# Online Appendix:

# "Interpersonal, cognitive, and manual skills: How do they shape employment and wages?"

Esther Mirjam Girsberger<sup>\*</sup> Miriam Koomen<sup>†</sup> Matthias Krapf<sup>‡</sup>

July 26, 2022

#### Abstract

We study how interpersonal, cognitive, and manual skills affect employment and wages in a search and matching model through their impact on productivity, complementarity, job destruction, and the cost of unemployment. Combining several data sets on workers who acquired skills in vocational education and training (VET), we quantify each channel, allowing for unobserved heterogeneity in ability. All three skills increase productivity, yet they affect job destruction, interpersonal and cognitive skills have the opposite effect. Focusing on low-ability workers, we then estimate the value of VET. Through VET, wages increase up to 10% and unemployment drops by over 50%. Low-ability workers thus have particularly large benefits from acquiring manual skills because they increase wages and shield from unemployment.

**Keywords:** Multidimensional skills, unemployment, wages, vocational education and training, labour market search.

JEL classification numbers: E24, J23, J24, J64.

<sup>\*</sup>University of Technology Sydney & IZA. Corresponding author. Contact: EstherMirjam.Girsberger@uts.edu.au. Address: UTS Business School, Department of Economics, 14-28 Ultimo Rd, Ultimo NSW 2008, Australia. Phone: +61 2 9514 3371.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>†</sup>Swiss National Bank, Switzerland. Email: miriam.koomen@snb.ch.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>University of Basel and University of Lausanne, Switzerland. Email: matthias.krapf@unibas.ch.

## A The Swiss Education System

Figure A.1 presents a simplified overview of the educational system in Switzerland. The education system is geographically diverse as the authority over education lies with the cantons rather than with the federal government. This figure shows some of these cantonal differences such as the different timing of when tracking starts (i.e. in most cantons primary school lasts six years and tracking starts in year 7, however, in some cantons tracking starts as early as year 5). Moreover, in some cantons VET is primarily available through training at host firms, while other cantons (mostly in the French-speaking parts) also offer it through vocational schools.



Figure A.1: Educational system in Switzerland Source: PH Zürich. Modified by Authors.

#### **B** Selection into vocational and general education

We present further evidence on selection into vocational and general education in Switzerland. We use the "Transitions from Education to Employment" longitudinal study (TREE). The TREE study is a panel survey which follows students through their post-compulsory education and training into employment. The data collects information about the standardised PISA test scores and self-assessed personality traits prior to completing compulsory education. It also records education, training and employment outcomes of study participants in subsequent waves. The data used in this paper covers one cohort of approximately 2,000 students in their last year of compulsory education in year 2000 (wave 1).<sup>1</sup>

Figure B.1 presents the distribution of standardised PISA test scores in reading and maths (as a measure of ability) and the distribution of self-assessed personality traits (persistence, locus of control and ambition) of male pupils in their last year of compulsory education. We split the pupils according to their future education pathway: compulsory education, vocational education (3- or 4-year VET) only, vocational + tertiary education, and general education.

We find a fair amount of heterogeneity in PISA test scores both within and across education groups. Pupils in the vocational education track have on average lower reading and maths test scores than those in the general education track, but higher scores than those with compulsory education only. Distinguishing vocational pupils by their future education level is crucial. The PISA test scores distributions of vocational pupils who later enrol in tertiary education dominate the ones of "only vocational" pupils, but they are similar to those of general education pupils. This suggests that "vocational + tertiary" pupils have comparable academic abilities to their peers in general education. In contrast, reading and maths scores of most pupils with only vocational education fall short of the median pupil in general education. Instead, their score distributions resemble those of pupils with only compulsory education.

In terms of personality traits, differences across education tracks are less stark. For locus of control and ambition, the respective distributions differ only marginally. For persistence, we find that pupils in the vocational and general education track are on average more persistent than those who do not go beyond compulsory education.

Table B.1 provides summary statistics for PISA test scores (reading, maths) and personality traits by education tracks (upper panel), as well as by occupation cluster (as defined in the beginning of Section ??) for those within the vocational education track. It also gives the share of each occupation cluster who enrol in tertiary education within 10 years.

Breaking up the vocational education track into occupation clusters which differ in their skill

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Due to sample size issues, non-negligible attrition in subsequent waves and missing information, this data cannot be used to estimate the labour market model in our paper.



(a) PISA reading test score

(b) PISA math test score



(c) Persistence (self-assessed)





(e) Ambition (self-assessed)

#### Figure B.1: Selection into compulsory, vocational, and general education

*Notes:* Standardised PISA reading and maths test scores lie between 0 and 1. Personality traits "Persistence", "Locus of control" and "Ambition" are the average over a number of ordinal survey questions relative to each trait which can take on value 1 'not at all true', 2 'hardly true', 3 'moderately true', and 4 'exactly true'. We distinguish: compulsory education (those who do not enrol in any further education programme), only vocational education (those who complete vocational education, but do not enrol in tertiary education within 10 years of graduation), vocational + tertiary education (those who complete vocational education and eventually enrol into tertiary education within 10 years after graduating from VET), and general education (those who complete 12 or 13 years of general education such as Gymnasium).

$eq:linear_line$									
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	PISA maths		Persistenc	Ð	LoC	۲)	Ambi	tion	Enrol in
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $									tertiary
	D Obs Mean	SD Obs	s Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
	<u> </u>	0.09 48	3 2.88	0.62	2.94	0.59	2.81	0.69	
	0.54 0.54 0	0.09 1,080	3.15	0.48	3.01	0.42	2.99	0.63	16.6%
	0.53 0.53 0	0.09 89(	3.15	0.49	3.00	0.43	2.96	0.62	
	07 117 0.60 (	0.07 190	3.14	0.48	3.04	0.39	3.12	0.64	
Vocational education by occupation cluster   Interpers. Manual Cognitive 3 0.50 0.07 1 0.53 0 3 3.53   High Low Medium 50 0.50 0.07 1 0.53 0.06 29 2.99 2.99   High Low Medium 50 0.48 0.08 28 0.55 0.06 29 2.99   High Low Medium 21 0.55 n.a. 0 1 3.23   Medium High Medium 23 0.49 0.09 20 0.09 20 3.13   Medium 38 0.44 0.07 76 0.59 0.09 20 3.13   Low Medium 38 0.44 0.07 23 0.09 31 3.23   Low Medium 50 0.47 0.09 36 0.31 3.13   Low Medium 50 0.47 <td>07 373 0.61 (</td> <td>0.08 585</td> <td>3.05</td> <td>0.51</td> <td>3.05</td> <td>0.46</td> <td>2.87</td> <td>0.65</td> <td></td>	07 373 0.61 (	0.08 585	3.05	0.51	3.05	0.46	2.87	0.65	
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$									
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	07 1 0.53	0	3.53	0.31	3.33	0.58	3.17	0.29	n.a.
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	<b>39 20 0.55 (</b>	0.06 29	) 2.99	0.57	2.88	0.43	2.87	0.67	12.8%
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0.52 0.52 0	0.08 44	t 3.10	0.59	2.96	0.56	2.95	0.66	4.0%
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	0	0	•						
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	a. 0		3.20	n.a.	2.40	n.a.	2.50	n.a.	n.a.
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	06 14 0.55 (	0.05 18	3.00	0.38	3.11	0.33	3.06	0.66	0%0
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	08 13 0.49 (	0.09 20	3.13	0.52	2.94	0.46	3.13	0.67	11.5%
$ \begin{array}{rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	07 76 0.59 (	0.09 115	3.05	0.51	2.99	0.49	2.93	0.65	31.3%
$ \begin{array}{r rrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrrr$	07 23 0.50 (	0.08 31	3.27	0.49	3.01	0.44	2.97	0.60	5.3%
High 57 0.47 0.09 35 0.51 0.11 45 3.21   High Medium 50 0.42 0.10 20 0.48 0.09 38 3.25   Low Low 38 0.47 0.08 22 0.50 0.09 38 3.19   Low High 5 0.52 0.07 1 0.57 0 3 3.33   Low Medium 32 0.45 0.08 21 0.54 0.08 23 3.33	0.56 0.56	0.09 83	3.14	0.53	3.07	0.40	2.94	0.68	23.2%
High Medium 50 0.42 0.10 20 0.48 0.09 38 3.25   Low Low 38 0.47 0.08 22 0.50 0.09 31 3.19   Low High 5 0.52 0.07 1 0.57 0 3 3.33   Low Medium 32 0.45 0.08 21 0.54 0.08 23 3.33	9 35 0.51 (	0.11 45	3.21	0.44	3.06	0.38	3.06	0.65	7.0%
Low Low 38 0.47 0.08 22 0.50 0.09 31 3.19   Low High 5 0.52 0.07 1 0.57 0 3 3.33   Low Medium 32 0.45 0.08 21 0.54 0.08 23 3.33	10 20 0.48 (	0.09 38	3.25	0.57	3.01	0.55	2.93	0.72	4.0%
Low High 5 0.52 0.07 1 0.57 0 3 3.33 Low Medium 32 0.45 0.08 21 0.54 0.08 23 3.30	08 22 0.50 0	0.09 31	3.19	0.45	3.08	0.49	2.95	0.61	10.5%
Low Medium 32 0.45 0.08 21 0.54 0.08 23 3.30	07 1 0.57	0	3.33	0.31	3.07	0.31	3.33	0.76	20.0%
	08 21 0.54 (	0.08 23	3.30	0.42	3.07	0.31	3.23	0.61	6.3%
Low 18 0.49 0.07 10 0.54 0.07 18 3.29	07 10 0.54 (	0.07 18	3.29	0.41	3.06	0.43	3.06	0.66	11.1%
Vocational education (only matched) 619 0.49 0.09 329 0.54 0.09 501 3.15	<b>19 329 0.54 (</b>	0.09 501	3.15	0.51	3.02	0.45	2.98	0.65	
<i>Notes:</i> Standardised PISA reading and maths test scores lie between 0 and 1. Personality traits "Persistence", "LoC" (Locus o ordinal survey questions relative to each trait. They can take on value 1 "not at all true", 2 "hardly true", 3 "moderately true"	1 1. Personality traits "Personality traits "Personality to the second sec	sistence", "LoC true" 3 "moder	" (Locus of e	control) ar	d "Ambitio	on" are th	le average	over a nui	nber of

mix reveals a large heterogeneity across clusters. Pupils in some VET occupations (like occupation cluster 11 with intermediate interpersonal, low manual and intermediate cognitive skills, or cluster 14 with low interpersonal, high manual and intermediate cognitive skills) have on average the same abilities as those with only compulsory education. In contrast, pupils in other VET occupations (like cluster 10 with intermediate interpersonal, low manual, and high cognitive skills) resemble quite closely pupils in general education in terms of their cognitive abilities and personality traits. Their rate of enrolling in tertiary education within 10 years is also much higher than the one of the former groups.

Overall, we find that the distributions of personality traits and abilities of pupils in different education tracks overlap to a large extent. Pupils in the vocational education track at the lower ability end resemble those who only get compulsory education, while pupils at the higher end resemble those who pursue a general education track. By focussing our analysis on workers who complete vocational education, but do not eventually enrol in tertiary education, we limit the heterogeneity in unobserved ability to a considerable degree.

#### C BIZ skill measures and their robustness

All BIZ skills are classified either as interpersonal, cognitive or manual according to Zihlmann et al. (2012). We use 24 out of 26 skills. Interpersonal skills include high sense of responsibility, high ability to work in a team, high sociability, communication talent, service orientation, hygiene awareness, high reliability, high mental stability, patience, and high empathy. Cognitive skills include mental flexibility, abstract-logical thinking skills, practical understanding, spatial visualisation ability, technical understanding, talent for languages (oral and written), creativity, sense of aesthetics, and organisational talent. The manual skills include physical agility, manual dexterity, good fine motor skills, good sense of taste and smell, and head for heights. The two excluded "skills" are robust health and strong physique because they describe physical attributes rather than skills that can be acquired.

We add up the number of acquired skills within each of the three skills. Each worker has acquired 0 to 5 interpersonal skills, 0 to 5 cognitive skills, and 0 to 3 manual skills. Figure C.1 visualises the different skill bundles supplied by the workers in our sample. It displays the joint distribution of cognitive and interpersonal skills for each of the four different values of manual skills.



Figure C.1: Skill bundles supplied by workers

Given the range of each skill, there are  $6 \times 6 \times 4 = 144$  possible skill bundles. Effectively, we observe only 45 of them in our sample. Not all skill bundles are equally frequent. Some skill bundles make up 5% or more of the sample, for other skill bundles we do not have a single observation. Generally, skill bundles close to the horizontal 00-55 line (0 interpersonal-0 cognitive to 5 interpersonal-5 cognitive) are somewhat more frequent than those off this line, reflecting the

positive correlation of these skills. The two most common skill bundles are the 5 interpersonal - 3 cognitive - 0 manual skills bundle (which includes administrative assistants), and the 1 interpersonal - 1 cognitive - 1 manual skills bundle (which includes car mechanics). Each of these two skill bundles makes up almost 10% of the sample.

We validate our skill measures by comparing them to two alternative measures such as 1) a *relative* skill measure where interpersonal, cognitive and manual skills in each occupation are measured as a percentage of total skills and 2) a PCA-based measure where we perform Principal Component Analysis on the 24 skills of our 200 VET occupations and retain the three principal components. We then combine these three principal components and impose three exclusion restrictions to interpret the measures as interpersonal, cognitive, and manual skills.

We replicate the empirical analysis of Table ?? using these two alternative measures. The results are available upon request. Our main empirical results from the paper still stand when using the relative skill measures: Interpersonal and manual skills have significantly higher returns to wages than cognitive skills once we control for the academic requirement index (ARI) of an occupation, the effects of intermediate and high ARI on wages and unemployment are quantitatively very similar, and having acquired more interpersonal skills is associated with a significantly higher likelihoood of being unemployed. The results for the PCA-based skill measures align only partially with our main results in the paper. Higher interpersonal PCA-measured skills are still associated with significantly higher unemployment. However, the relative ranking of wage returns to PCA-measured skills now places cognitive skills before manual and interpersonal skills, while the wage premia of intermediate ARI becomes 0 and the wage premia of high ARI shrinks by one half compared to the main results. The cognitive PCA-skill measure confounds cognitive skills acquired in VET and higher ability, while interpersonal and manual PCA-based skills are highly negatively correlated (-.80 correlation coefficient). Given that the three principal components in the PCA only explain 33% of the variation in the 24 underlying binary variables, the PCA-based skill measures are not appropriate for our setting where we are interested in understanding the effect of *learned skills* on various labour market outcomes.

### **D** Academic requirement index and skills of occupations

This appendix presents the skills and the respective shares of the low, intermediate and high academic requirement index (ARI) for each occupation cluster. The ARI is an index ranging from 1 to 6 based on Stalder (2011). We regroup Stalder's index into a baseline level (ARI of 1 or 2 or unknown), an intermediate level (ARI of 3 or 4) and a high level (ARI of 5 or 6). This information is used to ensure that our simulated model sample has approximately the same observed and unobserved characteristics as the data sample.

	Skills		Share in		ARI	
Interpersonal	Manual	Cognitive	sample	Baseline	Intermediate	High
	High	Low	9.1%	5.0%	95.0%	0%
II: -1-		High	14.9%	1.8%	44.9%	53.4%
High	Low	Medium	7.7%	74.1%	19.8%	6.1%
		Low	1.9%	96.7%	3.3%	0%
		High	7.9%	5.4%	79.4%	15.2%
	High	Medium	3.3%	66.5%	0%	33.5%
Math		Low	3.2%	88.3%	11.7%	0%
Medium		High	6.8%	17.3%	10.0%	72.7%
	Low	Medium	7.5%	79.0%	18.7%	2.3%
		Low	13.2%	21.3%	67.0%	11.7%
		High	2.1%	0%	100%	0%
	High	Medium	10.8%	97.8%	2.2%	0%
T.		Low	4.4%	99.1%	0.9%	0%
LOW		High	1.1%	1.9%	64.2%	34.0%
	Low	Medium	3.5%	42.9%	57.1%	0%
		Low	2.7%	70.2%	29.8%	0%

Table D.1: ACADEMIC REQUIREMENT INDEX AND SKILLS OF VET OCCUPATIONS

# **E** Identification: Parameters and moments

This appendix presents a table summarising which moments are used to identify all parameters in the model.

Table E.1:	MODEL PARAMETERS AND CORRESPONDING MOMENTS	
Parameter	Moment	#
Productivity and skill-specific demands (log-n	ormal marginals)	
General productivity: $\mu_0, \sigma_0$		
Interpersonal skills: $\mu_I$ , $\sigma_I$		
Cognitive skills: $\mu_C$ , $\sigma_C$	Mean & standard deviation of age-adjusted hourly wages by occupation cluster	32
Manual skills: $\mu_M, \sigma_M$		
Correlations: $\rho_{IC}$ , $\rho_{IM}$ , $\rho_{CM}$		
Type-specific productivity gain: $\alpha_{\tau_m}, \alpha_{\tau_h}$	same as above, it relies on the distribution of $\tau$ being known for each occupation cluster	
Flow cost of unemployment		
Common flow cost: $b_0$		
Interpersonal skills cost: $b_I$	. Biret nerventile of ore adjueted hourly worse hy occumption alueter	
Cognitive skills cost: $b_C$		16
Manual skills cost: $b_M$		
Offer arrival and destruction rates		
Offer arrival rate: $\lambda$	Yearly UE-transition rates by occupation cluster	16
General destruction rate: $\eta_0$		
Interpersonal skills marginal destruction: $\eta_I$	Yearly EU-transition rates by occupation cluster	16
Cognitive skills marginal destruction: $\eta_C$	Age-adjusted unemployment rates by occupation cluster	16
Manual skills marginal destruction: $\eta_M$		
Calibrated parameters		
Bargaining power worker: $\beta = 0.67$	Siegenthaler and Stucki (2015)	
Interest rate: $r = 0.05$		
	Total moments	96

#### F Goodness of fit

This appendix shows how well our model fits the observed moments. Tables F.1 and F.2 present the goodness of fit of the targeted moments. Figure F.1 displays the complete observed and simulated wage distributions (i.e. histograms) of all 16 occupation clusters. This figure goes beyond the directly targeted moments on hourly wages which only include the mean, standard deviation and lowest 1% of hourly wages for each occupation cluster.



*Notes:* The first two lines of figures relate to the occupation clusters with high interpersonal skills (the first for high manual, the second for low manual), the two middle lines are intermediate interpersonal skills (high, low manual) and the last two lines for low interpersonal skills (high, low manual). Cognitive skills vary from high (first column), to intermediate (second column) and low (third column).

Figure F.1: Goodness of fit: Wage distributions of observed (blue) and simulated (orange) wages by occupation cluster

	Skills			Mean hc	ourly wage		Std.	dev. hourly	wage	Lo	west 1% hc	ourly wage	
Interpersonal	Manual	Cognitive	Observed		Std. Err.	Simulated	Observed	Std. Err.	Simulated	Observed	Std. Err.	Simulated	
	High	Low		38.49	0.28	38.10	9.27	0.29	9.06	12.58	1.46		22.34
11:21		High		39.86	0.29	39.32	11.92	0.25	11.14	14.89	0.82		19.84
ngin	Low	Medium		34.34	0.31	33.15	9.42	0.29	9.70	12.48	1.38		17.07
		Low		28.03	0.43	32.42	6.37	0.34	9.11	12.70	1.77		16.96
		High		39.66	0.31	38.75	9.59	0.29	9.28	16.78	2.09		22.71
	High	Medium		37.29	0.49	37.33	96.6	0.52	10.71	14.81	2.50		19.07
		Low		33.57	0.43	34.12	8.47	0.58	8.69	10.59	2.73		19.52
Medium		High		38.25	0.36	40.18	10.13	0.33	10.01	9.74	2.20		18.71
	Low	Medium		35.12	0.29	32.83	8.81	0.28	8.79	12.92	1.28		17.59
		Low		37.15	0.23	36.39	9.15	0.27	9.18	13.74	1.24		19.83
		High		34.94	0.44	37.70	7.07	0.49	8.48	15.78	1.76		22.85
	High	Medium		34.04	0.20	33.62	7.38	0.27	8.63	11.63	1.64		18.97
1		Low		33.02	0.38	33.12	8.79	0.53	8.36	12.63	1.98		19.75
TOW		High		40.83	0.80	38.94	9.06	0.87	9.41	23.15	3.95		22.09
	Low	Medium		33.03	0.42	33.38	8.47	0.40	8.64	9.65	1.68		17.89
		Low		33.33	0.52	33.04	9.51	0.59	8.56	10.23	1.53		18.17
All (not directl	y targeted)			36.52		36.23	9.81		11.95	12.93			18.94
Contribution to	loss func	tion				286.0			112.0				273.3
Correlation ob:	s. & sim. 1	noments				0.86			0.72				0.61
Correlation ob	s. & sim. 1	noments in m	nodel withou	t skills		0.83			0.50				0.61
<i>Notes:</i> The table c wages. The first 1	lisplays the o 6 rows relate	bbserved moments to the targeted	ts, their standard moments for ea	d errors and tch occupat	l simulated co ion cluster in	unterparts from the sample. Rov	the model for w 17 relates to	the mean hour the overall m	ly wage, the star ments which ar	ndard deviation i e not directly ta	in hourly wage rgeted. Line 1	es and the 1% of 8 shows the corr	hourly elation
between the obser	ved and simu	ilated moments (	as a measure of	f fit for bety	ween occupati	on cluster variat	tion), while rov	v 19 shows the	e same correlatio	n between the o	bserved and s	imulated momen	ts for a

Table F.1: GOODNESS OF FIT I: WAGES

13

model without skills (but allowing for different ARI across occupation clusters).

		Table	F.2: GOOD	NESS OF	FIT II: U	JNEMPLOYN	<b>JENT AND</b>	LABOUR N	IARKET TR.	ANSITIONS			
	Skills			Unemplo	yment rate			EU rate			UE ra	lte	
Interpersonal	Manual	Cognitive	Observed		Std. Err.	Simulated	Observed	Std. Err.	Simulated	Observed	Std. Err.	Simulated	
	High	Low		0.038	0.006	0.038	0.023	0.006	0.027	0.500	0.104	0	.658
11: ~b		High		0.046	0.005	0.052	0.026	0.005	0.036	0.519	0.069	0.	.657
ngin	Low	Medium		0.029	0.005	0.039	0.026	0.006	0.025	0.875	0.085	0.	570
		Low		0.080	0.017	0.052	0.059	0.019	0.026	0.556	0.176	0.	.606
		High		0.017	0.004	0.031	0.006	0.003	0.018	0.500	0.224	0	649
	High	Medium		0.023	0.007	0.029	0.018	0.008	0.021	0.750	0.250	0.	677
Modim		Low		0.024	0.007	0.028	0.019	0.008	0.017	0.800	0.200	0.	.625
Medium		High		0.040	0.007	0.030	0.029	0.007	0.025	0.765	0.106	0.	.625
	Low	Medium		0.038	0.006	0.030	0.030	0.007	0.020	0.706	0.114	0	682
		Low		0.044	0.005	0.029	0.021	0.004	0.019	0.587	0.073	0.	595
		High		0.027	0.010	0.025	0.037	0.015	0.018	1.000	0.250	0	639
	High	Medium		0.033	0.005	0.023	0.017	0.004	0.014	0.650	0.109	0.	639
1		Low		0.036	0.008	0.023	0.014	0.006	0.012	0.500	0.151	0.	621
LOW		High		0.020	0.012	0.033	0.011	0.011	0.014	0.000	0.250	0.	.657
	Low	Medium		0.021	0.007	0.032	0.007	0.005	0.019	0.750	0.250	0.	579
		Low		0.026	0.008	0.022	0.023	0.010	0.014	0.750	0.250	0.	574
All (not direct)	y targeted			3.49%		3.38%	2.18%		2.21%	61.0%		63	.4%
Contribution to	o loss func	tion				46.4			36.2				32.9
Correlation ob	s. & sim. 1	noments				0.64			0.44			)-	0.31
Correlation ob	s. & sim. 1	noments in m	nodel withou	ıt skills		-0.01			0.08			0	0.21
<i>Notes</i> : The table c employment (UE) targeted. Row 18	lisplays the o yearly transit shows the co	bserved moment tion rate, respecti rrelation betweer	s, their standar ively. The first n the observed	l errors and 16 rows rela and simulat	simulated co te to the targe ed moments	unterparts from t eted moments for (as a measure of	he model for th each occupatic fit for between	e unemployme in cluster in the occupation clu	ant rate, the emp sample. Row 1' ister variation),	loyment-unemp 7 relates to the c while line 19 sh	loyment (EU) werall momen ows the same	and the unemployn ts which are not dir correlation betweel	nent- ectly n the
observed and simu	ulated momer.	nts for a model w	ithout skills (bu	ıt allowing f	or different /	ARIs across occu	pation clusters)						

#### **G** Estimation results: Compulsory education

This appendix presents the estimation results of a simple search model for a sample of workers who only have completed compulsory education. In this simplified model all parameters related to skills (i.e. skill-specific productivity, destruction rates, unemployment costs) are dropped. We use the same estimation algorithm as for the full model. Table G.1 presents the estimated parameters and standard errors, table G.2 reports the fit of the targeted moments.

Table G.1: ESTIMATED PARAM	IETERS: CO	MPULSOR	Y EDUCA	ATION
	Estimate	Std. Err.	Mean	Std. Dev
$\mu_{00}$ : General productivity (location)	3.78	0.07	45.72	13.47
$\sigma_{00}$ : General productivity (scale)	0.29	0.02		
$\lambda_{00}$ : Offer arrival rate	0.87	0.05		
$\eta_{00} * 100$ : Destruction rate	5.77	0.33		
$b_{00}$ : General unemployment cost	-246.35	55.05		

*Notes:* The general productivity follows a log-normal distribution. The mean is given by  $\exp(\mu + \sigma^2/2)$  and the variance by  $\left[exp(\sigma^2) - 1\right]exp(2\mu + \sigma^2)$ . Asymptotic standard errors are computed following French and Jones (2011).

	Observed	Std. Err.	Simulated
Mean hourly wage	30.76	0.10	30.44
Std. dev. hourly wage	8.49	0.10	8.97
Lowest 1% hourly wage	7.13	0.45	14.90
Unemployment rate	0.066	0.003	0.063
EU rate	0.032	0.002	0.037
UE rate	0.619	0.027	0.570

Table G.2: GOODNESS OF FIT: COMPULSORY EDUCATION

## References

- French, Eric and John Bailey Jones, "The effects of health insurance and self-insurance on retirement behavior," *Econometrica*, 2011, 79 (3), 693–732.
- Siegenthaler, Michael and Tobias Stucki, "Dividing the Pie: Firm-Level Determinants of the Labor Share," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 2015, 68 (5), 1157–1194.
- **Stalder, Barbara E**, "Das intellektuelle Anforderungsniveau beruflicher Grundbildungen in der Schweiz. Ratings der Jahre 1999-2005," 2011.
- Zihlmann, René, Anna Voigt Lutz, Claudia Butz, and Manfred Fasel, Berufswahlbuch 2012/13 mit Berufswahl-Kompass, Cornelsen Schweiz Schulverlage, 2012.