

PERSPECTIVES

SEASONALLY MALADJUSTED: HOW STATISTICAL METHODS HAVE DESTROYED 3.7 MILLION JOBS SINCE MARCH

July 30, 2020

Topics: <u>Market and Economics</u> Contributors: <u>Stephen J. Douglass</u>, Jess B. Yawitz, PhD



Subscribe to NISA Perspectives, Primers, News and Quarterly Economic Webinar Updates.

In this short note we demonstrate, primarily using a few examples and data points, how totally inappropriate it is to seasonally adjust initial unemployment claims during the pandemic and how doing so can lead to very misrepresentative "headline prints."

Why seasonally adjust claims?

The purpose of seasonal adjusting is to remove distortions that result from holidays, plant re-toolings, retail sector layoffs after the holidays, and other recurring calendar-based events that are effectively "noise" vis-à-vis true labor market conditions.

How is seasonal adjustment operationalized?

The Department of Labor utilizes econometric techniques to assign each of the 52 weeks a factor that captures whether that week is historically above or below the average of all 52 weeks. The factor is *multiplied* by the actual reported claims to obtain seasonally adjusted claims. If claims are generally high in a given week the factor is less than one; if low the factor is greater than one. The average factor for all 52 weeks is approximately one.

Why is this approach so inappropriate now?

History suggests that claims reported in the fourth week of March are low in comparison to the entire year and as a result that week is multiplied by a factor greater than one. The last week of March 2019, the reported claims of 184 thousand was increased by 27 thousand to obtain a seasonally adjusted 211 thousand (the factor was 1.15 then). The average seasonal adjustment in 2019 was 31 thousand jobs and the largest was 131 thousand. Brace yourself! This year actual claims for the fourth week of March were 6.016 million and the seasonal adjustment added 851 thousand (factor was 1.14) to obtain a seasonally adjusted 6.867 million! For perspective, actual claims have only exceeded 851 thousand once in the last 35 years, in the second week of 2009. You see the problem? Seasonal adjustment grosses up or down actual claims by a given percent.

Figure 1 shows how this multiplicative adjustment has distorted the claims data by a much larger number than in recent years. This distortion persisted through the most recent data. In the last three weeks through July 24, the number of actual initial claims declined by 306 thousand while the number of seasonally adjusted claims increased by 126 thousand. The seasonal adjustment actually reversed the sign on the trend in this widely followed high frequency indicator!



Figure 1: Seasonal Adjustment of Initial Jobless Claims

More interesting numbers

Through July 23rd cumulative seasonal adjustments to claims has resulted in a net increase of approximately 3.7 million reported claims. Since we believe typical employment seasonality is either irrelevant or insignificant this year, cumulative seasonal adjustments to claims have resulted in an approximately 3.7 million person overstatement of job losses YTD.

Here is an interesting what-if scenario. Suppose the economy had been shut down in January instead of March and the actual claims number for the second week of January was the reported number at the end of March: 6.016 million. Since the factor for that week is 0.61 (remember post-holiday retail layoffs) the seasonally adjusted claims would have been reported as 3.679 million, 2.337 million less than actual claims. Perhaps the headlines would not have been so dire.

Credit is due to our colleague, Dan Scholz, whose insight greatly contributed to this note.

Originally published on July 27, 2020; revised on July 30, 2020.

Disclaimer: By accepting this material, you acknowledge, understand and accept the following:

This material has been prepared by NISA Investment Advisors, LLC ("NISA"). This material is subject to change without notice. This document is for information and illustrative purposes only. It is not, and should not be regarded as "investment advice" or as a "recommendation" regarding a course of action, including without limitation as those terms are used in any applicable law or regulation. This information is provided with the understanding that with respect to the material provided herein (i) NISA is not acting in a fiduciary or advisory capacity under any contract with you, or any applicable law or regulation, (ii) that you will make your own independent decision with respect to any course of action in connection herewith, as to whether such course of action is appropriate or proper based on your own judgment and your specific circumstances and objectives, (iii) that you are capable of understanding and assessing the merits of a course of action and evaluating investment risks independently, and (iv) to the extent you are acting with respect to an ERISA plan, you are deemed to represent to NISA that you qualify and shall be treated as an independent fiduciary for purposes of applicable regulation. NISA does not purport to and does not, in any fashion, provide tax, accounting, actuarial, recordkeeping, legal, broker/dealer or any related services. You should consult your advisors with respect to these areas and the material presented herein. You may not rely on the material contained herein. NISA shall not have any liability for any damages of any kind whatsoever relating to this material. No part of this document may be reproduced in any manner, in whole or in part, without the written permission of NISA except for your internal use. This material is being provided to you at no cost and any fees paid by you to NISA are solely for the provision of investment management services pursuant to a written agreement. All of the foregoing statements apply regardless of (i) whether you now currently or may in the future become a client of NISA and (ii) the terms contained in any applicable investment management agreement or similar contract between you and NISA.