

Policy Analysis in Matching Markets

By NIKHIL AGARWAL*

Government policies intended to affect assignments are common in labor, education and other matching markets. Common interventions influence prices and/or quantities through direct subsidies (e.g. financial aid), price regulations (e.g. tuition caps, changes to the pay scale), quotas or supply interventions (e.g. establishing or closing public schools, funding for new positions). An empirical approach that accounts for the effects of these policies on the assignment of students to schools/colleges or workers to firms is necessary for capturing equilibrium re-sorting caused by these policies.

This article presents the key components of an empirical framework appropriate for such analysis and then uses the model and estimates from Agarwal (2015) to compare financial incentives and supply interventions intended to encourage training of medical residents in rural areas of the United States. The two key components of the framework are (i) a random utility model for the preferences of the agents and (ii) pairwise stability as a description of the equilibrium matches. The interventions mentioned above influence either preferences through financial incentives or available positions. Estimating the distribution of preferences can be challenging if data on stated preferences is not available. This problem is the subject of a recent methodological literature that is briefly mentioned in the article. Once a preference model has been estimated, counterfactual simulations of an equilibrium assignment with altered preferences or positions can be conducted to analyze and predict the effects of a proposed policy.

* Agarwal: Department of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02142 and NBER, agarwaln@mit.edu. Support from the National Science Foundation (grant SES-1427231) is gratefully acknowledged.

The specific empirical application we study is motivated by the perceived under-supply of medical labor in the rural US (Rosenblatt and Hart (2000)). Although a fifth of the U.S. population lives in rural areas, less than a tenth of physicians practice in rural communities. Specialized rural residency training and physician retention is seen as an important part of solution to this disparity. The Affordable Care Act addresses the shortage of rural physicians by funding an increase in the number of residency programs in rural areas, redistributing unused Medicare funds originally allocated for residency training in urban hospitals, and increasing the funding of loan forgiveness programs used to recruit physicians to shortage areas. Such regulations are not unique to the United States. Recently, Japan reduced capacities in urban residency programs to mitigate their rural resident shortage (Kamada and Kojima, 2010).

I. Model

Consider a two-sided matching market, and for ease of reference, one side is labelled workers and the other side is labelled firms. The model can also be used to study other markets, such as the matching of students to colleges or schools. The two key components of the model are the preferences of each side of the market, and an equilibrium concept describing the final matches.

A. Preferences

Let the (indirect) utility of worker $i \in \mathcal{I}$ for firm $j \in \mathcal{J}$ be given by

$$(1) \quad u_{ij} = U(z_{ij}, \xi_j, \eta_i),$$

where z_{ij} are observed worker-firm characteristics (that may include a wage), ξ_j is a firm-specific unobserved characteristic,

and η_i captures idiosyncratic tastes of the worker. Symmetrically, let the (indirect) utility of firm j for worker i be denoted

$$(2) \quad h_{ji} = H(x_{ji}, \varepsilon_i, \nu_j),$$

where x_{ji} are a set of observables that may or may not overlap with z_{ij} , ε_i and ν_j are firm and worker specific unobservables respectively. The utilities for the worker and the firm for remaining unmatched are denoted u_{i0} and h_{j0} respectively.

These utilities represents the (ordinal) preferences of the worker and the firms for agents on the other side of the market. This representation assumes that each agent's preferences depends only on the particular partner in consideration, and therefore rules out complementarities or externalities across matches such as peer effects. As is standard in the discrete choice literature, a scale and a location normalization are necessary on each side of the market.

For estimation, it is typically necessary to make parametric assumptions on $U(\cdot)$ and the distributions of unobserved terms. In many applications, a (pre-determined) tuition or a salary is one of the observable characteristics included in the preferences. If price regulations are the focus of the study, it can be important to instrument for this transfer to avoid bias in the estimates. Agarwal (2015) uses a control function approach to address this issue.

B. Pairwise Stability

A central concept in the empirical analysis of matching markets is **pairwise stability**. Formally, a match is a function $\mu : \mathcal{I} \rightarrow \mathcal{J} \cup \{0\}$, where 0 denotes being unmatched. We assume that $|\mu^{-1}(j)| \leq c_j$ where c_j is the capacity of firm j . A match μ is **blocked by an individual** if for any i , $u_{i\mu(i)} < u_{i0}$ or for any j and $i' \in \mu^{-1}(j)$, $h_{ji'} < h_{j0}$. μ is blocked by the pair (i, j) if $u_{ij} > u_{i\mu(i)}$ and $h_{ji} > h_{ji'}$ for some $i' \in \mu^{-1}(j)$.¹

Existence of a pairwise stable equilibrium is guaranteed when preferences satisfy sub-

stitutability properties, and while there may be multiple stable matches, the structure of the equilibrium set is well known (Roth and Sotomayor, 1992).² The equilibrium concept can be used either for estimation or for counter-factual predictions when estimation through other means is possible. Directly using this concept for analysis circumvents the need for modeling an application or interview process. However, the model may be mis-specified if these stages introduce large meaningful frictions in a particular market.

The definition of pairwise stability described above assumes that agents block matches based on pre-determined match values instead of also negotiating a transfer. It is therefore most appropriate to use this concept in settings where the terms of the partnership are inflexible or transfers are not used.³

II. Empirical Strategy

In some cases, direct data on agent choices is available and estimation of the preference models above can be accomplished using extensions of standard discrete choice approaches. This approach is most commonly applied when a centralized assignment authority uses reported preferences to determine assignments.⁴

More frequently, a researcher has data only on final assignments from sources such as matched employer-employee data or enrollment records. Even with such limited data, it may still be possible to estimate preference models if pairwise stability is a suitable assumption. Data limitations, however, necessitate additional restrictions on preferences. Menzel (2015) and Diamond and Agarwal (2016) show that flexible preference models are under-identified

²One may either place a restriction on preferences to guarantee a unique stable match, or select an equilibrium, say the firm-optimal one, for analysis.

³See empirical approaches following Choo and Siow (2006) for notions with transferable utility.

⁴Hastings et al. (2009), and Abdulkadiroglu et al. (2015) estimate preferences assuming truthful reporting, while approaches by He (2014), Agarwal and Somaini (2015), and references within consider the case where truthful reporting may not be a reasonable assumption.

¹We use the convention that $0 \in \mu^{-1}(j)$ if $|\mu^{-1}(j)| < c_j$.

in these cases because preferences on either side of the market can explain the observed matches. When many workers are matched to the same firm, some of the under-identification issues can be resolved (Diamond and Agarwal, 2016). Intuitively, multiple hires at the same firm for the same job must be similarly qualified in a pairwise stable match. This can allow a researcher to learn more about preferences, particularly on the firm side. In addition, exclusion restrictions whereby certain observables only enter one side of the market can be useful in learning about preferences.

Agarwal (2015) uses these two sources of information, and the assumption that the firms have identical preferences for workers, to estimate preferences using pairwise stability in the market for family medicine residents. The paper also demonstrates how a control function approach can be used to address endogeneity of certain characteristics such as salaries. Jiang (2016) uses a similar empirical framework, but one that relies on an observed proxy for the productivity of workers, to address the under-identification of preferences. Vissing (2016) extends the approach to allow for certain types of complementarities across matches to study the assignment of oil leases.

III. Price and Quantity Regulations in Matching Markets: Application to Rural Residency Training

This section uses data from the 2010-2011 academic year of the family medicine residency market and preference parameter estimates from Specification (1) of Agarwal (2015) to simulate the impact of various interventions for encouraging rural training. The tables below focus on quantifying impact of these policy interventions on the sorting and number of residents in rural programs.

A. Price Regulations: Financial Incentives for Rural Training

To simulate the impact of financial incentives, I exogenously increase the salaries at rural hospitals by \$5,000, \$10,000 and

\$20,000.⁵

Panel A presents the impact of increased incentives for rural training. The incentive affects residents roughly indifferent between a rural and an urban program to rank the rural program ahead of the urban program. Across the board, we see small increases in the number of residents matches to programs in rural communities. An incentive of \$20,000 increases the number of residents training in rural areas by about 17, from a base of 310. This incentive costs the government \$325,000 per additional resident matched to a rural program because most of the incentive accrues to residents assigned to positions that would be occupied without the financial incentive. Instead of affecting numbers, the primary impact is an increase in the human capital of residents matched to rural areas. As compared to a baseline of about an even chance, under a small \$5,000 incentive, a randomly chosen rural resident is about 9.4 percentage points more likely to have a higher human capital than an urban resident. This increase in the quality of residents is increasing with size of the incentives.

These results are driven by capacity constraints in desirable rural programs. With 310 out of rural 334 positions filled, there is little scope for a substantial increase total number of residents. Instead, there is an increase in the quality of residents matched at subsidized programs.

One may ask whether a simpler analysis based on partial equilibrium reasoning with unilateral salary increases by programs would lead to similar conclusions. With quasi-linear utility, a uniform increase in salaries of all residency programs would not impact assignments because the comparison between any two programs remains unchanged. A partial equilibrium analysis based on unilateral deviations would still find increases in numbers and quality at rural hospitals. We expect the importance of the general equilibrium effects, of course, to be less pronounced for smaller interven-

⁵The average resident is willing to take a \$8,000 salary cut to train at the average urban program instead of a rural program.

TABLE 1—EFFECTS OF POLICY INSTRUMENTS FOR ENCOURAGING RURAL TRAINING

<i>Panel A: Salary Incentives</i>			
	\$5,000	\$10,000	\$20,000
Rural Matches	10.23	17.3	20.63
Δ Pr. Rural Res.>Urban Res.	9.38%	17.70%	31.28%
Total Cost of Subsidy (mil.)	\$1.62	\$3.31	\$6.68
Δ Priv. Residents' Welfare (Mil.)	\$1.84	\$3.64	\$7.05
Cost Per Additional Resident	\$158,143	\$191,116	\$323,762
<i>Panel B: Quantity Regulations</i>			
	Reduce Urban Positions	Increase Rural Positions	Combined Policy
Modified Urban Capacity	2846	2963 (baseline)	2688
Modified Rural Capacity	334 (baseline)	460	460
Δ # Rural Matches	12.01	121.31	146.63
Δ Pr. Rural Res.>Urban Res.	-0.56%	7.02%	-3.73%
Δ Priv. Residents' Welfare (Mil.)	-\$3.76	\$5.39	-\$5.49

Notes: In the first and third columns of Panel B, urban positions are reduced in proportion to program size, subject to integer constraints, until further reductions would yield a greater number of residents than programs. Two rural positions were added per program in the second and third columns. Prob. $X > Y$ is the Wilcoxon statistic.

tions.

Table 1 also shows that a \$5,000 incentive results in a transfer of \$1.6 million from the government to residents. However, the estimated increase in residents' private welfare is 13.5% more than this amount. This difference is due to the presence of heterogeneous preferences and the ability of financial incentives to realize potential efficiency gains by assigning residents with the lowest distaste for rural programs to those positions. A small incentive for training in a rural program only induces a resident who is roughly indifferent between a rural and an urban program to choose rural training. This resident then opens up a position in an urban program that may be strongly preferred by another resident. Therefore, general equilibrium re-sorting effects of the financial incentive can result in an increase in the efficiency of assignments. Without preference heterogeneity, the impact on the private benefits to residents, net of the transfer, is only through the total number of positions filled at different programs.

B. Quantity Regulations

Panel B of Table 1 considers three types of quantity regulations. The first mimics the policy implemented in Japan and reduces the number of positions in urban programs proportional to the size of the pro-

gram. The second increases the number of rural training positions at existing rural programs. The final intervention combines the two by first increasing the number of positions at existing rural programs followed by decreasing the number of positions in urban programs proportionally.

Because reducing the number of positions offered at urban programs displaces residents, it mechanically increases the number of residents matching at rural programs. However, the sorting effects of these changes are not *a priori* clear. A naive reasoning may lead to the conclusion that caps have a large adverse impact on the quality of residents training at rural programs because displaced residents are disproportionately less desired by the programs they are matched to. However, residents displaced from urban programs in turn displace others, resulting in overall resorting. According to the estimates, the distribution of resident quality matching at rural programs is similar to the distribution before the caps.

An important, impact of these reductions is the loss in private welfare of residents from the decreased availability of positions. This decrease results in a similar number of additional residents in rural programs as a \$5,000 financial incentive. However, price incentives result in an overall gain for residents in addition to the transfer. The ob-

ervation suggests that quantity regulations are a blunt policy instrument that do not target residents with the least dislike for rural positions.

In contrast, increasing positions in rural programs results in increases in both the number and quality of residents matched to these programs. The change in quality of residents in rural areas is due to increases in the number of residents matched at the highest quality rural programs but decreases in the number of residents matched at low quality residency programs in urban and rural areas.

Finally, the third policy combines the other two and, by construction, has a large effect on the number of residents placed in rural programs. As compared to a singular increase in positions offered in rural areas, this policy can adversely affect the quality of residents assigned to rural program by forcing residents into undesirable residency positions that were earlier left vacant.

IV. Conclusion

Two common features of two-sided matching markets are that agents are heterogeneous and that highly individualized prices are often not used. Both properties have important policy implications because assignments are determined by the mutual choices of agents rather than price-based market clearing. The framework presented in this article captures these two aspects of matching markets and is a natural tool for prospective analysis when sorting is an important consideration in policy decisions.

The empirical application studied here highlights the importance of considering the sorting effects. The primary effect of financial incentives were to increase the quality of residents training in rural areas, not their numbers. In contrast, quantity regulations were effective at increasing the supply of residents in rural areas. Remarkably, however, this increase in numbers did not come at a large detriment to the quality of residents due to the re-sorting of residents.

In future work and as the application demands, it may be useful to extend the model to incorporate other equally impor-

tant factors such as entry into the market and salary setting.

REFERENCES

- Abdulkadiroglu, A., Agarwal, N., and Pathak, P. A. (2015). The Welfare Effects of Coordinated School Assignment: Evidence from the NYC High School Match. *NBER Working Paper*, No. 21046.
- Agarwal, N. (2015). An Empirical Model of the Medical Match. *American Economic Review*, 105(7):1939–78.
- Agarwal, N. and Somaini, P. (2015). Demand Analysis Using Strategic Reports: An Application to a School Choice Mechanism. *NBER Working Paper*, No. 20775.
- Choo, E. and Siow, A. (2006). Who Marries Whom and Why. *Journal of Political Economy*, 114(1):175–201.
- Diamond, W. and Agarwal, N. (2016). Latent Indices in Assortative Matching Models. *Quantitative Economics, forthcoming*.
- Hastings, J. S., Kane, T. J., and Staiger, D. O. (2009). Heterogeneous Preferences and the Efficacy of Public School Choice.
- He, Y. (2014). Gaming the Boston School Choice Mechanism in Beijing. *Toulouse School of Economics, mimeo*.
- Jiang, Y. (2016). Matching Games with Unobserved Heterogeneity: A Structural Analysis of Online Labor Markets. *John Hopkins University, mimeo*.
- Kamada, Y. and Kojima, F. (2010). Improving Efficiency in Matching Markets with Regional Caps: The Case of the Japan Residency Matching Program.
- Menzel, K. (2015). Large Matching Markets As Two-Sided Demand Systems. *Econometrica*, 83(3):897–941.
- Rosenblatt, R. A. and Hart, L. G. (2000). Physicians and Rural America. *The Western journal of medicine*, 173(5):348–51.

Roth, A. E. and Sotomayor, M. A. O.
(1992). *Two-Sided Matching*. Cambridge
University Press.

Vissing, A. (2016). One-to-Many Matching
with Complementary Preferences: An
Empirical Study of Natural Gas Lease
Quality and Market Power. *University
of Chicago, mimeo.*