

STRENGTHENING STATE CAPABILITIES: THE ROLE OF FINANCIAL INCENTIVES IN THE CALL TO PUBLIC SERVICE*

Ernesto Dal Bó
Frederico Finan
Martín A. Rossi

February 2013

Abstract

We study a recent recruitment drive for public sector positions in Mexico. Different salaries were announced randomly across recruitment sites, and job offers were subsequently randomized. Screening relied on exams designed to measure applicants' intellectual ability, personality, and motivation. This allows the first experimental estimates of (i) the role of financial incentives in attracting a larger and more qualified pool of applicants, (ii) the elasticity of the labor supply facing the employer, and (iii) the role of job attributes (distance, attractiveness of the municipal environment) in helping fill vacancies, as well as the role of wages in helping fill positions in less attractive municipalities. A theoretical model of job applications and acceptance guides the empirical inquiry. We find that higher wages attract more able applicants as measured by their IQ, personality, and proclivity towards public sector work – i.e., we find no evidence of adverse selection effects on motivation; higher wage offers also increased acceptance rates, implying a labor supply elasticity of around 2 and some degree of monopsony power. Distance and worse municipal characteristics strongly decrease acceptance rates but higher wages help bridge the recruitment gap in worse municipalities.

JEL Classification: H1

Keywords: State building, state capabilities, state capacity, public sector personnel, bureaucracy, public service motivation, labor markets, wages, elasticity of the labor supply, personality.

*We are grateful to Lawrence Katz (editor), Andrei Shleifer (co-editor), and four anonymous reviewers for several insightful comments that significantly improved the paper. We also thank David Card, Don Moore, Rohini Pande, Demian Pouzo, Bruce Sacerdote, Sinaia Urrusti-Frenk, Felix Vardy, Noam Yuchtman, and various seminar and conference participants for helpful suggestions. Michael Anderson generously provided us the code used in the multiple inference adjustments and the IT group at Berkeley-Haas constructed the data-capturing application. Katherine Nguyen also provided invaluable help.

I INTRODUCTION

Despite continuing disagreements among economists over the size and scope of state intervention, two ideas seem beyond dispute. One, the ability of the state to implement policies, raise revenue, and protect property rights, is a central aspect of economic development; and two, improving state capacity requires attracting the resources the state needs to function well.¹

Human capital is a key resource of the state enterprise: producing public goods and raising the revenue to finance them is surely better done by an adequate number of capable agents. But able agents constitute only one aspect of the well-functioning, professionalized bureaucracy that is the mark of the modern state (Weber (1911), Evans (1995)).² The state apparatus may also require individuals of integrity or with strong public sector motivation. This of course begs the question of what are the various dimensions of candidate quality, and how do we attract these qualities to the public sector.

In this paper we investigate the various dimensions of candidate quality and examine the role of incentives, both pecuniary and non-pecuniary, in attracting these qualities to the public sector. An essential ingredient needed to address this question is an estimate of the elasticity of the labor supply facing the firm (or in our case the government), and we provide the literature's first experimental estimate of this elasticity.³

Our analysis is based on an experiment conducted as part of an official program of Mexico's Federal government called the Regional Development Program (henceforth, RDP). The program seeks to enhance state presence in 167 of Mexico's most marginalized municipalities. To this effect, the program has built a network of around fifty coordinators who supervise an even larger network of 350 community development agents. These public agents are to embed themselves in the local communities and identify areas where public good provision is deficient, and work with existing public programs and local authorities to remedy such deficiencies. To hire these agents, the RDP conducted a recruitment drive in the months of June to August of 2011, during which positions were advertised, candidates were screened,

¹Abundant work in economics has emphasized the link between government and growth. More recently, Acemoglu (2005), Arias (2008), Besley and Persson (2009), and Besley and Persson (2010) have emphasized the importance of the operational capacity of the state in determining growth.

²For empirical work on the effects of bureaucratic structure on economic performance, see also Rauch (1995) and Evans and Rauch (1999).

³Manning (2011) in his excellent review of the literature on monopsony in the labor market states: "An ideal experiment that one would like to run to estimate the elasticity of the labor supply curve to a single firm would be to randomly vary the wage paid by the single firm and observe what happens to employment. As yet, the literature does not have a study of such an experiment." We are aware of only two papers that rely on randomization of wages, by Fehr and Goette (2007) and Goldberg (2010). These papers are more safely interpreted as studying the important but different issue of the labor supply of individuals.

and jobs were offered to selected candidates. This process involved an exogenous assignment of wage offers across recruitment sites, as well as an exogenous assignment of job offers. With this dual experimental design, we investigate three key questions.

The first question is: do higher wages attract higher quality applicants? As we show through a simple model, if higher quality candidates are priced by the market demand higher compensation, higher wages in the public sector are a necessary condition for attracting those candidates. However, higher wages may improve quality at the cost of attracting candidates with weaker public service motivation – a concern motivating a literature in economics (Handy and Katz (1998), Delfgaauw and Dur (2007), Francois (2000), Prendergast (2007)). Although these questions are of high practical relevance, empirical progress has met with at least two important hurdles. First, it is difficult to measure an individual’s quality. Secondly, and perhaps more importantly, different wage offers for a given position are not typically assigned exogenously.

In this study, we overcome these limitations by exploiting two features of the RDP. First, two different wage offers were randomly assigned across 106 recruitment sites. In one set of recruitment sites an offer of 5,000 Pesos per month was offered, while in the other sites a wage of 3,750 Pesos was offered. Second, the RDP involved a screening session measuring a rich array of candidate characteristics. This allows us to classify candidate profiles along the dimensions of quality and motivation that have become standard in the human resources area, both in academic and industry circles. To our knowledge, the generation of a dataset with this wealth of candidate information in the context of an experimental design involving compensation is novel.

Our characterization of candidate profiles involves two main categories. One is related to raw “quality” understood as aptitude or the ability to perform. This is measured directly through the candidate’s intelligence and other personality traits widely considered to affect job performance, and indirectly through the candidate’s market value proxied by current or past earnings. The other category relates to motivational profile, or the desire to perform, particularly in the context of public service. To cover this second category, the RDP screening exam included measures of integrity, pro-social inclinations, and the motivation for public service.

We find that higher wages help attract a better candidate pool both in terms of quality and motivation. In the places that announced a higher salary the average applicant was smarter, had better personality traits, had higher earnings, and a better occupational profile (e.g., more experience and white collar background). These improvements go together with a stronger public service motivation profile. That is, we find no evidence that higher wages only improve candidate quality at the cost of attracting less motivated individuals.

The second question motivating our study is whether higher wages can help the state recruit more candidates. While a substantial literature in labor economics has debated the properties of the labor supply facing the firm, clean evidence stemming from exogenous wage variation has been lacking.⁴ To investigate this, we start with the simple observation that real life recruitment is about more than posting wages. Positions must be advertised, applicants must express interest, and candidates must be screened and selected. Once selection is made, filling vacancies requires converting selections into accepted offers. This conversion process requires successfully re-contacting candidates first, and then having them accept the offer.

We incorporate the practical stages of recruitment into a simple theoretical model and decompose the labor supply elasticity into the elasticities of two subcomponents: the size of the applicant pool and the conversion rate of selected candidates into vacancies filled. Our point estimates indicate that the labor supply facing Mexico's government, while relatively elastic, is far from infinitely elastic and reflects monopsony conditions: a 33 percent increase in wages led to a 26 percent increase in applications and a 35 percent increase in the conversion rate, implying a labor supply (arc-) elasticity of around 2.15, which is similar in magnitude to the elasticity found in non-experimental studies (e.g. Falch (2011), Sullivan (1989)). Also noteworthy, a substantial role of higher wages is to increase conversion rates by raising the chance that candidates can be successfully recontacted.

The third question we address is: what are the effects on recruitment of job location disadvantages, such as commute distance or weak rule of law, and can higher wages help the state fill positions in less attractive locations? This is of direct policy relevance to governments seeking to improve public good delivery in remote and challenging areas. Unfortunately, progress on this topic remains limited – in large part because workers are not exogenously offered jobs with different characteristics. Candidates to the RDP who met certain eligibility criteria were randomly selected to work in a municipality within a particular geographical area, producing exogenous variation in terms of commuting (or relocation) distance, and work environment. We find that it is much harder to attract workers to municipalities that are distant, have more drug-related violence and score lower on the human development index.⁵ Higher wages, however, do help to bridge the recruitment gap in the worse municipalities.

While this paper has important implications for those concerned with the development and enhancement of state capabilities, it also contributes to an established yet active area in

⁴Manning (2011) provides an excellent review of the current state of the literature.

⁵These findings relate to a growing literature that examines of the effects of firms' characteristics on employee recruitment and retention. See for example recent work by Brown and Matsa (2012) who show that employers' financial distress is associated with fewer and lower quality applicants.

labor economics that examines the effects of financial incentives on job queues. For instance, using data from the Employment Opportunity Pilot Project, Holzer, Katz, and Krueger (1991) find that firms offering jobs that paid the minimum wage attracted significantly more job applicants than jobs that pay either slightly more or slightly less than the minimum wage. Krueger (1988) examines the determinants of outside applicants for federal job openings in the U.S. during the 1950-1980's. He finds that the ratio of federal to private sector earnings is associated with both application rates for government jobs, as well as the quality of the applicants. In a more recent paper, Marinescu and Wolthoff (2012) use data from an employment website and find that, conditional on occupation, higher wages attract more and better applicants.

The plan for the paper is as follows. The next section offers some background on the Regional Development Program. Section III lays out a simple theoretical model to derive the central predictions that we take to the data. A fuller version of the theory with additional predictions is available in the Online Appendix. Section III.B explains the experimental design. In Section IV.B, we describe the data and also introduce and validate our measures of candidate quality and motivation. Section V.B presents the results on the effects of financial incentives on the size and quality of the candidate pool. Section VII presents our empirical results on how wages and job characteristics affect recruitment and our estimates of the elasticity of the labor supply facing the employer. Section VII.B concludes.

II BACKGROUND

In 2011 the Mexican government began a program – the Regional Development Program (RDP) – designed to increase the presence of the state in some of its most marginalized and conflict-ridden municipalities. To achieve this objective, the program has created a large network of public agents – 350 community development agents and the 50 coordinators who supervise them – whose primary responsibilities are to identify the needs of the community and to report them directly to the federal government, who will then seek to channel resources to meet these demands.⁶ By establishing a direct link to its citizens, the federal government hopes to establish a presence in several of the areas where the local government has proven to be ineffective.

The program has been implemented across ten regions containing 167 municipalities and

⁶These agents were hired on a full-time basis under a temporary contract, with the expectation that it would be renewed as long as the program still existed. While this is admittedly not the stereotypical bureaucratic job, these types of positions have become quite common in Mexico, as in other parts of the world. For instance, in Brazil 25 percent of public employees are hired on a temporary contract. These types of employees were also commonly used in the implementation of the Progresa program in Mexico.

thousands of localities.⁷ Each of the 350 community development positions were assigned to a particular municipality. These municipalities were selected based on an index of their socio-economic characteristics. Consequently, the economic and social disparities between the RDP municipalities and the rest of Mexico are large. For instance, income per capita in the RDP municipalities is almost half of that in the other municipalities, and infant mortality is also 50 percent higher. The presence of drug cartels and subversive organizations is also a serious concern for these areas compared to the rest of Mexico.⁸

III THEORY

The classic textbook model linking monopsony power to the elasticity of the labor supply facing the firm considers an employer posting wages and workers instantly filling vacancies. But the reality of recruitment involves a process that extends through time, with workers applying for jobs, the employer making offers, and candidates deciding whether to accept the offer. Job applications have received attention in the literature (see for instance Holzer, Katz, and Krueger (1991), and more recently Brown and Matsa (2012) and Marinescu and Wolthoff (2012)), and so has the process of offers and acceptance (e.g., Weiss (1980) and Lang (1991)). In this section we develop a model capturing both the application and job offer-acceptance stages to analyze how wages will affect the size and quality of the applicant pool and the acceptance rates.

Consider an employer who faces a residual labor supply made up of a potentially large number of workers. There are two periods and no discounting. In period 1, each worker must decide whether to incur a cost $c > 0$ to show up for a job interview with our employer, who has posted a wage w . Should the worker decide to show up, he will receive an offer with probability $\rho \in (0, 1]$, in period 2. Individuals differ along two dimensions, namely market quality $v \in [0, \infty)$ and inclination towards public service $\pi \in [0, \infty)$ (or public service motivation, henceforth PSM). PSM is a specific utility the individual receives from holding a public sector job. To keep things as simple as possible, we will write the utility from getting the public sector job as $w + \pi$. Whether the individual will find this job attractive in period 2 will depend on his reservation utility given by a market opportunity with a value of $v + \varepsilon$.

The term ε captures an idiosyncratic shock to reservation utility that is realized and observed in period 2 before the individual is made an offer; ε is unbounded and is distributed according to the function $G(\varepsilon)$, with mean zero and associated density $g(\varepsilon)$. The quality v ,

⁷The ten regions are Sierra Cora-Huichol, Costa Infiernillo, Huasteca Veracruzana, Montaña de Guerrero, Sierra Guerrero, Selva Lacandona, Sierra Tarahumara, Tierra Caliente-Oriente, Triqui-Mixteca, and Zapoteca Chontal.

⁸Table A1 of the Online Appendix compares the RDP municipalities to the rest of Mexico along various socio-economic characteristics.

known by the individual from the beginning of period 1, determines her expected reservation utility. Individuals are indexed by their personal v , which is distributed according to the function $F(v)$ and density $f(v)$.⁹ At the end of period 2 job offers are made by our employer, then they are accepted or rejected, and payoffs are collected.

We will develop two cases. In the first case π and v are independently distributed among the population. In the second case π and v are positively correlated, and to simplify matters we focus on the extreme case in which all types (v, π) are contained in the graph of the function $v = m(\pi)$ (effectively, the type space becomes unidimensional), with $m'(\pi) > 0$, and $m(0) \geq 0$. This positive correlation case is not meant to generate general insights, but to provide a contrast with the independence case that helps us examine the data. To focus on the effects of interest, we make the important assumption that the probability ρ of getting the job is fixed, and to simplify notation we assume $\rho = 1$. The latter simplification is inconsequential, but the uniformity of ρ is not. If candidates believe that their chances of getting an offer depend on their type, different selection patterns are possible, including cases where non-monotone selection occurs (both very low and very high types enter). In the Online Appendix we isolate conditions under which the results of our basic model are preserved under a formulation where ρ depends on the type of candidates.¹⁰

III.A The effects of financial incentives on candidate quality

We now study the different decisions facing a worker in each period and solve the model by backward induction. If offered a job in period 2, a candidate with realized outside opportunity $v + \varepsilon$ will accept the job whenever $v + \varepsilon < w + \pi$, which for a type (v, π) will happen with probability $G(w + \pi - v)$. In period 1, entry decisions depend on the relationship between v and π .

A proposition in the Online Appendix characterizes the selection pattern into the applicant pool depending on the correlation between quality v and PSM π . The key takeaway is that the theory can rationalize a situation where quality and PSM display a positive correlation in the applicant pool, and where the relatively low quality and low PSM types select in. What is required is that quality and PSM be positively related in the population in a

⁹The heterogeneity in quality relates our model to the classic framework by Weiss (1980). However, we modify that setup in several ways, including the addition of a temporal dimension and the emergence of alternative opportunities after the first match between the worker and employer. This latter aspect evokes the motivating considerations of Lang (1991), although we abstract from his symmetric (and formally instantaneous) competition among employers.

¹⁰The dependence of ρ on candidate types raises issues similar to those studied by Morgan, Sisak, and Vardy (2012) in their model of job promotion policies in a general equilibrium context. In the online appendix we also examine cases where candidates infer job characteristics or eligibility criteria from the wage. We abstract from all of these complications in our main analysis to match the model to the recruitment process that actually took place, and to focus on what the data suggest are the first order mechanisms.

specific way: an increase in PSM must increase the quality of a candidate at a rate faster than one for one ($m'(\pi) > 1$, a condition we assume henceforth). Against that backdrop, we can establish,

Proposition 1 *a) Given the assumptions of our model, an increase in wages increases the size and average quality of the applicant pool.*

*b) In the case when PSM and quality are independent in the population, an increase in wages **decreases** the average PSM of the applicant pool.*

*c) In the case when PSM and quality are positively correlated according to the function $m(\pi)$, an increase in wages **increases** the average PSM of the applicant pool.*

Proof: See Online Appendix.

Higher wages should always increase the quality of the applicant pool, but whether they will increase PSM depends on the underlying correlation between quality and PSM in the population. In the independent case, we should expect higher wages to worsen PSM.¹¹ However, in the positive correlation case, we can expect wages not to worsen PSM, but rather to increase it alongside quality. We will let the data speak to this matter when we analyze the effects of wages on the applicant pool.

III.B The effects of financial incentives on recruitment

To have the model speak to the recruitment effects of wages in the simplest possible way, in what follows let us abstract from the PSM aspect. As shown in the Online Appendix, the selection pattern becomes very simple: there exists a finite type \bar{v} who is indifferent between attending the interview or not. All $v \leq \bar{v}$ prefer to attend and enter the candidate pool, while all $v > \bar{v}$ stay out, and the separating type \bar{v} is increasing in the value of the job w . As before, we have that higher wages increase the size and quality of the applicant pool. But recruitment requires filling vacancies with some of the applicants. Only those with modest reservation utility realizations (i.e., with $w > v + \varepsilon$) will accept an offer, so the overall recruitment, and effective labor supply facing the employer at wage w is,

$$S = \int_0^{\bar{v}} G(w - v) f(v) dv = F(\bar{v}) \int_0^{\bar{v}} G(w - v) \frac{f(v)}{F(\bar{v})} dv,$$

¹¹This result parallels several others studies in the literature (e.g. Handy and Katz (1998), Delfgaauw and Dur (2007), Francois (2000), Prendergast (2007)). Of these models, Delfgaauw and Dur (2007) is perhaps the closest to our set up for this section. Two important differences are that in their model the outside opportunity is unrelated to individual quality, and that they model PSM as inducing a taste for effort in a setting where moral hazard is a concern.

where $F(\bar{v})$ defines the size of the applicant pool and $\int_0^{\bar{v}} G(w-v) \frac{f(v)}{F(\bar{v})} dv$ defines the *conversion* rate γ , namely the rate at which offers are converted into filled vacancies. We can now state,

Proposition 2 *a) The measure of recruited candidates in our model, and the labor supplied to the firm in equilibrium, can be written as the product $F(\bar{v})\gamma(w, \bar{v})$ of the applicant pool size and the conversion rate. Thus, the elasticity of the labor supply facing the employer is*

$$\eta = \frac{dS}{dw} \frac{w}{S} = \frac{dF}{dw} \frac{w}{F} + \frac{d\gamma}{dw} \frac{w}{\gamma} \equiv \xi_{F(\bar{v})} + \xi_{\gamma(w, \bar{v})}.$$

b) Under the assumptions of the model, the elasticity of the applicant pool size is positive ($\xi_{F(\bar{v})} > 0$) while the sign of the elasticity of the conversion rate $\xi_{\gamma(w, \bar{v})}$ is ambiguous.

Proof: See Online Appendix.

This proposition establishes that the elasticity of the labor supply facing the employer can be written as the sum of the elasticities of two components: the size of the applicant pool, and the conversion rate. These are the elasticities we will measure in our empirical work. Furthermore, a wage increase should enlarge the applicant pool (from part a) of proposition 1) so we expect $\xi_{F(\bar{v})}$ to be positive. However, it is not necessarily true that the average conversion rate must go up with wages. This might be surprising, but is made transparent by the model: acceptance rates respond ambiguously to an increase in wages due to composition changes in the applicant pool. A higher wage will make all the infra-marginal types $v < \bar{v}$ in the pool more likely to accept, but the marginal type that is added is less likely to accept. If the effect on the inframarginal types dominates, then higher wages will increase conversion rates. Again, we will let the data speak to this.

IV EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

The process used to hire the public agents incorporated experimental variation in two consecutive stages. In the first stage, two separate wage offers were assigned across recruitment sites allowing us to study how wages affect the applicant pool.¹² In the second stage, eligible applicants for each vacancy were selected at random to be offered a job, creating a random match between municipalities and candidates; this permits an assessment of how characteristics of the municipalities affect acceptance decisions.

¹²Since the inception of Progresas/Oportunidades, the Mexican government has sought to incorporate an evaluation component in the design of several of their programs (e.g., Seguro Popular, Programa de Apoyo Alimentario). The predisposition of the top officials in the RDP to implement a randomized evaluation reflected that trend as well as their desire to increase their understanding of the selection process, with the ultimate objective of improving recruitment for social programs.

IV.A Job postings

Recruitment took place during June to August of 2011. The recruitment sites were located mostly within the ten target regions in localities with a small community college – in hopes of attracting a younger and more educated applicant pool.¹³ Job postings were then sent out to 113 schools in 106 localities throughout the regions; we will refer to these localities as “recruitment sites.”

The job advertisements provided a general description of the job, along with a toll-free number and an email address for interested applicants (see Figure A1 in the Online Appendix). Telephone operators would then register the callers by recording, in addition to their contact information, answers to some questions regarding the person’s education level and employment background. After registering the applicant and depending on the locality in which the person had seen the advertisement, the operator would communicate the salary attached to the job, as well as the date and place for the candidate to show up and participate in the screening session.¹⁴ All responses to questions concerning the job were given according to a pre-established script. In the end, 1,920 individuals registered; 1,665 did so by phone, 208 by email, and 47 individuals opted to do both.

Salaries were randomly assigned across recruitment sites, with 65 out of 106 localities (\simeq 61 percent) posting a wage of 5,000 Mexican Pesos per month and the remaining 41 out of 106 localities (\simeq 39 percent) announcing a wage of 3,750 Pesos per month. As a point of comparison, 5,000 Mexican Pesos was roughly equivalent to 500 US dollars at the time of the recruitment drive.¹⁵ Table I presents summary statistics for the localities

¹³While most of the recruitment sites were assigned to localities inside each targeted region, for logistical reasons a few were assigned to neighboring localities just outside of the region.

¹⁴We designed the experiment in such a way as to minimize the possibility of sorting. If people knew about competing recruitment sites offering different wages, the high wage places might attract all of the applicants even if the wage differential is infinitesimal. This could be mistaken for an infinitely large wage elasticity, when the reality is that at the lower wage people would apply as well if the higher wage were not available. To deal with this, our design forced each locality to offer a single wage – this was automatically the case when localities had only one school, and forced by block randomization when a locality contained more than one. This reduced the chances that individuals got to know about different recruitment sites potentially carrying a different wage offer. In addition, we also minimized the potential sorting effects by having the registration operators ask the candidate where he/she had seen the ad, and then communicate the wage and force the candidate to formalize their candidacy by attending the screening session in the same school. Naturally, a question arises as to whether candidates who showed up without registering could be displaying sorting effects. This could be the case if they had word of mouth information revealing the existence of two recruitment sites offering different wages. Since no two schools within a locality were associated with different wages, this was deemed unlikely – and in fact only 76 unregistered applicants turned out to be aware of multiple sites (which may not even have offered different wages). Among those who showed up for the exam, 37% had not registered, and conversely 71% individuals who had registered did show up. The pattern of unregistered show ups and registered no shows did not vary significantly by treatment and control.

¹⁵Based on data from the 2010 census, the wage offers of 3,750 and 5,000 Pesos correspond approximately to the 65th and 80th percentile of the wage distribution for the population residing in the program regions.

in our sample, by wage offering. For each characteristic, we also present the difference between locations with high versus low wage offerings (column 3), as well as the proportion of treatment assignments that yield a difference that was greater or equal to that under the actual treatment assignment, based on 1000 random draws (column 4). As expected from the random assignment, there is little difference between places where a high versus low wage was offered. Out of 15 characteristics, only one (share of indigenous population) is statistically significant at the 10 percent level. We also fail to reject the hypothesis that all the variables are jointly significant (F-test=1.17; p -value=0.30). Overall the results from Table I suggest that the randomization was effective.¹⁶

Given the experimental design, estimation of the causal effects of wages on the applicant pool is straightforward. We estimate the following regression model:

$$Y_{icr} = \beta_1 T_c + \zeta_r + \epsilon_{icr}, \quad (1)$$

where Y_{icr} is a characteristic of individual i who applied for the job in locality c , situated in region r . The variable T_c is an indicator equal to 1 if the locality received the high wage announcement, and ζ_r denotes region intercepts.¹⁷ The error term ϵ_{icr} , is assumed to be independent across localities but in our estimation we allow for arbitrary correlation across observations within the same locality. Given random assignment, the coefficient β_1 captures the causal effects of wages on a particular feature of the applicant pool. From Proposition 1, we expect $\beta_1 > 0$ when the dependent variable is a measure of the size or quality of the applicant pool.

IV.B Job offers and assignment

To assess their qualifications, in the screening session applicants were administered a three-hour exam designed to measure three broad categories of personal characteristics: aptitude, personality, and motivations (especially inclination towards public sector employment).¹⁸ These data were then entered and analyzed, and the 379 individuals (out of 2254 total applicants) who scored below a 7 on the Raven exam were considered not eligible for employment. The remaining applicants were stratified into one of four wage-IQ types: 1) High

¹⁶The employment figures may appear very high for a developing country but are in fact consistent with national averages. See <http://www.inegi.org.mx>.

¹⁷Our results are unaffected if we also control for the share of that population that is indigenous, or any of the other variables presented in Table I.

¹⁸According to Roberts (2006), there are four domains of personal variability, namely personality traits (e.g., the Big 5, introduced below), values and motives (e.g., goals, interests), abilities (verbal, quantitative, and spatial intelligence), and narratives (e.g., stories, memories). The questionnaire we used captured the first three of these four domains.

wage announcement and high IQ; 2) High wage announcement and normal IQ; 3) Low wage announcement and high IQ; 4) Low wage announcement and normal IQ, where “high IQ” is defined as a score above a 9 on the Raven exam, and “normal IQ” corresponds to scores of 7,8, or 9.

Each of the 350 vacancies was assigned to a municipality so that when the vacancy became filled, the hired person would work in that municipality. Then, each vacancy, now associated to a municipality, was randomly assigned to one of the four type categories (the proportion of vacancies in each wage bin followed the proportion of recruitment sites announcing each wage). Then job offers were made randomly to candidates from the region drawn from the wage-IQ bin corresponding to each vacancy. In some municipalities the program imposed an extra requirement that eligible candidates speak the local indigenous language.

Approximately 3-4 weeks elapsed between the time the average person took the exam and the moment when the RDP attempted to contact the selected candidates to make a job offer. If the person was not reached, the operators would try again over the course of about a week. If after that time the person could not be reached or had rejected the offer, a new person was randomly selected from the pool (again conditional on type) to be contacted. We will focus our analysis on the first wave of offers since offers that are rejected, and hence re-sampled, are no longer truly random.¹⁹

Given that job offers under the announced wage were exogenously assigned to applicants, we can estimate the causal effect of higher wages on the likelihood that the applicant accepts the job using a regression model similar to the one presented in equation (1), where the dependent variable, A_{ics} , is an indicator equal to 1 if the selected applicant ended up accepting the job. Specifically, we estimate the following model:

$$A_{ics} = \gamma_1 T_c + X_i' \beta + \zeta_s + \epsilon_{ics}, \quad (2)$$

where γ_1 is the conversion coefficient. Proposition 2 states that this coefficient has an ambiguous sign. If the effect of wages on inframarginal applicants dominates, then $\gamma_1 > 0$. The vector X_i is a set of individual characteristics, and ζ_s represents indicators for a region by indigenous requirement pair. The error term ϵ_{ics} again also allows for arbitrary correlation of observations within a locality.

When offered a position, candidates were also told the municipality in which they were expected to work. Because the assignment of the municipality was random, we can then

¹⁹Applicants who were offered a salary of 3,750 pesos per month and rejected it were re-contacted several days later and offered a salary of 5,000 pesos per month, which elicited further acceptances. In the analysis that follows we abstract from all offers in subsequent waves.

estimate how the characteristics of the municipality m to which an applicant was assigned affected his likelihood of acceptance, and whether the higher wage offer had a differential effect based on these characteristics. In particular, we augment equation (2) as follows:

$$A_{icms} = \gamma_1 T_c + \gamma_2 (T_c \times W_m) + \gamma_3 W_m + X_i' \beta + \zeta_s + \epsilon_{icms}, \quad (3)$$

where W_m is a characteristic of the municipality to which the applicant was assigned. In estimating equation 3, we consider the following municipal characteristics: distance to the assigned municipality (from the candidate’s home municipality), the municipality’s Human Development Index, and the number of drug-related deaths per 1000 inhabitants.

V DATA

V.A Measuring Candidate Characteristics

We group candidate characteristics into two broad categories. One is related to raw “quality” understood as aptitude or the ability to perform. The other relates to motivational profile, or the desire to perform, particularly in the context of public service. In this section, we discuss how we measure these characteristics and describe the applicant pool.

Quality

In this paper we take the view that quality relates to personal characteristics that make workers more productive and valuable to employers. We rely on two sets of measures. Our first measure of quality uses a person’s current and/or previous earnings in their last employment spell (“outside wages”) as an indication of the person’s outside opportunity. As is common on most job applications, candidates were asked during the screening exam to provide information about their last three places of employment. This information included length of employment, employer’s contact information (which signaled that information was verifiable) as well as previous wages. Using the candidates previous wage as a measure of quality has the advantage of capturing other elements of skill or productivity that are valued by the market, but not reflected in standard measures of ability and productivity (e.g., years of schooling). Also, the outside opportunity is more directly linked to a person’s decision to self-select into a job. A disadvantage of this measure is that realized past or current earnings may contain random shocks.

The second class of quality measures is based on a vast body of research in psychology that documents the importance of both cognitive and non-cognitive traits for predicting

earnings, job status, and job performance (Schmidt and Hunter 1998). To evaluate an applicant’s aptitude, the questionnaire included a series of questions intended to assess both raw cognitive ability (“general mental ability” or IQ), as well as standard market skills (e.g., computer use, years of schooling). We measured IQ through the *Raven’s Progressive Matrices* Set I published by Pearson. The Raven’s test, which is one of the most widely used tests for abstract mental aptitudes, measures a person’s capacity to think logically and solve abstract problems, independent of context or acquired knowledge. The test comprises a series of matrices, and for each matrix the test taker observes a visual pattern of abstract figures and must identify the missing piece from a set of available options. Due to logistical constraints and the need to screen for various attributes, we administered the Set I, which only contains 12 matrices. Consequently, this shorter version of the test cannot usually discriminate within the top 5% of the distribution.

To measure non-cognitive attributes, we examined a set of personality traits that psychologists have over time grouped into five categories labeled “the Big 5.” These traits are openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism (see the Data Appendix for a definition of each trait). We measured the Big 5 personality traits using the Big Five Inventory (BFI) developed by John (1990). This is a 44-item questionnaire. An important advantage is it has been translated into Spanish for deployment in Mexico, and its use validated there (Benet-Martínez and John 1988). These authors did not find important differences between the Mexican and US populations. More generally, John, Naumann, and Soto (2008) report on extensive studies validating the Big Five Inventory both for internal consistency in terms of test-retest reliability, as well as convergence with other personality inventories such as McCrae and Costa (1992) NEO Five Factor scale.

In the analysis to follow, we report results on each personality trait separately, as well as an index of the Big 5. The index is constructed as an equally-weighted average of the z -scores of each dimension, reverse-coding neuroticism which is widely considered to be a negative characteristic (the negative of neuroticism is usually labeled “emotional stability”). The standardization was based on the mean and standard deviation of the applicants in the low wage locations.

Public service motivation

We designed the questionnaire to measure an applicant’s inclination towards public service. Research indicates that public sector employees have a different motivation profile in terms of values, inclination to public service activities and volunteering (Bright (2005), Rotolo and Wilson (2006)). Researchers in the area of public administration have explored the idea

that public service motivation is central to the effective delivery of public goods and services (Perry and Wise 1990). Individuals with a strong desire to serve the public interest or who have higher levels of altruism are thought not only to be more attracted to public sector employment, but also perform better on the job, due perhaps to better match quality. While estimating the extent to which public service motivation affects job performance remains an active area of research, recent meta-studies do suggest that public service motivation is positively correlated with job performance in the public sector, broadly defined (Petrovsky 2009).

We measure an applicant’s public service motivation using Perry’s 1996 scale of Public Service Motivation (Perry 1996), which has become the gold standard in the literature on public service motivation. This index is constructed based on a questionnaire in which the subject must express agreement or disagreement with each of thirty-two statements. The questionnaire elicits opinions on the attractiveness of politics, public service, and pro-social activities. The questionnaire is subdivided into six modules labeled “Attraction to Policy Making” “Commitment to Policy Making,” “Social Justice,” “Civic Duty,” “Compassion,” and “Self-Sacrifice.” Each dimension is an average of responses to several statements that are measured on a 5-point Likert scale, where a 5 represents strong agreement with the statement, and a 1 denotes strong disagreement. As with the Big 5 index, we also construct a public service motivation index, which is an equally weighted average of the z -scores of each dimension. Each dimension is standardized based on the mean and standard deviation of the applicants in the low wage areas.

Given that public service motivation is in many respects closely related to pro-social behavior, we also collect information on various pro-social activities, such as volunteering, charity work, and political participation. We also observe the applicant’s play in non-incentivized experimental games designed to capture social preferences.

Summary statistics

Table II shows summary statistics for five different families of candidate characteristics: basic socio-demographics (Panel A), aptitudes and skills (Panel B), personality traits (Panel C), public service motivation (Panel D) and pro-social behavior (Panel E).²⁰ The total number of candidates that took the exam was 2,254, which is larger than the 1,929 who registered. This is due to the fact that some of those who registered alerted others about the exam. We perform our analysis with the full sample, but the results remain unchanged if we restrict attention to those who registered. The applicant pool is mostly males (60 percent), and the

²⁰See the Data Appendix for a description of each variable used in the analysis.

average age is 27 years old. Many of these candidates had recently finished studying and only a small fraction of them (14 percent) were employed at the time they applied. The average monthly wage reported for the last occupation of record is 4,276 Pesos per month which lies squarely between the two wages offered in the program (3,750 and 5,000 Pesos per month).

The candidates reported an average of 14 years of schooling. Although some over-reporting is possible, this average most likely reflects how the recruitment was targeted towards localities with community colleges. The average IQ score in the Raven's Matrices test was 8.77. The median score is 9, which matches what studies have revealed for US and UK populations (Pearson 1998). This goes together with a striking fraction of the candidates (39 percent) making a mistake when confronted with a simple hypothetical choice between a certain outcome of 2.5 million Pesos and a lottery with equally probable prizes of 2.5 and 5 million Pesos.²¹

Panel E displays summary statistics for various measures of pro-social behavior, like engaging in volunteer work (71 percent), charity (54 percent) and having voted in the last election (76 percent).²² The variable "Cooperation" tracks the contribution in a hypothetical voluntary contribution game where the person must decide how much out of fifty Pesos to contribute to a joint account, and how much to keep. Money in the joint account is multiplied by a factor of 1.4 and then divided between the two people participating. While the Pareto efficient allocation is to contribute all fifty Pesos, the Nash equilibrium is to contribute zero. "Altruism" tracks the amount the person gave out of the fifty Pesos to an anonymous individual in a hypothetical dictator game. In both games, we find that individuals, on average, contribute approximately half of their hypothetical endowment. "Negative reciprocity" records whether the person would reject an offer of one Peso in a hypothetical ultimatum game where the proposer keeps forty-nine Pesos. We find that 55 percent of the applicants exhibit traits of negative reciprocity. While the unincentivized nature of these games may be a limitation, there is some evidence that choices in incentivized experiments are often in line with choices in hypothetical games (Ben-Ner and Levy 2004). The choices made by the candidates do in fact correlate with the rest of their self-declared pro-social activities and with the patterns observed in incentivized experiments.

²¹Although this finding may seem puzzling, it has been documented in other settings and is an example of the "uncertainty effect" (e.g., Gneezy, List, and Wu (2006)).

²²According to the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA), turnout for the presidential 2006 election in Mexico was just short of 59 percent.

V.B Are these measures trustworthy?

We were able to collect a rich and comprehensive dataset on individual characteristics through the screening session. However, the fact that the information is self-reported raises the concern that individuals may have misrepresented themselves.²³

There are however, at least four reasons why the amount of misreporting may in fact be minimal and – more relevant to the validity of the analysis – not correlated with treatment. First, all applicants were asked to sign an honor code verifying that the information provided in the questionnaire was accurate, which should raise the psychological cost of manipulating responses. Second, the contact information of the applicant’s previous employers was collected, which provides an implicit threat of verification. Third, the measures we use are standard not only in the academic side of personnel psychology, but also in industry and consulting. Thus, these types of measures inform, at least partially, actual personnel decisions; this is suggestive of some validity.²⁴ Fourth and perhaps most important, as we discuss at length in the Online Appendix, the correlations in the data do not seem to suggest misreporting of previous salaries, response manipulation of pro-social attitudes, or differential effort-driven performance on the IQ tests.

VI EFFECTS OF FINANCIAL INCENTIVES ON THE APPLICANT POOL

Our paper contains two sets of empirical results. The first, presented in this section, concerns the effects of financial incentives on the applicant pool. The second, presented later, investigates the effects of financial incentives on the ability of the recruiter to fill vacancies given a set of candidates. Table III presents evidence that speaks to proposition 1. We estimate a series of models based on equation (1). The prediction of our theory is that higher wages should increase the number and quality of candidates. Each row corresponds to a separate regression. Column 1 presents the number of observations used in the estimation. Column 2 reports the mean of the dependent variable among the sites that were offered a low wage, whereas column 3 presents the estimates of the coefficient, β_1 , which measures the difference in the dependent variable between high versus low wage offers after adjusting for region fixed-effects. In column 4, we use randomization inference to compute p -values, which

²³Applicants were not told one way or the other whether the questionnaire would be used in the evaluation process.

²⁴Some specialists in personnel psychology have come to the view that “Results suggest that intentional distortion of self-descriptions may not be the problem it has often been assumed to be” (Hough and Ones 2002). These authors still advice to design tests with a clear request for truthful reporting and the potential for verification, as we have done.

measure the proportion of random treatment re-assignments that yield estimates greater than or equal to the actual treatment assignment, based on 1000 random draws. In column 5, we report p -values that control for the false discovery rate (FDR); that is, the proportion of rejections that are Type I errors. These FDR-adjusted p -values account for the fact that we are testing multiple outcomes (e.g. Anderson (2008)).

Consistent with the theory, the recruitment sites that offered higher wages (*treatment areas*) attracted 4.8 more applicants on average than those that posted the low wage announcement (*control areas*). Although this represents a 26.3 percent increase over the control areas, the difference is not statistically significant. Higher wages did however attract applicants with significantly higher reservation wages (proxied by previous earnings), as the theory predicts. The outside salaries of applicants in places with the high wage announcement are on average 820 Pesos higher than in the places with a low wage announcement; a difference that represents a 22 percent increase from the average among the control. While these results suggest a significant mean effect, Figure I shows that the higher wage offering also impacted the upper tail of the distribution. From panel A of Figure I, we see that the density of outside wages in the treatment sites has been shifted to the right of the density in the control sites.²⁵ Moreover, whereas the maximum outside wage in the control areas was 14,000 Pesos, it was above 20,000 Pesos in the treatment areas.²⁶ Panel B of Figure I plots the treatment effect on the number of applicants per site by six evenly distributed wage categories.²⁷ The high wage treatment had a significant effect on the number of applicants per site for each of the three wage categories above 3,000 Pesos per month. For instance, the treatment led to a 105 percent increase (treatment effect of 3.03; baseline=2.88) in the number of applicants per site who earned more than 5,500 Pesos per month in their previous employment. Consistent with these findings on outside wages, applicants from the treatment sites are much more likely to be currently employed, to have had work experience, and to have been previously employed in a white collar position.²⁸

In addition to these findings on outside wages and employment, we also find significant impacts when using various measures of cognitive traits. Applicants in the treatment areas scored 0.51 points higher on the Raven test. This represents an increase of 0.19 standard deviations relative to the control. This mean impact reflects an increase in the number

²⁵We can reject the hypothesis that the two distributions are the same, based on a Kolmogorov-Smirnov test (p -value=0.00).

²⁶Recall that most of these applicants are unemployed and hence report past, rather than current wages. Currently employed individuals may still apply to a job paying less than their current wage if they are pessimistic about their prospects in the current job.

²⁷These wage categories were defined based on the wage distribution of the control group.

²⁸We define white collar as any worker who performs professional, managerial, or administrative work.

of above average IQ candidates, as well as a decrease in the number of below average IQ candidates (see Figure II).²⁹ In line with the favorable impact on IQ, we also find that applicants from the higher wage sites were much less likely to choose a dominated strategy in the risk game. Interestingly, we do not find that higher wages attracted individuals with more education, or who are more likely to be able to use a computer (not reported). While it is hard to know for sure, we suspect the lack of effects along these dimensions is most likely a manifestation of the recruitment targeting, which led to an applicant pool with extremely high schooling and where 92 percent know how to use a computer.

In Panel B, we examine the effects of wages on personality traits, which as we discussed above are considered to be important determinants of job performance and earning potential. Higher wages attract individuals who are more conscientious, less neurotic, and to a lesser extent individuals who are more open to new experiences. While these are only mean impacts, we find (although do not report) that the high wage postings attracted significantly more individuals per site who are from the upper quintile of the distribution in terms of conscientiousness and emotional stability (i.e., less neurotic). While higher wages appear effective at attracting candidates with a better personality profile, as measured by the Big 5 personality traits, we do not find any evidence that wages impacted the applicant pool with regards to integrity.

VI.A Public service motivation (PSM)

While higher wages may have attracted individuals with a higher reservation wage, higher IQ and better personality traits, an important policy question is whether this comes at the expense of attracting applicants who are less motivated by public service. If public service motivation correlates with public sector job performance as the literature suggests, providing higher salaries may not help build up the human capacity of the state. But as shown in Proposition 1, the theoretical prediction is ambiguous and ultimately depends on the correlation between a person's PSM and his or her outside option. If the traits that define public service motivation are valued by the market or correlate positively with traits valued by the market, then the effects of offering higher wages on PSM can in fact be positive. In Table IV, we test this hypothesis.

In Panel A of Table IV, we find that the applicants who were recruited under the high wage offering scored a higher PSM index than applicants from the lower wage sites. Appli-

²⁹A potential explanation for this decrease is that candidates weigh the pros and cons of sinking the cost to attend a screening session. When the announced wage is higher, candidates may expect a higher threshold of eligibility, or tougher competition, causing those with lower IQs to desist. We do not find this pattern in other dimensions of quality, however, and therefore it is an aspect of behavior by applicants that our theory only takes up in the Online Appendix.

cants in the treatment sites found policy making more attractive, were more compassionate, and had a stronger belief in social justice. Similar to the effects involving the Big 5 personality traits, the high wage attracted significantly more individuals per site who are from the upper quintiles of the distribution both in terms of the overall index (see Figure III), as well as in terms of the subcomponents of commitment, compassion, and social justice (not reported).

The empirical findings suggest that higher wages cause no harm to public service motivation. Our model predicted that in a world where quality and PSM are positively correlated in the population, one could observe both a positive correlation between those traits in the applicant pool, and a positive effect of wages on both dimensions. That is what we find. In the case of a deterministic, positive relationship between quality and PSM, increases in wages improve PSM through their effect of attracting individuals with higher earning potential. If the relationship is not deterministic, one may wish to empirically disentangle the effect of wages on PSM conditional on quality from the effects that operate by increasing quality. Such an exercise would require different instruments to separately affect the quality and the PSM of applicants. What we can say however is that if the effects of wages on PSM conditional on quality are negative, they are not strong enough so as to induce an overall crowding out of PSM.

In Panel B of Table IV, we explore the effects of the treatment on other measures of prosocial behavior. Overall the findings are mixed. For some measures, we do not find any effects (volunteer and altruism). For other measures, we find negative effects (charity work and political party membership). And yet for some others the effects are positive (cooperation and willingness to pay a private cost to punish stingy behavior (negative reciprocity)).

In sum, we find strong evidence that higher wages attract individuals with higher quality, without any indication that this harms public service motivation. While enticing qualified applicants to apply with higher wage offers is a necessary first step for building up the human capacity of the state, it is by no means sufficient. In the next section we examine whether higher wages help fill vacancies.

VII EFFECTS OF FINANCIAL INCENTIVES ON RECRUITMENT

In this section, we examine the extent to which higher wages help the recruiter fill vacancies and present our estimate of the elasticity of the labor supply facing the RDP.

Table V presents the estimation results for a series of models based on equation (2). The

dependent variable is equal to 1 if the person selected to receive an offer accepted the position, and 0 if the person declined the initial offer or could not be reached after several attempts. Among individuals selected to receive a salary of 3,750 Pesos, 42.9 percent accepted the position. An offer of 5,000 Pesos increased conversion rates by 15.1 percentage points, or approximately 35.2 percent (see column 1). This yields an (arc-)elasticity for the conversion rate of $\xi'_{\gamma(w,\bar{v})} = 35.2/33 = 1.07$ (the prime denotes an arc elasticity).

Note that this elasticity of the conversion rate reflects both the effects of wages on acceptance decisions given candidate quality, as well as effects stemming from composition changes in the applicant pool, which is precisely an implication of the theory. Recall that proposition 2 did not pin down the sign of the elasticity of the conversion rate. Higher wages raise the probability that any given quality type will accept a job if offered, but higher wages also attract higher quality types on the margin who are less likely to accept a job. Our empirical findings suggest that the inframarginal effects dominate, and therefore higher wages help recruitment, which is arguably the relevant policy issue. Alternatively however, one might be interested in the effects of wages on acceptance decisions holding quality constant, which we would have been able to estimate in our setting had we chosen two random groups of people who had not made a decision to enter the applicant pool, and offered them jobs carrying different wages. Short of running such an experiment, we can still say something about the effect of wages on acceptance decisions holding quality constant, by applying treatment bounds. Following Lee (2009), we can compute bounds for the treatment effect by making opposite assumptions on the composition changes in the pool induced by the wage change. In one case, we assume that the treatment induced an additional 26 percent from the lowest tail of the quality distribution to become eligible for an offer, and in the other we assume the added applicants belonged to the top of the quality distribution. We obtain an estimate for the upper bound on the treatment effect of 0.41 (bootstrapped standard errors = 0.12), implying an elasticity of 2.95 for the conversion rate, and the lower bound on the treatment effects is 0.05 (bootstrapped standard errors = 0.10) or a wage elasticity of conversion of 0.36.

In column 2, we re-estimate the model including several of the characteristics of the applicant pool that differed across the two wage offers. The inclusion of these individual characteristics does not affect our point estimate of the effect of wages on conversion (point estimate = 0.160; s.e. = 0.054). Moreover, most of these characteristics do not predict conversion rates. Our theory predicts that the conversion rate should be lower for higher quality individuals. Although the sign of quality-related variables is, as expected, negative in four out of five cases, only years of schooling appears statistically significant.

An interesting fact arises when we unbundle the effect of wages on the conversion rate.

Recall that the dependent variable is zero for those individuals who declined the initial offer and those individuals who could not be reached after several attempts. There may be various reasons why these individuals were unreachable. For instance, they may have taken another job or decided against this job, and as a result may have chosen not to make themselves available.³⁰ Alternatively, they may have been busy during the call-back period, or their contact information was invalid.³¹ In any case, as we see from columns 3 and 4, much of the effect of wages on conversion rates comes from individuals not being recontacted as opposed to rejecting the offer directly. This suggests an interesting nuance to the practical challenges of recruitment. Higher wages help attract more and better applicants, and they certainly do not hurt a recruiter’s ability to convince a selected candidate to say “yes.” But crucially, higher wages help increase the chance of a successful matching process with the selected candidates.³²

Our theory does not pin down predictions on how the effects of wages on recruitment vary with individual characteristics. Nonetheless we explore this in Appendix Table A5. We investigate whether wages help recruitment differently along various dimensions, such as IQ, previous earnings, personality, and gender, and do not find important effects.

VII.A The elasticity of the labor supply facing the employer

In our theory section we established that the elasticity of the labor supply facing the employer $\eta = \frac{dS}{dw} \frac{w}{S}$ can be written as the sum $\xi_{F(\bar{v})} + \xi_{\gamma(w, \bar{v})}$ of the elasticities of the size of the applicant pool and of the conversion rate. We will estimate η by adding our estimates of the elasticity of the applicant pool and the conversion rate, and it is worth remarking that this approach has some identification advantages. To see this, suppose that a firm advertises jobs at two different wage levels, and attains two levels of recruitment, yielding two pairs of wage-employment data. The first inclination might be to compute the (arc-) elasticity defined by the two wage-employment pairs – after all, the firm’s recruitment equals the labor effectively supplied to the firm. But this could be misleading since actions by the employer, such as advertising the high wage positions more strongly, may violate the exclusion restriction even if wages were randomized. Thus, the use of employment-wage data to measure the labor supply elasticity may confound aspects of the labor supply with aspects of the labor demand.

³⁰Thus, a failure to recontact a candidate may reflect an implicit rejection of the job offer to be made. Recall that 3-4 weeks had elapsed between the time the average individual took the exam and when the RDP attempted to recontact candidates.

³¹In 23 of the cases, or 6 percent, the contact information was incorrect. For these cases, there is no difference between treatment and control.

³²While one might be concerned that the operators may have put more effort into contacting high wage applicants, this was certainly not the case. The call-back process was both completely centralized and scripted.

The safe approach is to use information on the elasticities of the applicant pool size and of the conversion rate emphasized in our theory, which reflect only on the labor supply.³³

The numeric computation of the labor supply elasticity must take into account that the wage variation in our setting is not infinitesimal, but large: 33 percent. So we should compute an arc-elasticity. Moreover, the arc-elasticity of a product is not equal to the sum of the arc-elasticities of its factors. Given the product $S(w) = F(\bar{v}(w)) \times \gamma(w, \bar{v}(w))$, where $F(\cdot)$ is the size of the applicant pool and $\gamma(\cdot)$ is the conversion rate, the arc-elasticity of the labor supplied to the firm S , denoted η' , is given by $\xi'_F + \xi'_\gamma + \xi'_F \xi'_\gamma \times \frac{\Delta w}{w}$ (where $\frac{\Delta w}{w}$ is the rate of wage increase and primes denote arc-elasticities). If we incorporate the possibility that higher wages led, according to our point estimate in Table III, to a 26.31 percent increase in the number of applicants, the arc-elasticity of the applicant pool is $\xi'_F = 26.31/33 = 0.8$. Taking into consideration that the arc-elasticity of the conversion rate estimated in the previous subsection was $\xi'_\gamma = 1.07$, we conclude that the arc-elasticity of the labor supply facing the employer is $\eta' = 2.15$.

How does our estimate of the elasticity of the labor supply compare with those in the literature? To our knowledge, no other study has estimated the elasticity of the labor supply facing the employer using randomized wages. But there are a number of quasi-experimental estimates, and these typically range anywhere from 0.1 to 3.9. For instance, Staiger, Spetz, and Phibbs (2010) examine the effects of a legislated increase in the wages at the Veteran Affairs hospitals, and find that a 10 percent increase in wages increased labor supply by between 0-2 percent. Falch (2011) analyzes an exogenous wage change paid to teachers in Norway, and estimates a labor supply elasticity of 1.4. Sullivan (1989) estimates the wage elasticity of the supply of nurses to individual hospitals by exploiting a shock to the demand curve. Using measures of hospital caseload as instruments, he estimates a long run elasticity of 3.86. But whether our estimates are directly comparable to those in this literature bears examination. Ours is an estimate of a short-run, partial equilibrium, elasticity of the labor supply facing an employer who offers a temporary job, and which involves an unexpected wage raise. Some of the previous work studies long run effects involving more stable jobs. We conjecture that our short-run estimate is a lower bound for longer run effects: when competitors adjust by raising their own wages, the effects we estimate of the higher wage are likely to become smaller, bringing our estimates even farther away from the infinite elasticity that characterizes competitive markets.

³³This is the approach we will follow here although in our case, by design, the advertising intensity per recruitment site was held constant across wage conditions and the selection intensity varied only marginally.

VII.B The role of financial incentives in overcoming challenging job characteristics

Our research design provides a unique opportunity to investigate how the characteristics of the municipality to which the applicant was assigned affect the acceptance decision. Because individuals were randomly assigned to a municipality, the characteristics of the municipality constitute an exogenous shock to their choice sets. The Online Appendix details an extension of our basic model that allows us to derive predictions on the effect of municipal characteristics on acceptance rates. The key theoretical predictions are that worse characteristics lower acceptance rates by candidates, but that under some conditions offering a higher wage should mitigate that negative impact. More precisely, the theory predicts that if high outside options and high quality types are less likely than low ones, then the coefficient γ_2 of the interaction between municipal attributes and wages in equation (3) is positive.

In Figure IV we examine whether acceptance decisions are affected by the distance to the municipality (Panel A), drug violence in the municipality (Panel B), and the municipality’s degree of human development as measured by the Human Development Index (Panel C). For each characteristic, we use a locally-linear regression to plot the probability that, conditional on being contacted, the applicant accepted the position, distinguishing between applicants who received the low wage offers (dashed blue line, confidence intervals in short-dashed blue lines) versus the high wage offers (solid red line, confidence intervals in dotted red lines).

Among the applicants who were offered a lower wage, we find a strong negative relationship between acceptance rates and the distance of the assigned municipality from the applicant’s home municipality. For instance, 80 percent of the applicants who were offered a job in a municipality located less than 100 kilometers away accepted the position across both wage conditions. Among those who were offered a job located more than 200 kilometers away, the acceptance rate fell to 25 percent in the low wage condition. This stands in striking contrast to the case of those in the high wage condition, whose acceptance rates remain around 80 percent even when offered a job located more than 200 km. This suggests a negative interaction between wages and job attributes (wages matter more for worse municipalities), which according to our theory can be rationalized in a world with decreasing densities for reservation wage shocks and quality types.

We find similar patterns when considering either drug-related violence, as measured by the number of drug-related deaths per 1000 inhabitants, or the municipality’s human development score. In both cases worse conditions cause lower acceptance rates, and this difference is strongly mitigated by high wage offers.³⁴

³⁴The results for the number of drug-related deaths per 1000 inhabitants are measured with less precision.

In Table VI, we present the regression counterparts to the results displayed in Figure IV. Each column presents regression coefficients from estimating variants of the model presented in equation 3, where the dependent variable equals 1 if the applicant accepted the offer, conditional on being re-contacted. In columns 1-3 we estimate separately the effects for each of the three municipality characteristics and its interaction with the treatment indicator; in column 4 we jointly estimate the effects of all three municipal characteristics. The specifications estimated in columns 1-4 are conditional on individuals who were successfully re-contacted since otherwise the individual would not know to which municipality he or she had been assigned. These estimates must be interpreted with care since those who are recontacted do not constitute a random sample. However, this potential selection will most likely dampen the estimated effects: if those who made an effort to re-establish a match are the ones with a stronger interest in the job, they should display less elastic responses to wage and job conditions. Moreover, it might be argued that the estimates in columns 1-4 are exactly the estimates of interest from the standpoint of the recruiter, as they are uncontaminated by the response of individuals who are unreachable and therefore unrecruitable.

The findings presented in Table VI are consistent with the patterns depicted in Figure IV. The direct effects presented in Table VI provide causal estimates of the effects of the work environment on the ability to recruit. In addition, the interaction effects show that the wage increase in the RDP largely compensated for the less desirable job conditions. For instance, the point estimates in column 1 suggest that while 10 extra kilometers of commuting distance reduced acceptance rates by 2.7 percentage points for those offered the low wage, distance had virtually no effect on the acceptance decisions of those offered a high wage. A similar calculation can be made with respect to drug-related deaths and the Human Development Index. An extra death per 1000 inhabitants (column 2) reduces acceptances by around 10 percentage points among the applicants offered the low wage. For those offered the higher wage, an extra death per 1000 inhabitants only reduces acceptance rates by 2.2 percentage points. Shifting a job from the municipality with the highest Human Development Index value (0.78) to that with the lowest (0.44) lowers acceptance rates by around 50 percentage points, and again the impact of the wage increase is sufficient to undo the effect of the worse municipal environment. When we estimate the effects of all three characteristics jointly, we find that the differential effect by drug violence falls in magnitude and loses precision (see column 4). Overall, these estimates demonstrate that the municipal environment has substantial effects on the cost of doing business facing an employer.

As a way to gauge sensitivity to the exclusion of the candidates who could not be reached, in column 5 we re-estimate the specification presented in column 4 using the entire sample. This specification preserves the experimental design and except for the addition of municipal

characteristics (and the interaction terms) it is similar to the regressions presented in Table V, in which we estimate the effects on recruitment. In this context, this specification implicitly assumes that candidates who were not reached still learned the job conditions. This assumption is obviously inaccurate and is likely to attenuate the findings in columns 1-4. As shown in column 5, while the point estimates do attenuate slightly, the effects remain quite similar.³⁵

Overall these findings highlight the importance of financial incentives in not only attracting qualified individuals but also inducing them to work in hard-to-fill positions.

VIII CONCLUSIONS

In June of 2011, Mexico's federal government set out to hire 350 public servants. These individuals were to work in a program designed to strengthen the state's presence in some of the country's most marginalized communities. As part of the recruitment process, two different wage offers were randomly assigned across recruitment sites, and applicants were administered a screening test designed to measure their aptitudes and motivations. Based on the experimental design, we show that offering higher wages attracts individuals with higher previous earnings, and who have both higher IQ and more desirable personality traits, as measured by the Big 5 personality and public service motivation tests.

These novel findings have implications for policy that ultimately depend on the screening capabilities of the state. On the one hand, in places where the ability of the state to screen candidates is low, finding instruments that improve the average quality of the applicant pool would be useful. On the other hand, if the state's ability to screen candidates is high, then costly instruments (such as high wages) would be attractive only if they extend the support and/or affect the upper tail of the quality distribution. We find that wages favorably impact the upper tail of the quality distribution, and they do so without lowering the public sector inclination of applicants. In other words, we do not find a tradeoff between quality in terms of features valued by the market and public service motivation. Of course, whether a tradeoff would have occurred at different levels of wage offerings or different job types remains an interesting area for future research.

The power of wages is not limited to attracting a larger and better applicant pool. Higher wages also increase the state's ability to fill vacancies. We estimate what we believe to be

³⁵One may wonder about why high wage offers do not shift acceptance rates up for all levels of job attributes including the very best. As we discuss in the Online Appendix, the model does not make a prediction about the level effects of wages, only on the effects of job attributes and their interaction with wages. As was made clear in Proposition 2*b*, the level effects of wages on acceptance rates are ambiguous in the presence of selection effects.

the first experiment-based elasticity of the labor supply curve facing a firm or government. We show, consistent with a large non-experimental literature, that the labor supply facing an employer is far from infinitely elastic, with an elasticity of 2.15. It is worth noting that this is a short run elasticity which may be reduced once competitors adjust, and which may also change as the RDP reaches its employment steady state.

Presumably, the wage is not the only aspect of a job that influences a person's willingness to accept the position. Our findings highlight the importance of other job attributes in the acceptance decision. Distance and bad characteristics of the municipal environment appear to be important hurdles to filling vacancies. Fortunately, higher wages appear to be an effective instrument to overcome these hurdles. These causal estimates allow us to quantify the effects on the cost of doing business of the general socioeconomic environment facing employers.

Our findings have important implications for those concerned with the development of state capabilities. Attracting individuals with the characteristics valued by markets and personnel specialists is probably a necessary first step towards building a competent public bureaucracy. However, our results do not necessarily imply that those who appear to be more able individuals will perform better once hired in the context of a program like the RDP—more research is certainly needed. Hopefully our approach, combining the measurement of individual characteristics with the randomization of wages and job offers, offers a useful blueprint for personnel studies. A natural next step is to extend our approach by linking the exogenous variation in incentives and individual characteristics it generates with bureaucratic performance and impact.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

UNIVERSIDAD DE SAN ANDRÉS

References

- Acemoglu, Daron. 2005. "Politics and economics in weak and strong states." *Journal of Monetary Economics* 52 (7): 1199–1226 (October).
- Anderson, Michael L. 2008. "Multiple Inference and Gender Differences in the Effects of Early Intervention: A Reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects." *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 103 (484): 1481–1495.
- Arias, Luz Marina. 2008. "A theory of the origins of coercive enforcement: The provision

- of public goods in Colonial Mexico.” Technical Report, University of California, San Diego.
- Benet-Martínez, Veronica, and Oliver P. John. 1988. “Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait method analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English.” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 75 (3): 729–750.
- Ben-Ner, Avner, and Ori Levy. 2004. “Economic and Hypothetical Dictator Game Experiments: Incentive Effects at the Individual Level.” *Unpublished*.
- Besley, Timothy, and Torsten Persson. 2009. “The Origins of State Capacity: Property Rights, Taxation, and Politics.” *American Economic Review* 99 (4): 1218–44 (September).
- . 2010. “State Capacity, Conflict, and Development.” *Econometrica* 78 (1): 1–34 (01).
- Bright, Leonard. 2005. “Public Employees With High Levels of Public Service Motivation.” *Review of Public Personnel Administration* 25 (2): 138–154.
- Brown, Jennifer, and David Matsa. 2012. “Boarding a Sinking Ship? An Investigation of Job Applications to Distressed Firms.” *Unpublished*.
- Delfgaauw, Josse, and Robert Dur. 2007. “Signaling And Screening of Workers’ Motivation.” *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization* 62 (4): 605–624 (April).
- Evans, Peter, and James E. Rauch. 1999. “Bureaucracy and Growth: A Cross-National Analysis of the Effects of “Weberian” State Structures on Economic Growth.” *American Sociological Review* 64 (5): pp. 748–765.
- Evans, Peter B. 1995. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Falch, Torberg. 2011. “Teacher Mobility Responses to Wage Changes: Evidence from a Quasi-natural Experiment.” *American Economic Review* 101 (3): 460–65 (May).
- Fehr, Ernst, and Lorenz Goette. 2007. “Do Workers Work More if Wages Are High? Evidence from a Randomized Field Experiment.” *American Economic Review* 97 (1): 298–317 (March).
- Francois, Patrick. 2000. “‘Public service motivation’ as an argument for government provision.” *Journal of Public Economics* 78 (3): 275–299 (November).
- Gneezy, Uri, John A. List, and George Wu. 2006. “The Uncertainty Effect: When a Risky Prospect is Valued Less than its Worst Possible Outcome.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121 (4): 1283–1309.

- Goldberg, Jessica. 2010. “Kwacha Gonna Do? Experimental Evidence about Labor Supply in Rural Malawi.” *Unpublished*.
- Handy, Femida, and Eliakim Katz. 1998. “The Wage Differential between Nonprofit Institutions and Corporations: Getting More by Paying Less?” *Journal of Comparative Economics* 26 (2): 246 – 261.
- Holzer, Harry J, Lawrence F Katz, and Alan B Krueger. 1991. “Job Queues and Wages.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106 (3): 739–68 (August).
- Hough, Leaetta M., and Deniz S. Ones. 2002. In *The Structure, Measurement, Validity, and use of Personality Variables in Industrial, Work, and Organizational Psychology*, edited by D. Ones H. Sinangil Anderson, N. and C. Viswesvaran.
- John, Oliver P. 1990. Pages 66–100 in *The “Big Five” factor taxonomy: Dimensions of personality in the natural language and in questionnaires.*, edited by L. A. Pervin. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- John, Oliver P., Laura P. Naumann, and Chistopher J. Soto. 2008. In *Paradigm Shift to the Integrative Big-Five Trait Taxonomy: History, Measurement, and Conceptual Issues*, edited by Richard W. Robins Oliver P. John and L. A. Pervin. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Kasser, T., and R. M. Ryan. 1996. “Further examining the American dream: Differential correlates of intrinsic and extrinsic goals.” *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22:280–287.
- Krueger, Alan B. 1988. “The determinants of queues for federal jobs.” *Industrial and Labor Relations Review* 41 (4): 567–581 (July).
- Lang, Kevin. 1991. “Persistent Wage Dispersion and Involuntary Unemployment.” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 106 (1): 181–202 (February).
- Lee, David S. 2009. “Training, Wages, and Sample Selection: Estimating Sharp Bounds on Treatment Effects.” *The Review of Economic Studies* 76 (3): 1071–1102.
- Manning, Alan. 2011, October. Chapter 11 of *Imperfect competition in the labor market*, edited by O. Ashenfelter and D. Card, Volume 4 of *Handbook of Labor Economics*, 973–1041. Elsevier.
- Marinescu, Ioana, and Ronald Wolthoff. 2012. “Wages, Applications, and Skills.” *Unpublished*.
- McCrae, Robert, and Paul Costa. 1992. *NEO PI-R professional manual*. Odessa, FL.: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

- Morgan, John, Dana Sisak, and Felix Vardy. 2012. "The Merits of Meritocracy." *Unpublished*.
- Pearson. 1998. *Raven's Advanced Progressive Matrices (APM)*. San Antonio, Texas: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Perry, James L., and Lois R. Wise. 1990. "The Motivational Bases of Public Service." *Public Administration Review* 50 (3): 367–373.
- Perry, John. 1996. "Measuring Public Service Motivation: An Assessment of Construct Reliability and Validity." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory* 6 (1): 5–22.
- Petrovsky, Nicolai. 2009. "Does Public Service Motivation Predict Higher Public Service Performance? A Research Synthesis." *Unpublished*.
- Prendergast, Canice. 2007. "The Motivation and Bias of Bureaucrats." *American Economic Review* 97 (1): 180–196 (March).
- Rauch, James E. 1995. "Bureaucracy, Infrastructure, and Economic Growth: Evidence from U.S. Cities During the Progressive Era." *The American Economic Review* 85 (4): pp. 968–979.
- Roberts, Brent W. 2006. Chapter 1 of *Research in Organizational Behavior*, edited by Barry M. Shaw and Roderick M. Kramer, Volume 24, 1–41. Elsevier.
- Rotolo, Thomas, and John Wilson. 2006. "EMPLOYMENT SECTOR AND VOLUNTEERING: The Contribution of Nonprofit and Public Sector Workers to the Volunteer Labor Force." *Sociological Quarterly* 47 (1): 21–40.
- Schmidt, Frank, and John Hunter. 1998. "The Validity and Utility of Selection Methods in Personnel Psychology: Practical and Theoretical Implications of 85 Years of Research Findings." *Psychological Bulletin* 124 (2): 262–274.
- Staiger, Douglas O., Joanne Spetz, and Ciaran S. Phibbs. 2010. "Is There Monopsony in the Labor Market? Evidence from a Natural Experiment." *Journal of Labor Economics* 28 (2): 211–236 (04).
- Sullivan, Daniel. 1989. "Monopsony Power in the Market for Nurses." *Journal of Law & Economics* 32 (2): S135–78 (October).
- VandenBos, G.R., and American Psychological Association. 2007. *A.P.A. dictionary of psychology*. American Psychological Association.
- Weber, Max. 1904-1911. Edited by Guenter Roth and Claus Wittich. New York: Bedminster.

Weiss, Andrew. 1980. "Job Queues and Layoffs in the Labor Markets with Flexible Wages."
Journal of Political Economy 88 (June): 526–38.

A Data appendix


The data used for our analysis come from three sources. The first is the information that was gathered as part of the recruitment exam. The second source is Mexico’s National Statistical Office (Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía - INEGI: <http://www.inegi.org.mx/>), which collects and maintains many of the country’s official datasets, including the population censuses. These variables are defined in the relevant tables. Some other variables, such as *Drug related deaths per per 1,000 inhabitants*, which records the number of homicides that are drug related per 1,000 inhabitants, were confidential government data. Other confidential data from government sources, used in the online appendix, are indicator variables for the presence of drug organizations and of subversive movements at the municipal level.

In this section, we describe the variables that we constructed using information obtained through the recruitment exam. These data are defined at the level of the individual. They were collected during a 3-hour exam held at the schools in which the ads had been distributed, during a 3 week period in July 2011. We use the following variables from these data:


- Indicator variables for *Male*, *Speaks indigenous language*, *Indigenous* (equals 1 if the person declares to be of indigenous origin, zero otherwise), *Uses computer*, *Currently attending school*, *Currently employed*, *Has work experience* (equals 1 if the person has ever held a job, zero otherwise), *Previous job was white collar*, *Chose Dominated Risk Option* (equals 1 if person chose a certain outcome of \$2.5 million instead a lottery with equally probable prizes of \$2.5 and \$5 million, zero otherwise), *Voted* (equals 1 if person voted in the last Federal elections, zero otherwise), *Volunteer* (equals 1 if person reports having done any volunteer work, zero otherwise), *Charity* (equals 1 if person reports having done charity work in the last year, zero otherwise), *Belongs to a political party* (equals 1 if the person reports being a member of a political party, zero otherwise).
- *Age* - Age measured in years, constructed from the applicant’s birth year
- *Years of schooling* - Measured in years and constructed based on the individual’s highest education level. We assumed the following formula: preschool = 3 years; primary education = 6 years; secondary education = 9 years; high school = 12 years; college = 16 years; post-graduate = 20 years.
- *Height* - Person’s self-reported height measured in meters
- *Wage in previous job* - Monthly wage the person reported receiving in their last job

- *Years of experience in the past three spells* - adds up the years of experience in the last three jobs held by the person
- *Raven* - The number correct (out of 12) the person correctly answered in the Raven Progressive Matrices, Set I (source: Pearson)
- *Extravert* -An orientation of one's interests and energies toward the outer world of people and things rather than the inner world of subjective experience; characterized by positive affect and sociability (VandenBos and Association 2007). Computed as the average response to 8 questions from the Big Five Inventory Test.
- *Agreeable* -The tendency to act in a cooperative, unselfish manner (VandenBos and Association 2007). Computed as the average response to 9 questions from the Big Five Inventory Test.
- *Conscientious* - The tendency to be organized, responsible, and hardworking (VandenBos and Association 2007). Computed as the average response to 9 questions from the Big Five Inventory Test.
- *Neurotic* - neuroticism is a chronic level of emotional instability and proneness to psychological distress. Emotional stability is predictability and consistency in emotional reactions, with absence of rapid mood changes (VandenBos and Association 2007). Computed as the average response to 8 questions from the Big Five Inventory Test.
- *Open* - The tendency to be open to new aesthetic, cultural, or intellectual experiences (VandenBos and Association 2007). Computed as the average response to 10 questions from the Big Five Inventory Test.
- *Big 5 Index* - an index of the Big 5 as an equally weighted average of the z-scores of each dimension, reversing neuroticism which is widely considered to be a negative characteristic.
- *PSM Index* - This measure relies on a questionnaire in which the subject must express agreement or disagreement with each of thirty-two statements. The questionnaire elicits opinions on the attractiveness of politics, public service, and prosocial activities. The questionnaire is subdivided into six modules labeled "Attraction to Policy Making" (which includes items such as "Politics is a dirty word"), "Commitment to Policy Making," "Social Justice," "Civic Duty," "Compassion," and "Self-Sacrifice." We then create an equally weighted average of the z-scores of each dimension.

- *Cooperation* - contribution in a hypothetical voluntary contribution game where the person must decide how much out of \$50 to contribute to a joint account, and how much to keep. Money in the joint account is multiplied by a factor of 1:4 and then divided between the two people participating. While the Pareto efficient allocation is to contribute all \$50, the Nash equilibrium is to contribute zero.
- *Altruism* - amount the person gave out of \$50 in a hypothetical dictator game.
- *Negative reciprocity* - an indicator equals 1 if person would reject an offer of \$1 in a hypothetical ultimatum game where the proposer keeps \$49.
- *Wealth Important* - One of the 7 components of the Aspiration Index (see Kasser and Ryan (1996)). It is intended to measure how important wealth is to the individual. It is constructed based on the average of answers to 5 questions that were asked on a 7-point response scale.
- *Fame important* - One of the 7 components of the Aspiration Index (see Kasser and Ryan (1996)). It is intended to measure how important fame is to the individual. It is constructed based on the average of answers to 5 questions that were asked on a 7-point response scale.
- *Integrity (projection bias)* - Constructed based on the following three questions: “If a person found your wallet with \$200 Pesos in it, what is the probability that it gets returned to you with all the money in it, if it was found a 1) neighbor; 2) policeman, 3) a stranger”. The answers to these three questions are then averaged.
- *Integrity (simple)* - an indicator equals 1 if person agreed with the statement “Laws are meant to be broken”, zero otherwise.




Panel A. Previous Wage Distribution by Treatment Assignment




Panel B: Effects of Financial Incentives on the Number of Applicants by Previous Wage Category

Figure I:
The Effects Of Financial Incentives On The Applicant Pool – Previous Wage

Figure Notes: Panel A depicts the distributions of previous wages by treatment assignment. Each density was estimated using an Epanechnikov kernel and an optimal bandwidth. Panel B depicts the effects of financial incentives on the average number of applicants per site for different previous wage categories. The computation of the treatment effects accounts for region intercepts. The vertical bars denote 95 percent confidence intervals. The standard errors are clustered at the locality level.




Panel A. Number of Applicants per Site by Raven's Score and Treatment Assignment




Panel B: Effects of Financial Incentives on the Number of Applicants per Site by Raven's Score

Figure II:
The Effects of Financial Incentives on the Applicant Pool – Raven Exam

Figure Notes: Panel A depicts the distributions of the number of applicants per site by raven's score and treatment assignment. Panel B depicts the effects of financial incentives on the average number of applicants per site for different raven categories. The computation of the treatment effects accounts for region intercepts. The vertical bars denote 95 percent confidence intervals. The standard errors are clustered at the locality level.




Panel A. Distribution of Public Service Motivation Index by Treatment Assignment




Panel B: Effects of Financial Incentives on the Number of Applicants by Public Service Motivation Index Quintile

Figure III:
The Effects of Financial Incentives on the Applicant Pool – Public Service Motivation

Figure Notes: See data appendix for more information on the definition of the Public Service Motivation index. The computation of the treatment effects accounts for region intercepts. The vertical bars denote 95 percent confidence intervals. The standard errors are clustered at the locality level.



Panel A: Distance to the Assigned Municipality



Panel B: Number of Deaths per 1000 Inhabitants in the Assigned Municipality



Panel C: Human Development Index of the Assigned Municipality

Figure IV: The Effects of Financial Incentives on Acceptance Rates by Municipal Characteristics

Figure Notes: Each plot depicts the effects of financial incentives on acceptance rates, by characteristic of the municipality to which the applicant was assigned. Each line was estimated using a locally-linear regression for the sample of applicants who were re-contacted.

Table I. Validation of the Experimental Design

	Low wage offer (1)	High wage offer (2)	Difference (3)	Randomization inference p-value (4)
Latitude	19.359	19.754	0.396 [0.548]	0.52
Longitude	99.088	100.136	1.048 [0.796]	0.20
Altitude (mts.)	732.450	898.242	165.792 [158.536]	0.30
Population (logs)	9.219	9.373	0.154 [0.331]	0.67
Number of households (logs)	7.825	7.971	0.145 [0.335]	0.71
Share of population between 15-65 years old	0.620	0.624	0.004 [0.007]	0.56
Share of male population	0.480	0.482	0.002 [0.003]	0.49
Share of indigenous population	0.275	0.160	-0.115 [0.061]*	0.05
Illiteracy rate (% of illiterate among 15 year olds and older)	0.104	0.096	-0.008 [0.013]	0.45
Average years of schooling	8.335	8.251	-0.084 [0.249]	0.75
Number of live births per woman	2.517	2.518	0.001 [0.081]	0.99
Employment rate	0.965	0.960	-0.004 [0.008]	0.88
Share of female-headed households	0.275	0.265	-0.009 [0.008]	0.28
Share of households with access to electricity, water, and sanitation	0.715	0.756	0.040 [0.049]	0.41
Share of households with a dirt floor	0.106	0.111	0.005 [0.018]	0.80
Number of observations	41	65		

Notes: This table compares the observable characteristics of the localities in which high wage announcements were made to those where the low wage was announced. Column (1) reports the mean of the corresponding variable among localities where a wage offer of 3,750 Pesos per month was announced. Column (2) reports the mean of the corresponding variable among localities where a wage offer of 5,000 Pesos per month was announced. Column (3) reports the difference between the two means, along with the standard errors. Column (4) reports the p-values based on a two-sided test statistic that the placebo coefficients are larger than the actual. The p-values were computed based on 1000 random draws. These data were computed at the locality-level by the Instituto Nacional de Estadística y Geografía (INEGI) based on the 2010 population census. The latitude and longitude data are measured in degrees, decimal minutes. * indicates statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level and *** at the 1% level. Robust standard errors are reported in brackets.

Table II. Summary Statistics of Candidate Pool

	Obs	Mean	Standard deviation	p10	p50	p90
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A: Socio-demographic characteristics						
Male	2244	0.60	0.49	0.00	1.00	1.00
Age	2231	27.34	6.89	20.00	26.00	37.00
Height	2191	1.63	0.10	1.50	1.63	1.76
Indigenous	2253	0.40	0.49	0.00	0.00	1.00
Wage in previous job	1584	4276.18	3078.61	1300.00	3800.00	8000.00
Previous job was white collar	1784	0.30	0.46	0.00	0.00	1.00
Currently employed	2250	0.14	0.34	0.00	0.00	1.00
Currently attending school	2252	0.18	0.39	0.00	0.00	1.00
Years of experience in past 3 spells	2237	1.36	2.45	0.00	0.25	4.00
Has work experience	2237	0.56	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00
Panel B: Aptitudes and skills						
Raven's score	2254	8.77	2.69	5.00	9.00	12.00
Years of schooling	2223	14.45	2.45	12.00	16.00	16.00
Chose dominated risk option	2238	0.39	0.49	0.00	0.00	1.00
Panel C: Personality traits						
Conscientiousness	2188	4.28	0.47	3.67	4.33	4.89
Extraversion	2206	3.67	0.55	3.00	3.63	4.38
Openness	2193	3.93	0.49	3.30	4.00	4.60
Agreeableness	2214	4.11	0.43	3.56	4.11	4.67
Neuroticism	2216	2.19	0.53	1.50	2.13	2.88
Big 5 Index	2120	0.05	0.73	-0.87	0.09	0.96
Integrity - Indirect measure	2206	45.01	22.62	13.33	46.67	75.00
Integrity - Direct measure	2248	0.06	0.24	0.00	0.00	0.00
Panel D: Public Service Motivation						
Commitment	2195	3.35	0.59	2.57	3.29	4.14
Social Justice	2204	3.70	0.57	3.00	3.80	4.40
Civic Duty	2183	3.94	0.63	3.14	4.00	4.71
Compassion	2192	3.05	0.55	2.38	3.00	3.88
Self sacrifice	2192	3.72	0.61	3.00	3.75	4.50
Attraction	2242	2.86	0.59	2.00	2.80	3.60
PSM index	2096	0.07	0.72	-0.79	0.05	1.01
Panel E: Prosocial behavior						
Volunteered in the last year	2249	0.71	0.46	0.00	1.00	1.00
Did charity work in the past year	2248	0.54	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00
Voted in last election	2250	0.76	0.43	0.00	1.00	1.00
Belongs to a political party	2250	0.10	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00
Altruism	2223	23.52	7.34	20.00	25.00	25.00
Negative Reciprocity	2231	0.55	0.50	0.00	1.00	1.00
Cooperation	2182	26.40	10.71	10.00	25.00	40.00
Importance of wealth	2048	3.22	1.38	1.40	3.20	5.20

Notes: This table reports summary statistics for the applicant pool. Column (1) reports the number of non-missing observations. Column (2) reports the mean of the corresponding variable, and column (3) reports the corresponding standard deviation. Columns (4)-(6) report the 10th, 50th, and 90th percentiles. The statistics are computed based on the responses from the recruitment exam. See the data appendix for more information on the variables.

Table III: Effects on Financial Incentives on Applicant Pool - Productive Attributes

	Obs	Control	Treatment	Randomization	FDR
	(1)	(2)	Effect	inference	q-value
			(3)	p-value	(5)
				(4)	
Number of applicants	106	18.093	4.714 [4.430]	0.36	n/a
Panel A: Market skills					
Wage in previous job	1572	3479.667	819.154 [174.703]***	0.00	0.00
Previous job was white collar	1170	0.243	0.069 [0.029]***	0.01	0.02
Currently employed	2225	0.104	0.053 [0.019]***	0.01	0.02
Has work experience	2212	0.459	0.167 [0.048]***	0.00	0.00
Years of experience in past 3 spells	2212	1.185	0.284 [0.171]	0.08	0.06
IQ (Raven test)	2229	8.488	0.506 [0.223]**	0.01	0.02
Raven score >=9	2229	0.572	0.091 [0.039]**	0.01	0.02
Chose dominated risk option	2213	0.431	-0.064 [0.025]**	0.01	0.02
Years of schooling	2198	14.552	0.091 [0.308]	0.40	0.14
Panel B: Personality traits					
Extraversion	2189	3.674	0.013 [0.036]	0.37	0.14
Agreeableness	2167	4.107	0.004 [0.022]	0.44	0.15
Conscientiousness	2191	4.235	0.063 [0.030]**	0.03	0.04
Neuroticism	2168	2.254	-0.099 [0.033]***	0.01	0.02
Openness	2168	3.910	0.042 [0.028]	0.08	0.06
Big 5 index	2099	0.000	0.087 [0.049]*	0.07	0.06
Integrity - direct	2223	0.067	-0.009 [0.013]	0.73	0.26
Integrity - indirect	2099	44.424	0.602 [1.232]	0.33	0.14

Notes: This table estimates the effects of higher wages on characteristics of the applicant pool. Each row is a separate regression using the variable listed as the dependent variable. Column (1) reports the number of observations in the regression. Column (2) reports the mean of the variable in the control group (low wage announcement), column (3) reports the coefficient on the treatment in a regression that includes region intercepts. Column (4) reports the p-values based on a one-sided test statistic that the placebo coefficients are larger than the actual. The p-values were computed based on 1000 random draws. Column (5) reports the q-value associated with the False Discovery Rate test, which accounts for the multiple testing. See the data appendix for more information on the variables. * indicates statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level and *** at the 1% level. Clustered standard errors at the level of the locality are reported in brackets.

Table IV: Effects on Financial Incentives on the Applicant Pool - Motivation Profile

	Obs (1)	Control (2)	Treatment Effect (3)	Randomization	
				inference p-value (4)	FDR p-value (5)
<u>Panel A: Public service motivation traits</u>					
Public service motivation index	2074	0.000	0.092 [0.046]**	0.05	0.09
Attractiveness	2217	2.803	0.070 [0.041]*	0.05	0.14
Commitment	2170	3.316	0.045 [0.035]	0.15	0.18
Social Justice	2180	3.646	0.075 [0.026]***	0.01	0.04
Civic Duty	2158	3.924	0.027 [0.033]	0.25	0.22
Compassion	2168	3.001	0.066 [0.031]**	0.04	0.14
Self sacrifice	2168	3.687	0.039 [0.034]	0.15	0.18
<u>Panel B: Prosocial behavior</u>					
Altruism	2199	23.491	0.039 [0.291]	0.53	0.29
Negative reciprocity	2206	0.508	0.075 [0.023]***	0.00	0.00
Cooperation	2157	26.174	0.675 [0.404]*	0.08	0.16
Did charity work in the past year	2223	0.605	-0.096 [0.041]**	0.01	0.05
Volunteered in the past year	2224	0.710	-0.006 [0.027]	0.38	0.34
Importance of wealth	2025	3.159	0.107 [0.087]	0.14	0.18
Belongs to a political party	2225	0.113	-0.026 [0.014]*	0.07	0.16
Voted	2225	0.758	0.019 [0.035]	0.33	0.26

Notes: This table estimates the effects of higher wages on characteristics of the applicant pool. Each row is a separate regression using the variable listed as the dependent variable. Column (1) reports the number of observations in the regression. Column (2) reports the mean of the variable in the control group (low wage announcement), column (3) reports the coefficient on the treatment in a regression that includes region intercepts. Column (4) reports the p-values based on a one-sided test statistic that the placebo coefficients are larger than the actual. The p-values were computed based on 1000 random draws. Column (5) reports the q-value associated with the False Discovery Rate test, which accounts for the multiple testing. See the data appendix for more information on the variables. * indicates statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level and *** at the 1% level. Clustered standard errors at the level of the locality are reported in brackets.

Table V: The Effects of Financial Incentives on Recruitment

	Accepted (1)	Accepted (2)	Rejected (3)	Not reachable (4)
High wage offer	0.151 [0.054]***	0.160 [0.054]**	-0.017 [0.034]	-0.135 [0.054]***
<u>Characteristics:</u>				
Male		-0.080 [0.058]		
Years of schooling		-0.022 [0.008]**		
High IQ		-0.017 [0.053]		
Wage in previous job > 5,000		-0.007 [0.067]		
Big 5 index		0.042 [0.038]		
PSM index		-0.024 [0.044]		
Mean of dependent variable	0.55	0.55	0.13	0.32
Observations	350	343	350	350
R-squared	0.10	0.12	0.09	0.13

Notes: This table estimates the effects of higher wages on conversion, or vacancy-filling. In columns (1) and (2), the dependent variable is an indicator equal to 1 if the person accepted the offer, zero if the person rejected it or could not be reached. In column (3), the dependent variable is an indicator equal to 1 if the person rejected the offer, zero if the person accepted it. In column (4), the dependent variable is an indicator equal to 1 if the person could not be contacted about the offer, zero otherwise. In addition to the controls listed in the table, all regressions included intercepts for a region by indigenous requirement pair. See the data appendix for more information on the variables. * indicates statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level and *** at the 1% level. Clustered standard errors at the level of the locality are reported in brackets.

Table VI: Effects of Municipal Characteristics on Acceptance Decisions

Dependent variable	Acceptance				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
High wage offer	0.047 [0.037]	0.066 [0.047]	0.075 [0.053]	0.056 [0.041]	0.147 [0.047]***
High wage offer × Distance	0.026 [0.005]***			0.028 [0.007]***	0.010 [0.007]
Distance	-0.027 [0.004]***			-0.028 [0.007]***	-0.017 [0.005]***
High wage offer × Drug-related deaths per 1000 inhabitants		0.078 [0.039]*		-0.033 [0.037]	-0.025 [0.040]
Drug-related deaths per 1000 inhabitants		-0.107 [0.044]**		0.000 [0.045]	-0.022 [0.040]
High wage offer × Human development index			-1.482 [0.738]**	-0.913 [0.645]	-1.368 [0.589]**
Human development index			1.526 [0.673]**	1.044 [0.598]*	1.002 [0.521]*
Observations	238	238	238	238	348
R-squared	0.25	0.21	0.2	0.26	0.18

Notes: This table estimates the effects of municipal characteristics on acceptance decisions. In all columns, the dependent variable is an indicator equal to 1 if the person accepted the offer, zero otherwise. In columns (1)-(4) the sample has been restricted to the applicants who were successfully contacted. In addition to the controls listed in the table, all regressions included intercepts for a region by indigenous requirement pair. See the data appendix for more information on the variables including their sources. Distance is measured in tens of kilometers. * indicates statistical significance at the 10% level, ** at the 5% level and *** at the 1% level. Clustered standard errors at the level of the locality are reported in brackets.