

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

No. 8835

**EXPORTS AND WITHIN-PLANT WAGE
DISTRIBUTIONS:
EVIDENCE FROM MEXICO**

Judith A Frías, David Kaplan and
Eric A Verhoogen

DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS



Centre for Economic Policy Research

www.cepr.org

Available online at:

www.cepr.org/pubs/dps/DP8835.asp

EXPORTS AND WITHIN-PLANT WAGE DISTRIBUTIONS: EVIDENCE FROM MEXICO

Judith A Frías, Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social
David Kaplan, Inter-American Development Bank
Eric A Verhoogen, Columbia University

Discussion Paper No. 8835
February 2012

Centre for Economic Policy Research
77 Bastwick Street, London EC1V 3PZ, UK
Tel: (44 20) 7183 8801, Fax: (44 20) 7183 8820
Email: cepr@cepr.org, Website: www.cepr.org

This Discussion Paper is issued under the auspices of the Centre's research programme in **DEVELOPMENT ECONOMICS**. Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of the Centre for Economic Policy Research. Research disseminated by CEPR may include views on policy, but the Centre itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Centre for Economic Policy Research was established in 1983 as an educational charity, to promote independent analysis and public discussion of open economies and the relations among them. It is pluralist and non-partisan, bringing economic research to bear on the analysis of medium- and long-run policy questions.

These Discussion Papers often represent preliminary or incomplete work, circulated to encourage discussion and comment. Citation and use of such a paper should take account of its provisional character.

Copyright: Judith A Frías, David Kaplan and Eric A Verhoogen

CEPR Discussion Paper No. 8835

February 2012

ABSTRACT

Exports and Within-Plant Wage Distributions: Evidence from Mexico*

This short paper examines the effect of exporting on within-plant wage distributions in employer-employee data on Mexican manufacturing plants. Using the late-1994 peso devaluation interacted with initial plant size as a source of exogenous variation in exporting and focusing on wages at the 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th and 90th percentiles within each plant, we document three patterns: (1) there is no evidence of an effect of exporting on wages at the 10th percentile; (2) the wage effects of exporting are larger at higher percentiles, up to the 75th; and (3) there is no evidence of an increase in dispersion within the top quartile.

JEL Classification: F16 and J31

Keywords: exports and wage distribution

Judith A Frías
Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social
Paseo de la Reforma No. 476
Col. Juárez
06600 México DF
MÉXICO

David Kaplan
Labor Markets and
Social Security Unit
Inter-American Development Bank
1300 New York Ave, NW
Stop W0616
Washington, DC 20577
USA

Email: judith.frias@imss.gob.mx

Email: dkaplan@iadb.org

For further Discussion Papers by this author see:
www.cepr.org/pubs/new-dps/dplist.asp?authorid=164715

For further Discussion Papers by this author see:
www.cepr.org/pubs/new-dps/dplist.asp?authorid=130857

Eric A Verhoogen
Department of Economics
Columbia University
IAB 1022, 420 W. 118th St.
New York, NY 10027
USA

Email: eric.verhoogen@columbia.edu

For further Discussion Papers by this author see:
www.cepr.org/pubs/new-dps/dplist.asp?authorid=138860

* We thank Marc Muendler for helpful comments, and Gerardo Durand, Abigail Durán, Mauro Gascon, Adriana Ramírez, and Gabriel Romero for tireless assistance with the plant data. All analysis of confidential data was carried out on-site and in accordance with Mexican confidentiality laws. This research was supported in part by National Science Foundation grant SES-0721068. The views expressed in the paper are the opinions of the authors and do not reflect the official positions of the Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social or the Inter-American Development Bank.

Submitted 28 January 2012

In many developing countries, increasing international integration has been accompanied by rising wage inequality, and traditional Heckscher-Ohlin models, which rely on between-sector reallocations to link trade and labor-market outcomes, are difficult to reconcile with this pattern (Goldberg and Pavcnik, 2007). Recently, researchers have proposed a number of potential within-sector explanations based on the behavior of heterogeneous firms, involving technology choice, quality upgrading, search and bargaining, or fair wages, among other mechanisms.¹ There is evidence at the plant level to support a within-sector link between trade and inequality. For instance, Verhoogen (2008) finds that initially larger, higher-productivity Mexican plants had higher export propensity and wages in cross-section in 1993 and that they were more likely to increase exports and wages in response to the late-1994 devaluation of the peso. The shock to exporting thus arguably increased dispersion in wages between plants within sectors.

At the plant level, however, many of the proposed within-sector mechanisms carry similar observable implications. Distinguishing among the various mechanisms will require moving to a lower level of disaggregation, and exploiting information at the level of individual workers within plants. In this short paper and the longer paper to which it is a companion (Frías, Kaplan and Verhoogen, 2011), we use employer-employee data from Mexico and an identification strategy from Verhoogen (2008) to examine the effects of exporting on wage outcomes that are not available in standard plant-level datasets. In Frías, Kaplan and Verhoogen (2011), we estimate the effect of exporting on wage premia, defined as wages above what individual workers would expect to earn elsewhere in the labor market. Wage premia are estimated as plant effects, controlling flexibly for individual heterogeneity (and allowing the return to worker ability to vary over time), implicitly assuming that the plant effect is the same for all employed workers.

In this short paper, by contrast, we do not attempt to control for worker heterogeneity, but instead focus on the effect of exporting on the shape of within-plant wage distributions. As we show in more detail below, we find that exporting has little effect on wages at the low end of the wage spectrum within plants, and that it raises within-plant wage dispersion, but not uniformly between all quantiles. The results are consistent with, but add important qualifications to, the finding of Verhoogen (2008) in plant-level data that exporting raised the ratio of white-collar to blue-collar average wages.

¹See, on technology choice, Yeaple (2005) and Bustos (2011); on quality upgrading, Verhoogen (2008); on search and bargaining, Davidson, Matusz and Shevchenko (2008), Helpman, Itskhoki and Redding (2010), Felbermayr, Prat and Schmerer (2011), and Coşar, Guner and Tybout (2010); on fair wages, Egger and Kreickemeier (2009) and Amiti and Davis (forthcoming).

This paper is related to an active theory literature on trade, matching and organizations which has proposed a variety of mechanisms linking trade and wage distributions within firms.² Recent papers using employer-employee data to investigate the consequences of trade for labor-market outcomes (without focusing on the overall within-plant distributions) include Krishna, Poole and Senses (2011), Hummels et al. (2011), and Davidson et al. (2011); see Frías, Kaplan and Verhoogen (2011) for a fuller literature review.

1 Data and Econometric Strategy

The dataset we employ is a balanced panel of plants that can be linked between a standard plant panel, the *Encuesta Industrial Anual (EIA)*, and employer-employee data from the administrative records of the Mexican social security agency, the *Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social (IMSS)*. For details, refer to Frías, Kaplan and Verhoogen (2011).³ In this paper, we focus on 2,531 plants with complete data over the 1993-2001 period. Appendix Table A.1 reports summary statistics by export status for 1993. It is worth emphasizing that plants in the linked EIA-IMSS sample are larger and have higher wages than the typical Mexican establishment.⁴

To fix ideas, consider the following model:

$$y_{jt} = \theta e_{jt} + \gamma \hat{\lambda}_{jt} * t + \mu_j + \xi_{kt} + \psi_{rt} + u_{jt} \quad (1)$$

where j and t index plants and years; y is a plant-level wage outcome; e is a measure of export status, either export share of sales or an indicator for exports being greater than zero; μ_j is a plant fixed effect; ξ_{kt} and ψ_{rt} are industry-year and region (state)-year effects; and u_{jt} is a mean-zero disturbance. $\hat{\lambda}$ is a proxy for a plant's underlying productivity (i.e. a Melitz-type draw), which here will be plant size, and t is year; the $\hat{\lambda}_{jt} * t$ term captures differential trends by plant size, for reasons that will be made clear below. The primary outcomes, y_{jt} , of interest are wage levels at

²This literature is too large to do justice to here; see Antràs and Rossi-Hansberg (2009) for a review.

³One detail is particularly relevant: the IMSS top-code varied over the period, and in particular was raised in 1994 and 1995. In results available from the authors, we re-do our estimates using plants for which the top- and bottom-codes are never binding at 90th and 10th percentiles, respectively, and find that our qualitative results are robust.

⁴Daily wages in the IMSS data are lower on average than eight times hourly wages in the EIA; this may reflect part-time work. Under-reporting is also a possible explanation, although Kumler, Verhoogen and Frías (2011) investigate the extent of under-reporting, comparing the administrative records to household data by region and demographic group, and find little evidence of under-reporting among large manufacturing plants that respond on a regular basis to the EIA.

various quantiles of within-plant distributions; following common practice, we focus on the 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th, 90th percentiles.⁵ Note that the individual at a given percentile within a plant will not be the same over time; our results should be interpreted as characterizing changes in the shape of within-plant distributions, not in wages of particular individuals.

Export status in (1) is likely to be endogenous. Suppose, for instance, that plants are subject to unobserved time-varying productivity shocks; a positive shock would be expected both to raise wages and induce the plant to increase exports, generating positive bias in estimates of θ . On the other hand, there may be reverse causation: if firms are subject to labor cost shocks, an increase in wages may induce firms to reduce exports, generating a negative bias in estimates of θ .⁶ To address endogeneity, we follow the strategy of Verhoogen (2008) and use the interaction of the late-1994 peso devaluation with initial plant size as a source of exogenous variation in the incentive to export. Appendix Figure A.1 plots the Mexican real exchange rate over the 1989-2004 period; Appendix Figure A.2 plots export share of sales and the fraction exporter over time in our balanced panel. The magnitudes of the devaluation and the subsequent export response are striking.⁷ Theoretical considerations would suggest that larger, more productive plants would be more likely to increase exports in response to the shock; see Verhoogen (2008). This in turn suggests that initial size interacted with the shock could serve as an instrument for exporting. A potential concern with this strategy is that there may be differential trends between larger and smaller plants, independent of the effect of the devaluation on the incentive to export. For this reason, we allow for a constant differential trend between larger and smaller plants and compare two periods, the period of the peso crisis and its immediate aftermath (1993-1997) and a later period without a devaluation (1997-2001).

Formally, we first write (1) in first differences, stacking the differences for the 1993-1997 and

⁵In principle, one could write a model like (1) at the individual level and estimate a set of conditional quantile regressions. But to our knowledge the econometric literature does not yet provide an estimator that can deal simultaneously with an endogenous covariate (export status) and the incidental fixed-effect parameters. Here we focus on simple least-squares regressions and leave the development of such a method for future work.

⁶Although the EIA dataset is supposed to exclude *maquiladoras* (assembly-for-export plants), it is possible that some plants shifted to an assembly-for-export model over the study period; this shift may well have generated a negative correlation between the change in export share and the change in wages within plants that should arguably not be attributed to an effect of exporting per se.

⁷Note that wage overall fell in real terms during the peso crisis; the key fact for our purposes is that they fell relatively less in initially larger, higher-export-propensity plants.

1997-2001 periods:⁸

$$\Delta y_{jt} = \theta \Delta e_{jt} + \dot{\xi}_{kt} + \dot{\psi}_{rt} + \gamma \widehat{\lambda}_{jt} + \dot{u}_{jt} \quad (2)$$

where $\Delta y_{jt} = y_{jt+4} - y_{jt}$; $\Delta e_{jt} = e_{jt+4} - e_{jt}$; $\dot{\xi}_{kt}$ and $\dot{\psi}_{rt}$ and \dot{u}_{jt} are again an industry-year effect, a region-year effect and a mean-zero disturbance. In the context of (2), our strategy is to instrument Δe_{jt} with $\widehat{\lambda}_{jt}$ interacted with an indicator for the peso-crisis period — that is, $\widehat{\lambda}_{jt} * T_{93-97}$ where T_{93-97} is an indicator for the 1993-1997 period. The instrumental-variables (IV) estimate of θ will thus be based on changes in export status induced by the interaction of initial size and the devaluation, separate from underlying differential trends between larger and smaller plants. Here we use log employment from the IMSS data as our proxy for a plant’s underlying Melitz draw, $\widehat{\lambda}_{jt}$.⁹

A thorny issue of interpretation is that exports and wages in a given period are simultaneous choices, presumably outcomes of the same firm optimization problem, and it may be unclear how to think about an “effect” of one on the other. One way to sidestep this difficulty is to focus on the reduced form corresponding to the IV model, and think of the devaluation as generating exogenous variation in the incentive to export. Here we present both IV and reduced-form results.¹⁰

2 Results

Table 1 presents simple cross-sectional regressions of wage outcomes on export status (either a 0/1 exporter indicator or export share of sales) or plant size (log employment), for the year 1993.¹¹ As is common in other datasets, exporting and plant size are associated with higher wages on

⁸The results are robust to changes in the beginning and end dates of the periods.

⁹Verhoogen (2008) focused on domestic sales as the preferred proxy for λ but showed that the basic patterns were robust to the choice of proxy. Here we use employment from the IMSS data to avoid difficulties arising from the fact that domestic sales enter in the denominator of export share.

¹⁰The reduced form can be written:

$$\Delta y_{jt} = \pi_1 \widehat{\lambda}_{jt} * T_{93-97} + \pi_2 \widehat{\lambda}_{jt} + \dot{\xi}_{kt} + \dot{\psi}_{rt} + \dot{u}_{jt} \quad (3)$$

Note that estimating (3) and testing whether $\pi_1 = 0$ is equivalent to running a regression of Δy_{jt} on $\widehat{\lambda}_{jt}$ and industry and region effects separately by period and testing whether the coefficients on $\widehat{\lambda}_{jt}$ are equal across periods, which is the approach of Verhoogen (2008).

¹¹Note that the outcome variable in Column 1, log mean hourly wage from the EIA, is not directly comparable to the outcome in Column 2, the mean of log daily wage from the IMSS data, both because of the hourly vs. daily issue discussed above, and because of the order of taking logarithms. The results in the two columns (and also below) are qualitatively similar, however.

average. Overall, there is little evidence of systematic differences in the cross-sectional wage-exporting or wage-size relationships across quantiles; the differences in estimates across columns 3-7 are generally not significant.

Table 2 examines changes in the wage outcomes over time. Panels A and B present OLS regressions of (2). Perhaps surprisingly, there is little robust evidence that within-plant increases in exports are associated with increases in wages, when controlling for differential trends by plant size. These results should be treated with caution, however, as the possible endogeneity of export status has not been addressed.

Columns 1-7 of Panel C present the reduced-form estimates corresponding to our IV model. In Columns 1 and 2, the significant coefficients initial log employment interacted with the indicator for the 1993-1997 period indicate that the differential trend between larger and smaller plants was significantly greater during the peso crisis period than during the period without a devaluation, suggesting that the differential shock to the incentive to export raised average plant-level wages. We see that this effect differed significantly by quantile, however. Column 3 indicates that there was no such difference in differential trends at the 10th percentile. The difference in differential trends was significantly greater at the 25th, 50th and 75th percentiles (Columns 4-6). Interestingly, the coefficients at the 75th and 90th percentiles are nearly identical, suggesting little increase in dispersion in the top quartile in response to the shock.

We now turn to the IV results. Column 8 of Panel C, Table 2 presents the first stage. Our instrument has explanatory power: the coefficient on initial log employment interacted with the 1993-1997 indicator is positive with a t-statistic of approximately 3. Panel D presents the IV estimates. The message is similar to that of the reduced-form results: the shock to exporting had no effect at the 10th percentile, but a significant positive effect at higher quantiles, with the magnitude of the effect increasing up to the 75th percentile. (Appendix Table A.2 reports reduced-form and IV estimates for various log wage ratios, which correspond to differences in estimates from Table 2. Except for the log 90-75 and 90-50 ratios, the increase in log wage ratios between quantiles are significant.)

The difference between the OLS and the IV results is notable. In our view, the most likely explanation is the reverse causality mentioned above: idiosyncratic shocks to wages may adversely affect plants' competitiveness on export markets and thus generate a spurious negative bias in the OLS estimates.

The magnitudes of the coefficients in Panel D of Table 2 appear large, but are plausible. Consider two plants that differ in initial log employment by one standard deviation, approximately 1.0. Column 8 of Panel C, Table 2 suggests that this gives rise to a 1.2% greater increase in export share in the larger plant over the 1993-1997 period than the 1997-2001 period. This (arguably exogenous) relative increase in export share is associated with approximately a 3.2% relative increase in mean hourly wage or a 6.4% relative increase in mean daily wage. These magnitudes are indeed large, but not implausibly so.

3 Conclusion

This paper has had the modest goal of establishing several facts about the effect of exporting on within-plant wage distributions, focusing on wages at the 10th, 25th, 50th, 75th and 90th percentiles. There are three key findings: (1) there is no evidence of an effect of exporting on wages at the 10th percentile; (2) the wage effects of exporting are larger at higher percentiles, up to the 75th; and (3) there is no evidence of an increase in dispersion between the 75th and 90th percentiles. The third fact suggests that the increase in within-plant wage dispersion is not due solely to wage increases for top managers.

An interesting issue that remains largely unexplored is the dynamic adjustment of the wage distribution within plants. It may be that in the response to the export shock plants must initially raise the wages of engineers, technicians and other skilled workers, but that wages at the low end catch up over the medium run. The results here are consistent with this interpretation, but data constraints limit our ability to pursue it further. Investigating such dynamics is a topic for future work.

References

- Amiti, Mary, and Donald R. Davis.** forthcoming. "Trade, Firms, and Wages: Theory and Evidence." Forthcoming, *Review of Economic Studies*.
- Antràs, Pol, and Esteban Rossi-Hansberg.** 2009. "Organizations and Trade." *Annual Review of Economics*, 1(1): 43 – 64.
- Bustos, Paula.** 2011. "The Impact of Trade Liberalization on Skill Upgrading: Evidence from Argentina." Unpub. Paper, Universitat Pompeu Fabra.

- Coşar, A. Kerem, Nezh Guner, and James Tybout.** 2010. “Firm Dynamics, Job Turnover, and Wage Distributions in an Open Economy.” NBER working paper no. 16326.
- Davidson, Carl, Fredrik Heyman, Steven Matusz, Fredrik Sjöholm, and Susan Chun Zhu.** 2011. “Globalization and Imperfect Labor Market Sorting.” Unpub. paper, Michigan State University.
- Davidson, Carl, Steven J. Matusz, and Andrei Shevchenko.** 2008. “Globalization and Firm Level Adjustment with Imperfect Labor Markets.” *Journal of International Economics*, 75(2): p295 – 309.
- Egger, Hartmut, and Udo Kreickemeier.** 2009. “Firm Heterogeneity and the Labour Market Effects of Trade Liberalisation.” *International Economic Review*, 50(1): 187–216.
- Felbermayr, Gabriel, Julien Prat, and Hans-Jörg Schmerer.** 2011. “Globalization and Labor Market Outcomes: Wage Bargaining, Search Frictions, and Firm Heterogeneity.” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 146(1): 39 – 73.
- Frías, Judith A., David S. Kaplan, and Eric Verhoogen.** 2011. “Exports and Wage Premia: Evidence from Mexican Employer-Employee Data.” Unpub. paper, Columbia University.
- Goldberg, Pinelopi Koujianou, and Nina Pavcnik.** 2007. “Distributional Effects of Globalization in Developing Countries.” *Journal of Economic Literature*, 45(1).
- Helpman, Elhanan, Oleg Itskhoki, and Stephen Redding.** 2010. “Inequality and Unemployment in a Global Economy.” *Econometrica*, 78(4): 1239–1283.
- Hummels, David, Rasmus Jørgensen, Jakob R. Munch, and Chong Xiang.** 2011. “The Wage Effects of Offshoring: Evidence from Danish Matched Worker-Firm Data.” NBER working paper no. 17496.
- Krishna, Pravin, Jennifer P. Poole, and Mine Zeynep Senses.** 2011. “Wage Effects of Trade Reform with Endogenous Worker Mobility.” NBER working paper no. 17256.
- Kumler, Todd, Eric Verhoogen, and Judith A. Frías.** 2011. “Payroll Tax Compliance When Enforcement is Weak: Evidence from Mexico.” Unpub. paper, Columbia University.
- Verhoogen, Eric.** 2008. “Trade, Quality Upgrading and Wage Inequality in the Mexican Manufacturing Sector.” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(2): 489–530.
- Yeaple, Stephen Ross.** 2005. “A Simple Model of Firm Heterogeneity, International Trade, and Wages.” *Journal of International Economics*, 65(1): 1–20.

Table 1. Wage outcomes, cross-sectional patterns, 1993

	log mean hourly wage (EIA) (1)	mean log daily wage (IMSS) (2)	Quantiles of within-firm log wage distribution				
			10th (3)	25th (4)	50th (5)	75th (6)	90th (7)
exporter	0.184*** (0.022)	0.091*** (0.015)	0.084*** (0.015)	0.096*** (0.017)	0.092*** (0.018)	0.105*** (0.019)	0.101*** (0.020)
export share	0.302*** (0.085)	0.117** (0.055)	0.140*** (0.054)	0.138** (0.060)	0.078 (0.062)	0.111* (0.067)	0.192*** (0.070)
log employment (IMSS)	0.148*** (0.010)	0.084*** (0.008)	0.087*** (0.007)	0.086*** (0.009)	0.088*** (0.009)	0.081*** (0.009)	0.083*** (0.010)

Notes: Table reports 21 separate regressions, of dependent variable at top against covariate at left, industry and region (state) effects. All regressions have N=2531 and include 6-digit industry-year effects and region (state)-year effects. Export share is fraction of total sales derived from exports. Exporter indicator takes the value 1 if export share is greater than zero, and 0 otherwise. Changes are for periods 1993-1997 or 1997-2001; initial log employment refers to employment as reported in IMSS data in first year of period (1993 or 1997). Robust standard errors in parentheses: * 10% level, ** 5% level, *** 1% level.

Table 2. Changes in wage outcomes

	Δ log mean hourly wage	Δ mean log daily wage	Δ quantiles of within-firm log wage distribution					Δ export share
	(EIA) (1)	(IMSS) (2)	10th (3)	25th (4)	50th (5)	75th (6)	90th (7)	(8)
<i>Panel A: OLS</i>								
Δ exporter	0.025** (0.011)	0.009 (0.007)	0.001 (0.008)	0.003 (0.008)	0.003 (0.008)	0.016 (0.010)	0.023* (0.012)	
initial log emp.	0.030*** (0.005)	0.044*** (0.004)	0.037*** (0.004)	0.043*** (0.004)	0.044*** (0.005)	0.045*** (0.005)	0.054*** (0.006)	
<i>Panel B: OLS</i>								
Δ export share	0.011 (0.043)	-0.019 (0.027)	-0.014 (0.030)	-0.056* (0.030)	-0.035 (0.032)	-0.029 (0.036)	-0.004 (0.044)	
initial log emp.	0.031*** (0.005)	0.044*** (0.004)	0.037*** (0.004)	0.044*** (0.004)	0.044*** (0.005)	0.045*** (0.005)	0.054*** (0.006)	
<i>Panel C: Reduced form and first stage</i>								
init. log emp.* T_{93-97}	0.032*** (0.010)	0.048*** (0.007)	-0.001 (0.008)	0.030*** (0.009)	0.048*** (0.009)	0.065*** (0.010)	0.065*** (0.012)	0.012*** (0.004)
initial log emp.	0.016 (0.006)	0.021*** (0.005)	0.037*** (0.005)	0.029*** (0.006)	0.022** (0.006)	0.015 (0.006)	0.024* (0.008)	0.004 (0.002)
<i>Panel D: IV</i>								
Δ export share	2.647** (1.227)	3.928*** (1.443)	-0.058 (0.639)	2.455** (1.113)	3.965*** (1.532)	5.296*** (1.945)	5.333*** (2.026)	
initial log emp.	0.006 (0.012)	0.007 (0.014)	0.037*** (0.007)	0.021* (0.011)	0.007 (0.015)	-0.004 (0.019)	0.004 (0.020)	

Notes: All regressions have $N = 5062$ and include 6-digit industry-year effects and region (state)-year effects. Export share is fraction of total sales derived from exports. Exporter indicator takes the value 1 if export share is greater than zero, and 0 otherwise. Changes are for periods 1993-1997 or 1997-2001; initial log employment refers to employment as reported in IMSS data in first year of period (1993 or 1997). T_{93-97} is indicator variable that takes the value 1 for 1993-1997 period, 0 for 1997-2001. Robust standard errors in parentheses: * 10% level, ** 5% level, *** 1% level.

Table A.1. Summary statistics, plant level, 1993

	non-exporters (1)	exporters (2)	all plants (3)
Total sales	149.12 (9.71)	413.91 (59.74)	228.21 (19.24)
K/L	150.95 (10.94)	188.00 (14.92)	162.02 (8.88)
Export share of sales		0.15 (0.01)	0.04 (0.00)
Employment (EIA)	187.94 (6.07)	382.05 (27.61)	245.92 (9.44)
Employment (IMSS)	178.50 (5.74)	386.63 (30.81)	240.67 (10.22)
White-collar share of hours (EIA)	0.30 (0.00)	0.32 (0.01)	0.30 (0.00)
Hourly wage (EIA)	43.28 (0.59)	57.77 (1.17)	47.61 (0.56)
White-collar hourly wage (EIA)	75.07 (1.24)	100.98 (2.18)	82.81 (1.11)
Blue-collar hourly wage (EIA)	28.87 (0.33)	34.86 (0.67)	30.66 (0.31)
Avg. daily wage (IMSS)	170.42 (1.39)	199.57 (2.63)	179.12 (1.28)
Median daily wage (IMSS)	135.86 (1.40)	162.53 (2.79)	143.83 (1.31)
N	1775	756	2531


Notes: Table reports statistics using 1993 data from EIA-IMSS 1993-2001 balanced panel. Standard errors of means in parentheses. Exporter defined as export sales > 0. Export share is fraction of total sales derived from exports. Sales measured in millions of 2002 Mexican pesos, capital-labor ratio in thousands of 2002 pesos, and average daily wage in 2002 pesos. Nominal exchange rate on June 30, 2002: 9.945 pesos/US\$1. EIA variables are reported at plant level. Avg. daily wage (IMSS) calculated by taking average within plant (weighting each worker equally), then taking average across plants (weighting each plant equally). Other IMSS variables calculated at plant level, then simple average taken across plants. For further details, refer to Frías, Kaplan and Verhoogen (2011).

Table A.2. Changes in wage inequality indicators, Reduced-form and IV results

	$\Delta \log$ 90/10 ratio (1)	$\Delta \log$ 75/25 ratio (2)	$\Delta \log$ 90/50 ratio (3)	$\Delta \log$ 50/10 ratio (4)	$\Delta \log$ 75/50 ratio (5)	$\Delta \log$ 50/25 ratio (6)	$\Delta \log$ 90/75 ratio (7)	$\Delta \log$ 25/10 ratio (8)
A. Reduced form								
init. log emp.* T_{93-97}	0.066*** (0.013)	0.035*** (0.008)	0.017 (0.011)	0.049*** (0.009)	0.016** (0.007)	0.018*** (0.005)	0.000 (0.009)	0.031*** (0.008)
initial log emp.	-0.013 (0.009)	-0.014* (0.005)	0.002 (0.008)	-0.015* (0.005)	-0.006 (0.004)	-0.008 (0.004)	0.008 (0.007)	-0.008 (0.004)
B. IV								
Δ export share	5.390** (2.097)	2.840** (1.133)	1.367 (1.020)	4.023** (1.587)	1.331* (0.695)	1.510** (0.664)	0.037 (0.772)	2.513** (1.103)
log emp., initial year	-0.033 (0.021)	-0.024** (0.011)	-0.003 (0.011)	-0.030** (0.015)	-0.011 (0.007)	-0.013* (0.007)	0.008 (0.009)	-0.017* (0.010)
industry-year effects	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
state-year effects	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
N	5062	5062	5062	5062	5062	5062	5062	5062


Notes: Coefficient estimates correspond to differences in estimates from Table 2, Panels C and D in main text; the additional information here is the standard errors. All regressions include 6-digit industry-year and region (state)-year effects. Export share is fraction of total sales derived from exports. Exporter indicator takes the value 1 if export share is greater than zero, and 0 otherwise. Robust standard errors in brackets. *10% level, **5% level, ***1% level.

Figure A.1. Real exchange rate



Notes: Real exchange rate calculated as $e \times \text{CPI(US)} / \text{CPI(Mexico)}$, where e is peso/US\$ nominal exchange rate. Data from IMF International Financial Statistics.

Figure A.2. Shift to export market, EIA panel



Notes: Data from balanced panel of 2,531 plants for which complete data is available from both EIA and IMSS datasets over the 1993-2003 period. Export percentage of sales calculated as (total exports for all plants)/(total sales for all plants). Plants with exports greater than zero classified as exporters. See text and Frías, Kaplan and Verhoogen (2011) for further details.