

Labor Market Dynamics and Consumer Behavior: A Micro-economic Analysis

Lianning Dai*

International Business School Suzhou, Xi'an Jiaotong-Liverpool University, Suzhou, China

**Corresponding author: Lianning Dai.*

Abstract

We look at how household spending changes when labor markets have bigger wage gaps, less stable jobs, and more flexible work forms; we use the utility maximization framework and inter-temporal budget constraint to see how these three labor market changes affect personal consumption choices. We find two main influence paths; one works through the budget constraint itself, changing what people can buy now and what they expect to buy later; the other works through income expectations, where higher uncertainty makes people save more for safety and spend less right now. These two paths do not work the same for all consumers; our analysis of group differences shows that employment type, income level, and age group all change how people react. Formal workers have fairly predictable budget limits, while flexible workers deal with much more changeable income. Low and middle-income households are more likely to face slow wage growth, while high-income households may gain from higher pay for skilled work. Young workers usually put off big purchases; middle-aged workers have fixed financial duties that are hard to change; older workers have less time to make up for income drops. These differences mean that policies to keep consumption stable should target different groups separately, instead of only using broad demand management methods. For the research method, this paper combines existing theoretical and empirical studies to build a complete micro-economic framework; it follows how labor market shocks move through budget constraints and income expectations, and finally lead to different consumption results for different groups.

Keywords

labor market change, consumer behavior, precautionary saving, group difference analysis, consumption structure

1. Introduction

In recent years, many different factors have changed the global labor market; digital technology development, industrial restructure after the pandemic, and the shift to low-carbon economy all play a part [1]. These changes are more than just changes in total employment numbers; they have changed how wages are distributed, made jobs less stable, and made flexible work much more common. All these changes directly affect how households earn money, how much they expect to earn in the future, and finally how they spend their money. Since household consumption is still the main driver of economic growth, understanding how

individual consumers adjust their spending when labor markets change has become an important topic for studying modern economies.

Current research still has two main gaps. First, most studies look at overall relationships; they do not carefully track the micro-level influence paths step by step [2]. Second, most research treats all consumers as the same group; it does not pay enough attention to how employment type, income level, and age make people respond differently to the same labor market change. To fill these two gaps, this paper tries to answer the following question:

Through what micro-economic paths do wage polarization, falling job stability, and more flexible employment change consumer behavior, and how do these effects differ across different groups of people?

To answer this question, we build our analysis on two basic micro-economic theories: utility maximization and the inter-temporal budget constraint. We find two paths that connect labor market change to consumption decisions; one path makes the budget constraint tighter or looser itself, the other changes long-term income expectations and how much people save for precaution. We then divide the analysis along three dimensions: employment type (formal work vs flexible work), income level, and age group.

This paper makes both theoretical and practical contributions. On the theory side, we expand the use of classical consumption models — the permanent income hypothesis, the life-cycle hypothesis, and precautionary saving theory — and add labor market structural change as a reason why different people have different consumption responses. On the practical side, it gives a micro-economic reason to move past broad aggregate demand policies, and toward policies that target the specific influence paths that affect the most exposed groups.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Defining Labor Market Change and Consumer Behavior

We define labor market change in this paper as long-term structural shifts in employment structure, wage distribution, and work forms; it is not the same as short-term cyclical changes. Following the method from [3], we measure labor market change along three dimensions: wage gaps across different skill groups, higher employment instability and unemployment risk, and the fast growth of flexible, non-standard work. This framework covers both global trends recorded by the ILO and World Bank, and the specific path of employment change in China.

For the consumer side, we define consumer behavior within the standard micro-economic framework; it refers to inter-temporal consumption and saving decisions that people make to get the most utility under budget limits. Instead of looking at total household consumption (the macro approach), this paper focuses on two micro-level indicators. One is the marginal propensity to consume (MPC), which measures how much of each extra unit of income goes to consumption; the other is consumption structure, measured by the share of basic living, development, and enjoyment spending in total expenditure. These two indicators show the decision-making logic that labor market shocks actually disturb.

2.2 Theoretical Foundations

The connection between labor markets and consumption has a long history in economic theory. Keynes [4], in the General Theory, was the first to make the most direct point: current consumption depends on current disposable income, and the labor market is the main source of that income. The Absolute Income Hypothesis is simple, but its meaning is important; when labor markets change wages or employment levels, consumption changes along with them.

Friedman [5] expanded this idea with the Permanent Income Hypothesis. He argued that consumers base their spending on long-run expected income, not short-term changes. This is especially relevant for understanding labor market change; if job stability shapes people's expectations of permanent income, then falling job security may lower consumption even when current wages stay the same. Modigliani and Brumberg [6] further developed the life-cycle view; they showed that consumers spread their consumption evenly over their whole life, borrowing when young, saving in middle age, and using savings when retired. This life-cycle

view is very important for understanding why labor market shocks affect different age groups differently; we discuss this point more in Section 4.

Leland [7] introduced the idea of precautionary saving. He showed that when income is uncertain and people are careful about risk, they save more and spend less right now. Stephens [8] gave early empirical evidence for this; he found that expectations of job loss significantly lower household spending, especially spending on durable goods. Dynan et al. [9] added a distribution angle: high-income households have a much lower MPC than low and middle-income groups. This means wage polarization, which makes income gaps wider, may lower the overall consumption tendency of the whole economy.

Evidence from China is largely in line with these mechanisms. Chamon and Prasad [10] found that rising saving rates among urban Chinese households came from growing income uncertainty, caused by labor market and pension system reforms; spending on development and enjoyment was squeezed the most. Feng et al. [11] showed that wider pension coverage greatly reduces precautionary saving among urban households; this finding is directly relevant for flexible workers, who often do not have such coverage. Blanchflower and Machin [3] also noted that flexible workers have a much stronger motive to save for precaution than formal employees.

2.3 Research Gaps and Contributions

Even with all this existing research, there are still important gaps. Most of the literature stays at the macro level; it looks at the total consumption effects of labor market changes, but does not break down the micro-level influence paths in a systematic way. There is also not enough attention paid to heterogeneity — how employment type, income bracket, and age group change the way people actually experience and respond to labor market shocks. Without adding heterogeneity into the micro-level utility framework, existing research cannot provide the detailed theoretical support that targeted consumption policies need.

The methodological innovation of this paper is that it puts heterogeneity across employment type, income level, and age group into a unified micro-economic utility framework. In this way, it provides a systematic, broken-down account of the influence mechanisms that connect structural labor market change to individual consumption decisions.

3. Impact Mechanism of Labor Market Changes on Consumer Behavior

3.1 Changes in Budget Constraints

The inter-temporal budget constraint is the logical starting point. The constraint states that the present value of lifetime consumption must equal the present value of lifetime labor income plus initial wealth [6]. Labor market changes disrupt this constraint in three distinct ways:

The first is the most direct: wage polarization reshapes current disposable income. Automation and digitalization have widened the skill premium, pushing the income distribution outward for high-skilled workers while stagnating wages for low- and middle-skilled workers [12, 13]. In Keynesian terms, this translates immediately into divergent consumption capacities—the budget line expands for some and contracts for others.

The second is subtler but arguably more consequential: declining employment stability shrinks the present value of expected future income. Rising unemployment risk and shorter job tenures reduce the discounted stream of earnings that finances future consumption, forcing households to reallocate spending and saving across their remaining working life [14]. This is not just about losing a job today; it is about the erosion of confidence in what one will earn tomorrow.

The third mechanism is qualitatively different from the first two. The expansion of flexible employment introduces income volatility that undermines the predictability of the budget constraint itself. Even when expected income is unchanged, a more volatile income process raises the variance of feasible consumption paths, effectively tightening the constraint through liquidity considerations [15]. A gig worker who earns the same average monthly income as a formal employee faces a fundamentally different—and tighter—budget set because the variance matters independently of the mean.

Taken together, these three mechanisms ensure that labor market change operates as a structural shock to the budget constraint underlying every consumption decision. The constraint does not simply shift inward or outward; its shape and stability change in ways that differ across workers.

3.2 Adjustment of Income Expectations

The second transmission path runs through income expectations. Friedman's Permanent Income Hypothesis [5] is the anchor here: current consumption is governed by permanent income, not transitory fluctuations. This means that shifts in long-run income expectations—not just current wage changes—are what trigger consumption adjustment. Formally, while the budget constraint channel operates through shifts in the feasible consumption set, the income expectation channel operates through revisions to the permanent income component of the utility-maximization problem—the two channels are linked by the fact that any change in the constraint's shape feeds into the consumer's assessment of long-run earnings.

Wage polarization affects this mechanism by altering the expected lifetime trajectory of earnings. Workers in shrinking middle-skill occupations are not just earning less today; they are revising their permanent income downward, and with it their sustainable consumption path. Workers in expanding high-skill segments do the opposite [12].

Declining employment stability and rising unemployment risk operate differently. They raise the variance of expected future income rather than its mean. Leland's framework [7] predicts that under prudent preferences, income uncertainty strengthens precautionary saving and crowds out current consumption. Stephens [8] provides empirical evidence that job-loss expectations significantly depress household spending, with durable and discretionary goods hit hardest.

Flexible employment adds a third layer. Flexible workers often have weaker access to unemployment insurance and pension coverage, increasing their exposure to income volatility [3,16]. Greater income uncertainty may therefore strengthen precautionary saving and shift consumption toward necessities [16].

The budget constraint and income expectation channels do not operate in isolation. They interact: a shock that tightens the current budget constraint while simultaneously raising income uncertainty produces a consumption response larger than either channel alone would predict. The next section examines how this interaction plays out differently across consumer groups.

4. Heterogeneity Analysis of Consumer Behavior

The two transmission channels identified above—budget constraint adjustment and income expectation revision—do not operate with uniform intensity across all consumers. Employment type, income level, and age cohort systematically shape how each channel functions, producing distinct patterns of consumption response. This section examines each dimension in turn.

4.1 Employment Type: Formal Versus Flexible Workers

The gap between formal and flexible employment is not just about income levels—it is about the very nature of the budget constraint each group faces. Formal employees typically have stable contracts, employer-provided social insurance, and predictable wage trajectories. Flexible workers—gig-economy participants, temporary contract workers, the self-employed in non-standard arrangements—face pronounced income volatility, limited access to unemployment insurance, and weaker pension coverage [3].

These structural differences mean that the two channels operate differently across the two groups. For a formal worker, a negative wage shock shifts the budget line inward, but the shift is predictable. The worker can re-optimize along a known constraint. For flexible workers, income volatility makes the constraint less predictable even when expected income is unchanged. Higher income volatility may therefore strengthen precautionary saving and suppress current spending [3,16].

The practical implication is clear. Facing the same adverse labor market shock, formal workers can partially buffer consumption through social insurance and stable expectations. Flexible workers typically have weaker buffers and may reduce current consumption by shifting spending toward necessities and postponing durable-

goods purchases. The two channels reinforce each other for flexible workers, producing a consumption contraction that income changes alone cannot explain.

4.2 Income Level

For low- and middle-income consumers, the budget constraint channel is likely to be strongest. These groups are disproportionately concentrated in middle-skill occupations vulnerable to automation-driven wage stagnation and displacement [12]. When wage polarization compresses their earnings, the budget line tightens with almost no buffer—savings are minimal, and consumption is already concentrated in necessities. The income expectation channel may reinforce this effect: workers in shrinking middle-skill occupations face a structural downward revision of permanent income, with limited prospects of re-employment at comparable wages. Precautionary saving intensifies, further crowding out current consumption and shifting the spending mix toward subsistence categories [10].

High-income consumers may experience the two channels differently. The skill premium that drives wage polarization simultaneously expands the budget line for high-skilled workers, increasing current disposable income and widening the affordable consumption set [12]. Through the expectation channel, rising demand for high-skilled labor lifts the expected lifetime earnings trajectory, reducing the perceived need for precautionary saving and releasing resources for current spending. This may shift consumption toward developmental and enjoyment categories, with durable goods and services absorbing a growing share of total expenditure.

The pattern that emerges is one of consumption polarization mirroring the wage polarization in the labor market. The same structural forces—automation, digital transformation, and the decline of middle-skill occupations—simultaneously widen the consumption possibilities of high-income households and narrow those of low- and middle-income households. Budget constraints diverge mechanically with income; income expectations diverge endogenously as workers in different segments of the labor market form fundamentally different assessments of their future earnings.

4.3 Age Cohort

Age matters because it determines the time horizon over which consumption adjustment can occur. Modigliani and Brumberg's life-cycle framework [6] provides the organizing logic: consumers at different stages face systematically different income profiles, consumption needs, and adjustment windows.

Young consumers—roughly 25 to 35—are in the early accumulation phase. Their current income is low relative to expected lifetime earnings, and they face high demand for durables, housing, and human capital investment. Labor market shocks affect this group mainly through the expectation channel rather than the budget constraint: because current income is a small share of lifetime resources, moderate wage changes have limited direct effect on the feasible consumption set. What matters more is that flexible employment is prevalent among young workers, introducing substantial uncertainty into permanent income expectations. The behavioral response takes the form of postponement—delayed home purchases, deferred marriage and childbearing, and increased investment in education as a hedge against labor market risk.

Middle-aged consumers—roughly 36 to 55—are at the peak of the earnings profile but simultaneously bear the heaviest consumption burdens. Mortgage payments, children's education, and elderly care obligations make their consumption basket highly rigid. For this group, labor market shocks are most consequential because they strike at the point of maximum financial obligation. Any income loss directly threatens the capacity to meet fixed commitments. Unemployment risk at this stage inflicts the greatest damage on permanent income expectations—the remaining working life is still substantial, but the cost of occupational retooling is high. Stephens [8] documents that elevated job-loss expectations among middle-aged workers significantly depress household consumption, especially of durable goods. The behavioral response is a sharp increase in precautionary saving and a forced compression of discretionary spending, while subsistence spending is maintained.

Consumers approaching retirement—55 and above—face the narrowest adjustment window. They have entered the dis-saving phase, and consumption is increasingly financed by accumulated wealth and pension income rather than current labor earnings. Labor market shocks affect this group through a distinctive

mechanism: the choice set narrows to delayed retirement or premature labor market exit. The pension replacement rate becomes the decisive parameter. Feng et al. [11] demonstrate that expanded pension coverage significantly reduces precautionary saving among urban Chinese households, underscoring the critical role of institutional insurance for this cohort. Where pension coverage is inadequate, older workers facing employment displacement exhibit the most conservative consumption behavior of all groups—the compressed time horizon leaves no room for income recovery.

Across all three dimensions, the analysis suggests that labor market shocks need not have uniform consumption effects. Employment type determines the volatility of the constraint, income level determines the buffer space available for adjustment, and age determines the time horizon over which adjustment can occur. These dimensions interact in practice—a middle-aged flexible worker with low income faces the most severe consumption compression—and together they explain why aggregate consumption responds unevenly to labor market structural change.

5. Conclusion

This paper studies how wage polarization, falling job stability, and the growth of flexible employment change consumer behavior; it works through two interacting micro-economic channels: budget constraint adjustment and income expectation revision.

The budget constraint channel changes what consumers can afford now and what they expect to afford later; the income expectation channel makes precautionary saving stronger when future earnings are more uncertain, and this crowds out current spending even when current income does not change. The main value of this paper is showing that these channels work differently across three dimensions. Employment type decides whether the budget constraint changes in a predictable way or becomes unstable itself; income level decides how much buffer people have to adjust. Low and middle-income households face tight limits, while high-income households gain from the skill premium. Age defines how much time people have to recover: young workers put off big purchases; middle-aged workers cut back on optional spending because they have fixed obligations; older workers have the smallest window for adjustment.

By adding this heterogeneity into the micro-level utility framework, this paper gives a systematic explanation of how structural labor market change leads to different consumption outcomes. The analysis also has policy meanings. Because influence mechanisms differ across groups, targeted measures can work together with broad aggregate demand management. Expanding social insurance for flexible workers could help stabilize their budget limits and reduce excessive precautionary saving; retraining and skill-upgrading programs for middle-skill workers could ease the wage polarization that limits their consumption; strengthening pension systems could make older workers less vulnerable when they lose jobs. These measures target the specific ways that labor market change lowers consumption, instead of only relying on broad demand stimulus.

We should also note several limitations of this study. The analysis is theoretical; it is based on existing evidence rather than original empirical data. The three heterogeneity dimensions are treated as separate, but in reality they work together; for example, a middle-aged flexible worker with low income faces combined pressures that separate analysis can only partly show. In addition, the framework does not consider institutional differences across countries, which may change how strong the identified influence channels are. Future empirical research using household panel data is needed to test and measure the channels identified here, and to estimate the interaction effects that this theoretical framework suggests.

References

- [1] International Labour Organization (ILO). (2025). World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2025. International Labour Office. https://ilo.org/sites/default/files/2025-01/WESO25_Trends_ExecSum_EN.pdf
- [2] Lundborg, P., Majlesi, K., & Mikkelsen, S. (2024). Labor market shocks and wealth accumulation. https://www.kavehmajlesi.com/uploads/7/2/8/9/7289299/lmm_wealth_accumulation_january_2024.pdf

- [3] Blanchflower, D. G., & Machin, S. (2022). The changing nature of work, wage inequality, and the future of work. *IZA World of Labor*, 2022(498). <https://doi.org/10.15185/izawol.498>
- [4] Keynes, J. M. (1936). *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*. Macmillan.
- [5] Friedman, M. (1957). *A Theory of the Consumption Function*. Princeton University Press.
- [6] Modigliani, F., & Brumberg, R. (1954). Utility analysis and the consumption function: An interpretation of cross-section data. In K. K. Kurihara (Ed.), *Post-Keynesian Economics* (pp. 388–436). Rutgers University Press.
- [7] Leland, H. E. (1968). Saving and uncertainty: The precautionary demand for saving. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 82(3), 465–473.
- [8] Stephens, M. (2004). Job loss expectations, realizations, and household consumption behavior. *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 86(1), 253–269.
- [9] Dynan, K. E., Skinner, J., & Zeldes, S. P. (2004). Do the rich save more? *Journal of Political Economy*, 112(2), 397–444. <https://doi.org/10.1086/381475>
- [10] Chamon, M. D., & Prasad, E. S. (2010). Why are saving rates of urban households in China rising? *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 2(1), 93–130. <https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.2.1.93>
- [11] Feng, J., He, L., & Sato, H. (2011). Public pension and household saving: Evidence from urban China. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 39(4), 470–485. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jce.2011.01.002>
- [12] Autor, D. H. (2019). Work of the past, work of the future. *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, 109, 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1257/pandp.20191110>
- [13] ILO. (2024). *World Employment and Social Outlook: Trends 2024*. Geneva: International Labour Organization. <https://doi.org/10.54394/HQAE1085>
- [14] Benito, A. (2006). Does job insecurity affect household consumption? *Oxford Economic Papers*, 58(1), 157–181. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oenp/gpi041>
- [15] Blundell, R., et al. (2024). Labor Market Risk, Precautionary Savings, and Consumption Dynamics: New Micro Evidence. *Econometrica*, 92(3), 875-906. <https://doi.org/10.3982/ECTA20245>
- [16] Carroll, C. D. (1997). Buffer-stock saving and the life cycle / permanent income hypothesis. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1162/003355397555109>

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

This paper is an output of the science project.

Open Access

This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative

Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

