

Earnings Differentials between German and French Speakers in Switzerland

ALEJANDRA CATTANEO and RAINER WINKELMANN*

JEL-Classification: J1, J31, J4, J7

Keywords: language, labor market segmentation, Swiss household panel

1. Introduction

Economists have not taken great interest in the study of language so far, with the notable exception of the economic analysis of immigration, where investments in language skills are recognized as decisive for the integration process (CHISWICK, 1991, DUSTMANN and FABBRI, 2003). However, this dismissive attitude may be about to change. One challenge is the surge of research at the intersection of psychology and economics that aims to establish a richer model of human behavior and motivation, opening up the black box of “given preferences”. Cognitive processes – language being an integral part of it – move to center stage. Indeed, according to a well-known theory in linguistics, language determines thought and action (WHORF, 1956).

A second development is the increased recognition that social interactions are important for understanding human behavior and economic outcomes. Again, language is an integral aspect. A third question is linked to globalization: in a globalized world, is the optimal number of languages in the world greater than, or equal to, one? These examples are indicative of, though by no means exhausting, the type of language related questions economists might become interested in.

* University of Zurich, Socioeconomic Institute. Correspondence: Zürichbergstr. 14, 8032 Zürich, +41 1 634 2292, winkelmann@sts.unizh.ch; This research was funded by a grant from the Swiss National Science Foundation. An earlier version was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Verein für Socialpolitik, Sept. 30–Oct. 2, 2003, at the 1st International Conference of Panel Data Users in Switzerland, Feb. 23–24, 2004, both in Zurich, and at the 7th IZA European Summer School in Labor Economics, Ammersee, April 19–25, 2004. We thank the participants and an anonymous referee for valuable comments.

The topic of the current paper directly relates to the second and third points, the role of language as an integrating or disintegrating force of economic activity. What is the role of language, in relation to other factors such as jurisdiction and geography, to shape markets? What borders matter more, those of countries or those of shared language? Often these two coincide but almost as often they do not, as the examples of many English speaking countries on one hand, and multilingual countries such as Switzerland and Belgium on the other, illustrate.

We approach the issue of shared language in the context of labor markets, using the Swiss experience as a case study. Switzerland has four official languages: German, French, Italian and Romansh, although the latter one is spoken only by a small minority. The three main languages correspond to three largely homogeneous linguistic regions. In such a multilingual country one might expect that language diversity generates segmented labor markets.

In this paper, we test whether labor markets are integrated along language frontiers. Labor market integration can be defined in a number of ways. In a first definition the “law of one wage” holds across linguistic regions: workers of similar skills receive the same wage, regardless of linguistic region. There are three classical mechanisms that each result in the law of one wage: perfect mobility of workers, of capital, or of goods.

An alternative definition of integration is that the law of one wage holds within any given linguistic region when comparing native and nonnative workers, i.e., workers whose mother tongue matches the dominant language and those for whom this is not the case. In the following we will often implicitly assume that people become nonnatives by moving across a language border although this is, strictly speaking, not required for our definition of nonnative, i.e., people might have been raised in a non-dominant language as mother tongue.

We concentrate in our paper on this second form of integration because it relates specifically to the effect of language. In contrast, when comparing wages across linguistic regions, wage differentials are affected by non-linguistic factors as well, such as geography, institutions, industrial structure and the like. Thus, we compare wages of natives and nonnatives in a given linguistic region, and evaluate the extent to which language matters for earnings. We will answer this question using different methods, carefully addressing the issue of self-selection bias that can result if the nonnatives observed in the sample (i.e. those who decided to live and work in a region where their mother tongue does not match the dominant language) are not a random selection of all nonnatives.

The implications of such a study extend beyond the Swiss case as its methods and results can be applied to other multilingual countries such as Belgium or Canada, as well as common markets such as the European Union, where

despite the cultural and linguistic differences among their members, there are no legal barriers for residents of member countries to move from one country to another.

The paper uses data from the Swiss Household Panel, which are well suited for this purpose as they provide information on the respondents' language skills, place of residence and income. There are momentarily no other representative survey data available in Switzerland, which include all the necessary information for such an analysis. The decennial census, for example, has the advantage of providing information on language spoken and region of residence for the entire population but it does not contain any information on income or earnings. Another survey done periodically in Switzerland is the Swiss Labor Force Survey. It includes detailed information on income but no information on language skills except for language spoken at the interview.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we summarize the previous literature on the economics of language paying special attention to studies that analyze the difference in earnings among language groups in multilingual countries. In Section 3, we discuss the research topic we consider in this paper, which is the integration of the Swiss labor market. In Section 4, we present the data and describe briefly the modalities of the data collection. Section 5 introduces the methods we use to analyze the data, while the results are presented in Section 6. Finally, Section 7 gives concluding remarks.

2. Previous Literature

Since the 1960s there have been many studies on the link between earnings and language among immigrants. More recent contributions to this literature include CHISWICK (1991), CHISWICK and MILLER (1994, 1995, 1996, 2001, 2002), DUSTMANN and VAN SOEST (2001) and DUSTMANN and FABBRI (2003). Even though some useful insights can be obtained from these studies, we will not discuss them in detail as our analysis will not consider immigrants.

More relevant to our present study and closer to the Swiss case is the prior research on language issues in Canada. This literature has been growing especially since the mid 60s when the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism made public a study showing a big earnings gap in favor of Anglophones in Montreal. A number of following studies, among them CARLINER (1981), GRENIER (1987) and VELTMAN (1979), confirmed that earnings of Francophones were lower than earnings of Anglophones and returns from learning English for Francophones were higher than returns from learning French for Anglophones.

Different explanations have been given for this fact. Mostly, they refer to the concentration of power in the hands of English speakers in the English Canada and the disproportionate share of economic power of English speakers in Quebec. However the earnings disparities seemed to have declined considerably since the 70s.

For Switzerland there are two previous studies by GRIN (1997) and by GRIN and SFREDDO (1998), where they compare the socioeconomic status of Germanophones, Francophones and Italophones. For a report completed for the Federal Office of Statistics (1997) Grin uses data collected for a project called 'Linguistic competences in Switzerland'. The sample consists of 2400 respondents and contains information on mother tongue and competences in other languages making the distinction between listening, writing, speaking and reading skills and between four levels of knowledge for each category. In this report he analyses the relationship between earnings and language, separately for men and women, using adjusted residuals, multivariate regression and Oaxaca decomposition analysis. He finds that for German and French speaking men there are no significant differences in terms of earnings, whereas Italophones seem to have significantly lower earnings than Germanophones. This result was confirmed in GRIN and SFREDDO (1998), where they analyse whether speaking Italian as mother tongue involves a penalty. For women, mother tongue does not seem to have any influence on earnings, as there is no significant difference between earnings of Germanophone, Francophone and Italophone females. In contrast to Grin, we use more recent data from a nationally representative sample and we control for self-selection.

3. Does Language Matter?

In a multilingual country such as Switzerland, the various language regions could effectively produce a labor market that is segmented along language borders rather than fully integrated. There are a number of conceivable indicators of labor market integration. A first indicator would be the degree of wage equality and convergence across linguistic regions. The problem with this indicator is that wage differentials between regions are affected by non-linguistic factors as well, such as geography, institutions, industrial structure and the like.

A second indicator would be the extent of mobility that takes place between language regions. Mobility is not the main concern of this paper, however. Rather, we propose an alternative indicator of labor market integration, namely the absence of wage discrimination. In any language region, otherwise equally

qualified workers should earn the same wage, regardless of their mother tongue. This is, of course, only a meaningful concept if we can assume that people living in Switzerland are truly bi- or tri-lingual. There is some evidence that this is the case although the increased importance of English is beginning to erode the time spent in school on learning a 2nd or 3rd national language. Still it is the case that children learn French in the German part of Switzerland, and German in the French part.

Under the perfect integration hypothesis, we should observe that people who work and live where a language other than their mother tongue is dominant should have the same earnings as those for whom the mother tongue is the dominant language, controlling for skills such as years of schooling and working experience. Note that this avoids wage comparisons across regions, comparisons that are made complicated by differences in industrial structure and in cost of living. Perfect integration so defined implies that workers, when considering where to work, should be indifferent with respect to the language region.

There are a number of explanations why markets might be segmented, i.e., why the language frontier may mean more than just switching language.

1. Cultural differences between regions. Language origin can be related to certain cultural habits or prejudices that are rewarded differently in different regions.
2. Missing networks. The lack of social contacts for nonnatives can make it difficult for a person to find a job matching to his/her skills.
3. Differences in the school systems. When the quality of schooling differs from region to region, a person from a region with lower education quality receives a lower wage.
4. The work experience acquired in the region of origin could be less valued than work experience obtained at the destination.

If we find evidence for segmentation, the next step would be to identify its origins.

4. Data

The empirical analysis is based on data from the Swiss Household Panel (SHP). The SHP is an annual survey of a nationally representative sample of more than 5000 households and all its members who are older than 14. The data collection is funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation, the University of Neuchâtel, and the Swiss Federal Office of Statistics. The interviews are held in French,

German, or Italian, depending on the preference of the respondent. The data collection method is Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI). We use waves 1999 and 2000, which include information on the respondents' language skills, canton of residence and other relevant socio-economic characteristics. The data from the SHP have been combined with data from the 1990 census, which provide some complementary information about regional and communal characteristics of the respondents' place of residence. We would have preferred to use the 2000 census for this purpose but these data were not yet available for public use at the time of writing this paper.

In order to find out if there are differences in earnings of native and nonnative speakers living in a certain part of Switzerland we need to delimit each linguistic region. To do this, we first determine the majority language spoken in each commune. In particular, we use information from the census on the percentage of people in each commune who speak a certain language as mother tongue, identified in the data as "first language for personal use". These percentages were obtained by dividing the number of people who have a particular mother tongue by the total population in the commune. People who live in communes where more than 50% of the population speak French were categorized as belonging to the French region. People who live in communes where more than 50% of the population speak German were considered as belonging to the German region. Individuals can then be either classified as natives if their mother tongue matches the majority language, or as nonnatives else. Individuals from communes with no language predominance were excluded from the sample. Because of the small amount of observations we have in the SHP for Italian speakers and the Italian canton, these were excluded from the analysis as well.

It could be argued that, for the purpose of our study, a more adequate definition of being native or nonnative should be based on the dominant language at the working place rather than at the place of residence. Unfortunately, this information is not available in the data. All people living in a nonnative region and commuting to a native region would then be misclassified as nonnatives (and vice versa). We don't think that this is a major problem in practice. However, the following results have to be interpreted under the (possibly invalid) assumption that the occurrence of cases for which dominant language at the place of residence and work differ does not bias the analysis systematically.

The sample is restricted to Swiss born residents aged 18 to 65, whose annual full-time equivalent earnings are more than 10,000 Francs. After deleting records with missing data, we obtain a sample of 5199 pooled observations. In Table 1, we present the means of some selected variables, together with their estimated standard errors. The standard errors have been adjusted for pooling. We display

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

| | Native (1) | Nonnative (2) | Whole Sample (3) |
|--------------------|-----------------|------------------|---------------------|
| Log earnings | 11.25 (0.01) | 11.22 (0.04) | 11.25 (0.01) |
| Years of schooling | 13.67 (0.03) | 13.69 (0.20) | 13.67 (0.03) |
| Experience | 21.35 (0.15) | 24.62 (0.98) | 21.43 (0.15) |
| Female | 0.46 (0.01) | 0.64 (0.04) | 0.46 (0.01) |
| Observations | 5075 | 124 | 5199 |

Standard errors in parentheses.

results separately for natives, nonnatives and for the whole sample. There are 5075 individuals who live in a region where their mother tongue matches the dominant language and 124 whose mother tongue does not match the dominant language in their region of residence. The small number of nonnatives causes the standard errors of the variables' means to be larger. 46% of the full sample are women but females are overrepresented among nonnatives, where their share amounts to 64%. The average level of education is about 14 years for both groups and the average level of experience is about 25 and 21 years for nonnatives and natives respectively.

Mean earnings of nonnatives are about 0.03 log points (or 3 percent) below those of natives. Here and elsewhere, we will interpret differences in mean log-earnings as *relative* differences in mean earnings (in levels). Strictly speaking, this interpretation is admissible under the additional assumption of homoskedasticity and for small log-differentials (WINKELMANN, 2001).

The point estimate suggests that working in a region where one's mother tongue is spoken is associated with higher earnings. However, a formal t -test for equal means cannot reject the null of no difference in earnings of natives and nonnatives ($t = 0.74$). So looking at overall averages, there appears to be no evidence for a segmented labor market. However, this result may be spurious, as natives and nonnatives may differ in other observed or unobserved respects. Methods to account for such differences are discussed next.

5. Empirical Methods

To test whether native and nonnative speakers have the same earnings, *ceteris paribus*, we adjust the raw differential using standard regression techniques. In particular, our analysis will be based on a human capital earnings function of the form:

$$w = \alpha + x'\beta + \delta \textit{nonnative} + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where w are logarithmic earnings, x is a vector of the individual's personal characteristics that affect earnings, and *nonnative* is a dummy variable that equals one if the individual's mother tongue matches the dominant language in his/her region of residence and zero otherwise. The coefficient of *nonnative*, δ , measures the so-called treatment effect. The "treatment" in this case is whether or not the individual works in a region where the mother tongue is not the dominant language. The null hypothesis to be tested is whether $\delta = 0$, i.e. whether language has no effect on earnings once we control for other relevant characteristics.

An issue that arises here is the potential endogeneity of the variable *nonnative*, that is the possibility that $E(\varepsilon | \textit{nonnative}) \neq 0$. We could have a positive correlation between *nonnatives* and ε if individuals who move are positively self selected. In other words, the typical individual who decides to move, and thereby becomes a nonnative in terms of language, could have relatively higher earnings whether or not he chooses to move.

To further analyze this issue, we assume that the decision to become a nonnative obeys the following latent model:

$$\textit{nonnative}^* = z'\gamma + u \quad (2)$$

$$\textit{nonnative} = 1 \text{ if } \textit{nonnative}^* > 0, \text{ i.e. } u > -z'\gamma$$

$$\textit{nonnative} = 0 \text{ if } \textit{nonnative}^* \leq 0, \text{ i.e. } u \leq -z'\gamma$$

where z collects all variables in x plus any other variables that affect the moving decision but not earnings, for example those that capture mobility cost. The following proxies for mobility costs are used: a binary indicator variable for being married, an indicator variable for being married to a person who has a different mother tongue, an interaction between this variable and an indicator for gender being female, and number of children.

We furthermore assume that x and z are exogenous, i.e. $E(\varepsilon | x, z) = 0$ and $E(u | z) = 0$. If u and ε are correlated direct estimation of the earnings equation

with OLS would produce selectivity bias, since the regressor *nonnative* is correlated with the error term (the regressor depends on u , and u and ε are correlated). We will use various approaches to correct for the possibility that nonnatives might be positively self selected, and to analyze the robustness of the results depending on the model specification.

5.1. Joint Normal Distribution and Maximum Likelihood Estimation

Assume that ε and u are bivariate normally distributed with mean zero, variances σ_ε^2 and 1, and correlation ρ . This is the well-known set-up discussed by HECKMAN (1974), who showed that the model parameters can be consistently estimated by either a two-step method or maximum likelihood. Under bivariate normality, the expected wage, conditional on being nonnative, is given by

$$E(w | x, z, \text{nonnative} = 1) = \alpha + x'\beta + \delta + \rho\lambda(z'\gamma) \quad (3)$$

where λ is the inverse Mills ratio $\phi(z'\gamma)/\Phi(z'\gamma)$ and ϕ and Φ are the density and cumulative density function of the standard normal distribution, respectively. If $\rho = 0$ there is no self-selection problem. However, if $\rho > 0$ then nonnatives are positively selected, i.e., their wages will exceed those of otherwise similar natives.

To apply Heckman's two step method, we estimate in a first step a probit model to obtain a consistent estimator of γ . Then we construct the variable $\hat{\lambda}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\lambda} &= \phi(z'\hat{\gamma})/\Phi(z'\hat{\gamma}) \text{ if } \text{nonnative} = 1 \\ \hat{\lambda} &= -\phi(z'\hat{\gamma})/(1-\Phi(z'\hat{\gamma})) \text{ if } \text{nonnative} = 0 \end{aligned}$$

In a second step we estimate Equation (3) by OLS using $\hat{\lambda}$ instead of λ . Standard errors need to be adjusted.

An alternative method is to jointly estimate the earnings equation and the selection equation using full maximum likelihood (where the two-step estimator may be used as starting value). Identification is achieved both through functional form, and by virtue of excluding the mobility cost related variables (marital status, number of children) from the outcome equation. The disadvantage of these two methods is that they don't work if the errors of both equations are not normally distributed.

5.2. Alternatives to Heckman's method

There are a couple of possibilities to relax the strong assumptions underlying the previous model. A first possibility is to estimate the model without imposing that ε and u are bivariate normally distributed. Assume instead that only u is normally distributed. Then we can use the following two-step procedure: first, we estimate the probit model $P(\text{nonnative}) = \Phi(z'\gamma)$ and obtain the fitted probabilities $\Phi(z'\hat{\gamma})$. In a second step we estimate the following model by OLS.

$$w = \alpha + x'\beta + \delta\Phi(z'\hat{\gamma}) + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

This is similar to two-stage least squares, only that the second equation is now non-linear. WOOLDRIDGE (2002) refers to this as the “plug-in” model. As before, δ measures the treatment effect. OLS standard errors can be used to test the hypothesis $H_0: \delta = 0$. If rejected, valid inference requires modifying the standard errors to account for generated regressors (WOOLDRIDGE, 2002, p. 116). A disadvantage of this method is that consistency of the OLS estimators relies on the probit model being the correct specification, i.e. on the normality of u .

If one wants to estimate without any distributional assumption, instrumental variable techniques can be applied. This of course requires that a good instrument for the treatment is available. With more than one instrument the validity of the instruments can be tested. We will use the following instruments: *number of kids*, *mixed marriage*, *female* \times *mixed marriage* and *married*, where *married* is a marital status indicator variable and *mixed marriage* is a dummy variable equal to one for people married to someone who has a different mother tongue.

5.3. Classical Switching Regression Model

All methods so far are based on the outcome equation (1): this equation has a single error ε , which means that the gain (or loss) from moving to another region (and thus from becoming a nonnative) is the same, and equal to δ , for all persons. Therefore, if selectivity is present (if u and ε are correlated) it must be based on *absolute advantage*, as people who move would be better (or worse) than average in both regions. This may not be a very realistic characterization of the selection process, and we can instead allow for selection based on *relative advantage*. To obtain such a model, consider a more general approach where each group has its own earnings equation as follows:

$$w_0 = \alpha_0 + x'\beta_0 + \varepsilon_0 \quad \text{if } \text{nonnative} = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$w_1 = \alpha_1 + x' \hat{\beta}_1 + \varepsilon_1 \text{ if } \textit{nonnative} = 1 \quad (6)$$

Let the decision to move be generated from the same model as in equation (2). This is the classical switching regressions model in which the returns to the variables included in x as well as the errors ε_0 and ε_1 of natives and nonnatives are potentially different (LEE, 1978). Different errors mean that a person could have above average earnings if she moved, but average earnings if she decided to stay. People who choose to move may be the ones who gain most from moving.

In this case we estimate two models, one for natives and one for nonnatives. We use a two-step method proposed by LEE (1978) (see also HECKMAN, TOBIAS and VYTLACIL, 2000). Assume that ε_0 , ε_1 and u have a trivariate normal distribution. Then, the procedure is as follows: first, we estimate a probit model of the decision to move and we compute $\hat{\lambda}$ as in Section 5.1. In a second step we estimate Equations (5) and (6) including the correspondent $\hat{\lambda}$ as an additional regressor. If we find that the coefficients of $\hat{\lambda}$ are significant and different between groups then we have some evidence to think that nonnatives are self selected and that the decision to move is based on comparative advantage.

A problem here is that we do not obtain an estimation of the treatment effect directly from the regression outcome. To obtain the treatment effect we need to do some extra calculations. At this point we should distinguish between two different parameters: the average treatment effect (ATE) and the effect of the treatment on the treated (TT). The ATE in our application is the expected gain or loss from moving for a randomly chosen individual and it is simply $ATE \equiv E(w_1 - w_0)$. It can be estimated as

$$\widehat{ATE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N x'_i (\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_0)$$

The TT is the average gain or loss from moving for those who actually moved and it is defined as $TT \equiv E(w_1 - w_0 | \textit{nonnative} = 1)$. It can be estimated as

$$\widehat{TT} = \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J x'_j (\hat{\beta}_1 - \hat{\beta}_0) + (\hat{\rho}_1 \hat{\sigma}_1 - \hat{\rho}_0 \hat{\sigma}_0) \hat{\lambda}_j$$

where the sum is taken over all observations for nonnatives. We did not need to make this distinction before as ATE equals TT in the case when $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_0$.

6. Results

Two basic specifications of the earnings equation are reported in Table 2. The first one includes the variable *nonnative*, standard variables used in the human capital earnings function such as *years of schooling* and *experience*, a dummy variable *german region*, to see whether there is a general premium for living in the German part regardless of the language one speaks, a variable for working status and a variable for place of residence. The second specification, in column (2), adds two variables to control for community characteristics of the respondent's place of residence. These are the unemployment rate and the share of nonnatives who have the same mother tongue as the respondent in his/her commune of residence. Possibly, being nonnative is less of a problem the more nonnatives are present. In this case the effect of this variable would be positive. The models are estimated using Ordinary Least Squares and pooling together both years but correcting the standard errors to account for pooling observations.

The coefficient of *nonnative* in column (1) is practically zero so there is no earnings premium for natives when we hold the other human capital variables constant. For *years of schooling* and *experience* the results are standard. For example, each additional year of schooling increases earnings by approximately 8%. The earnings of people living in the German part are estimated to be about 6% above those of people living in the French part. This effect is statistically significant at conventional levels. The regional wage disparities might be due to differences in industrial structure and economic activity between regions. The coefficients of the variables *full-time* and *urban* show that full-time workers have a 6% premium and that people who live in an urban area earn in average 3% more than their counterparts who live in a rural zone. The community variables added in column (2) are not significant. Therefore, we have no evidence that earnings of nonnatives are influenced by the proportion of people in the commune who speak the same language as mother tongue, or by the unemployment rate. For that reason, we will use the first specification of the earnings equation from now on.

The estimate for the coefficient of *nonnative* would indicate that the labor markets are indeed perfectly integrated. However, as we said in Section 5, we might be overestimating the coefficient of *nonnative* if individuals who move are positively self selected. For this reason we proceed to methods described in the previous section to correct for selectivity bias.

In columns (2) and (3) of Table 3 we report the results for Heckman's two step and maximum likelihood methods respectively. The full set of results is given in Table B.1 in Appendix B. The coefficient of *nonnative* is now positive and insignificant in both cases. The estimated correlation $\hat{\rho}$ is negative. Based on

Table 2: Ordinary Least Squares Results

| | (1) | (2) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Nonnative | 0.001 (0.046) | 0.010 (0.053) |
| Education | 0.078 (0.004) ^(c) | 0.079 (0.004) ^(c) |
| Experience | 0.039 (0.003) ^(c) | 0.039 (0.003) ^(c) |
| Experience ² /100 | -0.060 (0.006) ^(c) | -0.059 (0.006) ^(c) |
| Female | -0.234 (0.018) ^(c) | -0.231 (0.018) ^(c) |
| Year 2000 | 0.008 (0.009) | 0.007 (0.009) |
| German region | 0.055 (0.015) ^(c) | 0.069 (0.020) ^(c) |
| Urban | 0.029 (0.014) ^(b) | 0.024 (0.014) ^(a) |
| Full-time | 0.058 (0.023) ^(b) | 0.050 (0.023) ^(b) |
| Unemployment rate | | 0.009 (0.009) |
| Percentage nonnatives in the commune | | -0.001 (0.002) |
| Constant | 9.695 (0.072) ^(c) | 9.678 (0.072) ^(c) |
| Observations | 5201 | 5103 |
| R-squared | 0.28 | 0.28 |

Dependent variable: logarithmic earnings; Robust standard errors in parentheses.

(a) significant at 10%; (b) significant at 5%; (c) significant at 1%.

Source: SHP, Waves 1999–2000.

Table 3: Treatment Effects with Endogenous Selection

| | OLS (1) | Heckman 2S (2) | Heckman ML (3) | Plug-in (4) | IV (5) |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| Nonnative | 0.001 (0.046) | 0.114 (0.118) | 0.076 (0.098) | 0.073 (0.176) | 0.042 (0.146) |
| <i>Lambda</i> | | -0.057 (0.055) | -0.037 (0.037) | | |
| Hausman test | | | | | 0.06 |
| Sargan test | | | | | 8.32 |
| R-squared | 0.28 | | | 0.28 | 0.28 |

Dependent variable: logarithmic earnings; Robust standard errors in parentheses.
Source: SHP, Waves 1999–2000; n=5199.

the point estimate, an average person's earnings would be between 8 and 11% higher than earnings of natives if he/she moved from his/her region of origin. People who move are negatively selected, i.e. the “worst” people move. However the coefficient is not significantly different from zero, so that we do not have any evidence to conclude that there is a selectivity problem.

Table 3, columns (4) and (5), reports the results of the Plug-in and IV methods. Again, the coefficient of *nonnative* is positive and insignificant in both cases. As mentioned in Section 5.2, we use marital status related variables as instruments for the IV part. These are standard instruments as they are thought to influence the decision to move without affecting earnings directly. Indeed, a Sargan test for overidentification cannot reject the null hypothesis that the variables are valid instruments.

When we perform a Hausman test to compare the coefficients from the OLS model with the coefficients from 2SLS we find that we cannot reject the null hypothesis of no difference between the coefficient ($\chi^2 = 0.06$). This means that as before we have no evidence to suggest that $E(\varepsilon | \text{nonnative}) \neq 0$. Therefore, confirming the results from the Heckman models, we find no evidence of self-selection.

However, these results could be due to the fact that the models are misspecified or too restrictive. Next, we consider the possibility that people who move have a comparative advantage rather than an absolute advantage, i.e. we allow the error terms ε of both groups to differ. To do so we estimate a switching regression model. The results from the estimation of the natives and nonnatives equations are reported in Table 4, column (1) and (2) respectively, where we use the same

Table 4: Treatment Effects in the Switching Regression Model

| | Nonnative (1) | Native (2) | Whole Sample (3) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|
| Average treatment effect (nonnative) | 0.388 (0.206) ^(a) | | 0.179 (0.160) |
| Treatment effect on the treated | -0.106 (0.087) | | -0.079 (0.348) |
| λ_{1} | -0.171 (0.083) ^(b) | | -0.093 (0.074) |
| λ_{0} | | 0.050 (0.12) | 0.041 (0.121) |
| Observations | 124 | 5075 | 5199 |
| R-squared | 0.22 | 0.28 | 0.28 |

See Table 2.

specification of the earnings equation that we use for the OLS estimation. The full set of results is given in Table B.2 in Appendix B.

After performing an F -test to compare the coefficients from the natives and nonnatives equations we conclude that we cannot reject the null hypothesis that the coefficients from both equations are the same. There is no evidence that β differs between the two groups. Therefore we estimate another model where we allow only the errors to be different, which simplifies the analysis as we obtain again an estimate of the treatment effect parameter directly from the regression outcome. This is reported in column (3) of Table 4.

The coefficient of *nonnative* is once again positive and insignificant. The sign of ρ_1 , that is the sign of the correlation between ε_1 and u , is negative, which suggests that people who lose more from moving are the ones who move (i.e., there is selection based on comparative *disadvantage*). This is also consistent with the negative treatment effect on the treated found in columns (1) and (2). These results would not make sense if people's decision to move were based only on income considerations. Instead, this finding suggests that the individual decision to move is mostly based on other, not income-related, factors.

Moreover, the results reported in column (3) show that the difference between λ_0 and λ_1 is not significant so we cannot reject the null hypothesis that $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_0$. Thus, we cannot reject the hypothesis that either Heckman's or the 2SLS methods

are appropriate. Furthermore, as we cannot reject the null hypothesis of no selectivity we have no argument against using OLS.

To repeat, the perfect integration hypothesis says that assuming perfect bilingualism among the Swiss population, equally qualified workers should earn the same, regardless of their mother tongue. Depending on the detailed specification, the coefficient of *nonnative* is either zero (OLS) or positive but insignificant (after controlling for selectivity bias). The lack of precision is clearly affected by the small sample size, with only 124 observations on nonnatives. How strong evidence is this with regard to the perfect integration hypothesis? Note that we would require the finding of a significant negative coefficient in order to reject perfect integration. Thus, at a minimum, the evidence is compatible with integrated labor markets.

7. Conclusions

This paper was concerned with the earnings of natives and nonnatives living in the German and French linguistic regions of Switzerland. The hypothesis to be tested was that equally qualified workers residing in the same region should have the same earnings regardless of their mother tongue, i.e. the labor market is perfectly integrated.

The evidence for the empirical analysis was based on data from the first and second waves of the Swiss household panel for the years 1999 and 2000. In the study we used a human capital earnings function to which we added specific variables to control for the influence of language. The results show no evidence of a negative earnings differential between nonnatives and natives even after accounting for self-selection of internal migrants. Therefore we cannot reject the hypothesis that the Swiss labor market is perfectly integrated. On the other hand, we did not find any evidence to suggest that people who move are positively self selected. Indeed, individuals who move don't seem to have neither an absolute nor a comparative advantage. This finding suggests that people move for reasons other than earnings.

This paper is the first study of its kind using data from the Swiss Household Panel. Because we consider the topic of this paper of substantial policy concern, the question of the ways in which the individual's mother tongue can affect one's economic wealth still needs to be examined more thoroughly. In order to deepen the analysis, we plan to use in further studies data on regional and communal characteristics from the census 2000 instead of 1990 as well as a data set with more information about Italian speakers and the Italian canton in order to include them in the analysis.

Appendix A: Variables

| Name | Description |
|---|---|
| Log earnings | The natural logarithm of the annual gross work income (before taxes and social security contributions) in the year prior to the interview. We use the real income to account for changes in price levels. For this purpose we deflate the nominal incomes from 1998 and 1999 using the correspondent CPI published by the Swiss Federal Office of Statistics (1998 = 98.0, 1999 = 98.8). As we include part and full-time workers we need to adjust the earnings of part-time workers in order to make them comparable with earnings of full-time workers. In order to do this we compute full-time equivalent earnings dividing reported earnings by the percentage of employment. |
| Nonnative | Dummy variable that equals 1 for people who live in a community where their mother tongue, defined as first language for personal use, matches the dominant language and zero otherwise. |
| German region | Dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent lives in the German region. |
| Years of schooling | It was constructed assigning numbers between 7 and 18 to the variable 'highest obtained education'. |
| Experience | $= \text{age} - \text{education} - 6$. |
| Female | Dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent is a female and 0 otherwise. |
| Year 2000 | Dummy variable equal to 1 if the observation belongs to the year 2000 and 0 otherwise. |
| Urban | Dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent lives in an urban area and 0 otherwise. |
| Full-time | Dummy variable equal to 1 if the person works more than 80% and 0 otherwise. |
| Married | Dummy variable equal to 1 if the respondent is married or has a partner and 0 otherwise. |
| Mixed Marriage | Dummy variable equal to one for people married to a person who has another mother tongue. |
| Number of kids | Number of kids. |
| Percentage of nonnatives in the commune | Percentage of nonnatives in the respondent's commune who have the same mother tongue as the respondent. |

Appendix B: Tables

Table B.1: Regression Results for Models With Endogenous Selection

| | Heckman 2-step earnings selection | Maximum Likelihood earnings selection | Plug-in | IV | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Nonnative | 0.114 (0.118) | 0.028 (0.02) | 0.076 (0.098) | 0.027 (0.021) | 0.073 (0.176) | 0.042 (0.146) |
| Years of schooling | 0.078 (0.003) ^(c) | 0.032 (0.017) ^(a) | 0.078 (0.004) ^(c) | 0.030 (0.023) | 0.078 (0.004) ^(c) | 0.078 (0.003) ^(c) |
| Experience | 0.039 (0.002) ^(c) | -0.038 (0.037) | 0.039 (0.003) ^(c) | -0.036 (0.048) | 0.039 (0.003) ^(c) | 0.039 (0.002) ^(c) |
| Experience ² /100 | -0.060 (0.006) ^(c) | 0.140 (0.108) | -0.060 (0.005) ^(c) | 0.144 (0.134) | -0.061 (0.006) ^(c) | -0.060 (0.005) ^(c) |
| Female | -0.235 (0.015) ^(c) | 0.763 (0.186) ^(c) | -0.235 (0.018) ^(c) | 0.787 (0.242) ^(c) | -0.235 (0.018) ^(c) | -0.234 (0.015) ^(c) |
| Year 2000 | 0.008 (0.012) | 0.035 (0.086) | 0.008 (0.009) | 0.032 (0.059) | 0.008 (0.009) | 0.008 (0.012) |
| German region | 0.060 (0.015) ^(c) | -0.678 (0.086) ^(c) | 0.058 (0.016) ^(c) | -0.677 (0.110) ^(c) | 0.058 (0.017) ^(c) | 0.056 (0.015) ^(c) |
| Urban | 0.030 (0.013) ^(c) | -0.110 (0.093) ^(c) | 0.030 (0.014) ^(b) | -0.105 (0.093) | 0.030 (0.014) ^(b) | 0.030 (0.013) ^(b) |
| Full-time | 0.059 (0.017) ^(c) | -0.104 (0.115) | 0.058 (0.023) ^(b) | -0.102 (0.140) | 0.058 (0.023) ^(b) | 0.058 (0.017) ^(c) |
| Mixed marriage | | 0.764 (0.186) ^(c) | | 0.787 (0.242) ^(c) | | |
| Female mixed marriage | | 1.044 (0.248) ^(c) | | 1.016 (0.322) ^(c) | | |
| Married | | -0.417 (0.102) ^(c) | | -0.425 (0.134) ^(c) | | |
| Number of children | | -0.058 (0.052) | | -0.054 (0.059) | | |
| <i>Lambda</i> | -0.057 (0.055) | | -0.037 (0.037) | | | |
| Constant | 9.69 (0.054) ^(c) | -2.196 (0.385) ^(c) | 9.692 (0.072) ^(c) | -2.175 (0.416) ^(c) | 9.692 (0.072) ^(c) | 9.693 (0.054) ^(c) |

Robust standard errors in parentheses.

(a) significant at 10%; (b) significant at 5%; (c) significant at 1%.

Source: SHP, Waves 1999–2000; n=5199.

Table B.2: Regression Results for Switching Regression Model

| | Nonnatives (1) | Natives (2) | Whole sample (3) |
|------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Nonnative | | | 0.179 (0.16) |
| Years of schooling | 0.061 (0.030) ^(b) | 0.079 (0.004) ^(c) | 0.078 (0.004) ^(c) |
| Experience | 0.01 (0.024) | 0.040 (0.003) ^(c) | 0.039 (0.003) ^(c) |
| Experience ² /100 | -0.014 (0.047) | -0.062 (0.006) ^(c) | -0.061 (0.006) ^(c) |
| Female | -0.365 (0.101) ^(c) | -0.231 (0.018) ^(c) | -0.233 (0.018) ^(c) |
| Year 2000 | -0.016 (0.08) | 0.009 (0.009) | 0.008 (0.009) |
| German region | 0.106 (0.114) | 0.051 (0.018) ^(c) | 0.052 (0.018) ^(c) |
| Urban | 0.189 (0.094) ^(b) | 0.025 (0.014) ^(a) | 0.029 (0.014) ^(b) |
| Full-time | 0.018 (0.106) | 0.061 (0.023) ^(c) | 0.059 (0.023) ^(c) |
| Λ_{1i} | -0.171 (0.083) ^(b) | | -0.093 (0.074) |
| Λ_{0i} | | 0.050 (0.120) | 0.041 (0.121) |
| Constant | 10.639 (0.602) ^(c) | 9.688 (0.072) ^(c) | 9.694 (0.072) ^(c) |
| Observations | 124 | 5075 | 5199 |
| R-squared | 0.22 | 0.28 | 0.28 |

See Table 2.

References

- BUNDESAMT FÜR STATISTIK (2002), *Statistisches Jahrbuch der Schweiz*.
- CARLINER, GEOFFREY (1981), "Wage Differences by Language Group and the Market for Language Skills in Canada", *The Journal of Human Resources* 16, pp. 384–399.
- CHISWICK, BARRY R. (1991), "Speaking, Reading, and Earnings among Low-Skilled Immigrants", *Journal of Labor Economics* 9, pp. 149–170.
- CHISWICK, BARRY R. and PAUL W. MILLER (1994), "Language Choice among Immigrants in a Multi-lingual Destination", *Journal of Population Economics* 7, pp. 119–131.
- CHISWICK, BARRY R. and PAUL W. MILLER (1995), "The Endogeneity between Language and Earnings: International Analyses", *Journal of Labor Economics* 13, pp. 245–287.
- CHISWICK, BARRY R. and PAUL W. MILLER (1996), "Ethnic Networks and Language Proficiency among Immigrants", *Journal of Population Economics* 9, pp. 16–35.
- CHISWICK, BARRY R. and PAUL W. MILLER (2001), "A Model of Destination-Language Acquisition: Application to Male Immigrants in Canada", *Demography* 38, pp. 391–409.
- CHISWICK, BARRY R. and PAUL W. MILLER (2002), "Immigrant Earnings: Language Skills, Linguistic Concentrations and the Business Cycle", *Journal of Population Economics* 15, pp. 31–57.
- DE COULON, AUGUSTIN (2001), "Wage Differentials between Ethnic Groups in Switzerland", *Review of Labor Economics and Industrial Relations* 1, pp. 111–132.
- DUSTMANN, CHRISTIAN and ARTHUR VAN SOEST (2002), "Language and Earnings of Immigrants", *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 55, pp. 473–492.
- DUSTMANN, CHRISTIAN and FRANCESCA FABBRI (2003), "Language Proficiency and Labor Market Performance of Immigrants in the UK", *Economic Journal* 113, pp. 695–717.
- GRENIER, GILLES (1987), "Earnings by Language Group in Quebec in 1980 and Emigration from Quebec between 1976 and 1981", *Canadian Journal of Economics* 20, pp. 774–791.
- GRIN, FRANÇOIS (1996), "Economic Approaches to Language and Language Planning", *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 121, pp. 1–203.
- GRIN, FRANÇOIS (1997), *Langue et différentiels de statut socio-économique en Suisse*, Bundesamt für Statistik, Bern.

- GRIN, FRANÇOIS and CLAUDIO SFREDDO (1998), "Language-Based Earnings Differentials on the Swiss labor Market: Is Italian a Liability?", *International Journal of Manpower* 19, pp. 520–532.
- HECKMAN, JAMES J. (1974), "Shadow Prices, Market Wages, and Labor Supply", *Econometrica* 42, pp. 679–694.
- HECKMAN, JAMES J., JUSTIN L. TOBIAS and EDWARD VYTLACIL (2003), "Simple Estimators for Treatment Parameters in a Latent Variable Framework", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 85, pp. 748–755.
- VELTMAN, CALVIN J., JAC-ANDRE BOULET and CHARLES CASTONGUAY (1979), "The Economic Context of Bilingualism and Language Transfer in the Montreal Metropolitan Area", *Canadian Journal of Economics* 12, pp. 468–479.
- WHORF, BENJAMIN L. (1956), *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*, ed. John B. Carroll, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.
- WINKELMANN, RAINER (2001), "Correctly Interpreting the Results from a Log-Linear Regression under Heteroskedasticity – Methods and an Application to the Relative Wages of Immigrants", *Jahrbücher für Nationalökonomie und Statistik* 221, pp. 418–431.
- WOOLDRIDGE, JEFFREY (2002), *Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data*, Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press.

SUMMARY

The paper analyzes the effect of mother tongue on labor market outcomes of Swiss residents. This type of analysis can shed light on an important policy question. Is the Swiss labor market well integrated, or can one find instead segmentation along language borders? Improving on previous research in this area, we use a nationally representative household survey, the Swiss Household Panel 1999 and 2000, and we explicitly account for self-selection of workers into language areas. Overall, we find no evidence to suggest that the Swiss labor market is not perfectly integrated or that internal migrants are positively selected.

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

In diesem Aufsatz analysieren wir die Auswirkungen der Muttersprache auf den Arbeitsmarkterfolg von Bewohnern der Schweiz. Die wirtschaftspolitische Bedeutung rührt daher, dass eine derartige Analyse Hinweise zur sprachgrenzlichen Integration oder Segmentation des Arbeitsmarktes liefern kann. Wir verwenden

Daten einer national repräsentativen Haushaltsbefragung, das Schweizerische Haushaltspanel, für die Jahre 1999 und 2000, und wir modellieren explizit die Selbstselektion der Arbeiter in die Sprachregionen. Zusammenfassend finden wir weder Hinweise für eine Segmentierung, noch solche für eine positive Selektion bei der sprachgrenzlichen Mobilität.

RÉSUMÉ

Dans cet article nous analysons l'effet de la langue maternelle sur le succès des habitants suisses dans le marché de travail. Avec une telle analyse, on peut apprendre si le marché du travail suisse est bien intégré ou segmenté à travers des frontières de la langue. Nous utilisons une enquête de ménage nationale représentative, le Panel suisse des ménages pour les années 1999 et 2000, et nous modelons exactement l'autosélection des ouvriers dans les régions linguistiques. En résumé, nous ne trouvons ni d'indications pour une segmentation du marché de travail ni pour l'autosélection.