

Mario Larch¹ and Wolfgang Lechthaler ²

¹ifo Munich

²Kiel Institute for the World Economy

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

Why bother about Unemployment

- It's the main public concern
- Labor market frictions might alter the effects of trade liberalization
- Distributional consequences
- Optimal economic policy



- Felbermayr, Prat and Schmerer (2008) introduce search and matching unemployment into the Melitz-model
- Egger and Kreickemeier (2008a,b) introduce fair wages to generate in-group wage dispersion
- Helpman, Itskhoki and Redding (2008) introduce worker heterogeneity

(日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日) (日)

- Felbermayr, Prat and Schmerer (2008) introduce search and matching unemployment into the Melitz-model
- Egger and Kreickemeier (2008a,b) introduce fair wages to generate in-group wage dispersion
- Helpman, Itskhoki and Redding (2008) introduce worker heterogeneity
- One common feature of these models: There is only one factor of production
- We introduce search and matching unemployment into the model of Bernard, Redding and Schott (2007)

Main Features of our Model

- Firms are heterogenous with respect to their productivity
- Fixed costs of production, of exporting and entering the market
- Two factors of production: Skilled labor and unskilled labor
- Two goods: One skill-intensive, one unskill-intensive

Main Features of our Model

- Firms are heterogenous with respect to their productivity
- Fixed costs of production, of exporting and entering the market
- Two factors of production: Skilled labor and unskilled labor
- Two goods: One skill-intensive, one unskill-intensive
- Four separate labor markets with search and matching unemployment
- Mobility of workers: Workers can move from one sector to the other or train themselves



▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲ 三▶ ▲ 三▶ - 三 - のへぐ

Consumption and Production

Utility function:

$$U=C_i^{\alpha}C_j^{1-\alpha},$$

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □

Consumption and Production

Utility function:

$$U=C_i^{\alpha}C_j^{1-\alpha},$$

Aggregation of intermediate goods:

$$oldsymbol{Q}_i = \left[oldsymbol{M}_i^{rac{1}{\sigma}}\int_{\omega\in\Omega}oldsymbol{q}_i(\omega)^{(\sigma-1)/\sigma}oldsymbol{d}\omega
ight]^{\sigma/(\sigma-1)}$$

Consumption and Production

Utility function:

$$U=C_i^{\alpha}C_j^{1-\alpha},$$

Aggregation of intermediate goods:

$$oldsymbol{Q}_i = \left[oldsymbol{M}_i^{rac{1}{\sigma}}\int_{\omega\in\Omega}oldsymbol{q}_i(\omega)^{(\sigma-1)/\sigma}oldsymbol{d}\omega
ight]^{\sigma/(\sigma-1)}$$

Production function:

$$\boldsymbol{q}_i[\varphi_i] = \varphi_i \boldsymbol{S}^{\beta_i} \boldsymbol{L}^{1-\beta_i},$$



Standard matching function for four separate labor markets:

$$\boldsymbol{m}[\theta_{Li}] = \boldsymbol{m}_0 \left(\theta_{Li}\right)^{-\gamma},$$

- As in Stole and Zwiebel (96) each worker bargains individually and is treated as the marginal worker
- The wage is driven down to the outside option:

$$w_{Li} = rU_{Li} + \frac{\beta}{1-\beta} \left(\frac{c}{m(\theta_{Li})}\frac{r+s}{1-\delta}\right)$$

▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□▶ ▲□ ● のへで

- After learning its productivity the firm will decide whether to take up production and whether to export
- Entry threshold:

$$(1-\delta)\frac{\pi_d[\varphi_{id}^{*H}]}{r+\delta} = \frac{cP_i^H S[\varphi_{id}^{*H}]}{m[\theta_{Si}^H]} + \frac{cP_i^H L[\varphi_{id}^{*H}]}{m[\theta_{Li}^H]} + fP_i^H,$$

- After learning its productivity the firm will decide whether to take up production and whether to export
- Entry threshold:

$$(1-\delta)\frac{\pi_d[\varphi_{id}^{*H}]}{r+\delta} = \frac{cP_i^H S[\varphi_{id}^{*H}]}{m[\theta_{Si}^H]} + \frac{cP_i^H L[\varphi_{id}^{*H}]}{m[\theta_{Li}^H]} + fP_i^H,$$

Exporting threshold:

$$(1-\delta)\frac{\pi_x[\varphi_{ix}^{*H}]}{r+\delta} = \frac{cP_i^H S[\varphi_{ix}^{*H}]}{m[\theta_{Si}^H]} + \frac{cP_i^H L[\varphi_{ix}^{*H}]}{m[\theta_{Li}^H]} + f_x P_i^H,$$



- Product market similar to Bernard, Redding, Schott (2007)
- Labor market of low-skilled workers in sector one similar to Felbermayr, Prat, Schmerer (2008)
- Same parameter values for the other labor markets
- Asymmetry:
 - Sector 1 is skill-intensive: $\beta_1 = 1 \beta_2 = 0.8$
 - Country 1 has better training-opportunities: 50% skilled workers vs. 20% skilled workers in country 2

Specialization in Output



Sector-specific Unemployment



Sector-specific Wages



<u>ି</u> । ୧୦୦୦

Average Unemployment and Wages



Intra-Industry Trade





- As trade costs decrease, a country with a relative advantage in the training technology will specialize in the production of the skill intensive good.
- Workers will migrate to this sector and invest more in their human capital.
- The big winners are the skilled workers in the export sector, while skilled workers in the import sector loose.
- The effects for unskilled labor (the more mobile factor) are much more equally distributed. In line with the Heckscher-Ohlin model, in the country exporting the skill-intensive good, unskilled labor will suffer losses: Unemployment goes up and wages go down. Only for very low trade costs, intraindustry trade can overturn this result.