

Supplementary appendix to ‘Search intensity, wage segmentation and the wage distribution’

March 2009

1 Proof of Proposition 5

We have

$$\frac{G''(w)}{G'(w)} = \frac{\chi(w)}{\alpha(\theta(w))(y-w)(w-R)} \quad (1)$$

Using the definitions of the functions $\chi(w)$ given in the proof of Proposition 4, equation (1) becomes:

$$\frac{G''(w)}{G'(w)} = \frac{\gamma(y-R)}{(y-w)(w-R)} - \frac{1+\gamma-\alpha}{\alpha(y-w)} \quad (2)$$

Integrating this equation with the condition $\int_R^y G'(w)dw = 1$ yields

$$G'(w) = \frac{(y-w)^{\frac{(1+\gamma)(1-\alpha)}{\alpha}}(w-R)^\gamma}{\int_R^y (y-\xi)^{\frac{(1+\gamma)(1-\alpha)}{\alpha}}(\xi-R)^\gamma d\xi} \quad (3)$$

The cdf of the actual normalized wage is such that

$$H_G(\omega) = \Pr\left(\frac{w-R}{y-R} \leq \omega\right) = \Pr(w \leq R + \omega(y-R)) = G[R + \omega(y-R)] \quad (4)$$

Therefore one gets $H'_G(\omega) = (y-R)G'[R + \omega(y-R)]$, and the result follows.

2 Proof that there are no multiple offers

We closely follow Mortensen (1986) who shows in the standard job-search model that the probability of receiving more than one offer conditional on the fact that the worker receives at least one offer tends to 0 as the time interval tends to 0. The proof must be adapted to account for the fact that there are a continuum of markets in our model. Mortensen discretizes time, and interprets continuous time as a case in which the time interval between two dates tends to 0. We not only discretize time but also space: the wage distribution is cut into intervals of equal distance. The case of a continuum of markets corresponds to the case where such distance tends to 0.

Consider the function $\lambda(w) = x[s(w)]\theta(w)m[\theta(w)]$ defined over $[R, y]$. Our proof does not depend on the particular form taken by the function $\lambda(w)$ in our model. It is valid for any function $\lambda(w)$ that is positive and continuous on the interval $[R, y]$. Cut the interval $[R, y]$ into

n intervals of the same length $dw = (y - R)/n$. On interval $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, there is a unique wage $w_i = R + (i - 1)dw$. Now, consider interval i , and cut it into m intervals. Assume that the probability of receiving an offer from any such interval is $\lambda_i dw dt/m$ over the period dt , with $\lambda_i = \lambda(w_i)$.

Let X_i be the number of offers received from interval i over the period dt . The probability of receiving $k_i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ offers is:

$$\Pr(X = k_i) = C_m^{k_i} (\lambda_i dw dt/m)^{k_i} (1 - \lambda_i dw dt/m)^{m-k_i} \quad (5)$$

As $m \rightarrow \infty$, it tends to

$$\Pr(X = k_i) = e^{-\lambda_i dw dt} \frac{(\lambda_i dw dt)^{k_i}}{k_i!} \quad (6)$$

Hence, X_i follows the Poisson law of parameter $\lambda_i dw dt$.

Now, consider the random variable $X = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ which is the total number of offers received from all the intervals over the period dt . As the different variables are independent draws from Poisson laws, the sum of the draws also follows a Poisson law, whose parameter is the sum of the parameters of the different Poisson laws. Hence,

$$\Pr(X = k) = \Pr\left(\sum_{i=1}^n X_i = k\right) = e^{-\lambda dt} \frac{(\lambda dt)^k}{k!}, \quad \text{with } \lambda = \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i dw \quad (7)$$

As $n \rightarrow +\infty$, we obtain that X follows the Poisson law of parameter $\lambda = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_i dw = \int_R^y \lambda(w) dw$. The remainder of the proof is standard. Following Mortensen (1986),

$$\frac{\Pr(X = k)}{dt} = e^{-\lambda dt} \frac{\lambda^k (dt)^{k-1}}{k!} \quad (8)$$

The right-hand side tends to 0 when dt tends to 0 for all $k > 1$. Similarly, it tends to λ when dt tends to 0 when $k = 1$. It follows that the probability of receiving more than one offer conditional to the fact that the worker receives at least one offer tends to 0 when dt tends to 0.