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Inequality in Latin America is high...

...but has been declining since around 2000

- Average Gini coefficient is higher than .5 => most unequal region in the world
- After rising in the 1980s and 1990s, inequality has declined in practically all countries in the 2000s => Gini fell by an average of 1% per year
- Decline is statistically significant and robust to changing years, dataset or indicator
- The average decline 6.5 Gini points, more than twice the 2.5 Gini points increase in the 1990s
- Important contribution to the decline in poverty (by some estimates, around 40 percent on average)
- In countries with high growth & low growth
- In countries with high and low (by Latam standards) initial inequality
- In countries with left and nonleft governments
- In commodity exporters and commodity importers
Inequality in LA: 1980-2011

Gini coefficient – Household per capita income

Unweighted averages

Source: own estimates based on SEDLAC (CEDLAS and World Bank).
Declining income inequality by country: 2000-2011

(Annual Change of Gini in %)
Determinants of the decline in inequality

- Decline in earnings inequality
- Larger and more progressive transfers
- Higher labor participation rates
Contribution of proximate determinants to the decline in inequality (%) Latin America, c. 2000-2010

Source: Non-parametric decomposition results from Azevedo et al. (2013a); and parametric results provided by CEDLAS, based on data from SEDLAC (CEDLAS and The World Bank).
Declining earnings inequality

• Wage structure (relative wages) and composition effects (workers’ characteristics)
• The former dominate (in fact, composition effects can go in the opposite direction):
  – Bottom of wage distribution:
    • Higher demand for low-skilled workers?
    • More favorable labor market institutions (minimum wages)?
    • Lower labor market segmentation (for example, declining male, formal sector and urban wage premiums)?
  – Top of wage distribution:
    • Tinbergen’s race between education and technology?
    • Degraded tertiary education: new cohorts are of lower quality?
Zooming in: Brazil

• Inequality of overall income and labor (hourly) earnings experienced a considerable decline

• Returns to education declined at every level but the rate at which the decline occurred increased with education
  => In other words, the returns to education curve became less convex

• Average years of education increased from 7.5 to 8.6 and Gini coefficient of years of education decreased from 0.31 to 0.27
  => an expansion and a less dispersed distribution of education
Brazil: Decline in Inequality (Gini)

Fig. 1: Evolution of Household Per Capita Income Gini

Data: SEDLAC

Wang, Yang. 2013. “Decomposing the Changes in Male Wage Distribution in Brazil.” Tulane University, Ph.D. field paper
Brazil: Decline in Wage Inequality

Table 1: Dispersion of Real Wages: 2002-2011, Male aged 16-65

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gini</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theil</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-10</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>6.60</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-10</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-50</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obs</td>
<td>44097</td>
<td>43480</td>
<td>47187</td>
<td>49734</td>
<td>51479</td>
<td>51519</td>
<td>53825</td>
<td>55138</td>
<td>49419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wang, Yang. 2013. “Decomposing the Changes in Male Wage Distribution in Brazil.” Tulane University, Ph.D. field paper
Brazil: Decline in relative returns to education

Fig. 8: Relative Return to Education

Wang, Yang. 2013. “Decomposing the Changes in Male Wage Distribution in Brazil.” Tulane University, Ph.D. field paper
**Zooming in: Brazil**

- Proximate determinants (PNAD 2002-2011/13: decomposing changes for all workers, Ferreira, Firpo & Messina, 2014; for male wage earners only Wang, 2013):

  - *Wage structure effect* (distribution of relative wages) equalizing

  - *Composition effect* (distribution of workers’ characteristics) slightly **unequalizing** (Bourguignon et al., 2005, “paradox of progress” due to convexity of returns to education)
Brazil: Rising minimum wage

Fig. 13: Minimum Wage in Reais: 2002 Price

Wang, Yang. 2013. “Decomposing the Changes in Male Wage Distribution in Brazil.” Tulane University, Ph.D. field paper
Zooming in: Brazil

- Wage structure effect:
  - Rising real minimum wages => affects (favorably) relative position of workers at the bottom (Ferreira, Firpo & Messina)
  - Reduction in male and urban wage premium => affects (favorably) relative position of workers at the bottom (Ferreira, Firpo & Messina)
  - Tinbergen’s race: for male wage earners increase in relative supply of workers with more years of education associated with decline in education premium => affects (unfavorably) relative position of workers at the top (Yang, 2013)
  - Reduction in return to education for new cohorts due to a decline in the quality of workers with tertiary education?
    - Did skill premium decline uniformly (i.e., the distribution shifted to the left) or did the earnings distribution for workers with tertiary change in shape? The latter appears to be the case (Yang, 2013)
"Degraded" Tertiary? Brazil 2002-2011

Wang, Yang. 2013. “Decomposing the Changes in Male Wage Distribution in Brazil.” Tulane University, Ph.D. field paper
Zooming in: Mexico

Proximate determinants (decomposition earnings inequality to ENIGH 1996-2010, Campos, Esquivel and Lustig, 2014):

Same as in Brazil:

• *Wage structure effect* (distribution of relative wages by education) **equalizing**

• *Composition effect* (distribution of workers’ characteristics) slightly **unequalizing** (Bourguignon et al., 2005, “paradox of progress” due to convexity of returns to education)
Mexico: Decline in Inequality (Gini)

Mexico: Decline in skill premium coincides with the expansion of the relative supply of workers with post secondary education

In contrast to Brazil, in Mexico minimum wages did not increase at all...

Real Minimum Wage and Unionization: 1988-2010

A. Real Minimum Wage Index (December 2010=100)

B. Unionization Rate

Zooming in: Mexico

- Wage structure effect:
  - Real minimum wages flat since the early 1990s => no effect
  - Tinbergen’s race: increase in relative supply of workers with more years of education associated with decline in education premium => affects (unfavorably) relative position of workers at the top (Yang, 2013)
  - Reduction in return to education for new cohorts due to a decline in the quality of workers with tertiary education?
    - Did skill premium decline uniformly (i.e., the distribution shifted to the left) or did the earnings distribution for workers with tertiary change in shape? No immediate evidence of this in the case of Mexico
Mexico: Effects of supply on relative wage, 1989-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Panel</th>
<th>σ</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Rest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Panel A. σ=1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>0.351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.310</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.154</td>
<td>0.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel B. σ=2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989-94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994-2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.310</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>-0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ estimates based on ENIGH, several years.
Demand and Supply of Skills

If $\sigma = 1$

- Relative supply could account for as much as 47 per cent of changes in relative returns; dominate even in the face of rising demand

If $\sigma = 2$

- Supply still important but demand for skilled workers declines 1994-2006 and started to rise again for the period 2006-10.
Concluding Remarks

• Although declining earnings inequality is pervasive, causes appear to be heterogenous
• Common factors in Brazil and Mexico: wage structure effect is equalizing and composition effect is unequalizing
• However, determinants of changes in wage structure differ
• Brazil: rising minimum wages (institutions favored low-skilled workers), lower male and urban wage premia (lower labor market segmentation) and rising inequality in the distribution of returns to workers with tertiary (degraded tertiary)
• Mexico: mainly a story of rising supply of skilled workers
• However, must understand better the dynamics of labor demand
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