007

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: The sample is restricted to native workers aged 20-50 in 2003 working in the construction sector. I compute the cumulative variables between 2003 and 2007. Earnings are standardized by the worker's average earnings in 2002. Controls: gender, skill group, foreign status, and interactions of age categories and education attainment. Bartik is computed without considering the construction sector. The shock is the employment change in the construction sector between 2007 and 2012

7.2 Reallocation index from transition probabilities

This section explores an alternative approach to constructing the reallocation index. Instead of relying on workforce similarity, it utilizes sector transition probabilities. By focusing on worker movement between sectors, this method captures the likelihood that a worker from the construction sector would find it appealing to transition to another sector.

This approach tests the robustness of the previous results by removing reliance on specific definitions of reallocation probabilities. It builds on Schubert et al. (2019) by analyzing the actual mobility patterns of construction workers between 2000 and 2006.

The estimation follows a two-step approach, leveraging data on sectoral worker transitions in the MCVL from 2000 to 2006. The probability that a worker moves from the construction sector to sector s, denoted as $\pi_{cs\to p}$, is defined as follows:

$$\pi_{cs \to p} = \frac{\# \text{ in } cs \text{ in } t \text{ observed in sector } s \text{ in } t+1}{\# \text{ in } cs \text{ in } t \text{ observed in a new sector in } t+1} \approx \text{Prob}(\text{ move from } cs \text{ to sector } s \mid \text{ leave sector }).$$

The transition probabilities are calculated based on the condition that an individual leaves the construction sector and are modeled as a function of worker characteristics X_i . The vector X_i includes variables such as occupation skill group, gender, foreign-born status, and interactions between age categories and educational attainment.²⁰

Then, the transition probabilities will be π_{cs}^{s} , defined as:

$$\pi_{cs}^{s} = \operatorname{Prob}(\text{ move from } cs \text{ to sector } s \mid \text{ leave sector }, X_{i}).$$

Using a probit model, I estimate the transition probabilities for individuals leaving the construction sector between 2000 and 2006. The analysis is based on monthly data from this period, with the dependent variable indicating the sector in which individual i is employed after exiting the construction sector.²¹ From this first step, I derive the predicted probabilities. In the second step, these probabilities are averaged and weighted by the size of each sector within each province.

$$\widehat{\pi}_{cs \to j} = \Pr(\widehat{Y = 1} \mid X) = \Phi\left(X_i\widehat{\beta}\right)$$

Therefore, the final measure is:

$$\sum_{j} \widehat{\pi}_{cs \rightarrow j} * \frac{EmplShare_{j}^{r}}{EmplShare_{j}}$$

The main analysis shows that workers initially employed in the construction sector within provinces severely impacted by the Great Recession accumulated lower earnings during the economic downturn than those in less affected regions. This result is consistent with labor market frictions hindering workers from transitioning smoothly to new opportunities. This paper examines explicitly the frictions that individual workers face when changing sectors. The likelihood of movement is influenced by worker characteristics and the match between those characteristics and the province's sectoral composition. The underlying idea is that a worker's profile must appeal to hiring firms, and the local sectoral composition must provide enough contracting firms within that sector to facilitate the transition.

The previous section exploits the similarity between a moving worker and those in the receiving sector to estimate the likelihood of a worker transitioning to a firm in a particular sector. In contrast, this section focuses on the transitions of similar workers from the construction sector to other sectors during the pre-shock period, as previously outlined.

 $^{^{20}{\}rm To}$ account for potential seasonal variations that might lead to temporary sectoral shifts, the estimation also incorporates month-fixed effects.

²¹For instance, if worker *i* is in the construction sector in period *t* and transitions to another sector in t + 1, this change is reflected in the dependent variable.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Cumulativ	ve earnings	Emplo	oyment
Shock	-2.459***		-1.942***	
	(0.238)		(0.174)	
$Q_1 \times Shock$		-2.590***		-2.016***
V I		(0.260)		(0.176)
$Q_2 \times Shock$		-2.508***		-1.990***
•-		(0.251)		(0.172)
$Q_3 \times Shock$		-2.455***		-1.904***
• •		(0.263)		(0.181)
$Q_4 \times Shock$		-2.341***		-1.868***
• -		(0.261)		(0.178)
Constant	6.592^{***}	6.560***	4.869***	4.846***
	(0.164)	(0.150)	(0.113)	(0.102)
Observations	46,375	46,375	46,375	46,375
R^2	.237	.237	.328	.328
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table 11: Reallocation probabilities from transition probabilities

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Sample workers aged 20-50 years old in 2007 and working in the construction sector before the crisis. Column (1) makes no additional restriction. Column (2) restricts native workers. The computation of the cumulative variables is from 2007 and 2012. Wage is standardized by the average wage in 2006 from months with non-zero earnings. Every regression controls gender, age, education, skill group, foreign status, and interactions between age and education. Bartik is computed without considering the construction sector, and predicted values for the outside option are from the first stage. **probit model**.

Table 11 presents the results. Column (1) shows the impact of the shock on cumulative earnings, while Column (2) breaks down the shock's effect by quartiles of the reallocation probabilities. An equality test of the four coefficients is rejected at usual confidence levels, indicating that the shock's impact varies depending on the likelihood of transitioning to another sector. Although this effect is somewhat reduced compared to the baseline specification, where reallocation probabilities were used, the labor market dynamics during the Great Recession diminished the predictive power of worker flows from the construction sector. Despite this, columns (2) and (4) still reveal significant heterogeneity in impact due to varying transition probabilities.

7.3 Labor market adjustment and internal migration

As discussed in Section 2.1, the unexpected nature of the shock would typically lead to low levels of internal migration. Despite this, workers from the most affected regions are still likely to relocate to mitigate the adverse effects of the shock on their employment trajectories.

This subsection emphasizes the relevance of sectoral and regional mobility for construction workers. It employs a similar two-step approach to assess how geographical mobility contributes to mitigating the impact of the shock.

As a result, I assess the likelihood that a worker will migrate in response to the shock. To achieve this, I first estimate the conditional probability of a worker with specific characteristics changing provinces, using data from 1995 to 2007. Subsequently, I predict the probability of sector change for workers within the estimation sample. This conditional probability is given by:

$$Prob(migrate_i) = \sigma_r + X'_i\beta + \epsilon_{it},$$

where σ_r is a province fixed effect, and X_i is a vector of worker characteristics which includes: occupational skill groups, indicators for part-time and fixed-term contracts, labor market experience, interactions of age and gender, and interactions of age and education attainment. Following this estimation, the second step predicts the conditional probability that a worker would change the region on the set of workers in the estimation sample. I also consider the interaction between migration probability and shock for comparison with the reallocation probabilities.

Results are shown in Table 12. Column (1) presents the baseline specification from Section 6. In Column (2), the predicted probability of migration is included as a control.

Notably, workers with higher migration probabilities experience worse outcomes in the most affected regions. Migration probabilities were standardized to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one. An increase of one standard deviation in migration probabilities is associated with a 13.4 percent decrease of the initial annual earnings between 2007 and 2012.

The third column examines the interaction between migration probabilities and the shock to determine how well workers in more affected regions attenuate the shock's impact through this mechanism. The Great Recession limited workers' geographical mobility, and this section confirms that more adjustment needs to be made through this mechanism. Cumulative earnings and the interaction of the shock do not show a statistically significant relationship.

	(1)	(2)	(3)		
	Cumulative earnings				
Shock	-2.338***	-2.560***	-2.628***		
	(0.243)	(0.261)	(0.248)		
Reall.Index	0.0652***	0.0741***	-0.225*		
	(0.0174)	(0.0170)	(0.0852)		
Migration Prob.		-0.134***	-0.117		
-		(0.0302)	(0.0910)		
Reall.Index imes Shock			0.542***		
			(0.134)		
MigrationProb. imes Shock			-0.0409		
0			(0.143)		
Constant	6.584^{***}	6.630***	6.672***		
	(0.144)	(0.160)	(0.162)		
Observations	46,375	46,375	46,375		
R^2	.235	.236	.236		

Table 12: Labor market adjustment: Geographical and sectoral mobility

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: The sample comprises workers aged 20-50 in 2007 who were employed in the construction sector before the crisis. Column (1) imposes no additional restrictions. Column (2) incorporates the probability of migration. Column (3) includes interactions between the shock, the reallocation index, and the probability of migration. All regressions control for gender, age, education, skill group, foreign status, interactions between age and education, and Bartik-type shock and regional controls.

8 Conclusion

In this paper, I examined the impact of the decline in construction sector employment on Spanish workers from 2007 to 2012. During the Great Recession, Spain experienced one of the most severe economic downturns, with the construction sector being particularly hard-hit. The contraction was unevenly distributed across Spanish provinces, leading to significant earnings losses for workers initially employed in the sector. To quantify the shock's effects on earnings and employment, I employed a regression model that accounts for regional and individual heterogeneity and incorporates the asymmetric decline in construction sector employment across Spanish provinces.

The results indicate that employment losses were most severe in the early years of the Great Recession, with the employment probabilities of workers in the most exposed provinces eventually aligning with those in less affected regions during the subsequent recovery. The sectoral reallocation of workers in highly impacted regions partially explains the mitigation of the initial impact. The findings suggest that workers primarily adjusted through sectoral mobility, with geographical mobility playing a relatively minor role.

The second part of the paper exploits shock variation across provinces and administrative panel data that tracks all the worker's labor market history to investigate local sectoral compositions' contribution to attenuating job loss's consequences. Specifically, I analyze how differences in sectoral composition impact workers' ability to transition to new roles by addressing two key factors: (i) the suitability of sectors based on worker characteristics and (ii) the availability of job opportunities across regions due to spatial specialization patterns. To capture these dynamics, I construct a *reallocation index* that reflects the likelihood of transitioning from the construction sector to other industries. This index accounts for the imperfect substitutability of workers between sectors by leveraging variations in sectoral composition and worker characteristics across provinces.

Finally, the results remain consistent across various robustness checks. Crucially, falsification tests using pre-Great Recession data and outcomes show no statistically significant relationships, confirming the specificity of the findings to the actual recession period. The relevance of reallocation probabilities in mitigating the impact of the construction sector downturn remains robust, even when employing alternative definitions of reallocation probabilities or using an instrumental variable approach using the sector's cumulative growth during expansionary periods.

References

- ACEMOGLU, D. AND J. ANGRIST (2000): "How large are human-capital externalities? Evidence from compulsory schooling laws," *NBER macroeconomics annual*, 15, 9–59.
- ACEMOGLU, D. AND P. RESTREPO (2022): "Tasks, automation, and the rise in US wage inequality," *Econometrica*, 90, 1973–2016.
- AMIOR, M. AND A. MANNING (2018): "The persistence of local joblessness," *American Economic Review*, 108, 1942–70.
- ARNTZ, M., B. IVANOV, AND L. POHLAN (2022): "Regional Structural Change and the Effects of Job Loss," .
- ARTUÇ, E., S. CHAUDHURI, AND J. MCLAREN (2010): "Trade shocks and labor adjustment: A structural empirical approach," *American economic review*, 100, 1008–45.
- AUTOR, D. H., D. DORN, AND G. H. HANSON (2013): "The China Syndrome: Local Labor Market Effects of Import Competition in the United States," *American Economic Review*, 103, 2121–68.
- AUTOR, D. H., D. DORN, G. H. HANSON, AND J. SONG (2014): "Trade adjustment: Worker-level evidence," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 129, 1799–1860.
- BACHMANN, R., P. BECHARA, A. KRAMER, AND S. RZEPKA (2015): "Labour market dynamics and worker heterogeneity during the Great Recession–Evidence from Europe," *IZA Journal of European Labor Studies*, 4, 1–29.
- BEAUDRY, P., D. A. GREEN, AND B. SAND (2012): "Does industrial composition matter for wages? A test of search and bargaining theory," *Econometrica*, 80, 1063– 1104.
- BENTOLILA, S., P. CAHUC, J. J. DOLADO, AND T. LE BARBANCHON (2012): "Twotier labour markets in the great recession: France Versus Spain," *The Economic Journal*, 122, F155–F187.
- BERTOLI, S. AND J. F.-H. MORAGA (2013): "Multilateral resistance to migration," Journal of development economics, 102, 79–100.
- BLANCHARD, O. J., L. F. KATZ, R. E. HALL, AND B. EICHENGREEN (1992): "Regional Evolutions," *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1992, 1–75.
- BONHOMME, S. AND L. HOSPIDO (2017): "The cycle of earnings inequality: evidence from Spanish social security data," *The Economic Journal*, 127, 1244–1278.

- BORUSYAK, K., R. DIX-CARNEIRO, AND B. KOVAK (2022): "Understanding Migration Responses to Local Shocks," Available at SSRN 4086847.
- CADENA, B. C. AND B. K. KOVAK (2016): "Immigrants equilibrate local labor markets: Evidence from the Great Recession," *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 8, 257–90.
- CALDWELL, S. AND O. DANIELI (2024): "Outside Options in the Labour Market," *Review of Economic Studies*, rdae006.
- CARRINGTON, W. J. (1996): "The Alaskan labor market during the pipeline era," *Journal of Political Economy*, 104, 186–218.
- DAO, M., D. FURCERI, AND P. LOUNGANI (2017): "Regional labor market adjustment in the United States: trend and cycle," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 99, 243–257.
- DAUTH, W., S. FINDEISEN, AND J. SUEDEKUM (2014): "The rise of the East and the Far East: German labor markets and trade integration," *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 12, 1643–1675.
- DIX-CARNEIRO, R. (2014): "Trade liberalization and labor market dynamics," *Econo*metrica, 82, 825–885.
- DIX-CARNEIRO, R. AND B. K. KOVAK (2017): "Trade liberalization and regional dynamics," *American Economic Review*, 107, 2908–46.
- DUSTMANN, C., U. SCHÖNBERG, AND J. STUHLER (2017): "Labor supply shocks, native wages, and the adjustment of local employment," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 132, 435–483.
- FARBER, H. S. (2017): "Employment, hours, and earnings consequences of job loss: US evidence from the displaced workers survey," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 35, S235– S272.
- GATHMANN, C., I. HELM, AND U. SCHÖNBERG (2020): "Spillover effects of mass layoffs," Journal of the European Economic Association, 18, 427–468.
- GATHMANN, C. AND U. SCHÖNBERG (2010): "How general is human capital? A taskbased approach," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 28, 1–49.
- GULYAS, A., K. PYTKA, ET AL. (2019): "Understanding the sources of earnings losses after job displacement: A machine-learning approach," Tech. rep., University of Bonn and University of Mannheim, Germany.

- JACOBS, J. AND J. JANE (1969): *The Economy of Cities*, A Vintage book, V-584, Random House.
- JACOBSON, L. S., R. J. LALONDE, AND D. G. SULLIVAN (1993): "Earnings losses of displaced workers," *The American economic review*, 685–709.
- KAMBOUROV, G. (2009): "Labour market regulations and the sectoral reallocation of workers: The case of trade reforms," *The Review of Economic Studies*, 76, 1321–1358.
- LACUESTA, A., S. PUENTE, AND E. VILLANUEVA (2020): "The schooling response to a sustained increase in low-skill wages: evidence from Spain 1989–2009," *SERIEs*, 11, 457–499.
- MACALUSO, C. ET AL. (2017): "Skill remoteness and post-layoff labor market outcomes," in 2017 Meeting Papers, Society for Economic Dynamics, vol. 569.
- MANNING, A. AND B. PETRONGOLO (2017): "How local are labor markets? Evidence from a spatial job search model," *American Economic Review*, 107, 2877–2907.
- MARINESCU, I. AND R. RATHELOT (2018): "Mismatch unemployment and the geography of job search," *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 10, 42–70.
- MARSHALL, A. (1890): "Principles of Economics, 8th edn (1920)," London, Mcmillan.
- MAYER, W. (1974): "Short-run and long-run equilibrium for a small open economy," Journal of Political Economy, 82, 955–967.
- MIAN, A. AND A. SUFI (2014): "What explains the 2007–2009 drop in employment?" *Econometrica*, 82, 2197–2223.
- MOLLOY, R., C. L. SMITH, AND A. WOZNIAK (2011): "Internal migration in the United States," *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 25, 173–96.
- MONRAS, J. (2018): "Economic shocks and internal migration,".
- MORAGA, J. F.-H., A. FERRER-I CARBONELL, AND A. SAIZ (2019): "Immigrant locations and native residential preferences: Emerging ghettos or new communities?" *Journal of Urban Economics*, 112, 133–151.
- MORETTI, E. (2004): "Workers' education, spillovers, and productivity: evidence from plant-level production functions," *American Economic Review*, 94, 656–690.
- NAGORE GARCÍA, A. AND A. VAN SOEST (2017): "Unemployment exits before and during the crisis," *Labour*, 31, 337–368.

- NEAL, D. (1995): "Industry-specific human capital: Evidence from displaced workers," Journal of labor Economics, 13, 653–677.
- NIMCZIK, J. (2020): "Job mobility networks and data-driven labor markets," Tech. rep., Working Paper.
- ROGERSON, R. (2005): "Sectoral shocks, human capital, and displaced workers," *Review* of *Economic Dynamics*, 8, 89–105.
- SCHUBERT, G., A. STANSBURY, AND B. TASKA (2019): "Getting labor markets right: Outside options and occupational mobility," Tech. rep.
- (2020): "Employer Concentration and Outside Options,".
- SHAW, K. L. (1987): "Occupational change, employer change, and the transferability of skills," *Southern Economic Journal*, 702–719.
- UTAR, H. (2018): "Workers beneath the floodgates: Low-wage import competition and workers' adjustment," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 100, 631–647.
- WALKER, W. R. (2013): "The transitional costs of sectoral reallocation: Evidence from the clean air act and the workforce," *The Quarterly journal of economics*, 128, 1787– 1835.
- WOZNIAK, A. (2010): "Are college graduates more responsive to distant labor market opportunities?" Journal of Human Resources, 45, 944–970.
- YAGAN, D. (2019): "Employment hysteresis from the great recession," Journal of Political Economy, 127, 2505–2558.
- YI, M., S. MÜLLER, AND J. STEGMAIER (2024): "Industry mix, local labor markets, and the incidence of trade shocks," *Journal of Labor Economics*, 42, 000–000.

A Appendix: Figures



Figure A1: Employment share of the construction sector, 1995-2019

Notes: Presents the proportion of male workers in Spain's construction sector from January 1995 to December 2017. The data is restricted to male workers aged 20-60 and employed during the referenced period employed during the referenced period. The shaded area comprises the years of the Great Recession in Spain, between 2008 and 2014.

Figure A2: Employment share of the construction sector, 1995-2019



Notes: Presents the proportion of native workers in Spain's construction sector from January 1995 to December 2017. The data is restricted to native workers aged 20-60 and employed during the referenced period employed during the referenced period. The shaded area comprises the years of the Great Recession in Spain, between 2008 and 2014.

Figure A3: Manufacturing and construction employment shares, 1995-2019



Notes: Employed workers in the construction and manufacturing sector as a percentage of all employed workers, January 1995 to December 2019. Data is restricted to workers employed during the referenced period. The shaded area comprises the years of the Great Recession in Spain, between 2008 and 2014.



Figure A4: Construction sector employment in the US, 2003-2020

Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Notes: Construction employment by gender in the US, 2003-2020. Source: US Bureau of Labor Statistics 2006-2017



Figure A5: Change in the construction employment share by province, 2003-2020

Notes: Change in the employment share of the construction sector by province between 2007 and 2012 against construction employment share in 2006. The sample considers the 50 Spanish provinces.



Figure A6: Working status of highly skilled individuals in 2007

Notes: The shares are computed based on high skilled workers, and every year I tracked their working status up to 2015.



Figure A7: Working status of workers in the construction sector in 2003

Notes: The shares are computed based on native workers employed in the construction sector in 2003, and every year I tracked their working status up to 2007.

Figure A8: Impact of contraction of the construction sector employment. Weighted shock



Notes: Sample restricted to workers aged 29-42 working in the construction sector in 2007. Coefficients of the shock were used as an outcome variable and an indicator of whether the worker changed residence province or sector on a rolling basis. a) Out of the construction sector b) In a province different than the residence in 2007. Additional controls by initial share of construction sector employment, Bartik type variable, demographic characteristics, and interactions

B Appendix: Tables

	2004	2007	2012	2017
Age				
24<	0.403	0.347	0.258	0.292
24-35	0.396	0.406	0.352	0.390
35-45	0.156	0.185	0.248	0.189
>45	0.046	0.062	0.142	0.130
Mean age	28.0	29.1	32.7	31.3
Education				
Below secondary	0.695	0.693	0.638	0.646
Secondary	0.184	0.192	0.207	0.211
Tertiary	0.121	0.114	0.155	0.143
Type of contract				
Part-time	0.095	0.091	0.217	0.215
Fixed-term	0.928	0.886	0.872	0.837
Foreign born	0.289	0.424	0.252	0.293
Occupations				
Very-high skilled occupations	0.016	0.019	0.028	0.029
High skilled occupations	0.029	0.029	0.034	0.039
Medium-high skilled occupations	0.039	0.043	0.061	0.053
Medium-low skilled occupations	0.370	0.414	0.421	0.438
Low skilled occupations	0.546	0.495	0.457	0.440

Table A1: Descriptive evidence of new workers in construction sector

Notes: The table reports the characteristics of new workers in the construction sector per year.

	2004	2007	2012	2017
Age				
24<	0.285	0.269	0.167	0.171
24-35	0.432	0.408	0.396	0.344
35-45	0.196	0.221	0.280	0.273
>45	0.088	0.102	0.157	0.212
Mean age	30.6	31.3	34.2	35.3
Education				
Below secondary	0.602	0.611	0.610	0.610
Secondary	0.197	0.191	0.189	0.209
Tertiary	0.201	0.198	0.201	0.181
Type of contract				
Part-time	0.217	0.221	0.286	0.323
Fixed-term	0.846	0.815	0.802	0.820
Foreign born	0.144	0.232	0.208	0.201
Occupations				
Very-high skilled occupations	0.021	0.021	0.030	0.031
High skilled occupations	0.041	0.042	0.057	0.061
Medium-high skilled occupations	0.109	0.114	0.126	0.126
Medium-low skilled occupations	0.450	0.470	0.441	0.425
Low skilled occupations	0.379	0.353	0.346	0.356

Table A2: Descriptive evidence of leavers from the construction sector

Notes: The table reports the characteristics of the leavers in the construction sector per year. Leavers are those who do not appear more or those who leave the construction sector and move to another sector.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Cumulative wage	Cumulative years	Average yearly wage
		Panel A: Foreign	l
shock	-13.87**	-0.743**	-0.170**
	(3.992)	(0.241)	(0.0551)
$ShareCS_{2006}$	-3.804	-1.096**	0.179
	(7.291)	(0.342)	(0.142)
Constant	63.68***	4.292***	1.314***
	(3.725)	(0.253)	(0.0725)
		Panel B: Native	
shock	-27.76***	-1.702***	-0.141**
	(2.504)	(0.147)	(0.0420)
$ShareCS_{2006}$	-10.20	-0.338	-0.115
2000	(6.880)	(0.392)	(0.117)
Constant	75.13***	5.245***	1.226***
	(1.418)	(0.0783)	(0.0282)

Table A3: Impact of the employment contraction in the construction sector on worker's outcomes. By foreign born status.

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: In each regression, I control for gender, occupation skill level, education, age, and foreign-born status. I restricted workers under 50 years old in 2007 to avoid workers' early retirement before 2012. Shock measures the relative change of the share of workers in the construction sector by province. Bartik shock measures trends in employment growth in non-construction sectors. Cumulative wage is the sum from 2007 to 2012 of non-zero earnings standardized by the average wage in 2006. Cumulative years are the accumulated days worked from 2007 to 2012 and converted into years. Average yearly wage is the average yearly wage from 2007 to 2012.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Cumulative wage	Cumulative years	Average yearly wage
	Pan	el: Younger workers	s (<25)
Shock	-34.40***	-1.943***	-0.232***
	(4.457)	(0.239)	(0.0605)
$ShareCS_{2006}$	-32.32**	-1.231*	-0.428*
	(11.39)	(0.585)	(0.178)
Constant	93.67***	5.809***	1.449***
	(5.470)	(0.333)	(0.106)
	Pa	anel: Older workers	(>35)
Shock	-23.71***	-1.429^{***}	-0.108*
	(3.341)	(0.187)	(0.0526)
$ShareCS_{2006}$	3.081	-0.255	0.0973
	(7.736)	(0.382)	(0.125)
Constant	61.45***	4.395***	1.180***
	(2.104)	(0.124)	(0.0350)

Table A4: Impact of the employment contraction in the construction sector on worker's outcomes. By age group.

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: In each regression, I control for gender, occupation skill level, education, age, and foreign-born status. I restrict workers under 50 years old in 2007 to avoid workers' early retirement before 2012. Shock measures the relative change of the share of workers in the construction sector by province. Bartik shock measures trends in employment growth in non-construction sectors. Cumulative wage is the sum from 2007 to 2012 of non-zero earnings standardized by the average wage in 2006. Cumulative years are the accumulated days worked from 2007 to 2012 and converted into years. Average yearly wage is the average yearly wage from 2007 to 2012.

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		Cumula	tive wage	
	Change :	province	Change	e sector
	No	Yes	No	Yes
shock	-29.45***	-17.95**	-33.75***	-18.94***
	(3.368)	(5.313)	(3.430)	(3.678)
Constant	86.73***	75.04***	85.61***	81.64***
	(4.408)	(7.098)	(4.563)	(4.676)
Observations	35592	12531	19118	29005
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
		Cumula	tive year	
	Change	province	Change	e sector
	No	Yes	No	Yes
shock	-1.643***	-0.861**	-2.201***	-0.689**
	(0.219)	(0.260)	(0.256)	(0.214)
Constant	5.933***	4.690***	5.986***	5.267***
	(0.330)	(0.288)	(0.402)	(0.321)
Observations	35592	12531	19118	29005
Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Table A5: Impact of the employment contraction on workers wage and employment trajectories

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: The sample is restricted to native workers aged 20-50 in 2007 working in the construction sector. Cumulative variables are computed between 2007 and 2012. Wage is standardized by the average wage in 2006 for months with non-zero earnings. Every regression is controlled by gender, age, education, skill group, foreign status, and interactions between age and education. Bartik is computed without considering the construction sector and predicted values for the outside option are from a first stage **probit model**. The shock is the change in the construction sector employment share between 2007 and 2012

C Definitions

C.1 Bartik

Workers may experience variation in employment opportunities as the construction sector in their initial province of residence declines and as employment fluctuations occur in the other sectors. To account for such fluctuations, I construct a Bartik-type shock.

$$Bartik_{r} = \sum_{j=1}^{12} EmplShare_{2006,r}^{j} \cdot \ln \frac{empl_{2012,r}^{j}}{empl_{2007,r}^{j}}$$

Employment growth in each sector is weighted by the local employment share, which is computed without the construction sector.

C.2 Reallocation index computation

Sample: Workers not employed in the construction sector from 2000 to 2006. Observations are taken from March each year. I avoid seasonal variation in the compositions of sectors just by considering the employment probabilities in the same month each year.

Controls: Interactions of age categories with education attainment and age categories with gender, foreign-born status dummy, occupational skill group.

Outcome: Indicator variable is the individual i is employed in sector s at time t

Specification:

$$y_i^s = X_i\beta + \varepsilon_i$$

The estimation is based on the following sectors:

- 1. Agriculture, livestock, fishing
- 2. Extractive activities
- 3. Manufacture
- 4. Energy, gas, and steam supply
- 5. Commerce
- 6. Hospitality
- 7. Transport and storage, communication
- 8. Financial and insurance activities
- 9. Renting
- 10. Professional, scientific, technical activities
- 11. P.A. and defense, education, health services
- 12. Other

Each equation is estimated separately, and the coefficients are used to get the predicted probabilities given the worker's characteristics in my estimation sample. The predicted probabilities of moving to each sector are weighted by the relative size of each sector at the province level without considering workers in the construction sector.

$$\sum_{j=1}^{10} P(z=j|x=X_i) \cdot \frac{EmplShare_r^j}{EmplShare^j} \cdot \bar{w}_r$$
$$= \sum_{j=1}^{10} \frac{P(z=j|x=X_i)}{EmplShare^j} \cdot EmplShare_r^j \cdot \bar{w}_r$$
$$= \sum_{j=1}^{10} \frac{P(z=j|x=X_i)}{P(z=j)} \cdot EmplShare_r^j \cdot \bar{w}_r$$
$$= \sum_{j=1}^{10} \frac{P(z=j,x=X_i)}{P(z=j)P(x=X_i)} \cdot EmplShare_r^j \cdot \bar{w}_r$$



Figure A9: Histogram of the reallocation probabilities Notes: Reallocation probabilities of workers employed in the construction sector in 2007.

C.3 Description of outcomes

Table A6 presents descriptive statistics on cumulative earnings, average earnings, employment, and worker characteristics during the study period for construction workers and non-construction workers as a comparison group. The average non-construction worker earned positive earnings 4.6 out of a maximum of 6 years and earned cumulatively 61.56 times their pre-recession average monthly earnings. Workers initially employed in the construction sector had positive earnings 58% of the period between January 2007 and December 2012, about three-fourths the employment of the average non-construction worker. Finally, compared to their counterparts in other sectors, workers in the construction sector have lower educational attainment and are more likely to be male and foreign-born. I only consider native workers in the rest of the paper. During the Great Recession, outcomes of foreign workers were more likely to go unobserved, mainly due to return migration to the home country, which may cause a measurement bias of the effects.

	(1)	(2)
	Non-construction	Construction
Labor market outcomes		
Cumulative earnings	61.56	45.80
	(29.07)	(26.37)
Employment	4.55	3.48
	(1.804)	(1.779)
Education		
Below secondary	0.45	0.76
·	(0.498)	(0.427)
Secondary	0.26	0.16
v	(0.440)	(0.363)
Tertiary	0.29	0.08
	(0.452)	(0.278)
Worker's composition		
Tenure	3.57	2.06
	(4.579)	(3.033)
Average age	33.60	32.54
	(7.924)	(7.843)
Share female workers	0.47	0.08
	(0.499)	(0.273)
Share foreign workers	0.14	0.28
	(0.346)	(0.451)
Obs.	304085	52671

Table A6: Descriptive statistics of workers, 2007-2012

Notes: Workers in the construction and non-construction sectors are classified by their employment sector in 2007. An individual's cumulative earnings are calculated by dividing their non-zero earnings between 2007 and 2012 by their average monthly earnings between 2005 and 2006. Standard deviations are presented in parentheses

D Migration

D.1 Internal migration

Geographical mobility depends on credit availability, labor market security, and binding conditions during a recession. Then, lower geographical mobility could be expected compared to an expansionary period Dix-Carneiro and Kovak (2017), Autor et al. (2014). Since Blanchard et al. (1992) seminal paper, other studies have analyzed the role of labor mobility as an adjustment mechanism, finding mixed results. However, recent papers show adjustment from this mechanism is slow Amior and Manning (2018), Dix-Carneiro and Kovak (2017) and depends on worker's characteristics; the least mobile workers are the most vulnerable Gathmann et al. (2020).

Figure A10 shows that, on average, 3.25% workers changed job locations between 2000 and 2012. At the highest point, only 4.01% of individuals worked in a different province than the previous year. In comparison, Monras (2018) shows that in the United States, the proportion of Americans working in a different metropolitan area compared to the previous year was 5.4% before the Great Recession and 4.8% after 2007.

If workers move from more exposed to less exposed regions, outflows to other provinces should increase, even if this reaction takes some time. However, Figure A10 shows a decrease during the Great Recession in movers' share. This claim is in line with recent evidence. After a negative shock, exposed regions experience a decrease in inflows and not necessarily a strong response on outflows, Dustmann et al. (2017), Molloy et al. (2011).

However, this aggregate description of worker flows hides compositional changes. For instance, on the type of migrants before and after the crisis. So, to study this further, the following results change the scope of regional movements. Two mechanisms through which workers' population in a specific region may change: interregional mobility and movements to and from unemployment or non-employment. This relationship is expressed as:

$$\frac{L_{m,t} - L_{m,t-1}}{L_{m,t-1}} = \left[\frac{I_{m,t}^r}{L_{m,t-1}} - \frac{O_{m,t}^r}{L_{m,t-1}}\right] + \left[\frac{I_{m,t}^u}{L_{m,t-1}} - \frac{O_{m,t}^u}{L_{m,t-1}}\right]$$
(7)

The sub-index m is applied for the region, and t for the period. The left-hand side represents the relative change in the worker's population between two periods, which is decomposed as inflows minus outflows from each region and inflows minus outflows from a non-working condition²².

 $^{^{22}{\}rm The}$ aim of this section is not on individuals that are not actively working. Then I group unemployed and non-employed workers as individuals in a non-working condition



Figure A10: Share of workers change job's province Notes: Share of individuals working in a different province concerning the previous year, 2001-2012. The sample of workers between 2000-2012, based on a sample of workers in MCVL

 $I_{m,t}^r$ represents the number of workers which moved to region m in period t, and $O_{m,t}^r$ workers that were in region m at t-1, but in another region in t. Conversely, $I_{m,t}^u$ accounts for the number of workers that come to region m and previously were unemployed or non-employment. Finally, $O_{m,t}^u$ shows outflows to unemployment or non-employment.

Given equation 7 is an exact decomposition, I can decompose the variance as how much of the population growth rate in region m is explained by in-migration rates and how much by out-migration rates (Dustmann et al. 2017; Monras 2018).²³

Consider the following regression:

$$y_{tr} = \alpha_0 + \beta change_{tr} + \psi_t + \mu_r + \epsilon_{tr}$$

Such that y_{tr} could be inflows or outflows from another region or a non-working condition, and $change_{tr}$ the relative change in worker's population of the region m between period t and t - 1.

Table A7 shows worker flows from and to the non-working condition are relatively

²³Suppose we have an exact decomposition A=B+C and $\beta_1 = \frac{Cov(A,B)}{Var(A)}$, $\beta_2 = \frac{Cov(A,C)}{Var(A)}$. Then, as A=B+C and covariance properties $\beta_1 + \beta_2 = 1$, we can interpret β_1 and β_2 as a variance decomposition of A

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	I_m^r	I_m^u	O_m^r	O_m^u
		Panel A	2008	
change	0.0606^{***}	0.695^{***}	-0.0788***	-0.165^{***}
	(0.0143)	(0.0334)	(0.0181)	(0.0428)
Constant	0.0417^{***}	0.0961^{***}	0.0450^{***}	0.0929^{***}
	(0.00202)	(0.00274)	(0.00109)	(0.00391)
Observations	100	100	100	100
		Panel B	2:>2008	
change	0.0575^{***}	0.469^{***}	-0.0363***	-0.438***
	(0.00946)	(0.0168)	(0.0102)	(0.0189)
Constant	0.0405^{***}	0.101^{***}	0.0320^{***}	0.110^{***}
	(0.00124)	(0.00201)	(0.00125)	(0.00227)
Observations	450	450	450	450

Table A7: Decomposition variance of local population growth

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Regression of in-migration and out-migration on region m worker's population change. The sample considers the 50 Spanish provinces between 2005 and 2008 in panel A and after 2008 in panel B.

more important in explaining local population growth. More than 50% of the population growth variation is explained by non-employment flows, with a decrease in inflows' relative importance during the Great Recession and an increase in outflows to non-employment. This fact is consistent with the drop in employment at the national level. Considering the local growth of workers in the construction sector, an equivalent picture is appreciated. There is a decrease in general with a decrease in outflows to non-employment.

The common idea is that foreign workers are more predisposed to migrate. This includes a more significant propensity to international and interregional migration. I will start by analyzing the proportion of foreign workers in the interregional flows. Figure ?? presents the share of movers as a proportion of all workers, divided by demographic group. Define $G \in \{F, N\}$ as the group-specific identifier, with F for foreign, and N for natives, in panel (a) I present the share $\frac{M_t^G}{P_t^G}$, where M_t^G accounts for the number of individuals in the group G working in a different province than the previous year, and P_t^G the total number of individuals from a group G at time t, while in panel (b) I present $\frac{M_t^G}{P_t^N + P_t^F}$.

Figure ?? shows that foreign workers are likelier to change location. Considering the population of foreign workers each year, the proportion of workers who changed location one year before is higher for foreign than for native workers. However, as presented in panel (a), geographical mobility decreased for both demographic groups during the Great Recession. Also, foreign workers represent a low portion of total movers appreciated in panel (b).





Notes: Panel (a) Proportion of foreign movers as a share of all foreign workers, and proportion of native movers as a share of all native workers. Panel (b) Proportion of foreign movers as a share of all workers and proportion of native movers as a share of all workers. Movers are computed as workers who, one year before, had their main job in a different province.

D.2 International migration

The data in MCVL does not allow tracking if a worker migrates from Spain; in the case of foreign workers, that would be useful, as an additional mitigating force of a negative shock in the local area is international migration, which in the case of foreign workers is more likely to return to their home country Cadena and Kovak (2016).

Given this constraint, I could, at most, analyze the probability that a worker will be unemployed for a considerable amount of time. In the case of foreign workers, this would suggest that they return to their home country.

In native workers, there is a strong familial link and wealth accumulation, which could maintain a long non-employment time. This force is likely less critical in foreign workers than if an essential share of foreign workers disappears from the dataset. It is a consistent explanation to argue that they return to their home country.

Table A8 shows results from the probability a worker is not seen from some time into the future. As assumed in the previous discussion, them being a foreign worker implies a higher probability of disappearing from the social security records, this proportion is robust on adding controls on the local conditions faced.

Also, during the first years of the Great Recession, the share of foreign workers that exit the social security records was higher than in years before the Great Recession and also during the recovery period (Figure A13)

	(1)	(2)
	Non-emp	oloyment
Foreign	0.253***	0.250***
	(0.00837)	(0.00785)
$Share CS_{2006}$		-0.309***
		(0.0701)
$\Delta Share$		-0.0682
		(0.0472)
Constant	0.131***	0.136***
	(0.00983)	(0.0222)
Observations	96507	96507

Table A8: Probability a worker is non-employed during the Great Recession conditional con observables

Standard errors in parentheses

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01, *** p < 0.001

Notes: Probability a worker disappeared from my sample between 2007 and 2012 conditional on worker characteristics. The probability is computed from a linear probability model on a dummy that takes value one if workers disappear between 2007 and 2012, controlled by education, age, foreign status, occupational skill group, a decrease of local construction sector share, and initial share of the construction sector. The sample was constrained to individuals in the construction sector in 2007 and was based on a yearly panel with observations from 2005 to 2017.



Figure A12: Share of foreign workers leaving the ss records Notes: Share of foreign workers by year of exit from social security records of workers in the construction sector during 2007.



Figure A13: Emigration by country of birth, 2008-2021

Notes: Total of emigration by country of birth, 2008-2021 Source: INE