



Inequality and GDP

Prof. Robert Inklaar
University of Groningen

How large is cross-country income inequality?

The case for international price comparisons

Large, obviously



49th St & 7th Ave,
New York City, USA



Dharavi, Mumbai, India

© National Geographic



Towards greater precision: GDP/capita

- Exchange rate conversion
 - India (\$1600) vs. United States (\$54300) \Rightarrow 1:34
 - Global p90/p10: 62
 - Global Gini (population-weighted): 0.62



However, prices differ...

	India	United States
Whole wheat bread	\$0.52	\$0.90
Men's haircut	\$0.87	\$28.00

Source: International Comparison Program 2011: Data for Researchers (World Bank, 2014)

...as do budget shares

Price	India	United States
Whole wheat bread	\$0.52	\$0.90
Men's haircut	\$0.87	\$28.00
Budget share	India	United States
Food	29%	6%
Personal care	4%	2%



Price index comparison

- Fisher index: geometric mean of
 - What would Indians spend with Indian prices and US spending patterns (Laspeyres)?
 - What would Americans spend with US prices but Indian spending patterns (Paasche)?

$$P^F = \left(\left[\frac{\mathbf{p}'_{IND} \mathbf{q}_{USA}}{\mathbf{p}'_{USA} \mathbf{q}_{USA}} \right] \times \left[\frac{\mathbf{p}'_{IND} \mathbf{q}_{IND}}{\mathbf{p}'_{USA} \mathbf{q}_{IND}} \right] \right)^{0.5}$$

NB: adaptation needed for number of countries $N > 2$

Price index comparison

- Fisher index: the best (accepted) there is
 - Though see e.g. Neary (2004)
- Yet inherently imperfect, especially when comparing very 'different' countries (Deaton and Heston, 2010)

Practical pricing problems



Comparability vs. representativity



Practical pricing problems

Housing

vs.

Housing



Institutional setting

- Inflation measurement is in the national domain
- International price comparisons have a less convenient 'home'
 - Permanent program at Eurostat and OECD
- International Comparison Program (ICP)
 - Academic initiative in the 1960s (Kravis, Heston, Summers), global scope
 - Permanent status from UNSC: March 2016



Towards greater precision: GDP/capita

- Exchange rate conversion
 - India (\$1600) vs. United States (\$54300) \Rightarrow 1:34
 - Global p90/p10: 62
 - Global Gini (population-weighted): 0.62



The importance of purchasing power parities


- Relative price level in India (PPP/XR): 28% of the US
- PPP-converted GDP/capita:
 - India (\$5700) vs. United States (\$54300) \Rightarrow 1:10
 - Global p90/p10: 13
 - Global Gini (population-weighted): 0.46

Cross-country income inequality

From a single year to a trend

Conflicting trends

Between-country income inequality – earlier evidence




Source: computations based on PWT 5.6, 6.3 and 7.1; Aten, Heston and Summers.

Note: figure shows population-weighted Gini coefficient for GDP per capita in each year

Conflicting trends

Between-country income inequality – earlier evidence



Source: computations based on PWT 5.6, 6.3 and 7.1; Aten, Heston and Summers.

Note: figure shows population-weighted Gini coefficient for GDP per capita in each year



Traditional approach

- Assumption: PPPs change with relative inflation

$$\Delta PPP_{ijt} = \frac{P_{it}/P_{it-1}}{P_{jt}/P_{jt-1}}$$

- ‘Constant PPP assumption’, followed by:
 - Penn World Table (until version 7.x),
 - Maddison Project Database
 - World Development Indicators



Why not?


- Conceptual reasons, e.g.:
 - National inflation depends on national budget shares, PPPs depend on budget shares of multiple countries
- Practical reasons, e.g.:
 - Price measurement methods differ between CPI and ICP (trade balance)
 - Product samples differ (partly by design)

Next Generation approach

- Use multiple PPP benchmarks
 - Introduced with PWT version 8.0
- Separate series for cross-country levels and growth rates over time
 - National inflation best-suited for national growth measurement

The new pattern, ...


Between-country income inequality – the Next Generation



Source: computations based on PWT 8.0 , Feenstra, Inklaar and Timmer (*AER*, 2015)
Note: figure shows population-weighted Gini coefficient for GDP per capita in each year

... and the next surprise

Between-country income inequality – the latest surprise




Source: computations based on PWT 8.0 and PWT 9.0, Feenstra, Inklaar and Timmer (*AER*, 2015)

Note: figure shows population-weighted Gini coefficient for GDP per capita in each year


Major systematic differences

Differences in household consumption PPPs
ICP 2011 vs. extrapolated ICP 2005



Major regional differences

Differences in household consumption PPPs
 ICP 2011 vs. extrapolated ICP 2005




Forensic statistics

- World Bank (2014): major methodological changes from ICP 2005 and ICP 2011
 - Especially in linking of regions, ICP's answer to the comparability vs. representativity discussion

ICP's regional organization

- Administrative partition of the world
 - Regional bodies coordinate national agencies' price collection activities
 - Eurostat and OECD have well-established activities
 - CIS Stat, African and Asian Development Banks, ECLAC and ESCWA have more recent activities

ICP 2005 regions



Notes: Argentina, Lebanon and Syria participated in ICP 2005, but not in ICP 2011 and are therefore omitted. Zimbabwe's 2005 PPP was severely influenced by the concurrent period of hyperinflation, so is also omitted.



ICP's regional organization

- Economic rationale: consumption patterns differ around the world, so first compare like with like
 - Between-region comparison based on separate product list; *ICP 2005: ring product list*
- Political imperative: within-region comparisons should not be 'contaminated' by between-region comparisons
 - E.g. China-India PPP not affected by China-US and India-US price comparison; especially crucial within EU



Forensic statistics

- World Bank (2014): major methodological changes from ICP 2005 and ICP 2011
 - Especially in linking of regions, ICP's answer to the comparability vs. representativity discussion
- Deaton (*AER*, 2010) and Deaton and Aten (*AEJ: Macro*, 2017): Regional linking in ICP 2005 was suspect
- Inklaar and Rao (*AEJ: Macro*, 2017): test and adjust



Ring product selection bias

- Deaton (2010): ring country product list was a rich country product list
 - Bordeaux *supérieur*, with state certification of origin and quality, vintage 2003–2004
 - Peugeot 407 Berline with 2.0 liter 16v, ABS & automatic climate control
- Representative in Cameroon? Or Sri Lanka?
 - If not: likely upward bias in prices



Ring product selection bias

- Exploit that:
 1. Each ring country was in the regional and in the ring comparison
 2. The lower-income regions also included a higher-income ring country
- ‘Rich country’ product selection? → Ring prices will be higher than regional prices in low-income ring countries, relative to the highest-income ring country
 - Difference-in-difference setup


Ring product selection bias

<i>Africa (South Africa)</i>		<i>Asia-Pacific (Hong-Kong)</i>		<i>Eurostat-OECD (UK)</i>	
Cameroon	0.189***	Sri Lanka	0.198***	Estonia	0.036
	(0.038)		(0.054)		(0.023)
Egypt	-0.038	Malaysia	0.080**	Japan	0.037
	(0.047)		(0.036)		(0.030)
Kenya	0.044	Philippines	0.113**	Slovenia	0.050**
	(0.047)		(0.047)		(0.023)
Senegal	0.086*				
	(0.046)	<i>Latin America (Chile)</i>		<i>Western Asia (Oman)</i>	
Zambia	-0.054	Brazil	0.069**	Jordan	0.047
	(0.052)		(0.032)		(0.050)

Confirmed in Africa and (particularly) in Asia
Problem in ICP 2005, not in ICP 2011


Major systematic differences

Differences in household consumption PPPs
ICP 2011 vs. extrapolated ICP 2005



Disappear after bias correction


Differences in household consumption PPPs
ICP 2011 vs. extrapolated **counterfactual** ICP 2005





And a new trend is established

Between-country income inequality – ICP 2011 & ICP 2005C



Source: computations based on PWT 8.0 and PWT 9.0, Feenstra, Inklaar and Timmer (*AER*, 2015)
Note: figure shows population-weighted Gini coefficient for GDP per capita in each year

Cross-country income inequality over the very long run



The era of modern economic growth

- Maddison Project Database
 - Continues the work of Angus Maddison
 - Incorporates historical work on growth in GDP/capita
 - Still relies on Maddison's 1990 PPP comparison




Challenges to Maddison

- Prados de la Escosura (2000): PPPs vary systematically with the degree of openness
- Ward and Devereux (2016), Lindert/Williamson (2016), Lindert (2016): contemporaneous, historical price comparisons differ from extrapolated PPPs
 - Time series of (historical) National Accounts are not precise, e.g. World Wars



Case: economic leadership of UK or US?


UK GDP per capita, US=1





Case: economic leadership of UK or US?

UK GDP per capita, US=1








Constant-PPP vs. historical price

comparisons

UK GDP per capita, US=1




Next Generation approach





Inequality implications



Note: Country coverage varies between 27 and 40 countries, covering most of the world population
Source: Bolt, Inklaar, van Zanden and de Jong (2016), in progress



Broader considerations

- Price comparisons are sparse
 - 2/3 of observations (PWT or Maddison) relies on constant-PPP assumption
 - Pre-1950 shift based on 39 price comparison observations
- Precision of price comparisons is limited
 - For conceptual and practical reasons
 - But with severe consequences



Moving backwards & forwards

1. Next Generation approach cries out for more historical price comparisons
 - Especially in Latin America
2. With more frequent contemporaneous price comparisons, how to understand differences over time
 - Classical measurement error vs. systematic biases



Thank you!

Inequality and GDP

Prof. Robert Inklaar
University of Groningen