

Bougheas, Spiros; Riezman, Raymond

Working Paper

Market entry costs, underemployment and international trade

CESifo Working Paper, No. 3263

Provided in Cooperation with:

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

Suggested Citation: Bougheas, Spiros; Riezman, Raymond (2010) : Market entry costs, underemployment and international trade, CESifo Working Paper, No. 3263, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/46554>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Market Entry Costs, Underemployment and International Trade

Spiros Bougheas
Raymond Riezman

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 3263

CATEGORY 8: TRADE POLICY

NOVEMBER 2010

An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded

- from the SSRN website: www.SSRN.com
- from the RePEc website: www.RePEc.org
- from the CESifo website: www.CESifo-group.org/wp

Market Entry Costs, Underemployment and International Trade

Abstract

We develop a small, open economy, two-sector model with heterogeneous agents and endogenous participation in a labor matching market. We analyze the implications of asymmetric market entry costs for the patterns of international trade and underemployment. Furthermore, we examine the welfare implications of trade liberalization and find that under certain conditions the patterns of trade are not optimal. We also examine the robustness of our results when we allow for complementarities in the production function and for alternative matching mechanisms.

JEL-Code: F16.

Keywords: entry costs, patterns of trade, underemployment.

Spiros Bougheas
University of Nottingham
Nottingham / UK
spiros.bougheas@nottingham.ac.uk

Raymond Riezman
University of Iowa
Iowa City / USA
raymond-riezman@uiowa.edu

September, 2010

We would like to thank participants at the Society for the Advancement of Economic Theory Conference, Ischia 2009, the Mid-West International Economics Meeting, Evanston 2010 and the GEP Annual Conference, University of Nottingham, June 2010, for helpful comments and suggestions. The usual disclaimer applies.

1. Introduction

Establishing a competitive advantage in high-skilled sectors at the national level requires that a number of conditions must be met. The Ricardian theory of international trade emphasizes the need for technological know-how while from the Heckscher-Ohlin-Vanek model we learn that a sufficient endowment of skilled labor is necessary. While endowments and technologies are necessary pre-conditions they are by no means sufficient. Neoclassical trade theory is silent about the product and labor market institutions which play an important role in bringing the factors of production together. In particular, both the entry of workers into skilled labor markets and the establishment of new enterprises are costly.

When these costs are sufficiently high they discourage market participation. For example, Brixiova, Li and Yousef (2009) and Fan, Overland and Spagat (1999) suggest that the reluctance of workers to enter skilled labor markets can explain shortages of skilled labor in emerging economies and the consequent slow development of their private sector. In contrast, relatively low skill acquisition costs and small labor market frictions can potentially explain the phenomenon of overeducation and mismatch observed by researchers in many European countries and Canada.¹

Looking at the other side of the labor market, Djankov, La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes and Shleifer (2002) provide evidence that market entry costs incurred by start-up firms are significant and vary widely across countries. They find that "The official cost of following required procedures for a simple firm ranges from under 0.5 percent of per capita GDP in the United States to over 4.6 times per capita GDP in the Dominican Republic, with the worldwide average of 47 percent of annual per capita income."

In addition to market entry costs, we also need to consider frictions arising during the matching process of skills to firms. The decision of young people to acquire skills is going to depend, in addition to any direct costs, on their expectations about the probability of getting a job in the skilled sector and, given that they do find a job, on the quality of the match. Similarly, the decision of potential entrepreneurs to establish new firms will depend on their expectations about the future availability of skilled labor and the latter's level of skills. Furthermore, both parties decisions will depend on the allocation of the surplus generated by the match.

These issues are well understood by labor economists.² In this paper, we analyze some of the implications for international trade. We develop a two-sector model with three factors of production; namely, unskilled labor, skilled labor and entrepreneurial ability.³ One sector produces under a CRS technology a low-tech good that requires only unskilled labor. The second sector is a high-tech sector. To establish a production unit in that

¹See McGuinness (2006) for a review of this literature.

²For example, the need for coordination between skill acquisition and job creation in order to avoid situations where the economy is locked in a low-skill/bad-job trap is emphasized by both Snower (1996) and Redding (1996).

³A simplified version of the model with one-sided uncertainty has been used by Bougheas and Riezman (2007) to examine the relationship between the distribution of endowments and the patterns of trade and by Davidson and Matusz (2006) and Davidson, Matusz and Nelson (2006) to examine redistribution policy issues.

sector a skilled worker needs to be matched with an entrepreneur. There are two types of agents: workers and entrepreneurs. Both populations are heterogeneous. Workers are distinguished by their potential ability as skilled workers and entrepreneurs by their potential ability to manage a firm. Initially, each type must decide whether to enter the matching market. Workers who decide to enter incur a fixed cost related to the acquisition of skills. Entrepreneurs who opt to enter incur a cost for establishing a new firm. To capture the notion of decentralized labor markets we assume random matching. Those agents on the long side of the market who cannot find a match find employment in the unskilled sector as do those agents who decided not to attempt to enter the matching market. The output of matched pairs is a function of the two partners' abilities.

Not surprisingly, we find that disparities in labor institutions become a source of comparative advantage. The exact patterns will depend not only on the costs of entering the skilled sector but also on the mechanism used for dividing the surplus. This suggests that in addition to traditional sources of comparative advantage, i.e. endowments and technologies, we also need to take into account those costs related to the acquisition of skills, those costs related to the creation of firms and the institutional structure of labor markets (unions, minimum wages, etc.). Thus, our work is related to a group of papers suggesting that differences in labor market rigidities across nations can be a major driving force of comparative advantage (Krugman, 1995; Davis, 1998a; Davis, 1998d; Kreickemeier and Nelson, 2006). Research in this area has paid particular attention to rigidities that have a direct impact on wage formation. In contrast, our main interest is on cross-country differences in (a) the costs of establishing new firms, and (b) the costs of entering skilled labor markets. Finally, our work is also related to some recent theoretical work that explores the implications of trade liberalization for inequality and labor market outcomes.⁴

Our model generates either underemployment of skills or firm capacity that is not utilized depending of which side of the market is long.⁵ We demonstrate that the effect of trade liberalization on underemployment will depend on the pattern of trade. More specifically, we find that trade increases underemployment when the country has a comparative advantage in the high-tech sector. The level of underemployment will also depend on the sharing rule that divides the surplus between workers and entrepreneurs. Here, we find that the likelihood that the small-open economy has a comparative advantage in the high-tech sector is decreasing with the level of underemployment in autarky.

Most of our analytical results are derived from a benchmark version of our model that includes a linear production technology and a one-to-one matching mechanism. In Section 2 we develop the model and examine the autarky case and then in Section 3 we open

⁴In Helpman, Itzhaki and Redding (2009) although both populations of firms and entrepreneurs are heterogeneous it is only the participation of the second group that is derived endogenously. Egger and Kreickemeier (2008) analyze a model with one heterogeneous population and generalized endogenous participation where agents in addition to their level of skills also decide in which sector to be employed. In our model, both workers and entrepreneurs can choose whether or not to enter the matching market.

⁵Traditionally, matching models also include a search process thus generating unemployment (see, for example, Davidson, Martin and Matusz, 1999; Davidson, Matusz and Shevchenko, 2008; Felbermayr, Prat and Schmerer, 2008; Felbermayr, Larch and Lechthaler, 2009). In this paper, we have implicitly set search costs equal to zero to simplify our welfare analysis. Nevertheless, our model still generates equilibrium underemployment.

the small-economy to international trade. In Section 4 we analyze two extensions of the benchmark version of our model. First, we allow for complementarities in the production function and we use this extended version to explore the welfare implications of trade liberalization. We show that trade can potentially be welfare reducing. We also identify conditions under which the patterns of international trade are not optimal. Second, we also examine alternative matching mechanisms and show that our results are fairly robust. We offer some final comments in Section 5.

2. The Closed-Economy Benchmark Model

The economy is populated by two types of agents and produces two goods. The two types of agents, workers and entrepreneurs, are each of unit mass. The first good, the numeraire, is a high-tech product and its production requires the joint efforts of an entrepreneur and a worker. The second good is a primary commodity and all types of agents can produce one unit should they decide to seek employment in that sector. Let P be its price in numeraire units. All agents are risk neutral, form expectations rationally and have identical Cobb-Douglas preferences allocating equal shares of their income on each good which implies that real income is equal to nominal income divided by $\sqrt{P}$.⁶

The populations of both workers and entrepreneurs are heterogeneous. Workers are differentiated by their ability α to work in the high-tech sector and entrepreneurs by their ability z to manage in the high-tech sector. Both α and z are randomly drawn from uniform distributions with support $[0, 1]$. Both workers and entrepreneurs have to incur a fixed cost $0 < \gamma < 1$ and $0 < c < 1$, respectively, to enter the high-tech sector. Entrepreneurs and workers that have incurred the fixed entry costs are randomly matched. If the two masses are not equal then unmatched agents enter the primary sector. Matched pairs produce $\alpha + z$ units of the high-tech product.

To complete the description of the model we need to specify how matched pairs divide their joint output. The division of surplus normally depends on the outside options of the two parties and their relative bargaining power. Given that we have assumed away any recontracting the outside options of the two sides are the same and equal to P the income they will receive in their alternative employment option. For the moment we assume that all pairs divide the surplus equally. As we will see below, assuming equal division is analytically convenient and allows for analytical derivations. We will also explore numerically the consequences of relaxing this restriction.⁷

Given that an agent's expected payoff is increasing in her own ability there exist two cut-off ability levels α^* and z^* such that all workers with ability levels less than α^* and all entrepreneurs with ability levels less than z^* do not incur the high-tech sector entry

⁶Let X denote the level of consumption of the high-tech product, Y the level of consumption of the primary commodity and I the level of nominal income. By maximizing $\sqrt{XY}$ subject to $I = PX + Y$, we obtain the solutions $X = \frac{I}{4P}$ and $Y = \frac{I}{4}$, which after substituting them back in the utility function and multiplying by 2 (because (a) the marginal utility of income is equal to 1, and (b) the measure of agents is equal to 2) we obtain the solution in the text.

⁷Acemoglu (1996) also employs Nash bargaining in a random matching environment similar to the one in this paper.

costs and find employment in the primary sector. Thus, a mass of workers of $1 - \alpha^*$ and a mass of entrepreneurs of $(1 - z^*)$ will enter the matching market. The decisions to enter the high-tech sector, and thus the cut-off levels, will depend on each agent's belief about their likelihood of being matched. Thus, there are three cases to consider that correspond to three potential rational expectations equilibria, namely **matching market clearing** $(1 - \alpha^*) = (1 - z^*)$, **surplus of entrepreneurs** $(1 - \alpha^*) < (1 - z^*)$, and **surplus of workers** $(1 - \alpha^*) > (1 - z^*)$. The one that prevails will depend on the values of the various model parameters. In the benchmark model, as we verify below, the equilibrium type only depends on the relative size of the two entry costs. Thus, without any loss of generality we assume that $c < \gamma$ in which case in equilibrium, as we verify below, there will be a mass of entrepreneurs who incur the fixed cost of entry but are not matched.

By definition an entrepreneur with ability z^* is indifferent between investing and market search and directly entering the primary sector. Given that the income of this threshold agent is equal to z^* if matched and equal to P if unmatched, the equilibrium condition for the cut-off level is given by

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha^*}{1 - z^*} \right) \left(z^* + \frac{1 + \alpha^*}{2} \right) + \left(1 - \frac{1 - \alpha^*}{1 - z^*} \right) P - c = P \quad (1)$$

where $\frac{1 - \alpha^*}{1 - z^*}$ is the probability the entrepreneur is matched with a worker and $z^* + \frac{1 + \alpha^*}{2}$ is equal to the expected output of a matched pair where the entrepreneur has ability equal to z^* keeping in mind that only those workers with ability higher than α^* are attempting to enter the high-tech sector. The first term is multiplied by $\frac{1}{2}$ which is equal to the share of output received by each member of a matched pair. Similarly, α^* is determined by

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\alpha^* + \frac{1 + z^*}{2} \right) - \gamma = P \quad (2)$$

To close the model we need the equilibrium condition for one of the two goods markets. Without loss of generality we focus on the market for the primary commodity

$$2\alpha^* = \frac{2\alpha^*P - (\alpha^* - z^*)c + (1 - \alpha^*) \left(\frac{2 + \alpha^* + z^*}{2} - c - \gamma \right)}{2P} \quad (3)$$

The left-hand side is equal to the gross supply of the primary commodity. All workers that enter the matching market are matched and thus there are α^* unmatched workers which means there are α^* unmatched entrepreneurs. Therefore, in total there is a mass of $2\alpha^*$ agents that are employed in the primary sector and each produces one unit. The right-hand side is equal to the gross demand. The specification of preferences imply that an agent with income y demands an amount $\frac{y}{2P}$ of the primary commodity. Furthermore, risk-neutrality implies that the marginal utility of income is constant and thus, for the derivation of the gross market demand it suffices to derive aggregate income and divide it by $2P$. Agents employed in the primary sector produce one unit and earn income P and the first term of the numerator on the right-hand side shows their gross income. The second term captures the entry costs of unmatched entrepreneurs. The final term is equal

to the total income of matched pairs.⁸

In the next Proposition we verify that the solution of the above system is indeed a rational expectations equilibrium.

Proposition 1 *Under incomplete information if in the benchmark model $\gamma > c$ then $z^* < \alpha^*$.*

Proof (1) and (2) imply that $\frac{1}{2}(z^* + \frac{1+\alpha^*}{2}) - \frac{1-z^*}{1-\alpha^*}c = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{1+z^*}{2} + \alpha^*) - \gamma$. The equality can be written as $\frac{1}{4}(1 - \alpha^*)(\alpha^* - z^*) = \gamma - \frac{1-z^*}{1-\alpha^*}c$. For $\gamma = c$ the last expression can be written as $\frac{1}{4}(1 - \alpha^*)^2 = \gamma \frac{z^* - \alpha^*}{\alpha^* - z^*}$. Given that $\gamma > 0$ it follows that $\alpha^* = z^*$. Next consider the case $\gamma > c$ and let $\gamma \equiv c + \delta$. Now we can write the equality as $\frac{1}{4}(1 - \alpha^*)^2 = c \frac{z^* - \alpha^*}{\alpha^* - z^*} + \frac{\delta}{\alpha^* - z^*}$. Given that $\delta > 0$ we have $\alpha^* - z^* > 0$ which completes the proof.

2.1. Entry Costs and the Autarky Price

Comparative advantage is completely determined by comparing the autarky price with the foreign price and in the benchmark model the autarky price depends only on the two entry costs. With that in mind, in this section, we examine how changes in these costs affect the autarky price. Notice that by setting both entry costs equal to 0 we can derive a lower bound for the two cut-off levels α^* and z^* . From (2) it is clear that in this limiting case the two cut-off levels will be equal to $\frac{4P-1}{3}$ and using (3) we find out that they will be greater than $\frac{1}{2}$. This lower bound for the two cut-off levels will be proved to be useful for the derivation of the following proposition.

Proposition 2 *In the incomplete information case for $\gamma > c$ we have (a) $\frac{d\alpha^*}{d\gamma} > 0$, (b) $\frac{dz^*}{dc} > 0$, and (c) $\frac{d\alpha^*}{dc} < 0$.*

Proof See the Appendix

Changes in entry costs affect the two thresholds through a number of distinct channels. First, consider the effect of worker entry cost on the entry of workers. It is not surprising that an increase in γ discourages workers from participating in the matching market and thus the overall effect is to increase α^* . However, there is a second, smaller effect due to the choice of numeraire and works in the opposite direction. Other things equal, an increase in any of the two entry costs decreases the amount available of the high-tech product available for consumption and thus decreases P thus encouraging participation in

⁸For the derivation of the last term, given that the output of a matched pair is equal to the sum of the abilities of its members, it suffices to add individual abilities and subtract fixed costs. Thus, we have that aggregate income of matched pairs equals

$$\int_{\alpha^*}^1 \alpha d\alpha + \frac{1 - \alpha^*}{1 - z^*} \int_{z^*}^1 z dz - (1 - \alpha)(c + \gamma)$$

Notice that second term follows from random matching and $z^* < \alpha^*$.

the labour market. For similar reasons the overall effect of an increase in c is to discourage the entry of entrepreneurs in the matching market, i.e. z^* increases.

Next, consider the effect of an increase in any of the two entry costs on the entry decisions in the other side of the market. Payoffs depend on the abilities of both agents so any increase in the threshold level of either workers' or entrepreneurs' entry costs increases the expected payoff of the other type of agent and thus their incentive to participate. In the case of an increase in c on workers, the numeraire effect mentioned above discourages entry of entrepreneurs and thus increases the average ability of entrepreneurs in the market. This has a positive effect on workers' payoffs thus providing even stronger incentives for workers to participate, so an increase in the entrepreneur's cost (c) will encourage entry of workers (α^* falls.)

Finally, the effect of an increase in γ on the entrepreneurs' entry decision is ambiguous and the reason is the existence of a third indirect effect. Given that an increase in γ discourages the entry of workers the likelihood of potential entrepreneurs being matched declines which discourages this entry. Thus, the mass of high-tech firms will decline. It is clear that this effect is larger the wider the gap between the two entry costs. As Table 1 reveals, when the gap is small an increase in γ has a negative effect on z^* but the effect becomes positive when the gap is large.

Table 1: Entry Costs, Matching Market Participation and the Autarky Price

c	γ	α^*	z^*	P
0.1	0.2	0.57	0.36	0.42
0.1	0.4	0.65	0.08	0.19
0.1	0.6	0.78	0.07	0.06
0.1	0.8	0.91	0.41	0.01
0.3	0.4	0.59	0.49	0.27
0.3	0.6	0.68	0.43	0.10
0.3	0.8	0.83	0.60	0.02
0.5	0.6	0.64	0.58	0.12
0.5	0.8	0.80	0.69	0.02
0.7	0.8	0.78	0.85	0.00

Next, we examine how entry costs affect autarky prices.

Proposition 3 *Let $\gamma > c$. Then, (a) $\frac{dP}{dc} > 0$ and (b) $\frac{dP}{d\gamma} < 0$.*

Proof See the Appendix

The effect of a change in c on the autarky price is positive. This is because the decline in the participation rate by entrepreneurs increases the worker's expected payoff thus further increasing their participation rate. Thus, since there is a surplus of entrepreneurs, the supply of the high-tech product increases and this results in an increase in the autarky price. An increase in γ discourages the participation of workers in the matching market and as a consequence both the production of the high-tech product and the autarky price decline.

3. International Trade

We now consider international trade. Let P^T denote the international price. It is clear that if $P^T > P$ the economy will export the primary commodity and if $P^T < P$ the economy will export the high-tech product. The following Proposition follows directly from Proposition 3.

Proposition 4 *Suppose that $\gamma > c$. Then, other things equal, economies with higher labor entry costs will export the primary commodity and economies with higher entrepreneur entry costs will export the high-tech product.*

Remark 1 *In the statement of the Proposition the qualifier ‘other things equal’ is there to remind us that the pattern of international trade will depend not only on cross country differences in the gap between the two costs but also on the levels. The prediction will be reversed if we set entrepreneur entry costs higher than labor entry costs.*

3.1. Underemployment and Trade

We know from the autarky case that when entry costs are asymmetric in equilibrium there are some agents who entered the matching market but were not matched. The total expenditure of unmatched agents on entry costs $(\alpha^* - z^*)c$ provides a measure of inefficiency. As the following proposition demonstrates the effect of international trade on inefficiency depends on the pattern of trade.⁹

Proposition 5 *As the economy moves from autarky to free trade the measure of inefficiency declines when the economy exports the primary commodity and increases when the economy exports the high-tech product.*

Proof Setting $P = P^T$, rearranging and totally differentiating equations (1) and (2) we get the new system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}d\alpha + \frac{1}{4}dz &= dP^T \\ \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2}c\right)d\alpha + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{c}{1-\alpha}\right)dz &= dP^T \end{aligned}$$

The determinant of the new system is equal to

$$\Delta = \frac{3}{16} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2}c + \frac{1}{4} \frac{c}{1-\alpha} > 0$$

Then,

$$\frac{d\alpha}{dP^T} = \frac{\left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{c}{1-\alpha}\right)}{\Delta} > 0$$

⁹The * have been suppressed.

$$\frac{dz}{dP^T} = \frac{\left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2}c\right)}{\Delta} > 0$$

Lastly,

$$\frac{d\alpha}{dP^T} - \frac{dz}{dP^T} = \frac{\frac{c}{1-\alpha} \left(\frac{z-\alpha}{1-\alpha}\right)}{\Delta} < 0$$

Suppose that $P < P^T$. In this case the world price is higher than the autarky price so that the economy exports the primary product. The increase in the price will reduce inefficiency.

The intuition for this result is that if the economy exports the primary product when liberalized then trade will draw resources into that sector and out of the high-tech sector. The high-tech sector is where the matching inefficiencies occur and hence that is why efficiency increases as trade increases.

3.2. Division of surplus and Trade

To this point we have assumed that workers and entrepreneurs share firm output equally. However, it is clear that any change in the division rule will affect the two entry decisions and the autarky price. When the two parties share output equally but worker entry costs are higher than those of entrepreneurs it is not surprising that in equilibrium there is a surplus of entrepreneurs. Below we demonstrate that there always exists a sharing rule such that the two equilibrium cut-off levels are equal, i.e. $a^* = z^* = x$. Denote by β the share of output allocated to entrepreneurs and by β^* the value that sets $a^* = z^* = x$. Substituting these expressions in the equilibrium conditions (1) and (2) and (3) we get

$$\begin{aligned}\beta^* \left(\frac{1+3x}{2}\right) - c &= P \\ (1-\beta^*) \left(\frac{1+3x}{2}\right) - \gamma &= P\end{aligned}$$

and

$$2P = (1-x)(1+x-c-\gamma)$$

Eliminating the autarky price from the first two conditions and rearranging we obtain

$$\beta^* = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\gamma - c}{1+3x}$$

The solution is very intuitive. When the two entry costs are equal we also need to set the shares allocated to each side equal so that the entry masses of workers and entrepreneurs are also equal. If entrepreneur entry costs are higher then we need to increase the share of output allocated to entrepreneurs. The exact amount will depend on the gap between the two costs and their level.

Two countries that differ in their sharing rules but otherwise identical will have different autarky prices and thus both can benefit by opening to trade. Then we would like to know how a change in the sharing rule, keeping other things equal, might affect a small open

economy's patterns of trade. More specifically, suppose that we increase the share of output allocated to entrepreneurs, i.e. β increases. As Table 2 indicates the effect on the autarky price will depend on the relationship between β and β^* .¹⁰

Table 2: Sharing Rule and the Autarky Price

	$c = 0.5$	$\gamma = 0.6$	
β	α	z	P
0.3	0.72	0.85	0.015
0.4	0.60	0.69	0.096
0.46489	0.61	0.61	0.161
0.5	0.64	0.58	0.118
0.6	0.78	0.61	0.033
	$c = 0.5$	$\gamma = 0.7$	
β	a	z	P
0.3	0.74	0.84	0.015
0.4	0.63	0.67	0.095
0.43107	0.63	0.63	0.125
0.5	0.71	0.61	0.058
0.6	0.88	0.77	0.007

When $\beta < \beta^*$, an increase in the share of output allocated to entrepreneurs results in a higher autarky price and when $\beta > \beta^*$ the autarky price falls as β increases. Therefore, the autarky price reaches its maximum when $\beta = \beta^*$. This means that it is more likely there is comparative advantage in the high-tech product when the two masses of entrants are equal. This is intuitive given that when the two masses of entrants are equal underemployment and hence, inefficiency in the high-tech sector is minimized.

It is also interesting to note that with a variable sharing rule entrepreneurs are not necessarily on the long-side of the market as a relatively high proportion of output allocated to them can compensate for higher entry costs. The results in Table 2 suggest that there is a monotonic effect of a change in the sharing rule on the cut-off corresponding to the short-side of the market. So, for example in the case of $c = 0.5$ and $\gamma = 0.6$ as β goes from 0.3 to 0.464899 (increasing the share going to the short side of the market), the cutoff, z decreases monotonically meaning that more entrepreneurs are entering. When β is greater than 0.464899 workers are now on the short side of the market. So now as β *decreases* from 0.6 to 0.464899 (increasing the share going to the short side of the market) then the cut-off for workers, α decreases monotonically meaning that more workers are entering the market. Hence, this example shows that allocating more output to the short side of the market increases incentives to enter the matching market. In contrast, the effect on the

¹⁰In order to provide a formal proof of the result we need to introduce the general sharing rule β in the model. Performing comparative statics on the extended model proves to be a very daunting task. However, we have calibrated the model on the whole parameter space finding that the conclusions drawn from Table 2 are robust.

long-side is ambiguous as we have an additional effect. If the short side of the market has a declining share then there is less entry on the short side leading to a decrease in the likelihood a long side agent is matched.

4. Beyond the Benchmark Model

4.1. Skill Complementarity

In this section, we extend the benchmark model by allowing for a more general production function. More specifically, we consider the case where the skills of workers and entrepreneurs are complementary. Now, matched pairs produce $(\alpha + z)^2$ units of the high-tech product. Without any loss of generality, we are going to restrict our attention to the case where $\gamma > c$. To keep the analysis tractable we are also setting $\beta = \frac{1}{2}$. Given these restrictions, once more in equilibrium we must have $z^* < a^*$.

In this case all workers that invest in skills will be matched but only a proportion $\frac{1-\alpha^*}{1-z^*}$ of entrepreneurs will find employment in the high-tech sector. The equilibrium condition for z^* is given by

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1-\alpha^*}{1-z^*} \right) \frac{\int_{\alpha^*}^1 (\alpha + z^*)^2 d\alpha}{1-\alpha^*} + \left(1 - \frac{1-\alpha^*}{1-z^*} \right) P - c = P \quad (4)$$

where $\frac{1}{2} \frac{\int_{\alpha^*}^1 (\alpha + z^*)^2 d\alpha}{1-\alpha^*}$ is equal to the expected payoff of a matched entrepreneur with ability equal to the equilibrium cut-off level. The corresponding condition for α^* is given by

$$\frac{1}{2} \frac{\int_{z^*}^1 (\alpha^* + z)^2 dz}{1-z^*} - \gamma = P \quad (5)$$

Now, we turn our attention to the goods market equilibrium concentrating again on the market for the primary commodity. As before, the gross supply is equal to $2\alpha^*$. Next, we derive the gross demand of the primary commodity. As before, the specification of preferences imply that an agent with income y demands an amount $\frac{y}{2P}$ of the primary commodity. Agents employed in the primary sector produce one unit and earn income P . What remains is to derive the demand for the primary commodity by those agents who are matched.

The combined income of a matched pair comprising of an entrepreneur with ability z and a worker with ability α is equal to $(\alpha + z)^2$. In order to find the expected income of a matched pair we need to derive the distribution of $\alpha + z$ which is the sum of two independent, non-identically distributed uniform random variables.¹¹ More specifically, α is uniformly distributed on $[\alpha^*, 1]$ and z is uniformly distributed on $[z^*, 1]$.

¹¹This of course requires that this distribution is the same as the realized distribution resulting from random matching. Alós-Ferrer (2002) has show that this is indeed the case.

Lemma 1 *The distribution density function of $\alpha + z$ for $\alpha^* > z^*$ is given by*

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{\alpha + z - \alpha^* - z^*}{(1 - \alpha^*)(1 - z^*)} \quad \text{for} \quad \alpha^* + z^* < \alpha + z \leq 1 + z^* \\
& \frac{1}{(1 - z^*)} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 + z^* < \alpha + z \leq 1 + \alpha^* \\
& \frac{2 - \alpha - z}{(1 - \alpha^*)(1 - z^*)} \quad \text{for} \quad 1 + \alpha^* < \alpha + z \leq 2
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Proof Lusk and Wright (1982) provide the derivation when the two random variables are non-identically but independently uniformly distributed on intervals with a lower bound equal to 0. For our more general case we apply the following transformation. Let $Z = z - z^*$ and $A = \alpha - \alpha^*$. Then Z is uniformly distributed on $[0, 1 - z^*]$ and A is uniformly distributed on $[0, (1 - \alpha^*)]$. Also $\alpha + z = A + Z + \alpha^* + z^*$. So it is sufficient to find the distribution of $A + Z$.

Using the above density functions we can calculate the expected output of a matched pair ($E\{(\alpha + z)^2 \mid \alpha^* \leq \alpha \leq 1, z^* \leq z \leq 1\}$). It follows that the primary market equilibrium condition is given by

$$2a^* = \frac{2\alpha^*P - (a^* - z^*)c + (1 - \alpha^*)(E\{(\alpha + z)^2 \mid \alpha^* \leq \alpha \leq 1, z^* \leq z \leq 1\} - c - \gamma)}{2P} \tag{7}$$

The first term, on the right-hand side, is equal to the income of all workers employed in the primary sector. The second term is equal to the total entry costs of those entrepreneurs who failed to match and the last term is equal to the aggregate income of matched pairs net of entry costs.

As in the benchmark case, the system of equations (4), (5) and (7) solves for the three endogenous variables a^* , z^* and P . This new system is too complex to be analyzed analytically but numerical calibration of the model shows that the results in Propositions 2 - 5 derived for the benchmark case are also valid when complementarities are present.¹² Notice that the qualitative results on the pattern of trade do not depend on the exact form of the production function. This is because here we are concentrating on cross-country differences in market entry costs. As Bougheas and Riezman (2007), Costinot and Fogel (2009), Grossman and Maggi (2000), Ohnsorge and Trefler (2007) and Sly (2010) have shown, this is not the case anymore when countries also differ in the distribution of endowments.

4.1.1. Welfare with Skill Complementarity

When the technology is linear what matters for efficiency is who gets matched however, it does not matter with whom they are matched. The reason is that as long as we know who is matched on each side of the matching market we can find aggregate production

¹²The numerical results are provided in a separate Appendix.

in that sector by adding their respective ability levels. However, this is not the case when complementarities are present. Our function is a particular case of a super-modular function. As Grossman and Maggi (2000) have demonstrated efficiency requires that we match workers and entrepreneurs with identical abilities. Thus, we are going to use this more general framework to make some observations on the gains from trade and the pattern of trade. More specifically, using an example we are going to demonstrate that (a) trade can lead to welfare losses, and (b) that the pattern of trade may be sub-optimal. What drives these results is that the competitive equilibrium under autarky is inefficient.

Consider the example: $c = 0.5$ and $\gamma = 0.6$. We measure aggregate welfare by aggregating individual utilities yielding $W = 2\sqrt{XY}$, where X denotes the level of consumption of the high-tech product and Y the level of consumption of the primary commodity.¹³ Aggregate welfare derived in autarky equilibrium, W_A^C , is given by¹⁴

$$W_A^C = \frac{2\alpha^*P - (a^* - z^*)c + (1 - \alpha^*)(E\{(\alpha + z)^2 \mid \alpha^* \leq \alpha \leq 1, z^* \leq z \leq 1\} - c - \gamma)}{2\sqrt{P}} \quad (8)$$

Substituting the above values of entry costs in (4), (5) and (7) we find that $\alpha^* = 0.63$, $z^* = 0.5843$ and $P = 0.42$. Finally, substituting these values in the welfare function we find that $W_A^C = 0.82$.

Next, we compare the above solution with aggregate welfare in autarky under a social planner, W_A^S . We begin with the observation that a social planner would set the mass of workers participating in the matching market equal to the corresponding mass of entrepreneurs. Let x^* denote the proportion of agents who decide not to enter the matching market and let X_A^S and Y_A^S denote the representative agent's consumption levels of the high-tech product and the primary commodity correspondingly. These consumption levels are equal to the aggregate quantities produced in the economy divided by 2 (given that the measure of agents is equal to 2) and given by

$$X_A^S = \left(\int_{x^*}^1 (2x)^2 dx - (c + \gamma)(1 - x^*) \right) / 2 \quad (9)$$

and

$$Y_A^S = 2x^* \quad (10)$$

Given that the social planner matches agents of equal ability the first term in the brackets in (9) captures the level of aggregate production of the high-tech product. The second term is equal to the aggregate cost of entry in the matching market. Equation (10) follows from the fact that each agent employed in the primary sector produces one unit. After we substitute (9) and (10) in the welfare function we maximize the latter by choosing the proportion of agents who will find employment in the primary sector to obtain $x^* = 0.69$. Substituting the solution in (9) and (10) and then those solutions in the welfare function we get $X_A^S = 0.277$, $Y_A^S = 0.69$ and $W_A^S = 0.8746 > 0.82 = W_A^C$.

¹³Keep in mind that the size of the population has measure 2.

¹⁴See footnote 6

The above results show that in autarky the market equilibrium is inefficient which is not surprising given that the social planner eliminates underemployment (every agent who incurs the entry cost finds employment in the high-tech sector) and matches agents efficiently. Furthermore, given that the high-tech sector operates more efficiently, optimal participation in that sector is below the corresponding market equilibrium level.

Next, we consider the corresponding welfare levels under international trade when $P^T = 0.38 < P = 0.42$. Given that the international price is below the autarky price the small open economy has a comparative advantage in the high-tech product. By substituting the international price in (1) and (2) and solving the system we find the equilibrium cut-off participation rates for the open economy are equal to $\alpha^* = 0.61$ and $z^* = 0.56$. Substituting these values and the international price in the right hand side we find that $W_A^C = 0.81 < 0.82 = W_A^C$; thus, in this particular case, welfare under international trade is lower than welfare in autarky. The intuition for this result is that when the economy opens to trade it expands the sector in which the inefficiencies arise and in this particular case, the costs due to these inefficiencies exceed the gains from trading at a price that differs from the autarky one.

We need to be very careful about interpreting the last result. To see why, let us see what a national social planner would have done when facing the same exogenous international price. The social planner, in addition to allocating agents to sectors, decides which goods and what quantities will be traded with the rest of the world. Let $\tau_X \geq 0$ and $\tau_Y \geq 0$ denote the units traded of each good, where positive numbers indicate imports and negative exports. These quantities must satisfy the trade balance condition

$$P^T \tau_Y = -\tau_X$$

The representative agent's consumption levels of the two goods are given by

$$X_T^S = X_A^S + \tau_X$$

and

$$Y_T^S = Y_A^S + \tau_Y$$

Substituting the above three conditions in the welfare function and choosing the participation rate to maximize welfare we obtain $\tau_Y = 0.024$, $x^* = 0.68$, $X_T^S = 0.27$, $Y_T^S = 0.70$ and $W_T^S = 0.875 > 0.8746 = W_A^S$.¹⁵ This demonstrates that if the inefficiencies arising in the matching market are eliminated, trade always improves welfare.

Thus, if matching inefficiencies exist our results suggest that imposing trade restrictions might be welfare improving. However, the results also suggest that a better policy might be to improve labor and product market institutions thus facilitating more efficient matches. Once this is done, free trade is the preferred policy. So, it is not international trade that lowers welfare, rather it is labor market inefficiencies that cause welfare to fall in moving from autarky to free trade.

In the above example the social planner chooses to export the high-tech product and thus the equilibrium patterns of trade are optimal. But in the absence of a social planner

¹⁵Due to the choice of functional forms and parameter values the differences are small, however, they are robust in the sense that the qualitative results are obtained for a wide set of parameter values.

this is not always the case. Consider the following question: what must be the international price so that the social planner would choose not to trade; i.e. $\tau_X = \tau_Y = 0$? It is clear that this would be the price that would induce the social planner to choose the same ability cut-off level as the one chosen in the case for autarky, i.e. $x^* = 0.69$.¹⁶ We denote this price by P^S . This price solves

$$2x^* = \frac{2P^S x^* + \int_{x^*}^1 (2x)^2 dx - (c + \gamma)(1 - x^*)}{2P^S}$$

This is similar to (7) but now we have substituted the corresponding demand for and supply of the primary commodity given that production is determined by the social planner's allocation. Substituting the values for c , γ and x^* we obtain $P^S = 0.402$. The implication for trade patterns is that if $P^T > P^S$ then the social planner would choose to export the primary commodity and if $P^T < P^S$ the social planner would choose to export the high-tech product. If the world price, P^T lies between the autarky price without a social planner ($P = 0.42$) and the social planner's autarky price ($P^S = 0.402$) then the equilibrium pattern of trade will not be optimal. So, the interpretation is that matching inefficiencies cause the autarky price to be different than if no inefficiencies exist. If the world price lies between these two autarky prices then the pattern of trade is not optimal.

4.2. Alternative Matching Mechanisms

In this section, we examine the robustness of our comparative static results to alternative matching mechanisms. Up to this point we have assumed that exactly one entrepreneur (long-side of the market) is matched with one worker leaving the rest of the entrepreneurs to seek employment in the primary sector. Given our supposition that there is no possibility of recontracting (infinite search costs) we have assumed matched agents share the surplus equally. Before we consider any alternative mechanisms we will show that our benchmark set-up is equivalent to one in which all unmatched entrepreneurs are matched with one single worker while each one of the rest of the entrepreneurs are matched again with one worker. The worker who is matched with multiple entrepreneurs is in a strong bargaining position. Given that the production technology requires a single entrepreneur, bargaining will push the share of that entrepreneur down to the outside option which in this case is equal to the price of the primary commodity. Thus, in this new set up, with the exception of one pair, all other workers and entrepreneurs receive the same payoffs as those in the original set-up. Now there is one entrepreneur who receives the low payoff and a worker who receives a payoff that is equal to the total surplus generated by the pair minus the price of the primary commodity. Given that we have assumed that both populations are very large the two versions only differ in a set of measure 0.

¹⁶This is an application of the second welfare theorem. Suppose that the agents in the economy are allocated to sectors by the social planner (this step follows from the fact that the equilibrium allocation is inefficient) and then exchange goods in competitive markets. The equilibrium price would be the one that decentralizes the the social planner's optimal allocation under autarky.

Now consider the other extreme.¹⁷ Suppose that all workers (short-side of the market) are again matched but now some of them are matched with one entrepreneur and some of them are matched with two entrepreneurs.¹⁸ Thus, we now consider the case where underemployment is more evenly distributed in the economy. To keep this simple, we will ignore complementarities and focus on the linear technology case. Once more, under the supposition that $c < \gamma$ the mass of entrepreneurs who enter the matching market, $1 - z^*$, will be higher than the corresponding mass of workers, $1 - \alpha^*$. The proportion of workers matched with two entrepreneurs is equal to $\frac{\alpha^* - z^*}{1 - \alpha^*}$ and the proportion of entrepreneurs matched with workers who are also matched with another entrepreneur is equal to $2\frac{\alpha^* - z^*}{1 - z^*}$. The equilibrium condition that determines z^* is given by

$$2\frac{\alpha^* - z^*}{1 - z^*}P + \left(1 - 2\frac{\alpha^* - z^*}{1 - z^*}\right)\frac{1}{2}\left(z^* + \frac{1 + \alpha^*}{2}\right) - c = P \quad (11)$$

where the left-hand side is equal to the marginal entrepreneur's expected payoff from entering the market. The equilibrium condition for α^* is given by

$$\frac{\alpha^* - z^*}{1 - \alpha^*}\left(\alpha^* + \frac{1 + z^*}{2} - P\right) + \left(1 - \frac{\alpha^* - z^*}{1 - \alpha^*}\right)\frac{1}{2}\left(\alpha^* + \frac{1 + z^*}{2}\right) - \gamma = P \quad (12)$$

where if the marginal worker is matched with more than one entrepreneur they receive a payoff equal to the total surplus minus the price of the primary commodity (the entrepreneur's outside option) and if matched with a single entrepreneur they receive half the surplus. Once more, we need the market equilibrium condition (3) to close the model.

Numerical calibration shows that with one exception the comparative static results under this alternative mechanism are the same as those derived from the benchmark case.¹⁹ The only exception relates to the effect of a change in the entry cost of entrepreneurs on α^* that determines the mass of workers who enter the matching market. In the benchmark case we found that an increase in the entry cost has a negative effect on α^* thus encouraging the entry of entrepreneurs. This result could be reversed with the alternative matching mechanism because there is an additional effect. Namely, as the mass of entrepreneurs entering the matching market declines the likelihood that a worker will be matched with more than one entrepreneur, and thus receiving the higher payoff, also declines. For less extreme suppositions about the distribution of underemployment in the economy we would expect that the outcome would also depend on the level of the two entry costs.

5. Conclusions

Both workers and potential entrepreneurs who want to enter sectors that use advanced technologies must incur entry costs. For workers these costs might capture time and

¹⁷We are indebted to Carl Davidson for suggesting this alternative mechanism.

¹⁸Of course, if the measure of entrepreneurs who enter the matching market is more than twice the measure of corresponding workers then all workers will be matched with multiple entrepreneurs. However, given our parameter restrictions, this cannot happen in the linear technology case.

¹⁹The numerical results are provided in a separate Appendix.

money spent on skill acquisition while for entrepreneurs these costs might be related to the establishment of new technologies or more directly to costly procedures related to the start-up of new enterprises. The decision to incur these costs will depend on expectations about future benefits from participating in these markets. In turn, these benefits will depend on the likelihood of finding a match and thus employment in these markets and on the productivity of that match. Competitive markets can ensure that *ex ante* all entry decisions are optimal but *ex post* it is very likely that some agents will fail to match and thus their new skills or know-how will be underemployed. Having argued that such imbalances are common we have built a simple two-sector model with heterogeneous agents in order to explore their implications for international trade.

Our first task has been to explore the impact of a change in market entry costs on competitiveness and the patterns of international trade. We have found that the results will depend on three factors. First, on the side of the market that faces the change in entry costs, second, on the distribution of underemployment in the economy, and third, on the sharing rule for dividing the surplus generated by a match. More specifically, we have found that an increase in the entry costs of the agents on the short-side of the market will not decrease the competitiveness of that sector. However, the effect of an increase in the entry costs of the long-side of the market would depend on the distribution of underemployment in the economy. Furthermore, we have shown that the lower the level of underemployment, where the latter directly depends on the sharing rule, the higher the likelihood that the sector's competitiveness is strong. In order to keep the analysis simple we have derived these results under the supposition that the matching technology is such that everyone on the short-side of the market is matched. It seems intuitive that our results would hold if we also introduce probabilistic matching also on the short-side of the market.

Calibration has shown that our results also hold when we introduce complementarities in the production function. However, now in addition to inefficiencies arising because of social sub-optimal entry decisions we also have matching inefficiencies. Given that the autarkic equilibrium is not Pareto optimal it is not surprising that when the economy has a comparative advantage in the sector affected by those inefficiencies, international trade can be welfare reducing. In fact, we have also demonstrated that even the patterns of trade can be inefficient. We have also argued that the best policy response is to initiate measures that improve the functioning of the labor market rather than imposing restrictions on the cross-border movement of goods.

Appendix

Proof of Proposition 2

The system of equations (1), (2) and (3) can be rewritten as

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1+z}{2} + \alpha \right) - \gamma = P \quad (A1)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \left(z + \frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right) - \frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} c = P \quad (A2)$$

$$P = \frac{(1 - \alpha) \left(\frac{2+\alpha+z}{2} - c - \gamma \right) - (\alpha - z)c}{2\alpha} \quad (A3)$$

By substituting (A3) into (A1) and (A2) we can reduce the above system into two equations in the two unknowns α and z . Totally differentiating the new system we get

$$\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) d\alpha + \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) dz = \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} dc + \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} + 1 \right) d\gamma \quad (A4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2} c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) d\alpha + \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) dz \\ &= \left(\frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} + \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} \right) dc + \frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} d\gamma \end{aligned} \quad (A5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} &= \frac{-\left(\frac{2+\alpha+z}{2} - c - \gamma \right) + \frac{\alpha(1-\alpha)}{2} - \alpha z}{2\alpha^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} (-2 - z + 2c + 2\gamma - \alpha^2 - 2zc) \\ &< \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} (-2 + z + 2\alpha - \alpha^2 - 2z^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} (-2 + z(1 - 2z) + \alpha(2 - \alpha)) < 0 \end{aligned}$$

[The first inequality follows from the inequalities $z > c$ and $\alpha > \gamma$ and the fact that $2c(1 - z)$ is increasing in c . The second inequality follows from the fact that the lower bound on α and z implies that the second term cannot exceed 1 while the last term is less than 1.]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} &= \frac{1}{2\alpha} \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} + c \right) > 0 \\ \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} &= -\frac{1-z}{2\alpha} < 0 \\ \frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} &= -\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha} < 0 \end{aligned}$$

Next, we proceed to show that the determinant Δ is positive.

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) - \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2} c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) \\ &= \left[\frac{3}{16} - \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} - \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right] + \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} c - \frac{1}{1-\alpha} c \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2} c - \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2} c \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right] \end{aligned}$$

First, after substituting the partial derivatives of P given above in the the reduced system comprised of equations (A4) and (A5), we consider the sign of the first bracket.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{3}{16} - \frac{1}{8\alpha} \left(\frac{1-\alpha}{2} + c \right) + \frac{1}{16\alpha^2} (-2 + z(1-2z) + \alpha(2-\alpha)) \\
&= \frac{1}{16\alpha^2} (5\alpha^2 + 2 - (\alpha-z)(1+2c) - 2(c+\gamma))
\end{aligned}$$

Given that $\gamma > c$ and given that (A1) implies that $2\gamma < \left(\frac{1+z}{2} + \alpha\right)$ the above expression is larger than

$$\frac{1}{16\alpha^2} (5\alpha^2 + 1 - 3\alpha - 2c(\alpha - z))$$

Given that $\alpha > z > c$ the above expression is larger than

$$\frac{1}{16\alpha^2} (-3\alpha(1-\alpha) + 1) > 0$$

where the last inequality follows from $0 < \alpha < 1$.

Next consider the sign of the second bracket which given that $\frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} < 0$ it is larger than

$$\frac{c}{4(1-\alpha)^2\alpha^2} (2\alpha^2(1-\alpha) + \alpha^2(1-z)\alpha - \alpha^2(1-z)2c)$$

Given that (A2) implies that $c < \frac{1-\alpha}{1-z}\frac{1}{2} \left(z + \frac{1+\alpha}{2}\right)$ the above expression is larger than

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{c}{4(1-\alpha)^2} \left(2(1-\alpha) + (1-z)\alpha - (1-\alpha) \left(z + \frac{1+\alpha}{2} \right) \right) \\
& > \frac{c}{4(1-\alpha)} (3 - \alpha + 2(\alpha - z)) > 0
\end{aligned}$$

(a) $\Delta > 0$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{sign} \left\{ \frac{d\alpha^*}{dc} \right\} &= \text{sign} \left\{ \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha}c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) - \left(\frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} + \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} \right) \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) \right\} \\
&= \text{sign} \left\{ \frac{1-z}{8\alpha(1-\alpha)} (1-3\alpha) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where given that $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ is negative.

(b) $\Delta > 0$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{sign} \left\{ \frac{d\alpha^*}{d\gamma} \right\} &= \text{sign} \left\{ \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha}c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) \right\} \\
&= \text{sign} \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \left(-\frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha}c - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \frac{1-\alpha+2c}{2} \right) \\ & + \frac{1-\alpha}{2\alpha} \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2\alpha} \frac{1-\alpha+2c}{2} \right) \end{aligned} \right\} \\
&= \text{sign} \left\{ \frac{1}{8\alpha(1-\alpha)} ((1-\alpha)(7\alpha-3-8c) + 8\alpha c) \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that if $(7\alpha-3-8c) > 0$ then the whole expression is positive and the proof is completed. But even if $(7\alpha-3-8c) < 0$ then given that $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ the whole expression is still positive.

(c) $\Delta > 0$ implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sign} \left\{ \frac{dz^*}{dc} \right\} &= \text{sign} \left\{ \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) \left(\frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} + \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} \right) - \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2} c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) \right\} \\ &= \text{sign} \left\{ \frac{1-z}{8\alpha(1-\alpha)^2} (4\alpha(1-\alpha) + (1-\alpha)^2 - 4(1-z)c) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

Given that (A2) implies that $c < \frac{1-\alpha}{1-z} \frac{1}{2} (z + \frac{1+\alpha}{2})$ the expression in the brackets is larger than

$$\frac{1-z}{4\alpha(1-\alpha)} (\alpha - z) > 0$$

where the last inequality follows from $0 < z < 1$.

Proof of Proposition 3

(a) Totally differentiating (A1) we get

$$\frac{dP}{dc} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{dz}{dc} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\alpha}{dc}$$

Given that $\Delta > 0$ the sign of the above expression is the same as the sign of

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{4} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) \left(\frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} + \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} \right) - \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2} c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} \right] + \\ &\frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{\partial P}{\partial c} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) - \left(\frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} + \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} \right) \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{3}{16} \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} - \frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2} c \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} c \frac{\partial P}{\partial c} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \end{aligned}$$

Using results from the proof of Proposition 2 we can write the last expression as

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1-z}{2\alpha} \left(\frac{3}{16} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2} c + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1-\alpha} c \right) + \\ &\frac{1}{8\alpha} \frac{(1-z)(1-\alpha+2c)}{1-\alpha} + \frac{1}{16\alpha^2} \frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} (2+z-2c-2\gamma+\alpha^2+2zc) \\ &= \frac{1-z}{32(1-\alpha)\alpha^2} \left(4+4\alpha+2z+4cz-2\alpha^2-4c-4\gamma-3\alpha(1-\alpha)-4\alpha \frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} c \right) \end{aligned}$$

The term in the brackets is equal to

$$4+\alpha+2z+\alpha^2-4\gamma-4c \frac{1-z}{1-\alpha}$$

Given that (A2) implies that $c < \frac{1-\alpha}{1-z} \frac{1}{2} (z + \frac{1+\alpha}{2})$ the above expression is larger than

$$3+\alpha^2-4\gamma > 3+\alpha^2-4\alpha = (3-\alpha)(1-\alpha) > 0$$

(b) Totally differentiating (A1) we get

$$\frac{dP}{d\gamma} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{dz}{d\gamma} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{d\alpha}{d\gamma} - 1$$

The first two terms are equal to

$$\left\{ \frac{1}{4} \left[\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) \frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} - \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1-z}{(1-\alpha)^2} c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} \right) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} + 1 \right) \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{1-\alpha} c - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) - \left(\frac{1}{4} - \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} \right) \frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} \right] \right\} / \Delta$$

Given that $\Delta > 0$ to complete the proof it suffices to show that the difference of Δ minus the numerator is positive. This difference could be positive either because the numerator is negative or because the numerator is less than Δ . Using the expression for Δ derived in the proof of Proposition 2 we can write the difference as

$$\frac{1}{4} \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} - \frac{3}{16} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} - \frac{c}{1-\alpha} \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \alpha} + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} + \frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} \frac{\partial P}{\partial z} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} \frac{\partial P}{\partial \gamma} \right)$$

Given that the first three terms are positive to complete the proof we need to show that the expression in the brackets is positive. Once more, using results from the proof of Proposition 2 we can write that expression as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{4\alpha^2} (2 + z - 2c - 2\gamma + \alpha^2 + 2zc) - \frac{1-z}{1-\alpha} \frac{1-\alpha+2c}{4\alpha} + \frac{1-z}{8\alpha} + \frac{1-\alpha}{4\alpha} \\ = & \frac{1}{8\alpha^2(1-\alpha)} \left((1-\alpha)2(2+z-2c-2\gamma+\alpha^2+2zc) - 2\alpha(1-z)(1-\alpha+2c) + \alpha(1-\alpha)(1-z) + 2\alpha(1-\alpha)^2 \right) \\ = & \frac{1}{8\alpha^2(1-\alpha)} (4 - 3\alpha - \alpha^2 + 2z - 4c - 4\gamma + 4\alpha\gamma + 4zc - \alpha z - \alpha^2 z) \\ = & \frac{1}{8\alpha^2(1-\alpha)} (4 - 4\gamma(1-\alpha) - \alpha(3+\alpha) + z(2+2c-\alpha-\alpha^2)) > 0 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $1 > \alpha > \gamma > 0$.

References

- [1] D. Acemoglu, 1996, A microfoundation for social increasing returns in human capital accumulation, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 111, 779-804.
- [2] C. Alós-Ferrer, 2002. Random matching of several infinite populations, *Annals of Operations Research* 114, 33-38.
- [3] S. Bougheas and R. Riezman, 2007, Trade and the distribution of human capital, *Journal of International Economics* 73, 421-433.
- [4] A. Costinot and J. Fogel, 2009, Matching and inequality in the world economy, NBER Working Paper 14672, Cambridge, MA.
- [5] Z. Brixiova, W. Li and T. Yousef, 2009, Skill shortages and labor market outcomes in Central Europe, *Economic Systems* 33, 45-59.

- [6] C. Davidson, L. Martin and S. Matusz, 1999, Trade and search generated unemployment, *Journal of International Economics* 48, 271-299.
- [7] C. Davidson and S. Matusz, 2006, Trade liberalization and compensation, *International Economic Review* 47, 723-747.
- [8] C. Davidson, S. Matusz and D. Nelson, 2006, Can compensation save free trade, *Journal of International Economics* 71, 167-186.
- [9] C. Davidson, S. Matusz and A. Shevchenko, 2008, Globalization and firm level adjustment with imperfect labor markets, *Journal of International Economics* 75, 295-309.
- [10] D. Davis, 1998a, Does European unemployment prop up American wages? National labor markets and global trade, *American Economic Review* 88, 478-494.
- [11] D. Davis, 1998b, Technology, unemployment, and relative wages in a global economy, *European Economic Review* 42, 1613-1633.
- [12] S. Djankov, R. La Porta, F. Lopez-de-Silanes and A. Shleifer, 2002, The regulation of entry, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 117, 1-37.
- [13] H. Egger and U. Kreickemeier, 2008, Fairness, trade and inequality, GEP Research Paper 2008/11, University of Nottingham.
- [14] C. Fan, J. Overland and M. Spagat, 1999, Human capital, growth and inequality in Russia, *Journal of Comparative Economics* 27, 618-643.
- [15] G. Felbermayr, J. Prat and H.-J. Schmerer, 2008, Globalization and labor market outcomes: wage bargaining, search frictions and firm heterogeneity, IZA Discussion Paper 3363, Bonn.
- [16] G. Felbermayr, M. Larch and W. Lechthaler, 2009, Unemployment in an interdependent world, CESifo Working Paper 2788, Munich.
- [17] G. Grossman and G. Maggi, 2000, Diversity and trade, *American Economic Review* 90, 1255-1275.
- [18] E. Helpman, O. Itskhoki and S. Redding, 2009, Inequality and unemployment in a global economy, NBER Working Paper 14478, Boston.
- [19] U. Kreickemeier and D. Nelson, 2006, Fair wages, unemployment and technological change in a global economy, *Journal of International Economics* 70, 451-469.
- [20] P. Krugman, 1995, Growing world trade: causes and consequences, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* 327-362.
- [21] E. Lusk and H. Wright, 1982. Deriving the probability density for sums of uniform random variables, *The American Statistician* 36, 128-130.

- [22] S. McGuinness, 2006, Overeducation in the labor market, *Journal of Economic Surveys* 20, 387-418.
- [23] F. Ohnsorge and D. Treffer, 2007, Sorting it out: International trade with heterogeneous workers, *Journal of Political Economy* 115, 868-892.
- [24] S. Redding, 1996, The low-skill, low-quality trap: strategic complementarities between human capital and R&D, *Economic Journal*, 106, 458-470.
- [25] N. Sly, 2010, International productivity differences, trade and the distribution of factor endowments, University of Oregon, Mimeo.
- [26] D. Snower, 1996, The low-skill, bad-job trap, in A. Booth and D. Snower (eds.) **Acquiring Skills: Market Failures, their Symptoms, and Policy Responses**, Cambridge University press, New York.

Appendix (Not intended for publication)

Numerical Calculations (Complementarities)

The tables below show the equilibrium values of a^* , z^* and P for $\gamma < \alpha$ where $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.

c	γ	α	z	P
0.1	0.2	0.60	0.49	0.71
0.1	0.3	0.62	0.40	0.58
0.1	0.4	0.64	0.32	0.46
0.1	0.5	0.67	0.24	0.36
0.1	0.6	0.70	0.19	0.27
0.1	0.7	0.74	0.15	0.20
0.1	0.8	0.78	0.14	0.14
0.1	0.9	0.82	0.15	0.10
0.1	1.0	0.85	0.19	0.07

c	γ	α	z	P
0.2	0.3	0.60	0.52	0.63
0.2	0.4	0.62	0.46	0.52
0.2	0.5	0.64	0.40	0.42
0.2	0.6	0.67	0.36	0.33
0.2	0.7	0.70	0.33	0.25
0.2	0.8	0.74	0.32	0.19
0.2	0.9	0.77	0.32	0.14
0.2	1.0	0.80	0.34	0.10

c	γ	α	z	P
0.3	0.4	0.61	0.54	0.56
0.3	0.5	0.63	0.50	0.46
0.3	0.6	0.65	0.46	0.37
0.3	0.7	0.68	0.44	0.29
0.3	0.8	0.71	0.42	0.22
0.3	0.9	0.74	0.42	0.17
0.3	1	0.77	0.43	0.12

c	γ	α	z	P
0.4	0.5	0.62	0.56	0.49
0.4	0.6	0.64	0.53	0.40
0.4	0.7	0.66	0.51	0.32
0.4	0.8	0.69	0.50	0.25
0.4	0.9	0.72	0.49	0.19
0.4	1.0	0.75	0.50	0.14

c	γ	α	z	P
0.5	0.6	0.63	0.58	0.42
0.5	0.7	0.65	0.56	0.34
0.5	0.8	0.68	0.55	0.27
0.5	0.9	0.71	0.55	0.20
0.5	1.0	0.73	0.55	0.15

c	γ	α	z	P
0.6	0.7	0.65	0.60	0.36
0.6	0.8	0.67	0.59	0.28
0.6	0.9	0.70	0.59	0.22
0.6	1.0	0.73	0.59	0.17

c	γ	α	z	P
0.7	0.8	0.66	0.63	0.29
0.7	0.9	0.69	0.62	0.23
0.7	1.0	0.72	0.62	0.17

c	γ	α	z	P
0.8	0.9	0.68	0.65	0.24
0.8	1.0	0.71	0.65	0.18

c	γ	α	z	P
0.9	1.0	0.70	0.68	0.19

Numerical Calculations (Alternative Matching Mechanism)

The tables below show the equilibrium values of a^* , z^* and P for $\gamma < \alpha$ where $0 < \gamma \leq 1$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$.

c	γ	α	z	P
0.1	0.2	0.56	0.47	0.48
0.1	0.3	0.56	0.43	0.41
0.1	0.4	0.57	0.40	0.35
0.1	0.5	0.58	0.38	0.30
0.1	0.6	0.59	0.37	0.25
0.1	0.7	0.61	0.37	0.21
0.1	0.8	0.62	0.38	0.16
0.1	0.9	0.64	0.40	0.13
0.1	1.0	0.66	0.43	0.10

c	γ	α	z	P
0.2	0.3	0.56	0.51	0.39
0.2	0.4	0.57	0.48	0.32
0.2	0.5	0.59	0.47	0.29
0.2	0.6	0.60	0.46	0.22
0.2	0.7	0.62	0.47	0.17
0.2	0.8	0.64	0.48	0.13
0.2	0.9	0.66	0.50	0.10
0.2	1.0	0.69	0.53	0.07

c	γ	α	z	P
0.3	0.4	0.58	0.54	0.31
0.3	0.5	0.59	0.53	0.25
0.3	0.6	0.61	0.52	0.19
0.3	0.7	0.63	0.53	0.15
0.3	0.8	0.65	0.55	0.11
0.3	0.9	0.69	0.57	0.07
0.3	1	0.72	0.61	0.05

c	γ	α	z	P
0.4	0.5	0.60	0.57	0.22
0.4	0.6	0.62	0.57	0.17
0.4	0.7	0.64	0.58	0.12
0.4	0.8	0.67	0.60	0.08
0.4	0.9	0.71	0.63	0.05
0.4	1.0	0.76	0.68	0.03

c	γ	α	z	P
0.5	0.6	0.62	0.60	0.15
0.5	0.7	0.66	0.62	0.10
0.5	0.8	0.69	0.65	0.06
0.5	0.9	0.74	0.69	0.04
0.5	1.0	0.79	0.75	0.02

c	γ	α	z	P
0.6	0.7	0.67	0.65	0.08
0.6	0.8	0.72	0.69	0.05
0.6	0.9	0.77	0.74	0.03
0.6	1.0	0.83	0.80	0.01

c	γ	α	z	P
0.7	0.8	0.74	0.73	0.04
0.7	0.9	0.80	0.79	0.02
0.7	1.0	0.87	0.86	0.01

c	γ	α	z	P
0.8	0.9	0.84	0.83	0.01
0.8	1.0	0.91	0.91	0.00

c	γ	α	z	P
0.9	1.0	0.96	0.95	0.00