

Abstract and Theory

What are the downstream economic effects of

globalization? One of the most visible aspects of

globalization can be seen in the stark increase in free

economic theory argues trade results in both winners

agreements with explicit labor provisions (LPs) help

inequality, and hinders development by limiting access

to formal employment opportunities and economic

stability. Specifically, trade agreements with labor

work by protecting individuals from exploitation,

provisions address the exclusion channel for informal

discrimination, inadequate wages, and unsafe working

reduce the informal economy's size compared to

agreements without LPs. An extensive informal

economy contributes to heightened poverty, and

and losers within countries. However, trade's effect on

trade agreements since the mid-1990s. Traditional

informal work (unregistered and untaxed legal

activities deliberately concealed from public

authorities) is less clear. We argue that trade

Assessing the Influence of Labor Provisions on Informal Economy Dynamics: A Comparative Analysis



UROP Student: Vanessa Blemur

Research Mentor: Chris Gahagan

Methods

Using NAFTA as our primary case study, we conducted a quantitative analysis to examine how trade agreements with labor provisions (LPs) affect a country's informal economy. Our focus was specifically on comparing Free Trade Agreements (FTAs) that include labor provisions with those that do not, aiming to offer a clear comparison of the impact of LPs on a nation's informal economy. To test our argument, we investigate one trade agreement with labor provisions, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA). Utilizing synthetic controls, we show that signing NAFTA results in a significant reduction in the size of the informal economy for Mexico, compared to the counterfactual scenario where Mexico never joined NAFTA.

Results

The decrease in Mexico's informal economy following the signing of NAFTA was significant, as evidenced by our quantitative analysis using synthetic controls. Our study demonstrates a substantial decline in the size of Mexico's informal economy by as much as 5% of GDP, compared to the counterfactual scenario where NAFTA was not signed. Such a large decrease appears to be short-lived though, within a few years the size of the informal economy slowly increased. However, it is important to note that by the end of the temporal span, Mexico still experiences a decrease in the size of its informal economy compared to a scenario in which Mexico never signed NAFTA.

Discussion

As hypothesized, trade agreements with labor provisions can decrease the size of a country's informal economy. Our study aims to contribute to the understanding of the downstream economic effects of globalization, particularly concerning the informal economy in developing countries. By examining the impact of trade agreements with labor provisions, we provide valuable insights for policymakers seeking to promote inclusive economic growth and reduce poverty through international trade agreements.

Future Research and Implications

Although preliminary, the results above offer correlational evidence that trade Agreements with labor provisions can lower the size of the informal economy. Future research can utilize the synthetic control approach for other trade agreements such as the South African Development Community (SADC) trade agreement to test whether the specific mechanisms, in combination with trade liberalization, can explain why some agreements help to reduce informality, while others have a negligible or diminished effect. The relationship between labor provisions and the informal economy helps to address some of the complex and multifaceted aspects of globalization, with significant implications for economic development and policy formulation.

Hypotheses

conditions.

H1: Developing countries that sign Free Trade Agreements with labor provisions will see a decrease in the size of the informal economy compared to countries that sign trade agreements without labor provisions.



NAFTA, Informality, and Mexico vs Synthetic Mexico Mexico Synthetic Mexico 98 98 1980 1985 1990 1995 2000 2005 2010

References

