

Naghavi, Alireza

**Working Paper**

## Asymmetric Labor Markets, Southern Wages, and the Location of Firms

Nota di Lavoro, No. 17.2005

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM)

*Suggested Citation:* Naghavi, Alireza (2005) : Asymmetric Labor Markets, Southern Wages, and the Location of Firms, Nota di Lavoro, No. 17.2005, Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei (FEEM), Milano

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/74021>

**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.*

**Asymmetric Labor Markets,  
Southern Wages,  
and the Location of Firms**

Alireza Naghavi

NOTA DI LAVORO 17.2005

**JANUARY 2005**

KTHC - Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital

Alireza Naghavi, *University College Dublin and CERAS*

This paper can be downloaded without charge at:

The Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Note di Lavoro Series Index:  
<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.htm>

Social Science Research Network Electronic Paper Collection:  
<http://ssrn.com/abstract=657263>

# **Asymmetric Labor Markets, Southern Wages, and the Location of Firms**

## **Summary**

This paper studies the behavior of firms towards weak labor rights in developing countries (South). A less than perfectly elastic labor supply in the South gives firms oligopsonistic power tempting them to strategically reduce output to cut wages. In an open economy, competitors operating in perfectly competitive labor markets meanwhile enjoy less aggressive competitors and raise output. Finally, competition effect reduces the ex-post output of a relocating firm. These effects reduce relative profitability of the South casting doubts on traditional beliefs that multinationals are attracted to regions with lower wages. Adopting a minimum wage unambiguously enhances Southern competitiveness and welfare.

**Keywords:** Labor standards, Labor market imperfection, Oligopsony, Location of firms, Minimum wages, Strategic behavior, Multinationals, Southern welfare

**JEL Classification:** J80, F23, J42, F12, R38, L13

*I am grateful for invaluable guidance by Peter Neary while working on this paper. I also wish to thank Richard Baldwin, Dermot Leahy and Gianmarco Ottaviano for helpful comments. Financial support from the Institute for the Study of Social Change at University College Dublin is acknowledged.*

*Address for correspondence*

Alireza Naghavi  
CERAS  
Ecole Normale Supérieure  
48 Boulevard Jourdan  
75014 Paris  
France  
Phone: +33 1 43136389  
E-mail: naghavi\_alireza@yahoo.com

## 1. Introduction

The economic consequences of labor standards and the question whether WTO should have an active role in promoting regulatory standards in the South have been highly controversial issues in recent trade rounds.<sup>1</sup> Strong differences in opinions amongst major players have blocked attempts by industrialized nations (North), mainly the United States, to provide the WTO with the power to resolve issues dealing with labor standards. Officials from developing countries (South) view these efforts as nothing but attempts to take away the only competitive advantage of the South, namely abundant and relatively cheap labor. Although the Northern interest is claimed to be for humanitarian purposes, many suspect that the true motive behind it is egoistic, protectionist concerns. These concerns originate from a demand for 'fair trade' that itself originates from fears of an outflow of activity towards an artificially more competitive South and a subsequent loss of employment in Northern unskilled sectors.

There is a vast literature on labor standards that deals with their social, philosophical and economic aspects. Much of the economic literature such as Brown, Deardorff and Stern (1998) and Srinivasan (1997) reviews the issue in a non-analytical context and discusses the consequences of potential social clause tariffs used by the WTO to enforce labor standards. Maskus (1997) looks at core labor standards using basic microeconomic principles and proposes several policies to eliminate each problem. The conclusion often reached is that the indirect use of trade policy for this purpose harms precisely the people that the policy is intended to help.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Discussions on labor standards often refer to the five "core" labor standards, which consist of (1) elimination of exploitative use of child labor, (2) prohibition of forced labor, (3) elimination of discrimination in employment, (4) freedom of association, and (5) provision of the right to organize and bargain collectively. Here, we concentrate on "economic" labor standards by contrast dealing essentially with issues such as minimum wages and working conditions. See Irwin (2002).

<sup>2</sup> In contrast, Freeman (1994) and Krueger (1996) are two of few papers that have hinted their support for such policy initiatives.

Although these papers have suggested other direct policy measures to address the issue, a theoretical analysis to look at the crux of the problem has been missing in the economic literature. This paper studies the effect of the differences that exist between the labor markets of industrialized and developing countries. Namely it looks at the behavior of firms when they compete in a world product market while facing different labor market structures. The labor supply curve in the North is seen as fully elastic, resulting in perfectly competitive wages, whereas the Southern labor supply is assumed to be upward sloping due to the presence of abundant labor there. This of course gives firms that operate in the South market power in the labor market allowing them to pay workers a wage lower than the perfectly competitive level. This approach at the same time takes care of facts found in recent studies that multinationals, which relocate their production to the South, tend to pay higher than the market (reservation) wages (Brown, Deardorff and Stern, 2002).<sup>3</sup> This can be one explanation for the lack of labor standards in the South, or equally, the disadvantage experienced by labor symbolized by their lower wages. It also highlights the importance of the relationship between wages and the decision of Northern multinationals regarding their output and production location. Indeed, the ever-increasing ability of firms to carry jobs by choosing their production location has given rise to an

---

<sup>3</sup> It has often been argued that the labor supply in developing countries is perfectly elastic at the level of reservation survival wages, which could lie far beneath the perfectly competitive level. This is clearly the case in agricultural employment and the informal sector. This paper however focuses on the formal sector in the South as it is the latter that is usually related to competitive advantage concerns, fears of spillovers of the lower wages in the South, and possible job losses in the unskilled sectors in the North caused by the relocation of multinationals. As the workers doing the unskilled work in firms in the South are relatively more skilled than those working in farms and the informal sectors, it can be assumed that they create an upward sloping supply curve and thereby enjoy higher than reservation wages in the South. Working in the formal sector is hence still seen as a novelty for residents in the South regardless of their wages being much lower than that of their counterparts, namely the unskilled labor in richer countries.

important missing link between the labor market and the location of firms.<sup>4</sup> While this issue has rarely been discussed in labor literature, it has generally been taken for granted that firms always wish to move to regions where wages and labor rights are inferior in order to take advantage of lower marginal costs.

This paper explores this link by examining the strategic decisions of multinationals on output and location in response to labor policies in the South. It argues that, contrary to conventional wisdom, multinationals are not always attracted to regions with weak labor laws to take advantage of the lower labor costs. Even in the absence of social clause tariffs, potential monopsonistic/oligopsonistic market power in the South can actually make firms reluctant to base their production there. The results show that even in the absence of exogenous motives such as culture, politics, or stability that work against foreign investment in developing countries, the endogenous strategic behavior of firms can alone prevent delocation to the South. This theory shows one possible explanation for the paradoxical empirical findings of Rodrik (1996), which revealed that multinationals tend to locate more in countries where labor standards are enforced and hence marginal costs of labor are higher.<sup>5</sup>

To be more specific, firms decide on location by simply observing the profitability of each region, which is in turn determined by the strategic actions of firms in an open economy. In the absence of labor standards, a less than perfectly elastic labor supply in the South gives firms there an oligopsonistic position, which enables them to set wages through their choice of output. These

---

<sup>4</sup> Dewit, Leahy and Montagna (2003) is one of the few papers that point towards this direction. They study the location decision of firms with the asymmetry in the labor markets arising from the differences in employment protection laws in countries and therefore the flexibility with which firms can adjust output and employment in each region to the evolving economic conditions.

<sup>5</sup> This study was done on US multinationals and the receptivity of their locational decision on labor standards in force in host countries. Brown, Deardorff and Stern (2002) provide additional evidence to support the idea that the low standards are not a primary factor in investment decisions of multinationals.

firms at the same time compete in the product market, and in an open economy also with firms in the North that operate in a perfectly competitive labor market.<sup>6</sup> This dual market imperfection concept creates a link between the labor market and the product market. Firms located in the South tend to exploit their market power and suppress wages and employment by strategically reducing their output. This creates an indirect negative scale effect on profits that offsets or at least weakens the direct positive gains from lower wages. Firms remaining in the North can on the other hand free-ride on the presence of oligopsony in the South and strategically increase their output as they face less aggressive competitors. The combination of these effects along with the ex-post disadvantages of relocation to the South that arise from lower production and profits per firm (competition effect) could overshadow the attractiveness of lower wage in the South and make the North the more profitable region.

The paper further investigates a common complaint by labor unions and others in rich countries about the existence of no or unacceptably low minimum wages in the South, and the enforcement of such legislation there. It simultaneously studies objections made by Southern authorities regarding the adoption of such policies, which are claimed to adversely affect the competitiveness and welfare of the South. A minimum wage policy, namely a marginal increase in monopsony wages in the South, is therefore brought into the model to look at its impact on the competitiveness of the South and well being of labor there.<sup>7</sup> It will be seen in accordance with Martin and Maskus (2001) that adopting labor standards can actually increase the competitiveness of the South when the product market (demand) is taken into account. It also looks at the

---

<sup>6</sup> Monopsony has been a common argument used to model the lack of labor standards in the South. See for example Maskus (1997) and Corden and Vousden (2002). The demand side of labor emerging from a product market has however been left out of their analysis.

<sup>7</sup> As all core labor standards share the feature that workers are paid less than their value (marginal value product of their labor), wages can also be used as an indicator of the enforcement of standards in the region. Lim (2001) shows that higher wages are usually correlated with better labor standards.

implications of such policies on Southern welfare and shows that the South unambiguously gains from adopting a minimum wage law both on grounds of competitiveness in the product market and through a higher consumer and wage surplus experienced by its citizens.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces the model and presents the asymmetry in the structure of the labor markets. The effects of lower wages in the South on output and the location of firms are then brought into the model in section 3. Section 4 looks at the competitiveness and the welfare effects of introducing a fixed minimum wage above the distorted market wages in the South. Section 5 concludes.

## **2. The Model: Asymmetric Labor Markets**

There are two countries: the North and the South. The difference between the two regions lies in the toughness of competition in their labor market. The North is assumed to have a perfectly elastic labor supply, while abundant labor in the South causes a less than infinitely elastic labor supply giving firms exploitative market power. There are  $N$  firms in the world market of which  $n$  firms are located in the North and  $N-n$  in the South. Firms are fully mobile and can locate in either region. A single factor of production, labor, is used to produce the good. Workers are paid the market wage  $w_i$ , which is also the marginal cost of production. On the product side of the market, firms produce a homogeneous good for an integrated world market and compete in an open economy à la Cournot. Markets are assumed to be segmented with firms optimizing for their domestic and export markets independently. They incur unit trade costs  $\tau$  on their exports to the other region. The game consists of two stages: firms decide on plant location in the first stage and engage in production in the second stage.

Demand takes the familiar linear form

$$p_i = a - y_i \quad \text{for } i = N, S, \tag{1}$$

where  $a$  represents the market size and is assumed to be identical for both regions and subscripts  $N$  and  $S$  stand for the North and the South.  $y$  indicates total production *for* each region and is

$$\begin{aligned} y_N &= q_{NN} + (n-1)\bar{q}_{NN} + q_{SN} + (N-n-1)\bar{q}_{SN} \\ y_S &= q_{NS} + (n-1)\bar{q}_{NS} + q_{SS} + (N-n-1)\bar{q}_{SS} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where  $q$  is the quantity produced and the bar indicates production by all other firms. The first subscript shows where the good is produced, while the second refers to the market it is intended for. The paper initially looks at a duopoly case in order to fully capture and display the effects of the labor market structure on the behavior of firms regarding their choices on output and location.<sup>8</sup> The rest of the main text refers to the two established firms: a Northern multinational, which chooses location, and a local Southern firm.<sup>9</sup>

The profit functions for the Northern and the Southern firm are respectively

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_N &= q_{NN}(p_N - w_N) + q_{NS}(p_S - w_N - \tau) \\ \pi_S &= q_{SN}(p_N - w_S - \tau) + q_{SS}(p_S - w_S) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $w_i$  is the wage paid to workers in each region.<sup>10</sup> Due to a fully elastic labor supply curve in the North, firms treat wages as exogenous and pay workers their marginal value product.<sup>11</sup> While the Northern labor market behaves competitively, the upward sloping supply curve in the South creates a monopsony/oligopsony form of market imperfection.<sup>12</sup> In other words, a firm in the South takes the labor supply into consideration when choosing output. It limits production as

---

<sup>8</sup> The model is shown in its full form with  $N$  firms in appendix II.

<sup>9</sup> The model is fully robust with respect to the identity of firms. The locational outcome as well as the welfare results remain unchanged for instance when both firms are footloose Northern multinationals.

<sup>10</sup> Unit trade cost  $t$  is normalized by the market size and is represented by  $\tau$  so that  $\tau = t/(a-w)$ . This allows us to set  $a-w$  (or  $a-w_N$ , when appropriate) to unity and eliminate it from all the upcoming equations.

<sup>11</sup> It is assumed throughout this paper that labor standards are always perfectly enforced in the North.

<sup>12</sup> Under the typical monopsony argument, the firm is the single employer and gains from infra-marginal reductions in wages for all workers whenever it cuts hiring. This generates a marginal cost curve for labor that lies above the labor supply curve. The firm maximizes profit by setting employment where the marginal cost of labor equals its marginal revenue product, causing a markup of marginal cost over wages.

more output means higher employment, which in turn increases wages due to the upward sloping labor supply curve. This results in wages lower than their competitive level. In an open economy, a monopsonist competing in the product market drives a wedge between foreign and domestic wages by limiting employment in its local labor market, even at fixed product prices. When there is more than one firm in the South, an oligopsony situation occurs as firms compete for labor with other local firms. Firms however retain some market power due to the less than perfectly elastic labor supply and still exploit workers by paying them a wage below their marginal value.<sup>13</sup>

Southern wage or the inverse labor supply function can be written as

$$w_N - w_S = \beta[Q_S^* - Q_S], \quad (4)$$

where  $Q_S^*$  and  $Q_S$  are the quantity produced in the South under perfect competition and distortion respectively.<sup>14</sup>  $\beta$  is the slope of the supply curve (inverse elasticity of supply). Note that the fact that output appears in the wage function of firms in the South creates a link between wages and output. Asymmetry between the two regions arises because moving to the South would internalize this wage function in the profit maximization problem of a firm. A higher quantity produced by a firm in the South decreases its profit margin in the South by increasing wages. Total profits however also depend on the firm's total production shown by  $q_{SN}$  and  $q_{SS}$  outside the parentheses in (3). Much of the previous literature on labor standards such as Maskus (1997) have used a constant elasticity of substitution form of labor supply function, namely  $w_S = w/(1 + 1/\eta)$  where  $1/\eta$  represents the inverse elasticity/slope of the labor supply curve, to show an imperfect labor market in the South. Their analysis is limited to labor supply curves with a maximum slope of 1, as  $\eta \geq 1$  must hold to satisfy the second order condition of monopsony profits. The wage function in this paper is modelled in a linear manner and there are no restrictions on the slope of the labor supply curve ( $\beta$ ) as the second order condition  $\partial^2 \pi_S / \partial q_S^2 = -2(1 + \beta)$  is negative for all

---

<sup>13</sup> See Bashkar, Manning and To (2002) for a thorough description of oligopsonistic labor markets.

<sup>14</sup> The term perfect competition here only refers to the labor market.

values of  $\beta$ . A labor supply function of this form gives a vertical intercept of  $w_N - \beta Q_S^*$ . Figure 1 represents the Southern labor market. It can be seen that a lower elasticity of labor supply entails lower wages and production.

To first derive competitive output  $Q_S^*$ , we look at a case in which the labor market in the South is perfectly competitive. This creates a symmetric case, where firms in both regions are wage-takers, leaving no strategic relationship between output and wages. Wages in the two regions would hence be equal. Total quantity produced in the South would be

$$Q_S^* = \frac{(a - w)(2 - \tau)}{3} \quad (5)$$

and the equilibrium distribution of firms across the two regions

$$n^* = N/2 \quad (6)$$

in presence of the smallest form of trade or transport costs  $\tau$ .<sup>15</sup>

### 3. Decisions of Firms

#### 3.1. Production

In the second stage, firms compete in quantity in an open economy. If the Northern firm remains at home, profit maximizing output of the Northern and the Southern firm for each region is

$$\begin{aligned} q_{NN}(\beta) &= \frac{a - 2w_N + \tau + w_S(Q_S)}{3} = \frac{10\beta + 3 + \tau(7\beta + 3)}{3(3 + 8\beta)} \\ q_{NS}(\beta) &= \frac{a - 2w_N - 2\tau + w_S(Q_S)}{3} = \frac{10\beta + 3 - \tau(17\beta + 6)}{3(3 + 8\beta)} \\ q_{SN}(\beta) &= \frac{a - 2w_S(Q_S) - 2\tau + w_N}{3} = \frac{4\beta + 3 - 2\tau(7\beta + 3)}{3(3 + 8\beta)} \\ q_{SS}(\beta) &= \frac{a - 2w_S(Q_S) + \tau + w_N}{3} = \frac{4\beta + 3 + \tau(10\beta + 3)}{3(3 + 8\beta)} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $\tau \leq \frac{10\beta + 3}{17\beta + 6}$  and  $\tau \leq \frac{4\beta + 3}{2(7\beta + 3)}$  for  $q_{NS}$  and  $q_{SN}$  to be positive respectively. As the

---

<sup>15</sup> As the derivations for this case are trivial, details have been reduced to appendix I.

Southern firm is the sole producer in the South, total production in this case is  $Q_S=q_{SS}+q_{SN}$ . Using (7) to substitute for  $Q_S$  in (4), the Southern wage becomes

$$w_S = w_N - \frac{4\beta^2(2-\tau)}{3(3+8\beta)}. \quad (4')$$

Alternatively, if the Northern firm moves production to the South, quantity produced by both firms becomes

$$\begin{aligned} q_{SN}^D(\beta) &= \frac{a-\tau-w_S(Q_S)}{3} = \frac{2\beta+3-\tau(4\beta+3)}{9(2\beta+1)} \\ q_{SS}^D(\beta) &= \frac{a-w_S(Q_S)}{3} = \frac{2\beta+3+2\tau\beta}{9(2\beta+1)} \end{aligned} \quad (7')$$

where superscript  $D$  denotes delocation. Should the Northern multinational decide to delocate to the South, total production in the South  $Q_S$  turns to  $2(q_{SS}^D+q_{SN}^D)$ . Replacing for  $Q_S$  in (4) from (7'), the oligopsony wage after delocation becomes

$$w_S^D = w_N - \frac{\beta(2\beta-3)(2-\tau)}{9(1+2\beta)}. \quad (4'')$$

By differentiating the optimal quantities of a Southern firm in (7) and (7') with respect to  $\beta$ , we can see how firms react to different degrees of labor supply elasticity by changes in output. As

$\frac{\partial q_{SS}}{\partial \beta} \leq 0$  and  $\frac{\partial q_{SN}}{\partial \beta} \leq 0$  in both scenarios, we can conclude that the quantity produced by a firm

located in the South is lower the more inelastic is the labor supply curve (higher  $\beta$ ). Cutting output by one unit reduces wages by more when labor supply is more responsive to wages. This gives a bigger market power to firms in the South inducing them to further reduce wages by cutting production and employment. When the monopsonist in the South competes in the product market with a firm located in the North, a strategic environment is created and the latter responds to the practice of market power by the monopsonist. The multinational operating in the North as a result moves up its reaction curve and expands production because it faces a less aggressive

competitor. Hence  $\frac{\partial q_{NN}}{\partial \beta} \geq 0$  and  $\frac{\partial q_{NS}}{\partial \beta} \geq 0$  show that output by a firm in the North is always increasing in  $\beta$ .<sup>16</sup> The number of firms in each region is the other factor that influences firms' output and plays a key role on profits. As the multinational moves into the South, quantity produced by each firm falls also due to the competition effect.

The rest of the paper abstracts from trade costs in order to clearly highlight the effects of the difference in the labor markets of the two regions and enhance the tractability of the model. Figure 2 shows the output level for each locational scenario. It is easy to see that the output of the multinational is always higher if it stays at home than when it relocates to the South. Tariffs in this case simply decrease exports and increase domestic production in both regions without a bias.

### 3.2. Location

Firms decide on production location in the first stage of the game. If the South offers higher profits than the North, the Northern firm delocates to the more profitable region. Substituting the optimal quantities back into the profit functions, optimal profits of locating in the North and the South are

$$\pi_N = q_{NN}(\beta)^2 + q_{NS}(\beta)^2 = \frac{2(10\beta + 3)^2}{9(8\beta + 3)^2}, \quad (8)$$

$$\pi_S = (2\beta + 1)[q_{SN}(\beta)^2 + q_{SS}(\beta)^2] = \frac{2(4\beta + 3)^2(2\beta + 1)}{9(8\beta + 3)^2}, \quad (9)$$

while the profits of each firm if they both operate in the South are

---

<sup>16</sup> It is interesting to note that the essence of the results remain the same if the model is extended to a Bertrand environment with differentiated products. The Southern monopsonist reduces wages and is able to charge a lower price. The Northern firm also lowers its price as a response but to a lesser degree. This has the similar effect as the Cournot case above of making delocation less attractive due to the lower prices charged in the South.

$$\pi_S^D = (2\beta + 1)[q_{SN}^D(\beta)^2 + q_{SS}^D(\beta)^2] = \frac{2(2\beta + 3)^2}{81(2\beta + 1)}. \quad (9')$$

Equation (8) clearly shows that profits of locating in the North are higher when there is a labor market distortion in the South and to a higher degree the more inelastic is Southern labor supply (higher  $\beta$ ). This is due to the strategic increase in output that stems from the lower output in the South. On the other hand, equations (9) and (9') show that  $\beta$  can make profits of locating in the South go either way. In the absence of labor standards, a higher  $\beta$  brings about two effects: there is a direct positive effect on profits as a higher  $\beta$  leads to lower wages and the latter entails higher marginal profits. There is also an indirect strategic effect as firms produce less to cause these lower wages. This has a negative effect on total profits as the firm lowers its scale of production. Whether Southern profits increase or decrease with monopsony/oligopsony depends on which of these two effects dominate. The number of firms in the South is also important as it influences the magnitude of the scale effect. When there are more firms in the South, production per firm is lower not only due to oligopsony, but also because of the competition effect. This magnifies the effect of reduced quantity on profits, making the loss more likely to outweigh the gains from lower wages. The combination of these effects and increased profits in the North from higher output determines whether lack of labor standards in the South raises or lowers its profitability.

The optimal profits of each firm can be found for both scenarios by replacing the appropriate optimal quantities back into the profit function. Figure 3 shows the profits earned from each region for all locational scenarios. Profit of a firm located in the North is always increasing in  $\beta$  because of increased production. For a firm located in the South on the other hand, profits decrease with  $\beta$  as a result of lower output up to a critical value of  $\beta$  and start rising thereafter. After this level of  $\beta$  the direct gain of locating in the South from lower wages dominates the

indirect loss from the strategic reduction in output.<sup>17</sup> The  $\beta$  where profits of a firm in the South is at its minimum increases as firms move to the South indicating that the scale effect dominates for a larger range of  $\beta$  with more firms in the South. This happens as the competition effect reduces output, increasing the net cutback in quantity brought about by a firm's monopsony power.

In summary, a monopsonist in the South must compete in the product market with firms operating in a perfectly competitive Northern labor market when the economy is opened to the world market. This gives rise to the importance of strategic changes in output when calculating the profitability of each region. The direct gain in marginal profits from lower wages and the indirect loss in total profits due to a strategic cut in the scale of production determine whether or not profitability of locating in the South increases with weaker labor rights. The combination of these two effects along with the strategic increase in output of a firm located in the North as a reaction towards a less aggressive competitor determines which region is more profitable as a base for production.

### 3.3. Equilibrium Outcome

Looking at the problem from a game theoretic perspective, figure 3 can be divided into four regions. It can easily be seen that delocation to the South is always dominated by other outcomes in areas I, II and III. In area I, a firm unconditionally earns higher profits by locating in the North as the effect of lower production in the South from the oligopsony effect always dominates. This would also give the Southern firm incentives to locate in the North if it were mobile as its profits

---

<sup>17</sup> Note that these traits indicate a normal case where the term in brackets in (4) is positive so that a higher  $\beta$  signifies lower wages. With a low enough  $\beta$  and a high number of firms in the South ( $\beta < 3/2$  in the duopoly case), total quantity produced in the South is higher than its level under a perfectly competitive labor market making the term in the brackets negative. This gives the awkward result that wages in the South are higher than competitive wages prevailing in the North. This situation is not an area of interest and is ignored in the analysis, as it is in any case never an equilibrium outcome.

after moving would still be higher than what it would earn in the South. The profitability of locating in the North is unconditionally higher when profits of a firm in the symmetric case are higher than the profits of the Southern firm with one firm in each country. The critical value of  $\beta$  up to which this occurs is  $\bar{\beta} = \sqrt{3}/4$ .

In areas II and III both firms have higher profits if they locate in separate regions. Profits of locating in the North are higher than that of the South up to  $\tilde{\beta} = 3/2$  where the profitability of the two regions with one firm in each is equal.  $\bar{\beta} < \beta < \tilde{\beta}$  represents area II where the free-riding effect dominates so that the strategic increase in output by a firm in the North increases the relative profitability of locating there. The Northern firm thus decides to forgo the market power it could acquire by relocating.

In area III where  $\tilde{\beta} < \beta < \beta''$ , the multinational is tempted to move to the South to take advantage of the negligible wages there as the Southern firm makes higher profits. However, the competition effect plays the dominant role in this area as if it relocates to the South, output and hence profits of all firms in the South fall below what the firm could earn by staying in the North. Thus in this area lower wages are attractive, but not sufficient to induce the Northern firm to move production.

When  $\beta$  reaches high levels, its direct linear effect on wages gains more significance as its marginal effect on quantity gradually diminishes. For a quasi-vertical Southern labor supply curve in area IV (very high values of  $\beta > \beta''$ ) the Northern firm moves to the South as the ex-post profits of relocating to the South is higher than profits of staying in the North.

Note that for a significant range of slopes of the labor supply curve considered in previous literature ( $\beta \leq 1$ ), the locational equilibrium would be agglomeration in the North when mobility of the Southern firm is allowed for. Although the analysis for the South in this paper is extended to consider highly inelastic labor supply curves, very high values of  $\beta$  are of small significance.

Smaller values of  $\beta$  are of greater interest as impact of limited standards on Southern wages are likely to be small in the context of a quasi-elastic labor pool near reservation wages (Maskus, 1997). It is also worth noting that this represents the worst-case scenario, namely the situation where delocation is most likely to occur. While adding tariffs leaves  $\bar{\beta}$  and  $\tilde{\beta}$  unchanged, it increases  $\beta''$  as  $\frac{\partial \beta''}{\partial \tau} > 0$ . This indicates that a higher tariff reinforces the results by pushing back delocation to the South and making it unattractive for an even larger range of  $\beta$ .<sup>18</sup>

We can conclude that the negative strategic scale effect of oligopsony on profits weakens the profitability of lower wages in the South. Therefore, the North can, regardless of the higher marginal costs associated with it, be more attractive or at least as attractive as the South for a significant range of  $\beta$  with the help of its strategic increase in output and the competition effect. In fact, the analysis shows that for a large range of  $\beta$  lack of labor standards does not attract multinationals to the South and may even drive them away. This is contrary to conventional wisdom which believes that weak labor standards will always lead to social dumping in developing countries. The strategic behavior of firms and the resulting outcome in quantity produced can be an explanation why multinationals forgo lower wages and tend to locate in the North, where labor standards are fully implemented. This also takes away any justification for worries by the North over loss of jobs due to transfer of activity to the South. We saw that firms in the North not only hesitate to relocate to the South, but even increase domestic activity, i.e. production, as a strategic reaction towards lower Southern output.

***Proposition 1***

*Lack of labor rights in the South unconditionally makes the North the more attractive region for  $0 < \beta < \bar{\beta}$  where the ‘oligopsony effect’ dominates in profits. Lower wages in the South are also*

---

<sup>18</sup> A unilateral social clause tariffs can also be applied here, but it would lower the profitability of the South to an even greater extent and further discourage delocation.

*not sufficient to make Northern firms relocate to the South for a large range of  $\beta$  when  $\beta \geq \bar{\beta}$ . The monopsony situation in the South induces Northern firms to remain in the North to 'free-ride' on the existence of less aggressive competitors in the South up to  $\tilde{\beta}$ . Even after  $\tilde{\beta}$ , where lower wages make the South more profitable than the North, a Northern firm is better off by operating at home to avoid the 'competition effect' it would create by relocating to the South. Only for very high values of  $\beta > \beta''$ , where wages approach zero, does the lower marginal cost (quasi-free production) in the South become a significant attraction for multinationals.*

#### **4. Minimum Wage, Southern Competitiveness and Welfare**

After proving that lower wages in the South do not necessarily attract more multinationals to the region, it is essential to find out if a minimum wage policy in the South actually helps improve Southern standards of living. Means of implementing standards in the South can take several forms, but they all point towards higher marginal costs of production in the South. This could be interpreted as partially taking away the market power of multinationals that exploit workers in the South by reducing output and wages. Therefore, this section looks at an exogenous marginal increase in wages in the South towards of the competitive level as means of reducing the monopsony power of firms operating there.<sup>19</sup> Recalling the location results that the Northern firm does not move to the South unless the labor supply curve in the South is highly inelastic shows that relocated multinationals are not the only firms affected by higher wages. When the South upgrades its standards, local Southern firms are also forced to abide by the new set of standards in force. This creates concerns that the South may lose in terms of welfare as local firms could undergo huge, maybe unrecoverable, losses when forced to increase wages.

---

<sup>19</sup> This rules out the introduction of unions as a means of introducing labor standards unless they are specifically designed to increase wages without limiting employment.

Once again concentrating on the case of free trade, a minimum wage can be introduced as a small exogenous increment in Southern wages:<sup>20</sup>

$$w_S^{\min} = w_S + \varepsilon = w_N - \frac{8\beta^2}{3(3+8\beta)} + \varepsilon. \quad (10)$$

$\varepsilon \leq \frac{8\beta^2}{3(3+8\beta)}$  must be satisfied to assure that wages in the South do not surpass those in the

North.<sup>21</sup> Firms change their level of output accordingly with this increase in wages and maximize profits using the constant  $w_S^{\min}$  instead of the wage function  $w_S(Q_S)$ . The wage used hence no longer contains the quantity produced by the firm, depriving the latter from its monopsony power. In figure 1, the monopsonist moves up the labor supply curve and increases output up to the point where the latter meets the minimum wage. The quantity produced by each firm after the implementation of the policy becomes

$$\begin{aligned} q_{Ni}^{\min}(\beta) &= \frac{1+\varepsilon}{3} - \frac{8\beta^2}{9(3+8\beta)} \\ q_{Si}^{\min}(\beta) &= \frac{1-2\varepsilon}{3} + \frac{16\beta^2}{9(3+8\beta)}, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $i=N,S$ . It can easily be seen that a minimum wage policy reverses the sign of the changes in output with respect to  $\beta$  as  $\frac{\partial q_{Ni}^{\min}}{\partial \beta} \leq 0$  and  $\frac{\partial q_{Si}^{\min}}{\partial \beta} \geq 0$ . Keeping  $\varepsilon$  constant, a more inelastic labor supply still means a lower wage in the South prior to the policy.<sup>22</sup> Yet, as wages are no longer dependent on output, a lower wage does not entail an oligopsony effect and is nothing but a marginal cost advantage over the Northern firm. The more inelastic the labor supply, the higher is this cost advantage and in turn Southern production. In a Cournot environment, the Northern

---

<sup>20</sup>  $\varepsilon$  is an increment in wages normalized by the market size ( $a-w$ ) as with  $\tau$  for the simplicity of notation.

<sup>21</sup> In other words, a higher increment is allowed for when labor supply is less elastic (wages are lower).

<sup>22</sup> Changes in  $\varepsilon$  are irrelevant in this paper as we are interested in introducing a minimum wage policy as a one-time change in the labor market structure as opposed to analyzing changes in the minimum wage.

firm now reacts to a more aggressive competitor and reduces output accordingly. Adjusted quantities for both firms are shown by the dotted line in figure 2. Profits of each firm also change accordingly and are found by substituting quantities produced from (11) into (3):

$$\pi_N^{\min} = q_{NN}^{\min}(\beta)^2 + q_{NS}^{\min}(\beta)^2 = \frac{2[3(1+\varepsilon)(3+8\beta)-8\beta^2]^2}{81(3+8\beta)^2}, \quad (12)$$

$$\pi_S^{\min} = q_{SN}^{\min}(\beta)^2 + q_{SS}^{\min}(\beta)^2 = \frac{2[3(1-2\varepsilon)(3+8\beta)+16\beta^2]^2}{81(3+8\beta)^2}. \quad (13)$$

The effect of minimum wages on profits is identical to that on output with  $\beta$  drastically increasing the profits in the South while decreasing that in the North. Profits after the introduction of minimum wages are shown by the dotted line in figure 3. Note that the Northern firm is driven out of the market when the South has a very high wage advantage of  $\beta \geq \frac{3}{2}(1+\varepsilon) + \frac{3}{4}\sqrt{2(2\varepsilon+3)(\varepsilon+1)}$ . It can therefore be concluded that minimum wages actually

increase the competitiveness of the South by eliminating on one side the negative oligopsony effect on output and profits in the South, and on the other side the free-riding opportunity of firms located in the North.

If the initial situation is oligopsony ( $\beta > \beta'$ ), effects of a minimum wage policy are similar to those explained above as the desire to reduce output with a higher  $\beta$  disappears. Recall however that the minimum wage should be higher in the oligopsony case as Southern wages are already higher due to a lower concentration of firms. The increment in this case is added to (4') instead and gives a minimum wage of

$$w_S^{D\min} = w_N - w_S^D + \varepsilon = w_N - \frac{2\beta(2\beta-3)}{9(1+2\beta)} + \varepsilon \quad (10')$$

The increment  $\varepsilon$  must satisfy the condition  $\varepsilon \leq \frac{2\beta(2\beta-3)}{9(2\beta+1)}$  for the wage to remain lower than

that in the North. The quantity produced by both firms and their profits become

$$q_{Si}^{D\min}(\beta) = \frac{(2\beta + 3)^2}{27(2\beta + 1)} - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \quad (11')$$

$$\pi_S^{D\min} = q_{SN}^{D\min}(\beta)^2 + q_{SS}^{D\min}(\beta)^2 = \frac{2[(2\beta + 3)^2 - 9\varepsilon(2\beta + 1)]^2}{729(2\beta + 1)^2}. \quad (13')$$

where  $i=N,S$ . Output and profits are increasing in  $\beta$  for both firms equally. The change in output and profits are also illustrated for this case in figures 2 and 3. Notice that due to the oligopsony situation here, the positive effect of a minimum wage on output is less significant than when there is one firm in the South. This is because rival employers must also increase their wages to respect the new minimum wages and increase output.<sup>23</sup>

Turning our attention now to total Southern welfare, we must also take into account the impact of the policy on consumer and worker surplus in the South. Note that the latter is the triangle under the wage level and above the labor supply curve in figure 1. Southern welfare can be written as

$$W_S = \pi_S + WS_S + CS_S \quad \text{where} \quad WS_S = \frac{\beta Q_S^2}{2}, CS_S = \frac{(Q_N + Q_S)^2}{4}, \quad (14)$$

whereas in the case of a minimum wage it turns to

$$W_S^{\min} = \pi_S^{\min} + WS_S^{\min} + CS_S^{\min} \quad \text{where} \quad WS_S^{\min} = \frac{\beta Q_S^{\min} (Q_S^{\min} + \varepsilon)}{2}, CS_S^{\min} = \frac{(Q_N^{\min} + Q_S^{\min})^2}{2}, (14')$$

with  $Q_i^{\min} = q_{iN}^{\min} + q_{iS}^{\min}$  representing the total output for each region. The same concept applies for the delocation case using the corresponding values for profits and total output.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Bashkar and Toe (2002) demonstrates the impact of minimum wages in an oligopsonistic model in detail. It explains that due to the presence of multiple employers, a minimum wage also shifts the supply and with it the marginal cost curve to the left as the supply curve faced by a firm also depends on rival wage rates. As all employers must increase wages, labor market competition increases. They conclude that a minimum wage moderately set above the market wage still increases employment through greater labor participation.

<sup>24</sup> As the impact of a minimum wage with delocation is similar to that for FDI, this case will not be discussed any further.

The welfare effects of implementing a minimum wage policy can immediately be seen as  $\pi_S^{min} > \pi_S$ ,  $Q_S^{min} > Q_S$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  from the above discussion and  $Q_N^{min} + Q_S^{min} > Q_N + Q_S$  from (7) and (11). The inequalities imply that along with the increased competitiveness of the South, wage surplus increases due to higher wages and employment, and consumer surplus increases due to a higher output. As a result a minimum wage policy unambiguously enhances Southern welfare. The results are fully robust for all non-negative, feasible values of trade costs.<sup>25</sup>

These findings suggest that improving labor standards can raise welfare in the South. It increases output and with it employment, raises wages and can even make the South a more attractive region for production than when the authorities in the South turn their back on labor standards. The results can give grounds in favor of taking international action for enforcing policies that aim at increasing *economic* labor standards in the South. In fact, the desired outcomes are shown to be achievable even through an often skeptically perceived minimum wage policy.

***Proposition 2***

*Introducing a minimum wage policy in the South boosts output, profits, and hence the competitiveness of firms in the South. It eliminates the oligopsony and the free-riding effect in the South and the North respectively. The more inelastic is Southern labor supply, the greater is the marginal cost advantage. Wage surplus and consumer surplus also increase due to a rise in wages, output and hence employment towards their competitive level. Thus adopting a minimum wage policy improves Southern welfare unambiguously.*

**5. Conclusion**

This paper builds a simple model to study the relationship between regional differences in labor markets and the location of firms. Specifically, it explains the strategic behavior of firms towards the lack of labor rights in the South when firms compete in an open economy with asymmetric labor markets. The framework shows the linkage between the product and the labor market

---

<sup>25</sup> Calculations are available from the author upon request.

caused by the market imperfection in the South and highlights the importance of this link in firms' decisions on output and location. It attempts to answer commonly asked questions about labor standards and the action of multinationals such as: Do firms react to low labor standards in the South and relocate to produce with lower labor costs (social dumping) as claimed in industrialized countries? Does the South lose in terms of competitiveness and welfare by adopting tougher labor standards as claimed by developing countries?

Due to the capacity of firms to influence wages through their choices of location and output, both decisions turn strategic towards the labor market. A strategic cut in production subsequent to the potential market power a firm can gain by moving to the South makes the latter a less attractive region to locate production. Meanwhile, the North becomes even more profitable as firms located there free-ride on the presence of less aggressive oligopsonists in the South by increasing their production. Total production and therefore profits per firm also fall after delocation as a result of the competition effect that emerges from having one more firm in the South. These effects induce firms to remain in the North and can even at times tempt a Southern firm to leave the South regardless of the lower wages there. The new paradoxical results build a theoretical background for the empirical suggestion that multinationals do not necessarily choose production location on a basis of weaker labor standards. Present fears in the North of losing jobs to a more competitive South are thus not legitimate as a weaker labor standard regime in the South increases production and profits in the North and induces firms to stay in the North.

The paper also delivers a policy message by demonstrating that a minimum wage policy as means of improving labor standards in the South can make the latter better off in every aspect. It shows that a small increment in the Southern wage eliminates the monopsony/oligopsony market distortion, drastically increasing production and with it the competitiveness of the South in the world market. Higher wages, output and employment at the same time raise both wage and consumer surplus in the South resulting in an unambiguous improvement in Southern welfare. This gives a hint of justification for those who see such efforts as a humane act. More detailed

work remains to be done on the issue to include the impact of social clause tariffs and the efficacy of threats to apply them in case of non-compliance. As this paper showed that the South always benefits from adopting labor standards anyway, such punishments would be deemed unnecessary and inefficient to bring about a change if governments were to act rationally. Yet if substantiating these benefits does not prove useful in convincing the representatives of the South, leaving the job to a trade-related organization with the power of enforcement such as the WTO may be the only credible solution to assure long-term prosperity and growth in the poorer regions of the world.

## Appendix I: The Perfectly Competitive Labor Market Case

Profits per firm in each country are

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_N &= q_{NN}(p_N - w) + q_{NS}(p_S - w - t) \\ \pi_S &= q_{SN}(p_N - w - t) + q_{SS}(p_S - w)\end{aligned}\tag{A.1}$$

Note that  $w$  is the competitive wage that here applies to both regions. Firms take production by all other firms as given and maximize profits by solving for their optimal output for each region. Optimal quantities by each firm in the case of perfectly competitive labor markets assuming symmetry are

$$\begin{aligned}q_{NN}^* &= \frac{[1 + (N - n)\tau]}{N + 1} \\ q_{NS}^* &= \frac{[1 - (N - n + 1)\tau]}{N + 1} \\ q_{SN}^* &= \frac{[1 - (n + 1)\tau]}{N + 1} \\ q_{SS}^* &= \frac{1 + n\tau}{N + 1}\end{aligned}\tag{A.2}$$

where the star denotes harmonized labor standards. Replacing optimal quantities back into firms' profit functions and setting profits from locating in the North and the South equal, the equilibrium distribution of firms can be found:

$$n^* = N / 2\tag{A.3}$$

In the presence of the smallest form of trade/transport costs, firms prefer to locate close to their consumers. The only possible equilibrium with equal market sizes is when half the total number of firms locate in each region. This yields total production in each region, which is

$$\begin{aligned}Q_N^* &= \frac{N}{2}(q_{NN}^* + q_{NS}^*) \\ Q_S^* &= \frac{N}{2}(q_{SN}^* + q_{SS}^*)\end{aligned}\tag{A.4}$$

for the North and the South respectively. Profitability of the two regions is equal and can be seen in figure 3 as the horizontal line.

## Appendix II: Location of Firms in a Multi-Firm Case

This appendix extends the model to a multi-firm case to show the dynamics of multinationals' movements as a result of asymmetric labor markets in a more general setting. With  $N$  firms in the world market, total production in the South equals

$$Q_S = q_{SN} + (N - n - 1)\bar{q}_{SN} + q_{SS} + (N - n - 1)\bar{q}_{SS} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where the bar above quantity produced indicates production by all other firms.

Recall from section 2 that the number of firms in each region with symmetric labor markets ( $Q_S^*$ ) is  $N/2$ . With asymmetric labor markets, the inverse labor supply function in the South is (A.2) in text where with many firms (A.5) is used as the total production in the South. I look at the case where trade costs are approaching zero as adding the latter does not change the nature of the results.

The profit maximizing quantity produced by each of the  $n$  firms in the North and the  $N-n$  in the South are respectively

$$\begin{aligned} q_{NN}(n, N) = q_{NS}(n, N) &= \frac{N + 1 + 2\beta N(N - n) - 3\beta n + 4\beta N + \beta}{(N + 1)[N + 1 + 3\beta N(N - n) - 2\beta n + 3\beta N + \beta]} \\ q_{SN}(n, N) = q_{SS}(n, N) &= \frac{N + 1 + \beta N(n + 1)}{(N + 1)[N + 1 + 3\beta N(N - n) - 2\beta n + 3\beta N + \beta]} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

When a multinational that initially resides in the North has to make its decision on location, it must compare the profits of not moving to the ex-post profits that will prevail after it relocates to the South. After a Northern firm moves to the South,  $n-1$  firms remain in the North while the number of firms in the South increases to  $N-n+1$ . The ex-post optimal quantity that will be produced by firms in each region after the move becomes

$$\begin{aligned} q_{NN}(n-1, N) = q_{NS}(n-1, N) &= \frac{N + 1 + 2\beta N(N - n) - 3\beta n + 6\beta N + 4\beta}{(N + 1)[N + 1 + 3\beta N(N - n) + 4\beta n]} \\ q_{SN}(n-1, N) = q_{SS}(n-1, N) &= \frac{N + 1 + \beta Nn}{(N + 1)[N + 1 + 3\beta N(N - n) + 4\beta n]} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Using the optimal quantities from (A.6) in (A.1), optimal profits of remaining in the North can be found:

$$\pi_N(n, N) = q_{NN}(n, N)^2 + q_{NS}(n, N)^2 \quad (\text{A.8})$$

The profits of the same firm if it moves to the South would become

$$\pi_S(n-1, N) = [1 + \beta(N - n + 2)][q_{SS}(n-1, N)^2 + q_{SN}(n-1, N)^2] \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where (A.7) is used to substitute for the optimal quantity produced by each firm in (A.1). Figure 4 simulates these profits for  $N=10$  and calculates the threshold  $\beta$  for all possible initial values of  $n$  where the profitability of the two regions is equal. The multinational keeps production in the North if  $\beta$  is below this level and chooses to relocate otherwise. This value of  $\beta$  is equivalent to the intersection of the two curves  $\pi_N$  and  $\pi_S^D$  in figure 3 for the duopoly case. It is decreasing in  $n$  signifying that when there are more firms in the South, a higher value of  $\beta$  is required for a firm to move to the South to take advantage of lower wages. This occurs as the competition effect brought about by having an extra firm in the South leads to lower production and less profits per firm. The competition effect in turn reinforces the scale effect and causes the oligopsony effect and the subsequent strategic reaction of the Northern firms to outweigh the effects of lower wages on profits for a larger range of  $\beta$ . Therefore, delocation becomes less likely as the flow of Northern firms to the South continues with the equilibrium number of firm in each region determined by the prevailing elasticity of labor supply in the South. In summary, as oligopsony power is strongest when the *concentration* of firms is highest, a lower number of firms in the South strengthens the oligopsony effect, increasing the potential gains attained from delocation. At the same time, a higher number of firms in the North makes delocation more attractive by creating a competition effect in the North and diminishing the free riding effect that is shared by all Northern firms. It can also be seen that a higher number of firms in the world market weakens the general effect of oligopsony as more competition for labor is created.

## ***References***

Bashkar V., Alan Manning and Ted To, “Oligopsony and Monopsonistic Competition in the Labor Market”, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, vol. 16 (2), pp. 155--175, 2002.

Brown, Drusilla, Alan Deardorff and Robert Stern, “The Effects of Multinational Production on Wages and Working Conditions in Developing Countries”, Paper presented at the CEPR/NBER/SNS Conference, International Seminar on International Trade (ISIT), “Challenges to Globalization,” Stockholm, May 24-25, 2002.

Brown, Drusilla, Alan Deardorff and Robert Stern, “Trade and Labor Standards”, *Open Economies Review*, 9, pp. 171--194, 1998.

Corden, W. Max and Neil Vousden, “Paved with good intentions: social dumping and raising labour standards in developing countries”, Research School of Pacific and Asian Studies, ANU, Working Paper No. 98/3, March 2002.

Dewit, Gerda, Dermot Leahy and Catia Montagna, “Employment Protection and Globalisation in Dynamic Oligopoly”, CEPR discussion paper nr. 3871, 2003.

Freeman, Richard, “A Hard-Headed Look at Labour Standards”, in *International Labour Standards and Economic Interdependence*, ed. Werner Sengenberger and Duncan Campbell, Geneva: International Institute for Labour Studies, 1994.

Irwin, Douglas A., “Free Trade Under Fire” Princeton University Press, 2002.

Krueger, Alan B., “Labor Standards and International Trade,” paper prepared for the Annual Bank Conference on Development Economics, World Bank, 1996.

Lim, Linda Y.C. 2001, *The Globalization Debate: Issues and Challenges*, Geneva: International Labour Organization.

Martin, Will and Keith E. Maskus, “Core Labor Standards and Competitiveness: Implications for Global Trade Policy”, *Review of International Economics*, 9, vol. 2, 317--328, 2001.

Maskus, Keith, “Should core labor standards be imposed through international trade policy?” World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 1817, 1997.

Rodrik, Dani, "Has Globalization Gone Too Far?" Washington, DC: Institute for International Economics, 1997.

Rodrik, Dani, "Labor Standards in International Trade: Do They Matter and What Do We Do About Them?" in Lawrence, Robert, Dani Rodrik, and John Whalley (eds), *Emerging Agenda for Global Trade: High Stakes for Developing Countries*, Overseas Development Council, Washington, D.C., 1996.

Srinivasan, T. N., "Trade and Human Rights", in Deardorff, Alan V. and Robert M. Stern (eds.), *Representation of Constituent Interests in the Design and Implementation of U.S. Trade Policies*, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1997.

Figure 1: Monopsony




Figure 2: Production




Figure 3: Profits and the Location of Firms





Figure 4: Location of Firms in the Multi-Firm Case



## NOTE DI LAVORO DELLA FONDAZIONE ENI ENRICO MATTEI

### Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei Working Paper Series

Our Note di Lavoro are available on the Internet at the following addresses:

<http://www.feem.it/Feem/Pub/Publications/WPapers/default.html>

<http://www.ssrn.com/link/feem.html>

### NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2004

IEM	1.2004	<i>Anil MARKANDYA, Suzette PEDROSO and Alexander GOLUB: <u>Empirical Analysis of National Income and So2 Emissions in Selected European Countries</u></i>
ETA	2.2004	<i>Masahisa FUJITA and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Strategic Immigration Policies and Welfare in Heterogeneous Countries</u></i>
PRA	3.2004	<i>Adolfo DI CARLUCCIO, Giovanni FERRI, Cecilia FRALE and Ottavio RICCHI: <u>Do Privatizations Boost Household Shareholding? Evidence from Italy</u></i>
ETA	4.2004	<i>Victor GINSBURGH and Shlomo WEBER: <u>Languages Disenfranchisement in the European Union</u></i>
ETA	5.2004	<i>Romano PIRAS: <u>Growth, Congestion of Public Goods, and Second-Best Optimal Policy</u></i>
CCMP	6.2004	<i>Herman R.J. VOLLEBERGH: <u>Lessons from the Polder: Is Dutch CO2-Taxation Optimal</u></i>
PRA	7.2004	<i>Sandro BRUSCO, Giuseppe LOPOMO and S. VISWANATHAN (lxv): <u>Merger Mechanisms</u></i>
PRA	8.2004	<i>Wolfgang AUSENNEGG, Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>IPO Pricing with Bookbuilding, and a When-Issued Market</u></i>
PRA	9.2004	<i>Pegaret PICHLER and Alex STOMPER (lxv): <u>Primary Market Design: Direct Mechanisms and Markets</u></i>
PRA	10.2004	<i>Florian ENGLMAIER, Pablo GUILLEN, Loreto LLORENTE, Sander ONDERSTAL and Rupert SAUSGRUBER (lxv): <u>The Chopstick Auction: A Study of the Exposure Problem in Multi-Unit Auctions</u></i>
PRA	11.2004	<i>Bjarne BRENDSTRUP and Harry J. PAARSCH (lxv): <u>Nonparametric Identification and Estimation of Multi-Unit, Sequential, Oral, Ascending-Price Auctions With Asymmetric Bidders</u></i>
PRA	12.2004	<i>Ohad KADAN (lxv): <u>Equilibrium in the Two Player, k-Double Auction with Affiliated Private Values</u></i>
PRA	13.2004	<i>Maarten C.W. JANSSEN (lxv): <u>Auctions as Coordination Devices</u></i>
PRA	14.2004	<i>Gadi FIBICH, Arieh GAVIOUS and Aner SELA (lxv): <u>All-Pay Auctions with Weakly Risk-Averse Buyers</u></i>
PRA	15.2004	<i>Orly SADE, Charles SCHNITZLEIN and Jaime F. ZENDER (lxv): <u>Competition and Cooperation in Divisible Good Auctions: An Experimental Examination</u></i>
PRA	16.2004	<i>Marta STRYSZOWSKA (lxv): <u>Late and Multiple Bidding in Competing Second Price Internet Auctions</u></i>
CCMP	17.2004	<i>Slim Ben YOUSSEF: <u>R&amp;D in Cleaner Technology and International Trade</u></i>
NRM	18.2004	<i>Angelo ANTOCI, Simone BORGHESI and Paolo RUSSU (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity and Economic Growth: Stabilization Versus Preservation of the Ecological Dynamics</u></i>
SIEV	19.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Paolo ROSATO, Alberto LONGO and Valentina ZANATTA: <u>Information and Willingness to Pay in a Contingent Valuation Study: The Value of S. Erasmo in the Lagoon of Venice</u></i>
NRM	20.2004	<i>Guido CANDELA and Roberto CELLINI (lxvii): <u>Investment in Tourism Market: A Dynamic Model of Differentiated Oligopoly</u></i>
NRM	21.2004	<i>Jacqueline M. HAMILTON (lxvii): <u>Climate and the Destination Choice of German Tourists</u></i>
NRM	22.2004	<i>Javier Rey-MAQUIEIRA PALMER, Javier LOZANO IBÁÑEZ and Carlos Mario GÓMEZ GÓMEZ (lxvii): <u>Land, Environmental Externalities and Tourism Development</u></i>
NRM	23.2004	<i>Pius ODUNGA and Henk FOLMER (lxvii): <u>Profiling Tourists for Balanced Utilization of Tourism-Based Resources in Kenya</u></i>
NRM	24.2004	<i>Jean-Jacques NOWAK, Mondher SAHLI and Pasquale M. SGRO (lxvii): <u>Tourism, Trade and Domestic Welfare</u></i>
NRM	25.2004	<i>Riaz SHAREEF (lxvii): <u>Country Risk Ratings of Small Island Tourism Economies</u></i>
NRM	26.2004	<i>Juan Luis EUGENIO-MARTÍN, Noelia MARTÍN MORALES and Riccardo SCARPA (lxvii): <u>Tourism and Economic Growth in Latin American Countries: A Panel Data Approach</u></i>
NRM	27.2004	<i>Raúl Hernández MARTÍN (lxvii): <u>Impact of Tourism Consumption on GDP. The Role of Imports</u></i>
CSRM	28.2004	<i>Nicoletta FERRO: <u>Cross-Country Ethical Dilemmas in Business: A Descriptive Framework</u></i>
NRM	29.2004	<i>Marian WEBER (lxvi): <u>Assessing the Effectiveness of Tradable Landuse Rights for Biodiversity Conservation: an Application to Canada's Boreal Mixedwood Forest</u></i>
NRM	30.2004	<i>Trond BJORN DAL, Phoebe KOUNDOURI and Sean PASCOE (lxvi): <u>Output Substitution in Multi-Species Trawl Fisheries: Implications for Quota Setting</u></i>
CCMP	31.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part I: Sectoral Analysis of Climate Impacts in Italy</u></i>
CCMP	32.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI, Alessandra GORIA, Paolo MOMBRINI and Evi SPANTIDAKI: <u>Weather Impacts on Natural, Social and Economic Systems (WISE) Part II: Individual Perception of Climate Extremes in Italy</u></i>
CTN	33.2004	<i>Wilson PEREZ: <u>Divide and Conquer: Noisy Communication in Networks, Power, and Wealth Distribution</u></i>
KTHC	34.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI (lxviii): <u>The Economic Value of Cultural Diversity: Evidence from US Cities</u></i>
KTHC	35.2004	<i>Linda CHAIB (lxviii): <u>Immigration and Local Urban Participatory Democracy: A Boston-Paris Comparison</u></i>

KTHC	36.2004	<i>Franca ECKERT COEN and Claudio ROSSI</i> (lxviii): <u>Foreigners, Immigrants, Host Cities: The Policies of Multi-Ethnicity in Rome. Reading Governance in a Local Context</u>
KTHC	37.2004	<i>Kristine CRANE</i> (lxviii): <u>Governing Migration: Immigrant Groups' Strategies in Three Italian Cities – Rome, Naples and Bari</u>
KTHC	38.2004	<i>Kiflemariam HAMDE</i> (lxviii): <u>Mind in Africa, Body in Europe: The Struggle for Maintaining and Transforming Cultural Identity - A Note from the Experience of Eritrean Immigrants in Stockholm</u>
ETA	39.2004	<i>Alberto CAVALIERE</i> : <u>Price Competition with Information Disparities in a Vertically Differentiated Duopoly</u>
PRA	40.2004	<i>Andrea BIGANO and Stef PROOST</i> : <u>The Opening of the European Electricity Market and Environmental Policy: Does the Degree of Competition Matter?</u>
CCMP	41.2004	<i>Micheal FINUS</i> (lxix): <u>International Cooperation to Resolve International Pollution Problems</u>
KTHC	42.2004	<i>Francesco CRESPI</i> : <u>Notes on the Determinants of Innovation: A Multi-Perspective Analysis</u>
CTN	43.2004	<i>Sergio CURRARINI and Marco MARINI</i> : <u>Coalition Formation in Games without Synergies</u>
CTN	44.2004	<i>Marc ESCRHUELA-VILLAR</i> : <u>Cartel Sustainability and Cartel Stability</u>
NRM	45.2004	<i>Sebastian BERVOETS and Nicolas GRAVEL</i> (lxvi): <u>Appraising Diversity with an Ordinal Notion of Similarity: An Axiomatic Approach</u>
NRM	46.2004	<i>Signe ANTHON and Bo JELLES MARK THORSEN</i> (lxvi): <u>Optimal Afforestation Contracts with Asymmetric Information on Private Environmental Benefits</u>
NRM	47.2004	<i>John MBURU</i> (lxvi): <u>Wildlife Conservation and Management in Kenya: Towards a Co-management Approach</u>
NRM	48.2004	<i>Ekin BIROL, Ágnes GYÓVAI and Melinda SMALE</i> (lxvi): <u>Using a Choice Experiment to Value Agricultural Biodiversity on Hungarian Small Farms: Agri-Environmental Policies in a Transition al Economy</u>
CCMP	49.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON</i> : <u>The EU Emissions Trading Scheme. Allowance Prices, Trade Flows, Competitiveness Effects</u>
GG	50.2004	<i>Scott BARRETT and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Optimal Disease Eradication</u>
CTN	51.2004	<i>Dinko DIMITROV, Peter BORM, Ruud HENDRICKX and Shao CHIN SUNG</i> : <u>Simple Priorities and Core Stability in Hedonic Games</u>
SIEV	52.2004	<i>Francesco RICCI</i> : <u>Channels of Transmission of Environmental Policy to Economic Growth: A Survey of the Theory</u>
SIEV	53.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Maureen CROPPER, Alan KRUPNICK and Nathalie B. SIMON</i> : <u>Willingness to Pay for Mortality Risk Reductions: Does Latency Matter?</u>
NRM	54.2004	<i>Ingo BRÄUER and Rainer MARGGRAF</i> (lxvi): <u>Valuation of Ecosystem Services Provided by Biodiversity Conservation: An Integrated Hydrological and Economic Model to Value the Enhanced Nitrogen Retention in Renaturated Streams</u>
NRM	55.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Tun LIN</i> (lxvi): <u>Biodiversity Conservation on Private Lands: Information Problems and Regulatory Choices</u>
NRM	56.2004	<i>Tom DEDEURWAERDERE</i> (lxvi): <u>Bioprospection: From the Economics of Contracts to Reflexive Governance</u>
CCMP	57.2004	<i>Katrin REHDANZ and David MADDISON</i> : <u>The Amenity Value of Climate to German Households</u>
CCMP	58.2004	<i>Koen SMEKENS and Bob VAN DER ZWAAN</i> : <u>Environmental Externalities of Geological Carbon Sequestration Effects on Energy Scenarios</u>
NRM	59.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Mariaester CASSINELLI and Alessandro LANZA</i> (lxvii): <u>Using Data Envelopment Analysis to Evaluate Environmentally Conscious Tourism Management</u>
NRM	60.2004	<i>Timo GOESCHL and Danilo CAMARGO IGLIORI</i> (lxvi): <u>Property Rights Conservation and Development: An Analysis of Extractive Reserves in the Brazilian Amazon</u>
CCMP	61.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Carlo CARRARO</i> : <u>Economic and Environmental Effectiveness of a Technology-based Climate Protocol</u>
NRM	62.2004	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Resource-Abundance and Economic Growth in the U.S.</u>
NRM	63.2004	<i>Györgyi BELA, György PATAKI, Melinda SMALE and Mariann HAJDÚ</i> (lxvi): <u>Conserving Crop Genetic Resources on Smallholder Farms in Hungary: Institutional Analysis</u>
NRM	64.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK and E.E.M. NILLESEN</i> (lxvi): <u>The Socio-Economic Value of Natural Riverbanks in the Netherlands</u>
NRM	65.2004	<i>E.C.M. RUIJGROK</i> (lxvi): <u>Reducing Acidification: The Benefits of Increased Nature Quality. Investigating the Possibilities of the Contingent Valuation Method</u>
ETA	66.2004	<i>Giannis VARDAS and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS</i> : <u>Uncertainty Aversion, Robust Control and Asset Holdings</u>
GG	67.2004	<i>Anastasios XEPAPADEAS and Constadina PASSA</i> : <u>Participation in and Compliance with Public Voluntary Environmental Programs: An Evolutionary Approach</u>
GG	68.2004	<i>Michael FINUS</i> : <u>Modesty Pays: Sometimes!</u>
NRM	69.2004	<i>Trond BJØRNDAL and Ana BRASÃO</i> : <u>The Northern Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries: Management and Policy Implications</u>
CTN	70.2004	<i>Alejandro CAPARRÓS, Abdelhakim HAMMOUDI and Tarik TAZDAÏT</i> : <u>On Coalition Formation with Heterogeneous Agents</u>
IEM	71.2004	<i>Massimo GIOVANNINI, Margherita GRASSO, Alessandro LANZA and Matteo MANERA</i> : <u>Conditional Correlations in the Returns on Oil Companies Stock Prices and Their Determinants</u>
IEM	72.2004	<i>Alessandro LANZA, Matteo MANERA and Michael MCALEER</i> : <u>Modelling Dynamic Conditional Correlations in WTI Oil Forward and Futures Returns</u>
SIEV	73.2004	<i>Margarita GENIUS and Elisabetta STRAZZERA</i> : <u>The Copula Approach to Sample Selection Modelling: An Application to the Recreational Value of Forests</u>

CCMP	74.2004	<i>Rob DELLINK and Ekko van IERLAND</i> : <u>Pollution Abatement in the Netherlands: A Dynamic Applied General Equilibrium Assessment</u>
ETA	75.2004	<i>Rosella LEVAGGI and Michele MORETTO</i> : <u>Investment in Hospital Care Technology under Different Purchasing Rules: A Real Option Approach</u>
CTN	76.2004	<i>Salvador BARBERÀ and Matthew O. JACKSON</i> (lxx): <u>On the Weights of Nations: Assigning Voting Weights in a Heterogeneous Union</u>
CTN	77.2004	<i>Àlex ARENAS, Antonio CABRALES, Albert DÍAZ-GUILERA, Roger GUIMERA and Fernando VEGA-REDONDO</i> (lxx): <u>Optimal Information Transmission in Organizations: Search and Congestion</u>
CTN	78.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Armando GOMES</i> (lxx): <u>Contracting with Externalities and Outside Options</u>
CTN	79.2004	<i>Rabah AMIR, Effrosyni DIAMANTOUDI and Licun XUE</i> (lxx): <u>Merger Performance under Uncertain Efficiency Gains</u>
CTN	80.2004	<i>Francis BLOCH and Matthew O. JACKSON</i> (lxx): <u>The Formation of Networks with Transfers among Players</u>
CTN	81.2004	<i>Daniel DIERMEIER, Hülya ERASLAN and Antonio MERLO</i> (lxx): <u>Bicameralism and Government Formation</u>
CTN	82.2004	<i>Rod GARRATT, James E. PARCO, Cheng-ZHONG QIN and Amnon RAPOPORT</i> (lxx): <u>Potential Maximization and Coalition Government Formation</u>
CTN	83.2004	<i>Kfir ELIAZ, Debraj RAY and Ronny RAZIN</i> (lxx): <u>Group Decision-Making in the Shadow of Disagreement</u>
CTN	84.2004	<i>Sanjeev GOYAL, Marco van der LEIJ and José Luis MORAGA-GONZÁLEZ</i> (lxx): <u>Economics: An Emerging Small World?</u>
CTN	85.2004	<i>Edward CARTWRIGHT</i> (lxx): <u>Learning to Play Approximate Nash Equilibria in Games with Many Players</u>
IEM	86.2004	<i>Finn R. FØRSUND and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Properties of a Non-Competitive Electricity Market Dominated by Hydroelectric Power</u>
KTHC	87.2004	<i>Elissaios PAPHAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Natural Resources, Investment and Long-Term Income</u>
CCMP	88.2004	<i>Marzio GALEOTTI and Claudia KEMFERT</i> : <u>Interactions between Climate and Trade Policies: A Survey</u>
IEM	89.2004	<i>A. MARKANDYA, S. PEDROSO and D. STREIMIKIENE</i> : <u>Energy Efficiency in Transition Economies: Is There Convergence Towards the EU Average?</u>
GG	90.2004	<i>Rolf GOLOMBEK and Michael HOEL</i> : <u>Climate Agreements and Technology Policy</u>
PRA	91.2004	<i>Sergei IZMALKOV</i> (lxx): <u>Multi-Unit Open Ascending Price Efficient Auction</u>
KTHC	92.2004	<i>Gianmarco I.P. OTTAVIANO and Giovanni PERI</i> : <u>Cities and Cultures</u>
KTHC	93.2004	<i>Massimo DEL GATTO</i> : <u>Agglomeration, Integration, and Territorial Authority Scale in a System of Trading Cities. Centralisation versus devolution</u>
CCMP	94.2004	<i>Pierre-André JOUVET, Philippe MICHEL and Gilles ROTILLON</i> : <u>Equilibrium with a Market of Permits</u>
CCMP	95.2004	<i>Bob van der ZWAAN and Reyer GERLAGH</i> : <u>Climate Uncertainty and the Necessity to Transform Global Energy Supply</u>
CCMP	96.2004	<i>Francesco BOSELLO, Marco LAZZARIN, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL</i> : <u>Economy-Wide Estimates of the Implications of Climate Change: Sea Level Rise</u>
CTN	97.2004	<i>Gustavo BERGANTIÑOS and Juan J. VIDAL-PUGA</i> : <u>Defining Rules in Cost Spanning Tree Problems Through the Canonical Form</u>
CTN	98.2004	<i>Siddhartha BANDYOPADHYAY and Mandar OAK</i> : <u>Party Formation and Coalitional Bargaining in a Model of Proportional Representation</u>
GG	99.2004	<i>Hans-Peter WEIKARD, Michael FINUS and Juan-Carlos ALTAMIRANO-CABRERA</i> : <u>The Impact of Surplus Sharing on the Stability of International Climate Agreements</u>
SIEV	100.2004	<i>Chiara M. TRAVISI and Peter NIJKAMP</i> : <u>Willingness to Pay for Agricultural Environmental Safety: Evidence from a Survey of Milan, Italy, Residents</u>
SIEV	101.2004	<i>Chiara M. TRAVISI, Raymond J. G. M. FLORAX and Peter NIJKAMP</i> : <u>A Meta-Analysis of the Willingness to Pay for Reductions in Pesticide Risk Exposure</u>
NRM	102.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI and David TOMBERLIN</i> : <u>Real Options Analysis of Fishing Fleet Dynamics: A Test</u>
CCMP	103.2004	<i>Alessandra GORIA e Gretel GAMBARELLI</i> : <u>Economic Evaluation of Climate Change Impacts and Adaptability in Italy</u>
PRA	104.2004	<i>Massimo FLORIO and Mara GRASSENI</i> : <u>The Missing Shock: The Macroeconomic Impact of British Privatisation</u>
PRA	105.2004	<i>John BENNETT, Saul ESTRIN, James MAW and Giovanni URGA</i> : <u>Privatisation Methods and Economic Growth in Transition Economies</u>
PRA	106.2004	<i>Kira BÖRNER</i> : <u>The Political Economy of Privatization: Why Do Governments Want Reforms?</u>
PRA	107.2004	<i>Pehr-Johan NORBÄCK and Lars PERSSON</i> : <u>Privatization and Restructuring in Concentrated Markets</u>
SIEV	108.2004	<i>Angela GRANZOTTO, Fabio PRANOVI, Simone LIBRALATO, Patrizia TORRICELLI and Danilo MAINARDI</i> : <u>Comparison between Artisanal Fishery and Manila Clam Harvesting in the Venice Lagoon by Using Ecosystem Indicators: An Ecological Economics Perspective</u>
CTN	109.2004	<i>Somdeb LAHIRI</i> : <u>The Cooperative Theory of Two Sided Matching Problems: A Re-examination of Some Results</u>
NRM	110.2004	<i>Giuseppe DI VITA</i> : <u>Natural Resources Dynamics: Another Look</u>
SIEV	111.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI, Alistair HUNT and Anil MARKANDYA</i> : <u>Willingness to Pay to Reduce Mortality Risks: Evidence from a Three-Country Contingent Valuation Study</u>
KTHC	112.2004	<i>Valeria PAPPONETTI and Dino PINELLI</i> : <u>Scientific Advice to Public Policy-Making</u>
SIEV	113.2004	<i>Paulo A.L.D. NUNES and Laura ONOFRI</i> : <u>The Economics of Warm Glow: A Note on Consumer's Behavior and Public Policy Implications</u>
IEM	114.2004	<i>Patrick CAYRADE</i> : <u>Investments in Gas Pipelines and Liquefied Natural Gas Infrastructure What is the Impact on the Security of Supply?</u>
IEM	115.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA</i> : <u>Oil Security. Short- and Long-Term Policies</u>

IEM	116.2004	<i>Valeria COSTANTINI and Francesco GRACCEVA: <u>Social Costs of Energy Disruptions</u></i>
IEM	117.2004	<i>Christian EGENHOFER, Kyriakos GIALOGLOU, Giacomo LUCIANI, Maroeska BOOTS, Martin SCHEEPERS, Valeria COSTANTINI, Francesco GRACCEVA, Anil MARKANDYA and Giorgio VICINI: <u>Market-Based Options for Security of Energy Supply</u></i>
IEM	118.2004	<i>David FISK: <u>Transport Energy Security. The Unseen Risk?</u></i>
IEM	119.2004	<i>Giacomo LUCIANI: <u>Security of Supply for Natural Gas Markets. What is it and What is it not?</u></i>
IEM	120.2004	<i>L.J. de VRIES and R.A. HAKVOORT: <u>The Question of Generation Adequacy in Liberalised Electricity Markets</u></i>
KTHC	121.2004	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>Asset Accumulation, Fertility Choice and Nondegenerate Dynamics in a Small Open Economy</u></i>
NRM	122.2004	<i>Carlo GIUPPONI, Jaroslaw MYSLAK and Anita FASSIO: <u>An Integrated Assessment Framework for Water Resources Management: A DSS Tool and a Pilot Study Application</u></i>
NRM	123.2004	<i>Margaretha BREIL, Anita FASSIO, Carlo GIUPPONI and Paolo ROSATO: <u>Evaluation of Urban Improvement on the Islands of the Venice Lagoon: A Spatially-Distributed Hedonic-Hierarchical Approach</u></i>
ETA	124.2004	<i>Paul MENSINK: <u>Instant Efficient Pollution Abatement Under Non-Linear Taxation and Asymmetric Information: The Differential Tax Revisited</u></i>
NRM	125.2004	<i>Mauro FABIANO, Gabriella CAMARSA, Rosanna DURSI, Roberta IVALDI, Valentina MARIN and Francesca PALMISANI: <u>Integrated Environmental Study for Beach Management: A Methodological Approach</u></i>
PRA	126.2004	<i>Irena GROSFELD and Iraj HASHI: <u>The Emergence of Large Shareholders in Mass Privatized Firms: Evidence from Poland and the Czech Republic</u></i>
CCMP	127.2004	<i>Maria BERRITTELLA, Andrea BIGANO, Roberto ROSON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>A General Equilibrium Analysis of Climate Change Impacts on Tourism</u></i>
CCMP	128.2004	<i>Reyer GERLAGH: <u>A Climate-Change Policy Induced Shift from Innovations in Energy Production to Energy Savings</u></i>
NRM	129.2004	<i>Elissaios POPYRAKIS and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>Natural Resources, Innovation, and Growth</u></i>
PRA	130.2004	<i>Bernardo BORTOLOTTI and Mara FACCIO: <u>Reluctant Privatization</u></i>
SIEV	131.2004	<i>Riccardo SCARPA and Mara THIENE: <u>Destination Choice Models for Rock Climbing in the Northeast Alps: A Latent-Class Approach Based on Intensity of Participation</u></i>
SIEV	132.2004	<i>Riccardo SCARPA Kenneth G. WILLIS and Melinda ACUTT: <u>Comparing Individual-Specific Benefit Estimates for Public Goods: Finite Versus Continuous Mixing in Logit Models</u></i>
IEM	133.2004	<i>Santiago J. RUBIO: <u>On Capturing Oil Rents with a National Excise Tax Revisited</u></i>
ETA	134.2004	<i>Ascensión ANDINA DÍAZ: <u>Political Competition when Media Create Candidates' Charisma</u></i>
SIEV	135.2004	<i>Anna ALBERINI: <u>Robustness of VSL Values from Contingent Valuation Surveys</u></i>
CCMP	136.2004	<i>Gernot KLEPPER and Sonja PETERSON: <u>Marginal Abatement Cost Curves in General Equilibrium: The Influence of World Energy Prices</u></i>
ETA	137.2004	<i>Herbert DAWID, Christophe DEISSENBERG and Pavel ŠEVČIK: <u>Cheap Talk, Gullibility, and Welfare in an Environmental Taxation Game</u></i>
CCMP	138.2004	<i>ZhongXiang ZHANG: <u>The World Bank's Prototype Carbon Fund and China</u></i>
CCMP	139.2004	<i>Reyer GERLAGH and Marjan W. HOFKES: <u>Time Profile of Climate Change Stabilization Policy</u></i>
NRM	140.2004	<i>Chiara D'ALPAOS and Michele MORETTO: <u>The Value of Flexibility in the Italian Water Service Sector: A Real Option Analysis</u></i>
PRA	141.2004	<i>Patrick BAJARI, Stephanie HOUGHTON and Steven TADELIS (lxxi): <u>Bidding for Incomplete Contracts</u></i>
PRA	142.2004	<i>Susan ATHEY, Jonathan LEVIN and Enrique SEIRA (lxxi): <u>Comparing Open and Sealed Bid Auctions: Theory and Evidence from Timber Auctions</u></i>
PRA	143.2004	<i>David GOLDREICH (lxxi): <u>Behavioral Biases of Dealers in U.S. Treasury Auctions</u></i>
PRA	144.2004	<i>Roberto BURGUET (lxxi): <u>Optimal Procurement Auction for a Buyer with Downward Sloping Demand: More Simple Economics</u></i>
PRA	145.2004	<i>Ali HORTACSU and Samita SAREEN (lxxi): <u>Order Flow and the Formation of Dealer Bids: An Analysis of Information and Strategic Behavior in the Government of Canada Securities Auctions</u></i>
PRA	146.2004	<i>Victor GINSBURGH, Patrick LEGROS and Nicolas SAHUGUET (lxxi): <u>How to Win Twice at an Auction. On the Incidence of Commissions in Auction Markets</u></i>
PRA	147.2004	<i>Claudio MEZZETTI, Aleksandar PEKEČ and Ilia TSETLIN (lxxi): <u>Sequential vs. Single-Round Uniform-Price Auctions</u></i>
PRA	148.2004	<i>John ASKER and Estelle CANTILLON (lxxi): <u>Equilibrium of Scoring Auctions</u></i>
PRA	149.2004	<i>Philip A. HAILE, Han HONG and Matthew SHUM (lxxi): <u>Nonparametric Tests for Common Values in First-Price Sealed-Bid Auctions</u></i>
PRA	150.2004	<i>François DEGEORGE, François DERRIEN and Kent L. WOMACK (lxxi): <u>Quid Pro Quo in IPOs: Why Bookbuilding is Dominating Auctions</u></i>
CCMP	151.2004	<i>Barbara BUCHNER and Silvia DALL'OLIO: <u>Russia: The Long Road to Ratification. Internal Institution and Pressure Groups in the Kyoto Protocol's Adoption Process</u></i>
CCMP	152.2004	<i>Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>Does Endogenous Technical Change Make a Difference in Climate Policy Analysis? A Robustness Exercise with the FEEM-RICE Model</u></i>
PRA	153.2004	<i>Alejandro M. MANELLI and Daniel R. VINCENT (lxxi): <u>Multidimensional Mechanism Design: Revenue Maximization and the Multiple-Good Monopoly</u></i>
ETA	154.2004	<i>Nicola ACOCELLA, Giovanni Di BARTOLOMEO and Wilfried PAUWELS: <u>Is there any Scope for Corporatism in Stabilization Policies?</u></i>
CTN	155.2004	<i>Johan EYCKMANS and Michael FINUS: <u>An Almost Ideal Sharing Scheme for Coalition Games with Externalities</u></i>
CCMP	156.2004	<i>Cesare DOSI and Michele MORETTO: <u>Environmental Innovation, War of Attrition and Investment Grants</u></i>

CCMP	157.2004	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Marzio GALEOTTI and Alessandro LANZA: <u>How Consistent are Alternative Short-Term Climate Policies with Long-Term Goals?</u></i>
ETA	158.2004	<i>Y. Hossein FARZIN and Ken-Ichi AKAO: <u>Non-pecuniary Value of Employment and Individual Labor Supply</u></i>
ETA	159.2004	<i>William BROCK and Anastasios XEPAPADEAS: <u>Spatial Analysis: Development of Descriptive and Normative Methods with Applications to Economic-Ecological Modelling</u></i>
KTHC	160.2004	<i>Alberto PETRUCCI: <u>On the Incidence of a Tax on PureRent with Infinite Horizons</u></i>
IEM	161.2004	<i>Xavier LABANDEIRA, José M. LABEAGA and Miguel RODRÍGUEZ: <u>Microsimulating the Effects of Household Energy Price Changes in Spain</u></i>

#### NOTE DI LAVORO PUBLISHED IN 2005

CCMP	1.2005	<i>Stéphane HALLEGATTE: <u>Accounting for Extreme Events in the Economic Assessment of Climate Change</u></i>
CCMP	2.2005	<i>Qiang WU and Paulo Augusto NUNES: <u>Application of Technological Control Measures on Vehicle Pollution: A Cost-Benefit Analysis in China</u></i>
CCMP	3.2005	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON, Maren LAU, Richard S.J. TOL and Yuan ZHOU: <u>A Global Database of Domestic and International Tourist Numbers at National and Subnational Level</u></i>
CCMP	4.2005	<i>Andrea BIGANO, Jacqueline M. HAMILTON and Richard S.J. TOL: <u>The Impact of Climate on Holiday Destination Choice</u></i>
ETA	5.2005	<i>Hubert KEMPF: <u>Is Inequality Harmful for the Environment in a Growing Economy?</u></i>
CCMP	6.2005	<i>Valentina BOSETTI, Carlo CARRARO and Marzio GALEOTTI: <u>The Dynamics of Carbon and Energy Intensity in a Model of Endogenous Technical Change</u></i>
IEM	7.2005	<i>David CALEF and Robert GOBLE: <u>The Allure of Technology: How France and California Promoted Electric Vehicles to Reduce Urban Air Pollution</u></i>
ETA	8.2005	<i>Lorenzo PELLEGRINI and Reyer GERLAGH: <u>An Empirical Contribution to the Debate on Corruption Democracy and Environmental Policy</u></i>
CCMP	9.2005	<i>Angelo ANTOCI: <u>Environmental Resources Depletion and Interplay Between Negative and Positive Externalities in a Growth Model</u></i>
CTN	10.2005	<i>Frédéric DEROIAN: <u>Cost-Reducing Alliances and Local Spillovers</u></i>
NRM	11.2005	<i>Francesco SINDICO: <u>The GMO Dispute before the WTO: Legal Implications for the Trade and Environment Debate</u></i>
KTHC	12.2005	<i>Carla MASSIDDA: <u>Estimating the New Keynesian Phillips Curve for Italian Manufacturing Sectors</u></i>
KTHC	13.2005	<i>Michele MORETTO and Gianpaolo ROSSINI: <u>Start-up Entry Strategies: Employer vs. Nonemployer firms</u></i>
PRCG	14.2005	<i>Clara GRAZIANO and Annalisa LUPORINI: <u>Ownership Concentration, Monitoring and Optimal Board Structure</u></i>
CSRM	15.2005	<i>Parashar KULKARNI: <u>Use of Ecolabels in Promoting Exports from Developing Countries to Developed Countries: Lessons from the Indian LeatherFootwear Industry</u></i>
KTHC	16.2005	<i>Adriana DI LIBERTO, Roberto MURA and Francesco PIGLIARU: <u>How to Measure the Unobservable: A Panel Technique for the Analysis of TFP Convergence</u></i>
KTHC	17.2005	<i>Alireza NAGHAVI: <u>Asymmetric Labor Markets, Southern Wages, and the Location of Firms</u></i>

(lxv) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications” organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and sponsored by the EU, Milan, September 25-27, 2003

(lxvi) This paper has been presented at the 4th BioEcon Workshop on “Economic Analysis of Policies for Biodiversity Conservation” organised on behalf of the BIOECON Network by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, Venice International University (VIU) and University College London (UCL), Venice, August 28-29, 2003

(lxvii) This paper has been presented at the international conference on “Tourism and Sustainable Economic Development – Macro and Micro Economic Issues” jointly organised by CRENoS (Università di Cagliari e Sassari, Italy) and Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei, and supported by the World Bank, Sardinia, September 19-20, 2003

(lxviii) This paper was presented at the ENGIME Workshop on “Governance and Policies in Multicultural Cities”, Rome, June 5-6, 2003

(lxix) This paper was presented at the Fourth EEP Plenary Workshop and EEP Conference “The Future of Climate Policy”, Cagliari, Italy, 27-28 March 2003

(lxx) This paper was presented at the 9<sup>th</sup> Coalition Theory Workshop on "Collective Decisions and Institutional Design" organised by the Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona and held in Barcelona, Spain, January 30-31, 2004

(lxxi) This paper was presented at the EuroConference on “Auctions and Market Design: Theory, Evidence and Applications”, organised by Fondazione Eni Enrico Mattei and Consip and sponsored by the EU, Rome, September 23-25, 2004

**2004 SERIES**

<b>CCMP</b>	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti )
<b>GG</b>	<i>Global Governance</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>SIEV</b>	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
<b>NRM</b>	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
<b>KTHC</b>	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
<b>IEM</b>	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
<b>CSRM</b>	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
<b>PRA</b>	<i>Privatisation, Regulation, Antitrust</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
<b>ETA</b>	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>CTN</b>	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>

**2005 SERIES**

<b>CCMP</b>	<i>Climate Change Modelling and Policy</i> (Editor: Marzio Galeotti )
<b>SIEV</b>	<i>Sustainability Indicators and Environmental Valuation</i> (Editor: Anna Alberini)
<b>NRM</b>	<i>Natural Resources Management</i> (Editor: Carlo Giupponi)
<b>KTHC</b>	<i>Knowledge, Technology, Human Capital</i> (Editor: Gianmarco Ottaviano)
<b>IEM</b>	<i>International Energy Markets</i> (Editor: Anil Markandya)
<b>CSRM</b>	<i>Corporate Social Responsibility and Sustainable Management</i> (Editor: Sabina Ratti)
<b>PRCG</b>	<i>Privatisation Regulation Corporate Governance</i> (Editor: Bernardo Bortolotti)
<b>ETA</b>	<i>Economic Theory and Applications</i> (Editor: Carlo Carraro)
<b>CTN</b>	<i>Coalition Theory Network</i>