Job Ladders and Labor Productivity Dynamics

Elias Albagli    Benjamin Garcia    Sebastian Guarda
Alberto Naudon    Matias Tapia

November, 2021
Motivation:

- **Cerra and Saxena [2008, 2017], Reinhart and Rogoff [2009]**
- Multiple potential channels; we want to focus on a particular mechanism: destruction of valuable labor matches
- Severe recessions have **persistent** effects on output & productivity
  - Cerra and Saxena [2008, 2017], Reinhart and Rogoff [2009]
  - Multiple potential channels; we want to focus on a particular mechanism: destruction of valuable labor matches
  - Recessions and their aftermath change the composition of employment
Our paper in a nutshell

Motivation:

- Cerra and Saxena [2008, 2017], Reinhart and Rogoff [2009]
- Multiple potential channels; we want to focus on a particular mechanism: destruction of valuable labor matches
- Severe recessions have **persistent** effects on output & productivity
  - Cerra and Saxena [2008, 2017], Reinhart and Rogoff [2009]
  - Multiple potential channels; we want to focus on a particular mechanism: destruction of valuable labor matches
  - Recessions and their aftermath change the composition of employment

Specific question:

- Is average **match quality** relevant for aggregate labor productivity variations across the business cycle? Do job ladders play a role?
  - **Job ladder**: Workers share a ranking of jobs, they climb slowly through E-E transitions, and fall off (into unemployment) because of negative shocks (Moscarini and Postel-Vinay [2018]).
Motivation:

- Cerra and Saxena [2008, 2017], Reinhart and Rogoff [2009]
- Multiple potential channels; we want to focus on a particular mechanism: destruction of valuable labor matches
- Severe recessions have persistent effects on output & productivity
  - Cerra and Saxena [2008, 2017], Reinhart and Rogoff [2009]
  - Multiple potential channels; we want to focus on a particular mechanism: destruction of valuable labor matches
  - Recessions and their aftermath change the composition of employment

Specific question:

- Is average match quality relevant for aggregate labor productivity variations across the business cycle? Do job ladders play a role?
  - Job ladder: Workers share a ranking of jobs, they climb slowly through E-E transitions, and fall off (into unemployment) because of negative shocks (Moscarini and Postel-Vinay [2018]).
  - Previous models focus on job creation (Barlevy [2002])...
  - ...but new empirical evidence suggests a role for job destruction (Mueller [2017]): in the US, during recessions the pool of the unemployed shifts toward workers with high wages. These shifts are driven by the high cyclicality of separations for high-wage workers.
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  - In this context, standard TFP shocks cannot account for significant changes in match quality: high quality matches are hard to break
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  - (work in progress) Liquidity constraints, which limit the ability of productive matches to face temporary adverse shocks, can force separations in high quality jobs
Our paper in a nutshell

What we do:

- Augment the standard search model with a stylized job ladder, and analyze whether the cyclical behavior of job matches affects aggregate productivity. We find:

  - In this context, standard TFP shocks cannot account for significant changes in match quality: high quality matches are hard to break.
  - But exogenous **across-the-board destruction** shocks can produce significant and persistent losses on labor productivity, through match quality.
  - (work in progress) Liquidity constraints, which limit the ability of productive matches to face temporary adverse shocks, can force separations in high quality jobs.

- Takeaway: Events which cause across-the-board job losses destroy matches far up in the ladder, which are relevant inputs and difficult to recover.

- Explanation: Good matches are valuable **intangible capital**, not destroyed by standard TFP shocks that reduce flows temporarily but have little effect on present value.

- Potential mechanism: Financial frictions and wage rigidities that limit the ability of firms-worker matches to smooth out adverse shocks.
Motivation: Micro

Significant presence of a job ladder in wages...

Figure: Wage gains (losses) of job transitions:

Source: Albagli et al. [2018] with data from the Servicio de Impuestos Internos. Wage gains are calculated from real wages, after controlling for year and age gains.
Motivation: Micro

... and in productivity gains as well

Figure: Productivity gains (losses) of job transitions:

Source: Albagli et al. [2018] with data from the Servicio de Impuestos Internos. They use mean labor productivity, calculated as sales over number of employed workers. Productivity gains are calculated as differentials between the firms of origin and destination, controlling for year and sector gains.
How does resource allocation vary across the business cycle?

- Ever since Schumpeter [1939] the hypothesis of crisis-driven creative destruction has provided a potential silver lining to recessions.

- Caballero and Hammour [1994, 1996] coin the *cleansing effect*: inefficient arrangements are wiped out, higher productivity arrangements remain. Reallocation of factors to more productive uses increases because the opportunity cost to do so is low.

- Inefficient arrangements can survive temporarily due to frictions that prevent resources from moving to their most productive use.
  - Mortensen and Pissarides [1994]: Search frictions prevents instant formation of highly efficient firm-worker matches.
Empirical Findings of Cleansing Effect

However, evidence of the cleansing effect in the data is rather ambiguous:

- On the one hand, there is evidence of cleansing in manufacturing from late 1940s to 1990s, and for the entire private sector from 1990s to early 2000s
  - Davis and Haltiwanger [1992, 1990, 1999], Davis et al. [2012, 2006] respectively

- This effect apparently became weaker for the great financial crisis, and there are theoretical reasons to think it lessens with financial crises in general
  - Foster et al. [2016], Barlevy [2003], Eslava et al. [2010]

- But there are also many studies find no evidence of a cleansing effect!
  - No relationship between worker-firm match quality and the business cycle conditions when it ends: Mustre-del Río [2012]
  - No or little relationship between firm productivity and exit in Chile, Colombia, Japan and Indonesia: Liu and Tybout [1996], Nishimura et al. [2005], Hallward-Driemeier and Rijkers [2010]
  - Baily et al. [1992], Griliches and Regev [1995] do not find evidence of an increased contribution of reallocation to productivity growth
On the other hand, many authors have taken an opposite view, positing that recessions have severe negative and long lasting effects:

- Permanent output losses in financial and political crises (Cerra and Saxena [2008]) or all crises (Cerra and Saxena [2017]). Further, the labor share decreases and recovers only slowly and partially, especially for financial crises: Diwan [2001]

- Recessions may actually wipe out highly productive arrangements, due to credit frictions or temporarily unobservable productivity: Barlevy [2003], Ouyang [2009]

- Jobs created during recessions are usually less productive, less well-paid, and less likely to last: Bowlus [1995], Davis et al. [1996]. Barlevy [2002] models this fact through an increase in labor market frictions in a model of on-the-job search.
Literature

Job Ladder Models

Job ladder models extend the Mortensen and Pissarides [1994] model to include on-the-job search in the spirit of Jovanovic [1979, 1984]. They are a natural starting point for this paper:

- Endogenous job destruction as in den Haan et al. [2000] allows for a cleansing effect, while decreases in average match quality allow for a scarring effect.

- Most of these models link job-to-job transitions to productivity-enhancing reallocation: Krause and Lubik [2006], Menzio and Shi [2011].

- These models reconcile micro behavior with macro implications:
  - Krolikowski [2017], Jung and Kuhn [2018] study the persistent effects on earnings of displaced workers.
  - Moscarini and Postel-Vinay [2016] claim the job ladder stopped in the Great Recession and has not fully resumed, while Moscarini and Postel-Vinay [2017] posit this as the cause of the missing inflation puzzle.

Barlevy [2002] is the only one (that we are aware of) to study theoretically cleansing vs sullying in the labor market. Our contribution studies the role of job destruction in the scarring of the labor market, instead of a sullying effect through job creation.
Model Overview

Discrete time version of search & matching model of Mortensen and Pissarides [1994], with three tractable extensions:

1. **Wage rigidity as in Hall [2005]**
   - Realistic unemployment response to TFP shocks

2. **Endogenous separations as in den Haan et al. [2000]**
   - Allows for cleansing effect

3. **A job ladder in the spirit of Moscarini and Postel-Vinay [2018], with two rungs**
   - Drives our mechanisms
Model Setup

Agents

- Two types of risk-neutral, ex-ante homogeneous agents: workers and firms.

- Unemployed workers $u_t$ receive utility $b$ and search for a job with probability 1.

- Employed workers $n_t$ receive wages, and with fixed probability $s$ are allowed to search for a new job, without losing the current one. If one allows $s>1$, it can also be thought as a measure of the relative efficiency in the search process vis a vis unemployed workers.

- Firms hire workers and produce a final good. They can post vacancies $v_t$ at a cost of $\psi$.

- Search is costless for workers, and matching is modeled in the DMP fashion:
  - Workers find jobs with probability $p_t = \Lambda \theta_t^{1-\kappa}$, market tightness $\theta_t$.
  - Firms fill vacancies with probability $q_t = p_t/\theta_t$, decreasing in $\theta_t$.
  - Matches formed in $t$ start producing in $t + 1$. 
The output of a match is given by $A_t y^i + x$, three components:

- $A_t$ is aggregate TFP which follows an AR(1).
- $y^i$ is a match-specific permanent component, $i = \{h, l\}$.
- $x$ is a match-specific transitory component, i.i.d. across time.
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- $A_t$ is aggregate TFP which follows an AR(1).
- $y^i$ is a match-specific permanent component, $i = \{h, l\}$.
- $x$ is a match-specific transitory component, i.i.d. across time.

The permanent component is drawn upon match contact. With probability $\lambda$ it is equal to $y^h$ and it is equal to $y^l$ otherwise. Stays fixed for the duration of the match.

The transitory component is drawn from a $N \left(0, \left(\sigma^i_x\right)^2\right)$. It is known every period before production takes place, and changes every period.
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Wages and labor flows

- Knowing $A_t$, $y$ and $x$, matches Nash-bargain over wages. Then, after wage rigidity like in Hall [1995], wages $w_t^h(x)$ and $w_t^l(x)$ are determined.

- Since $x$ is i.i.d. every period while $y$ is permanent, workers in $l$ matches ($n_t^l$) will search on the job but workers in $h$ matches ($n_t^h$) will not.
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Wages and labor flows

Knowing $A_t$, $y$ and $x$, matches Nash-bargain over wages. Then, after wage rigidity like in Hall [1995], wages $w_t^h(x)$ and $w_t^l(x)$ are determined.

Since $x$ is i.i.d. every period while $y$ is permanent, workers in $l$ matches ($n_t^l$) will search on the job but workers in $h$ matches ($n_t^h$) will not.

For $i = h$, $l$ matches there will be a cutoff value called $\kappa_{it}$, such that if $x < \kappa_{it}$ the match is destroyed. We assume efficient endogenous job separation: $S_t^i(\kappa_{it}) = 0$.

We also model a standard exogenous job separation probability $\delta_t$ which follows an AR(1).

Notice labor flows:

- $u_t \leftrightarrow n_t^l$
- $u_t \leftrightarrow n_t^h$
- $n_t^l \rightarrow n_t^h$
Model Timing

1. New matches formed last period join previously active matches
2. Productivities $A_t$ and $x$ are revealed
3. A proportion $\delta$ of current matches are exogenously destroyed
4. Shares $F^i (\kappa^i_t)$ are destroyed for each type $i$
5. Unemployed workers receive $b$
6. Surviving matches bargain over wages and produce
7. Workers search for a job and firms post vacancies
8. New matches are formed
Labor Market Dynamics

- Let $\rho^i_t$ be the probability of remaining in a match of quality $i$:
  \[
  \rho^i_t := (1 - \delta) \left( 1 - F^i \left( \kappa^i_t \right) \right)
  \]  
  (1)

- Then the mass of workers in a high quality matches evolves according to:
  \[
  n^h_t = \rho^h_t \left( n^h_{t-1} + \lambda p_{t-1} \left( u_{t-1} + sn^l_{t-1} \right) \right)
  \]  
  (2)

- And the mass of workers in a low quality matches according to:
  \[
  n^l_t = \rho^l_t \left( (1 - \lambda p_{t-1} s) n^l_{t-1} + (1 - \lambda) p_{t-1} u_{t-1} \right)
  \]  
  (3)

- Also
  \[
  u_t + n^h_t + n^l_t = 1
  \]  
  (4)
For any variable $X_t(x)$, let $\hat{X}^i_t := \int_{\kappa^i_t}^{\infty} \frac{X^i_t(x)}{1-F^i(\kappa^i_t)} \, dF^i(x)$ be its expected value across $x$.

Then, the value of being employed in a match with permanent productivity $h$ or $l$ and transitory productivity $x$ is:

$$W^h_t(x) = w^h_t(x) + \beta E_t \left\{ \rho^h_{t+1} \hat{W}^h_{t+1} + (1 - \rho^h_{t+1}) U_{t+1} \right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

$$W^l_t(x) = w^l_t(x) + \beta E_t \left\{ \left( \lambda p_t s \rho^h_{t+1} \hat{W}^h_{t+1} + (1 - \lambda p_t s) \rho^l_{t+1} \hat{W}^l_{t+1} \right) + \left( 1 - \lambda p_t s \rho^h_{t+1} - (1 - \lambda p_t s) \rho^l_{t+1} \right) U_{t+1} \right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

The value of being unemployed is:

$$U_t = b + \beta E_t \left\{ \rho_t \left( \lambda \rho^h_{t+1} \hat{W}^h_{t+1} + (1 - \lambda) \rho^l_{t+1} \hat{W}^l_{t+1} \right) + \left( 1 - \rho_t \left( \lambda \rho^h_{t+1} + (1 - \lambda) \rho^l_{t+1} \right) \right) U_{t+1} \right\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)
Value Functions

The value of being an employer in a match with permanent productivity $h$ or $l$ and transitory productivity $x$ is:

$$ J^h_t (x) = A_t y^h + x - w^h_t (x) + \beta E_t \{ \rho^h_{t+1} \hat{J}^h_{t+1} \} $$

$$ J^l_t (x) = A_t y^l + x - w^l_t (x) + \beta E_t \{ (1 - \lambda p_t s) \rho^l_{t+1} \hat{J}^l_{t+1} \} $$

The value of an open vacancy is:

$$ V_t = -\psi + q_t \beta E_t \{ \lambda \rho^h_{t+1} \hat{J}^h_{t+1} + (1 - \lambda) \rho^l_{t+1} \hat{J}^l_{t+1} \} $$

With $\psi$ vacancy posting cost. Free entry implies $V_t = 0$ for all $t$, leading to a standard job creation condition.
Wages

- Real wages are

\[
\hat{w}_t^i (x) = \rho_w \hat{w}_{t-1}^i (x) + (1 - \rho_w) \tilde{w}_t^i (x),
\]

where \( \tilde{w}_t^i (x) \) a notional wage coming from nash bargaining, and \( \rho_w \in (0, 1) \).

- Therefore, defining the surplus of a match as

\[
S_t^i (x) = J_t^i (x) + W_t^i (x) - U_t,
\]

\( \tilde{w}_t^i (x) \) solves

\[
J_t^i (x) = (1 - \eta) S_t^i (x) \quad \text{and} \quad W_t^i (x) - U_t = \eta S_t^i (x)
\]

leading to

\[
\tilde{w}_t^h (x) = \eta \left[ A_t y^h + x + \theta_t \psi \right] + (1 - \eta) b
\]

\[
\tilde{w}_t^l (x) = \eta \left[ A_t y^l + x + \theta_t \psi \right] + (1 - \eta) b - \eta (1 - \eta) \beta E_t \{ \lambda p_t s \rho_{t+1}^h \tilde{S}_{t+1}^h \}
\]
Model Productivity

- Let $\hat{x}^i$ be average $x$ across active $i$ matches. Total output:

$$Y_t = n^h_t (A_t y^h + \hat{x}^h_t) + n^l_t (A_t y^l + \hat{x}^l_t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

- Let $\chi = n^h/n$. Average Labor Productivity is $Y_t/n_t$:

$$ALP_t = \chi_t (ALP^h_t) + (1 - \chi_t) (ALP^l_t)$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

- We can provide a useful decomposition:

$$\frac{dALP_t}{ALP_t} = \zeta^A_t \frac{dA_t}{A_t} + \frac{ALP^h_t - ALP^l_t}{ALP_t} d\chi_t + \zeta^x_t \frac{d\hat{x}^h_t}{\hat{x}^h_t} + \zeta^x_t \frac{d\hat{x}^l_t}{\hat{x}^l_t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (18)
Data

Apart from standard macro data, we use administrative micro data from the SII (the Chilean IRS):

- Firm and worker identifiers allow tracking over time.
- Includes all employment relationships with a wage contract (58% of active workers).
- Annual statement including various categories of labor income, and monthly employment status of individual workers.
Data

Apart from standard macro data, we use administrative micro data from the *SII* (the Chilean IRS):

- Firm and worker identifiers allow tracking over time.
- Includes all employment relationships with a wage contract (58% of active workers).
- Annual statement including various categories of labor income, and monthly employment status of individual workers.
  - Allows us to build monthly labor flows, including job to job transitions.
  - Characterize matches by low/high tenure
- We keep only a subset of employment relationships, as in Albagli et al. [2018].
Calibration

For a monthly frequency:

- Discount factor $\beta$, bargaining power $\eta$ and matching function elasticity $\kappa$ from the literature.

- Wage rigidity $\rho_W$, SS unemployment $u$ and SS vacancy filling probability $q$ from other studies, the latter two will help with $b$ and $\psi$.

- We normalize $\bar{A}$ and $y^l$ to 1.

- High quality matches in the model will have longer tenure than low quality matches. We exploit this fact to draw from IRS data moments:
  - We match proportion of high/low tenure matches, separation probabilities by tenure, low $\rightarrow$ high tenure E-E transitions, and wage gains from such transitions. We also match cross-section wage volatility.

- Through steady state equations, we obtain $\lambda$, $s$, $y^h$, $\Lambda$, $\sigma^l_x$ and $\sigma^h_x$. Still in need of a good calibration of $\bar{\delta}$
### Calibration

**Table: Calibrated Parameters and Matched Moments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount Factor</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>0.9959</td>
<td>5% real interest rate [Krolikowski, 2017]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Bargaining Power</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Mortensen and Pissarides [1994]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Elasticity</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Hosios condition [Hosios, 1990]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Rigidity</td>
<td>$\rho_w$</td>
<td>0.9435</td>
<td>Chilean Data (Garcia et al, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS unemployment rate</td>
<td>$u$</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>Chilean Data (NAIRU 2008-2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS vacancy filling probability</td>
<td>$q$</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>den Haan et al. [2000]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady state TFP</td>
<td>$\bar{A}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l$ Permanent Productivity</td>
<td>$y^l$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share of high tenure matches$^1$</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.96%</td>
<td>DJ1887 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob. keeping $h$ tenure job</td>
<td></td>
<td>99.69%</td>
<td>DJ1887 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob. keeping $l$ tenure job</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.95%</td>
<td>DJ1887 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job to Job probability $l \rightarrow h$</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>DJ1887 form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log wage volatility</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9333</td>
<td>DJ1887 form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$l \rightarrow h$ wage gains</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.28%</td>
<td>DJ1887 form</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

$^1$ High tenure = at least 5 years
Results

- Negative productivity shocks induce higher endogenous separation.
- Low quality matches are destroyed easily, but high quality matches have high continuation values and are largely unaffected.
- Match quality composition improves.

**Figure: Aggregate Productivity Shock**
Results

- Both the extensive and intensive margin work to attenuate the TFP impact in measured productivity: a cleansing effect

**Figure: Aggregate Productivity Shock: ALP decomposition**

\[
\frac{dALP_t}{ALP_t} = \zeta_t^A \frac{dA_t}{A_t} + \frac{ALP_h - ALP_l}{ALP_t} dX_t + \zeta_t^h \frac{dX^h_t}{X^h_t} + \zeta_t^l \frac{dX^l_t}{X^l_t},
\]

- TFP effect
- Extensive Margin
- Intensive Margin
Results

- Job destruction shocks cause across the board job losses.
- Low quality jobs are recovered easily, but their high quality counterparts are not.
- Persistent deterioration in composition of match quality and output, while unemployment mostly recovers.

Figure: Job Destruction Shock
Results

- As a result, measured productivity shows persistent deterioration

Figure: Job Destruction Shock: ALP decomposition

\[
\frac{d\text{ALP}_t}{\text{ALP}_t} = \zeta_t^A \frac{dA_t}{A_t} + \frac{\text{ALP}_t^h - \text{ALP}_t^l}{\text{ALP}_t} \frac{d\chi_t}{\chi_t} + \zeta_t^x \frac{d\hat{x}_t^h}{\hat{x}_t^h} + \zeta_t^x \frac{d\hat{x}_t^l}{\hat{x}_t^l},
\]

- TFP effect
- Extensive Margin
- Intensive Margin
As opposed to productivity shocks, with job destruction shocks the ALP deterioration is persistent even if the underlying shock is not!

Figure: iid shocks: ALP decomposition
Financial frictions (preliminary)

- Liquidity constraints plus wage rigidity can break up valuable matches

- In the standard model, firm-worker matches have perfect access to financial markets and therefore only care about present values, not about per period flows

- Introduce reduced-form financial friction: exogenous probability \( \omega \) that a match with positive continuation value but a negative cash value in the current period is forced to separate.

- This is, a liquidity constraint becomes active for some matches that have a positive value but are forced to separate if they cannot cover wages - which are not fully flexible- with their period output.
Results (very preliminary)

- Negative productivity shocks can now generate persistent effects on average job quality (AJQ)
Conclusions

We set up a job ladder model with endogenous and exogenous separations calibrated with Chilean micro data.

Preliminary results:

- Good matches are valuable, difficult to obtain, hard to break endogenously.
- Standard TFP shocks are dampened by a cleansing effect.
- Separation shocks that affect high quality matches have long lasting impact that is not predicted in standard search and matching models.

The following suggests that events which cause across the board job destruction will have long lasting consequences for productivity, due to a persistent deterioration in match quality.
Appendix
## All Calibrated Parameters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discount Factor</td>
<td>$\beta$</td>
<td>0.9959</td>
<td>5% real interest rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worker Bargaining Power</td>
<td>$\eta$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Literature Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Elasticity</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>Hosios (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage Rigidity</td>
<td>$\rho_w$</td>
<td>0.9398</td>
<td>Chilean Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steady state TFP</td>
<td>$\bar{A}$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Quality Persistent Productivity</td>
<td>$y^l$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idiosyncratic Productivity Mean</td>
<td>$\mu_x$</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Normalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed Search Ability</td>
<td>$s$</td>
<td>0.9417</td>
<td>Matches labor flows data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prob. of High-Quality Match</td>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
<td>Matches labor flows data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Quality Persistent Productivity</td>
<td>$y^h$</td>
<td>1.828</td>
<td>Obtained Endogenously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching Efficiency</td>
<td>$\Lambda$</td>
<td>0.3964</td>
<td>Obtained Endogenously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy Posting Cost</td>
<td>$\psi$</td>
<td>0.3812</td>
<td>Obtained Endogenously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Benefit</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>0.6583</td>
<td>Obtained Endogenously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS Exogenous Destruction Rate</td>
<td>$\bar{\delta}$</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>Matches Relevant Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Quality $x$ Volatility</td>
<td>$\sigma^h_x$</td>
<td>35.25</td>
<td>Matches Relevant Statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Quality $x$ Volatility</td>
<td>$\sigma^l_x$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Matches Relevant Statistics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IRFs: TFP shock

**ALP - all matches**

- 10: 1.54
- 20: 1.55
- 30: 1.56
- 40: 1.57

**ALP - h matches**

- 10: 1.9
- 20: 1.92
- 30: 1.94
- 40: 1.96

**ALP - l matches**

- 10: 1.125
- 20: 1.13
- 30: 1.135
- 40: 1.14

**% of High Q Matches**

- 10: 53.8
- 20: 54
- 30: 54.2
- 40: 54.4

**Output**

- 10: 1.555
- 20: 1.56
- 30: 1.565
- 40: 1.57

**h avg. wages**

- 10: 1.07
- 20: 1.075
- 30: 1.08
- 40: 1.08

**l avg. wages**

- 10: 1.5
- 20: 1.52
- 30: 1.54
- 40: 1.56

**h NB avg. wages**

- 10: 1.04
- 20: 1.05
- 30: 1.06
- 40: 1.07

**l NB avg. wages**

- 10: 0.132
- 20: 0.133
- 30: 0.134
- 40: 0.135

**h avg. x**

- 10: 0.14
- 20: 0.145
- 30: 0.15
- 40: 0.155

**l avg. x**

- 10: 0.16
IRFs: TFP shock

- **Unemployment (%):**
  - 8.5
  - 8
  - 7.5
  - 10 20 30 40

- **h survival prob. (%):**
  - 99.688
  - 99.687
  - 99.686
  - 99.685
  - 10 20 30 40

- **I survival prob. (%):**
  - 93
  - 92.5
  - 92
  - 10 20 30 40

- **Job finding prob. (%):**
  - 47
  - 46
  - 45
  - 44
  - 43
  - 10 20 30 40

- **Vacancy fill. prob. (%):**
  - 36
  - 35.5
  - 35
  - 34.5
  - 34
  - 10 20 30 40

- **Tightness:**
  - 1.4
  - 1.35
  - 1.3
  - 1.25
  - 1.2
  - 10 20 30 40

- **h matches, % of population:**
  - 50.02
  - 50
  - 49.98
  - 49.96
  - 10 20 30 40

- **l matches, % of population:**
  - 41.5
  - 42
  - 42.5
  - 10 20 30 40

- **Vacancies:**
  - 0.65
  - 0.6
  - 0.55
  - 10 20 30 40

- **Job to Job prob. (%):**
  - 0.31
  - 0.3
  - 0.295
  - 0.29
  - 10 20 30 40
IRFs: Job destruction shock

[Graphs showing various indicators such as ALP (all matches), ALP - h matches, ALP - I matches, % of High Q Matches, Output, h avg. wages, l avg. wages, h NB avg. wages, l NB avg. wages, h avg. x, l avg. x over time (10, 20, 30, 40).]
IRFs: Job destruction shock
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Ex. destruction shock (%)
Elías Albagli, Mario Canales, Chad Syverson, Matias Tapia, and Juan Wlasiuk. Firm Productivity and Job Transitions: The Reallocation Puzzle. Mimeo, Banco Central de Chile, 2018.


