Some Explanations for Changes in the Distribution of Household Income in Slovakia: 1988 and 1996

By: Thesia Garner and Katherine Terrell

SOME EXPLANATIONS FOR CHANGES IN
THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME
IN SLOVAKIA: 1988 AND 1996

Thesia I. Garner*

Division of Price and Index Number Research
Postal Square Building, Room 3105
Bureau of Labor Statistics
2 Massachusetts Avenue
Washington, D. C. 20212
U.S.A.
Garner_T@BLS.gov
Telephone: (202) 691-6576
Fax: (202) 691-6583

and

Katherine Terrell

William Davidson Institute and
University of Michigan Business School
Ann Arbor, MI 48109
U.S.A.
terrell@umich.edu
Telephone: (734) 615-4558
Fax: (734) 936-8715

May 2001

Abstract

This paper measures the change in overall net monetary income inequality during the first seven years of transition and considers the relative importance of two possible explanations for the increase in inequality: a) changes in the sources of household income, and b) changes in the household composition. Changes in the sources of household income reflect the role of the government and market during the transition period, while changes in household composition reflect social reactions to the changing economic environment. We find that the increase in inequality in labor income drove the large increase in inequality (i.e., the Gini index of household per capita income rose from 0.195 in 1988 to 0.263 in 1996). Changes in the distribution of pensions and other social payments mitigated the rise in earnings inequality, with the latter playing a more role in reducing changes overall income inequality over time. We show there are large shifts in the demographic composition of households over this period: far fewer households with children, far more households headed by pensioners, increases in the number of one-person households and decreases in large (five person) households. Although we find that these shifts in the demographic composition of households are increasing overall inequality, by increasing between group inequality, most of the change in inequality over time is accounted for by increase in within group inequality. We conclude that over the first seven years of the transition labor market forces are driving changes in overall inequality in Slovakia to a much greater extent than changes in the Government's social safety net or in individual's decisions about household formation.

1

Non-Technical Summary

In this paper we measure the extent to which income inequality increased in Slovakia from 1988 to 1996 and we examine two potential explanations for the increase in inequality over this period: a) changes in the sources of household income, and b) changes in the household composition. Changes in the sources of household income reflect the role of the government and market during the transition period, while changes in household composition reflect social reactions to the changing economic environment.

We compare inequality before the transition began, in 1988, to the level of inequality eight years later using *Microcensus* data, and four measures of inequality (the Gini, the Theil, the coefficient of variation and the mean log deviation) and three measures of adult-equalent income (the OECD, the Luxemburg Income Study and the per capita measures). We find a significant rise in non-monetary income inequality. For example, the Gini index of household per capita income rose from 0.195 in 1988 to 0.263 in 1996.

To examine the extent to which different sources of income explain the increase in overall income inequality, we decompose the Gini using the Lerman and Yitzhaki (1985, 1989, 1994) decomposition method. We find that changes in the distribution of non-agricultural earnings explain the lion's share of the increase in overall inequality. Changes in the distribution of pensions and other social payments mitigated the rise in earnings inequality, with the latter playing a more role in reducing changes overall income inequality over time.

We show there are large shifts in the demographic composition of households over this period: far fewer households with children, far more households headed by pensioners, increases in the number of one-person households and decreases in large (five person) households. In order to analyze the effect of changes in the demographic composition of households on income inequality we decompose the mean log deviation index of inequality for within group and between group changes over time (Shorrocks, 1984). Although we find that the shifts in the demographic composition of households are increasing overall inequality, by increasing between group inequality, most of the change in inequality over time is accounted for by increase in within group inequality.

We conclude that over the first seven years of the transition labor market forces are driving changes in overall inequality in Slovakia to a much greater extent than changes in the Government's social safety net or in individual's decisions about household formation.

1. Introduction

Under the Soviet system, the Central and East European (CEE) countries maintained the most equal distributions of income in the world. Hence greater income inequality was an expected outcome of a transition from a command to a market economy. Indeed, as prices were liberalized and market forces unleashed, workers with scarce skills saw their earnings rise, while others suffered severe declines in their earnings and even unemployment (see e.g., Terrell, 1999 for a description of winners and losers in the emerging labor market of transition economies).

As expected, we find in our earlier study (Garner and Terrell, 1998) that Slovakia experienced a substantial increase in the inequality of labor earnings during the first four

3

years of transition (1989-1993), however the surprizing result was the very small increase

in overall <u>income</u> inequality.[1] Using *Family Budget Survey (FBS)* data, we found the

Gini coefficient for total household per capita rose from 0.157 to 0.168 over this period,

whereas the Gini for the per capita earnings from labor rose from 0.281 to 0.344 (with

much of the rise resulting from self-employment income). The increase in total income

inequality arising from this earnings component was almost completely mitigated by

changes in the incidence of taxes and distribution of transfers, with the former playing a

slightly more important role than the latter.

In this paper we build on our earlier work to learn about the extent to which

inequality increased as the transition progressed to 1996 and to examine some potential

explanations for the increase in inequality over this period. We compare inequality

before the transition began, in 1988, to the level of inequality eight years later using

Microcensus data. This is a larger database than the *FBS* which we used earlier and it is

designed to be representative of the total population with its own set of weights.[2] As in

our previous work, we decompose changes in total inequality by changes in sources of

income (i.e., earnings from labor, versus transfer income). In this way we can examine

the extent to which the labor market affected the distribution of income and the role that

the government played in providing a social safety net in 1996 compared to 1988 (and to

1993). Moreover, in this paper we explore an additional factor: the extent to which

changes in the demographic composition of households may help explain changes in

---

[1] We refer to after-tax income, including in-kind payments.
[2] For our earlier study, we created population weights using the *Microcensus* and *FBS* data to make the FBS data as representative as possible. The Central Statistical Office does not produce population weights for the *FBS*.

income inequality over these eight years. The transition process that Slovakia has been undertaking since 1989 has impacted both of these channels of income inequality.

2. Transition in Slovakia

The Slovak economy experienced an enormous transformation during the 1988-1996 period. The macroeconomic statistics in Table 1 indicate the tremendous growth of the private sector as its share of GDP rose from about 5 percent in 1990 to 70 percent in 1996. As in all the Central and East European economies, GDP fell for the first four years of transition (by an average of almost 7 percent a year) but rebounded in 1994 with strong growth through 1996, the end of our period of analysis. Inflation rose by 58 percent during the year that the government liberalized all prices (1991), fell to single digits in 1992 and then rose to 25.7 percent in 1993, the year of the "Velvet Divorce" with the Czech Republic. The decline in output impacted the level of employment, which in 1996 was still only 84.5 percent of the level in 1989. This was accompanied by large sectoral shifts in the structure of employment away from agriculture and industry (including manufacturing and utilities), which declined by 44.2 percent and 26.8 percent, respectively. Employment in the service sector absorbed some but not all of the outflows as it grew by 12.1. (*Slovak Statistical Yearbook*, 1997.) Hence unemployment rates were fairly high -- ranging from 10 percent to 14 percent -- throughout the period under analysis.

As a result of all these structural changes in the economy, individuals were faced with much uncertainty about both their job security and the purchasing power of their income during this period. This uncertainty had an impact on the family formation and

household structure of the Slovakian people.   As seen in Table 2, marriage rates and birth rates declined tremendously from 1989 to 1996, while the divorce rate rose only slightly over the time period. Not surprisingly, the rate of natural increase (the rate at which the population grows based on birth and death rates) fell from 5.0 to 1.6 over this period. Unlike the dramatic case of Russia, where the male mortality rate rose during the transition, the death rate and the infant mortality rate fell over the period.

In this paper we examine how this changing environment affected the distribution of income over time. After measuring the change in overall inequality, we consider the relative importance of two possible explanations for the increase in inequality: a) changes in the sources of household income, and b) changes in the household composition. Changes in the sources of household income reflect the role of the government and market during the transition period, while changes in household composition reflect social reactions to the changing environment. We note that these changes affect the distribution of total income by changing both the numbers of people in different demographic groups as well as the distribution of incomes *per se*.

3. Methods and Data

3.1 Data

The data for this analysis are from the *Microcensuses* taken in 1989 and 1997. Data for each survey refer to income in each previous year.   The sample for the first survey represents approximately 5 percent of the households who were living in Slovakia in 1988 (a subsample of the one used for the Czechoslovak *Microcensus)*. The unit of sample selection is the house or apartment. Data are available by common budget households, defined as a set of persons in the same dwelling who share the main

6

household expenditures. People living in the dwelling declared their status according to how they shared expenditures (Atkinson and Micklewright, 1992). The sample for the 1997 *Microcensus* was created by selecting one percent of all households living in Slovakia in 1997 following a similar procedure as was used for the earlier surveys (Slovak Central Statistical Office website 2001).   The 1988 data set includes information on 31,600 households and the 1996 data set includes data on 16,336 households.

3.2 Inequality Measurement

Our analysis of overall inequality uses Lorenz curves (L) and inequality indices based on rankings of weighted population samples. The indices include the standard Gini coefficient (G) and three generalized entropy measures: one half the square of the coefficient of variation (CV), the Theil coefficient (T), and the mean logarithmic deviation (D).[3] The Lorenz curve for discrete distributions, in our case deciles, can be defined as:

$$L\left(\frac{j}{10}\right) = \sum_{i=1}^{10}\frac{Y_i}{Y}\ where \quad 1 \leq j \leq 10 \ and \quad Y = \sum_{i=1}^{10} Y_i \ . \tag{1}$$

(Lambert 1993, p. 40.) The indices of inequality can be defined as:

$$G = \sum_i \sum_j \frac{\left|Y_i - Y_j\right|}{2n^2\overline{Y}} \tag{2}$$

$$CV = \frac{1}{2n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left[\left(\frac{Y_i}{\overline{Y}}\right)^2 - 1\right] \tag{3}$$

---

[3] For definitions of these measures of inequality see Coulter et al., 1992

$$T= (1/n)\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(\frac{Y_i}{\bar{Y}}\right)\ln\left(\frac{Y_i}{\bar{Y}}\right) \tag{4}$$

$$D = (1/n)\sum_{i=1}^{n}\ln\left(\frac{\bar{Y}}{Y_i}\right) \tag{5}$$

where Y_i = the rank weighted income, $\bar{Y}$ = the mean income, and n = the number of income units (persons in the population in our case). Each of the overall measures differs in its sensitivity to income variations at different levels of the distribution. For equi-distant transfers, the Gini index is considered to be more sensitive to transfers around the mode, while the Theil measure and one-half the square of the coefficient of variation are more sensitive to transfers at the top of the distribution. The mean logarithmic deviation is relatively more responsive to transfers at the lower end of the distribution.

If the values of all the indices are higher in year *t* than they are in year *t-1*, then it can be said that the distribution of income is more unequal in year *t*. When one Lorenz curve lies above another at one or more points, and does not lie below it at any point, then there is clear Lorenz dominance. However, if one Lorenz curve crosses the other, no conclusions can be drawn regarding relative inequality.

Household data from the *Microcensus* are the basis of our analysis. However, since the focus of this research is the inequality of income across individuals, we allocate adjusted household income to each household member. This weighting results in the individual distribution rather than household distribution of income. The amount of adjusted (or "equivalent") income per person in each household unit is calculated by dividing total household income by the number of equivalent adults in the household. We examine the robustness of our results using four different equivalence scales:

- the *OECD equivalence scale*

first adult receives a weight of 1, each additional adult receives a weight of 0.7, and each child a weight of 0.5

- the *Luxembourg Income scale* (LIS)
    the square root of household size

- *per capita* (PC) adjustment
    each person receives a weight of one

3.3 Decomposition Analysis

We undertake two types of decompositions in order to understand which factors are important in contributing to the levels of inequality in each year and changes in inequality over time. The first decomposition is by sources of income and the second is by demographic composition of the household.

Total household income is defined as the sum of monetary income net of taxes (wage and other taxes and fees) plus the cash value of in-kind income.[4] We analyze the following six sources of income for 1988 and 1996:

- **Earned Income**
    1. Earnings from any non-agricultural employment ("wage income")[5]
    2. Earnings from agricultural employment

- **Social Payments**
    3. Pensions
    4. Other social payments which include:[6]
        - *Sickness Related Benefits* (which include income from health insurance and financial support while taking care of a family member);
        - *Unemployment Benefits* (in 1996 only)
        - *Child Allowances*
        - *Social Assistance and Other Family Benefits* (including maternity leave, and parental allowances)

---

[4] We were unable to analyze taxes since this was available separately only in 1988.

[5] This includes income from the self-employed. We would have liked to analyze self-employment income separately but this was not possible given the construction of the data set in 1988.

[6] We are unable to separate out the distributional impact of the subgroups of social payments over time since the categories in 1988 are not comparable to those in 1996.

- **Other Income**
  5. In-kind income
  6. Other monetary income, which includes income from property, institutions or private persons and income from abroad.

To analyze the <u>share of inequality due to each of these sources of income</u>, we use the Lerman and Yitzhaki (1985, 1989, 1994) decomposition of the Gini.[7] The Lerman and Yitzhaki method decomposes the Gini into three terms: the Gini of the factor component (G_g), the correlation of the factor component with the cumulative distribution of overall income (R_g), and the share of the factor component in overall income, (S_g):

$$G = \sum_{g=1}^{G} G_g R_g S_{g.} \tag{6}$$

where:

$$G_g = \frac{2\,\mathrm{cov}\left[y^g, F^g\right]}{\bar{y}^g}, \tag{6a}$$

$$R_g = \frac{\mathrm{cov}\left[y^g\, F\right]}{\mathrm{cov}\left[y^g, F^g\right]} \tag{6b}$$

$$S^g = \frac{\bar{y}^g}{\bar{Y}} \tag{6c}$$

where $y^1 \ldots y^g$ represent the income levels of factor components g, F^g represents the cumulative distribution of y^g and $\bar{Y}^g$ represents the mean. F is the cumulative distribution of Y and $\bar{Y}$ is the mean of overall income.

In order to analyze the effect of the <u>demographic composition</u> of households on income inequality we decompose two indices, which are members of the Generalized

---

[7] Lerman (1999) wrote in a recent survey article, "It is now well understood that the seemingly simple question 'what is the role of an income source in overall income inequality' is complex." Surely, part of the

Entropy (GE) measures of inequality measures, the Theil and the mean log deviation indices. Both are additively decomposable by population subgroups (Shorrocks, 1984). To define these indices, let the population be partitioned into k mutually exclusive sub-groups, for example, household composition. The additive decomposability of T and D can be illustrated by re-writing equations (4) and (5) as follows:

$$T = \sum_k r_k T_k + \sum_k r_k \ln[\lambda_k] \tag{7}$$

and

$$D = \sum_k v_k D_k + \sum_k v_k \ln(1/\lambda_k) \tag{8}$$

where $r_k = \dfrac{n_k * \overline{Y_k}}{n * \overline{Y}}$ is the contribution of group k to overall income, $v_k = n_k / n$ is the population share of group k, $\lambda_k = \overline{Y}_k / \overline{Y}$ is group k's mean income. For each index presented in (7) and (8), total inequality can be expressed as the sum of two contributions: the first term being the "within-group" component (the weighted sum of the inequalities within each sub-group) and the second term is the "between group" component (the inequality remaining were each person's income to be equal to his/her sub-group's mean income).

We decompose inequality changes and focus on the mean log deviation measure since is provides a more useful decompositional formulation than does the Theil.[8] The change in inequality over the two years, t and $t+1$ can be written as

$$\boxed{\Delta I_0} \approx \boxed{\sum_k \overline{v}_k \Delta I_{0k} +} \boxed{\sum_k \overline{I}_{0k} \Delta v_k +} \boxed{\sum_k [\lambda_k - \overline{\ln(\lambda_k)}] \Delta v_k +} \boxed{\sum_k (\overline{\theta}_k - \overline{v}_k) \Delta \ln(\overline{Y}_k))}$$

difficulty is that "a source's contribution to inequality depends not only on aspects of the source itself but also on how it interacts with other sources." However, this does not invalidate the source decomposition.
[8] According to Jenkins (1995).

term A   term B   term C   term D

The change operator is Δ, and a bar over a variable represents the arithmetic mean of the

base and current period values.[9] The overall change in inequality can be decomposed into

four parts: term A represents the impact of 'pure' within-group inequality changes over

time; terms B and C represent the effect on overall inequality of changes in the

population shares on the 'within group' and 'between group' components, respectively.

Term D represents relative changes in the subgroup means.

4.   Findings

The startling finding in this paper is how much income inequality increased over

1993-1996 period compared to the 1988/9-93 period. Whereas we (Garner and Terrell,

1998) found total household per capita income inequality did not increase appreciably

from 1989 to 1993, we now find that over the 1988-1996 period it has grown by a

relatively large amount. As indicated in Table 3, the Gini indices rise by at least 33

percent between 1988 and 1996 when the per capita Gini rose by only 7 percent between

1989 and 1993. The other measures of inequality (Theil, coefficient of variation and the

mean log deviation) essentially double in size between 1988 and 1966.[10] We also note

that the 1996 Lorenz curve, plotted in Chart 1, shifts out to the right of the 1988 Lorenz

curve at each point. In looking for explanations for this rise in inequality, we begin by

examining changes in the sources of income.

---

[9] Mookherjee and Shorrocks (1992) are credited for creating the decomposition. See Jenkins (1995) for a
further application.

[10] We note that in almost all cases the per capita income measures are higher than are those using the
OECD and LIS adult equivalent adjustments.

4.1 Sources of Income

As noted above, we examine six sources of after-tax income: income from labor (subdivided into agricultural and non-agricultural income), social transfers (subdivided into pensions and other social payments) and other income (in-kind income and other monetary income). We describe in this section the distributions of each of these sources of income in 1988 and 1996 using various methods presented in Tables 4 and 5 and Charts 1 through 5.[11] Table 4 contains information on the share of income from each of the six sources across all persons within each decile of the income distribution. For example, 23.5 percent of all income is from non-agricultural sources for persons in decile 1 in 1988. Table 5 presents results from the decomposition described in equations (6a) to (6c). Charts 1, 2 and 4 present the Lorenz and Concentration curves of each source of income. Finally, Charts 3 and 5 provide information on the percentage of households in each decile that have a positive value for a particular source of income.

Clearly the first place to look for an explanation of the significant increase in total income inequality is in the change in the distribution of **earnings from labor**. A comparison of the top with the bottom half of Chart 1, indicates that the distance between the 1996 and 1988 concentration curves for earned income is greater than the distance between the Lorenz curves for total income, indicating a increase in the concentration of earned income over this time period.[12] Decomposing earned income into two sources -- agricultural and non-agricultural -- and plotting their concentrations curves for each year, we learn that the distribution of earnings from non-agricultural activity has become far

---

[11] The results in this section (in Charts 1-5 and in Tables 4 and 5) are based on person-weighted, adult-equivalent (LIS) incomes.
[12] Hence, the relative change in inequality between earned ant total income over time is qualitatively similar using the 1988-1996 the *Microcensus* data and the 1989-1993 *Family Budget Survey* data.

more concentrated among the higher income groups over time whereas earnings from agricultural income have become less concentrated over the household income distribution in 1996 than in 1988 (Chart 2).

The numbers in Table 5 indicate that earned non-agricultural income contributes more to total income inequality than any other source in both years and its contribution has risen over time from 0.147 to 0.255. This is the largest increase from any source of income. On the other hand, earned agricultural income played a small role in overall inequality in 1988, contributing 0.045 to the overall Gini, and an even smaller role in 1996, contributing only 0.004.

We then ask which factor might be driving the changes in the contributions of non-agricultural and agricultural income to overall household income inequality -- changes in the inequality of that source *per se* or changes in the shares of the population earning that component of income? As seen in Chart 3, in 1988 the percentage of households with earnings from non-agricultural activity was about the same in all deciles (approximately 90 percent of the households in each of the top seven deciles) but in 1996, the percentages of households with non-agricultural earnings is not as equally distributed: Whereas in 1996, 90 percent of the households in the top four deciles continue to earn non-agricultural income, the proportion fell to 80 percent, 70 percent , and 60 percent for the next three deciles, respectively. I.e., a smaller share of households in the second to the sixth deciles earn non-agricultural income in 1996 compared with 1988 (Table 4).

The increased contribution to total inequality from non-agricultural income over time (from 0.147 to 0.255) seems to be driven by the increase in its inequality (rising from 0.362 to 0.458) and a decline in the share of individuals with this income (from 85.0

14

percent to 78.4 percent). Because that decline in the share of individuals with this
income was in the lower half of the distribution, the average share of income from non-
agricultural activities that the households receive over the eight-year period did not
change much, and actually rose somewhat, from 0.622 in 1988 to 0.678 in 1996 (Table
5).[13]

The decreased contribution of agricultural income to total household income
arises largely because the share of total income from agriculture for households fell from
0.094 to 0.013and the person shares fell from 20.1 percent to 3.9 percent (Table 5). As
seen in Chart 3, the shares of households with some agricultural income declined from
1988 to 1996. We also see that the person weighted share of total income from
agriculture within each decile fell over time (Table 4). The distribution of agricultural
income seems to have become slightly more unequal as the factor Gini rose by only 11
percent (as compared to 27 percent for non-agricultural income) as seen in Table 5.
Although agricultural income became more unequal over the time period, it became less
concentrated among the higher income groups.

The income shortfall created by the decline in the overall share of agricultural
earnings and the decline in the share of non-agricultural earnings for the lower half of the
distribution was filled by **pension income**, which became a larger share of total
household weighted income (rising from 0.124 to 0.180) and of person weighted income
(rising from 0.345 to 0.379) over the time period (Table 5). As seen in Table 4, this is
due to the rising share of pension income in each decile, except for the top and bottom
ones. The concentration curves for pension income (Chart 4) indicates that it is
becoming less concentrated relative to overall income, as pension income was previously

---

[13] If someone in the household received the income, a share was allocated to each person therein.

skewed to the lower end of the distribution. The curve above the equal line indicates that pensions are concentrated among those who are poorer or at the end of the income distribution. In 1988, pensions were more concentrated among people in the lower end of the income distribution. By 1996, those at the lower end of the distribution were receiving a disproportionate lower share of pension income up until about the 30th percentile. After that point, pensions became a larger share relative to population ranking based on overall income. For example, in 1996, 80 percent of the population had access to about 85 percent of all pension income. In contrast, in 1988, pension incomes were equally concentrated among the population at the 80 percentile.

There was a decrease in the factor Gini for pension income from 1988 to 1996 from 0.755 to .730 (Table 5). However, the overall effect of the distribution pension income on total income inequality and the difference over time is small: in 1988 it contributed to lowering inequality by 0.016 and in 1996 the contribution was -0.012 (Table 5).

Although **other social payments** have fallen as a share of household and person weighted income, from 0.111 to 0.083 for household weighted income and 0.825 to 0.552 for persons weighted income (Table 5), they are more targeted to the lower end of the distribution by 1996. As seen in Table 4, the share of other social payments as a percent of person weighted household income has fallen in the top eight deciles and risen dramatically (from 11 percent to 31 percent for the lowest decile). For the second decile, the increase was only slight. Similarly for households, Chart 5 indicates the share of households with any other social income payments fell in all categories except the lowest decile, where it rose. As seen in Chart 4, in 1988 the poorest 20 percent of the

population received less than its share of other social payments, while the top half of the distribution received more. However the concentration curve in 1988 hovers around the 45-degree line. Finally, the increasing importance of other social payments to total inequality is seen in Table 5: whereas these payments reduced total inequality by only 0.001 in 1988, in 1996 they lowered total inequality by 0.015.

Although **net monetary income** is only a small share of total household income in both years (0.011 and 0.024 at the household level and 0.184 and 0.105 at the person level), its share at the top two deciles rose considerably in 1996 (see Table 4). Similarly, the share of households with net monetary income fell in all but the top decile where it rose (Chart 5). The 1996 concentration curve reveals that other net monetary income is less equally distributed across the total population than such income for 1988. (Chart 4). This source of income is quite eclectic, including earnings from abroad as well as income from property and from other people.

Finally, **in-kind income** became more equally distributed (and less concentrated) over the total income population (Chart 4). The shares of this income across the deciles fell from 1988 to 1996 but the shares fell in almost the same way (Table 4). The results in Chart 5 reveal a much lower and similarly distributed percentage of households with in-kind income in 1996 as in 1988.

In summary: overall inequality rose during the period, largely due to the rise in the inequality of non-agricultural earned income and partially due to the rise in inequality of other monetary income (which includes foreign income). The rise in the contribution of non-agricultural earnings to total income inequality is likely due to a tremendous rise

17

in inequality in the distribution of non-agricultural earnings and a decline both in the share of individuals with this income.

4.2 Demographic Characteristics of Households

Among other channels, changes in income inequality can be driven by changes in the composition of the household. The demographic shifts we noted in Table 2, regarding the noticeable decline in the marriage rates and live-births are reflected in the structures of the households in the 1988 and 1996 *Microcensus* data. For example, we show in Table 6 that the share of the households with one or more children fell to 33 percent in 1996 from 45 percent in 1988. Similarly, we noted above that the death rates declined slightly, yielding higher life expectancy. We find in the *Microcensus* data that the average age of the head of the household rose as the share of households with heads over 70 years of age increased and the share with heads less than 39 years of age fell.

As a result of the tremendous structural changes in the Slovak economy , with labor being reallocated from the inefficient old state sector to the new private sectors, many people became unemployed or took early retirement. Hence, it is not surprising to note in Table 6 that the head of the household in 1996 is much less likely to be working and more likely to be a pensioner or unemployed compare to 1988. However, the rise in the share of households headed by pensioners – from 26 percent to 35 percent – could also reflect other factors, such as general aging of the population or a change in household formation, in addition to the increase in the number of pensioners brought about by the restructuring. The figures in Table 7 reveal that the number of pensioners rose by about 10 percent from 1989 to 1995 and that the rise was higher among old-age and disability pensioners (14 percent) than among widows (8 percent). As seen in Table 7, the

18

government has maintained the value of pension income by allowing it to rise at the same rate that wages are rising. Hence pensions have been consistently around 45 percent of the average wage over this period. Given these statistics, we question if the Slovak government's decision to maintain the purchasing power of pensioners at a relatively high level has enabled pensioners to live independently, rather than together with their children's family. Consistent with this hypothesis is the finding in Table 6 that there is a decrease in the share of households with five or more persons and an increase in the share with one person.

How do these changes in household composition impact the distribution of income during the 1988 and 1996 periods? We begin to examine this issue by describing the demographic characteristics of the households in each decile in Chart 6. For example, the number of persons per household declined over the period in all but the lowest decile, which in 1996 has more members (2.5) than in 1988 (1.6). This is most likely due to a decline in the number of children per household in each decile, except for the lowest where it rose. Households in the lowest decile are comprised partially of more children, more economically active adults and more unemployed adults (not shown in Chart 6). However, households in the first decile are not composed of more pensioners, The lower right hand chart in Chart 6 indicates that the percentage of households in the first decile with a pensioner head decreased in 1996, while the percentage increased in all other deciles in 1996 relative to 1988.

In order to increase our understanding of the role of demographic characteristics on income inequality, we first decompose overall inequality into the portion due to inequality within each group and the portion arising from the inequality that remained if

each person's income was equal to her/his sub-group's mean income (i.e., between group inequality). Following this results, we present the results from the inequality decomposition which reflects changes over time.

The findings from the within year decompositions, described in equations (9) and (10), are presented in Table 8. The decompositions are carried out for the six groups previously described in Table 6 plus two new demographic classifications of households based on a combination of the other characteristics.

Not surprising, the decompositions for the Theil and mean log deviation indices show that the majority of overall inequality can be explained by inequality from within the groups -- very little is driven by the between group differences.[14] Moreover, the increase in inequality over time is being driven by changes in within group inequality since in most cases (six out of eight categories) the between group inequality has fallen over time. For example, in the third category, number of economically active members, the inequality within the groups (i.e., none, one, two, three+ members) represented 56 percent of total inequality in 1988 (i.e., 0.0337/0.0600) and it rose to explain 83 percent of inequality in 1996. The difference in the within group inequality over time was 1.14 of the difference in the overall inequality over time. Hence the share explained by between group inequality was –0.14 of the difference in overall inequality.

The three categories for which the between group inequality is relatively more important are the third (mentioned above), seventh (age of adults with number of adults and number of children) and eighth (if children present and number of economically active members) categories in Table 8. Here the differences in the means (not shown) of

---

[14] This is the finding in almost all decompositions of this sort – within group inequality is more important than between group inequality in explaining overall inequality.

each group are relatively larger in explaining overall inequality than the dispersion of income within each group, as compared to the other five categories. Nevertheless, the pattern of greater increase in within group inequality than between group over time still holds.

The analysis of the <u>impact on income inequality of demographic changes</u> in the populations over the 1988 to 1996 period are presented in Table 9. The decomposition in Table 9 yields information on the impact that changes in the following four factors have on changes in overall inequality over time: i) changes in within group inequality (Term A); ii) changes in population shares on the within group component of inequality (Term B); iii) changes in population shares on the between group component of inequality (Term C); and iv) changes in the subgroup mean (Term D). The values in Table 9 are expressed as proportions (or shares) of the total difference in overall inequality. As was learned from the analysis in Table 8, the vast majority of the change in overall inequality in 1988 compared to 1996 was brought about the changes in inequality within each sub-group (e.g., the households with no, one, two or three plus children). In all but two groups -- number of children and economic activity of head of household -- the within group inequality (Term A) grew by more than 100 percent of the change in overall inequality. In all but one group (number of children) the change in the relative subgroup means (Term D) actually lowered the change in overall inequality. Hence, the dispersion within each group grew, but the differences in the relative means of these subgroups fell.

What about the shift in population shares (Terms B and C)? In general they increase inequality but their impact is small compared to the impact of Terms A and D.

21

Moreover, they tend to impact between-group inequality more than within-group inequality. For example, the shift in the population shares of households headed by economically active individuals, pensioners and "other " (e.g., unemployed) increased between group inequality by a larger amount than it impacted within group inequality. Similarly, shifts in the share of the population across categories of "age of pensioner head" increased between group inequality but lowered within group inequality. In sum shifts in the demographic composition of the households are increasing overall inequality over time.

5. Conclusions

We have found a large increase in total income inequality in Slovakia eight years after the beginning of transition. The Gini index of household per capita income (net monetary income plus in-kind income) rose from 0.195 in 1988 to 0.263 in 1996. Using the LIS equivalent household income, the Gini rose from 0.187 to 0.250. In this paper we examine the impact of markets and countervailing government safety nets on this change in inequality over time by analyzing shifts in sources of income, in their distributions, means, shares, and in the percentage of persons with these incomes (based on person allocations). We learned that the earned non-agricultural income contributes most to overall income inequality in each year, due to its large income share and to how unequally it is distributed (Factor Gini). Moreover, in 1996 it accounted for much more of total inequality than it did in 1988 and hence is the single most important factor contributing to the large increase in overall income inequality between 1988 and 1996. The distribution of pension income mitigated overall inequality in both years, but less so

in 1996, whereas the distribution of other social payments played a much larger role in reducing income inequality in 1996 than in 1988.

We show there are large shifts in the demographic composition of households over time: far fewer households with children, far more households headed by pensioners, increases in the number of one-person households and decreases in large (five person) households. We find that these shifts in the demographic composition of households are increasing overall inequality, by increasing between group inequality. Their impact is larger than that found for the U.K. by Jenkins (1995) and Mookherjee and Shorrocks (1982). Nevertheless, most of the change in inequality over time is accounted for by increase in within group inequality. And given our finding above, we are lead to believe that this is due to an increase in the dispersion of labor earnings over this period. Finally it is interesting to note that although dispersion of income within each group has grown significantly over time, the differences in the means of each group have actually decreased over time. Hence between group inequality has declined from 1988 to 1996. We conclude that over the first seven years of the transition labor market forces are driving changes in overall inequality in Slovakia to a much greater extent than changes in the Government's social safety net or in individual's decisions about household formation.

REFERENCES

Atkinson, Anthony B. and John Micklewright (1992), *Economic Transformation in Eastern Europe and the Distribution of Income*, Cambridge University Press.

Buhmann, Brigitte, Lee Rainwater, Guenther Schmaus, and Timothy M. Smeeding (1992), "Equivalence Scales, Well-Being, Inequality, and Poverty: Sensitivity Estimates Across Ten Countries Using the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) Database," *Review of Income and Wealth*, Vol. 34., No. 2, June: 115-142.

Chase, Robert (1998), "Baby Boom or Bust? Changing Fertility in Post-Communist Czech Republic and Slovakia" William Davidson Institute Working Paper No. 157

Commission of the European Communities (CEC, 1992), *Employment Observatory, Central and Eastern Europe, Employment Trends and Developments*, No. 1, January.

Garner, Thesia I. and Katherine Terrell (1998), "A Gini Decompositon Analysis of Inequality in the Czech and Slovak Republics During the Transition," *The Economics of Transition*, 6(1): 23-46.

Jenkins, Stephen P. (1991), "The Measurement of Income Inequality" in Lars Osberg (ed.) *Economic Inequality and Poverty: International Perspectives*. Sharp Publishers: London: 3-38.

Jenkins, Stephen P. (1995), "Accounting for Inequality Trends: Decomposition Analyses for the U.K., 1971-86," *Economica*. 62(245): pp. 29-63.

Lambert, Peter J. (1993), The Distribution and Redistribution of Income, A Mathematical Analysis, Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press.

Lerman R. (1999), "How income sources affect income inequality?" in J.Silber (ed), *Handbook on Income Inequality Measurement*, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lerman, Robert I. and Shlomo Yitzhaki (1985), "Income Inequality Effects by Income Sources: A New Approach and Applications to the U.S.," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, February, Vol. 67: 151-156.

Lerman, Robert I. and Shlomo Yitzhaki (1989), "Improving the Accuracy of Estimates of Gini Coefficients," *Journal of Econometrics*, September, Vol. 42: 43-47.

Lerman, Robert I. and Shlomo Yitzhaki (1994), "The Effect of Marginal Changes in Income Sources on U. S. Income Inequality," *Public Finance Quarterly*, October.

Milanovic, Branko (1992), "Income Distribution in Late Socialism: Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria Compared," Socialist Economies Reform Unit, Country Economics Department, World Bank, Research paper series, paper number 1, March.

Milanovic, Branko (June 1992), "Distributional Impact of Cash and In-Kind Transfers in Eastern Europe and Czechoslovakia," Socialist Economies Reform Unit, Country Economics Department, World Bank, Research paper series, paper number 9.

Mookherjee, D. and A. F. Shorrocks (1982), "A decomposition analysis of the trend in UK income inequality," *Economic Journal*, 92, 886-992.

Podder, Nripesh (1993), "The Disaggregation of the Gini Coefficient by Factor Components and its Applications to Australia," *Review of Income and Wealth*, Series 39, No. 1, March: 51-61

Shorrocks, A. F. (1984), "Inequality Decomposition by Population Subgroups," *Econometrica*, Vol. 52, No. 6: 1369-1385.

Shorrocks, A. F. (1980), "The Class of Additively Decomposable Inequality Measures," *Econometrica*, Vol. 48, No. 3: 613-625.

Slovak Central Statistical Office (2001), website: http://www.statistics.sk/.

Smeeding, Timothy M. (1991), "Cross-National Comparisons of Inequality and Poverty Position," in Lars Osberg (ed.), *Economic Inequality and Poverty: International Perspectives*, New York: M. E. Sharpe, Inc., pp. 39-59.

Tsakloglou P. (1993) "Aspects of inequality in Greece: Measurement, decomposition and inter-temporal change: 1974, 1982," *Journal of Development Economics,* 40: 53-74.

Yitzhaki, Shlomo (1989), "Ginjack and Ginjackw," Fortran program, September 27

Table 1
Macroeconomic Data for Slovakia

	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	Source
Economic Growth											*Source*
%GDP growth (real)	-2.5	-14.6	-6.5	-3.7	4.9	6.7	6.2	6.2	4.1	1.9	EBRD, EIU
GDP per capita ($US)	2,710	2,052	2,213	2,258	2,571	3,240	3,495	3,679	3,802	3,970	EBRD, OECD
Prices											
CPI Index (% change)	18.4	58.3	9.1	25.1	11.7	7.2	5.4	6.4	5.6	14.0	World Bank, EBRD, DataStream
Trade											
Current Account Balance (%GDP)	-6.1	3	1.6	-5	4.8	2.3	-11.2	-10	-10.1	-5.5	World Bank, EBRD, EIU
Market Liberlization											
Private Sector Share of GDP (%)	5	NA	NA	NA	55	60	70	75	75	75	World Bank, EBRD
Labor Markets											
Unemployment Rate (%)	1.5	11.8	10.3	12.2	13.7	13.1	11.1	11.6	11.9	19.2	EBRD, Business Central Europe
% change in productivity	NA	NA	NA	NA	6.8	4.0	2.5	4.1	11.5	2.0	EBRD
% change in wages	NA	NA	NA	NA	7.0	5.7	9.8	7.5	6.1	-3.9	EBRD
Index of Employment Levels (1989=1)*	0.982	0.859	0.868	0.846	0.837	0.857	0.845	0.826	0.818	0.780	UNDP

*Employment in 1989 was 2,504,079

Table 2
Slovakia: Population Changes in Rates per 1,000 Inhabitants

Indicator	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996
Marriages	6.90	7.60	6.20	6.40	5.80	5.30	5.10	5.10
Divorces	1.57	1.67	1.49	1.52	1.53	1.62	1.67	1.75
Live-Births	15.20	15.10	14.90	14.10	13.80	12.40	11.40	11.20
Deaths	10.20	10.30	10.30	10.10	9.90	9.60	9.80	9.50
Infant Mortality	13.50	12.00	13.20	12.60	10.60	11.20	11.00	11.00
Natural Increase	5.00	4.80	4.60	4.00	3.90	2.80	1.60	1.70

Source: *Statistical Yearbook of the Slovak Republic*, 1996 (p. 154)

Table 3

Slovakia: Overall Income Inequality: 1988 and 1996[1]

	1988 (n=31,606)			1996 (n=16,336)			% difference (1996 vs.1988)		
	OECD	LIS	PC	OECD	LIS	PC	OECD	LIS	PC
Log Deviation	0.050	0.062	0.062	0.125	0.128	0.142	150.1	107.2	129.3
Thiel	0.051	0.060	0.065	0.111	0.112	0.128	117.6	86.7	96.9
CV2/2	0.060	0.067	0.079	0.134	0.131	0.157	123.8	96.1	99.2
Gini	0.172	0.187	0.195	0.243	0.25	0.263	41.3	33.7	34.9

Data: Slovak Republic *Microcensus* 1988 and 1996

[1]Household equivalent after tax monetary plus in-kind income, LIS equivalence scale; person weighted distribution

Table 4
Slovakia: Income Distribution[1] by Source within Each Decile

1988

| Decile | Earned Income | | Social Payments | | Other monetary | In-Kind | |
	Non-Agricultural	Agricultural	Pension	Excluding pension	income	Income	Total
1	23.5%	1.7%	58.1%	11.3%	2.1%	3.4%	100.0%
2	48.6%	3.6%	24.6%	18.3%	1.8%	3.1%	100.0%
3	59.1%	4.6%	14.1%	18.0%	1.3%	2.7%	100.0%
4	65.6%	4.8%	10.0%	16.1%	0.8%	2.6%	100.0%
5	68.0%	6.0%	8.3%	14.0%	0.9%	2.8%	100.0%
6	68.0%	7.5%	8.1%	12.1%	0.8%	3.4%	100.0%
7	67.1%	9.3%	8.6%	10.3%	0.9%	3.7%	100.0%
8	66.9%	10.3%	9.0%	8.5%	0.9%	4.4%	100.0%
9	66.2%	12.2%	8.7%	7.2%	1.0%	4.6%	100.0%
10	61.5%	18.8%	7.6%	5.4%	1.4%	5.3%	100.0%

1996

| Decile | Earned Income | | Social Payments | | Other monetary | In-Kind | |
	Non-Agricultural	Agricultural	Pension	Excluding pension	income	Income	Total
1	32.7%	0.7%	30.9%	31.4%	1.5%	2.9%	100.0%
2	39.8%	0.9%	36.2%	20.1%	1.3%	1.7%	100.0%
3	46.7%	1.1%	33.2%	16.1%	1.0%	1.9%	100.0%
4	50.8%	1.2%	32.2%	12.5%	1.2%	2.0%	100.0%
5	57.9%	0.8%	26.9%	11.1%	0.9%	2.4%	100.0%
6	65.6%	1.8%	20.1%	8.7%	1.2%	2.6%	100.0%
7	73.4%	1.5%	14.6%	6.9%	1.2%	2.3%	100.0%
8	76.8%	1.5%	12.5%	5.0%	1.6%	2.6%	100.0%
9	77.9%	1.8%	11.5%	3.6%	2.5%	2.6%	100.0%
10	85.5%	1.1%	4.5%	1.5%	6.0%	1.4%	100.0%

	Share of total income based on household distribution	Share of total income based on person distribution	Gini Correlation	Factor Gini	Contribution to Overall Gini	
	Table 5					
	Slovakia: Decomposition by Source of Income[1]					
1988						
earned non-agricultural income	0.622	0.850	0.652	0.362	0.147	
earned agricultural income	0.094	0.201	0.537	0.881	0.045	
pension income	0.124	0.345	-0.172	0.755	-0.016	
other social payments	0.111	0.825	-0.020	0.474	-0.001	
other monetary incomes	0.011	0.184	0.145	0.927	0.002	
in-kind income	0.038	0.593	0.426	0.721	0.012	
1996						
earned non-agricultural income	0.678	0.784	0.821	0.458	0.255	
earned agricultural income	0.013	0.039	0.312	0.979	0.004	
pension income	0.180	0.379	-0.093	0.730	-0.012	
other social payments	0.083	0.552	-0.281	0.653	-0.015	
other monetary incomes	0.024	0.105	0.598	0.972	0.014	
in-kind income	0.022	0.322	0.262	0.853	0.005	

[1]Household equivalent after tax monetary plus in-kind income, LIS equivalence scale; inequality statistics based on person weighted distribution

N.B.:

Household equivalent after tax income, including in-kind, in current CSK crowns for 1988 and SR crowns for 1996,based on person weights

	Mean
1988	39410
1996	76566

Table 6
Slovakia: Demographic Composition of the Household (Percentage Distribution of Households)

Charactersitic	1988	1996	Charactersitic	1988	1996
Children Present in Household			**Age of Head**		
no children	55.4	67.0	head <=29 years of age	10.1	5.9
children present	44.6	33.0	head 30-34 years of age	11.9	7.0
			head 35-39 years of age	12.5	9.4
Number of Children			head 40-44 years of age	10.6	13.0
no children	55.4	67.0	head 45-49 years of age	9.2	13.4
one child	16.8	16.4	head 50-54 years of age	8.6	10.3
two children	19.7	12.9	head 55-59 years of age	9.2	8.7
three or more children	8.1	3.7	head 60-64 years of age	8.6	8.3
			head 65-69 years of age	8.0	8.1
Economic Activity of Head			head 70+ years of age	11.3	14.8
economically active	73.3	60.4	missing		1.1
unemployed	none	3.5			
pensioner	26.4	34.7	**Age of Pensioner Head**		
other	0.3	1.4	no pensioners	72.7	65.3
			pensioner head <= 59 years of age	4.4	5.2
Household Size			pensioner head 60-64 years of age	5.9	6.9
one person	17.8	21.2	pensioner head 65-69 years of age	6.7	7.9
two persons	24.3	23.0	pensioner head 70+years of age	10.3	14.8
three persons	17.6	17.7			
four persons	24.1	25.4	**No. of Econ. Active Members**		
five persons	10.9	8.7	no econ active members	21.5	28.2
six or more persons	5.3	4.0	one econ active member	25.0	26.6
			two econ active members	42.0	33.9
			3 or more econ active members	11.5	11.3

Table7

Slovakia: Number of Pensioners and Average Monthly Pension,[1] 1989-1995

Number of Pensioners (in thousands)

	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Total	1065	1087	1124	1156	1172	1178	1173
Old-Age	488	506	532	548	553	556	558
Disability[2]*	218	223	230	243	252	256	248
Widow	270	275	279	283	286	288	291

Average Monthly Pension (in Slovak crowns)

	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Old-Age	1432	1550	1884	2058	2367	2852	3102
Disability[2]	1310	1413	1750	1940	2247	2714	2950
Widow	742	825	1007	1118	1255	1431	1594

Average Pension as a Share of the Wage

	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995
Old-Age	46.3%	48.2%	50.3%	45.5%	45.0%	46.8%	43.8%
Disability[2]	42.4%	43.9%	46.7%	42.9%	42.7%	44.6%	41.7%
Widow	24.0%	25.6%	26.9%	24.7%	23.9%	23.5%	22.5%

Source: *Statistical Yearbook of the Slovak Republic*, 1994 (p.148, 406) and 1996 (p.180, 476)

[1] Monthly level of pension paid out excluding child support bonus and disability benefits

[2] For the handicapped

Table 8
Within-Group and Between-Group Income Inequality[1] in Slovakia: 1988 and 1996

Category	Sample	Year	Theil			Mean Log Deviation		
			Aggregate Inequality	Within-group inequality	Between-group inequality	Aggregate Inequality	Within-group inequality	Between-group inequality
		1988	0.0600	0.0585	0.0015	0.0618	0.0603	0.0015
1	Number of Children	1996	0.1124	0.1090	0.0034	0.1284	0.1248	0.0036
2	Household Size	1988	0.0600	0.0522	0.0077	0.0618	0.0529	0.0089
		1996	0.1124	0.1091	0.0032	0.1284	0.1250	0.0034
3	No. of Econ. Active Members	1988	0.0600	0.0337	0.0263	0.0618	0.0337	0.0281
		1996	0.1124	0.0935	0.0189	0.1284	0.1089	0.0195
		1988	0.0600	0.0525	0.0075	0.0618	0.0536	0.0082
4	Economic Activity of Head	1996	0.1124	0.1039	0.0085	0.1284	0.1192	0.0092
5	Age of Head	1988	0.0600	0.0502	0.0098	0.0618	0.0517	0.0101
		1996	0.1124	0.1071	0.0052	0.1284	0.1230	0.0054
		1988	0.0600	0.0529	0.0071	0.0618	0.0537	0.0081
6	Age of Pensioner Head	1996	0.1124	0.1088	0.0035	0.1284	0.1247	0.0037
7	Age of Adults, No. of Adults and No. of Children	1988	0.0600	0.0413	0.0187	0.0618	0.0415	0.0203
		1996	0.1124	0.0995	0.0129	0.1284	0.1146	0.0138
8	Children and Econ. Active Members	1988	0.0600	0.0299	0.0301	0.0618	0.0299	0.0318
		1996	0.1124	0.0878	0.0245	0.1284	0.1027	0.0257

[1]Household equivalent after tax monetary plus in-kind income, LIS equivalence scale; person weighted distribution

Subgroup defined as follows:

Number of Children: no children, 1 child, two children, 3+ children

Number of HH Members: one, two three, four, five+

Number of economically active members: none, one, two, three+

Economic Activity of Head: economically active, pensioner, other

Age of Head: 15-39, 40-54, 55-64, 65+

Age of pensioner: no pensioner head, pensioner l.t. 65, pensioner g.t. eq. 65 years.

Age l.t. 65, no children,two adults; 3) Age l.t. 65, no children, three+ adults; 4) Age l.t. 65, children, two adults; 5) Age l.t. 65, on child, two adults; 6) Age l.t. 65, two children, two adults; 7) Age l.t. 65, three+ children, two adults; 8) Age l.t. 65, children, three+ adults; 9) Age g.t. 65, with and without children, one adult 10) Age

Econ. Activity and no. of children: 1) no children, no econ active adult; 2) no children, one econ active adult; 3) no children, two econ active adults; 4) no children, three+ econ active adults; 5) children, no econ active adult; 6) children, one econ active adult; 7) children, two econ active adults; 8) children, three+ econ active adults.

Sub-group Decompositions of Changes in Aggregate Income Inequality: 1988 - 1996[1]

| | Contribution to change in overall inequality due to changes in: | | | |
| | Within Group inequality (Term A) | Population Shares effect on | | Group Mean Incomes (Term D) |
		within (Term B)	between (Term C)	
No. Children	0.889	0.087	-0.022	0.046
Household Size	1.067	0.013	0.015	-0.095
No. Econ. Active Members	1.127	-0.007	0.099	-0.218
Econ. Activity of Head	0.928	0.046	0.128	-0.102
Age of Pensioner Head	1.061	-0.009	0.047	-0.100
No. Children, No. and Age of Adults	1.089	0.009	0.026	-0.125
Children-Econ Active Members	1.077	0.005	0.139	-0.221

[1]Household equivalent after tax monetary plus in-kind income, LIS equivalence scale; person weighted distribution; Based on the Mean Log Deviation Measure of Inequality.

Subgroup defined as follows:

Number of Children: no children, 1 child, two children, 3+ children

Number of HH Members: one, two three, four, five+

Number of economically active members: none, one, two, three+

Economic Activity of Head: economically active, pensioner, other

Age of Head: 15-39, 40-54, 55-64, 65+

Age of pensioner: no pensioner head, pensioner l.t. 65, pensioner g.t. eq. 65 years.

Age and No. of adults and no. of children: 1) Age l.t. 65, no children,one adult; 2) Age l.t. 65, no children,two adults; 3) Age l.t. 65, no children, three+ adults; 4) Age l.t. 65, children, two adults; 5) Age l.t. 65, on child, two adults; 6) Age l

Econ. Activity and no. of children: 1) no children, no econ active adult; 2) no children, one econ active adult; 3) no children, two econ active adults; 4) no children, three+ econ active adults; 5) children, no econ active adult; 6) children, one

Chart 1
Lorenz Curve and Concentration Curve for All Income

### Lorenz Curve: Total Household Income Including In-kind

shares of total after tax household income including in-kind

Deciles of persons ranked by equivalent total after tax household income including in-kind -LIS scale

Concentration Curve: All Earned Income

shares of income from working (earned)

Deciles of persons ranked by equivalent total after tax household income including in-kind -LIS scale

Chart 2
Concentration Curves: Non Agricultural vs. Agricultural Income

Non-Agricultural Earned Income

shares of non-agr. income

Deciles of persons ranked by equivalent total after tax household income including in-kind -LIS scale

Earned Agricultural Income

shares of agr. income

Deciles of persons ranked by equivalent total after tax household income including in-kind -LIS scale

Chart 3

Percentage of Households with Earned Income: Agricultural vs. Non-Agricultural

Non-Agricultural Income — bar chart of percentage by Income Decile (1 through 10) for 1988 and 1996.

Agricultural Income — bar chart of percentage by Income Decile (1 through 10) for 1988 and 1996.

Chart 4
Concentration Curves of Other Source of Income

**Pension Income**

shares of pension income

1988 ···■··· 1996 —— equality

Social Income not including Pensions

shares of social income not including pensions

1988 ···■··· 1996 —— equality

Other Net Monetary Income

shares of other net monetary income

1988 ···■··· 1996 —— equality

In-kind Income

shares of in-kind income

1988 ···■··· 1996 —— equality

Chart 5
## Percentage of Households with Unearned Income by Source

Pension Income — 1988, 1996 (Income Decile 1–10)

Social Income (excluding pensions) — 1988, 1996 (Income Decile 1–10)

Other Net Monetary Income — 1988, 1996 (Income Decile 1–10)

In-Kind Income — 1988, 1996 (Income Decile 1–10)

Chart 6
Demographic Characteristics by Income Decile

Average Number of Persons per Household

Average Number of Children per Household

Average Number of Economically Active Members per Household

Percentage of Households with Pensioner Head

THE WILLIAM DAVIDSON INSTITUTE
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN BUSINESS SCHOOL

DAVIDSON INSTITUTE WORKING PAPER SERIES - Most Recent Papers
The entire Working Paper Series is available at: www.wdi.bus.umich.edu

CURRENT AS OF 5/30/01

Publication	Authors	Date
No. 377 Some Explanations for Changes in the Distribution of Household Income in Slovakia: 1988 and 1996	Thesia Garner and Katherine Terrell	May 2001
No. 376 Competition and Enterprise Performance in Transition Economies: Evidence from a Cross-country Survey	Wendy Carlin, Steven Fries, Mark Schaffer and Paul Seabright	May 2001
No. 375 Why More is Actually Less: New Interpretations of China's Labor-Intensive FDI	Yasheng Huang	May 2001
No. 374 Economic Fragmentation and FDI in China	Yasheng Huang	May 2001
No. 373 Earnings Disparities in the Czech Republic: Evidence of the Past Decade and Cross-National Comparison	Jiri Vecernik	May 2001
No. 372 Economic Reform, Democracy and Growth During Post-Communist Transition	Jan Fidrmuc	Mar. 2001
No. 371 Do Multinational Enterprises Substitute Parent Jobs for Foreign Ones? Evidence from Firm Level Panel Data	Jozef Konings and Alan Murphye	Apr. 2001
No. 370 From Needs to the Market: Changing Inequality of Household Income in the Czech Transition	Jiri Vecernik	Apr. 2001
No. 369 Competition and Corporate Governance: Substitutes or Complements? Evidence from the Warsaw Stock Exchange	Irena Grosfeld and Thierry Tressel	Mar. 2001
No. 368 Multinational Corporations as Catalyst for Industrial Development: The Case of Poland	Carlo Altomonte and Laura Resmini	Feb. 2001
No. 367 A Multi-Task Theory of the State Enterprise Reform	Chong-En Bai, David D. Li, Zhigang Tao, and Yijiang Wang	Mar. 2001
No. 366 Confidence Building in Emerging Stock Markets	Enrico C. Perotti, Luc Laeven, and Pieter van Oijen	Dec. 2000
No. 365 Incentive Contracting versus Ownership Reforms: Evidence from China's Township and Village Enterprises	Chun Chang, Brian McCall, and Yijang Wang	Nov. 2000
No. 364 Individual Pay and Outside Options: Evidence from the Polish Labour Force Survey	Fiona Duffy and Patrick Paul Walsh	Mar. 2001
No. 363 Investment, Credit Rationing and the Soft Budget Constraint: Evidence from Czech Panel Data (revised Davidson Institute Working Paper No. 60a)	Lubomír Lízal and Jan Svejnar	Feb. 2001
No. 362 A Network Perspective on Inter-Organizational Transfer of R&D Capabilities: A Study of International Joint Ventures in Chinese Automobile Industry	Zheng Zhao, Jaideep Anand and Will Mitchell	Feb. 2001
No. 361 Network Restructuring and Firm Creation in East-Central Europe: A Public-Private Venture	Gerald A. McDermott	Dec. 2000
No. 360 Responses of Private and Public Schools to Voucher Funding: The Czech and Hungarian Experience	Randall K. Filer and Daniel Münich	Oct. 2000
No. 359 Labor Market Uncertainty and Private Sector Labor Supply in Russia	Steven Stillman	Sept. 2000
No. 358 Russian Roulette-Expenditure Inequality and Instability in Russia, 1994-1998	Branko Jovanovic	Sept. 2000
No. 357 Dealing with the Bad Loans of the Chinese Banks	John P. Bonin and Yiping Huang	Jan. 2001
No. 356 Retail Banking in Hungary: A Foreign Affair?	John P. Bonin and István Ábel	Dec. 2000
No. 355 Optimal Speed of Transition: Micro Evidence from the Czech Republic	Stepan Jurajda and Katherine Terrell	Dec. 2000

No. 354 Political Instability and Growth in Dictatorships	Jody Overland, Kenneth L. Simons and Michael Spagat	Nov. 2000
No. 353 Disintegration and Trade	Jarko Fidrmuc and Jan Fidrmuc	Nov. 2000
No. 352 Social Capital and Entrepreneurial Performance in Russia: A Panel Study	Bat Batjargal	Dec. 2000
No. 351 Entrepreneurial Versatility, Resources and Firm Performance in Russia: A Panel Study	Bat Batjargal	Dec. 2000
No. 350 The Dynamics of Entrepreneurial Networks in a Transitional Economy: The Case of Russia	Bat Batjargal	Dec. 2000
No. 349a R&D and Technology Spillovers via FDI: Innovation and Absorptive Capacity	Yuko Kinoshita	Apr. 2001
No. 349 R&D and Technology Spillovers via FDI: Innovation and Absorptive Capacity	Yuko Kinoshita	Nov. 2000
No. 348 Microeconomic aspects of Economic Growth in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union, 1950-2000	Sergei Guriev and Barry W. Ickes	Nov. 2000
No. 347 Effective versus Statutory Taxation: Measuring Effective Tax Administration in Transition Economies	Mark E. Schaffer and Gerard Turley	Nov. 2000
No. 346 Objectives and Constraints of Entrepreneurs: Evidence from Small and Medium Size Enterprises in Russia and Bulgaria	Francesca Pissarides, Miroslav Singer and Jan Svejnar	Oct. 2000
No. 345 Corruption and Anticorruption in the Czech Republic	Lubomír Lízal and Evžen Kočenda	Oct. 2000
No. 344 The Effects of Direct Foreign Investment on Domestic Firms	Jozef Konings	Oct. 2000
No. 343 On the Identification of Relative Wage Rigidity Dynamics	Patrick A. Puhani	Oct. 2000
No. 342 The Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment in Transition Economies	Alan A. Bevan and Saul Estrin	Oct. 2000
No. 341 The Global Spread of Stock Exchanges, 1980-1998	Klaus Weber and Gerald F. Davis	Nov. 2000
No. 340 The Costs and Benefits of Euro-isation in Central-Eastern Europe Before or Instead of EMU Membership	D. Mario Nuti	Oct. 2000
No. 339 Debt Overhang and Barter in Russia	Sergei Guriev, Igor Makarov and Mathilde Maurel	Sept. 2000
No. 338 Firm Performance and the Political Economy of Corporate Governance: Survey Evidence for Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia	Patrick Paul Walsh and Ciara Whela	July 2000
No. 337 Investment and Instability	Nauro F. Campos and Jeffrey B. Nugent	May 2000
No. 336 The Evolution of the Insurance Sector in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union	Robert B.K. Pye	Aug. 2000
No. 335 Institutional Technology and the Chains of Trust: Capital Markets and Privatization in Russia and the Czech Republic	Bruce Kogut and Andrew Spicer	Aug. 2000
No. 334 The Evolution of Market Integration in Russia	Daniel Berkowitz and David N. DeJong	Aug. 2000
No. 333 Efficiency and Market Share in Hungarian Corporate Sector	László Halpern and Gábor Kőrösi	July 2000
No. 332 Search-Money-and-Barter Models of Financial Stabilization	S.I. Boyarchenko and S.Z. Levendorskii	July 2000
No. 331 Worker Training in a Restructuring Economy: Evidence from the Russian Transition	Mark C. Berger, John S. Earle and Klara Z. Sabirianova	Aug. 2000
No. 330 Economic Development in Palanpur 1957-1993: A Sort of Growth	Peter Lanjouw	Aug. 2000
No. 329 Trust, Organizational Controls, Knowledge Acquisition from the Foreign Parents, and Performance in Vietnamese International Joint Ventures	Marjorie A. Lyles, Le Dang Doanh, and Jeffrey Q. Barden	June 2000
No. 328 Comparative Advertising in the Global Marketplace: The Effects of Cultural Orientation on Communication	Zeynep Gürhan-Canli and Durairaj Maheswaran	Aug. 2000
No. 327 Post Privatization Enterprise Restructuring	Morris Bornstein	July 2000
No. 326 Who is Afraid of Political Instability?	Nauro F. Campos and Jeffrey B. Nugent	July 2000

No. 325 Business Groups, the Financial Market and Modernization	Raja Kali	June 2000
No. 324 Restructuring with What Success? A Case Study of Russian Firms	Susan Linz	July 2000
No. 323 Priorities and Sequencing in Privatization: Theory and Evidence from the Czech Republic	Nandini Gupta, John C. Ham and Jan Svejnar	May 2000
No. 322 Liquidity, Volatility, and Equity Trading Costs Across Countries and Over Time	Ian Domowitz, Jack Glen and Ananth Madhavan	Mar. 2000
No. 321 Equilibrium Wage Arrears: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Institutional Lock-In	John S. Earle and Klara Z. Sabirianova	Oct. 2000
No. 320 Rethinking Marketing Programs for Emerging Markets	Niraj Dawar and Amitava Chattopadhyay	June 2000
No. 319 Public Finance and Low Equilibria in Transition Economies: the Role of Institutions	Daniel Daianu and Radu Vranceanu	June 2000
No. 318 Some Econometric Evidence on the Effectiveness of Active Labour Market Programmes in East Germany	Martin Eichler and Michael Lechner	June 2000
No. 317 A Model of Russia's "Virtual Economy"	R.E Ericson and B.W Ickes	May 2000
No. 316 Financial Institutions, Financial Contagion, and Financial Crises	Haizhou Huang and Chenggang Xu	Mar. 2000
No. 315 Privatization versus Regulation in Developing Economies: The Case of West African Banks	Jean Paul Azam, Bruno Biais, and Magueye Dia	Feb. 2000
No. 314 Is Life More Risky in the Open? Household Risk-Coping and the Opening of China's Labor Markets	John Giles	Apr. 2000
No. 313 Networks, Migration and Investment: Insiders and Outsiders in Tirupur's Production Cluster	Abhijit Banerjee and Kaivan Munshi	Mar. 2000
No. 312 Computational Analysis of the Impact on India of the Uruguay Round and the Forthcoming WTO Trade Negotiations	Rajesh Chadha, Drusilla K. Brown, Alan V. Deardorff and Robert M. Stern	Mar. 2000
No. 311 Subsidized Jobs for Unemployed Workers in Slovakia	Jan. C. van Ours	May 2000
No. 310 Determinants of Managerial Pay in the Czech Republic	Tor Eriksson, Jaromir Gottvald and Pavel Mrazek	May 2000
No. 309 The Great Human Capital Reallocation: An Empirical Analysis of Occupational Mobility in Transitional Russia	Klara Z. Sabirianova	Oct. 2000
No. 308 Economic Development, Legality, and the Transplant Effect	Daniel Berkowitz, Katharina Pistor, and Jean-Francois Richard	Feb. 2000
No. 307 Community Participation, Teacher Effort, and Educational Outcome: The Case of El Salvador's EDUCO Program	Yasuyuki Sawada	Nov. 1999
No. 306 Gender Wage Gap and Segregation in Late Transition	Stepan Jurajda	May 2000
No. 305 The Gender Pay Gap in the Transition from Communism: Some Empirical Evidence	Andrew Newell and Barry Reilly	May 2000
No. 304 Post-Unification Wage Growth in East Germany	Jennifer Hunt	Nov. 1998
No. 303 How Does Privatization Affect Workers? The Case of the Russian Mass Privatization Program	Elizabeth Brainerd	May 2000
No. 302 Liability for Past Environmental Contamination and Privatization	Dietrich Earnhart	Mar. 2000
No. 301 Varieties, Jobs and EU Enlargement	Tito Boeri and Joaquim Oliveira Martins	May 2000
No. 300 Employer Size Effects in Russia	Todd Idson	Apr. 2000
No. 299 Information Complements, Substitutes, and Strategic Product Design	Geoffrey G. Parker and Marshall W. Van Alstyne	Mar. 2000
No. 298 Markets, Human Capital, and Inequality: Evidence from Rural China	Dwayne Benjamin, Loren Brandt, Paul Glewwe, and Li Guo	May 2000
No. 297 Corporate Governance in the Asian Financial Crisis	Simon Johnson, Peter Boone, Alasdair Breach, and Eric Friedman	Nov. 1999
No. 296 Competition and Firm Performance: Lessons from Russia	J. David Brown and John S. Earle	Mar. 2000

No. 295 Wage Determination in Russia: An Econometric Investigation	Peter J. Luke and Mark E. Schaffer	Mar. 2000
No. 294 Can Banks Promote Enterprise Restructuring?: Evidence From a Polish Bank's Experience	John P. Bonin and Bozena Leven	Mar. 2000
No. 293 Why do Governments Sell Privatised Companies Abroad?	Bernardo Bortolotti, Marcella Fantini and Carlo Scarpa	Mar. 2000
No. 292 Going Public in Poland: Case-by-Case Privatizations, Mass Privatization and Private Sector Initial Public Offerings	Wolfgang Aussenegg	Dec. 1999
No. 291a Institutional Technology and the Chains of Trust: Capital Markets and Privatization in Russia and the Czech Republic	Bruce Kogut and Andrew Spicer	Feb. 2001
No. 291 Institutional Technology and the Chains of Trust: Capital Markets and Privatization in Russia and the Czech Republic	Bruce Kogut and Andrew Spicer	Mar. 1999
No. 290 Banking Crises and Bank Rescues: The Effect of Reputation	Jenny Corbett and Janet Mitchell	Jan. 2000
No. 289 Do Active Labor Market Policies Help Unemployed Workers to Find and Keep Regular Jobs?	Jan C. van Ours	Feb. 2000
No. 288 Consumption Patterns of the New Elite in Zimbabwe	Russell Belk	Feb. 2000
No. 287 Barter in Transition Economies: Competing Explanations Confront Ukranian Data	Dalia Marin, Daniel Kaufmann and Bogdan Gorochowskij	Jan. 2000
No. 286 The Quest for Pension Reform: Poland's Security through Diversity	Marek Góra and Michael Rutkowski	Jan. 2000
No. 285 Disorganization and Financial Collapse	Dalia Marin and Monika Schnitzer	Oct. 1999
No. 284 Coordinating Changes in M-form and U-form Organizations	Yingyi Qian, Gérard Roland and Chenggang Xu	May 1999
No. 283 Why Russian Workers Do Not Move: Attachment of Workers Through In-Kind Payments	Guido Friebel and Sergei Guriev	Oct. 1999
No. 282 Lessons From Fiascos in Russian Corporate Governance	Merritt B. Fox and Michael A. Heller	Oct. 1999
No. 281 Income Distribution and Price Controls: Targeting a Social Safety Net During Economic Transition	Michael Alexeev and James Leitzel	Mar. 1999
No. 280: Starting Positions, Reform Speed, and Economic Outcomes in Transitioning Economies	William Hallagan and Zhang Jun	Jan. 2000
No. 279 : The Value of Prominent Directors	Yoshiro Miwa & J. Mark Ramseyer	Oct. 1999
No. 278: The System Paradigm	János Kornai	Apr. 1998
No. 277: The Developmental Consequences of Foreign Direct Investment in the Transition from Socialism to Capitalism: The Performance of Foreign Owned Firms in Hungary	Lawrence Peter King	Sept. 1999
No. 276: Stability and Disorder: An Evolutionary Analysis of Russia's Virtual Economy	Clifford Gaddy and Barry W. Ickes	Nov. 1999
No. 275: Limiting Government Predation Through Anonymous Banking: A Theory with Evidence from China.	Chong-En Bai, David D. Li, Yingyi Qian and Yijiang Wang	July 1999
No. 274: Transition with Labour Supply	Tito Boeri	Dec. 1999
No. 273: Sectoral Restructuring and Labor Mobility: A Comparative Look at the Czech Republic	Vit Sorm and Katherine Terrell	Nov. 1999
No. 272: Published in: *Journal of Comparative Economics* "Returns to Human Capital Under the Communist Wage Grid and During the Transition to a Market Economy" Vol. 27, pp. 33-60 1999.	Daniel Munich, Jan Svejnar and Katherine Terrell	Oct. 1999
No. 271: Barter in Russia: Liquidity Shortage Versus Lack of Restructuring	Sophie Brana and Mathilde Maurel	June 1999
No. 270: Tests for Efficient Financial Intermediation with Application to China	Albert Park and Kaja Sehrt	Mar. 1999
No. 269a: Russian Privatization and Corporate Governance: What Went Wrong?	Bernard Black, Reinier Kraakman and Anna Tarassova	May 2000
No. 269: Russian Privatization and Corporate Governance: What Went Wrong?	Bernard Black, Reinier Kraakman and Anna Tarassova	Sept. 1999