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Motivations

Main goals of the paper

- Comprehensive picture of global and regional within-country inequality trends:
  - three measures of income inequality with a correction for the multitude of data sources and measurement errors.

- Associations with potential drivers that explain common trend of (increasing) income inequality:
  - Focus on identifying systematic *global vs. region specific* drivers of inequality.
Skill-biased technological change and increasing wage inequality
- Innovation in advanced economies
- Imitation and adoption in developing economies

Technological change might be induced via trade
- Innovation incentives in exporting sectors (e.g. Meschi & Viavarelli, 2009)
- Technologies embedded in capital imports (e.g. Acemoglu, 2003)
- Outsourcing and Multinationals

Trade effects (Hecksher-Ohlin model - Stolper-Samuelson theorem (SST) theorem):
- Increasing inequality in high income countries
- Decreasing inequality in low income countries

Education: increasing the skill level of people via education should countervail the skill premium.

“Race” Between Education and Technology

Capital/labour share and role of finance
Causes of changing inequality in the World: review II

- Political system: States mitigate market risks and perform a more or less extensive redistributive role
  - Labor market institutions
  - Tax and transfer system & the secondary income distribution
  - Education & health policies
When we move toward an analysis of inequalities in the wider world, we are required to cope with far more complex and uncertain data.

- Development of a self-consistent data set derived from the UNU-WIDER World Income Inequality Database (WIID V3.0B).

- WIID combines an updated (unpublished) version of the Deininger&Squire dataset with unit data from a variety of other sources including the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), Transmonee by UNICEF, SEDLAC (Social and Economic Database for Latin American Countries), World Bank sources and household surveys from national statistical offices, resulting in a total of 7,054 observations (with a time span 1960–2013).

- While the data still originate from different sources, they are transparent with respect to the income- and/or consumption definition, the statistical units to be adopted and the use of equivalence scales and weighting.
Measures of inequality and data source II

- Data selection to give robustness:
  - Only sources with comprehensive population coverage by gender, age and region.
  - Requirement of further consistency with respect to the underlying income concept, and construct per capita-, rather than household-based, Gini indices. Insurmountable, albeit well-known, source of inconsistency in the dataset is the income vs consumption concept used across countries to measure inequality.
  - Minimum of three time observations over one decade required.

- Two measures of Gini indices:
  - **Single Source Gini (SS Gini):** select one source per country that best meets the selection criteria with regards to time coverage, reliability and regional consistency.
  - **MultiSource Gini (MS Gini):** allow multiple sources for a country, but exclude sources in two cases: sources have data for only a single year; and sources whose data are unreasonably inconsistent for consecutive years with data from other sources.
Measures of inequality and data source III

- **Decile Ratio**: the share (percent) of income accruing to the bottom decile in relation to that of the top decile of the income distribution.

- Creating this internally consistent dataset reduces the size of available observations and time span:
  - **MS Gini**: 945 observations from 74 countries, weighted to the advanced economies (1975–2013, concentrated in the period 1980–2011 for advanced economies and in the period 1988–2006 for developing economies)
  - **SS Gini**: 649 observations from 60 countries (1985–2004)
  - **DecRatio**: 691 obs from 71 countries
### Table 1: Income Gini Source Inconsistencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>WB1</th>
<th>WB2</th>
<th>WB3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td></td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WB1: World Bank Poverty Monitoring Database 2002; WB2: Deininger and Squire 2004; WB3: World Development Indicators 2004. In each case, WB1 provides the longer time series but WB2 or WB3 appear only once. Source: WIID V3.0B.
Multi-source Gini coefficients and Decile ratios
## Summary Statistics of Income Inequality Series

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>MS Gini&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>DecRatio</th>
<th>MS Gini</th>
<th>DecRatio</th>
<th>IncGini</th>
<th>DecRatio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AdvEcon</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>⇑</td>
<td>⇓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAEE</td>
<td>34.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>50.86</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>⇓</td>
<td>⇑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAP</td>
<td>36.79</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>⇑</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>31.42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MENA</td>
<td>38.78</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>⇑</td>
<td>⇓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>42.05</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Statistically significant time trend (> 1975) from a fixed effects regression of inequality against time.

<sup>b</sup>Multi-source Gini

AdvEcon (Advanced Economies), CAEE (Central Asia & Eastern Europe), LAC (Latin America & Caribbean), EAP (Eastern Asia & the Pacific), SA (South Asia), MENA (Middle East & North Africa, SSA (Sub Saharan Africa).
Multi-source vs Single-source income Gini coefficients

![Graph showing multi-source vs single-source income Gini coefficients for various countries over different years. The graph includes data for Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, and Sweden. The x-axis represents years ranging from 1960 to 2020, and the y-axis represents income Gini coefficients ranging from 20 to 40. The graph compares MS Gini (multi-source) and SS Gini (single-source) coefficients.](image-url)
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Measures of covariates I

- Technological change represented as total factor productivity (TFP), measured using a conventional growth accounting framework.
  - The growth rate of real GDP per worker, the growth rate of physical capital per worker and the capital and labor shares are obtained from Penn World Tables (PWT8.0).
  - Human capital by worker as a function of mean years of schooling taken from the demographic dataset of the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis and the Vienna Institute of Demography (IIASA/VID).

- Trade flows from Correlates of War (COW v3.0) bilateral trade database.
  - Imports flows categorized into those from high-income and low-income countries, as a proxy for high-skilled and low-skilled (manufacturing) imports respectively (exclusion of countries whose exports are predominantly natural resources or certain plantation crops)
  - Total exports in GDP
Measures of covariates II

- **Education** (data consistent with human capital estimation in TFP equation).
  - Source: demographic dataset from the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis and the Vienna Institute of Demography (IIASA/VID).
  - Measures of attainment: mean years of schooling and population shares by education category: no schooling, primary, secondary and tertiary attainment
  - Measures of inequality: education Gini coefficient measuring the degree of education inequality in the population older than 15. Moreover decomposing the education Gini of the total population, into the share of unschooled people and an education Gini for those with at least some formal education (categories 2-4).

- **Labor vs. Capital Income.**
  - Share of labor income from PWT 8.0. Data are limited to after 1980 for Advanced Economies and after 1990 for Developing Economies
Governance. Four measures in order to capture the redistributive capacity of governments:

- Relative weight of public social spending categories by using data on the shares in total spending from the Statistics of Public Expenditure for Economic Development (SPEED) database of the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) + robustness checks
  - education expenditures
  - health expenditures
  - social protection expenditures
- Political orientation of the chief executive’s party taken from the World Bank’s Database of Political Institutions (DPI): an increasing score from 1 to 3, indicating right, center and left, respectively.
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Data

Education Gini coefficient

- East Asia & Pacific
- Europe & Central Asia
- High-income OECD
- Latin America & Caribbean
- Middle East & North Africa
- South Asia
- Sub-Saharan Africa

Years

- Educ Gini 15+
- Educated Gini 15+
### Summary statistics and trend of the variables in the model by Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Advanced Economies</th>
<th>Developing Economies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Within sd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSGini</td>
<td>28.09</td>
<td>2.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSGini</td>
<td>28.39</td>
<td>2.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DecRatio</td>
<td>15.61</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TFP</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp^high</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp^low</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp</td>
<td>30.05</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>61.32</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSEduc</td>
<td>10.28</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSHhealth</td>
<td>12.07</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>4.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MY S^{15+}</td>
<td>12.13</td>
<td>0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EducGini^{15+}</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EducGini^E^{15+}</td>
<td>10.70</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_{15+}^1</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_{15+}^2</td>
<td>18.69</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_{15+}^3</td>
<td>59.53</td>
<td>3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p_{15+}^4</td>
<td>19.41</td>
<td>3.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*a For an explanation of variable abbreviations see Section 6.

*b Statistically significant time trend (> 1975) from a fixed effects regression of inequality against time.
Model specification

\[ IGini_t = \beta_1 TFP_{t-1} + \beta_3 T_{t-1} + \beta_4 E_{t-1} + \beta_5 L_{t-1} + \beta_5 P_{t-1} + \gamma Year + \alpha_i + \epsilon \]

\[ T = [Imp^{high}, Imp^{low}, Exp] \]
\[ E = [MY S^{15+}, EducGini_{15+}, p_{15+}, EducGini^E_{15+}, p^2_{15+}, p^3_{15+}, p^4_{15+}] \]
\[ P = [PO, P S^{Educ}, P S^{Health}, P S^{SP}] \]
Modelling: dynamic panel models estimated with a method that controls for country-specific effects and corrects for error disturbances, and test the robustness of the findings with respect to income inequality measures, model specifications and regions.

Feasible Generalized Least Squares (FGLS) estimator combined with unobserved country fixed effects.

All explanatory variables lagged one period in order to account for reverse causality.

For tackling the issue of stationary, at least with respect to the dependent variables, TFP and the labor share, a time trend (Year) is included.

Results for each of three income inequality measures and education variables.
Regressions run separately for the global level, for Advanced and for Developing Economies as well as excluding and including political factors as doing so reduces the number of countries and time periods.
Main results I

Broad regional splitting (Advanced economies vs Developing economies) reveals differentials in drivers, magnitude and direction of effects

- No effect of TFP in AE but marginal effect in DE
- Trade with low-income countries decreases inequality in all regions
  - The equalizing effect of imports from low-income countries contradicts the implication of the Stolper-Samuelson theorem that imports from low-income countries compete with goods produced in low-skilled sectors of high-income countries, thereby increasing income inequality.
- Trade with high-income countries increases inequality only in DE
- Support for equalizing role of education in AE, mixed results for DE (increasing population shares with primary and tertiary education have disequalizing effects)
- Inequality increasing effect of education expenditures in AE, no significant effect in DE
Main results II

- Equalizing effect of health expenditures in *all regions*
- Relation between functional and personal income distribution in AE (the general decline in the share of labor incomes added to increase income inequality.)
Remarks I

- Importance of dealing with issues of data quality in an empirical study of income inequality.
- Tremendous and valuable effort to create a consistent data-set of income inequality across countries and over time along with a coherent set of potential drivers of inequality.
- Trade-off between quality and coverage (actually, around 30% of the original WIDER data “survived”; Advanced Economies take 50% of the data)
- Exclusion vs imputation (to keep representativeness)
- Model:
  - Meaning of \((t - 1)\) in the model when data are not equispaced. Does it have an effect on estimation?
  - FGLS with FE is a reasonable solution in estimation. Comparison with estimates obtained using other consistent estimators (e.g. GMM Arellano and Bond estimator, even if \(N\) is fixed)
Remarks II

- Some interactions in the model could give more insights (e.g. TFP and trade)
- The division between Advanced and Developing Economies is quite rough (acknowledged by the authors) and leaves further investigation of differential regional splittings.
- A sort of hierarchical approach may be useful: test the hypothesis that the coefficients of each explanatory variable are jointly equal across all the regressions
- Omitted factors? (Dynamics of top incomes, Financialization, Informal Markets)