

Job Security, Stability and Production Efficiency

Hu Fu¹ Robert Kleinberg¹ Ron Lavi²
Rann Smorodinsky²

¹Cornell University

²Technion – Israel Institute of Technology

- ▶ Kelso and Crawford (1982) introduce the study of labor markets in a many-to-one matching model.
- ▶ Their solution concept: classic Gale-Shapley stability
 - ▶ Employees can choose to change jobs but will not.
 - ▶ Firms can choose to hire or fire employee but will not.
- ▶ Two problems:
 - ▶ Theoretical - existence of stable outcomes is limited
 - ▶ Realistic - firing employees is difficult in many job markets (e.g., job markets in Europe).
- ▶ IDEA - relax the notion of stability while capturing job security.

The Kelso and Crawford model (ECMA, 1982)

A job market is a tuple (N, M, v, b) (abbreviated (v, b)):

- ▶ N - finite set of firms, M - finite set of workers.
- ▶ $v = \{v^n\}_{n=1}^N$, $v^n : 2^M \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}_+$ firm n 's production function, $v^n(\emptyset) = 0$ and $v(X) \leq v(Y) \quad \forall n$ and $\forall X \subset Y \subseteq M$.
- ▶ $b = \{b_m^n\}_{m \in M, n \in N}$ represent exogeneous a-priori workers' preferences over firms (in monetary values)

The Kelso and Crawford model - cont.

- ▶ An **assignment** $A = \{A^1, \dots, A^N\}$: firm n receives the set of workers A^n . Some workers may be left unassigned.
- ▶ An **allocation** is a pair (A, s) , A is an assignment and $s \in \mathbb{R}_+^M$.
- ▶ $u_m(A, s) = s_m - b_m^n$ for $m \in A^n$ is m 's quasi-linear utility.
- ▶ $\Pi^n(A, s) = v^n(A^n) - \sum_{m \in A^n} s_m$ is the profit of firm n .

Assumption (adopted from Kelso and Crawford):

$$\forall n, C \subset M, m \in M \setminus C, v^n(m|C) \geq b_m^n$$

"This is a natural restriction, since if a worker's marginal product, net of the salary required to compensate him or her for the disutility of work at a given firm, were negative, the firm could agree to let the worker do nothing for a salary of zero." (K & C)

Definition

An allocation (A, s) is **individually rational (IR)** if

- (1) $\Pi^n(A, s) = v^n(A^n) - \sum_{m \in A^n} s_m \geq 0 \quad \forall n \in N$; and
- (2) $u_m(A, s) = s_m - b_m^n \geq 0$ for all $n \in N$ and $m \in A^n$.

Definition

A coalition $\{n, C\}$ is **blocking** for an allocation (A, s) if exists $\hat{s} \in \mathfrak{R}_+^C$:

- ▶ $u_m(n, \hat{s}_m) \geq u_m(k, s_m) \quad \forall k \in N, m \in A^k \cap C$
- ▶ $v^n(C) - \sum_{m \in C} \hat{s}_m \geq v^n(A^n) - \sum_{m \in A^n} s_m$

with at least one of the inequalities being strict.

Definition

An allocation (A, s) is **stable** if it is IR and there exist no blocking coalitions.

A **new** notion of stability

Definition

An allocation (A, s) is **individually rational (IR)** if

- (1) $\Pi^n(A, s) = v^n(A^n) - \sum_{m \in A^n} s_m \geq 0 \quad \forall n \in N$; and
- (2) $u_m(A, s) = s_m - b_m^n \geq 0$ for all $n \in N$ and $m \in A^n$.

Definition

A coalition $\{n, C\}$ is **JS-blocking** for an allocation (A, s) if exists $\hat{s} \in \mathfrak{R}_+^C$:

- ▶ $u_m(n, \hat{s}_m) \geq u_m(k, s_m) \quad \forall k \in N, m \in A^k \cap C$
- ▶ $v^n(C) - \sum_{m \in C} \hat{s}_m \geq v^n(A^n) - \sum_{m \in A^n} s_m$
- ▶ $A^n \subset C$

with at least one of the inequalities being strict.

Definition

An allocation (A, s) is **JS-stable** if it is IR and there exist no **JS-blocking** coalitions.

Results (1) - Efficiency

$P(A) = \sum_n (v^n(A^n) - \sum_{m \in A^n} b_m^n) = \text{efficiency/welfare level of } A.$
 \bar{A} is efficient if $P(\bar{A}) = \max_A P(A).$

Results (1) - Efficiency

$P(A) = \sum_n (v^n(A^n) - \sum_{m \in A^n} b_m^n) = \text{efficiency/welfare level of } A.$
 \bar{A} is efficient if $P(\bar{A}) = \max_A P(A).$

Example

Two firms $\{1, 2\}$ and two workers $\{a, b\}$, $v_1(a) = 2, v_1(b) = 1,$
 $v_2(a) = 1, v_2(b) = 2, v_i(ab) = \max(v_i(a), v_i(b)).$ Workers are indifferent between the two firms.

Maximal welfare is 4 (by assigning a to 1 and b to 2).

(A, s) stable $\implies A$ is efficient (Kelso and Crawford, 1982).

Results (1) - Efficiency

$P(A) = \sum_n (v^n(A^n) - \sum_{m \in A^n} b_m^n) = \text{efficiency/welfare level of } A.$
 \bar{A} is efficient if $P(\bar{A}) = \max_A P(A).$

Example

Two firms $\{1, 2\}$ and two workers $\{a, b\}$, $v_1(a) = 2, v_1(b) = 1,$
 $v_2(a) = 1, v_2(b) = 2, v_i(ab) = \max(v_i(a), v_i(b)).$ Workers are
indifferent between the two firms.

Maximal welfare is 4 (by assigning a to 1 and b to 2).

(A, s) stable $\implies A$ is efficient (Kelso and Crawford, 1982).

The assignment of a to 2 and b to 1, with salaries $s_1 = s_2 = 1$, is
JS-stable, and it has welfare of 2.

Results (1) - Efficiency

$P(A) = \sum_n (v^n(A^n) - \sum_{m \in A^n} b_m^n) = \text{efficiency/welfare level of } A.$
 \bar{A} is efficient if $P(\bar{A}) = \max_A P(A).$

Example

Two firms $\{1, 2\}$ and two workers $\{a, b\}$, $v_1(a) = 2, v_1(b) = 1,$
 $v_2(a) = 1, v_2(b) = 2, v_i(ab) = \max(v_i(a), v_i(b)).$ Workers are
indifferent between the two firms.

Maximal welfare is 4 (by assigning a to 1 and b to 2).

(A, s) stable $\implies A$ is efficient (Kelso and Crawford, 1982).

The assignment of a to 2 and b to 1, with salaries $s_1 = s_2 = 1$, is
JS-stable, and it has welfare of 2.

Theorem (A $\frac{1}{2}$ -First Welfare Theorem)

(A, s) JS-stable allocation $\implies P(A) \geq \frac{1}{2} \max_{\bar{A}} P(\bar{A}).$

Proof of first result

(for the case $b_m^n = 0$).

Let \bar{A} be the optimal assignment and A a JS-stable assignment

Since firm n does not want to expand from A^n to $\bar{A}^n \cup A^n$:

$$v^n(\bar{A}^n \cup A^n) - v^n(A^n) \leq \sum_{m \in \bar{A}^n \setminus A^n} s_m.$$

$$\text{Rearranging: } v^n(\bar{A}^n) \leq v^n(\bar{A}^n \cup A^n) \leq \sum_{m \in \bar{A}^n \setminus A^n} s_m + v^n(A^n)$$

Summing over all firms:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n v^i(\bar{A}^i) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{m \in A^i} s_m + \sum_{i=1}^n v^i(A^i) \leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n v^i(A^i)$$

(last inequality follows from (IR) of A).

A class of production functions

Most of the current literature focuses on the set of production functions called **Gross Substitues (GS)**.

We consider the set of production functions called **Almost Fractionally Sub-additive (AFS)** - definition to follow.

- ▶ *GS* is a strict (tiny) subset of *AFS*.
- ▶ *AFS* allows for a significantly richer structure of substitutabilities, and even some complementarities.

Fractional Subadditivity (Feige 2009)

Definition

For any $C \subseteq M$, a vector of non-negative weights $\{\lambda_D\}_{D \subseteq C, D \neq \emptyset}$ is a **fractional cover** of C if for any $m \in C$, $\sum_{\{D \subseteq C: m \in D\}} \lambda_D = 1$.

Example

$C = \{a, b, c\}$. $\lambda_a = 1, \lambda_{bc} = 1$ is a fractional cover of C .
 $\lambda_{ab} = \lambda_{ac} = \lambda_{bc} = \frac{1}{2}$ is also a fractional cover of C .

Fractional Subadditivity

Definition (Bondareva-Shapley, also in Feige 2009)

$v^n : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is **Fractionally Sub-additive on** $C \subseteq M$ if for any fractional cover $\{\lambda_D\}_{D \subseteq C, D \neq \emptyset}$ of C , $v(C) \leq \sum_{D \subseteq C, D \neq \emptyset} \lambda_D v(D)$.

$v^n : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is **Fractionally Sub-additive**, denoted $v \in FS$, if for any $C \subseteq M$, v is Fractionally Sub-additive on C .

A detour to cooperative GT

In cooperative game theory a Fractionally Sub-additive function is called a **(anti-) balanced cooperative game** (a-la Bondareva and Shapley).

Definition (Bondareva-Shapley, also in Dobzinski et al. 2010)

A non-negative vector of salaries s is called a **supporting salary vector** for a production function v and a set of workers $C \subseteq M$ if

(1) $\sum_{m \in C} s_m = v(C)$; and

(2) For any $T \subset C$, $\sum_{m \in T} s_m \leq v(T)$ (reversed CORE)

Theorem (**Bondareva-Shapley**)

A production function v is F.S. on $C \subseteq M$ if and only if there exists a supporting salary vector for (C, v) .

Corollary: $v \in FS$ if and only if there exists a supporting salary vector for (C, v) for all $C \subseteq M$.

The connection of FS to JS-stability

Lemma

If $v^1, \dots, v^N \in FS$ and then every efficient assignment $A = \{A^1, \dots, A^N\}$ is JS-stable.

For example, (A, s) is a JS-stable allocation if for every firm n we set $\{s_m\}_{m \in A^n}$ to be a supporting salary vector for (v^n, A^n) .

The connection of FS to JS-stability

Lemma

If $v^1, \dots, v^N \in FS$ and then every efficient assignment $A = \{A^1, \dots, A^N\}$ is JS-stable.

For example, (A, s) is a JS-stable allocation if for every firm n we set $\{s_m\}_{m \in A^n}$ to be a supporting salary vector for (v^n, A^n) .

Proof: IR is immediate. No firm k wants to add a single employee $m \in A^n$ since:

- ▶ $v^n(A^n) = \sum_{i \in A^n} s_i$
- ▶ $v^n(A^n \setminus \{m\}) \geq \sum_{i \in A^n \setminus \{m\}} s_i$
- ▶ Therefore
$$v^k(A^k \cup \{m\}) - v^k(A^k) \leq v^n(A^n) - v^n(A^n \setminus \{m\}) \leq s_m$$

No firm wants to hire several employees using similar manipulations.

Definition

$v^n : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is **Almost Fractionally Sub-additive**, denoted $v \in AFS$, if:

1. For any $C \subset M$ (excluding $C = M$) v is Fractionally Sub-additive on C ; and
2.
$$v(M) \leq \frac{\sum_{m \in M} v(M \setminus m)}{|M| - 1}.$$

A production function is a vector of $2^M - 1$ real numbers and so can be viewed as an element of the $2^M - 1$ -dimensional Euclidean space which induces a natural measure.

Theorem (Lehmann, Lehmann and Nisan, GEB 2006)

GS \subset *SUBMODULAR* \subset *FS* (\subset *AFS*) and for some natural measure over the set of production functions *GS* has measure zero while *SUBMODULAR* (and hence *AFS*) has positive measure

An example of a production function in AFS

Example

There are 3 workers, denoted a, b, c and let the production function v be defined by: $v(a) = v(b) = v(c) = 3$,
 $v(\{a, b\}) = v(\{a, c\}) = 6$, $v(\{b, c\}) = 4$, $v(\{a, b, c\}) = 8$.

Claim: $v \in AFS$ (but not in FS).

Observation: Worker a and the pair $\{b, c\}$ are complementarities.

Theorem (A Second Welfare Theorem)

*If $v^n \in GS \ \forall n \in N$ and A is Pareto efficient
then (A, s) is stable for some s (Kelso and Crawford, 1982).*

Theorem (A Second Welfare Theorem)

*If $v^n \in GS \ \forall n \in N$ and A is Pareto efficient
then (A, s) is stable for some s (Kelso and Crawford, 1982).*

*If $v^n \in AFS \ \forall n \in N$ and A is efficient
then (A, s) is JS-stable for some s .*

Sketch of proof of second result

Case 1: In A , several firms receive a non-empty set of employees

Since $A^n \subset M$ (in particular, $A^n \neq M$) for all n , it follows that v^n is F.S. on A^n for all n .

Thus, there exists a supporting salary vector for (A^n, v^n) for all n and we already saw that setting salaries $\{s_m\}_{m \in A^n}$ to be supporting salaries for $v^n(A^n)$ yields a JS-stable outcome.

Sketch of proof of second result

Case 2: A assigns all workers to a single firm, firm n

Set $\forall m, s_m = v^n(M) - v^n(M \setminus \{m\})$.

- ▶ No firm k wants to hire a single employee m since:

$$v^k(\{m\}) \leq v^n(M) - v^n(M \setminus \{m\}) = s_m$$

(inequality follows from efficient assignment).

No firm wants to hire several employees using similar manipulations.

- ▶ IR holds since for $v \in AFS$,

$$v(M) \geq \sum_{m \in M} (v(M) - v(M \setminus \{m\}))$$

(rearranging the second condition of AFS).

Results (3) - Maximality of AFS

Theorem

If $\bar{v} \notin GS$ then there exists a job market $(v, 0)$, where $v^1 = \bar{v}$ and for all $n > 1$ $v^n \in GS$ such that no stable allocation exists (Gul & Stacchetti, JET 1999).

Results (3) - Maximality of AFS

Theorem

If $\bar{v} \notin GS$ then there exists a job market $(v, 0)$, where $v^1 = \bar{v}$ and for all $n > 1$ $v^n \in GS$ such that no stable allocation exists (Gul & Stacchetti, JET 1999).

If $\bar{v} \notin AFS$ then there exists a job market $(v, 0)$, where $v^1 = \bar{v}$ and for all $n > 1$ $v^n \in AFS$ such that no efficient JS-stable allocation of the market exists.

Structure of proof of third result

(proof somewhat more involved than previous proofs)

Definition

$v^n : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is **Symmetrically Fractionally Sub-additive (SFS)**, if $v(C) \leq \frac{\sum_{m \in C} v(C \setminus m)}{|C|-1}$ for all $C \subset M$.

Note that $AFS \subset SFS$.

Structure of proof of third result

(proof somewhat more involved than previous proofs)

Definition

$v^n : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is **Symmetrically Fractionally Sub-additive (SFS)**, if $v(C) \leq \frac{\sum_{m \in C} v(C \setminus m)}{|C|-1}$ for all $C \subset M$.

Note that $AFS \subset SFS$. Proof shows:

- ▶ If $\bar{v} \notin SFS$ then there exists a job market $(v, 0)$, where $v^1 = \bar{v}$ and for all $n > 1$ $v^n \in AFS$ such that no JS-stable allocation exists (in particular, any efficient allocation is not JS-stable).

Structure of proof of third result

(proof somewhat more involved than previous proofs)

Definition

$v^n : 2^M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is **Symmetrically Fractionally Sub-additive (SFS)**, if $v(C) \leq \frac{\sum_{m \in C} v(C \setminus m)}{|C|-1}$ for all $C \subset M$.

Note that $AFS \subset SFS$. Proof shows:

- ▶ If $\bar{v} \notin SFS$ then there exists a job market $(v, 0)$, where $v^1 = \bar{v}$ and for all $n > 1$ $v^n \in AFS$ such that no JS-stable allocation exists (in particular, any efficient allocation is not JS-stable).
- ▶ If $\bar{v} \in SFS \setminus AFS$, no efficient JS-stable allocation exists (but there may exist inefficient JS-stable allocations).

Structure of proof of third result

(proof somewhat more involved than previous proofs)

Definition

$v^n : 2^M \rightarrow \mathfrak{R}_+$ is **Symmetrically Fractionally Sub-additive (SFS)**, if $v(C) \leq \frac{\sum_{m \in C} v(C \setminus m)}{|C|-1}$ for all $C \subset M$.

Note that $AFS \subset SFS$. Proof shows:

- ▶ If $\bar{v} \notin SFS$ then there exists a job market $(v, 0)$, where $v^1 = \bar{v}$ and for all $n > 1$ $v^n \in AFS$ such that no JS-stable allocation exists (in particular, any efficient allocation is not JS-stable).
- ▶ If $\bar{v} \in SFS \setminus AFS$, no efficient JS-stable allocation exists (but there may exist inefficient JS-stable allocations).

Remark: We do not know if any tuple of production functions in SFS admit a JS-stable allocation; this is an (interesting?) open question.

Results (4) - JS-Stability and a natural auction game

The *SPIB* (*2nd-Price Item Bidding*) complete information game: Firms bid simultaneously for workers, each in a 2nd price auction.

Nash equilibrium with **weak no overbidding** satisfies:

$$v^n(A^n) \geq \sum_{m \in A^n} p_m^n, \text{ where } p_m^n \text{ is firm } n\text{'s bid for worker } m.$$

An assignment is called an **SPIB-assignment** if it is the outcome of a pure Nash equilibrium with no over-bidding of the SBIP-game.

Theorem

Any assignment is an SPIB-assignment if and only if it is a JS-stable assignment.

Results (4) - JS-Stability and a natural auction game

The *SPIB* (*2nd-Price Item Bidding*) complete information game: Firms bid simultaneously for workers, each in a 2nd price auction.

Nash equilibrium with **weak no overbidding** satisfies:

$$v^n(A^n) \geq \sum_{m \in A^n} p_m^n, \text{ where } p_m^n \text{ is firm } n\text{'s bid for worker } m.$$

An assignment is called an **SPIB-assignment** if it is the outcome of a pure Nash equilibrium with no over-bidding of the SBIP-game.

Theorem

Any assignment is an SPIB-assignment if and only if it is a JS-stable assignment.

- ▶ Ties existence of pure NE with weak no overbidding to existence of JS-stability
- ▶ Ties efficiency of JS-stability to efficiency of NE outcomes.
- ▶ Salaries in the two settings are not identical (typically, NE salaries are lower than JS-stable salaries).

Summary

- ▶ Study JS-stable allocations, a relaxation of the classic stable allocation concept.
- ▶ Show an approximate first welfare theorem.
- ▶ Show a second welfare theorem that holds for the class of AFS valuations. This class is significantly larger than GS.
- ▶ Show maximality of AFS: it is the largest class for which the second welfare theorem is guaranteed to hold.
- ▶ Show a connection to a second price auction game.
- ▶ Many extensions and open problems present themselves...