

**Tsukuba Economics Working Papers
No. 2014-002**

A Simple Model of Competition Policies, Trade, and the Skill Premium

by

Yoshinori Kurokawa

July 2014

This version: April 2020

UNIVERSITY OF TSUKUBA
Department of Economics
1-1-1 Tennodai
Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8571
JAPAN

A Simple Model of Competition Policies, Trade, and the Skill Premium*

Yoshinori Kurokawa[†]
University of Tsukuba

April 6, 2020

Abstract

We develop a simple model of competition policies and trade, where fixed costs are shared within a cartel. The closed economy model shows that entry deregulation can increase the skill premium by increasing firm numbers and decreasing firm size, while an antitrust policy has the opposite effects. The numerical example with two asymmetric countries shows that entry deregulation and antitrust policy in one country, respectively, can increase and decrease the skill premia in both countries; however, the domestic skill premium is changed by a greater percentage than the foreign one. Available U.S. data show that our model seems empirically relevant.

Keywords: Trade, Entry policy, Antitrust policy, Skill premium, Firm numbers/size

JEL Classifications: F12, F16, J31, L13, L41, L51

*I am very grateful to the editors, a referee, Tomohiro Ara, Ichiroh Daitoh, Colin Davis, Fumio Dei, Difei Geng, Yunfang Hu, Koji Ishibashi, Hirokazu Ishise, Yoshitaka Itsumi, Naoto Jinji, Timothy Kehoe, Morimitsu Kurino, Mamello Nchake, Takeshi Ogawa, Toshihiro Okubo, Gina Pieters, Ariell Reshef, Kim Ruhl, Tetsuya Saito, Yoichi Sugita, Kazuhiro Yamamoto, Akihiko Yanase, Morihiro Yomogida, and seminar participants at Keio, the 4th Spring Meeting of the JSIE, the 2014 JEA Spring Meeting, the 2014 NASM of the Econometric Society, the IEFS Japan Annual Meeting 2014, and the Spring 2015 Midwest International Trade Meetings for their useful comments. I also thank Daniel Sokol for the data help. Any errors are mine. This research is supported by a grant-in-aid from the Zengin Foundation for Studies on Economics and Finance and by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) No. 25780157 (2013-2015).

[†]Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Tsukuba, 1-1-1 Tennodai, Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-8571, Japan. Tel.&Fax: +81-29-853-7426. E-mail: kurokawa.yoshi.fw@u.tsukuba.ac.jp.

1 Introduction

How competition policies interact with international trade has been one of the so-called “new issues” in the World Trade Organization (WTO). In 1996, the Singapore Ministerial Conference of the WTO set up the Working Group on the Interaction between Trade and Competition Policy (WGTCP) to study this issue, with the participation of all WTO members. The provisional decision to start negotiations was taken at the Doha Ministerial Conference in 2001. In July 2004, however, the WTO General Council decided that this issue would no longer form part of the Work Programme set out in the Doha Ministerial Declaration and therefore no further work toward negotiations would take place within the WTO during the Doha Round. As a result, the WGTCP is currently inactive.¹

This paper now casts a doubt on this decision by the WTO and argues that the decision might have been premature. This is because the interaction between domestic competition policies and trade can result in a change in wage inequality in a trading partner even if it is not the purpose of the policies, which implies the essential necessity of international negotiations/coordination of competition policies among the trading countries.

To show this possible interaction between domestic competition policies and trade, this paper now develops a simple, general equilibrium model in which competition policies—both entry and antitrust policies—can change the skill premium for wages. It extends our initial work (Kurokawa, 2010), which linked entry policy to the skill premium in a closed economy model.² There are two sectors: a final goods sector and an intermediate goods sector. Final goods are homogeneous goods produced under conditions of constant returns to scale and perfect competition. Intermediate goods are differentiated goods produced under conditions of increasing returns to scale and monopolistic competition. Monopolistically competitive firms are Cournot competitors, and cartels of firms are allowed in that a certain set of firms collude in decision-making. While cartels are detrimental in that they directly decrease the degree of competition, efficiency gains from a cartel exist in that the fixed costs are shared within a cartel.³ There are also two types of labor: high-skilled labor and low-skilled labor. The production of final goods uses a variety of intermediate goods/tasks and high-skilled labor, and the production of intermediate goods uses low-skilled labor.⁴ One might interpret that high-skilled labor manages a variety of tasks, and each of tasks is performed by low-skilled labor. A government can control the number and the size of monopolistically competitive firms by exogenously changing the fixed costs of entry (entry

¹Regional trade agreements containing competition policy provisions have recently proliferated instead.

²Our initial work (Kurokawa, 2010) examined the effects of entry policy on the skill premium in a closed economy model. We now examine the effects of entry and antitrust policies in closed and open economy models.

³As will be mentioned later, one might think of automobile industries as an actual example that independent firms that collude share fixed costs.

⁴In this paper, a variety of intermediate goods are interpreted as a variety of tasks, a common interpretation in task-based model literature. For example, Mitchell (2005) and Grossman and Rossi-Hansberg (2008) adopt this interpretation.

policy) or the size of cartels (antitrust policy).

We first show, in a closed economy model, that entry deregulation that reduces the fixed costs of entry can increase the skill premium by increasing the number of firms and decreasing firm size in the intermediate goods sector, which was also documented by our 2010 paper. Antitrust policy that reduces the size of cartels, however, can decrease the skill premium by decreasing the number of firms and increasing firm size, which is a new result of this paper. The key mechanism that drives these results is that entry deregulation that lowers the fixed costs of entry increases the number of intermediate firms, that is, the variety of intermediate goods/tasks used by the final good. On the other hand, antitrust policy that reduces the size of cartels increases the fixed costs per firm since the fixed costs are shared within a cartel, thereby decreasing the number of intermediate firms, that is, the variety of intermediate goods/tasks used by the final good. Then, entry deregulation and antitrust policies, respectively, increases and decreases the skill premium if varieties and high-skilled labor are complementary.

We next extend the model to a two-country model while our 2010 paper focused on a closed economy model. The extended model shows that in the case in which the two countries are symmetric, entry deregulation that is conducted symmetrically in each country can increase the skill premia symmetrically in both countries while antitrust policy that is conducted symmetrically in each country can have the opposite effect. Then entry deregulation and antitrust policy in each country contribute to this change in the skill premia by, respectively, increasing and decreasing the total number of varieties common to both countries.

In the case in which the countries are asymmetric, though the effects of competition policies in one country on the skill premium in each country are not clear, our numerical example illustrates a possibility that entry deregulation and antitrust policy in one country, respectively, can increase and decrease the skill premia in both countries through trade. The domestic skill premium, however, is changed by a greater percentage than the foreign one.

Finally, we show that available data from the U.S. are compatible with the main predictions and assumption of our model. It indicates that our model does appear to be empirically relevant.

The main contributions of this paper are as follows. First, we attempt to internationally link competition policies—both entry and antitrust policies—to the skill premium. It is widely recognized that skill-biased technological change (e.g., Berman et al., 1994; Katz and Autor, 1999; Krusell et al., 2000) or trade (e.g., Feenstra and Hanson, 1996; Dinopoulos and Segerstrom, 1999; Acemoglu, 2003; Kurokawa, 2011) is an explanation for changes in the skill premium in wages.⁵ However, competition policies as a cause for changes in the skill premium have received little attention in the wage inequality literature, although there is

⁵For example, see Kurokawa (2014) for a survey of trade and wage inequality.

an empirical fact that the number of firms and the skill premium increased in the U.S. after the Carter/Reagan deregulation was implemented in the late 1970s and early 1980s (e.g., see Kurokawa, 2010). Our 2010 paper, however, linked entry policy to the skill premium in a closed economy model.⁶ The current paper extends this work by linking internationally both entry and antitrust policies to the skill premium in a two-country model. Note that a change in fixed costs may be caused by technological change as well as competition policies and that competition policies and trade may interactively affect the skill premium as shown by our model. Therefore, competition policies may strengthen or weaken the effects of technological change and trade.

Second, our paper adds to the literature on competition policies and trade. Probably the most related work is Neary (2003a, 2003b). Neary (2003a) analyzes the effects of an increase in the number of firms, due to a change in competition policy, on the relative wage between the trading countries in a model of general oligopolistic equilibrium. Neary (2003b) analyzes the effects of an increase in the number of firms that is interpreted as competition policy on wages vs. profits in a model of oligopoly in general equilibrium, and he also extends it to the model with high- and low-skilled wages to analyze the effects of trade liberalization on the relative wage of high- to low-skilled workers—the skill premium. Our paper analyzes the effects of both an increase in the number of firms and a change in cartel size on the skill premium in a general equilibrium model of monopolistic competition. To the best of our knowledge, our paper is the first to link competition policies to the skill premium via trade.

Third, this paper emphasizes changes in both entry and antitrust policies as sources of changes in the firm size. Past studies have emphasized technological change. For example, Mitchell (2005) and Mobius and Schoenle (2006) argue that technological change, such as the introduction of new flexible machines, changes the organization of production from mass production to smaller customized batches, thus decreasing the size of plants/firms. Our 2010 paper, however, argues that in addition to technological progress, entry deregulation that reduces the fixed costs of entry can decrease firm size and increase the number of firms. We now argue, using a unified framework, that both entry deregulation and cartel restriction policies can change firm size and the number of firms.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 develops a simple model. In Section 3, we examine the possible effects of both entry and antitrust policies. Section 4 extends our model to a two-country model. In Section 5, we discuss the empirical relevance of our model. Section 6 concludes the paper and indicates opportunities for future research.

⁶As far as we are aware, our initial work (Kurokawa, 2010) is only one study on the subject. It showed that entry policy can affect the skill premium.

2 Model

2.1 The setup of the model

Our 2010 paper extended the standard one-sector monopolistic competition model (Dixit and Stiglitz, 1977) to a two-sector model and focused on the effect of entry policy on the skill premium in a closed economy model. We now extend that focus to analyze the effects of entry and antitrust policies in closed and open economy models.

Consider an economy with an intermediate goods sector and a final goods sector. There are two types of labor, high-skilled and low-skilled labor, with endowments of \bar{H} and \bar{L} , respectively.

The intermediate goods sector is monopolistically competitive. There is a continuum $[0, n]$ of differentiated intermediate goods. Firms are Cournot competitors,⁷ and there is free entry and exit. Each variety uses low-skilled labor, and the technology of each variety is specified by the following increasing returns to scale production function:

$$x(j) = \max[l(j) - f, 0], \forall j,$$

where $x(j)$ is the output of variety j , $l(j)$ is the input of low-skilled labor to produce variety j , and f is the fixed costs in terms of low-skilled labor.

The final goods sector is perfectly competitive and homogeneous. The final goods use a variety of intermediate goods/tasks and high-skilled labor, and the technology is specified by the following constant returns to scale production function:

$$y = \left[\left(\int_0^n x(j)^\rho dj \right)^{\epsilon/\rho} + H^\epsilon \right]^{1/\epsilon},$$

where y is the output of final goods, and $x(j)$ and H are the inputs of differentiated intermediate goods/task j and high-skilled labor. We assume that $\epsilon < 1$ and that $0 < \rho < 1$. The elasticity of substitution between a composite of intermediate goods—which we call varieties—and high-skilled labor is $\sigma = 1/(1 - \epsilon)$.

We note that one might interpret the above production structure of the intermediate and final goods as follows. High-skilled labor manages a variety of tasks, and each of tasks is performed by low-skilled labor. Lucas (1978) and Rosen (1982), for example, also build models in which managerial skill enters the production function. We also note that for simplicity, in our model the final goods sector uses only high-skilled labor; the intermediate goods sector only low-skilled labor. We can generalize the model to a model in which each sector uses both types of labor. It can be shown that as long as varieties and high-skilled

⁷See Dixit (1979) and Singh and Vives (1984) for the analysis of Cournot competition in the case of differentiated goods.

labor are complementary, the main results hold.

Here, as in Seade (1980) and Ohyama (1999), we allow for cartels of firms in that a certain set of firms collude in their output decisions.⁸ For simplicity, we assume that the size of each cartel is symmetric and is given by m ($m \leq n$). Thus, the number of cartels is n/m . Each cartel is assumed to determine its output so as to maximize its total profit, taking other cartels' outputs as given. Cartels are detrimental in that they directly decrease the degree of competition. In this paper, however, there also exist efficiency gains from a cartel in that the fixed costs f are shared within a cartel and thus become f/m per firm in a cartel.⁹ One might think of automobile industries as an actual example that independent firms that collude share fixed costs (e.g., Toyota and Daihatsu; Nissan and Renault). Note that each variety j is still produced by an individual firm j (one of n firms), not by a cartel (m of n firms).

The demand side is as follows. A representative consumer has the endowments of high-skilled and low-skilled labor: \bar{H} and \bar{L} .¹⁰ The utility function is given by:

$$u(c) = c,$$

where c is the consumption of the final goods. The budget constraint is given by:

$$p_y c = w_H \bar{H} + w_L \bar{L},$$

where p_y is the price of the final goods, w_H is the wage for high-skilled labor, and w_L is the wage for low-skilled labor.¹¹

The market clearing (full employment) conditions for high-skilled labor and low-skilled labor are:

$$H = \bar{H},$$

$$\int_0^n l(j) dj = \bar{L}.$$

Finally, let us assume that a government can control firm numbers, n , and firm size, \bar{L}/n , by exogenously changing the fixed costs of entry f (entry policy) and the size of the cartels m (antitrust policy) in the intermediate goods sector.

⁸ As noted by Ohyama (1999), each cartel may also be considered as a merged firm consisting of several indivisible units of production.

⁹ In the Ichikawa and Kikuchi (2002) model of communications networks and trade, the fixed costs of network provision are shared by users, and an increase in the number of users lowers the fixed costs per user.

¹⁰ The results for the case of a representative consumer (an aggregate consumer) are the same as those for the case of two types of consumers: high- and low-skilled labor.

¹¹ As will be shown later, we consider the long-run economy where the profit of each firm becomes zero, and thus there is no profit in the consumer's budget.

2.2 Firm numbers and the skill premium in equilibrium

By solving the model,¹² we can derive the free-entry number of firms \bar{n} in the intermediate goods sector with the regulated fixed costs at \bar{f} and the regulated cartel size at \bar{m} :

$$\bar{n} = \frac{\bar{L}(1-\rho)}{\bar{f}/\bar{m}}. \quad (1)$$

We can also obtain the skill premium $w_H(\bar{f}, \bar{m})$ corresponding to the regulated fixed costs at \bar{f} and the regulated cartel size at \bar{m} :

$$w_H(\bar{f}, \bar{m}) = \left(\bar{n}^{(\rho-1)/\rho} p\right)^\epsilon \left(\frac{\bar{L}}{\bar{H}}\right)^{1-\epsilon}, \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{n} = \bar{L}(1-\rho)/(\bar{f}/\bar{m})$ and $p = 1/\rho$. For simplicity, we have assumed that firms are identical and equilibria symmetric. Thus, letting $p(j)$ denote the price of intermediate goods j , we have $p(j) = p, \forall j$. Note also that we have normalized $w_L = 1$ and thus the relative wage of high-skilled to low-skilled labor—the skill premium—is w_H as above.

3 Competition Policies and the Skill Premium

We now establish the possible relationship between competition policies and the skill premium. From (1) and (2), we derive the following two propositions. Note that Proposition 1 reproduces the results that was documented by our 2010 paper, which analyzed the effect of a decrease in fixed costs on the skill premium in a closed economy.

Proposition 1 (*Entry deregulation, firm numbers/size, and the skill premium*) *Suppose that the government decreases the fixed costs \bar{f} . Then, we have the following.*

- (a) *The number of firms \bar{n} increases, while the firm size \bar{L}/\bar{n} decreases.*
- (b) *The skill premium w_H decreases if $\epsilon > 0$, remains unchanged if $\epsilon = 0$, and increases if $\epsilon < 0$.*

Proof. (a) It is evident from (1) that decreasing the fixed costs \bar{f} increases the number of firms \bar{n} , thereby decreasing firm size \bar{L}/\bar{n} .

(b) Differentiating (2) with respect to \bar{f} yields:

$$\frac{dw_H(\bar{f}, \bar{m})}{d\bar{f}} = \underbrace{+ \text{ or } 0 \text{ or } -}_{\epsilon} \overbrace{\left(\bar{n}^{(\rho-1)/\rho} p\right)^{\epsilon-1} \frac{(\rho-1)^2}{\rho} \bar{n}^{-1/\rho} p \left(\frac{\bar{L}}{\bar{H}}\right)^{1-\epsilon} \bar{L}\bar{m}\bar{f}^{-2}}^{+}.$$

■

¹²Solving the model is standard and has been relegated to Appendix.

Proposition 2 (*Antitrust policy, firm numbers/size, and the skill premium*) Suppose that the government decreases the cartel size \bar{m} . Then, we have the following.

(a) The number of firms \bar{n} decreases, while the firm size \bar{L}/\bar{n} increases.

(b) The skill premium w_H increases if $\epsilon > 0$, remains unchanged if $\epsilon = 0$, and decreases if $\epsilon < 0$.

Proof. (a) It is evident from (1) that decreasing the cartel size \bar{m} decreases the number of firms \bar{n} , thereby increasing firm size \bar{L}/\bar{n} .

(b) Differentiating (2) with respect to \bar{m} yields:

$$\frac{dw_H(\bar{f}, \bar{m})}{d\bar{m}} = \underbrace{+ \text{ or } 0 \text{ or } -}_{\epsilon} \overbrace{\left(\bar{n}^{(\rho-1)/\rho p}\right)^{\epsilon-1} - \frac{(\rho-1)^2}{\rho} \bar{n}^{-1/\rho p} \left(\frac{\bar{L}}{\bar{H}}\right)^{1-\epsilon} \bar{L} \bar{f}^{-1}}^{-}$$

■

In these propositions, we have shown that entry deregulation that lowers the fixed costs of entry \bar{f} increases the number of firms, that is, the variety of intermediate goods/tasks \bar{n} used by the final good. Then, the skill premium increases if $\epsilon < 0$, that is, if a composite of intermediate goods—varieties—and high-skilled labor are complementary (i.e., fulfilling variety–skill complementarity).¹³ However, antitrust policy that reduces the size of cartels \bar{m} increases the fixed costs per firm since the fixed costs are shared within a cartel. This decreases the number of firms, that is, the variety of intermediate goods/tasks \bar{n} used by the final good, thereby decreasing the skill premium under variety–skill complementarity. We have also shown that entry deregulation decreases the size of firms in the intermediate goods sector that is measured by employment per intermediate firm, \bar{L}/\bar{n} , while antitrust policy increases it. We note that firm size measured by firm sales per intermediate firm, px , is also decreased by entry deregulation and increased by antitrust policy. As do the skill premia and the size of firms, the welfares also move to the opposite directions in these two cases. An increase in n due to a decrease in f increases the quantity of the composite good $X = \left(\int_0^n x(j)^\rho dj\right)^{1/\rho}$ (as pointed out by Ethier, 1982) and thus the quantity of the final good y .¹⁴ This increases the consumption c and thus the welfare u .¹⁵ On the other hand, a decrease in n due to a decrease in m decreases the quantity of the composite good

¹³Kurokawa (2011) defines the case $\epsilon < 0$ ($\sigma < 1$) as the case in which varieties and high-skilled labor are complementary. The number of inputs has a related role in other papers. For example, Blanchard and Kremer (1997) define the index of complexity that relates the increased number of inputs to more complexity in production processes. Kremer (1993) theoretically shows that higher skilled workers will use more complex technologies that incorporate a greater number of tasks.

¹⁴Ethier (1982) documented that the increased number of inputs translates into higher productivity.

¹⁵As shown by a model developed by Vives (1988), policies that lower the cost of entry need not increase the welfare.

X and thus the quantity of the final good y . This decreases the consumption c and thus the welfare u .

The key mechanism driving the above results is very simple. Here, let us focus on the case of entry deregulation. An increase in the number of varieties n , due to a decrease in the fixed costs of entry f , increases the quantity of the composite good X through an increase in productivity. This directly increases the marginal products and thus the demand of high-skilled labor. If varieties and high-skilled labor are complementary ($\epsilon < 0$), it also increases the relative demand and thus the relative wage of high-skilled to low-skilled labor w_H . In other words, an increase in the number of varieties n lowers the price of the composite good $P_X = \left(\int_0^n p(j)^{\rho/(\rho-1)} dj \right)^{(\rho-1)/\rho}$. Under the complementarity, it causes the demand and thus the wage of high-skilled labor w_H to increase. The similar argument also holds for the case of antitrust policy. Here, we have linked an increase in the number of varieties to an increase in the skill premium through the complementarity between varieties and skill. As will be discussed in Section 5, if we interpret varieties as varieties of tasks, intuitively it would be plausible to assume that high-skilled workers are more complementary to varieties of tasks than low-skilled workers are.

Thus far, we have considered the case in which the government changes either the fixed costs of entry \bar{f} using an entry policy or the size of cartels \bar{m} with an antitrust policy. We now consider the case in which the government changes both the fixed costs of entry \bar{f} and the size of cartels \bar{m} . Of course, the net effect on the skill premium depends on which policy dominates in changing the number of firms \bar{n} . We thus obtain the following proposition regarding this net effect.

Proposition 3 (*Entry and antitrust policies, firm numbers/size, and the skill premium*) *If the government decreases the fixed costs \bar{f} by a greater percentage than does the cartel size \bar{m} , and if varieties and high-skilled labor are complementary ($\epsilon < 0$), then the skill premium w_H increases because of an increase in the number of firms \bar{n} and a decrease in firm size \bar{L}/\bar{n} .*

Proof. From (1), it is evident that if the fixed costs \bar{f} decrease by a greater percentage than does the size of cartels \bar{m} , then the number of firms \bar{n} increases, thus decreasing the firm size \bar{L}/\bar{n} . Then, given (2), it is evident that if $\epsilon < 0$, then an increase in \bar{n} increases w_H , noting that $0 < \rho < 1$. ■

As a corollary of this proposition, we can see that if the government decreases the cartel size \bar{m} and the fixed costs \bar{f} by the same percentage, then competition policies do not affect the skill premium w_H because the number of firms \bar{n} does not change. In particular, if the government prohibits cartel by regulating the cartel size from \bar{m} to 1 and also decreases the fixed costs from \bar{f} to \bar{f}/\bar{m} , thereby changing \bar{m} and \bar{f} by the same percentage, then we can consider this case as a change from the cartel equilibrium to the non-cartel equilibrium

without altering the total number of firms \bar{n} . Needless to say, in this case the skill premium w_H remains unchanged.

4 A Two-Country Model: Competition Policies, Trade, and the Skill Premium

We consider two countries, country 1 and country 2. Let these two countries trade intermediate varieties with each other, while final goods are nontradable. Labor is mobile within each country but not across countries. There are no trade costs. Then the number of varieties that the final sector can use increases; in fact, it increases merely from \bar{n}^i to $\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2$ (the sum of the autarky levels) in each country i , $i = 1, 2$. This increase is because the number of varieties \bar{n}^i produced in each country remains unchanged before and after trade, with the constant endowment of low-skilled labor \bar{L}^i .

4.1 Symmetric Countries

First, we consider the case of symmetric countries. Then, the skill premium corresponding to the regulated fixed costs and the regulated cartel size in each country i , $i = 1, 2$, is:

$$w_H^1(\bar{f}^1, \bar{f}^2, \bar{m}^1, \bar{m}^2) = \left((\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2)^{(\rho-1)/\rho} \frac{1}{\rho} \right)^\epsilon \left(\frac{\bar{L}^1}{\bar{H}^1} \right)^{1-\epsilon}, \quad (3)$$

$$w_H^2(\bar{f}^1, \bar{f}^2, \bar{m}^1, \bar{m}^2) = \left((\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2)^{(\rho-1)/\rho} \frac{1}{\rho} \right)^\epsilon \left(\frac{\bar{L}^2}{\bar{H}^2} \right)^{1-\epsilon}, \quad (4)$$

where $\bar{n}^1 = \bar{L}^1(1-\rho)/(\bar{f}^1/\bar{m}^1)$ and $\bar{n}^2 = \bar{L}^2(1-\rho)/(\bar{f}^2/\bar{m}^2)$. Note that due to the symmetry, each of variables with superscript i is equal, for $i = 1, 2$ (e.g., $\bar{L}^1 = \bar{L}^2$). Note also that due to the symmetry, we have set $w_L^1 = w_L^2 = 1$ as the numeraire.

We now determine the possible effects of competition policies on the skill premium through trade. Since the two countries are symmetric, we consider the case in which both countries conduct competition policies simultaneously and symmetrically. First, we determine the effects of entry deregulation.

Proposition 4 (*Entry deregulation, trade, and the skill premium*) *Suppose that the government in each country i decreases the fixed costs \bar{f}^i symmetrically. Then, the skill premia in both countries w_H^1 and w_H^2 symmetrically decrease if $\epsilon > 0$, remain unchanged if $\epsilon = 0$, and increase if $\epsilon < 0$.*

Proof. Suppose that the government in each country i decreases the fixed costs \bar{f}^i symmetrically. Then the number of firms \bar{n}^i increases symmetrically in each country i . Hence, due to $(\rho-1)/\rho < 0$ the term $(\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2)^{(\rho-1)/\rho} (1/\rho)$ symmetrically decreases in equations (3) and (4). Thus it is evident from equations (3) and (4) that the skill premia in both

countries w_H^1 and w_H^2 symmetrically decrease if $\epsilon > 0$, remain unchanged if $\epsilon = 0$, and increase if $\epsilon < 0$. ■

As can be seen from equations (3) and (4), entry deregulation in one country can contribute to a change in the skill premium in both countries through a change in $\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2$.

Here, we note that even if these two countries do not trade with each other, a symmetric decrease in fixed costs in both countries can cause the skill premium to change in both countries. In that autarky case, however, entry deregulation in each country contributes only to the change in the skill premium in own country. We also note that just moving from autarky to trading equilibrium, without changing fixed costs, can change the skill premium in both countries through an increase in the number of varieties.¹⁶

Similarly, we can also determine the effects of antitrust policy.

Proposition 5 (*Antitrust policy, trade, and the skill premium*) *Suppose that the government in each country i decreases the cartel size \bar{m}^i symmetrically. Then, the skill premia in both countries w_H^1 and w_H^2 symmetrically increase if $\epsilon > 0$, remain unchanged if $\epsilon = 0$, and decrease if $\epsilon < 0$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that for Proposition 4. ■

As does entry deregulation, through a change in $\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2$ because of trade, antitrust policy in one country can also affect the skill premium in both countries. However, the effects are opposite to those of entry deregulation.

Thus, it follows that if the government in each country decreases the fixed costs and the cartel size by the same percentage, then competition policies do not affect the skill premium in either country. This lack of change is because the number of firms does not change in either country and thus, neither does the total number of varieties.

4.2 Asymmetric Countries

Next, we consider the case of asymmetric countries. We assume that the two countries have identical technologies and preferences but differ in their endowments of high-skilled labor and low-skilled labor, \bar{H}^i and \bar{L}^i , $i = 1, 2$. Then $w_L^1 = w_L^2$ does not necessarily hold. Therefore, we only set $w_L^1 = 1$ as the numeraire.

Then, the skill premium corresponding to the regulated fixed costs and the regulated

¹⁶Kurokawa (2011) analyzed the effect of trade in varieties on the skill premium in both of the trading countries.

cartel size in each country i , $i = 1, 2$, is:

$$w_H^1(\bar{f}^1, \bar{f}^2, \bar{m}^1, \bar{m}^2) = \left(\left(\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2 (w_L^2)^{\rho/(\rho-1)} \right)^{(\rho-1)/\rho} \frac{1}{\rho} \right)^\epsilon \left(\frac{\bar{L}^1}{\bar{H}^1} \right)^{1-\epsilon}, \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{w_H^2}{w_L^2}(\bar{f}^1, \bar{f}^2, \bar{m}^1, \bar{m}^2) = \left(\frac{\left(\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2 (w_L^2)^{\rho/(\rho-1)} \right)^{(\rho-1)/\rho} \frac{1}{\rho}}{w_L^2} \right)^\epsilon \left(\frac{\bar{L}^2}{\bar{H}^2} \right)^{1-\epsilon}, \quad (6)$$

where $\bar{n}^1 = \bar{L}^1(1-\rho)/(\bar{f}^1/\bar{m}^1)$ and $\bar{n}^2 = \bar{L}^2(1-\rho)/(\bar{f}^2/\bar{m}^2)$. Note that we have set $w_L^1 = 1$ as the numeraire.¹⁷

We now want to see the possible effects of competition policies in one country on the skill premium in the other country through trade. If the government in one country i decreases the fixed costs \bar{f}^i , the number of firms in that country \bar{n}^i surely increases. In this asymmetric case, however, as can be seen there is now an extra term $(w_L^2)^{\rho/(\rho-1)}$ in equation (5), and there are now extra terms $(w_L^2)^{\rho/(\rho-1)}$ and w_L^2 in equation (6).¹⁸ Due to these extra terms, it is not clear whether the term $(\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2 (w_L^2)^{\rho/(\rho-1)})^{(\rho-1)/\rho} (1/\rho)$ decreases in equation (5) or whether the term $(\bar{n}^1 + \bar{n}^2 (w_L^2)^{\rho/(\rho-1)})^{(\rho-1)/\rho} (1/\rho)/w_L^2$ decreases in equation (6). Thus the effects of entry deregulation in one country on the skill premium in each country are not clear. For the same reason, the effects of antitrust policy in one country are not clear, either. It should also be noted that even if the two countries have the same ratio of low- to high-skilled labor ($\bar{L}^1/\bar{H}^1 = \bar{L}^2/\bar{H}^2$), due to the extra term w_L^2 in equation (6) the skill premia are not necessarily equal in these countries.

Here, we resort to a concrete numerical example to illustrate that there is a case in which entry deregulation and antitrust policy in one country, respectively, increases and decreases the skill premia in both countries and to also show the quantitatively different effects of a domestic policy on the domestic and foreign skill premia. Note that the parameters are not calibrated because our model is very simple and thus cannot perform full-scale calibrations capturing many facts. Here, we just want to show this numerical example to highlight the existence of such a case.

Example Consider the numerical example of asymmetric countries in which

$$\bar{f}^1 = \bar{f}^2 = 4, \bar{m}^1 = \bar{m}^2 = 2, \rho = \frac{1}{2}, \epsilon = -1, \bar{H}^1 = 200, \bar{L}^1 = 100, \bar{H}^2 = 75, \bar{L}^2 = 50.$$

Then, from (5) and (6), we obtain:

$$w_H^1 = 4.6875, \frac{w_H^2}{w_L^2} = 8.33.$$

¹⁷If we introduce a tradable homogenous intermediate good as numeraire, due to its price equalization across the two countries it is possible to have $w_L^1 = w_L^2 = 1$ even in the case of asymmetric countries

¹⁸It can be shown that the low-skilled wage w_L^2 decreases (resp. increases) when the total value of the composite intermediate goods decreases (resp. increases).

We consider the following three cases.

1. If the government in country 1 decreases the fixed costs \bar{f}^1 from 4 to 1, then w_H^1 increases from 4.6875 to 15.625 and w_H^2/w_L^2 also increases from 8.33 to 13.89. This shows that the decrease in the fixed costs in country 1 raises the skill premium in country 1 by a greater percentage than that in country 2.
2. If the government in country 1 decreases the cartel size \bar{m}^1 from 2 to 1, then w_H^1 decreases from 4.6875 to 2.67 and w_H^2/w_L^2 also decreases from 8.33 to 6.69. This shows that the decrease in the cartel size in country 1 decreases the skill premium in country 1 by a greater percentage than that in country 2.
3. If the government in each country i simultaneously decreases the fixed costs \bar{f}^i from 4 to 1, then w_H^1 increases from 4.6875 to 18.75 and w_H^2/w_L^2 also increases from 8.33 to 33.33. As we can see, the increase in the skill premium in each country is greater than that in the first case in which only country 1 conducts entry deregulation.

5 Empirical Relevance

In this section, we discuss the empirical relevance of our model, although a definitive answer must wait for serious empirical work.

Are the main predictions of our model empirically relevant? Table 1 shows available empirical evidence from the U.S. for entry costs, cartels, firm numbers/size, and the skill premium. The data for the entry cost index and the total cartel cases are from Nicoletti and Scarpetta (2003) and the Workload Statistics provided by the Antitrust Division at the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ), respectively. Nicoletti and Scarpetta (2003) compiled an index on product market regulation, and we measure the total cartel cases by the total criminal cases (filed). The data for firm numbers/size and the skill premium are from the U.S. Annual Survey of Manufactures (ASM). We measure firm numbers and firm size by the number of establishments and the number of workers per establishment, respectively. The skill premium is measured by the relative wage of non-production to production workers. We note that the table provides the data on the entry cost index and the total cartel cases for 1978 and 1998, while it provides the ASM data for 1977 and 1997. This is because the Nicoletti and Scarpetta (2003) index's starting date is 1978 and its ending date is 1998, while the ASM uses census data for the number of establishments and this census is conducted at 5-year intervals including the years 1977 and 1997.

=== Table 1 ===

As shown in Table 1, from the late 1970s to the late 1990s entry costs decreased and cartel activities became more active. Over the same period, firm numbers increased, firm

size decreased, and the skill premium increased. These observations are indeed compatible with the predictions that our model has derived under the assumption that a composite of intermediate goods—varieties—and skill are complementary ($\epsilon < 0$). Recall that, in both autarky and two-country models, a decrease in entry costs f is accompanied by an increase in firm numbers, a decrease in firm size, and an increase in the skill premium, under the assumption of variety–skill complementarity. Recall also that more active cartel activities (an increase in m) are also accompanied by an increase in firm numbers and the skill premium and a decrease in firm size. Thus the main predictions under the assumption of variety–skill complementarity does appear to be empirically relevant.

What about the assumption of variety–skill complementarity? Is this assumption also empirically relevant? A definitive answer must wait for estimating the elasticity of substitution between intermediate goods—which we call varieties—and high-skilled workers. However, if we interpret varieties as varieties of tasks, intuitively it is plausible to assume that higher skilled workers are more complementary to varieties of tasks than lower skilled workers are. Indeed, this assumption can be compatible with the data on Stanford business school alumni. Using data on Stanford business school alumni, Lazear (2005, 2012) empirically confirmed that leaders are generalists who need not excel in any one skill but are competent in many. He defines leaders as individuals who have a position defined as a “C” level position (CEO, COO, CFO, etc.), a managing director, or similar, which would be a high-skill position.

6 Conclusion and Extensions

This paper has developed a simple, general equilibrium model to examine the possible effects of both entry and antitrust policies on the skill premium in wages through a change in firm numbers/size. The closed economy model has shown that entry deregulation that reduces the fixed costs of entry can increase the skill premium by increasing the number of firms and decreasing the firm size. However, an antitrust policy that reduces the size of cartels can decrease the skill premium by decreasing the number of firms and increasing the firm size. We have also extended the model to a two-country model. The extended model has shown that in the case of symmetric countries, entry deregulation that is conducted symmetrically in both countries can increase the skill premia symmetrically in both countries while antitrust policy that is conducted symmetrically in both countries can have the opposite effect. In the case of asymmetric countries, though the effects are not clear, our numerical example has shown a possibility that entry deregulation and antitrust policy in one country, respectively, can increase and decrease the skill premia in both countries through trade; however, the domestic skill premium is changed by a greater percentage than the foreign one. Thus, in both symmetric and asymmetric cases, the interaction between domestic competition policies and trade can change wage inequality in a trading partner

even if it is not the purpose of the policies. This implies that the international coordination of competition policies are essentially necessary among the trading countries.

Several next steps could be pursued for future research. First, our model has implied the essential necessity of international coordination of competition policies. We can thus extend our model to explicitly analyze international policy coordination as does Ohyama (1997).¹⁹ Second, our paper has focused on the interaction between competition policies and free trade. It would be interesting to introduce tariffs/trade costs into our model and analyze the interaction between the competition and trade policies. Third, in our model the fixed costs are in terms of low-skilled labor. Thus an extension of our model is to introduce the fixed costs of high-skilled labor, as well.

Fourth, this paper has provided a simple model with symmetric firms as a first step. It would also be interesting to extend our model to a heterogeneous firm model. The results regarding entry deregulation in a closed economy will remain unchanged. Upon application of the well-known argument by Melitz (2003), firms whose productivities are above the cutoff productivity stay and produce in the intermediate goods market. If the fixed costs of entry are decreased due to entry deregulation, then the number of producing firms will increase, which increases the number of varieties available to the final goods. It raises the skill premium if varieties and high-skilled workers are complements, and it decreases the average size of firms measured by employment. However, the results regarding entry deregulation in an open economy might not be clear even in the case of symmetric countries. Suppose that fixed costs are decreased due to entry deregulation in each country. Then the total number of producing firms in each country will increase, but the number of exporters in each country might decrease. Hence, the total number of the domestic and imported varieties available to the final goods in each country might not increase. As for antitrust policy, it would not be safe to assume that cartels are formed symmetrically among firms in a heterogeneous firm setting. Modeling how cartels are formed among heterogeneous firms will be a challenge.

Finally, we have discussed the empirical relevance of our model in Section 5, but a definitive answer must wait for serious empirical work. In particular, it would be important to estimate the elasticity of substitution between intermediate goods—which we call varieties—and high-skilled workers like several studies (e.g., Krusell et al., 2000) have estimated the elasticity of substitution between capital and high-skilled workers.²⁰

¹⁹Ohyama (1997) considers the international coordination of entry policy in a model of monopolistic competition. Yanase (2019) extends it to a model with non-homothetic quadratic preferences. For the international coordination of merger policy, see Richardson (1999) and Horn and Levinsohn (2001).

²⁰Kiyota and Kurokawa (2019) have recently provided a first statistical test on whether intermediate goods are complements for skilled labor. Using a two-level CES production function and the panel data of 40 countries over 1995–2009, they show that the elasticity of substitution between intermediate goods and unskilled labor is significantly greater than that between intermediate goods and skilled labor, suggesting intermediate goods–skill complementarity.

Appendix: Solving the Model

A.1 The intermediate goods sector

First, we derive the free-entry number of firms \bar{n} in the intermediate goods sector with the regulated fixed costs at \bar{f} and the regulated cartel size at \bar{m} .²¹ For simplicity, we assume that firms are identical and equilibria symmetric. Thus we have $p(j) = p$ and $x(j) = x, \forall j$.

Given an arbitrary n , as in Seade (1980) and Ohyama (1999) each cartel maximizes the total profit of \bar{m} firms $\bar{m}px - \bar{m}(w_Lx - w_L\bar{f}/\bar{m})$, taking other cartels' outputs as given. By setting $w_L = 1$ as the numeraire and noting that an individual firm is negligible in the aggregate economy,²² the output $x(n; \bar{f}, \bar{m})$, the price $p(n; \bar{f}, \bar{m})$, and the profit $\pi(n; \bar{f}, \bar{m})$ of each variety corresponding to this n are:

$$x(n; \bar{f}, \bar{m}) = \left[\left(\frac{1}{p_y n^{(\epsilon/\rho)-1} \rho} \right)^{\epsilon/(1-\epsilon)} - n^{\epsilon/\rho} \right]^{-1/\epsilon} H, \forall j;$$

$$p(n; \bar{f}, \bar{m}) = \frac{1}{\rho}, \forall j;$$

$$\pi(n; \bar{f}, \bar{m}) = \left(\frac{1}{\rho} \right) x(n; \bar{f}, \bar{m}) - x(n; \bar{f}, \bar{m}) - \frac{\bar{f}}{\bar{m}}, \forall j.$$

As the price is independent of the number of varieties n , the price when the profit of each variety reaches zero because of free entry and exit is also:

$$p = \frac{1}{\rho}.$$

Then, the zero profit condition $px(\bar{n}; \bar{f}, \bar{m}) - x(\bar{n}; \bar{f}, \bar{m}) - \bar{f}/\bar{m} = 0$, with $p = 1/\rho$, specifies the output of each variety:

$$x(\bar{n}; \bar{f}, \bar{m}) = \frac{\bar{f}\rho}{\bar{m}(1-\rho)}.$$

Substituting this output into the equality of labor demand and supply in the intermediate sector, $\bar{n} [x(\bar{n}; \bar{f}, \bar{m}) + \bar{f}/\bar{m}] = \bar{L}$, gives the free-entry number of firms \bar{n} :

$$\bar{n} = \frac{\bar{L}(1-\rho)}{\bar{f}/\bar{m}}. \tag{A1}$$

²¹Mankiw and Whinston (1986) are one of the notable theoretical studies on the free-entry number of firms. It shows that there is a tendency toward excess entry from a social standpoint in homogeneous product markets and that product differentiation can reverse this tendency.

²²Our model with symmetric firms cannot capture the cross-sectional fact that larger employers pay higher wages at a given point in time (Brown and Medoff, 1989). Extending our model to a heterogeneous firms model may capture this size–wage relationship in the cross-section. Holmes and Mitchell (2008) link the size–skill relationship in the cross-section (where larger plants employ a larger/smaller fraction of skilled workers) to changes in the skill premium over time. They show that if the size–skill relationship is positive, an expansion of markets due to increased trade can raise the skill premium without technological change.

A.2 The final good sector

Next, we derive the solutions for the final sector.

Here, we find it useful to define a composite good

$$X = \left(\int_0^n x(j)^\rho dj \right)^{1/\rho}$$

and its price p_X . Then the profit of the final good sector becomes:

$$p_y (X^\epsilon + H^\epsilon)^{1/\epsilon} - p_X X - w_H H.$$

By solving the cost minimization problem for the composite good X , its price p_X becomes:

$$p_X = \left(\int_0^n p(j)^{\rho/(\rho-1)} dj \right)^{(\rho-1)/\rho}.$$

By symmetry $p(j) = p$, p_X becomes:

$$p_X = n^{(\rho-1)/\rho} p.$$

The market clearing condition for the final good and the first order conditions with respect to X and H thereby yield:

$$w_H = \left(n^{(\rho-1)/\rho} p \right)^\epsilon \left(\frac{\bar{L}}{\bar{H}} \right)^{1-\epsilon}.$$

As we have normalized $w_L = 1$, the relative wage of high-skilled to low-skilled labor—the skill premium—is w_H .

A.3 The skill premium

Finally, by combining the above solutions in the intermediate sector and in the final sector, we obtain the skill premium $w_H(\bar{f}, \bar{m})$ corresponding to the regulated fixed costs at \bar{f} and the regulated cartel size at \bar{m} :

$$w_H(\bar{f}, \bar{m}) = \left(\bar{n}^{(\rho-1)/\rho} p \right)^\epsilon \left(\frac{\bar{L}}{\bar{H}} \right)^{1-\epsilon}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\bar{n} = \bar{L}(1-\rho)/(\bar{f}/\bar{m})$ and $p = 1/\rho$.

References

- Acemoglu, D. (2003), Patterns of Skill Premia, *Review of Economic Studies* 70 (2): 199–230.
- Berman, E., Bound, J., Griliches, Z. (1994), Changes in the Demand for Skilled Labor within U.S. Manufacturing: Evidence from the Annual Survey of Manufactures, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 109 (2): 367–397.
- Blanchard, O., Kremer, M. (1997), Disorganization, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 112 (4): 1091–1126.
- Brown, C., Medoff, J. (1989), The Employer Size–Wage Effect, *Journal of Political Economy* 97 (5): 1027–1059.
- Dinopoulos, E., Segerstrom, P. (1999), A Schumpeterian Model of Protection and Relative Wages, *American Economic Review* 89 (3): 450–472.
- Dixit, A.K. (1979), A Model of Duopoly Suggesting a Theory of Entry Barriers, *Bell Journal of Economics* 10 (1): 20–32.
- Dixit, A.K., Stiglitz, J.E. (1977), Monopolistic Competition and Optimum Product Diversity, *American Economic Review* 67 (3): 297–308.
- Ethier, W.J. (1982), National and International Returns to Scale in the Modern Theory of International Trade, *American Economic Review* 72 (3): 389–405.
- Feenstra, R.C., Hanson, G.H. (1996), Foreign Investment, Outsourcing and Relative Wages, in: Feenstra, R.C., Grossman, G.M., Irwin, D.A. (Eds.), *The Political Economy of Trade Policy: Papers in Honor of Jagdish Bhagwati*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press: pp. 89–127.
- Grossman, G.M., Rossi-Hansberg, E. (2008), Trading Tasks: A Simple Theory of Offshoring, *American Economic Review* 98 (5): 1978–1997.
- Holmes, T.J., Mitchell, M.F. (2008), A Theory of Factor Allocation and Plant Size, *RAND Journal of Economics* 39 (2): 329–351.
- Horn, H., Levinsohn, J. (2001), Merger Policies and Trade Liberalisation, *Economic Journal* 111 (470): 244–276.
- Ichikawa, T., Kikuchi, T. (2002), Congestible Communications Networks and International Trade, *Canadian Journal of Economics* 35 (2): 331–340.
- Katz, L.F., Autor, D.H. (1999), Change in the Wage Structure and Earnings Inequality, in: Ashenfelter, O., Card, D. (Eds.), *Handbook of Labor Economics, Vol. 3A*, Amsterdam: North-Holland: pp. 1463–1555.

- Kiyota, K., Kurokawa, Y. (2019), Intermediate Goods–Skill Complementarity, Keio-IES Discussion Paper Series DP2019-013, Institute for Economic Studies, Keio University.
- Kremer, M. (1993), The O-Ring Theory of Economic Development, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 108 (3): 551–575.
- Krusell, P., Ohanian, L.E., Rios-Rull, J.-V., Violante, G.L. (2000), Capital–Skill Complementarity and Inequality: A Macroeconomic Analysis, *Econometrica* 68 (5): 1029–1053.
- Kurokawa, Y. (2010), Fixed Cost, Number of Firms, and Skill Premium: An Alternative Source for Rising Wage Inequality, *Economics Letters* 108 (2): 141–144.
- Kurokawa, Y. (2011), Variety–Skill Complementarity: A Simple Resolution of the Trade–Wage Inequality Anomaly, *Economic Theory* 46 (2): 297–325.
- Kurokawa, Y. (2014), A Survey of Trade and Wage Inequality: Anomalies, Resolutions and New Trends, *Journal of Economic Surveys* 28 (1): 169–193.
- Lazear, E.P. (2005), Entrepreneurship, *Journal of Labor Economics* 23 (4): 649–680.
- Lazear, E.P. (2012), Leadership: A Personnel Economics Approach, *Labour Economics* 19 (1): 92–101.
- Lucas, R.E., Jr. (1978), On the Size Distribution of Business Firms, *Bell Journal of Economics* 9 (2): 508–523.
- Mankiw, N.G., Whinston, M.D. (1986), Free Entry and Social Inefficiency, *RAND Journal of Economics* 17 (1): 48–58.
- Melitz, M.J. (2003), The Impact of Trade on Intra-Industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity, *Econometrica* 71 (6): 1695–1725.
- Mitchell, M.F. (2005), Specialization and the Skill Premium in the 20th Century, *International Economic Review* 46 (3): 935–955.
- Mobius, M., Schoenle, R. (2006), The Evolution of Work, NBER Working Paper No. 12694.
- Neary, J. Peter (2003a), Competitive versus Comparative Advantage, *The World Economy* 26 (4): 457–470.
- Neary, J. Peter (2003b), Globalization and Market Structure, *Journal of the European Economic Association* 1 (2/3): 245–271.
- Nicoletti, G., Scarpetta, S. (2003), Regulation, Productivity and Growth: OECD Evidence, *Economic Policy* 18 (36): 9–72.

- Ohyama, M. (1997), Monopolistic Competition, Increasing Returns and International Coordination of Entry Policy, *Pacific Economic Review* 2 (3): 197–209.
- Ohyama, M. (1999), Market, Trade and Welfare in General Equilibrium, *Japanese Economic Review* 50 (1): 1–24.
- Richardson, M. (1999), Trade and Competition Policies: Concordia Discors? *Oxford Economic Papers* 51 (4): 649–664.
- Rosen, S. (1982), Authority, Control, and the Distribution of Earnings, *Bell Journal of Economics* 13 (2): 311–323.
- Seade, J. (1980), On the Effects of Entry, *Econometrica* 48 (2): 479–489.
- Singh, N., Vives, X. (1984), Price and Quantity Competition in a Differentiated Duopoly, *RAND Journal of Economics* 15 (4): 546–554.
- Vives, X. (1988), Sequential Entry, Industry Structure and Welfare, *European Economic Review* 32 (8): 1671–1687.
- Yanase, A. (2019), Monopolistic Competition and International Coordination of Entry Policy Revisited, Nagoya University.

	<i>1978</i>	<i>1998</i>
<i>Entry cost index (Nicoletti and Scarpetta, 2003)</i>	4.0	1.4
<i>Total cartel cases (DOJ)</i>	31	62
	<i>1977</i>	<i>1997</i>
<i>Firm numbers (ASM)</i>	359,928	373,548
<i>Firm size (ASM)</i>	54.4	48.4
<i>Skill premium (ASM)</i>	1.58	1.88

Table 1: Indirect evidence from the U.S.