



*The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library*

**This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.**

**Help ensure our sustainability.**

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search

<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>

[aesearch@umn.edu](mailto:aesearch@umn.edu)

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

*No endorsement of AgEcon Search or its fundraising activities by the author(s) of the following work or their employer(s) is intended or implied.*

# Effects of Trade on Female Labor Force Participation\*

Philip Sauré<sup>†</sup>

Hosny Zoabi<sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract

This paper uncovers a counter-intuitive effect of international trade on female labor shares: whenever trade *expands*, sectors intensive in female labor, female labor shares *drop* and vice versa. According to our key assumption a rising capital labor ratio closes the gender wage gap. The paper's mechanism operates as follows. Expansions of sectors intensive in female labor come along with contractions of sectors intensive in male labor. These contractions imply that male labor reallocates to sectors intensive in female labor. The capital labor ratio in the latter sectors drops, which widens the gender wage gap and causes a decrease in aggregate female labor shares. Based on instrumented U.S.-Mexican trade flows, we provide empirical evidence in support of our theory.

Keywords: Trade, Female Labor Force Participation, Fertility, Technological Change.

JEL Classifications: F10, F16, J13, J16.

---

\*We would like to thank Daron Acemoglu, Raphael Auer, Jeffrey Campbell, David de la Croix, Matthias Doepke, Oded Galor, Moshe Hazan, Elhanan Helpman, Kiminori Matsuyama, Omer Moav, Joel Mokyr, Yona Rubinstein, Analia Schlosser, David Weil and Joseph Zeira and two anonymous referees for valuable comments. All remaining errors are ours. The views expressed in this paper are the author's and do not necessarily represent those of the Swiss National Bank.

<sup>†</sup>P. Sauré, Swiss National Bank, Boersenstrasse 15, CH-8022 Zurich, Switzerland. E-mail: Philip.Saure@snb.ch.

<sup>‡</sup>H. Zoabi, The Eitan Berglas School of Economics, Tel Aviv University, P.O.B. 39040 Ramat Aviv, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel. E-mail: hosnyz@post.tau.ac.il.

# 1 Introduction

Both female labor force participation and trade integration are commonly viewed as determinants of economic development. While research abounds on either of these two subjects separately, the literature addressing the interaction between international trade and female labor force participation remains surprisingly scarce.<sup>1</sup> This gap is worrying since the interaction itself is likely to significantly influence economic development. The current study therefore aims to fill part of this gap, both theoretically and empirically.

We show that international trade, via the demand for male and female labor, impacts the respective wages unevenly and thus affects female labor shares. The according elasticities of labor supply stem from households' optimal choice. Within this setting, our theory suggests that when trade expands sectors that intensively use female labor, aggregate female labor shares actually drop, and vice versa.

The mechanism behind this seemingly paradoxical result rests on three main assumptions. First, female labor and male labor are imperfect substitutes, which makes them two distinct factors of production.<sup>2</sup> We can consequently distinguish between sectors with relatively high demand for female labor labeled the *females' relative advantage sectors* and the corresponding *males' relative advantage sectors*. Second, we assume that physical capital complements female labor more than male labor.<sup>3</sup> Our third assumption states that households split their time between home production (child-rearing in our case) and employment in the labor market, thus generating elastic labor supply.

Under these assumptions, the following mechanism operates. An economy that specializes in the females' relative advantage sector experiences a contraction of the males' relative

---

<sup>1</sup>The major contribution dates back to Becker (1957), who deals with the positive impact of trade volumes on female labor force participation through a reduction in discrimination driven by higher competition.

<sup>2</sup>Acemoglu, Autor and Lyle (2004) have utilized the large positive shock to demand for female labor induced by World War II to understand the effect of an increase in female labor supply on females' and males' wages. They find that a 10% increase in female labor input decreases females' wages by about 7% – 8%, but reduces males' wages by only 3% – 5%. The authors infer that the elasticity of substitution between female and male labor ranges between 2.5 and 3.5.

<sup>3</sup>Goldin (1990) argues that the rapid accumulation of physical capital during the nineteenth century, which characterized industrialization, was responsible for a dramatic increase in the relative wage of women.

advantage sector. Consequently, male workers migrate to the expanding sector. This inflow of labor into the expanding sector depresses the capital-labor ratio in this sector. Thus, given the strong complementarity between physical capital and female labor, the relative returns to female labor decline, causing the gender wage gap to increase. Finally, the increase in the gender wage gap depresses female labor force participation.

To formalize our argument, we adopt the model of Galor and Weil (1996) and generalize it to a trade setting. Following this earlier work we assume that females and males have equal quantities of brains, but males have more brawn. As a direct consequence, males' wages are higher than females' wages as long as brawn is a valued input.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, child-rearing is assumed to require time that cannot be spent working, so that the opportunity cost of raising children is proportional to the market wage.<sup>5</sup> Given that males and females are equally productive in raising children, women with the lower market wage raise children. Finally, within such a setting, the high complementarity between female labor and physical capital is captured by assuming that physical capital complements brains more than brawn. Moreover, as economies accumulate physical capital, the rewards to brains increase relative to brawn and the gender wage gap declines. Indeed, Goldin (1990) writes:

The labor market's rewards for strength, which made up a large fraction of earnings in the nineteenth century, ought to be minimized by the adoption of machinery, and its rewards for brain power ought to be increased (p. 59).

From the international trade perspective, the assumptions above boil down to a two-country, two-good, three-factor model. The three factors of production are capital, mental labor and physical labor. Just as in ordinary Heckscher-Ohlin-type models, the cross-country

---

<sup>4</sup>O'Neill (2003) shows that there is still a 10 differential in female and male wages in the U.S. in 2000, that remains unexplained by gender differences in schooling, actual experience and job characteristics. Indeed, Figure 1 shows that the wage ratio between female workers and male workers in the U.S. was less than one during the period 1800-1990.

<sup>5</sup>Goldin (1995) provides evidence that shows that few women in the 1940s and 1950s birth cohorts were able to combine childbearing with strong labor-force attachment. Angrist and Evans (1998) and Bailey (2006) find a negative causal effect running from fertility to female labor force participation.

differences in capital-labor ratios in combination with cross-sector differences in factor requirements generate patterns of comparative advantage and motives for trade. Given the complementarity between physical capital and female labor described above, the capital abundant economy specializes in the females' relative advantage sector. Finally, while supply of capital and male labor are inelastic, female labor supply is elastic and, in particular, reacts positively to a closing gender wage gap.

Moreover, we show that our static mechanism also applies in the case of technological progress that is biased towards the females' relative advantage sector. Such a technological progress increases the wages in this sector. This increase in wages attracts male workers to the females' relative advantage sector, an effect that can be strong enough to drive female workers out of formal employment. In this way, technological progress, biased towards female labor, might in turn curb female labor force participation.<sup>6</sup>

The dynamics of our autarkic economy is similar to Galor and Weil (1996). As in this earlier work, increases in the capital labor ratio raise the relative wage of women, leading women to substitute out of child rearing and into market labor. This choice, in turn, determines the savings rate as well as population growth, which are the two variables that determine the per-household capital stock for the subsequent generation and thus govern the dynamics of our model.

Since international specialization makes capital scarce economies expand the males' sectors and closes their wage gap, trade openness fosters female labor share and decreases the fertility rates. The parallel impact of trade on capital accumulation in the capital abundant economy, however, is ambiguous. While international trade hinders female labor force participation and increases fertility, these adverse effects on capital accumulation may be dominated by the positive effects of the gains from trade on total savings. In either case, our model predicts that capital accumulation in the rich country falls short of capital accumu-

---

<sup>6</sup>For the role of technological progress in explaining the demographic transition see Galor and Weil ((1999), (2000)) and Galor and Moav (2002). For the impact of technological progress on fertility and female labor force participation see Greenwood and Seshadri (2005) and Doepke, Hazan and Maoz (2007).

lation in the poor country and, consequently, suggests convergence of per-household capital stocks.

To advance our understanding of how trade affects female labor force participation quantitatively, we test our theory using bilateral trade data for the U.S. (the rich economy) and Mexico (the poor economy). We place our theory within the context of long run growth and frame it with a model of demographic transition. In light of data constraints, however, we limit our examination to the period of 1990 – 2007, for which high-quality data are available. We build our examination on two major data sources. First, from IPUMS-CPS we establish different measures of female labor force participation and a set of covariates. Second, “the Origin of Movement” database administered by WISER, provides export data by U.S. state and destination country.

Central to our estimation strategy is the uneven surge in bilateral trade volumes over the period 1990-2007 across the 51 U.S. states. For example, trade with Mexico increased by almost 3.2 percent of total output for Texas, while for New York the increase was 0.1 percent of total output. We exploit this cross-state variation in the exposure to trade with Mexico to examine how trade has impacted female labor force participation at the state level.<sup>7</sup> We define our dependent variable as either female hours worked as a share of total hours worked or female employment as a share of total employment. Trade shares are instrumented by geographic distance. In our regressions the impact of trade with Mexico on female labor force participation of U.S. states is always negative and highly significant. This supports our hypothesis that in rich countries, trade with poor countries tends to reduce female labor supply. These results are robust to the inclusion of a large number of control variables. Moreover, since our theory suggests that international specialization affects female labor force participation while male labor force participation remains constant, we test our empirical model on male and female labor separately and find support to this prediction. Finally, to eliminate the possibility that the estimated effects are driven by the low-skill

---

<sup>7</sup>Our approach is similar to Campbell and Lapham (2004) who exploit variations in exposure to international trade to identify the effect of international trade shocks.

sectors only, we limit our sample to highly educated individuals and find that our results still hold.

The present study connects to various literatures. The general framework is that of Heckscher-Ohlin-type models (see Helpman and Krugman (1985)). More precisely, we deal with a rather unconventional case of a two-good, three-factor setup as studied in Chang (1979) and Jones and Easton (1983). Similarly to these earlier studies, we find that the well-known Stolper-Samuelson Theorem does generalize to this setting, and hence the expansion of certain sectors does not necessarily imply an increase in the price of the intensively used factors. Further, by virtue of the focus on female labor shares, we need to model a non-trivial elasticity of female labor supply. Doing so, we depart from the conventional approach in which factor endowments are viewed as given and trade patterns are explored but examine, instead, how trade affects the supply of factors and, in particular, female labor force participation.<sup>8</sup>

Further literature on international trade and labor markets analyzes the impact of trade on unemployment and labor reallocation (e.g., Davis (1998), Wacziarg and Wallack (2004) and Helpman and Itskhoki (2007)) or reveals labor market frictions as determinants of comparative advantage and international trade (Saint-Paul (1997), Cunat and Melitz (2007)). Further studies address the question of whether to include labor market standards in trade agreements (Brown (2001) and Bagwell and Staiger (2001)). The link between trade, the gender wage gap and female labor force participation, however, is understudied. A noteworthy exception is Becker (1957), who argues that trade increases competition among firms and, thus, reduces costly discrimination and closes the gender wage gap. Tests of this hypothesis have generally produced mixed support (see Black and Brainerd (2004), Hazarika and Otero (2004), Berik, van der Meulen and Zveglic (2004) for some of the scarce empirical investigations). Our mechanism, in contrast, operates in perfectly competitive goods and factor

---

<sup>8</sup>While it is straight forward to introduce, additionally, Ricardian motives of trade, our key assumption on the complementarity between mental labor and physical capital requires a three-factor model of the kind we employ.

markets through the differential demand for gender labor across sectors and international specialization.

A different body of literature addresses the reduction in the gender wage gap and the increase in women’s labor force participation. Welch (2000), Gosling (2003) and Black and Spitz-Oener (2010) focus on the role of primary attributes. While Welch (2000) and Gosling (2003) attribute the reduction in the gender wage gap to the expansion in the value of brains relative to brawn, Black and Spitz-Oener (2010) addresses the importance of the relative increases in non-routine analytic tasks and non-routine interactive tasks, which are associated with higher skill levels.<sup>9</sup> Our modeling setup corresponds to this literature by taking primary attributes as the source of the gender wage gap.

The link between women’s relative wages and fertility is fairly well established. In our framework, the pure effect of an increase in household income, holding the price of children constant, is to raise the demand for children.<sup>10</sup> If all child-rearing is done by females, an increase in females’ wages raises both household income and the price of children, and thus has offsetting income and substitution effects on the demand for children. In our model, if both males’ and females’ wages proportionately increase, then the substitution effect driven by the increase in the cost of raising children negates the income effect and leaves fertility unchanged. In such a framework, closing the gender wage gap causes fertility to decline.<sup>11</sup>

There is little research on the links and interactions between demography and international trade. Closest to our argument is Galor and Mountford (2008), who endogenize educational choice and fertility choice, arguing that the gains from trade are channeled to-

---

<sup>9</sup>See also Mulligan and Rubinstein (2005), who attribute the reduction in the gender wage gap to a positive selectivity bias, and Fernández (2007), who addresses the role of culture and learning. For a discussion of the gender wage gap in the U.S., see Goldin (1990) and for the evolution of female labor force participation, see Goldin (2006).

<sup>10</sup>Pencavel (1986) finds a positive association between fathers’ labor supply and the number of children. This is consistent with our framework assuming that fathers’ wage has a pure income effect on the number of children.

<sup>11</sup>For a support for a negative effect of women’s wage and a positive effect of male income on birth rates see Heckman and Walker (1990). Similarly, Schultz (1985), using changes in the world prices of agricultural commodities as an instrument to overcome the endogeneity of income and labor supply, finds that an increase in the relative wages of women played an important role in Sweden’s fertility transition.



wards population growth in non-industrial countries while in industrial countries they are directed towards investment in education and growth in output per-capita. Our theory, which disregards educational choice, highlights the impact on female labor force participation.<sup>12</sup>

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 formalizes our argument, section 3 provides an empirical evidence and section 4 presents some concluding remarks. Figures and tables appear at the end.

## 2 The Model

In our modeling strategy we follow Galor and Weil (1996) by adopting a standard OLG model with endogenous choice of fertility.

At time  $t$  the economy is populated by  $L_t$  households, each containing one adult man (a husband) and one adult woman (a wife). Individuals live for three periods: childhood, adulthood and old age. In childhood, individuals consume a fixed quantity of their parents' time. In adulthood, individuals raise children, supply labor to the market, and save their wages. In old age, individuals merely consume their savings. The capital stock in each period is equal to the aggregate savings of the previous period.

A key assumption is that men and women differ in their labor endowments. While men and women have equal endowments of mental labor units, men have more physical labor units than women. These differences translate into a gender wage gap, which, in turn, governs the trade-off between female labor force participation and fertility.

---

<sup>12</sup>It is worth stressing that our mechanism holds not only for child-rearing, but also for any home produced good whose production requires a time investment on the part of parents.

## 2.1 Production

### 2.1.1 Technologies

Two intermediate goods,  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  are assembled into a final good  $Y$  by the CES-technology:

$$Y_t = (\theta X_{1,t}^\rho + (1 - \theta) X_{2,t}^\rho)^{1/\rho} \quad \rho, \theta \in (0, 1). \quad (1)$$

Intermediate goods are produced using three factors: capital  $K$ , physical labor  $L^p$ , and mental labor  $L^m$ . We want to reflect the fact that sectors vary in their factor intensity, in particular, in their intensity of mental and physical labor. This, in turn, generates differences in demand for male and female labor across sectors. Thus, we impose the following structure on production of intermediate goods:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= a K_t^\alpha (L_t^m)^{1-\alpha} + b L_{1,t}^p \\ X_2 &= b L_{2,t}^p. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here, the variables  $L_{i,t}^p$  stand for the physical labor employed in sector  $i$  at time  $t$ , while  $L_t^m$  is the amount of mental labor in the first sector at time  $t$ .

### 2.1.2 Labor Supply

Men and women are equally efficient in raising children. On the labor market, however, each woman supplies one unit of mental labor  $L^m$  while each man supplies one unit of mental labor  $L^m$  plus one unit of physical labor  $L^p$ . Thus, as long as physical labor has a positive price, men receive a higher wage than women and therefore the opportunity cost of raising children is higher for a man than for a woman. Consequently, men only raise children when women are doing so full-time. Finally, we assume that male workers cannot divide mental and physical labor and must allocate both units to one sector. This means, in particular, that men employed in the  $X_2$ -sector waste their mental endowment.

## 2.2 Preferences

Individuals born at  $(t - 1)$  form households in period  $t$  and derive utility from the number of their children  $n_t$  and their joint old-age consumption  $c_{t+1}$  of a final good  $Y$  according to<sup>13</sup>

$$u_t = \gamma \ln(n_t) + (1 - \gamma) \ln(c_{t+1}). \quad (3)$$

It is assumed that parents' time is the only input required to raise children and thus the opportunity cost of raising children is proportional to the market wage. Let  $w_t^F$  and  $w_t^M$  be the hourly wage of female and male workers, respectively. Normalizing the hours per period to unity, the full income of a household is  $w_t^M + w_t^F$ , which is spent on consumption and raising children. Further, let  $z$  be the fraction of the time endowment of one parent that must be spent to raise one child. If the wife spends time raising children, then the marginal cost of a child is  $zw_t^F$ . If the husband spends time raising children, then the marginal cost of a child is  $zw_t^M$ . The household's budget constraint is therefore

$$\begin{aligned} w_t^F zn_t + s_t &\leq w_t^M + w_t^F & \text{if} & \quad zn_t \leq 1 \\ w_t^F + w_t^M(zn_t - 1) + s_t &\leq w_t^M + w_t^F & \text{if} & \quad zn_t > 1 \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $s_t$  is the household's savings. In the third period, the household consumes its savings

$$c_{t+1} = s_t(1 + r_{t+1}) \quad (5)$$

where  $r_{t+1}$  is the net real interest rate on savings.

---

<sup>13</sup>Note that since the basic unit is a household which consists a husband and wife,  $n_t$  is, in fact, the number of pairs of children that a couple has.

## 2.3 Optimality

It will prove useful to conduct the analysis in terms of per-household variables. We therefore define:

$$k_t = K_t/L_t \quad m_t = L_t^m/L_t \quad l_{i,t} = L_{i,t}^p/L_t$$

as capital, productive mental labor and sectorial physical labor *per-household*, respectively.

Finally, we define

$$\kappa_t = k_t/m_t \tag{6}$$

as the ratio of capital to mental labor employed in the first sector. This ratio will play a central role in the following analysis.

### 2.3.1 Firms

Profit maximization of competitive final good firms implies, by (1) and (2), that relative prices are:

$$\frac{p_{2,t}}{p_{1,t}} = \frac{1-\theta}{\theta} \left( \frac{X_1}{X_2} \right)^{1-\rho} = \frac{1-\theta}{\theta} \left( \frac{a\kappa_t^\alpha m_t + bl_{1,t}}{bl_{2,t}} \right)^{1-\rho}, \tag{7}$$

where we write  $p_{i,t}$  as  $X_i$ 's price in period  $t$ . Given  $p_{i,t}$ , cost minimizing final good producers leads us to the usual ideal price index  $P_t$ , which we normalize to one

$$P_t = \left( \left( \frac{\theta}{p_{1,t}^\rho} \right)^{1/(1-\rho)} + \left( \frac{1-\theta}{p_{2,t}^\rho} \right)^{1/(1-\rho)} \right)^{-(1-\rho)/\rho} = 1. \tag{8}$$

From equation (2) the return to capital in the first sector is

$$r_t = p_{1,t} \alpha a \kappa_t^{\alpha-1} \tag{9}$$

Wages are derived from (2) and reflect the marginal productivity of labor. For males we have

$$w_t^M = p_{1,t}b[(1 - \alpha)a/b\kappa_t^\alpha + 1] \quad \text{if} \quad L_{1,t}^p > 0 \quad (10)$$

$$w_t^M = p_{2,t}b \quad \text{if} \quad L_{2,t}^p > 0, \quad (11)$$

which reflects mental and physical labor productivity in the first sector, and only physical labor productivity in the second sector. Similarly, female wage is

$$w_t^F = p_{1,t}(1 - \alpha)a\kappa_t^\alpha \quad \text{if} \quad zn_t < 1, \quad (12)$$

which reflects mental labor productivity in the first sector.

### 2.3.2 Households

Household's maximizing problem yields

$$zn_t = \begin{cases} \gamma(1 + w_t^M/w_t^F) & \text{if } \gamma(1 + w_t^M/w_t^F) \leq 1 \\ 2\gamma & \text{if } 2\gamma \geq 1 \\ 1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

Equation (13) implies that in the case in which  $\gamma \geq 1/2$  women raise children full time regardless of their wages. We rule out this scenario by imposing  $\gamma < 1/2$ . Under this restriction, women raise children full-time only under very high gender wage gaps. But as the gender gap decreases women join the labor force and fertility decreases. When  $w_t^F$  approaches  $w_t^M$ , women spend a fraction  $2\gamma$  of their time raising children. Finally, under  $\gamma < 1/2$  the budget constraint (4) collapses to

$$s_t = (1 - zn_t)w_t^F + w_t^M \quad (14)$$

and (13) becomes

$$zn_t = \min \left\{ \gamma \left( 1 + w_t^M / w_t^F \right), 1 \right\}. \quad (15)$$

## 2.4 Closed Economy

### 2.4.1 Static Equilibrium

The equilibrium of the integrated economy is determined by looking at two regimes separately. The first is a regime in which women do not participate in the formal labor market, and the second is a regime in which women participate. To simplify the analysis, we assume that, in equilibrium, the second sector is too small to accommodate all male labor. Specifically, we assume<sup>14</sup>

$$2 - \alpha \geq 1/\theta \quad (16)$$

to be satisfied throughout the following analysis. Under this assumption,  $L_{1,t}^p > 0$  holds and the ratio of male to female wage can be computed by the marginal productivities in the first sector

$$\frac{w^M}{w^F} = 1 + \frac{b}{(1 - \alpha)a\kappa_t^\alpha}. \quad (17)$$

This ratio determines female labor force participation  $1 - zn_t$  through (15)

$$zn_t = \min \left\{ \gamma \left( 2 + \frac{b}{(1 - \alpha)a\kappa_t^\alpha} \right), 1 \right\}. \quad (18)$$

To determine equilibrium  $\kappa_t$ , combine male wages (10) and (11), prices (7), and the resource constraint for male labor  $1 = l_{1,t} + l_{2,t}$  to get

$$(1 - \alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1 = \frac{1 - \theta}{\theta} \left( \frac{\frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha m_t + l_{1,t}}{1 - l_{1,t}} \right)^{1-\rho}. \quad (19)$$

---

<sup>14</sup>A sufficient condition for  $l_{i,t} > 0$  is that the relative price (7) falls short of the ratio of marginal rates of transformation at  $l_{1,t} = 0$  and  $zn_t = 0$  i.e.  $(1 - \alpha)\kappa_t^\alpha a/b + 1 > (1 - \theta)/\theta (\kappa_t^\alpha a/b)^{1-\rho}$ . If  $\kappa_t^\alpha a/b \geq 1$  then this sufficient condition is implied by  $(1 - \alpha) \geq (1 - \theta)/\theta$ , or (16). If  $\kappa_t^\alpha a/b < 1$  instead, the sufficient condition is implied by  $1 > (1 - \theta)/\theta$  and hence, again, by (16).

Further note that

$$l_{1,t} = m_t - (1 - zn_t) \quad (20)$$

so that equation (19) becomes

$$(1 - \alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1 = \frac{1 - \theta}{\theta} \left( \frac{\frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha m_t + m_t - (1 - zn_t)}{1 - m_t + (1 - zn_t)} \right)^{1-\rho}. \quad (21)$$

Equations (6), (18), and (21) determine  $m_t$  and  $zn_t$  and thus the equilibrium. There are two qualitatively different types of equilibria to distinguish.

**The First Regime**  $zn_t = 1$ . In the case in which  $zn_t = 1$ , equation (21) can be written in terms of  $\kappa_t$  (substitute  $m_t = k_t/\kappa_t$ ):

$$(1 - \alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1 = \frac{1 - \theta}{\theta} \left( \frac{\frac{a}{b} \frac{k_t}{\kappa_t^{1-\alpha}} + \frac{k_t}{\kappa_t}}{1 - \frac{k_t}{\kappa_t}} \right)^{1-\rho}. \quad (22)$$

**The Second Regime**  $zn_t < 1$ . In case in which  $zn_t < 1$  we use  $m_t = k_t/\kappa_t$  and  $zn_t$  from (18) to write (21) as

$$(1 - \alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1 = \frac{1 - \theta}{\theta} \left( \frac{\frac{a}{b} \frac{k_t}{\kappa_t^{1-\alpha}} + \frac{k_t}{\kappa_t} - 1 + \gamma \left( 2 + \frac{b}{a} \frac{\kappa_t^{-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \right)}{1 - \frac{k_t}{\kappa_t} + 1 - \gamma \left( 2 + \frac{b}{a} \frac{\kappa_t^{-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \right)} \right)^{1-\rho}. \quad (23)$$

Equations (22) and (23) determine the equilibrium  $\kappa_t$  in the first and second regime, respectively. Notice that expressions on the left of both equations are increasing in  $\kappa_t$ , while both terms on the right are decreasing in  $\kappa_t$ . This implies that  $\kappa_t$  is unique in both regimes. Moreover, the expressions on the right of (22) and (23) are increasing in  $k_t$  and we can write  $\kappa_t(k_t)$  as an increasing function.

This means that, quite intuitively, a capital-rich economy has a higher capital-mental labor share than a capital-scarce economy. When going back to equation (18), this observation shows also that the higher the capital stock  $k_t$  of an economy, the lower fertility  $zn_t$  is. As  $\kappa_t(k_t)|_{k_t=0} = 0$ , (18) further implies that there is a  $k_o > 0$  so that the economy is in

the first regime when its capital stock falls short of  $k_o$ , while the economy is in the second regime if not. By combining condition  $\gamma(2 + b/[(1 - \alpha)a\kappa_o^\alpha]) = 1$  with equation (22) and  $\kappa_o = k_o/m_o$ , this threshold can be shown to be

$$k_o = \theta(1 - \gamma) \left( 1 - 2\gamma + \gamma \frac{1 - \alpha\theta}{1 - \alpha} \right)^{-1} \left[ \frac{(1 - \alpha)(1 - 2\gamma)}{\gamma} \frac{a}{b} \right]^{-1/\alpha}. \quad (24)$$

At capital stocks below the threshold  $k_o$  all women raise children full-time. When capital is gradually accumulated and this threshold is passed, women integrate into the labor market and, as the variable  $\kappa_t$  keeps increasing, the gender wage gap closes and female labor supply rises. At the same time, and as a mirror image, fertility declines.

These observations regarding the impact of the capital stock on fertility and on female labor force participation bring us to the dynamics of the model.

#### 2.4.2 Dynamics

The dynamics of the model are governed by two endogenous variables: savings  $s_t$  and fertility  $n_t$ . With the notation in per-household terms, the ratio of saving and fertility gives the next period's capital stock, i.e.  $k_{t+1} = s_t/n_t$ . Combining the budget constraint (14) and fertility (15) and distinguishing the two regimes, we can write

$$k_{t+1} = \frac{s_t}{n_t} = \begin{cases} zw_t^M & \text{if } k_t < k_o \\ z^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} w_t^F & \text{if } k_t \geq k_o. \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Equations (10) and (11) give the price ratio

$$\frac{p_{2,t}}{p_{1,t}} = (1 - \alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1 \quad (26)$$



which, combined with the normalization (8), renders the price of the first intermediate good

$$p_{1,t} = \left( \theta^{1/(1-\rho)} + (1-\theta)^{1/(1-\rho)} \left( \frac{1}{(1-\alpha)^{\frac{a}{b}} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1} \right)^{\rho/(1-\rho)} \right)^{(1-\rho)/\rho}.$$

With (10), (12) and (25) we thus have

$$k_{t+1} = \begin{cases} zb \left( \theta^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \left( (1-\alpha)^{\frac{a}{b}} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1 \right)^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} + (1-\theta)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \right)^{\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}} & \text{if } k_t < k_o \\ zb^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} \left( \theta^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \left( (1-\alpha)^{\frac{a}{b}} \kappa_t^\alpha \right)^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} + (1-\theta)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \left( \frac{(1-\alpha)^{\frac{a}{b}} \kappa_t^\alpha}{(1-\alpha)^{\frac{a}{b}} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1} \right)^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} \right)^{\frac{1-\rho}{\rho}} & \text{if } k_t \geq k_o. \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

These expressions show that in both regimes,  $k_{t+1}$  is increasing in  $\kappa_t$  and thus, since  $\kappa_t$  is an increasing function in  $k_t$ , the schedule  $k_{t+1}(k_t)$  of the dynamic system is described by an increasing function.

We can now make two observations, which jointly imply the existence of a steady state under the second regime. First, the variable  $\kappa_t$  determined by (22) or (23) as well as the threshold capital stock (24), are independent of  $z$ . Thus, given that  $z$  is sufficiently large, an economy with per-household capital stock  $k_t = k_o$  from (24) experiences positive capital growth due to capital accumulation (27): its capital stock in period  $t+1$  exceeds its capital stock of the previous period, i.e.  $k_{t+1} > k_t$  holds. Second, as  $k_t$  grows unbounded, the ratio  $\kappa_t/k_t = 1/m_t$  is bounded from above.<sup>15</sup> Thus, dividing the second line on the right hand side of equation (27) by  $k_t$  shows that  $k_{t+1}/k_t$  approaches zero as  $k_t$  grows unbounded. Together, these findings imply that, if  $z$  is sufficiently large, the dynamic system has a steady state in the second regime.

Our knowledge about the dynamics and the steady state of the system is sufficient to tell a simple story about economic development and female labor force participation. In an economy where capital is scarce, female labor force participation is zero. As time passes and per-household capital stock gradually accumulates, the rewards of formal employment for female workers increase relative to rewards for male workers. This closing of the gender wage

---

<sup>15</sup>See Appendix.

gap fosters female labor force participation and curbs fertility. Both effects accelerate per-household capital accumulation, which continues under the second regime up to the point where the economy reaches its steady state.

## 2.5 International Trade

International trade in goods induces specialization at the country level so that countries expand some sectors while contracting others. If, as in the current model, sectors differ in factor intensity, international specialization affects relative factor prices within each country. In the following paragraphs, we explore these effects of trade, particularly its impact on the gender wage gap and hence on fertility and female labor force participation.

We assume that the world consists of two countries, Home (no \*) and Foreign (\*). In addition, the superscript <sup>A</sup> indicates autarky variables, while its absence indicates variables of the free trade equilibrium. Moreover, we denote the relative price of the two goods by  $\pi_t = p_{2,t}/p_{1,t}$ , the ratio of male to female wage by  $\omega_t = w_t^M/w_t^F$ , and the relative population size of Foreign to Home by  $\lambda_t = L_t^*/L_t$ . Without loss of generality Home will represent the capital scarce and Foreign the capital abundant country, i.e., we assume that  $k_t < k_t^*$  for the initial period  $t$ . For later use, we define the set of all possible factor distributions in a world as:

$$FD_t = \{(\lambda_t, k_t, k_t^*) \mid \lambda_t \in [0, \infty]; k_t, k_t^* \geq 0 \text{ and } (k_t + \lambda_t k_t^*)/(1 + \lambda_t) = \bar{k}_t\}, \quad (28)$$

where  $\bar{k}_t$  is the average per household capital stock of the world economy.

### 2.5.1 Factor Price Equalization

A good starting point for analysis of the free trade equilibrium is the Factor Price Equalization Set

$$FPES_t = \{(\lambda_t, k_t, k_t^*) \in FD_t \mid w^M = w^{*,M}, w^F = w^{*,F}, r^F = r^*\}. \quad (29)$$

(Remember that the absence of superscript <sup>A</sup> indicates equilibrium variables under free trade – *e.g.* at  $w^M$ ,  $w^{*,M}$  etc.) Among all possible distributions of factors across countries, the  $FPES_t$  comprises those that lead to free trade equilibria characterized by identical factor prices across countries. In terms of prices and output, these equilibria then replicate the equilibrium of an integrated world economy where factors are not restricted by national borders.<sup>16</sup> Thus, the  $FPES_t$  describes the conditions on factor distributions under which borders do not affect the world efficiency frontier. Loosely conceptualized, a factor allocation is an element of the  $FPES_t$  if relative factors are distributed “not too unevenly”.

The following proposition conveniently characterizes the  $FPES_t$  of the present model.

### Proposition 1

*Factor prices equalize if and only if  $\kappa_t^* = \kappa_t$ .*

**Proof.** See Appendix. ■

The proposition shows that  $\kappa_t = \kappa_t^*$  implies  $\omega_t = \omega_t^*$ , a regime in which fertility, determined by (15), equalizes in both countries:  $zn_t = zn_t^* = z\bar{n}_t$ .<sup>17</sup> Combined with  $\kappa_t = \kappa_t^* = \bar{\kappa}_t$  this leads to:

$$\bar{\kappa}_t = \frac{k_t}{l_{1,t} + 1 - z\bar{n}_t} = \frac{k_t^*}{l_{1,t}^* + 1 - z\bar{n}_t}. \quad (30)$$

By the definition of the  $FPES_t$ ,  $\bar{\kappa}_t$  and  $\bar{n}_t$  are also the capital-mental labor ratio and fertility of the integrated world economy. The constraints  $l_{1,t}, l_{2,t}^* \in [0, 1]$  lead to a restriction on capital stock conditions for factor price equalization:

$$(1 - z\bar{n}_t)\bar{\kappa}_t \leq k_t, k_t^* \leq (2 - z\bar{n}_t)\bar{\kappa}_t \quad (31)$$

by the resource constraint. Capital stocks of both countries must add up to the aggregate world capital stock, i.e.,  $\bar{k}_t = (k_t + \lambda_t k_t^*) / (1 + \lambda_t)$ . Thus, the  $FPES_t$  is described by (31)

---

<sup>16</sup>If the equilibrium of the integrated economy is replicated, factors in all countries must equalize. Conversely, if factor and good prices equalize in both countries, the world equilibrium is an equilibrium of the integrated economy.

<sup>17</sup>Upper bars indicate variables of the integrated economy.

and

$$k_t = (1 + \lambda_t)\bar{k}_t - \lambda_t k_t^*. \quad (32)$$

Using the concise graphical representation from Helpman and Krugman (1985), Figure 2 illustrates the  $FPES_t$ . Each point  $A$  on the plane represents a partition of world labor and world capital: the distance between the vertical axis and  $A$  represents Home's male labor  $L_t$ , while the distance between the horizontal axis and  $A$  represents Home's capital  $K_t$ ; Foreign's variables are  $L_t^* = \bar{L}_t - L_t$  and  $K_t^* = \bar{K}_t - K_t$ , respectively. Since female labor shares are determined by the wage gap and hence by factor prices only, factor price equalization implies that female labor shares equalize in both countries. Thus, in the case where global female labor shares are positive, Home must hold a minimum level of capital to keep  $X_1$ -production operating and generate jobs in this sector. This case is illustrated in the top panel of Figure 2. If, instead, global female labor shares are zero, Home may in fact entirely lack capital. By fully specializing on  $X_2$ -production, Home's factor prices may still equalize with Foreign's. In this case, which is illustrated by the bottom panel of Figure 2, the equilibrium of the integrated economy is replicated and the world economy is at its efficiency frontier.

We can now readily determine the specialization pattern of both economies under the assumption that factor prices equalize. Recalling assumption  $k_t < k_t^*$ , we observe:

$$m_t = k_t/\bar{k}_t < k_t^*/\bar{k}_t = m_t^*,$$

while

$$l_{2,t} = 1 - [m_t - (1 - z\bar{n}_t)] > 1 - [m_t^* - (1 - z\bar{n}_t)] = l_{2,t}^*.$$

Confirming Heckscher-Ohlin-based intuition, the capital scarce Home country specializes in production of the labor intensive good,  $X_2$ , while capital abundant Foreign specializes in  $X_1$ -production.

We can further compare the trade equilibrium with the respective autarky equilibria: notice that  $1 - z\bar{n}_t \leq m_t < m_t^*$  implies  $l_{1,t}^* > 0$  so that  $\omega_t^* = 1 + b/(a(1 - \alpha))\bar{k}_t^{-\alpha}$  and (18)

applies for Foreign. As  $\omega_t^* = \omega_t$  and since  $\kappa_t(k_t)$  is an increasing function, we use (18) again to conclude:

$$zn_t^A \geq z\bar{n}_t \geq zn_t^{*,A}.$$

These inequalities are strict if  $1 > zn_t^A$  holds. Consequently, relative to autarky, trade increases female labor force participation in the capital scarce country and decreases it in the capital abundant country.

Both observations combined imply that the country which, by international specialization, *contracts* the sector that is particularly suitable for female labor, experiences an *increase* in female labor force participation. Conversely, the country which *expands* the sector suitable for female labor, experiences a *decrease* in female labor force participation.

The reason for this seemingly paradoxical finding is the following. For each economy, the key determinant of female labor force participation is the wage gap  $\omega_t^{(*)}$ . In autarky and under factor price equalization, this wage gap is determined by the relative productivities in the  $X_1$ -sector via (18) and ultimately by the capital-mental labor ratio  $\kappa_t^{(*)}$ . When international specialization induces Home to contract its  $X_1$ -sector and expand its  $X_2$ -sector, male workers move from the first to the second sector, taking their mental labor with them. Thus, they increase the ratio  $\kappa_t$  and hence female labor force participation  $(1 - zn_t)$ . Conversely, when Foreign workers react to trade-induced international price shifts and move from the second to the first sector, they dilute the capital-mental labor share  $\kappa_t^*$ , which increases the wage gap and decreases female labor force participation.<sup>18</sup>

In sum, under factor price equalization, we get sharp results on the impact of trade on female labor force participation in the capital scarce and abundant countries, respectively.

---

<sup>18</sup>The effect of relative productivities on the gender wage gap, which is the core of our mechanism operates under substantial generalizations. If  $F(K, M, L)$  represents a standard constant return to scale production function in the first sector, it is sufficient to assume that capital  $K$  complements mental labor  $M$  relatively more than physical labor  $L$  (*i.e.* ,  $F_{KM}/F_M > F_{KL}/F_L \geq 0$ , in line with Goldin (1990)) in order to generate the effect discussed. In particular, under these conditions, higher male employment in the first sector increases the gender wage gap.

The key mechanism for the result described above, however, depends on the fact that the wage gap is a function of only the capital-mental labor ratio  $\kappa_t^{(*)}$ . It may occur to the reader that international trade can induce male workers of one country to entirely abandon the first sector, while, at the same time, factor prices and the wage gap in particular do not equalize in both countries. If this is the case, the one-to-one relationship between  $\kappa_t$  and  $zn_t$  described by (18) does not hold and the mechanism described above ceases to apply. Consequently, our results under factor price equalization cannot be expected to hold under each and every factor distribution  $(\lambda_t, k_t, k_t^*) \in FD_t$ . The extent to which they generalize beyond factor price equalization is the subject of the next subsection.

### 2.5.2 Beyond Factor Price Equalization

Let us begin the general case of international trade by focusing on one country, for example, Home, with exogenous relative world prices  $\pi_t$  – i.e., assume, for the moment, Home to be a small open economy. For this exercise, we abandon Home’s role as the capital scarce country. When world prices coincide with Home’s autarky price  $\pi_t^A$ , we have  $l_{1,t}, l_{2,t} > 0$ , as argued in the case of the closed economy. Thus, by wages (10), (11), and (12) we find that:

$$\omega_t = \pi_t \frac{b/a}{1-\alpha} \kappa_t^{-\alpha} \quad (33)$$

$$\pi_t = (1-\alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1 \quad (34)$$

hold for  $\pi_t$  in a small neighborhood of  $\pi_t^A$ . Combine (33) and (34) to verify that in this neighborhood, the wage gap

$$\omega_t = \frac{\pi_t}{\pi_t - 1} \quad (35)$$

is decreasing in  $\pi_t$  and  $zn_t$  is also decreasing by (15). Since  $\kappa_t$  is increasing in  $\pi_t$  by (34),  $m_t = l_{1,t} + 1 - zn_t$  must be decreasing in  $\pi_t$ , which finally means that  $l_{1,t}$  is decreasing in  $\pi_t$ . These relations hold as long as  $l_{1,t}, l_{2,t} > 0$  apply. Thus, by the constraints  $l_{1,t} \in [0, 1]$ , there are thresholds  $\underline{\pi}$  and  $\bar{\pi}$  with  $\underline{\pi} < \pi_t^A < \bar{\pi}$  so that for  $\pi_t < \underline{\pi}$ , we have  $l_{1,t} = 1$  and  $\kappa_t$  as well

as the wage gap  $\omega_t$  defined by (17) are constant. Conversely, for  $\pi_t > \bar{\pi}$ , we have  $l_{1,t} = 0$  in which case (33) holds and  $\kappa_t = k_t/(1 - zn_t)$  and (15) imply:

$$\frac{\omega_t}{(1 - \gamma(1 + \omega_t))^\alpha} = \pi_t \frac{b/a}{1 - \alpha} k_t^{-\alpha}. \quad (36)$$

This equation defines  $\omega_t$  as an increasing function of  $\pi_t$ . Finally, at  $\pi_t \rightarrow \infty$  equation (36) implies  $\omega_t \rightarrow (1 - \gamma)/\gamma$ .

Figure 3 summarizes these findings of the function  $\omega_t(\pi_t)$ . For small  $\pi_t$ , the wage gap  $\omega_t$  is constant. For the intermediate range  $\pi_t \in (\underline{\pi}, \bar{\pi})$ , the wage gap  $\omega_t(\pi_t)$  is decreasing but for  $\pi_t > \bar{\pi}$  it is increasing. By the generic relation (15), these swings in  $\omega_t$  are paralleled by swings in  $zn_t$ .

Now consider the Home economy facing relative world prices  $\pi_t < \pi_t^A$ . This means that, relative to autarky, the wage gap  $\omega_t$  increases and, hence, fertility  $n_t$  rises while female labor participation  $(1 - zn_t)$  drops. At the same time trade expands the  $X_1$ -sector and contracts the  $X_2$ -sector.<sup>19</sup> If, instead,  $\pi_t > \pi_t^A$ , there are two possible outcomes. First, if  $\pi_t$  is not too large, then the effect of trade is a reduction in the wage gap  $\omega_t$  and thus a decrease in fertility  $n_t$  and an increase in female labor force participation  $(1 - zn_t)$ . Second, if  $\pi_t$  is sufficiently large, then trade induces an increase in  $\omega_t$  and  $n_t$  and a decrease in  $(1 - zn_t)$ . In Figure 3, the threshold that separates the two cases is labeled  $\pi_u$ . In either case, trade contracts the  $X_1$ -sector and expands the  $X_2$ -sector.<sup>20</sup>

Now, return to the trade equilibrium between capital scarce Home and capital abundant Foreign. The autarky prices of both countries satisfy (34), implying  $\pi_t^A < \pi_t^{*,A}$ , while the

---

<sup>19</sup>To see this, notice that  $\pi_t < \pi_t^A$  implies  $l_{1,t} > l_{1,t}^A$  and, as (34) holds,  $\kappa_t < \kappa_t^A$ . This, in turn leads to  $m_t > m_t^A$  so that total output in the first sector  $ak_t^\alpha m_t^{1-\alpha} + bl_{1,t}$  rises relative to autarky. Output of the second sector  $b(1 - l_{1,t})$  drops.

<sup>20</sup>Observe that  $\pi_t > \pi_t^A$  implies  $l_{1,t} < l_{1,t}^A$  so output in the second sector  $b(1 - l_{1,t})$  expands in both cases. Further, for  $\pi_t < \bar{\pi}$  (34) holds, implying  $\kappa_t > \kappa_t^A$  or  $m_t < m_t^A$ . Any increase in  $\pi_t$  above  $\bar{\pi}$  reduces female labor  $1 - zn_t$  while  $l_{1,t} = 0$  continues to hold. Thus,  $m_t < m_t^A$  in this range, too. Together, this means that output in the first sector  $ak_t^\alpha m_t^{1-\alpha} + bl_{1,t}$  falls.

world price under free trade  $\pi_t$  must lie between the respective autarky prices:

$$\pi_t^A \leq \pi_t \leq \pi_t^{*,A}. \quad (37)$$

Thus, trade (weakly) increases relative prices  $\pi_t$  in Home while it (weakly) decreases them in Foreign. With this observation, we can apply the insights of the analysis above. For capital abundant Foreign, trade unambiguously causes a (weak) increase in the wage gap  $\omega_t$  and thus a drop in female labor force participation. We can therefore generalize the first part of our result derived under factor price equalization. The country which, by international specialization, expands the sector suitable for female employment experiences a decrease in female labor force participation.

For capital scarce Home, however, trade induces a decrease in the wage gap  $\omega_t$  and an increase in female labor force participation if and only if  $\pi_t$  is not too high (i.e.,  $\pi_t \leq \pi_u$  holds). In this restricted case, we recover the second part of the result derived under factor price equalization. The country which contracts the sector suitable for female labor experiences an increase in female labor force participation.

This second observation is a non-trivial generalization of the parallel result under factor price equalization. To verify this statement, use that under free trade  $l_{1,t}^* > 0$  and  $l_{2,t} > 0$  hold so that, by (10) and (11)

$$(1 - \alpha) \frac{a}{b} (\kappa_t^*)^\alpha + 1 \geq \pi_t \geq (1 - \alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1 \quad (38)$$

holds. Proposition 1, however, states that factor price equalization requires  $\kappa_t = \kappa_t^*$ , implying  $\pi_t = (1 - \alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1$ . By construction of  $\bar{\pi}$ , however, all world equilibria with  $\pi_t \in (\bar{\pi}, \pi_u)$  are characterized by equality  $\pi_t > (1 - \alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1$ , implying that factor prices do not equalize. Since finally, by construction of  $\pi_u$  we have  $\omega_t > \omega_t^A$  for all equilibria with  $\pi_t \in (\bar{\pi}, \pi_u)$  we conclude that trade induces an increase of female labor force participation in Home for a set of factor endowments that is strictly larger than the  $FPES_t$ .



Summarizing, we use the definitions (28) and (29) to state the following proposition.<sup>21</sup>

**Proposition 2**

(i) *In Foreign, trade expands the sector that uses female labor intensively, but unambiguously reduces female labor force participation.*

(ii) *There is a set  $S_t \subset FD_t$  with  $FPES_t \subsetneq S_t$  and the following property: for each element of  $S_t$  trade contracts the sector that uses female labor intensively in Home, but increases Home's female labor force participation.*

**2.5.3 Dynamics under Trade**

The dynamics of the model under free trade are again driven by two key variables, savings  $s_t$  and fertility  $n_t$ . Per-household capital stocks of either country follow the generic dynamic system equivalent to (25), now expanded to:

$$k_{t+1}^{(*)} = \begin{cases} zw_t^{M,(*)} & \text{if } zn_t^{(*)} = 1 \\ z^{\frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma}} w_t^{F,(*)} & \text{if } zn_t^{(*)} < 1 \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

To calculate the respective wages (10) - (12), we can use the final good normalization (8) and the definition of  $\pi_t$  to derive:

$$p_{1,t} = \left( \theta^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} + (1-\theta)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \pi_t^{\frac{-\rho}{1-\rho}} \right)^{(1-\rho)/\rho} \quad \text{and} \quad p_{2,t} = \left( \theta^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \pi_t^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} + (1-\theta)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \right)^{(1-\rho)/\rho} \quad (40)$$

These defined wages and dynamic system, (39), give rise to the following observations

**Proposition 3**

(i)  $zn_t^* \leq zn_t$ .

(ii)  $k_{t+1}^* \geq k_{t+1}$ .

---

<sup>21</sup>As shown in earlier versions of this paper, assuming that physical capital and metal labor are production factors of  $X_2$  does not change our results. Also the additivity of physical capital in equation 2 is not crucial for our mechanism to hold.

(iii) If  $\alpha(\theta/(1-\theta))^{\frac{-1}{1-\rho}} \geq (1-2\gamma)/\gamma$  holds then  $k_{t+1} \geq k_{t+1}^A$ .

(iv)  $k_{t+1}^*/k_{t+1} \leq k_{t+1}^{*,A}/k_{t+1}^A$ .

**Proof.** See Appendix. ■

Proposition 3 (i) and (ii) show that trade cannot reverse the order of countries regarding population growth or capital abundance. The capital rich country has always weakly lower fertility rates, higher female labor force participation and faster pace of per-household capital accumulation.

Proposition 3 (iii) shows that, if the first sector is sufficiently large (i.e.,  $1-\theta$  is sufficiently small), trade unambiguously accelerates the pace of capital accumulation in the capital scarce country. It is worth emphasizing that this result also holds in the case where world prices  $\pi_t$  are very large and all men in Home work in the  $X_2$ -sector while female labor participation drops relative to autarky ( $\pi_t > \pi_u$  in Figure 3). Even in this case, where a reduced female labor force participation depresses savings and increased population growth dilutes the following period's per household capital stock, the gains from trade are sufficient to grant a net increase in per-household capital accumulation relative to autarky. We cannot, however, make a parallel statement for the capital rich economy, for which the effect of trade on capital accumulation is ambiguous. Indeed, it can be shown that for capital accumulation in the rich economy, the positive forces stemming from the gains of trade might either dominate or be dominated by the adverse effect of reduced female labor force participation and higher fertility.

Finally, Proposition 3 (iv) makes a relative statement about the countries' capital accumulation. Trade cannot accelerate capital accumulation in the rich country by more than it accelerates it in the poor country. In particular, the proposition thus shows that trade spurs convergence of per-household capital stocks. At the same time, using Proposition 3 (ii) and (iv), a simple induction argument leads to  $k_{t+\tau}^*/k_{t+\tau} \leq k_{t+\tau}^{*,A}/k_{t+\tau}^A$  for all  $\tau \geq 0$  and hence:

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} k_t = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} k_t^* = \tilde{k}.$$

Since in the limit, factor endowments between countries equalize, the motives to trade disappear. Consequently, the limit  $\tilde{k}$  is equal to the limit of the closed economy:  $\tilde{k} = k$ , where  $k$  is the steady state capital stock of the closed economy.

In sum, Proposition 3, shows that in transition to an economy's steady state, international trade fosters convergence in fertility, labor force participation, and per-household capital stocks. The steady state itself, in turn, does not differ from the one in autarky. Consequently, the integration of global goods markets has no effects in the very long run, as trade flows and their impact on female labor force participation disappear. This latter result of quasi-autarkic steady states is an artifact of our pure Heckscher-Ohlin environment and should not be stressed further. Thus, when productivity parameters in equation (2) are country-specific, Ricardian motives to trade arise and trade volumes are positive in the steady state as well. Consequently, long-run effects of openness on female labor shares will materialize in such a modified setup.

## 2.6 Technological Progress

The reduction in the gender wage gap is often attributed to technological change. Thus, Welch (2000), Gosling (2003) and Black and Spitz-Oener (2010) argue that the increase in the market price for women's labor was brought about by a relative increase in the valuation of skill (mental labor endowments), which is, at least in part, explained by technological change. Galor and Weil (1996) show how technological change can eliminate poverty traps, characterized by high fertility, low female labor force participation and low per-household capital stocks. They argue that "technological progress will eventually eliminate such a development trap, leading to a period of rapid output growth and a rapid fertility transition" (p. 383).

Another popular hypothesis rests on demand shifts in favor of goods whose production is more intensive in skill or, more generally, in female labor inputs. The mechanism outlined above, in which, male workers searching for the highest return to their labor crowd out women

in the labor market sheds some doubt on the generality of these pro-growth effects. Indeed, we show next that the effect that leads to a decrease in female labor force participation and an increase in fertility in response to the expansion of the females' comparative advantage sector operates under technological change and shifts in demand as well.

For the formal analysis of technological change and demand shifts, we return to the closed economy. To incorporate technological change biased towards the sectors that generate demand for female labor, we rewrite the production functions (2) as:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= \mu [aK_t^\alpha (L_t^m)^{1-\alpha} + bL_{1,t}^p] \\ X_2 &= bL_{2,t}^p \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

so that growth of the parameter  $\mu \geq 1$  mimics technological progress that is biased towards the first sector. As a result of incorporating  $\mu$  into our framework (23) becomes<sup>22</sup>

$$\frac{\theta}{1-\theta} \mu^\rho \left[ (1-\alpha) \frac{a}{b} \kappa_t^\alpha + 1 \right] = \left( \frac{\frac{a}{b} \frac{k_t}{\kappa_t^{1-\alpha}} + \frac{k_t}{\kappa_t} - 1 + \gamma \left( 2 + \frac{b}{a} \frac{\kappa_t^{-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \right)}{1 - \frac{k_t}{\kappa_t} + 1 - \gamma \left( 2 + \frac{b}{a} \frac{\kappa_t^{-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \right)} \right)^{1-\rho} \tag{42}$$

While the right hand side of (42) is decreasing in  $\kappa_t$ , the left hand side of (42) is increasing in  $\kappa_t$  and in  $\mu$ , for  $\rho \in (0, 1)$ . This implies that an increase in  $\mu$  decreases the equilibrium level of  $\kappa_t$ , which, in turn, decreases female's productivity relative to male productivity, widens the gender wage gap and curbs female labor force participation.

After reading the previous subsections, the intuition for this result is straightforward. An increase in  $\mu$  increases male productivity in the first sector relative to the second sector. As long as the elasticity of substitution between  $X_1$  and  $X_2$  is greater than one, the relative price  $\pi$  decreases but the decrease is less than the increase in  $\mu$ . As a result, male wage increases in the first sector, inducing male workers to move from the second sector to the first sector. This increases male labor employed in the first sector and dilutes  $\kappa$  so that

---

<sup>22</sup>Under  $\mu \geq 1$  condition (16) is sufficient for  $l_{1,t}^p > 0$  to hold, i.e., male employment in the first sector is positive.

women’s relative productivity declines, driving women out of formal employment into the child-rearing.

A similar mechanism applies under demand shifts towards the first good, equivalent to an increase in the parameter  $\theta$  (compare (1)). Again, equation (42) shows that an increase in  $\theta$  is followed by a decrease in  $\kappa_t$ , which curbs women’s productivity by more than men’s, widens the wage gap and thus decreases female labor force participation while fostering fertility.

Thus, our model shows that neither a technological change biased towards sectors with a high demand for female labor nor demand shift towards goods of these sectors necessarily generates increases in female labor participation. The resulting increase in fertility generally counters the pro-growth effects.

### 3 Empirical Evidence

Our theory predicts an asymmetric impact of trade liberalization on the labor markets of capital rich and capital scarce economies: while trade lowers female labor force participation in the former, it tends to increase it in the latter. We like to think of our theory in the context of long run growth and frame it with a model of demographic transition. In light of data limitations, however, we choose to test the predictions through the surge in U.S.-Mexican trade during the period 1990–2007, a period of trade liberalization, which we simply label the “NAFTA episode” in the following<sup>23</sup>.

The choice of the NAFTA episode has a number of virtues. First, the U.S. and Mexico are paradigmatic for a pair of capital rich and capital poor economies, for which our theory applies.<sup>24</sup> As a second advantage of the NAFTA episode, U.S.-Mexican trade experienced

---

<sup>23</sup>This label is misleading to the extent that not all of the increase in US-Mexican trade is attributed to tariff reductions of NAFTA. In fact, Krueger (1999) puts forward that Mexico’s unilateral tariff reduction in the late 1980s and its abandoning of the exchange rate peg explains the larger part of the increase in trade volumes. For the purpose of our test, however, this observation is of minor importance. We are only concerned about identifying an episode of substantial increase in trade volumes.

<sup>24</sup>Capital stocks per worker can be calculated from real investment data as in PWT6.2. At depreciation

a substantial growth during that period: U.S. trade with Mexico as a share of U.S. GDP increased by more than a factor of 3 between 1990 and 2007, while Mexico's share in U.S. total trade rose by more than a factor of 2 (Figure 4). Via this substantial increase of bilateral trade volumes we hope to identify a sizable impact of trade on labor markets. Third, the choice of the NAFTA episode allows us to take advantage of the high quality of U.S. trade and labor market data. In particular, we can exploit exposure to trade with Mexico on a U.S. state level. Finally, due to the specific geographical constellation, U.S. trade with Mexico is particularly uneven across U.S. states, which allows us to use distance as a powerful instrument for a change in trade volumes and thus establish causality running from change in trade to change in female labor share.

### 3.1 Data

We rely on three different data sources. First, we use data from the March Current Population Survey conducted by the Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS-CPS).<sup>25</sup> From (IPUMS-CPS) we take the variables age, sex, marital status, population status (to distinguish between civilian or Armed Forces), nativity (to identify immigrants), location (state), Hispanic origin (to identify Mexicans), educational attainment, employment status (to compute the formal employment share) weeks worked and usual hours worked (to compute total hours worked). Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for female and male labor for the years 1990/91 and 2006/07. As is visible in Table 1, while female labor force participation has increased, male labor force participation has decreased during the NAFTA episode. Second, we use the "Origin of Movement" database administered by WISER,<sup>26</sup> which covers export data by state and destination country from 1988 onward. These data are disaggregated by good categories (SIC from 1988 to 2000; NAICS from 1997 onward).

---

rates between .01 and .1, the relative capital stock of the U.S. in 2003 exceeds the one of Mexico by a factor of four. Consistent with our theory, the female labor share in the U.S. ranged from 43.1 to 46.3 between 1985 and 2006 while the according range for Mexico is 29.4 to 35.3 (United Nations Statistics Division).

<sup>25</sup>King, Ruggles, Alexander, Leicach and Sobek (2009).

<sup>26</sup>World Institute for Strategic Economic Research; data available under <http://www.wisertrade.org>. Cassey (2006) gives a good introduction to the data and their limitations.

Third, we use the Bureau of Economic Analysis for GDP by state data.<sup>27</sup>

### 3.2 The Empirical Model

In our empirical exercise we concentrate on one side of our theory and aim at identifying the effect of trade on the U.S. labor market (the capital rich economy). More precisely, we exploit the variation of U.S.-Mexican trade across different U.S. states to identify the differential impact of trade on female labor shares across states.<sup>28</sup> According to our theory, a higher exposure to trade with Mexico induces lower female labor force participation in the different U.S. states. Analyzing this relation on the state level, our reduced form model takes the following form

$$y_{st} = \delta_s + \alpha t + \beta Trade_{st} + X'_{st}\gamma + u_{st} \quad (43)$$

where  $s$  indicates U.S. states and  $t$  periods. The dependent variable  $y_{st}$  is the female labor share,  $Trade_{st}$  is trade volume per output and  $\delta_s$  denotes a full set of state dummies. Apart from a time-trend we control for a vector of covariates  $X'_{st}$  chosen by economic intuition but unrelated to our theoretical model. Our initial period is 1990-1, denoted by  $t = 0$ , while the end period is 2006-7, denoted by  $t = 1$ .<sup>29</sup>

Taking differences eliminates the state fixed effects and the empirical model (43) becomes

$$\Delta y_s = \alpha + \beta \Delta Trade_s + \Delta X'_s \gamma + u_{s1} - u_{s0} \quad (44)$$

---

<sup>27</sup>Data available under <http://bea.doc.gov/regional/>.

<sup>28</sup>The focus on U.S. states as economic entities may seem problematic since state borders are not relevant restrictions for the labor. This drawback, however, implies that inter-state labor migration can eliminate differences in the wage gap and female labor force participation across states, which tends to eliminate the differential effects of trade across states. Thus, no differential effect of trade on female labor shares across states can be expected as long as the U.S. labor market works frictionless. We nevertheless expect to capture labor markets effects to the extent that frictions of labor movement related to geographical distance impede a full equalization of factor prices across U.S. states.

<sup>29</sup>This time window is determined by availability of trade data. The data set includes entries for the years 1988/89 but these are of minor quality.

where for any variable  $z_{st}$  the notation  $\Delta z_s$  indicates the change over time ( $\Delta z_s = z_{s1} - z_{s0}$ ). Our theory predicts that the estimate of  $\beta$  in (44) is negative.

Concerned with the possibility that labor market conditions in the U.S. can constitute a form of comparative advantage and thus drive trade volumes, we slightly modify the gravity equation of the trade literature and instrument  $Trade_{st}$  by distance to Mexico.<sup>30</sup> Thus, our first stage regression is:

$$Trade_{st} = \varrho_s + \mu t + \theta d_{st} + X'_{st} \rho + \nu_{st} \quad (45)$$

where  $\varrho_s$  denotes a full set of state dummies and  $d_s$  is distance of state  $s$  to Mexico. By taking differences our first stage regression becomes:

$$\Delta Trade_s = \mu + \theta d_s + \Delta X'_s \rho + \nu_{s1} - \nu_{s0} \quad (46)$$

Figure 5 illustrates that distance is strongly correlated with the increase in trade share, satisfying a first necessary condition for being a valid instrument.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup>More precisely, we regress trade volume as a percentage of GSP on spherical distance of U.S. state-capitals to Mexico City, while the standard gravity equation estimates the log of bilateral trade volume on the log of GDP, spherical distance and other variables. Our justification is the fit of the data. For a more elaborate and elegant way for instrumenting trade with distance see Feyrer (2009).

<sup>31</sup>By our identifying assumption, distance to Mexico does not impact the change in female labor shares across U.S. states through other channels than bilateral trade. To lend support to this assumption we examine the quality of distance as an instrument by comparing its explanatory power for the change in female labor force participation in two different periods: first, 1990–2000, in which we observe a substantial increase in U.S.-Mexican trade; and second, 1960–1970, in which U.S.-Mexican trade was stagnant, which we simply label the “pre-NAFTA episode” (Figure 4). To this end, we employ the 1 percent Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (IPUMS-USA) of the decennial censuses data (Ruggles, Sobek, Alexander, Fitch, Goeken, Kelly Hall, King and Ronnander (2009)). This source provides us with employment data for men and women for the years 1950, 1960 and 1970 for the pre-NAFTA period, and 1980, 1990 and 2000 for the NAFTA period. Table A-1 (see Appendix) summarizes these reduced form regressions of change in female labor force participation directly on distance in the two episodes and shows that during the NAFTA period the coefficient of distance is positive and significant while in the pre-NAFTA period is negative and sometimes insignificant, which is consistent with our story.



### 3.3 Control Variables

To control for differential business cycle effects across states we include log per capita “Gross State Product” (GSP) and the unemployment rate. We also control for average education level for females, which is positively correlated with female labor share.<sup>32</sup> Further, we include the share of Mexican immigrants, which might either depress female labor participation – *e.g.* due to cultural differences reducing gender labor market participations<sup>33</sup> – or else increase female labor participation – *e.g.* by increasing supply of nannies and private child-care. We have no strong prior on the sign of this latter control variable.

The secular trend towards higher female labor force participation together with the fact that it is naturally bounded from above implies that female labor force participation converges across states. Hence, the initial level of female labor share is highly correlated its their changes. To account for this convergence effect, we include initial level of female labor force participation in the controls when estimating (44). A problem with this control variable, however, is that it is correlated with the error term  $u_{i1} - u_{i2}$  in (44) through equation (43), wherefore we instrument it with lagged female labor participation (values from 1980/81).

### 3.4 Regression Results

For our baseline specification we define female labor participation as the share of hours worked by females. Taking this share is not a strict necessity but it eliminates labor market shocks that are common to both sexes. In all our specifications labor force is defined as the total of individuals aged between 16 and 65, excluding members of the Armed Forces. We further define exposure to trade as twice the state exports to Mexico over GSP. The

---

<sup>32</sup>We define two categories of education. First, educated individuals who have at least some college and for whom we assign a weight of 1. Second, uneducated individuals who are at most high school graduates and for whom we assign a weight of 0. The education level of a state is defined as the average of individual weights.

<sup>33</sup>On a national level, this concern seems unsubstantiated: national averages of female hours worked as percentage of male hours worked of Mexicans exceed the according numbers of the full sample by 0.5% to 1.9% between 1990 and 2007.

restriction to exports is due to the fact that import data per state are not available.<sup>34</sup> Distance is spherical distance from state-capitals to Mexico City.

Table 2 reports the results of our baseline regression. Column 1 reports a simple OLS regression of our dependent variable: change in female labor share on an initial level of female labor share, which we take it to be the average of 1980 and 1981 and the change in trade with Mexico. Our focus, however, lies on the remaining five columns that summarize IV estimates, where the change in trade is instrumented by distance. Column 2 reports estimates without controls, column 3 includes average female labor share of 1990 and 1991, which is instrumented by the average values of 1980 and 1981; column 4 includes the differences of log per capita GSP and unemployment share; column 5 includes differences in female education share and column 6 includes change in Mexican immigration share.

The coefficient of our interest is the one on change in trade with Mexico ( $\beta$ ). All of its estimates have the expected negative sign and are significant on the one percent confidence level. Column 3, indicates that a one percent increase in trade share with Mexico (as experienced by Arizona) decreases the female relative to male labor share by around 1.5 percent. The coefficient on the initial level of female labor share is negative and significant, as predicted by convergence forces.<sup>35</sup>

### 3.5 Robustness

We next conduct some robustness check for the results obtained in the baseline regression (column 3 in Table 2). First, we exclude Texas as well as Alaska and Hawaii from the sample since these states appear to be outliers in terms of distance (see Figure 5), and hence in predicted trade shares. Table 3 summarizes the corresponding results in the first three columns. The exclusions do not affect the general picture: the impact of trade share with

---

<sup>34</sup>We assume that import equalizes export in order to reveal, quantitatively, a more realistic coefficient of trade on female labor share.

<sup>35</sup>Table 2 shows that the OLS estimate is larger than IV estimate. One possible interpretation from this difference, which is consistent with our theory is that higher female labor force participation induces a higher relative advantage in the capital intensive sector which implies higher international specialization and trade.

Mexico remains negative and significant at the 1% level (5% in column 3).

We are also concerned about our definition of trade shares, since Cassey (2006) reports that export data exhibit systematic differences between “origin of movement definition” and “origin of production.” Since these errors are substantial in the agricultural and mining sectors only, we replace total export over GSP per state by the according manufacturing export percentages. Column 4 in Table 3 shows that our concerns are unsubstantiated: the estimates are still significant at the 1% level and estimated magnitudes are very similar.

In trade literature the standard measure for distance is the spherical one (spherical distance between capitals). We check whether our results depend on the choice of distance and replace it by ground distance to the Mexican border (column 5 in Table 3).<sup>36</sup> Results show that neither the point estimates nor the significance level are affected.

Since our theory rests on the within household optimization, it seems appropriate to restrict our sample to married individuals only. Column 6 in Table 3 shows that the point estimates and the significance remain in the same range (5% level).

Next we replace the definition of our dependent variable from share of hours to relative employment. This obviously eliminates the important intensive margin of individuals’ labor market participation. Column 7 in Table 3 shows that the estimates are significant at the 5% level.

Our theory suggests that trade-induced specialization reduces female labor force participation in capital rich country while making male workers merely change sectors. Consequently, we need to check that our results above are driven by changes in female employment only. We do so by investigating the impact of trade on female and male working hours separately. Average female hours per week are 22.77 (standard deviation across states is 1.92) in 1990/1991 and 24.24 (1.84) in 2006/2007. The according numbers for male are 32.92 (1.89) and 32.2 (1.81), respectively (Table 1). These regressions are summarized in Table A-2.<sup>37</sup> While all point estimates of the coefficient on change in trade share with Mexico are

---

<sup>36</sup>Ground distance is measured in time and derived from maps.google.com.

<sup>37</sup>Column 2, 4, 6 and 8 in Table A-2 show that using population weight to unravel the impact of change in

negative and significant for females, trade, overall, does not significantly impact male hours: estimates are insignificant, positive and around zero.

Finally, to eliminate the possibility that the estimated effects stem from the low skill sectors only we limit our sample to highly educated individuals and find that our results still hold.

Moreover, our theory suggests that female labor force participation drops due to the decrease in the relative price of mental labor, which, in turn, can be associated with higher education. Accordingly, we examine the impact of trade on female and male working hours for the skilled population. We define skilled individuals by those whose education is above high school graduation. Consistent with our theory, Table A-3 shows that all regressions exhibit a negative impact of trade on female labor force participation while, such an impact does not prevail for male workers.

## 4 Concluding Remarks

This paper analyzes how expansions and contractions of sectors that use female labor intensively affect aggregate female labor force participation. We argue that when international trade expands sectors conducive to female employment, female labor force participation drops and *vice versa*. This is because male workers earn higher wages than women and are therefore always formally employed. Thus, when an economy specializes in sectors intensively use female labor, other sectors contract and male workers move to the expanding sectors, driving female workers out of formal employment.

Interestingly, Our mechanism also applies in the case of technological progress, which is biased towards female labor. In particular, technological progress biased towards FRAS increases the wages in this sector. This increase in wages attracts male workers who leave the MRAS, an effect that can be strong enough to drive female workers out of formal employment. In this way, technological progress biased towards female labor might curb female labor force

---

trade at the individual level does not change neither the magnitudes of our estimates nor their significance.

participation.

Turning to the dynamics, our model suggests that international trade fosters per-household capital growth in the capital scarce economy. In the capital abundant economy, however, the impact of international trade on capital growth is ambiguous. Although international trade hinders female labor force participation and increases fertility, domination of these adverse effects by positive forces stemming from gains from trade may occur. In both cases, our model suggests that trade cannot accelerate capital accumulation in the rich country by more than it accelerates capital accumulation in the poor country and, thus, our theory predicts convergence of per-household capital stocks.

Finally, we test our theory using bilateral trade data for the U.S. and Mexico. We exploit U.S. cross-state variation in the exposure to trade with Mexico to examine how trade has impacted female labor force participation. Instrumenting trade shares with geographic distance, our cross-state regressions support the hypothesis that, in rich economies, international trade with poor countries tends to reduce female labor supply. These findings are robust to various definitions of female labor supply and a set of controls.

## References

- Acemoglu, Daron, David H. Autor, and David Lyle**, “Women, War, and Wages: The Effect of Female Labor Supply on the Wage Structure at Midcentury,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 2004, 112 (3), 497–551.
- Angrist, Joshua D. and William N. Evans**, “Children and Their Parents Labor Supply: Evidence from Exogenous Variation in Family Size,” *The American Economic Review*, June 1998, 88 (3), 450–477.
- Bagwell, Kyle and Robert W. Staiger**, “Domestic Policies, National Sovereignty, and International Economic institutions,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May 2001, 116 (2), 519–562.

- Bailey, Martha J.**, “More power to the pill: The impact of contraceptive freedom on women’s lifecycle labor supply,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2006, *121* (1), 289–320.
- Becker, Gary S.**, *The Economics of Discrimination*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Berik, Gunseli, Rodgers van der Meulen, and Joseph Zveglic**, “International Trade and Gender Wage Discrimination: Evidence from East Asia,” *Review of Development Economics*, 2004, *8*, 237254.
- Black, Sandra and Elizabeth Brainerd**, “Importing Equality? The Impact of Globalization on Gender Discrimination,” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 2004, *57*, 540–549.
- Black, Sandra E. and Alexandra Spitz-Oener**, “Explaining Women’s Success: Technological Change and the Skill Content of Women’s Work,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2010. Forthcoming.
- Brown, Drusilla K.**, “Labor Standards: Where Do They Belong on the International Trade Agenda?,” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 2001, *15* (3), 89–112.
- Campbell, Jeffrey and Beverly Lapham**, “Real Exchange Rate Fluctuations and the Dynamics of Retail Trade Industries on the U.S.-Canada Border,” *American Economic Review*, September 2004, *94* (4), 1194–1206.
- Cassey, Andrew**, “State Export Data: Origin of Movement vs. Origin of Production,” 2006. Unpublished manuscript.
- Chang, W.**, “Some Theorems of Trade and General Equilibrium with Many Goods and Factors,” *Econometrica*, 1979, *34*, 709–726.

- Cunat, Alejandro and Marc J. Melitz**, “Volatility, Labor Market Flexibility, and the Pattern of Comparative Advantage,” 2007. NBER Working Paper 13062.
- Davis, Donald R.**, “Does European Unemployment Prop up American Wages? National Labor Markets and Global Trade,” *The American Economic Review*, Jun 1998, 88 (3), 478–494.
- Doepke, Matthias, Moshe Hazan, and Yishay D. Maoz**, “The Baby Boom and World War II: A Macroeconomic Analysis,” December 2007. NBER Working Paper 13707.
- Feenstra, Robert C., Robert E. Lipsey, Haiyan Deng, Alyson C. Ma, and Henry Mo**, “World Trade Flows: 1962-2000,” January 2005. NBER Working Paper No. W11040.
- Fernández, Raquel**, “Culture as Learning: The Evolution of Female Labor Force Participation over a Century,” August 2007. Unpublished manuscript, NYU.
- Feyrer, James**, “Distance, Trade, and Income - The 1967 to 1975 Closing of the Suez Canal as a Natural Experiment,” 2009. Unpublished manuscript.
- Galor, Oded**, “From Stagnation to Growth: Unified Growth Theory,” in Philip Aghion and Steven N. Durlauf, eds., *Handbook of Economic Growth*, Vol. 1A, Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2005, pp. 171–293.
- and **Andrew Mountford**, “Trading Population for Productivity: Theory and Evidence,” *Review of Economic Studies*, February 2008, 75 (1), 1143–1179.
- and **David N. Weil**, “The Gender Gap, Fertility, and Growth,” *American Economic Review*, June 1996, 86 (3), 374–387.
- and —, “From Malthusian Stagnation to Modern Growth,” *American Economic Review*, May 1999, 89 (2), 150–154.

- and — , “Population, Technology, and Growth: From Malthusian Stagnation to the Demographic Transition and Beyond,” *American Economic Review*, September 2000, 90 (4), 806–828.
- and Omer Moav, “Natural Selection and the Origin of Economic Growth,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, November 2002, 117 (4), 1113–1191.
- Goldin, Claudia**, *Understanding the Gender Gap: An Economic History of American Women*, NY: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- , “Career and Family: College Women Look to the Past,” in F. Blau and R. Ehrenberg, eds., *Gender and Family Issues in the Workplace*, New York: Russell Sage Press, 1995, pp. 20–58.
- , “The Quiet Revolution That Transformed Womens Employment, Education, and Family,” *American Economic Review*, May 2006, 96 (2), 1–21.
- Gosling, Amanda**, “The Changing Distribution of Male and Female Wages, 1978–2000: Can the Simple Skills Story be Rejected?,” September 2003. CEPR Discussion Paper No. 4045.
- Greenwood, Jeremy and Ananth Seshadri**, “Technological Progress and Economic Transformation,” in Philippe Aghion and Steven N. Durlauf, eds., *Handbook of Economic Growth*, Vol. 1B, Amsterdam: Elsevier North-Holland, 2005, pp. 1225–1273.
- Hazarika, Gautam and Rafael Otero**, “Foreign Trade and the Gender Earnings Differential in Urban Mexico,” *Journal of Economic Integration*, 2004, 19 (2), 353 – 373.
- Heckman, James J. and James R. Walker**, “The Relationship between Wages and Income and the Timing and Spacing of Births: Evidence from Swedish Longitudinal Data,” *Econometrica*, November 1990, 58 (6), 1411–1442.



- Helpman, Elhanan and Oleg Itskhoki**, “Labor Market Rigidities, Trade and Unemployment,” 2007. NBER Working Paper 13365.
- and **Paul Krugman**, *Market Structure and Foreign Trade*, MIT Press Cambridge, MA; London, England, 1985.
- Heston, Alan, Robert Summers, and Bettina Aten**, *Penn World Table Version 6.2* Center for International Comparisons of Production, Income and Prices at the University of Pennsylvania September 2006.
- Jones, R. W. and S. T. Easton**, “Factor Intensities and Factor Substitution in General Equilibrium,” *Journal of International Economics*, 1983, 15, 65–99.
- King, Miriam, Steven Ruggles, Trent Alexander, Donna Leicach, and Matthew Sobek**, *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series, Current Population Survey: Version 2.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor], cps.ipums.org 2009.
- Krueger, Anne O.**, “Trade Creation and Trade Diversion under NAFTA,” 1999. NBER Working Paper No. 7429.
- Mulligan, Casey B. and Yona Rubinstein**, “Selection, Investment, and Women’s Relative Wages since 1975,” February 2005. NBER Working Paper 11159.
- O’Neill, June**, “The Gender Wage Gap in Wages, circa 2000,” *American Economic Review, Papers and Proceedings*, May 2003, 93 (2), 309–314.
- Pencavel, John**, “Labor Supply of Men: A Survey,” in Orley Ashenfelter and Richard Layard, eds., *Handbook of labor economics*, Vol. 1, Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1986, pp. 3–101.
- Ruggles, Steven, Matthew Sobek, Trent Alexander, Catherine A. Fitch, Ronald Goeken, Patricia Kelly Hall, Miriam King, and Chad Ron-**

**nander**, *Integrated Public Use Microdata Series: Version 4.0* [Machine-readable database]. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota Population Center [producer and distributor], <http://usa.ipums.org/usa/> 2009.

**Saint-Paul, G.**, “Is Labour Rigidity Harming Europes Competitiveness? The Effect of Job Protection on the Pattern of Trade and Welfare,” *European Economic Review*, 1997, *41*, 499–506.

**Schultz, Paul T.**, “Changing World Prices, Women’s Wages, and the Fertility Transition: Sweden, 1860-1910,” *Journal of Political Economy*, December 1985, *93* (6), 1126–1154.

**Wacziarg, Romain and Jessica Seddon Wallack**, “Trade liberalization and Intersectoral Labor Movements,” *Journal of International Economics*, December 2004, *64* (2), 411–439.

**Welch, Finis**, “Growth in Women’s Relative Wages and in Inequality Among Men: One Phenomenon or Two?,” *The American Economic Review*, May 2000, *90* (2), 444–449.

# Figures & Tables




Figure 1: Relative Wages, United States 1800-1990. Source: Galor (2005).




Figure 2: Factor Price Equalization Set




Figure 3: Wage Gap and World Price




Figure 4: U.S. Trade Share – Imports plus Exports over GDP – with Mexico (red line, right scale) and Mexico's Share of U.S. Trade Volumes (blue line, left scale). Source: (1) Nominal GDP: are from Heston et al. (2006) and (2) US imports from and export to Mexico are from Feenstra et al. (2005) for the period 1962 - 2000 and from United States International Trade Commission for the period 2001 - 2008




Figure 5: Change in Trade with Mexico by State (1990-2007). left Panel: all states; right panel: excluding Alaska, Hawaii and Texas.

Table 1: Characteristics of U.S. State, 1990/91 and 2006/07

	1990/91	2006/07
<hr/> FEMALE <hr/>		
Education (%)	39.38 (5.59)	56.55 (5.36)
Weekly hours worked	22.77 (1.92)	24.24 (1.84)
Employment (%)	65 (5.2)	67 (4.7)
<hr/> MALE <hr/>		
Education (%)	41.21 (6.36)	50.87 (5.92)
Weekly hours worked	32.92 (1.89)	32.2 (1.81)
Employment (%)	78 (3.6)	77 (4.2)
<hr/> State <hr/>		
per-capita GSP	28321 (11307)	37968 (13881)
Trade share (%)	0.53 (0.98)	1.21 (1.51)
Unemployment (%)	6.34 (1.36)	4.82 (1.09)
Mexican Immigrants (%)	1.47 (3.03)	2.94 (3.69)

NOTE.-Gross state standard deviations are in parentheses. Data for education, labor participation and Mexican immigrants are from IPUMS-CPS, data for trade are from World Institute for Strategic Economic Research and data for Gross State Product are from the Bureau of Economic Analysis. State Education rate is measured by the share of civilians aged 16–65 that have, at least, some college. Employment is the share of the working group out of the population aged 16–65. Per capita Gross State Product data are chained 2000 dollars. Trade share data are calculated as two fold export volumes over GSP. Census sample weights are used for all calculations.

Table 2: The Effect of U.S. Trade with Mexico on U.S. Female Labor Force Participation during the period 1990/91–2006/07

	Dependent Variable: Change in Females Share in Average Hours Worked					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$\Delta$ Trade with Mexico	-0.280 (0.201)	-0.806* (0.409)	-1.506*** (0.420)	-1.879*** (0.689)	-1.268*** (0.424)	-1.259*** (0.445)
FLFP in 1980/81	-0.248*** (0.060)					
FLFP in 1990/91			-0.635*** (0.157)	-0.760*** (0.179)	-0.629*** (0.129)	-0.601*** (0.152)
$\Delta \ln(\text{GSP per capita})$				0.020 (0.016)		
$\Delta$ Unemployment				0.490** (0.213)		
$\Delta$ Females' Education					0.125** (0.051)	
$\Delta$ Mexican immigrants						-14.010 (12.342)
First-Stage Coefficients (Dependent Variable: $\Delta$ Trade)						
Distance		-2.134*** (0.544)	-2.021*** (0.581)	-1.989*** (0.584)	-2.004*** (0.597)	-1.850*** (0.629)
First-Stage Coefficients (Dependent Variable: FLFP in 1990/91)						
FLFP in 1980/81			0.529*** (0.066)	0.563*** (0.069)	0.527*** (0.063)	0.531*** (0.068)
Number of obs	51	51	51	51	51	51
Estimation Method	(OLS)	(IV)	(IV)	(IV)	(IV)	(IV)

NOTE.-Robust standard errors adjusted for heteroscedasticity are reported in parentheses. All models are weighted by CPS sampling weights. See the note to Table 1 for additional sample details and variables definition.

Table 3: The Effect of U.S. Trade with Mexico on U.S. Female Labor Force Participation

Dependent Variable:	Change in Females Share in						Employment
	Average Hours Worked						
	Excluding			Trade in	Distance	Married	
	TX	Hi&AK	TX, HI&AK				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	Manufacture	in minutes	Couples	(7)
$\Delta$ Trade with Mexico	-1.917*** (0.500)	-1.103*** (0.331)	-1.363** (0.519)	-1.631*** (0.502)	-1.559*** (0.442)	-1.130** (0.427)	-4.929** (2.131)
FLFP in 1990/91	-0.684*** (0.170)	-0.629*** (0.162)	-0.655*** (0.175)	-0.599*** (0.150)	-0.671*** (0.671)	-0.539** (0.250)	-0.600** (0.264)
	First-Stage Coefficients (Dependent Variable: $\Delta$ Trade)						
Distance	-1.409** (0.540)	-3.866*** (0.802)	-2.837*** (0.815)	-1.871*** (0.546)	-1.864*** (0.538)	-2.112*** (0.568)	-1.891*** (0.608)
	First-Stage Coefficients (Dependent Variable: FLFP in 1990/91)						
FLFP in 1980/81	0.532*** (0.067)	0.555*** (0.060)	0.552*** (0.060)	0.529*** (0.066)	0.545*** (0.062)	0.544*** (0.075)	0.593*** (0.107)
Number of obs	50	49	48	51	51	51	51

NOTE.-Robust standard errors adjusted for heteroscedasticity are reported in parentheses. All the above regressions are conducted according to the model described in column 3 in Table 2. See the note to Table 1 for additional sample details and variables definition.



# APPENDIX

## Proofs & Tables

**Proof that  $1/m_t$  is bounded above.** First observe that  $k_t \rightarrow \infty$  means  $k_t > k_o$  so that the second regime applies. Use (23) to confirm that  $\kappa_t \rightarrow \infty$  as  $k_t \rightarrow \infty$  (else the denominator in the brackets of the expression on the right turns negative). Finally, divide equation (21) by  $\kappa_t^\alpha$  to get

$$\frac{1-\theta}{\theta} \frac{1}{\kappa_t^{\alpha\rho}} \left( \frac{\frac{a}{b}m_t + [m_t - (1-zn_t)]\kappa_t^{-\alpha}}{1-m_t + (1-zn_t)} \right)^{1-\rho} \rightarrow (1-\alpha)\frac{a}{b} \quad (k_t \rightarrow \infty).$$

Since this limit is positive, the term in brackets must approach infinity as  $k_t \rightarrow \infty$  so that, as  $\lim_{\kappa_t \rightarrow \infty} zn_t = 2\gamma$ ,  $\lim_{\kappa_t \rightarrow \infty} m_t = 2(1-\gamma)$  must hold. This proves that  $1/m_t$  is bounded above. ■

**Proof of Proposition 1.** The proof of " $\Rightarrow$ " is immediate by  $r_t = r_t^*$  and (9).

For " $\Leftarrow$ " assume that  $\kappa_t^* = \kappa_t$ , which implies  $r_t = p_{1,t}\alpha a \kappa_t^{\alpha-1} = p_{1,t}\alpha a (\kappa_t^*)^{\alpha-1} = r_t^*$  and  $w_t^F = p_{1,t}(1-\alpha)a\kappa_t^\alpha = p_{1,t}(1-\alpha)a(\kappa_t^*)^\alpha = w_t^{F,*}$ . By  $X_{2,t} > 0$  we have  $l_{2,t} + l_{2,t}^* > 0$ . In case  $l_{2,t}^*, l_{2,t} > 0$   $w_t^M = w_t^{M,*}$  follows from (10). In case  $l_{2,t}^* = 0$  this implies

$$w_t^M = p_{2,t}b \leq w_t^{M,*}.$$

At the same time  $l_{1,t}^* = 1$  implies

$$w_t^{M,*} = p_{1,t}((1-\alpha)a(\kappa_t^*)^\alpha + b) = p_{1,t}((1-\alpha)a\kappa_t^\alpha + b) \leq w_t^M$$

so that  $w_t^M = w_t^{M,*}$ . In case  $l_{2,t} = 0$  switching Home and Foreign variables leads to  $w_t^M = w_t^{M,*}$  again. ■

**Proof of Proposition 3.** (i) By (15) it is sufficient to show  $\omega_t^* \leq \omega_t$ . Since free trade implies  $l_{1,t}^* > 0$  and  $l_{2,t} > 0$  we have  $\omega_t = \pi_t b / [a(1-\alpha)\kappa_t^\alpha] \geq 1 + b/[a(1-\alpha)\kappa_t^\alpha]$  and  $\omega_t^* = 1 + b/[a(1-\alpha)(\kappa_t^*)^\alpha] \geq \pi_t b / [a(1-\alpha)(\kappa_t^*)^\alpha]$ . Combining these relations gives

$$\frac{\omega_t^*}{\omega_t} \leq \frac{\pi_t + \omega_t^*}{\pi_t + \omega_t}$$

and proves statement (i).

(ii) By (i) and (15) we have  $zn_t^* \leq zn_t$  and can distinguish two cases. The first where  $zn_t = 1$  gives with (39) and  $l_{2,t} > 0$

$$\frac{k_{t+1}^*}{k_{t+1}} \geq \frac{w^{M,*}}{w^M} \geq \frac{p_{2,t}b}{p_{2,t}b} = 1$$

If instead  $zn_t < 1$  (i) implies  $zn_t^* < 1$  so that (39)

$$\frac{k_{t+1}^*}{k_{t+1}} = \frac{w^{F,*}}{w^F} = \frac{\omega_t}{\omega_t^*} \frac{w^{M,*}}{w^M} \geq \frac{w^{M,*}}{w^M} = 1$$

where we used (i) in the first inequality and the second inequality follows as above.

(iii) If  $zn_t^A = 1$  we have

$$\frac{k_{t+1}^A}{k_{t+1}} \leq \frac{w^{M,A}}{w^M} = \frac{p_{2,t}^A b}{p_{2,t} b} \leq 1$$

If, instead,  $zn_t^A < 1$  then  $zn_t < 1$  (from (35) as long as  $l_{1,t} > 0$  and  $m_t > 0$  otherwise) and

$$\frac{k_{t+1}^A}{k_{t+1}} \leq \frac{w^{F,A}}{w^F} = \frac{\omega_t}{\omega_t^A} \frac{w^{M,A}}{w^M}$$

For the case  $\omega_t \leq \omega_t^A$  (or  $\pi_t \leq \pi_u$  in Figure 3) this proves the claim. If instead  $\omega_t > \omega_t^A$  we use  $\kappa_t = k_t/(1 - zn_t)$  and (15) to write

$$\kappa_t \left( 1 - \gamma \left( 1 + \pi_t \frac{b/a}{1-\alpha} \kappa_t^{-\alpha} \right) \right) = k_t$$

and take implicit derivatives

$$\frac{d\kappa_t}{d\pi_t} = \kappa_t \frac{1}{1-\alpha} \frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)a/b\kappa_t^\alpha - \gamma\pi_t}$$

At the same time (40) leads to

$$\frac{dp_{1,t}}{d\pi_t} = -p_{1,t}^{1-\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} \left( \frac{1-\theta}{\pi_t} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{d}{d\pi_t} \ln(p_{1,t}\kappa_t^\alpha) = \frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{\gamma}{(1-\gamma)a/b\kappa_t^\alpha - \gamma\pi_t} - \left( \left( \frac{\theta}{1-\theta} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \pi_t^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} + \pi_t^{\frac{-\rho}{1-\rho}} \right)^{-1} \pi_t^{-1}$$

A sufficient condition for this expression to be positive is

$$\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{\gamma}{\pi_t^{-1}(1-\gamma)a/b\kappa_t^\alpha - \gamma} > \frac{1}{\left( \frac{\theta}{1-\theta} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \pi_t^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} + 1}$$

or with  $\omega_t = \pi_t b / [a(1-\alpha)\kappa_t^\alpha]$

$$\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha} \frac{\gamma}{\frac{1-\gamma}{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{\omega_t} - \gamma} > \frac{1}{\left( \frac{\theta}{1-\theta} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \pi_t^{\frac{\rho}{1-\rho}} + 1}$$

Since  $\omega_t > 1$  and  $\pi_t > 1$  this condition is satisfied whenever

$$\alpha \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma-(1-\alpha)\gamma} > \frac{1}{\left( \frac{\theta}{1-\theta} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} + 1}$$

or  $(\theta/(1-\theta))^{\frac{1}{1-\rho}} \geq (1-2\gamma)/(\alpha\gamma)$  holds, proving the statement (iii).

(iv) Notice with Proposition 2 (i) that  $zn_t^* < 1$  implies  $k_{t+1}^*/k_{t+1}^{*,A} = p_{1,t}(\kappa_t^*)^\alpha / (p_{1,t}^{*,A}(\kappa_t^{*,A})^\alpha)$ . If  $zn_t^* = 1$ , instead,  $k_{t+1}^*/k_{t+1}^{*,A} = p_{1,t}((1-\alpha)a\kappa_t^* + b) / (p_{1,t}^{*,A}((1-\alpha)a\kappa_t^{*,A} + b))$ . Now, inequality (37) and expression (40) for the price  $p_{1,t}^{*,A}$  imply  $p_{1,t}/p_{1,t}^{*,A} \leq 1$ . Further, by  $m_t^{*,A} \leq m_t^*$  we

have  $\kappa_t^{*,A} \geq \kappa_t^*$  and thus

$$k_{t+1}^*/k_{t+1}^{*,A} \leq \left( \kappa_t^*/\kappa_t^{*,A} \right)^\alpha$$

Similarly, we compute for  $zn_t < 1$  that  $k_{t+1}/k_{t+1}^A = p_{1,t}\kappa_t^\alpha/(p_{1,t}^A(\kappa_t^A)^\alpha)$  while for  $zn_t = 1$   $k_{t+1}/k_{t+1}^A = p_{1,t}((1-\alpha)a\kappa_t^\alpha + b)/(p_{1,t}^A((1-\alpha)a(\kappa_t^A)^\alpha + b))$  holds. By (37) and expression (40) we have  $p_{1,t}/p_{1,t}^A \geq 1$ . Further, by  $m_t^A \geq m_t$  we have  $\kappa_t^A \geq \kappa_t$  and thus

$$k_{t+1}/k_{t+1}^A \geq \left( \kappa_t/\kappa_t^A \right)^\alpha$$

Combining both inequalities leads to

$$\frac{k_{t+1}^*/k_{t+1}^{*,A}}{k_{t+1}/k_{t+1}^A} \leq \left( \frac{\kappa_t^*/\kappa_t^{*,A}}{\kappa_t/\kappa_t^A} \right)^\alpha = \left( \frac{m_t^{*,A}/m_t^*}{m_t^A/m_t} \right)^\alpha$$

Using again  $m_t^{*,A} \leq m_t^*$  and  $m_t^A \geq m_t$  shows that the expression on the right falls weakly short of unity, which proves the statement. ■

Table A-1: Explanatory Power of Distance on Female Labor Force Participation

Dependent Variable: Change in	Share of Hours Worked		Relative Employment	
	pre NAFTA	NAFTA	pre NAFTA	NAFTA
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
distance	-3.933*** (1.44)	2.703*** (0.562)	-4.423 (4.572)	10.236*** (1.844)
Initial FLFP	-0.009 (0.111)	-0.544*** (0.08)	-0.217 (0.134)	-0.736*** (0.125)
	First-Stage Coefficients (Dependent Variable: Initial level for FLFP)			
Lagged FLFP	0.675*** (0.085)	0.593*** (0.039)	0.753*** (0.047)	0.632*** (0.068)
Number of obs	42	51	42	51

NOTE.-Robust standard errors adjusted for heteroscedasticity are reported in parentheses. In all regressions FLFP is regressed on distance and the initial level of FLFP. The dependent variables, relative employment described in columns 3 & 4 is the ratio of females employment over males employment. The initial level of FLFP is instrumented by its lagged level. The pre-NAFTA period is 1960–1970 and the NAFTA period is 1990–2000. Lagged levels are 1950 and 1980, respectively. For the pre-NAFTA period part of the data are missing for 9 states, which are Alaska, Delaware, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont and Wyoming. Restricting our NAFTA period regressions to the same 42 states does not affect neither the magnitudes of coefficients nor their significance. See the note to Table 1 for additional sample details and variables definition.

Table A-2: The effect of U.S. trade with Mexico on U.S. Females/Males Labor Force Participation

Dependent Variable	FEMALE				MALE			
	Hours worked		Employment		Hours worked		Employment	
	State Weight	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$\Delta$ Trade with Mexico	-0.72** (0.27)	-0.65*** (0.17)	-0.02** (0.01)	-0.02*** (0.01)	0.60 (0.38)	0.39** (0.17)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.00)
LFP in 1990/91	-0.25*** (0.08)	-0.42*** (0.07)	-0.29*** (0.08)	-0.39*** (0.08)	-0.08 (0.13)	-0.24** (0.09)	0.11 (0.11)	0.01 (0.09)
First-Stage Coefficients (Dependent Variable: $\Delta$ Trade)								
Distance	-2.06*** (0.56)	-4.79*** (0.68)	-2.06*** (0.57)	-4.74*** (0.67)	-2.12*** (0.56)	-4.56*** (0.71)	-2.10*** (0.56)	-4.60*** (0.71)
First-Stage Coefficients (Dependent Variable: LFP in 1990/91)								
LFP in 1980/81	0.93*** (0.11)	0.93*** (0.12)	0.92*** (0.09)	0.90*** (0.10)	0.67*** (0.07)	0.79*** (0.08)	0.74*** (0.07)	0.82*** (0.07)
Number of obs	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51

NOTE.-Robust standard errors adjusted for heteroscedasticity are reported in parentheses. All regressions are conducted according to the model described in column 3 in Table 2. The independent variables are instrumented by distance and the according Labor Force Participation shares in 1980/81. Regressions described in column 2, 4, 6 and 8 are weighted by state population size. See the note to Table 1 for additional sample details and variables definition.

Table A-3: The effect of U.S. trade with Mexico on U.S. Females/Males Labor Force Participation (for skilled population)

Dependent Variable	FEMALE				MALE			
	Hours worked		Employment		Hours worked		Employment	
State Weight	(1)	+	(3)	+	(5)	+	(7)	+
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$\Delta$ Trade with Mexico	-0.76*** (0.25)	-0.51*** (0.15)	-0.02** (0.01)	-0.01** (0.00)	0.22 (0.38)	0.26* (0.15)	-0.01 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.00)
LFP in 1990/91	-0.29*** (0.1)	-0.43*** (0.08)	-0.29*** (0.08)	-0.42*** (0.11)	-0.03 (0.09)	-0.19* (0.1)	0.51** (0.21)	0.36** (0.19)
First-Stage Coefficients (Dependent Variable: $\Delta$ Trade)								
Distance	-2.12*** (0.55)	-4.9*** (0.74)	-2.1*** (0.55)	-4.76*** (0.67)	-2.04*** (0.57)	-4.36*** (0.73)	-2.07*** (0.58)	-4.54*** (0.72)
First-Stage Coefficients (Dependent Variable: LFP in 1990/91)								
LFP in 1980/81	0.75*** (0.12)	0.84*** (0.13)	0.76*** (0.13)	0.88*** (0.12)	0.61*** (0.07)	0.73*** (0.09)	0.61*** (0.07)	0.61*** (0.08)
Number of obs	51	51	51	51	51	51	51	51

NOTE.-Robust standard errors adjusted for heteroscedasticity are reported in parentheses. All regressions are conducted according to the model described in column 3 in Table 2. The independent variables are instrumented by distance and the according Labor Force Participation shares in 1980/81. We define skilled individuals by those whose education is above high school graduation. Regressions described in column 2, 4, 6 and 8 are weighted by state population size. See the note to Table 1 for additional sample details and variables definition.