

The Long-Term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

Aniket Baksy, University of Melbourne

Daniele Caratelli

Niklas Engbom, New York University & NBER

OzMac 2025 Workshop

Motivation: 40 years of wage stagnation

- ▶ Stagnant real wages for typical US worker over past 40 years. **Why?**

▶ fig

- ▶ technological change

Autor-Levy-Murnane '03, Acemoglu-Autor '11, Acemoglu-Restrepo '20

- ▶ globalization and trade

Elsby-Hobijn-Sahin '13, Autor-Dorn-Hanson '13

- ▶ institutional changes

Autor-Manning-Smith '16, Vogel '23

Motivation: 40 years of wage stagnation

- ▶ Stagnant real wages for typical US worker over past 40 years. **Why?**

▶ fig

- ▶ technological change

Autor-Levy-Murnane '03, Acemoglu-Autor '11, Acemoglu-Restrepo '20

- ▶ globalization and trade

Elsby-Hobijn-Sahin '13, Autor-Dorn-Hanson '13

- ▶ institutional changes

Autor-Manning-Smith '16, Vogel '23

- ▶ **This paper:** job ladder model to study role of **changing structure of labour market**

- ▶ **mismatch** between open jobs & searching workers

- ▶ **employer concentration** limiting job shopping

- ▶ reduced efficiency of search by employed workers

Motivation: 40 years of wage stagnation

- ▶ Stagnant real wages for typical US worker over past 40 years. **Why?**

▶ fig

- ▶ technological change

Autor-Levy-Murnane '03, Acemoglu-Autor '11, Acemoglu-Restrepo '20

- ▶ globalization and trade

Elsby-Hobijn-Sahin '13, Autor-Dorn-Hanson '13

- ▶ institutional changes

Autor-Manning-Smith '16, Vogel '23

- ▶ **This paper:** job ladder model to study role of **changing structure of labour market**

- ▶ **mismatch** between open jobs & searching workers

- ▶ **employer concentration** limiting job shopping

- ▶ reduced efficiency of search by employed workers

- ▶ These factors combine to **reduce mobility toward better paid jobs**

Topel-Ward '92

Motivation: 40 years of wage stagnation

- ▶ Stagnant real wages for typical US worker over past 40 years. **Why?** ▶ fig
- ▶ technological change Autor-Levy-Murnane '03, Acemoglu-Autor '11, Acemoglu-Restrepo '20
- ▶ globalization and trade Elsby-Hobijn-Sahin '13, Autor-Dorn-Hanson '13
- ▶ institutional changes Autor-Manning-Smith '16, Vogel '23
- ▶ **This paper:** job ladder model to study role of **changing structure of labour market**
 - ▶ mismatch between open jobs & searching workers
 - ▶ employer concentration limiting job shopping
 - ▶ reduced efficiency of search by employed workers
- ▶ These factors combine to **reduce mobility toward better paid jobs** -40%
- ▶ Why you should care: combined effect leads to **4 p.p. lower real wages**

Outline

1. simple job ladder model: infer **mobility** from gap b/n **overall wages** vs **offered wages**
2. take simple model to data: substantial decline in **net upward mobility**
 - ▶ decline robust to adding **on-the-job wage dynamics**, unobserved heterogeneity, **measurement error**
3. where does decline come from? add labour market frictions to model
 - ▶ modest roles for **mismatch**, **employer concentration**
 - ▶ results point to **declining search efficiency of employed workers**
4. role of declining mobility for wages
 - ▶ combined effect of all labour mkt frictions leads to **4 p.p. lower real wages**
 - ▶ by itself, reduced mobility accounts for **nearly 2/3rds of this**

A Simple Job Ladder Model

- ▶ Time is continuous, infinite horizon, focus on steady states
- ▶ Unit mass of risk-neutral workers move in and out of employment & across jobs
- ▶ Let n = share nonemployed. While non-employed, workers receive **job offers** at rate p
 - ▶ an offer = a piece rate w drawn from a **wage offer distribution $F(w)$**
 - ▶ assume parameters such that non-employed worker accepts all offers
- ▶ While employed, earn wage w until job ends, for one of 3 reasons:
 1. **Directed Outside offers** at rate λ^e with a wage from $F(w)$ that she **may** accept
 2. **Undirected Outside offers** at rate λ^f with a wage from $F(w)$ that she **must** accept
 3. **Job Loss Shocks** at rate δ that leave her non-employed
- ▶ **Flow Balance:** outflows from nonemp = inflows, i.e. $pn = \delta(1 - n)$.

▶ extensions

A Simple Job Ladder Model

- Let $\mathbf{G}(w)$ = CDF of wages. In steady state, satisfies **Kolmogorov Forward Equation**

$$0 = - \underbrace{(\delta + \lambda^f) \mathbf{G}(w)}_{\text{job loss} + \text{undirected offer}} - \underbrace{\lambda^e (1 - \mathbf{F}(w)) \mathbf{G}(w)}_{\text{directed outside offers}} + \underbrace{p \mathbf{F}(w) \frac{n}{1-n}}_{\text{hires from non-empl.}} + \underbrace{\lambda^f \mathbf{F}(w)}_{\text{undirected offer}}$$

- Wage distribution $\mathbf{G}(w)$ is a function of $\mathbf{F}(w)$ and **net upward mobility** κ :

$$\mathbf{G}(w) = \frac{\mathbf{F}(w)}{1 + \kappa (1 - \mathbf{F}(w))}, \quad \underbrace{\kappa}_{\text{net upward mobility rate}} \equiv \frac{\lambda^e}{\delta + \lambda^f}$$

- Net upward mobility rate, κ = Average # of outside offers between two separation events
- Higher $\kappa \implies$ Faster wage growth \implies larger gap btw **offer** & **wage** distributions

Infer Net Upward Mobility in the Data


- ▶ What does κ look like in data? Using CPS (1982-2023), obtain residual wages ► details
 - ▶ **Wage distribution $G(w)$** : residual wages among all workers
 - ▶ **Offer distribution $F(w)$** : among those who were non-employed in the previous month

Infer Net Upward Mobility in the Data

- What does κ look like in data? Using CPS (1982-2023), obtain residual wages


► details

- **Wage distribution $G(w)$:** residual wages among all workers
- **Offer distribution $F(w)$:** among those who were non-employed in the previous month




Infer Net Upward Mobility in the Data

- ▶ What does κ look like in data? Using CPS (1982-2023), obtain residual wages ▶ details
- ▶ **Wage distribution $G(w)$:** residual wages among all workers
- ▶ **Offer distribution $F(w)$:** among those who were non-employed in the previous month



Infer Net Upward Mobility in the Data

- ▶ What does κ look like in data? Using CPS (1982-2023), obtain residual wages ► details
- ▶ **Wage distribution $G(w)$:** residual wages among all workers
- ▶ **Offer distribution $F(w)$:** among those who were non-employed in the previous month




Infer Net Upward Mobility in the Data

- What does κ look like in data? Using CPS (1982-2023), obtain residual wages

► details

- **Wage distribution $G(w)$:** residual wages among all workers
- **Offer distribution $F(w)$:** among those who were non-employed in the previous month





Infer Net Upward Mobility in the Data

- What does κ look like in data? Using CPS (1982-2023), obtain residual wages

► details

- **Wage distribution $G(w)$:** residual wages among all workers
- **Offer distribution $F(w)$:** among those who were non-employed in the previous month



by demographic groups

► overid test

► between-occupation

► better matched?

► direct evidence (CPS, PSID)

Estimation of the Simple Model

- ▶ Where does declining net upward mobility could come from - $\lambda^e \downarrow$, $\delta \uparrow$, or $\lambda^f \uparrow$?
- ⇒ Estimate simple model using SMM: taking $F(\cdot)$ from data, pick $(p, \delta, \lambda^f, \kappa)$ ► objective
- ▶ 4 sets of moments:
 - ▶ N-E transition rate, which particularly informs nonemployed offer arrival rate p
 - ▶ E-N transition rate, which particularly informs separation rate δ
 - ▶ share of job stayers, which particularly informs undirected offer rate λ^f
 - ▶ wage distribution, which particularly informs net upward mobility rate κ
- ▶ Estimate decade-by-decade from 1980s to 2010s.
- ▶ Overidentified but excellent fit, particularly for wage distribution ► moments

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

► gender ► race ► educ ► age

... is massive: 42% decline in net upward mobility κ between 1980s and 2010s!

	Internally estimated			λ^e	Decomposition: $\kappa = \frac{\lambda^e}{\delta + \lambda^f}$		
	p	δ	λ^f	κ	δ	λ^f	λ^e
1980s				1.087 (0.022)			
1990s				0.848 (0.026)			
2000s				0.762 (0.030)			
2010s				0.569 (0.037)			

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

► gender ► race ► educ ► age

... is not driven largely by increased separation rates: δ stable

	Internally estimated				Implied λ^e	Decomposition: $\kappa = \frac{\lambda^e}{\delta + \lambda^f}$		
	p	δ	λ^f	κ		δ	λ^f	λ^e
1980s		0.007 (0.000)		1.087 (0.022)		1.087		
1990s		0.007 (0.000)		0.848 (0.026)		1.084		
2000s		0.008 (0.000)		0.762 (0.030)		1.064		
2010s		0.008 (0.000)		0.569 (0.037)		1.056 6%		

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

► gender

► race

► educ

► age

... nor by more frequent undirected offers: λ^f stable

	Internally estimated				Implied λ^e	Decomposition: $\kappa = \frac{\lambda^e}{\delta + \lambda^f}$		
	p	δ	λ^f	κ		δ	λ^f	λ^e
1980s		0.007 (0.000)	0.015 (0.000)	1.087 (0.022)		1.087	1.087	
1990s		0.007 (0.000)	0.015 (0.000)	0.848 (0.026)		1.084	1.067	
2000s		0.008 (0.000)	0.013 (0.001)	0.762 (0.030)		1.064	1.177	
2010s		0.008 (0.000)	0.016 (0.001)	0.569 (0.037)		1.056 6%	1.040 9%	

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

► gender

► race

► educ

► age

... but by less frequent directed offers: λ^e declines substantially!

	Internally estimated				Implied λ^e	Decomposition: $\kappa = \frac{\lambda^e}{\delta + \lambda^f}$		
	p	δ	λ^f	κ		δ	λ^f	λ^e
1980s		0.007 (0.000)	0.015 (0.000)	1.087 (0.022)	0.024 (0.000)	1.087	1.087	1.087
1990s		0.007 (0.000)	0.015 (0.000)	0.848 (0.026)	0.019 (0.001)	1.084	1.067	0.865
2000s		0.008 (0.000)	0.013 (0.001)	0.762 (0.030)	0.016 (0.001)	1.064	1.177	0.720
2010s		0.008 (0.000)	0.016 (0.001)	0.569 (0.037)	0.014 (0.001)	1.056 6%	1.040 9%	0.610 92%

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

► gender

► race

► educ

► age

... is really a story about the *employed*: nonemp offer arrival rate p stable

	Internally estimated				Implied λ^e	Decomposition: $\kappa = \frac{\lambda^e}{\delta + \lambda^f}$		
	p	δ	λ^f	κ		δ	λ^f	λ^e
1980s	0.020 (0.000)	0.007 (0.000)	0.015 (0.000)	1.087 (0.022)	0.024 (0.000)	1.087	1.087	1.087
1990s	0.020 (0.000)	0.007 (0.000)	0.015 (0.000)	0.848 (0.026)	0.019 (0.001)	1.084	1.067	0.865
2000s	0.018 (0.000)	0.008 (0.000)	0.013 (0.001)	0.762 (0.030)	0.016 (0.001)	1.064	1.177	0.720
2010s	0.018 (0.000)	0.008 (0.000)	0.016 (0.001)	0.569 (0.037)	0.014 (0.001)	1.056 6%	1.040 9%	0.610 92%

Full Model: Overview

- ▶ Extension 1: on-the-job wage dynamics
- ▶ Extension 2: unobserved heterogeneity
- ▶ Extension 3: respondent error in CPS data

Full Model: Overview

- ▶ Extension 1: on-the-job wage dynamics
 - ▶ Wages evolve **on-the-job** according to an AR1 in continuous time

▶ full model KFE

$$dw = \theta(\mu - w)dt + \sigma dW(t)$$

- ▶ Extension 2: unobserved heterogeneity
- ▶ Extension 3: respondent error in CPS data

Full Model: Overview

- ▶ Extension 1: on-the-job wage dynamics
 - ▶ Wages evolve **on-the-job** according to an AR1 in continuous time

▶ full model KFE

$$dw = \theta(\mu - w)dt + \sigma dW(t)$$

- ▶ Extension 2: unobserved heterogeneity
 - ▶ Two **unobserved types**, different separation rates, wage growth
 - ▶ Different offer distributions, $F^k(w)$, differing in mean values with $\mathbb{E}^2(w) = \mathbb{E}^1(w) + \omega$
- ▶ Extension 3: respondent error in CPS data

Full Model: Overview

- ▶ Extension 1: on-the-job wage dynamics
 - ▶ Wages evolve **on-the-job** according to an AR1 in continuous time

▶ full model KFE

$$dw = \theta(\mu - w)dt + \sigma dW(t)$$

- ▶ Extension 2: unobserved heterogeneity
 - ▶ Two **unobserved types**, different separation rates, wage growth
 - ▶ Different offer distributions, $F^k(w)$, differing in mean values with $\mathbb{E}^2(w) = \mathbb{E}^1(w) + \omega$
- ▶ Extension 3: respondent error in CPS data
 - ▶ Allow share ε to **misreport being employed**, share ν to **misreport stayer status**
 - ▶ Allow persistent **nonresponse**: prob p^{in}, p^{out} of becoming nonresponsive/responsive

Model Estimation: Decade-by-Decade, Flexibly Vary Params

1. Take observed offer distribution $f(w)$ from the data
2. Calibrate three parameters one-to-one to hit particular data moment
 - ▶ p^{in} : share of non-missing in month m who are missing in $m + 1$
 - ▶ p^{out} : share of missing in month m who are non-missing in $m + 1$
 - ▶ ν : Misclassified stayers from share non-emp. in two consecutive months who are stayers
3. 11 parameters via the Simulated Method of Moments

$$\left[\underbrace{p, \lambda^e, \lambda^f}_{\text{job offer arrival rates}}, \underbrace{\mu, \theta, \sigma}_{\text{on-the-job dynamics}}, \underbrace{\pi, \delta^1, \delta^2, \omega}_{\text{selection on unobservables}}, \underbrace{\varepsilon}_{\text{misclassification}} \right]$$

- ▶ true offer distbns
- ▶ employment flows
- ▶ on-the-job wage dyn
- ▶ job loser wage dyn
- ▶ job-to-job flows
- ▶ overall mobility
- ▶ role for unobsd heterog.
- ▶ offers by empstat
- ▶ params from data
- ▶ SMM estimates
- ▶ SMM intuition
- ▶ share of stayers
- ▶ joint distbns (stayers)
- ▶ joint distbns (losers)

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder Revisited

	μ	θ	σ
1980s	0.081 (0.078)	0.017 (0.006)	0.055 (0.006)
1990s	0.080 (0.047)	0.017 (0.007)	0.060 (0.008)
2000s	0.073 (0.041)	0.029 (0.014)	0.078 (0.013)
2010s	0.062 (0.046)	0.041 (0.019)	0.097 (0.023)

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder Revisited

	μ	θ	σ	π	ω	δ^1	δ^2
1980s	0.081 (0.078)	0.017 (0.006)	0.055 (0.006)	0.222 (0.119)	0.197 (0.052)	0.029 (0.012)	0.007 (0.008)
1990s	0.080 (0.047)	0.017 (0.007)	0.060 (0.008)	0.182 (0.053)	0.291 (0.066)	0.029 (0.014)	0.006 (0.001)
2000s	0.073 (0.041)	0.029 (0.014)	0.078 (0.013)	0.275 (0.054)	0.192 (0.068)	0.029 (0.012)	0.005 (0.002)
2010s	0.062 (0.046)	0.041 (0.019)	0.097 (0.023)	0.463 (0.092)	0.197 (0.074)	0.029 (0.014)	0.002 (0.001)

explain part of gap b/n F , G : lower λ^e , higher λ^f

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder Revisited

	μ	θ	σ	π	ω	δ^1	δ^2	p
1980s	0.081 (0.078)	0.017 (0.006)	0.055 (0.006)	0.222 (0.119)	0.197 (0.052)	0.029 (0.012)	0.007 (0.008)	0.021 (0.001)
1990s	0.080 (0.047)	0.017 (0.007)	0.060 (0.008)	0.182 (0.053)	0.291 (0.066)	0.029 (0.014)	0.006 (0.001)	0.024 (0.001)
2000s	0.073 (0.041)	0.029 (0.014)	0.078 (0.013)	0.275 (0.054)	0.192 (0.068)	0.029 (0.012)	0.005 (0.002)	0.022 (0.001)
2010s	0.062 (0.046)	0.041 (0.019)	0.097 (0.023)	0.463 (0.092)	0.197 (0.074)	0.029 (0.014)	0.002 (0.001)	0.021 (0.001)

explain part of gap b/n F , G : lower λ^e , higher λ^f stable

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder Revisited

	μ	θ	σ	π	ω	δ^1	δ^2	p	λ^f
1980s	0.081 (0.078)	0.017 (0.006)	0.055 (0.006)	0.222 (0.119)	0.197 (0.052)	0.029 (0.012)	0.007 (0.008)	0.021 (0.001)	0.015 (0.001)
1990s	0.080 (0.047)	0.017 (0.007)	0.060 (0.008)	0.182 (0.053)	0.291 (0.066)	0.029 (0.014)	0.006 (0.001)	0.024 (0.001)	0.017 (0.001)
2000s	0.073 (0.041)	0.029 (0.014)	0.078 (0.013)	0.275 (0.054)	0.192 (0.068)	0.029 (0.012)	0.005 (0.002)	0.022 (0.001)	0.015 (0.001)
2010s	0.062 (0.046)	0.041 (0.019)	0.097 (0.023)	0.463 (0.092)	0.197 (0.074)	0.029 (0.014)	0.002 (0.001)	0.021 (0.001)	0.016 (0.002)
explain part of gap b/n F , G : lower λ^e , higher λ^f								stable	stable

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder Revisited

	μ	θ	σ	π	ω	δ^1	δ^2	p	λ^f	λ^e
1980s	0.081 (0.078)	0.017 (0.006)	0.055 (0.006)	0.222 (0.119)	0.197 (0.052)	0.029 (0.012)	0.007 (0.008)	0.021 (0.001)	0.015 (0.001)	0.025 (0.004)
1990s	0.080 (0.047)	0.017 (0.007)	0.060 (0.008)	0.182 (0.053)	0.291 (0.066)	0.029 (0.014)	0.006 (0.001)	0.024 (0.001)	0.017 (0.001)	0.019 (0.003)
2000s	0.073 (0.041)	0.029 (0.014)	0.078 (0.013)	0.275 (0.054)	0.192 (0.068)	0.029 (0.012)	0.005 (0.002)	0.022 (0.001)	0.015 (0.001)	0.013 (0.004)
2010s	0.062 (0.046)	0.041 (0.019)	0.097 (0.023)	0.463 (0.092)	0.197 (0.074)	0.029 (0.014)	0.002 (0.001)	0.021 (0.001)	0.016 (0.002)	0.017 (0.005)
explain part of gap b/n F , G : lower λ^e , higher λ^f								stable	stable	big ↓

The Long-term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder Revisited

	μ	θ	σ	π	ω	δ^1	δ^2	p	λ^f	λ^e
1980s	0.081 (0.078)	0.017 (0.006)	0.055 (0.006)	0.222 (0.119)	0.197 (0.052)	0.029 (0.012)	0.007 (0.008)	0.021 (0.001)	0.015 (0.001)	0.025 (0.004)
1990s	0.080 (0.047)	0.017 (0.007)	0.060 (0.008)	0.182 (0.053)	0.291 (0.066)	0.029 (0.014)	0.006 (0.001)	0.024 (0.001)	0.017 (0.001)	0.019 (0.003)
2000s	0.073 (0.041)	0.029 (0.014)	0.078 (0.013)	0.275 (0.054)	0.192 (0.068)	0.029 (0.012)	0.005 (0.002)	0.022 (0.001)	0.015 (0.001)	0.013 (0.004)
2010s	0.062 (0.046)	0.041 (0.019)	0.097 (0.023)	0.463 (0.092)	0.197 (0.074)	0.029 (0.014)	0.002 (0.001)	0.021 (0.001)	0.016 (0.002)	0.017 (0.005)
explain part of gap b/n F , G : lower λ^e , higher λ^f							stable	stable	big ↓	

► EN by wage

► JJ rate in model & data

Why has mobility declined? Adding labour market structure

▶ details

- ▶ Extend model: allow p, λ^e to depend on labour market structure
- ▶ Underlying contact rate from a standard matching fn framework
- ▶ Assume **on-the-job search**: employed workers search at relative intensity ϕ
- ▶ Assume US = many segmented labour markets, differ in mkt tightness

- ▶ Each market = finite num of firms (m). Own employees can't apply to own vacancies.

Why has mobility declined? Adding labour market structure

▶ details

- ▶ Extend model: allow p, λ^e to depend on labour market structure
 - ▶ Underlying contact rate from a standard matching fn framework
 - ▶ Assume on-the-job search: employed workers search at relative intensity ϕ
 - ▶ Assume US = many segmented labour markets, differ in mkt tightness
- ⇒ Mismatch: nonlin matching fn + dispersed tightness ⇒ lower effective agg. contact rate
- Barnichon-Figura '15
- ▶ Each market = finite num of firms (m). Own employees can't apply to own vacancies.

Why has mobility declined? Adding labour market structure

▶ details

- ▶ Extend model: allow p, λ^e to depend on labour market structure
 - ▶ Underlying contact rate from a standard matching fn framework
 - ▶ Assume on-the-job search: employed workers search at relative intensity ϕ
 - ▶ Assume US = many segmented labour markets, differ in mkt tightness
- ⇒ Mismatch: nonlin matching fn + dispersed tightness ⇒ lower effective agg. contact rate

Barnichon-Figura '15

- ▶ Each market = finite num of firms (m). Own employees can't apply to own vacancies.
- ⇒ Concentration: lower m ⇒ lower effective contact rates for emp relative to non-emp

Gottfries-Jarosch '23

Why has mobility declined? Adding labour market structure

▶ details

- Extend model: allow p, λ^e to depend on labour market structure
- Underlying contact rate from a standard matching fn framework
- Assume **on-the-job search**: employed workers search at relative intensity ϕ

- Assume US = many segmented labour markets, differ in mkt tightness

⇒ **Mismatch**: nonlin matching fn + dispersed tightness ⇒ lower effective agg. contact rate

Barnichon-Figura '15

- Each market = finite num of firms (m). Own employees can't apply to own vacancies.

⇒ **Concentration**: lower m ⇒ lower effective contact rates for emp relative to non-emp

Gottfries-Jarosch '23

$$\underbrace{\lambda^e}_{\text{Upward mobility}} \approx \underbrace{\chi}_{\text{matching efficiency}} \underbrace{\left(\frac{V}{S}\right)^\alpha}_{\text{aggregate tightness}} \underbrace{(1 - \tau)}_{\text{mismatch}} \underbrace{\frac{m-1}{m}}_{\text{employer concentration}} \underbrace{\phi}_{\text{search of employed}}$$

The factors behind the Long-Term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

$$\lambda^e \approx \chi \left(\frac{V}{S} \right)^\alpha \left(1 - \tau \right) \frac{m-1}{m} \phi$$

Upward mobility matching efficiency aggregate tightness mismatch employer concentration search of employed




Figure: agg. vacancy rate: from JOLTS/Barnichon (2010)

Contrib. to declining mobility

Matching efficiency	35%
Aggregate tightness	-45%

The factors behind the Long-Term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

$$\lambda^e \approx \chi \left(\frac{V}{S} \right)^\alpha \left(1 - \tau \right) \frac{m-1}{m} \phi$$

Upward mobility matching efficiency aggregate tightness mismatch employer concentration search of employed




Figure: mismatch: from dispersion in job finding rates across occupations

Contrib. to declining mobility

Matching efficiency	35%
Aggregate tightness	-45%
Mismatch	31%

The factors behind the Long-Term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

$$\underbrace{\lambda^e}_{\text{Upward mobility}} \approx \underbrace{\chi}_{\text{matching efficiency}} \quad \underbrace{\left(\frac{V}{S}\right)^\alpha}_{\text{aggregate tightness}} \quad \underbrace{(1 - \tau)}_{\text{mismatch}} \quad \underbrace{\frac{m-1}{m}}_{\text{employer concentration}} \quad \underbrace{\phi}_{\text{search of employed}}$$

Concentration: infer from state-level panel. Idea:

- ▶ conditional on ϕ , higher concentration
- ⇒ lower mobility *for emp relative to nonemp*

► details

Contrib. to declining mobility

Matching efficiency	35%
Aggregate tightness	-45%
Mismatch	31%
Employer concentration	24%

The factors behind the Long-Term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

$$\underbrace{\lambda^e}_{\text{Upward mobility}} \approx \underbrace{\chi}_{\text{matching efficiency}} \quad \underbrace{\left(\frac{V}{S}\right)^\alpha}_{\text{aggregate tightness}} \quad \underbrace{(1 - \tau)}_{\text{mismatch}} \quad \underbrace{\frac{m-1}{m}}_{\text{employer concentration}} \quad \underbrace{\phi}_{\text{search of employed}}$$

Contrib. to declining mobility

Matching efficiency	35%
Aggregate tightness	-45%
Mismatch	31%
Employer concentration	24%
Relative search intensity	-70%

The factors behind the Long-Term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder

$$\lambda^e \approx \chi \left(\frac{V}{S} \right)^\alpha (1 - \tau) \frac{m-1}{m} \phi$$


Upward mobility matching efficiency aggregate tightness mismatch employer concentration search of employed



Contrib. to declining mobility

Matching efficiency	35%
Aggregate tightness	-45%
Mismatch	31%
Employer concentration	24%
Relative search intensity	-70%


The Consequences of the Long-Term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder



Accounting exercise:

- ▶ offered wages ($F_t(w)$): grow as in data
- ▶ Hold **one/a few params** fixed in 1980s
- ▶ Quantify impact on **gap** and hence
overall wages = offered wages + gap

The Consequences of the Long-Term Decline of the U.S. Job Ladder



Accounting exercise:

- ▶ offered wages ($F_t(w)$): grow as in data
- ▶ Hold **one/a few params** fixed in 1980s
- ▶ Quantify impact on **gap** and hence
overall wages = offered wages + gap

Combined effect: -4.0p.p. real wages
 $(\approx 40\% \text{ of labor share decline})$

The Structure of the U.S. Labor Market & Wage Stagnation

We use an estimated structural job ladder model to show:

1. **Upward job mobility has fallen by 40%** between the 1980s and 2010s
2. Primarily accounted for by changes in three structural factors:
 - (a) **Greater mismatch** between open jobs and searching workers
 - (b) **Greater employer concentration** that has limited the scope for job shopping
 - (c) **Less search by employed workers**
3. Combined effect: **4 p.p. lower real wages** ($\approx 40\%$ of fall in aggregate labor share)


Thank you!

aniket.baksy@unimelb.edu.au

Appendix

Wage stagnation since the 1980s

▶ back



Workers enter non-employed with human capital $h(0) = 0$ and retire at age \bar{A}

- ▶ Log wage of worker i at age a :

$$\underbrace{W(i, t)}_{\text{wage}} = \underbrace{X(i, t)}_{\text{gender, race, education, occupation, state}} + \underbrace{h(a)}_{\text{human capital evolves flexibly with age } a} + \text{piece rate}$$

- ▶ Non-employed workers contact open jobs at rate \hat{p}
 - ▶ Each job associated with a draw of a piece rate from $\hat{F}(r)$; accept jobs with $r \geq \hat{R}$
- ▶ Employed workers subject to three type of events
 - ▶ **Job loss** at rate $\hat{\delta} \implies$ non-employment
 - ▶ **Directed outside offer** from $\hat{F}(r)$ at rate $\phi^e \hat{p} \implies$ accepted if pays better
 - ▶ **Undirected outside offer** from $\hat{F}(r)$ at rate $\phi^f \hat{p} \implies$ accepted regardless of pay

The Distribution of Workers over States

▶ back

Let $n(a)$ be the non-employment rate at age a and $\hat{x}(r, a)$ the distribution over piece rates:

$$0 = -\underbrace{\frac{\partial}{\partial a} ((1 - n(a)) \hat{x}(r, a))}_{\text{aging}} - \underbrace{\left(\hat{\delta} + \phi^f \hat{p} + \phi^e \hat{p} (1 - \hat{F}(r)) \right) (1 - n(a)) \hat{x}(r, a)}_{\text{outflows: job loss, undirected JJ, directed JJ}} \\ + \underbrace{\hat{f}(r) \hat{p} n(a)}_{\text{hires from nonemployment}} + \underbrace{\hat{f}(r) \phi^f \hat{p} (1 - n(a))}_{\text{inflows from undirected JJ}} + \underbrace{\hat{f}(r) \phi^e \hat{p} (1 - n(a)) \int_{\hat{R}}^r \hat{x}(u, a) du}_{\text{inflows from directed JJ from lower } r}$$

subject to $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \hat{x}(r, a) = \hat{f}(r)$ for all r , and $\int_{\hat{R}}^{\infty} \hat{x}(r, a) dr = 1$ for all a .

Relative Wages

▶ back

$$\underbrace{w}_{\text{relative wage}} = \widehat{w}(i, a) - \underbrace{\overline{w}^h(a)}_{\text{average wage of hire from non-employment}},$$

$$\underbrace{F(w)}_{\text{distribution of truncated offered relative wages}}$$

$$= \frac{\widehat{F}(w + \bar{r}) - \widehat{F}(\widehat{R})}{1 - \widehat{F}(\widehat{R})},$$

$$\underbrace{p}_{\text{effective JFR of non-employed}}$$

$$= \widehat{p}(1 - \widehat{F}(\widehat{R})),$$

$$\underbrace{\delta}_{\text{effective separation rate}}$$

$$= \widehat{\delta} + \phi^f \widehat{p} \widehat{F}(\widehat{R}),$$

$$\underbrace{\lambda^f}_{\text{effective undirected offer rate}}$$

$$= \phi^f \widehat{p}(1 - \widehat{F}(\widehat{R})),$$

$$\underbrace{\lambda^e}_{\text{effective directed offer rate}}$$

$$= \phi^e \widehat{p}(1 - \widehat{F}(\widehat{R}))$$

The Distribution of Relative Wages

▶ back

- ▶ Let $G_{\bar{A}}(w)$ be the overall share of employed workers earning less than relative wage w
- ▶ In paper: $G_{\bar{A}}(w)$ depends on $F(w)$, a key ratio of parameters κ , and a finite-life adjustment


$$G_{\bar{A}}(w) = \frac{F(w)}{1 + \kappa(1 - F(w))} \left(1 + C_{\bar{A}}(w)\right), \quad \text{where} \quad \lim_{\bar{A} \rightarrow \infty} C_{\bar{A}}(w) =$$

$$\underbrace{\kappa}_{\text{net upward mobility rate}} = \frac{\lambda^e}{\underbrace{\delta + \lambda^f}_{\# \text{ of directed offers between 2 events that set workers back}}}$$

- ▶ Faster upward mobility \implies greater wage growth \implies larger gap btw offer & wage distr.

Our Data: The Current Population Survey

▶ back




Our Data: The Current Population Survey

▶ back




Our Data: The Current Population Survey

▶ back



Our Data: The Current Population Survey

▶ back



Taking the Simple Model to Data

▶ back

- ▶ Theory about residual wage dispersion: project log wages on observables year-by-year

$$\ln W_{it} = \underbrace{\alpha_{ry}}_{\text{race}} + \underbrace{\alpha_{gy}}_{\text{gender}} + \underbrace{\alpha_{ey}}_{\text{education}} + \underbrace{\alpha_{sy}}_{\text{state}} + \underbrace{\alpha_{oy}}_{\text{occupation}} + \underbrace{\alpha_{my}}_{\text{survey month}} + \tilde{w}_{it}$$

- ▶ Express wages relative to hires from non-employment of same age

$$w_{it} = \tilde{w}_{it} - \underbrace{\bar{w}_{at}}_{\text{average residual wage out of non-empl.}}$$

- ▶ Estimate $G(w)$ and $F(w)$ non-parametrically

- ▶ **Wage distribution $G(w)$** : residual wages among all workers
- ▶ **Offer distribution $F(w)$** : among those who were non-employed in the previous month

Estimation of the Simple Model


▶ back

$$\min \left\{ \underbrace{\left(\frac{p}{p+\delta} (1 - e^{-12(p+\delta)}) - \text{NE rate}^{\text{data}} \right)^2}_{\text{Annual NE rate: particularly informs } p} + \underbrace{\left(\frac{\delta}{p+\delta} (1 - e^{-12(p+\delta)}) - \text{EN rate}^{\text{data}} \right)^2}_{\text{Annual EN rate: particularly informs } \delta} \right. \\ \left. + \underbrace{\left(\sum_{i=1}^N e^{-11(\delta+\lambda^f)(1+\kappa(1-F_i))} \frac{(1+\kappa) f_i}{(1+\kappa(1-F_i))^2} - \text{stayers}^{\text{data}} \right)^2}_{\text{Annual share job stayers: particularly informs } \lambda^f} + \underbrace{\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{(1+\kappa) f_i}{(1+\kappa(1-F_i))^2} - g_i^{\text{data}} \right)^2}_{\text{Wage distribution: particularly informs } \kappa} \right\}$$

- ▶ $N = 50$ in our benchmark, estimation decade-by-decade.

Moments by Decade: 1980s


▶ back



	Data	Model
EN rate	0.074 (0.000)	0.074 (0.000)
NE rate	0.203 (0.001)	0.203 (0.001)
Stayer	0.741 (0.001)	0.741 (0.001)

Moments by Decade: 1990s


▶ back



	Data	Model
EN rate	0.074 (0.000)	0.074 (0.000)
NE rate	0.209 (0.001)	0.209 (0.001)
Stayer	0.759 (0.002)	0.759 (0.002)

Moments by Decade: 2000s


▶ back



	Data	Model
EN rate	0.079 (0.000)	0.079 (0.000)
NE rate	0.190 (0.001)	0.190 (0.001)
Stayer	0.789 (0.001)	0.789 (0.001)

Moments by Decade: 2010s

▶ back




	Data	Model
EN rate	0.081 (0.000)	0.081 (0.000)
NE rate	0.189 (0.001)	0.189 (0.001)
Stayer	0.785 (0.002)	0.785 (0.002)

Net Upward Mobility by Gender

▶ back


- ▶ Women move up the job ladder less
- ▶ Experienced somewhat larger declines



Net Upward Mobility by Race

▶ back


- ▶ Minorities move up the job ladder less
- ▶ Experienced somewhat larger declines



Net Upward Mobility by Education

▶ back


- ▶ College graduates move up the job ladder more
- ▶ Experienced similarly large proportional declines



Net Upward Mobility by Age

▶ back

- ▶ Similar net upward mobility in 1980s
- ▶ Particularly large decline for young



Net Upward Mobility has Declined Substantially

▶ back

The decline is

- ▶ larger for younger workers (20-29 and 30-39 relative to 40+)

▶ graph

- ▶ similar for women relative to men

▶ graph

- ▶ similar across race groups

▶ graph

- ▶ larger for better educated workers

▶ graph

- ▶ mixed across occupation/industry groups

▶ graph

&

▶ graph

- ▶ largest in the middle of the occupational wage distribution


▶ graph

- ▶ larger for occupations more exposed to non-competes

▶ graph


Decline in net upward mobility sharper for the youngest

▶ back




Decline in net upward mobility comparable across genders

back




Decline in net upward mobility similar across race groups

▶ back




Decline in net upward mobility larger for better educated workers

◀ back




Decline in net upward mobility mixed across Occupation groups

▶ back




Decline in net upward mobility mixed across Industry groups

◀ back




Decline largest in the middle of Occupational Wage Distribution

▶ back




Decline larger for Occupations more exposed to Non-competes

▶ back




Decline in Net Upward Mobility: κ at Different Percentiles

▶ back




Decline in Net Upward Mobility: κ at Different Percentiles

▶ back



Decline in Net Upward Mobility: Between-Occupation Results


▶ back



Decline in Net Upward Mobility: Unlikely to be better match quality

back


- ▶ Better screening \implies fewer bad matches form in first place
- ▶ Convergence of offer & wage distributions and fall in mobility
- ▶ However, implies decline in EN rate, especially among new matches
- ▶ Only modest decline in data




Direct Evidence on Mobility

▶ back

March CPS: Stayed with employer throughout the year



PSID: Share of employed poached in the past year



Decomposition of Wage Growth (NLSY)

▶ back

- Decompose residual wage growth (rel. to someone of the same age)

$$dw_t = \underbrace{\sum_{i \in S_t} \frac{\omega_{it} + \omega_{it-1}}{2} (w_{it} - w_{it-1})}_{\text{contribution of stayers}} + \underbrace{\sum_{i \in M_t} \frac{\omega_{it} + \omega_{it-1}}{2} (w_{it} - w_{it-1})}_{\text{contribution of movers}}$$
$$+ \underbrace{\sum_{i \in H_t} \omega_{it} w_{it} - \sum_{i \in X_t} \omega_{it-1} w_{it-1}}_{\text{flows in and out of non-empl.}} + \underbrace{\sum_{i \in N_t} \omega_{it} w_{it} - \sum_{i \in O_t} \omega_{it-1} w_{it-1}}_{\text{flows in and out of missing}}$$
$$+ \underbrace{\sum_{i \in S_t \cup M_t} (w_{it} + w_{it-1}) \frac{\omega_{it} - \omega_{it-1}}{2}}_{\text{adjustment factor}}$$

NLSY vs CPS residual wage distributions

▶ back




Figure: Wage and Offer Distributions in 1980s




Figure: Wage and Offer Distributions in 2000s

Wage Distributions

▶ back

- Kolmogorov Forward Equation for the wage distribution $G(w)$ is now

$$0 = -\underbrace{\delta G(w)}_{\text{reallocation} + \text{job loss}} - \underbrace{\phi \lambda (1 - F(w)) G(w)}_{\text{outside offers}} + \underbrace{\lambda F(w) \frac{u}{1-u}}_{\text{hires from non-empl.}} + \underbrace{\delta \lambda^f F(w)}_{\text{reallocation}}$$
$$- \underbrace{\theta(\mu - w) g(w)}_{\text{drift in wages on job}} + \underbrace{\frac{\sigma^2}{2} g'(w)}_{\text{shocks}}$$

with boundary conditions $\lim_{w \rightarrow 0} G(w) = 0$ and $\lim_{w \rightarrow \infty} G(w) = 1$

- As before u satisfies flow balance equation

$$\lambda u = \delta (1 - \lambda^f)(1 - u)$$

Why has mobility declined? Adding labour market structure

▶ back

- ▶ Model extension: allow λ^e to be determined by underlying labour market structure
- ▶ Assume US divided into perfectly segmented labour markets indexed by i
 - ▶ Within each market, m_i identical firms each advertise v_i vacancies. Let $V_i = v_i m_i$.
 - ▶ On-the-job search: employed workers search w/ relative intensity ϕ . Search effort $S_i = u_i + \phi e_i$.
 - ▶ Cobb-Douglas matching function: $\mathcal{M}_i = \chi S_i^{1-\alpha} V_i^\alpha$
 - ▶ Firm-worker contact rate $\lambda_i \equiv \frac{\mathcal{M}_i}{S_i} \equiv \chi x_i^\alpha$, x_i = tightness
 - ▶ Firms can exclude current employees from applying to own vacancies
- ▶ This setup generates two forces affecting measured aggregate mobility:
 - ▶ **Mismatch:** nonlinear matching fn + dispersion in tightness \implies lower effective agg. contact rate
 - ▶ **Concentration:** lower $m_i \implies$ lower effective contact rates for the employed relative to non-emp


Barnichon-Figura '15

Gottfries-Jarosch '23


Recovering the True Offer Distributions

▶ back

- ▶ The observed offer distribution is mixture of the true and wage distribution
- ▶ Given parameter values, we can recover the true offer distribution
 - ▶ offer distribution of the high type is log normal distribution with the same st.d and mean $+\omega$
 - ▶ offer distribution of the low type is the residual



Observed and true offer distributions"




Offer distribution by type

Flows In & Out of Employment

▶ back

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \underbrace{\pi}_{\text{share of low type}}, \quad \underbrace{\delta^1}_{\text{job loss of low type}}, \quad \underbrace{\delta^2}_{\text{job loss of high type}}, \quad \underbrace{\lambda}_{\text{job finding rate}}, \quad \underbrace{\varepsilon}_{\text{emp.stat. misclassification}} \end{array} \right]$$




- ▶ Some stayers report period of non-employment
- ▶ Informs employment status misclassification


Wage Dynamics of On-the-Job

▶ back

$$\left[\begin{array}{c} \underbrace{\mu}_{\text{long-run mean}} , \underbrace{\theta}_{\text{persistence}} , \underbrace{\sigma}_{\text{st.d. of wage innovations}} \end{array} \right]$$



Wages of job stayers at t & $t + 12$ (data)




Wages of job stayers at t & $t + 12$ (model)

Flows Between Jobs


▶ back

λ^e
arrival rate of voluntary outside offers
,

λ^f
arrival rate of reallocation shocks



Offer and wage distributions




Share of job stayers by wage

Flows Between Jobs


▶ back

λ^e
arrival rate of voluntary outside offers
,

λ^f
arrival rate of reallocation shocks



Wages of all workers at t & $t + 12$ (data)




Wages of all workers at t & $t + 12$ (model)

Wage Dynamics of Job Losers


▶ back

$$\overbrace{\quad}^{\omega}$$

mean difference in offer distribution



Wage at $t + 12$ by wage at t among job losers



Share non-employed at $t + 12$ by wage at t

Parameters Directly From the Data


▶ back

		(1) 1982–1991	(2) 1992–2001	(3) 2002–2011	(4) 2012–2021
in	re-entry to being observed	0.123	0.111	0.115	0.139
out	rate of dropout from survey	0.156	0.146	0.124	0.167
ε	share workers on temp. layoff	0.011	0.011	0.012	0.012
ν	recall error for stayer status (annual)	0.102	0.153	0.198	0.253
λ	job finding rate, unemp	0.055	0.054	0.046	0.046
τ	matching wedge	0.090	0.112	0.194	0.242


Joint Distribution of Stayers

▶ back

Data




Model




Joint Distribution of Job Losers

◀ back

Data



Model



Eight Parameters Via the Simulated Method of Moments

▶ back

$$\left\{ \underbrace{\mu, \rho, \sigma}_{\text{on-the-job dynamics}}, \underbrace{\delta^1, \delta^2, \omega}_{\text{unobserved heterogeneity}}, \underbrace{\lambda^f}_{\text{reallocation shocks}}, \underbrace{\lambda^e}_{\text{job finding rate of employed}} \right\}$$

► On-the-job wage dynamics

- Joint distribution over wages of job stayers

▶ joint distribution of stayers

► Unobserved heterogeneity

- Joint distribution over wages of job losers

▶ joint distribution of job losers

► **Reallocation shocks:** Joint distribution over wages of all workers and share of stayers

► **Arrival rate of outside offers:** Gap between wage and offer distribution

Eight Parameters Via the Simulated Method of Moments


▶ back

Table: Parameter estimates from step II

	(1) 1982–1991	(2) 1992–2001	(3) 2002–2011	(4) 2012–2021
μ	long-run mean wage	0.184	0.072	0.245
θ	autocorrelation of wage process	0.013	0.017	0.016
σ	s.d. of diffusion	0.194	0.221	0.232
ω	difference in offered wage btw types	0.103	0.151	0.019
δ^1	separation rate, low type	0.083	0.089	0.100
δ^2	separation rate, high type	0.010	0.010	0.010
λ^f	job-to-job move upon separation	0.450	0.527	0.529
λ^e	arrival rate of job offers	0.025	0.019	0.014

Share of Stayers


▶ back



- ▶ The EN rate informs the model EN rate $\delta(1 - \lambda^f)$
- ▶ λ^e gives voluntary job-to-job flows
- ▶ Use the share that remain in job to get λ^f

Overall Mobility is Not Informative About Reallocation Mobility

◀ back



- ▶ Similar overall mobility as raw CPS
- ▶ But not informative about reallocation part
 - ▶ ≈55% are associated with wage gain
 - ▶ Systematic upward only 1/4 of total
- ⇒ Need to incorporate wage information

Unobserved Heterogeneity is a Crucial Factor Behind the Wage-Offer Gap

▶ back

1. Job-to-job mobility toward higher paying jobs—important yet < 50% of gap
2. Unobserved heterogeneity is also very important—hires earn less in all jobs
3. Wage growth within jobs—return to tenure is positive


Decomposition of gap between offer and wage distributions

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Overall gap	Job-to-job	Unobs. het.	On-the-job
0.104	39.6%	39.0%	33.2%

The Employed Sample Better Job Offers

▶ back

- ▶ Faberman et al. (2024): employed get better offers
- ▶ Model replicates this through selection
- ▶ Pool of unemployed dominated by low type



Employer Granularity From State-Year Panel

▶ back

- ▶ The # of LMs in state s in period y , B_{sy} , is assumed proportional to the # of workers N_{sy}

$$\beta = \frac{N_{sy}}{B_{sy}}.$$

That is, each market contains β workers

- ▶ It follows that the # of firms per market m_{sy} is

$$m_{sy} = \frac{M_{sy}}{B_{sy}} = \beta \frac{M_{sy}}{N_{sy}}.$$

- ▶ Then we can obtain a measure of the number of workers per market from

$$\ln \frac{\lambda_{sy}^e}{\lambda_{sy}} = \ln \left(1 - \frac{fsize_{sy}}{\beta} \right) + \alpha_s + \alpha_y + \varepsilon_{sy}, \quad m_y = \frac{\beta}{fsize_y}$$

Employer Granularity From State-Year Panel

▶ back


Table: Parameter estimates from cross-state panel

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
β	43.454 (5.255)	34.133 (2.050)	63.754 (17.543)	39.185 (7.510)	38.834 (9.526)	39.143 (7.186)
Trend					-0.000 (0.000)	
Controls	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes
Year FE	no	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
State FE	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
Obs.	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000

JJ Rate in Model & Data

▶ back


- ▶ Can get JJ rate in CPS since 1994
- ▶ Model understates somewhat the data
- ▶ But matches well the trend



Suggestive Evidence of a Decline in Upward Job Mobility

▶ back


- ▶ Workers at the top are more likely to stay




Suggestive Evidence of a Decline in Upward Job Mobility

▶ back

- ▶ Workers at the top are more likely to stay
- ▶ The share of stayers has risen
- ▶ Large rise at bottom consistent with $\lambda^e \downarrow$



12-Month EN Rate by Wage



12-Month Job Stayers by Wage

