

The impact of trade liberalization on wage inequality: Case of Pakistan

Zara Salman

and

Mariam Javed

Department of Economics

School of Humanities, Social Sciences and Law

LAHORE UNIVERSITY OF MANAGEMENT SCIENCES

Lahore, Pakistan

May 2011

Abstract: This paper examines whether trade liberalization played a role in shaping the wage structure of Pakistan in the late 1990s and early 2000. It uses manufacturing workers data from LFS supplemented by external information to analyze the impact of trade liberalization. In general, the results show that trade liberalization, measured through import penetration ratio, export penetration ratio and relative prices of each industry, not only impacted wages but also increased wage inequality across skill levels from 1996-97 to 2005-06. The econometrics analysis confirms that increase in import penetration raises skilled premium while simultaneously reducing unskilled premium; a result in contention with the findings of the Stolper-Sameulson Theorem.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank our Supervisor, Dr. Abid Burki, for his constant support and guidance, as well as helping us with all data related issues. A special thanks to Abu Bakr Memon for helping us out with STATA. The data for this paper was provided by Dr. Abid Burki, Professor of Economics, Lahore University of Management Sciences.

Section 1

Introduction

While an increasing number of developing economies are engaging in trade liberalization, its impact on wage inequality is not quite understood. Trade liberalization is defined as the removal or reduction of restrictions or barriers on the free exchange of goods between nations. This includes the removal or reduction of both tariff (duties and surcharges) and non-tariff obstacles (like licensing rules, quotas and other requirements) [Investopedia]¹. This phenomenon is seen to impact wages for various skill levels differently and therefore, is likely to have consequences on wage inequality as well. Even though various studies have focused on how economic growth and various demographic factors affect wage inequality, few studies examine the impact on it as a result of policy changes such as, trade liberalization [Kassa (2003)]. Given Pakistan's slashing reforms towards liberalization of trade in the 1990s especially after its membership of the WTO in 1995, the impact of this policy on wage inequality is equally important as other determinants.

The Heckscher-Ohlin model and the Stolper-Sameulson Theorem provide the necessary theoretical underpinning to explain how free-trade impacts wages in different sectors of the economy. According to the H-O model, countries specialize in the production of those goods which intensively use the factors of production in which they are abundantly endowed. Consequently, this model predicts that while developed countries specialize in the production of goods that intensively use skilled labor, developed countries like Pakistan, specialize in goods that intensively use unskilled labour [Giliani et al. (2003)]. Under this approach, international competition in developed countries will only increase wages of high-skilled labour, if and only if

¹ <http://www.investopedia.com/>

there is an increase in the relative prices of goods they specialize in. This result is presented by the Stolper-Sameulson Theorem. This theorem, in the developing country context, would imply that trade liberalization increases the relative prices of industries that employ unskilled labour, and therefore, increasing their wages would consequently reduce wage inequality within the country.

In this paper, we investigate the effect of trade liberalization policies on wage inequality in Pakistan in 1990s and early 2000. Firstly, our paper aims to investigate whether trade liberalization played any role in influencing the Pakistani wage structure, during this ten year period after joining the WTO. Secondly, if it did have any impact, we seek to investigate whether it is in accordance with the result expected by the Stolper-Sameulson Theorem. We find that an increase in trade liberalization, measured through import penetration, export penetration and relative prices of each industry, has increased wage inequality for different skill levels; a result contrary to that predicted by the Stolper-Sameulson Theorem.

The rest of this section provides a literature review, the objectives of the research and describes Pakistan's background on trade liberalization and wage inequality. Section 2 outlines the empirical model while Section 3 describes the data and data sources. Section 5 then presents the estimation results, while Section 6 provides a discussion of these findings in light of other research. Concluding comments and recommendations are in Section 6.

1.2 Literature Review

Current research indicates that the impact of trade liberalization on wage inequality is highly debatable. The East Asian countries experienced a positive effect of trade liberalization i.e. a

decline in wage inequality, in accordance to the Stolper-Samuelson theorem. Yet some Latin American countries seem to have experienced the reverse of what the theorem predicted; a liberal trade policy seems to have increased wage inequality. Beyer et al. (1999), while conducting a study on Chile, found that liberalization had a substantial effect on wage inequality. They provided two reasons for the increase in inequality i.e. transformation in the productive structure of the economy and technological change which was skill biased. These changes resulted in an improvement in wages for skilled labour. However, our paper differs from this approach because its focus lies only on the manufacturing sector. Thus, instead of focusing on both the reasons that Beyer et al. (1999) provides, it provides a more in depth analysis on one of them i.e. skill biased change.

Furthermore, according to Galiani et al. (2003), the trade liberalization reforms introduced in the nineties in Argentina demonstrate that wage inequality widened in those manufacturing industries where import penetration deepened. In their empirical analysis, the impact of import penetration on college wage premium was studied. By controlling for both individual and industry specific characteristics, it was discovered that there is a positive and significant correlation between both variables. This clearly indicated that while trade liberalization increases wage inequality in Argentina, it does not completely explain this rise. Therefore other factors must be taken into account as well. While our paper also uses a similar measure of import penetration, it further strengthens its results by using other measures as well like export penetration and relative prices.

Moreover, some research has led to results that indicate no relation in the empirical analysis of the impact of trade openness on wage inequality. According to Munshi et al. (2006) who studied this relationship for the cotton textile industry of Bangladesh, liberal trade reforms do not

increase wage inequality. Four measures were used to estimate this relationship i.e. the ratio of USA to Bangladeshi manufacturing prices, the ratio of exports plus imports to GDP, the ratio of aggregate exports to GDP, and the ratio of imports of consumer goods to aggregate consumption. All measures show an increase in both the wages of skilled and unskilled workers, implying that trade liberalization has led to a positive technical change which is skill neutral but that it does not affect wage inequality. However, it must be taken into account that this paper only focuses on the cotton textile industry, while our paper provides a broader analysis since it uses two-digit manufacturing industries.

On the other hand, while the above studies go against the predictions of Stolper-Samuelson theorem, those done by Bigsten et al. (2006), Goh et al. (2005) and Kumar et al. (2005) seem to reinforce the predictions of the Stolper-Samuelson theorem. Kumar et al. (2005) use tariff reductions to study the impact of trade liberalization on wage inequality in India, implying that productivity increases are passed on to industry wages. As those manufacturing industries with higher proportion of unskilled labour had greater tariff reductions, the increase in their wages was also greater relative to skilled labour. Conversely, while this paper investigates trade openness by using policy measures like tariff reductions, our paper differs by providing a different analysis based on outcome measures.

Moreover, in this paper it must be emphasized that for our analysis, we depart from H-O model to a degree. This is because the H-O model assumes that perfect inter-sector mobility of labour, which consequently results in wages for workers with the same degree of skill to equalize across all industries. With reference to Pakistan, the following table shows the existence of inter-industry wage premiums.

Table: 1 Inter-Industry Premiums for three skill groups

	Skilled Premium	Semi-Skilled Premium	Unskilled Premium
Food, beverage and tobacco	135.0	59.9	44.2
Textile wearing apparel, leather industry	153.5	64.8	44.1
Paper, paper products, printing, publishing	155.4	64.4	48.8
Chemical, petroleum, coal, rubber & plastic	162.1	93.3	52.7
Basic metal industries	145.7	80.1	62.4
Fabricated metal, machinery & equipment	176.5	67.2	49.9
Other Industries	172.6	66.7	50.3

Note: Data for Mean of yearly real wage (Year. 1996-97). Real Wages in (000) Rupees.

1.3 Objective of the research

The variation in wage premiums across industries for workers with the same skills, paves the way for researching the impact of trade liberalization on wage inequality. This paper aims to use inter-sector and time variability from 1996 to 2005 in trade liberalization as well as skill premiums to explore the role played by the former in influencing the wage structure of Pakistan in late 1990s and early 2000. Since no such study has been conducted for Pakistan, our paper will serve as an important tool for policy makers, to draw lessons from existing policy measures which effect the development and growth of the economy. Moreover, the conclusions drawn from this research can also be used as a reference and an evaluation tool for future policy changes as Pakistan enters into new trade relations with various countries.

1.4 Background of Pakistan's trade liberalization and wage inequality


Trade liberalization in Pakistan was introduced to strengthen its industrial base. Till the sixties, Pakistan had a very restricted trade policy of import substitution in order to protect its weak manufacturing sector. This was because Pakistan had always focused on its agricultural sector and combined with a lack of well organized infrastructure and political instability, trade policy was characterized with high tariff and non tariff barriers. However, in the seventies the

beginning of an open trade policy was seen. Yet the most substantial change occurred in the late eighties and early nineties when tariff slabs were reduced from 17 to 10 and a uniform tax was introduced instead of a commodity based sales taxes. Moreover, the maximum tariff was decreased from 225 percent in 1986-87 to 70 percent in 1994-95, whereas non-tariff barriers were mostly removed as well. Through various tax holidays and tariff cuts like the decline in average tariff rate from 77 percent to about 17 percent, the government of Pakistan aimed to provide incentives to improve the efficiency of its manufacturing sector. Moreover, measures to encourage exports were introduced which included the removal of all export duties except for 251 items for which Pakistan has a comparative advantage in the international market. Also included in these measures was entering into Free trade Agreements with mutual agreements on easy access to markets for countries like Malaysia and Sri Lanka [Bashir (2003)]. Pakistan also became member of the World Trade Organization in 1995 which lead to further openness through steps like signing the Agreement on Textile and Clothing [Industrial Information Network]². Moreover, the implementation of a Structural Adjustment and Stabilization Program lead to further trade reforms as they were an integral part of the development process introduced by them [Hyder et al. (2011)]. These measures resulted in a positive effect which was seen in the trade-to-GDP ratio. The ratio increased by 0.4 percentage points per annum in Pakistan since 1990 [Civil Service of Pakistan].³ . The result of these measures can also be seen in the rising trend of exports and imports as depicted by Figure1.

² <http://www.iin.com.pk/>

³ <http://www.cssforum.com.pk/>

Figure: 1 Total imports, exports and trade balance




Source: UN Comtrade

While the volume of trade has increased in Pakistan, the trend for wages has changed as well. Figure 2 shows an upward trend of real per capita mean incomes over time for both rural and urban areas of Pakistan. Furthermore, according to PIDE, real and money wages in Pakistan have shown a positive trend from year 1995 till 2005 with a growth rate lower than GDP per capita growth rate in the nineties but higher than GDP per capita from the year 2000 onwards [Irfan (2008)]. Moreover, the trend of wages based on educational categories shows a positive movement over the period 1995-2006 with the greatest improvement seen for workers with higher degrees. This can be seen in Figure 3

However, it must be indicated that based on the background of trade liberalization in Pakistan, this paper will only look at the effect of the manufacturing sector wages, since the focus of trade


liberalization policies has been to improve the industrial sector. Furthermore, it will use measures that utilize exports, imports and relative prices to indicate the openness of trade.

Figure: 2 Mean income trend



Source: Pakistan Institute of Development Economics

Figure: 3 Wage trend based on educational category



Source: Pakistan Institute of Development Economics

Section 2

Econometric Methodology

2.1 Basic model

In this section, we present the estimation strategy used in this study. We commence by introducing the basic model that is frequently used in human capital literature in order to determine differences in wages across skill levels, which includes individual, yearly, industrial and regional control variables. We then proceed to introduce the augmented empirical specifications.

In our basic model, we include the skill dummies in order to see the differences in wage premiums between skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers across different industries.

$$Wage_i = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 age + \alpha_3 age^2 + \delta_1 married + \delta_2 male + \delta_3 urban + \delta_4 training + \delta_5 Y + \gamma P + \lambda I + \phi_1 S + \varepsilon_i \quad (2.1)$$

We use an OLS model to estimate the equation 2.1. In the above Model 1, Y represents the year dummy, P represents provinces dummies, I represents industry dummies while S represents skill dummies. We run two variations of Model 1, one for each year, 1996 and 2006 respectively.

Moreover, there is a need to control for clustering in this model since we have used aggregate level data for imports, exports and prices at industry level and combined it with our micro level data for workers with respect to their industries. If we do not control for clustering at industry level, our estimated standard errors from OLS estimates on the aggregate data will be too small while their respective t-values will be very large, making us reject the null hypothesis of no significance [Cheah (2009)].

2.2 Introducing Trade Variables

Basing our analysis on Giliani and Sanguinetti's paper (2003), we introduce interaction terms between trade and skill variables in order to evaluate how trade liberalization impacts wage premiums. Trade liberalization is measured through import and export penetration ratios and relative prices for each industry⁴. In Model 2, we only introduce interactions between skill dummies and import penetration to see the impact of reduction in tariffs and quotas on the skill premiums. Furthermore, in Model 3, we add interaction terms between skill dummies and export penetration to Model 2, in order to assess the significance of trade liberalization, encompassing both exports and imports in influencing wages premiums. We then add relative prices to Model 3, by including its interactions with the skill dummies of industries in order to decipher how their inclusion further affects the impact of our variables of interest on disparity in wages across varied skill levels. This is done in model 4.

Section 3

Data and Construction of Variables

3.1 Data Sources

In this section we will discuss the data sources used in this study and highlight the construction of different variables used in the empirical models. Furthermore, we provide a brief description of these variables, followed by summary statistics.

⁴When we introduce these interactions we remove the skill dummies from the equation

The data used in this study is obtained from a nationally representative cross-sectional data set named as the **Labor Force Survey of Pakistan**. The LFS is an annual survey, carried about by the Federal Bureau of Statistics. The major aim of the survey is to collect a set of comprehensive statistics on the various dimensions of country's civilian labour force. The number of sample households in the survey is 32,778 (99.7% of the total sample). Furthermore, it uses a Multi-stage stratified random sample [International Household Survey Network].⁵

We obtain the survey for the year 1996-97 and 2005-06 and merge these two data sets in order to carry out our analysis. Since trade liberalization policies gained tremendous momentum in the early nineties and moreover, Pakistan became member of the World Trade Organization at this time, 1996-97 is an ideal time period to be taken as the base period to which trade liberalization effects of wages can be compared. Secondly, a nine to ten year gap between the two data points is ample time for the trade liberalization policies to have any effect and thus 2005-06 is taken as the second data point.

Furthermore, since this survey does not provide data on imports, exports or their respective prices, which is necessary for our analysis, we obtained this information from the Federal Bureau of Statistics Yearbook 2006, Section 9. Moreover, as we are interested in evaluating the effects of trade liberalization on wage inequality in the manufacturing sector, we restrict our sample to the Two Digit Standard Industrial Classification (SIC). The description is given in table 3.1.

Table: 3.1 Two Digit (SIC) for Manufacturing Industries

Code	Description
31	Manuf. Of food beverage and tobacco
32	Manuf. Of textile wearing apparel and leather industry
33	Manuf. Of wood or wood product or furniture

⁵ <http://surveynetwork.org/>

34	Manuf. Of paper, paper product, printing, publishing
35	Manuf of Chemical petroleum, coal rubber & plastic prod.
36	Manuf. Non-metallic product except petroleum & coal
37	Basic metal industries
38	Manuf. Fabricated metal products, machinery & equipment
39	Other manuf. Industries & handicraft

Source: Code Book, Labor Force Survey, 1996-97.

While, the LFS provides us data about all industries, the Statistical Yearbook, 2006 is unable to supply us with trade data for Industries 33 and 36. Therefore, as key information on imports and exports is missing for these industries, we drop their respective observations from the sample.

3.2 Definition and Construction of Variables

Basing our model on Giliani and Sanguinetti's paper, 'The impact of trade liberalization on wage inequality: evidence from Argentina' (2003), the extent of trade liberalization is measured through import penetration, export ratio and relative prices. Import penetration is the logarithm of the ratio of imports to the gross value added for each industry in the manufacturing sector, whereas export ratio is defined as the logarithm of the ratio of exports to the gross value added for each industry in the manufacturing sector. These variables have been adjusted for inflation using GDP deflator, where the base year is 2000-01⁶.

To gather data on relative prices for each industry, we divided the production value of each industry by the quantity produced for it. This method was used as no data was available for individual industry prices. However, since these prices were not in the same unit, due to each industry having a different quantity unit, we converted the prices into index numbers. This was obtained by dividing each price by the year's Consumer Price Index and multiplying by 100 to get real prices and then dividing those real prices by the Whole Price Index of the base year

⁶ GDP Deflator: 1996= 62.04, 2006=147.07

2000-2001⁷. By this method we were able to compare the prices of 1996-1997 with 2005-2006 as base year.

Table: 3.2 Periodic changes in trade variables

Industries	Import penetration		Export ratio		Relative prices	
	1996-1997	2005-2006	1996-1997	2005-2006	1996-1997	2005-2006
Food, beverage and tobacco	0.81	1.58	0.07	0.07	1.11	0.73
Textile, wearing, apparel and leather	0.04	0.04	3.60	1.29	1.22	0.73
Paper, paper products, printing, publishing	0.67	0.62	0.00	0.00	1.64	0.73
Chemical, petroleum, coal, rubber & plastic	3.81	1.90	0.11	0.22	0.88	0.73
Basic metal industries	3.23	2.63	0.00	0.00	2.15	0.73
Fabricated metal, machinery & equipment	4.03	6.91	0.17	0.14	2.75	0.73
Other manufacturing Industries & handicraft	40.67	53.01	45.93	59.50	4.82	0.73

Source: Federal Bureau of statistics Yearbook 1996 & 2006

Furthermore, in order to see the effect of trade liberalization on wage inequality among labor of different skill levels in the manufacturing sector, we defined variables for wage and the three skill categories. The variable for wage is an annual estimate calculated by translating weekly or monthly earnings (whichever is available for a particular cross-section), into yearly income. However, since there was still a constraint of missing wages for certain observations (3381 observations) that needed to be addressed, we used observations from our working sample, to estimate by OLS a typical wage determination (2.1). We then used the parameter estimates from this equation and values of all right hand-side variables for non-workers to generate the predicted or fitted wage for the non-workers.

We analyzed the level of skill premiums by educational level of workers. Therefore, we defined three skill groups: unskilled (those individuals who have at most attended primary school but have not finished it), semi-skilled (those that have at most attended Intermediate level of

⁷ WPI: 1996=81.62, 2006=136.68

schooling but have not finished it) and skilled group (those who have finished a tertiary degree). Dummies are generated for each skill level and are equal to 1, corresponding to the worker's respective skill.

We have taken age and age² as a proxy for experience and experience² respectively. We do not use Mincer's method because it requires completed years of schooling which is missing in our data. The available data fails to differentiate between attended years of schooling and completed years of schooling. Furthermore, we use the dummies for gender, marital status, training and rural-urban origin as right hand side variables for our wage equation. We also generate dummies for 7 industries and 4 provinces in order to control time-invariant industries and province specific effects. Since, we are interested in evaluating the impact of trade liberalization on wage inequality across two periods, we further generate a dummy for year 1996 equal to 1 if year is 1996-97 and year 1996 equal to 0 if year is 2005-06.

We also introduce interaction terms in our study. These include interactions between different levels of skill and import penetration, export ratio and relative prices. The interaction terms generated are: *impskilled*, *impsemi*, *importunskill*, *expskilled*, *expsemi*, *expunskill*, *pskill*, *psemi*, *punskill*. The variables are defined in table 3.3 while summary statistics for all these variables are given in Table 3.4.

Table: 3.3 Definition of variables used in the regression analysis

Variables	Description
Wage (lnwage)	Yearly wages of all workers in the manufacturing sector excluding industry 33 and 36
Age (age)	Age in years
Age ² (age2)	Quadratic term for age
Male (male)	=1 if worker is male
Married (mar)	=1 if worker is married
Urban (urban)	=1 if worker works in an urban area
Year 1996 (yr1996)	=1 if year is 1996

Training (train)	=1 if worker has training
Punjab (punjab)	=1 if worker is in Punjab
Sindh (Sind)	=1 if worker is in Sindh
NWFP (nwfp)	=1 if worker is in NWFP
Balochistan (baloch)	=1 if worker is in Balochistan
Manuf. Of food, beverage and tobacco (in31)	=1 if worker works in the food, beverage and tobacco industry
Manuf. Of textile, wearing, apparel and leather industry (in32)	=1 if worker works in the textile, wearing, apparel and leather industry
Manuf. Of paper, paper product, printing, publishing (in34)	=1 if worker works in the paper, paper product, printing, publishing industry
Manuf of Chemical, petroleum, coal ,rubber & plastic (in35)	=1 if worker works in the chemical, petroleum, coal, rubber and plastic industry
Basic metal industries (in37)	=1 if worker works in the basic metal industry
Manuf. Fabricated metal, machinery & equipment (in38)	=1 if worker works in the fabricated metal, machinery and equipment industry
Other manuf. Industries & handicraft (in39)	=1 if worker works in other manufacturing industries and handicrafts
Import Penetration (lnimp)	Ratio of imports to value added
Export Penetration (lnexp)	Ratio of exports to value added
Relative Prices (price)	Ratio of real prices to Wholesale Price Index
Skilled (skilled)	=1 if worker has at most attended primary school but has not finished it
Semi-skilled (semiskilled)	=1 if worker has at most attended Intermediate level of schooling but has not finished it
Unskilled (unskilled)	=1 if worker has finished a tertiary degree
Skilled Dummy * Import Penetration (impskilled)	Interaction term of skilled with import penetration
Semi-skilled Dummy * Import Penetration (impsemi)	Interaction term of semi-skilled with import penetration
Unskilled Dummy * Import Penetration (impunskill)	Interaction term of unskilled with import penetration
Skilled Dummy * Export Penetration (expskilled)	Interaction term of skilled with export penetration
Semi-skilled Dummy * Export Penetration (expsemi)	Interaction term of semi-skilled with export penetration
Unskilled Dummy * Export Penetration (expunskill)	Interaction term of unskilled with export penetration
Skilled Dummy * Relative Prices (pskill)	Interaction term of skilled with relative prices
Semi-skilled Dummy * Relative Prices (psemi)	Interaction term of semi-skilled with relative prices
Unskilled Dummy * Relative Prices (punskill)	Interaction term of unskilled with relative prices

Table 3.4: Summary statistics of the variables employed in the wage equation

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev	Min.	Max.
Wage	10.343	1.130	0	13.693
Age	29.901	12.869	10	85
Age ²	1059.707	936.506	100	7225
Male	0.611	0.487	0	1
Female	0.389	0.487	0	1
Married	0.520	0.499	0	1
Unmarried	0.478	0.499	0	1
Urban	0.660	0.474	0	1
Rural	0.312	0.474	0	1
Year 1996	0.312	0.463	0	1
Year 2006	0.688	0.463	0	1

Training	0.078	0.268	0	1
Punjab	0.66	0.482	0	1
Sindh	0.248	0.432	0	1
NWFP	0.089	0.285	0	1
Balochistan	0.022	0.145	0	1
Manuf. Of food beverage and tobacco	0.107	0.309	0	1
Manuf. Of textile wearing apparel and leather industry	0.577	0.494	0	1
Manuf. Of paper, paper product, printing, publishing	0.034	0.182	0	1
Manuf of Chemical petroleum, coal rubber & plastic prod.	0.054	0.227	0	1
Basic metal industries	0.021	0.144	0	1
Manuf. Fabricated metal products, machinery & equipment	0.104	0.305	0	1
Other manuf. Industries & handicraft	0.102	0.303	0	1
Import Penetration	0.804	1.233	0.026	4.198
Export Penetration	0.998	1.196	0	4.318
Relative Prices	1.160	1.027	0.732	4.819
Skilled	0.059	0.235	0	1
Semi-skilled	0.335	0.472	0	1
Unskilled	0.606	0.489	0	1
Skilled Dummy * Import Penetration	0.056	0.341	0	4.198
Semi-skilled Dummy * Import Penetration	0.267	0.777	0	4.198
Unskilled Dummy * Import Penetration	0.481	1.068	0	4.198
Skilled Dummy * Export Penetration	0.043	0.313	0	4.318
Semi-skilled Dummy * Export Penetration	0.307	0.791	0	4.318
Unskilled Dummy * Export Penetration	0.648	1.089	0	4.318
Skilled Dummy * Relative Prices	0.063	0.319	0	4.819
Semi-skilled Dummy * Relative Prices	0.370	0.751	0	4.819
Unskilled Dummy * Relative Prices	0.727	1.031	0	4.819

Section 4

Empirical Findings

In this section, we will present and discuss the findings of our empirical model. We begin with our basic model, and move on to the modifications we made to the basic model. We investigate the effect of our three measures of trade liberalization collectively as well as separately on wage inequality in Pakistan.

Table 4.1 presents a pair of typical estimated coefficients for variables that control for individual characteristics for the year 1996 and 2006 from (Eq. (2.1)). The estimated coefficients are close to what we expected. Wages increase with education and age. Urban workers earn more than rural workers in both years, as is expected. Marital status and Gender are insignificant. Wages do not vary by gender as the females included in this sample are mostly involved in white-collared jobs rather than blue-collared jobs. In 1996, there is no significant difference in wages across provinces; however, in 2006 the wages in Sindh are significantly higher than Punjab, while the wages in NWFP are significantly lower than Punjab. Furthermore, wages on average have increased in the Food, Chemical, Metal and Fabricated Metal industries (compared to the base category) over the ten year period. However, wages on average declined in the Textile and Paper industry over this period. The skilled premium also increased on average during this period.

Variable	1996-97	2005-06
Skilled labour	0.938*** (0.123)	1.062*** (0.054)
Semi-skilled labour	0.374*** (0.027)	0.327*** (0.007)
Age	0.063*** (0.009)	0.045*** (0.005)
Age2	-0.001*** (0.009)	-0.000*** (0.000)
Married	0.065 (0.049)	0.033 (0.038)
Male	0.058 (0.047)	-0.018 (0.008)
Urban	0.142***	0.133***

Table: 4.1 Individual control variables: estimates for selected

	(0.02)	(0.029)
Training	0.036	0.045
	(0.045)	(0.045)
Sindh	0.043	0.049**
	(0.062)	(0.015)
NWFP	-0.126	-0.178***
	(0.076)	(0.042)
Balochistan	0.100	0.022
	(0.066)	(0.101)
Food, beverage and tobacco	-0.222***	-0.060***
	(0.017)	(0.003)
Textile wearing apparel, leather industry	-0.143***	-0.164***
	(0.017)	(0.003)
Paper, paper products, printing, publishing	-0.024	-0.044***
	(0.335)	(0.009)
Chemical, petroleum, coal, rubber & plastic products	-0.131**	-0.045***
	(0.052)	(0.012)
Basic metal industries	-0.052**	0.189***
	(0.015)	(0.015)
Fabricated metal product,machinery & equipment	-0.126***	0.019***
	(0.009)	(0.005)
R-Squared	0.234	0.146
Number of Observations	3220	7117

Notes: ***,** indicate significance at 1%,5% respectively.

Standard errors are written in parenthesis

The robust standard errors are corrected for clustering at the industry level.

Model 2 details the introduction of interaction terms between import penetration and skill levels to the original model, to see the impact of trade liberalization on wage inequality. The results of the regression are given in Table 4.2. The estimated impact of import penetration on the wages of skilled workers is positive and highly significant, while its impact on the wages of unskilled workers is negative and also statistically significant. Since, the coefficient for Import Penetration* Semi-skilled is statistically insignificant, we observe no change in the wages of semi-skilled workers with an increase in import penetration. Overall this result implies that as

import penetration increases by 1%, wage premiums of skilled workers increase by 0.212% while the wages of the unskilled workers decrease by 0.199%.

Moving on, when we further add interactions between export penetration ratio and skill dummies (Model 3), we observe that some of our coefficients change drastically, as shown in Table 4.2.

The coefficient for the year dummy increases substantially. The industries which had significant coefficients in Model 2, become statistically insignificant in Model 3, and vice versa. This Model also makes the effect of our import penetration interaction insignificant, implying that there is no change in wage premiums as a result of higher import penetration. Furthermore, as the interactions between export penetration and skilled dummy, and export penetration and unskilled dummy, are statistically insignificant, there is no impact of higher export penetration on the wage premiums of the skilled and unskilled categories and no substantial effect of wage inequality.

However, higher export penetration leads to an increase in wage premiums for the semi-skilled.

As export penetration increases by 1%, the wage premium for the semi-skilled increases by 0.221%.

Proceeding to Model 4, relative prices of industries are now interacted with the skill dummies and added to Model 3. The results of this model, as shown in Table 4.2, are quite consistent with that of Model 3 and thus quite contradictory to Model 2. All import penetration interactions with skill dummies are still insignificant and there is still no impact of export penetration on skilled wage premium. The interactions with relative prices also come out as insignificant. However, unlike Model 3, Model 4 shows that not only semi-skilled but also unskilled wage premium is increasing with an increase in export penetration. Here a 1% increase in export penetration leads to a 0.191% and 0.136% increase in wage premiums for semi-skilled and unskilled labour respectively. This result shows that while with respect to import penetration and relative prices,

there is no impact on wage inequality, wage inequality is decreasing with respect to export penetration.

Table: 4.2 Parameter estimates for model 2, 3, 4

Variable	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Skilled Dummy * Import Penetration	0.213** (0.079)	0.276 (0.154)	0.065 (0.170)
Semi-skilled Dummy * Import Penetration	-0.090 (0.073)	0.054 (0.056)	0.023 (0.065)
Unskilled Dummy * Import Penetration	-0.199* (0.092)	0.051 (0.124)	0.092 (.106)
Skilled Dummy * Export Penetration		0.371 (0.267)	0.218 (0.226)
Semi-skilled Dummy * Export Penetration		0.221*** (0.062)	0.191*** (0.047)
Unskilled Dummy * Export Penetration		0.086 (0.060)	0.136*** (0.035)
Skilled Dummy * Relative Prices			0.456 (0.250)
Semi-skilled Dummy * Relative Prices			0.106 (0.058)
Unskilled Dummy * Relative Prices			-0.062 (0.056)
Age	0.063*** (0.008)	0.061*** (0.004)	0.058*** (0.004)
Age2	-0.0006*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)
Married	0.009 (0.046)	0.015 (0.034)	0.025 (0.033)
Male	0.002 (0.016)	0.005 (0.014)	0.005 (0.016)
Urban	0.182*** (0.025)	0.174*** (0.014)	0.165*** (0.013)
Training	0.081* (0.040)	0.080* (0.034)	0.067 (0.038)
Year 1996	0.479*** (0.037)	0.326*** (0.031)	0.294*** (0.039)
Sindh	0.112** (0.045)	0.104** (0.029)	0.087** (0.027)
NWFP	-0.162** (0.049)	-0.158** (0.053)	-0.171** (0.050)
Balochistan	0.034 (0.72)	0.039 (0.079)	0.042 (0.076)
Food, beverage and tobacco	-0.578* (0.269)	0.613 (0.322)	0.699** (0.275)
Textile wearing apparel, leather industry	-0.750* (0.330)	0.454 (0.366)	0.532 (0.308)
Paper, paper products, printing, publishing	-0.473 (0.304)	0.800* (0.352)	0.844** (0.288)
Chemical, petroleum, coal, rubber & plastic	-0.394	0.745*	0.819**

	(0.264)	(0.331)	(0.256)
Basic metal industries	-0.252	0.897**	0.929***
	(0.235)	(0.302)	(0.243)
Fabricated metal, machinery & equipment	-0.336	0.635**	0.701**
	(0.186)	(0.244)	(0.202)
R- Squared	0.174	0.180	0.188
Number of Observations	10337	10337	10337

Notes: ***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, 10% respectively.

Standard errors are written in parenthesis

The robust standard errors are corrected for clustering at the industry level.

Since the introductions of these export penetration interactions and price interactions have caused significant changes in our coefficients of Model 2, we expect these to be highly correlated with other variables in the regression. We confirm this assertion by reporting the correlation matrix. Table 4.3 shows that interaction terms between skill and export penetration are highly correlated with the interaction terms between skill and import penetration, and therefore their inclusion in Model 3 gives divergent results. Furthermore, the interaction terms between skill and relative prices are also highly correlated with interactions between export penetration and skill dummy, as well as with the interactions between import penetration and skill dummy.

Table: 4.3 Correlation Matrix

	Wage	Age	Age ²	Male	Married	Urban	Year 1996
Wage	1.00						
Age	0.27	1.00					
Age ²	0.24	0.98	1.00				
Male	-0.12	-0.02	-0.01	1.00			
Married	0.22	0.65	0.56	-0.01	1.00		
Urban	0.15	0.09	0.07	-0.09	0.03	1.00	
Year 1996	0.22	0.06	0.06	-0.001	0.06	0.08	1.00
Training	0.08	0.00	0.00	-0.03	0.01	0.02	0.31
Sindh	0.11	0.08	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.22	0.01
NWFP	-0.05	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.01	-0.06	0.01
Balochistan	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.04	-0.004
Industry 31	0.01	0.07	0.07	0.08	0.06	-0.07	0.02
Industry 32	-0.14	-0.11	-0.11	-0.03	-0.09	-0.03	-0.15
Industry 34	0.03	-0.01	-0.01	-0.03	-0.02	0.06	0.01
Industry 35	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.08	-0.10
Industry 37	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.05
Industry 38	0.04	0.04	0.04	-0.03	0.04	0.03	-0.01

Price*Skilled	0.21	0.10	0.08	-0.02	0.07	0.11	0.10
Price*Semi-skilled	0.15	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	0.01	0.11	0.23
Price*Unskilled	-0.03	-0.10	0.01	0.01	-0.1	-0.10	0.42
Import Penetration* Skilled	0.18	0.10	0.08	-0.01	0.07	0.09	0.06
Import Penetration* Semi-skilled	0.11	0.03	0.02	-0.01	0.02	0.07	0.11
Import Penetration* Unskilled	0.00	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.01	-0.07	0.24
Export Penetration* Skilled	0.15	0.07	0.06	-0.03	0.05	0.07	0.07
Export Penetration* Semi-skilled	0.11	-0.02	-0.03	-0.02	-0.02	0.08	0.18
Export Penetration* Unskilled	-0.03	-0.02	0.01	0.00	-0.03	-0.08	0.35

	Training	Sindh	NWFP	Baloch	Industry 31	Industry 32	Industry 33
Training	1.00						
Sindh	-0.06	1.00					
NWFP	-0.01	-0.18	1.00				
Balochistan	-0.03	-0.09	-0.05	1.00			
Industry 31	-0.06	0.06	0.09	0.05	1.00		
Industry 32	-0.04	-0.03	-0.11	-0.04	-0.40	1.00	
Industry 34	-0.003	0.03	-0.03	-0.002	-0.07	-0.22	1.00
Industry 35	-0.02	0.09	0.03	0.00	-0.08	-0.28	-0.05
Industry 37	0.03	0.05	-0.01	0.01	-0.05	-0.17	-0.03
Industry 38	0.01	-0.05	0.02	0.03	-0.12	-0.40	-0.06
Price*Skilled	0.04	0.12	0.00	-0.02	-0.10	-0.11	0.04
Price*Semi-skilled	0.14	0.02	0.02	-0.02	-0.04	-0.15	0.02
Price*Unskilled	0.15	-0.12	0.02	0.00	-0.06	-0.20	-0.05
Import Penetration* Skilled	0.03	0.10	0.01	-0.01	-0.01	-0.19	0.00
Import Penetration* Semi-skilled	0.08	-0.01	0.04	-0.01	-0.01	-0.39	-0.10
Import Penetration* Unskilled	0.08	-0.07	0.07	0.02	-0.002	-0.50	-0.05
Export Penetration* Skilled	0.01	0.09	-0.01	-0.02	-0.04	-0.01	-0.03
Export Penetration* Semi-skilled	0.11	-0.001	0.00	-0.03	-0.13	-0.01	-0.07
Export Penetration* Unskilled	0.14	0.01	0.01	-0.02	-0.19	-0.04	-0.11

	Industry 35	Industry 37	Industry 38	Price* Skilled	Price* Semi- skilled	Price* Unskilled	Import * Skilled
Industry 35	1.00						
Industry 37	-0.04	1.00					
Industry 38	-0.08	-0.05	1.00				
Price*Skilled	0.10	0.05	0.02	1.00			
Price*Semi-skilled	-0.02	0.04	0.05	-0.10	1.00		
Price*Unskilled	-0.10	-0.01	0.01	-0.14	-0.35	1.00	
Import-Penetration* Skilled	0.18	0.05	0.06	0.78	-0.08	-0.12	1.00
Import-Penetration* Semi-skilled	0.05	0.06	0.19	-0.07	0.75	-0.24	-0.06
Import-Penetration* Unskilled	-0.02	0.02	0.17	-0.09	-0.22	0.78	-0.07
Export-Penetration* Skilled	-0.04	-0.02	-0.04	0.71	-0.07	-0.10	0.64
Export-Penetration* Semi-skilled	-0.08	-0.06	-0.11	-0.08	0.75	-0.27	-0.06
Export-Penetration* Unskilled	-0.13	-0.09	-0.18	-0.12	-0.29	0.78	-0.10

	Import Penetration* Semi-skilled	Import Penetration* Unskilled	Export Penetration* Skilled	Export Penetration* Semi-skilled	Export Penetration* Unskilled
Import Penetration* Semi-skilled	1.00				
Import Penetration* Unskilled	-0.15	1.00			
Export Penetration* Skilled	-0.05	-0.06	1.00		
Export Penetration* Semi-skilled	0.69	-0.18	-0.05	1.00	
Export Penetration* Unskilled	-0.20	0.72	-0.08	-0.23	1.00

Note: High correlation highlighted in bold

Since, there exists significantly high correlations between our key variables, we proceed to run separate models for each of these set of interactions. Table 4.4 reports their results. Model 2, here only includes the interactions between import penetration and skill dummies. Its results have been interpreted earlier which show that as import penetration increases in different industries, the skilled premium increases, while the unskilled premium decreases; therefore, causing wage inequality to increase substantially.

Model 5 only includes the interactions between export penetration and skill dummies. This estimation elicits that as export penetration increases by 1%, the wage premium for the skilled and the semi-skilled increases by 0.48% and 0.181% respectively. From this model, we can interpret that skilled and semi skilled premiums increase while there is no significant change in wage premium for the unskilled, as export penetration of different industries increases.

Therefore, rise in export penetration, similar to import penetration, has resulted in increasing wage inequality in Pakistan.

Model 6, also reiterates our results that an increase in relative prices of industries is likely to increase wage inequality. As a result of an increase in relative prices, there is no significant

change in the wage premium for the unskilled worker. However, the skill and semi-skilled wage premium show a substantial growth with respect to rising relative industry prices. If relative prices in any industry increase by 1%, the skilled and semi-skilled wage premium increases by 0.483% and 0.086% respectively.

Table: 4.4 Parameter estimates for model 2, 5, 6

Variable	Model 2	Model 5	Model 6
Skilled Dummy * Import Penetration	0.213** (0.079)		
Semi-skilled Dummy * Import Penetration	-0.090 (0.073)		
Unskilled Dummy * Import Penetration	-0.199* (0.092)		
Skilled Dummy * Export Penetration		0.485** (0.136)	
Semi-skilled Dummy * Export Penetration		0.181*** (0.045)	
Unskilled Dummy * Export Penetration		0.044 (0.041)	
Skilled Dummy * Relative Prices			0.483** (0.153)
Semi-skilled Dummy * Relative Prices			0.086* (0.036)
Unskilled Dummy * Relative Prices			-0.074 (0.044)
Age	0.063*** (0.008)	0.061*** (0.004)	0.058*** (0.005)
Age2	-0.0006*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)
Married	0.009 (0.046)	0.015 (0.031)	0.026 (0.037)
Male	0.002 (0.016)	0.007 (0.016)	0.003 (0.014)
Urban	0.182*** (0.025)	0.179*** (0.017)	0.167*** (0.014)
Training	0.081* (0.040)	0.090 (0.048)	0.074 (0.046)
Year 1996	0.479*** (0.037)	0.367*** (0.038)	0.445*** (0.052)
Sindh	0.112** (0.045)	0.109*** (0.024)	0.089** (0.031)
NWFP	-0.162** (0.049)	-0.160** (0.054)	-0.174*** (0.047)
Balochistan	0.034 (0.72)	0.036 (0.072)	0.039 (0.072)
Food, beverage and tobacco	-0.578* (0.269)	-0.291** (0.105)	-0.142** (0.051)

Textile wearing apparel, leather industry	-0.750*	0.118	-0.208***
	(0.330)	(0.082)	(0.049)
Paper, paper products, printing, publishing	-0.473	0.463***	-0.034
	(0.304)	(0.111)	(0.071)
Chemical, petroleum, coal, rubber & plastic	-0.394	0.500***	0.008
	(0.264)	(0.103)	(0.081)
Basic metal industries	-0.252	0.607***	0.092
	(0.235)	(0.111)	(0.068)
Fabricated metal, machinery & equipment	-0.336	0.387***	-0.054
	(0.186)	(0.102)	(0.050)
R- Squared	0.174	0.177	0.186
Number of Observations	10337	10337	10337

Notes: ***, **, * indicate significance at 1%, 5%, 10% respectively.

Standard errors are written in parenthesis

The robust standard errors are corrected for clustering at the industry level.

To test the validity of model 2, 5 and 6 we carried out an F-test by comparing each with a restricted model which had no interaction term. The F-test showed that for H_0 : no significant difference between the two models, we reject the null hypothesis for all three models. Moreover, this test is confirmed by the p-values of each model. For model 2, the p value (0.0378) is significant at 5% level. For model 5 and 6, the p values 0.0015 and 0.0031 respectively are significant at 1% level. Table 4.5 shows these results. These results confirm that the three separate models with import penetration, export ratio and relative prices as indicators for trade openness are valid and therefore, more suitable to study the impact on wage inequality than model 4 which has all three indicators together.

Table: 4.5 F-Test

Import Penetration* Skilled= Import Penetration* Semi-skilled= Import Penetration* Unskilled
F(3,6) = 5.45
Prob > F = 0.0378
Export Penetration* Skilled= Export Penetration* Semi-skilled= Export Penetration* Unskilled
F(3,6) = 20.20
Prob > F = 0.0015

Price*Skilled= Price*Semi-skilled= Price*Unskilled

F(3,6) = 15.50

Prob > F = 0.0031

Section 5

Discussion

In our empirical analysis, we used the three indicators of trade liberalization i.e. import penetration, export ratio and relative prices together in one model, (Model 3) to study the effect on wage premiums based on skill. However, this model produced insignificant results for the indicators of import penetration and relative prices for all skill types. A significant impact on wage inequality was only seen with respect to export penetration for the semi-skilled and unskilled labour, which showed that wage inequality decreases as the ratio of exports with

respect to the value added increases, leading to a rise in wage premiums. If this model was to be considered, then it would signify that the reduction in tariffs and non-tariff barriers, for import competing industries, does not lead to a change in wages for any skill. Neither does the increase in relative prices of each industry. However, if trade openness as indicated by research, has led to a significant positive change in the composition of production towards manufacturing in Pakistan and also to a reduction in labour force participation inequality based on gender [Hyder et al. (2011)], then the possibility of trade's impact on wage inequality is not far-fetched.

In addition, the interaction terms of our three variables turned out to be correlated with each other, casting doubt on the validity of the results of the first model. Therefore, we investigated the effect of the three indicators separately. When we estimated Model 2 with only import penetration dummies, our results regarding increasing wage inequality matched those of Galiani et al (2003). Their results depicted that an increase in import penetration ratio in the country leads to higher wage premiums of skilled workers relative to other skill based labour. This revealed a significant widening of the wage gap. While our results of model 2 also show a similar increase in the premium for skilled labour, it also shows significant decrease in skill premium for unskilled labour, significantly widening the wage gap in Pakistan's case as well.

Moreover, our results oppose the findings of Goh et al. (2005), who conducted a study for Poland. They find wage premiums to have increased for unskilled labour, while there being no impact on the skilled premium, with the reduction in tariffs. Their results support the findings of Stolper-Sameulson. This difference from our results can be attributed to the fact that Poland carried out trade liberalization while being in the transitioning stage, and thus the increase in wages for the unskilled is likely to be influenced by greater efficiency that usually follows the transition from a planned to a market economy.

It is also relevant to compare our findings with that of India and Bangladesh, since they are quite similar to Pakistan, in terms of wage structures and trade reforms. According to Mishra et al. (2005), the impact of tariffs and non-tariff barriers on wages in India is such that, sectors with a higher proportion of unskilled labour and higher reductions in protectionist measures will experience an increase in relative wages, relative to those sectors with skilled labour. One reason for the differences between our results could be attributed to the fact that we do not look at the skill based impact of trade reforms for each sector. Moreover, the trade reforms in India were much more drastic than those in Pakistan so that might have led to a variation in results.

Furthermore, in model 5 we only studied the effect of export penetration ratios on wages. This model supports the results of model 2 by also depicting increasing wage inequality. This model predicts increases in the wages for skilled and semi-skilled workers, while there being no significant effect on wages of the unskilled. This result, along with that of the previous model is somewhat similar to the case of Bangladesh. Munshi et al. (2006) use four measures of trade openness. With respect to their results on trade liberalization through measure of exports and imports, our results are quite consistent. Their coefficient is lower for unskilled and higher for skilled, leading to greater wage inequality. However, with respect to their relative price measure, their results diverge from the results of our model 6, where we find that relative price interaction terms depict a rising wage inequality due to relatively high premiums for skilled and semi-skilled labour. According to Munshi et al. (2006), changes in prices due to openness have an insignificant effect on wages. In their analysis different measures give quite contradictory results on the effect of trade liberalization on wage inequality. Therefore, in their final analysis, they

conclude that due to overlapping standard errors of estimated coefficients, there is no statistically significant difference between the effect of the above measures of liberalization on wages for unskilled and skilled workers. Though their overall result conflicts with ours, it must be considered that similar to the case of India, the case of Bangladesh also looks at sector specific data.

Section 6

Conclusion

We examined the role of trade liberalization on wage inequality for the period 1996-2005, by combining micro level data from the Labour Force Survey of Pakistan with national data on trade variables from the Federal Bureau of Statistics. We used three measures representing the introduction of trade reforms that is, import penetration, export penetration and relative prices for the manufacturing sector, in order to study the effect on wage premiums based on different levels of skill and by using inter-sector and time variability. Our findings indicate that while it is

difficult to study the effects of trade liberalization by using all the measures together, but by analyzing them separately we can see that for Pakistan, wage premiums for the skilled rise relatively to those for the unskilled. We predict that a 10% increase in import penetration, increases the wage premiums for the skilled workers by 2.12%, while it reduces the wages premiums of the unskilled workers by nearly 2%. Furthermore, we also observe that a 10% increase in export penetration increases premiums of the skilled and the semi-skilled workers by 4.8% and 1.8% respectively, while having no impact on the wages of the unskilled worker. This implies that wage inequality has risen in Pakistan due to the effects of trade openness; a result contrary to the predictions of the Stolper-Samuelson Theorem as well as to the experience of countries like India and Bangladesh.

However, these results must be considered keeping in mind some shortcomings. Most of the empirical research about the trade liberalization impacts on wages has been done using Panel data for industries, which is not available in case of Pakistan. This allows researchers to control for sector and time fixed effects and can be used to evaluate how trade liberalization impacts wages for different skill levels across different industries. Furthermore, the availability of industry specific trade data in case of Pakistan is also a shortcoming, in estimating such a model. Another limitation of our analysis is that, our model considers two surveys for the ten year period, and therefore, more accurate results could have been obtained using yearly surveys for all these ten years.

Despite these shortcomings, the paper enriches the line of studies in the international trade literature that could assist policy makers in developing countries engage in an informed decision-making concerning whether trade liberalization is best to reduce wage inequality. Empirically, it would further be useful to investigate how trade liberalization impacts wage inequality for

workers at three-digit industry level, to provide a deeper analysis. Furthermore, effects of trade liberalization on wage inequality across skill levels could be seen controlling for other events like recession, devaluation and oil boom. These may be lines of enquiry for the future research.

References

- Arne Bigsten, D. D. (2004). Trade Reform and Wage Inequality in Kenya, 1964-2000. *Working Papers of Economics*, Goeteborg University , 2-3.
- Bashir, Z. (2003). The Impacts of Economic Reforms and Trade Liberalisation on Agricultural Export Performance in Pakistan. *The Pakistan Development Review* 42(4) , 2-4.
- Beyer, H., Rojas, P., & Vergara, R. (1999). "Trade Liberalization and Wage Inequality", *Journal of Development Economics* ,59, 103-123.
- Cheah, B. C. (2009). Clustering Standard Errors or Modeling Multilevel data?. University of Columbia, 2-4.
- Civil Service of Pakistan. Trade Liberalization in Pakistan. Retrieved 05 19, 2011, <http://www.cssforum.com.pk/>
- Galiani, S., & Sanguinetti, P. (2003). The Impact of Trade Liberalization on Wage Inequality: Evidence from Argentina. *Journal of Development Economics* ,72, 2-17.
- Goh, C-C., & Javorcik, B. S. (2005). Trade Protection and Industry Wage Structure in Poland. *Policy Research Working Paper Series, 3552, The World Bank* , 15-17.
- Government of Pakistan (2009). *Economic Survey of Pakistan (2008-2009)*. Economic Adviser's Wing, Ministry of Finance. Islamabad.
- Hyder, A., & Behrman, J. R. (2011). International Trade Openness and Gender Gaps in Pakistani Labor Force Participation Rates Over 57 Years. *PSC Working Paper Series* , 4-7.

Index Mundi. *Pakistan GDP Deflator*. Retrieved 04 25, 2011,
<http://www.indexmundi.com>

Industrial Information Network. Implications of WTO in Pakistan. Retrieved 05 20, 2011,
<http://www.iin.com.pk/>

International Household Survey Network. Pakistan Labour Force Survey 2006-2007. Retrieved 05 18, 2011, <http://surveynetwork.org/>

Investopedia. Trade Liberalization. Retrieved 05 19, 2011,
<http://www.investopedia.com/>

Irfan, M. (2008). Pakistan's Wage Structure. *Pakistan Institute of Development Economics* , 15-18.

Kaasa, A. (2003). Factors Influencing Income Inequality in Transition Economies. 11.

Mishra, P., & Kumar, A. (2005). Trade Liberalization and Wage Inequality: Evidence from India. *IMF Working Paper No.05/20* , 4-18.

Munshi, F., & Durevall, D. (2006). Trade Liberalization and Wage Inequality: Empirical evidence from Bangladesh. *Working Papers in Economics*, Goeteborg University , 5-21.

UN Comtrade. International Merchandise Trade Statistics. Retrieved 05 17, 2011,
<http://comtrade.un.org>

Zakir, N., & Idrees, M. (2009). Trends in Inequality, Welfare, and Growth in Pakistan, 1963-64 to 2004-05. *PIDE Working Papers*, 53 , 16.