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ABSTRACT

This pilot empirical study seeks to ascertain how income inequality affects growth by incorporating panel data information into a macroeconomic model. People’s Republic of China is used as the pilot field. Provincial urban and rural household data are used to construct income inequality measures, which are then used to augment household consumption equations in a quarterly macroeconomic model. Model simulations are performed to study the inequality effect on gross domestic product growth and its sectoral components. Results show that income inequality forms robust explanatory variables of consumption and that the way inequality develops carries certain negative consequences on gross domestic product and sectoral growth.
I. INTRODUCTION

Since undertaking market reforms in 1978, the economy of People’s Republic of China (PRC) has achieved sustained high growth and rapid progress in poverty reduction. The World Bank estimates that in the more than two decades since reforms started, average income per capita in the country has quadrupled, while more than 270 million people have been lifted out of poverty (Chen and Wang 2001). From 1978 to 2004, gross domestic product (GDP) growth in the PRC averaged nearly 10% annually, the highest growth rate of any country in the world for the same period, and, at least in the near term, it has not yet shown signs of slowing down.

If there seems to be a dark lining to these extraordinary achievements, it is that income inequality in the country—seen as a whole, within/between urban and rural areas, and across provinces—has also risen quite rapidly in the period (see for example World Bank 1997, Chen and Wang 2001, Kanbur and Zhang 2005). For any given level of natural or human capital, the greater the inequality, the higher the poverty one could expect. Income inequality is also seen to affect long-term economic growth, although there is no consensus on the direction of the effect.

If income inequality affects growth positively, it is possible that the poverty-reducing impact of this growth offsets the direct adverse effect of inequality on welfare, thus tolerating relatively high inequality. On the other hand, if inequality affects growth negatively, then addressing it immediately should be an important concern.

This paper investigates empirically how much and in what ways income inequality affects the PRC’s economic growth by means of incorporating income disparity measures derived from provincial panel data of urban and rural household income into a macroeconometric model, and simulating the effects of changes in income inequality on growth. The rest of the paper is structured as follows. Section II gives a summary of the inequality situation in the PRC. Section III briefly surveys the literature on the transmission mechanism between income inequality and economic growth. Section IV describes our modeling approach and discusses available inequality measures that might be pertinent to our investigation. Section V describes the estimation results of incorporating income inequality into the macroeconometric model. Section VI presents the results of model simulations showing the effects of inequality changes on other economic variables. The last section concludes.

II. BACKGROUND ON INCOME INEQUALITY IN THE PRC

Income inequality had remained fairly mild and stable under an egalitarian regime prior to economic reforms that started in 1978. According to Li et al. (2000, 3–4), the Gini ratio of urban workers was 0.16; the Gini ratio for rural households was 0.21 in 1978;¹ and the Gini ratio among provinces was 0.14 in 1979. The situation has changed considerably since the reforms. Following the government’s introduction of individual incentives (also known as the household responsibility

¹ Li et al. (2000, 3) list several estimates for rural households’ Gini ratio in 1978: 0.21 estimated by the National Statistics Bureau of China, 0.22 estimated by Adelman and Sunding in 1987, and 0.31 estimated by the World Bank in 1983.
system) and market forces in 1978, as these immediately began to increase returns to capital and land, diversify employment, and increase factor mobility (World Bank 1997), income inequality rose significantly for the country as a whole, within/between urban and rural areas, and across provinces. This is particularly interesting in view of the fact that inequality is found to remain fairly constant over time in many economies (e.g., see Besley and Burgess 2003).

Krongkaew (2003) reports the per capita income Gini ratio in the whole of the PRC to be at 0.29 in 1981, and to have risen progressively to 0.30 in 1984, 0.35 in 1989, 0.39 in 1995, and 0.46 in 2000. Li et al. (2000, 8) estimate that within rural areas the Gini ratio of household income rose from 0.21 to 0.34 from 1979 to 1995, and that within urban areas the Gini ratio went up from 0.16 to 0.28 in the same period. Li et al. (2000) and Zhang (2003), meanwhile, report the interprovincial per capita income Gini ratio to have been rising almost consistently from 0.32 in 1978, to 0.28 in 1983, 0.38 in 1988, 0.39 in 1995, 0.40 in 1999, and 0.42 in 2000.

The household responsibility system initially resulted in rural income growth surpassing urban income growth as farms achieved greater productivity, but this trend was soon reversed as agricultural productivity hit the ceiling and rural income fell further behind urban income. In fact, one may divide the period 1981 up to the present for the PRC into three different subperiods differentiated by the growth–equity characteristic of the economy, as was done by the World Bank (1997). The period 1981–1984 could be classified as a period of growth with equity as real mean income increased by 12.6% a year during this period while the Gini ratio rose only marginally. The period 1984–1989 could be classified as a period of income inequality with little growth as overall real mean income increased by less than 1% a year for this period, and this was very unevenly distributed as income of the richest decile increased while the income of the poorest decile fell (World Bank 1997).\(^2\) Finally, the period 1990 up to the present is a period of growth with income inequality as both overall real mean income and the Gini ratio grew rapidly.

Some researchers have claimed that the PRC possibly has the largest income gap between the rural and urban sectors in the world (e.g., see Lin 2003). Inequality decompositions done by the government show that the rural–urban income gap explained one third of total inequality in 1995 and one half the increase in inequality since 1985. Rural per capita income was 38.9% of urban per capita income in 1978, 53.8% in 1985, and was down to 35.9% in 2000 (Lin 2003). Li et al. (2000) note the same diverging path of rural and urban incomes. This does not even take into account the set of publicly provided services (housing, pensions, health, education, and other entitlements) that augment urban incomes by an average of 80 percent. When these are considered, rural–urban disparities accounted for an even greater share of total inequality (World Bank 1997). Figure 1 shows for the period 1992–2003 the widening gap between urban and rural per capita incomes.

Across provinces, the biggest source of increasing income inequality appears to be between coastal and interior provinces. Coastal provinces benefited from their proximity to world markets, better infrastructure, and educated labor force as the PRC opened up to the outside world (World Bank 1997). Interprovincial inequality accounted for a quarter of total inequality in 1995 and explained a third of the increase since 1985. In 1985 residents in the interior of the PRC earned 75% as much as their coastal counterparts; by 1995 this had dropped to 50% (World Bank 1997).

\(^2\) However, this description may not be so accurate if we look at the official statistics on per capita GDP.
III. THEORIES ON INCOME INEQUALITY → GROWTH NEXUS

One of the most famous postulates concerning income inequality and growth was put forward by Kuznets (1955). In what has come to be known as Kuznets’s hypothesis, it is postulated that in the course of the development of a country, inequality first rises before eventually declining—the inverted-U hypothesis. However, Kuznets’s hypothesis implies a causal relationship of growth → inequality at a macro level, i.e., relating inequality to the stages of economic development.

Theories concerning how income inequality affects economic growth are more micro oriented, i.e., relating heterogeneous consumers’ behavior and investment indivisibility to aggregate demand (e.g., see Bagliano and Bertola 2004). Specifically, the theories demonstrate that unequal income distribution among households—at a point in time but more especially as it changes over time—affects aggregate consumption and demand structure through heterogeneous propensities to consume and to save, and these effects are then transmitted to investment allocations, especially investment in human capital (see for example Benabou 1996, Galor and Zeira 1993, Galor and Tsiddon 1997). Consequent theories augment the transmission process by studying the effect of inequality on redistributive policies and the possible inefficiencies those may bring. Broader sociological studies also pinpoint inequality as a possible cause for socio-political instability or violence (see for example Knack and Keefer 2000), and even for the differences in fertility rate (see Perotti 1996).

3 An early pioneer of this issue is Staehle (1937 and 1938), who demonstrated how visible income distribution changed in Germany using quarterly data and how such changes affected aggregate market demand. In this context, he pointed out the weakness of Keynes’s aggregate propensity to consume for overlooking the implication of income distribution and endorsed Robinson’s (1933) proposal to bring income distribution between classes into discussions of aggregate output growth. Noticeably, Robinson’s idea is precursory to the later development of growth models with two classes (see Kaldor 1956 and 1957, Bourguignon 1981). An example of recent theories is Zweimüller (2000), which shows how inequality can affect long-run growth negatively by depressing aggregate demand for innovative products.

4 For evidence or lack of this, see Alesina and Rodrik (1994), Persson and Tabellini (1994), Perotti (1996), and Deininger and Squire (1998).
Many empirical studies have produced positive evidence about the link between growth and income inequality (e.g., Aghion et al. 1999). These studies can roughly be divided into two strands: cross-country analyses and micro-based (usually household survey based) studies. Cross-country analyses are frequently carried out by running regressions of growth rates on various proxies for income inequality and redistribution effects together with relevant control variables. These are often criticized, however, for lack of structural models and thus methodological crudity (e.g., see Figini 1999). Micro applied studies, on the other hand, while methodologically tighter, often lack a systematic and direct link to the macro economy.5

One increasingly popular approach is to study the subject by means of computable general equilibrium (CGE) models. The CGE approach has the attraction of providing a logically consistent way of analyzing the link between aggregate economic growth and disaggregated income changes. A good example of this is the model developed recently by the Poverty and Social Impact Analysis Group at the World Bank (see Bourguignon et al. 2003). However, as CGE models are heavily calibrated, it is difficult to assess the model conclusions empirically. Moreover, CGE models tend to lack realistic dynamic adjustment mechanisms and might not be able to account for the heterogeneous effects of a given policy within assumed homogenous agent groups, thus making them miss important sources of changes in income inequality.

IV. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION AND INEQUALITY MEASURES

In this study, we explore a novel route of augmenting a macroeconometric model of the PRC with income inequality measures built upon panel data such that the impact of income inequality on growth and the macro economy can be studied via model simulations.6

The macroeconometric model of the PRC was developed at the Asian Development Bank (ADB) jointly with the Institute of World Economics and Politics (IWEP) of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), following He et al. (2005). The model, hereafter referred to as the ADB PRC model, uses quarterly data and contains over 70 endogenous variables and less than 20 nonmodeled variables. It is structured into six blocks: investment, foreign trade, government, banking, prices, and private income and consumption. The last block is built upon aggregate time series of urban and rural household per capita income. A detailed description of the model plus a full equation list is given in Qin et al. (2006).7 To augment the model, panel data of urban and rural household per capita incomes of 30 provinces and autonomous municipalities at annual frequency are collected.8

Two types of income inequality measures can be derived from the available data. One is income inequality between urban and rural areas measured by the ratio of their per capita incomes using solely the aggregate time-series data (see Figure 1). The other is income inequality within urban and within rural areas, obtained by exploiting provincial panel data on per capita income. There are several possible measures to characterize income inequality of panel data according to

5 A good example of micro empirical studies relating to the PRC is carried out by Benjamin et al. (2004). Based on household survey data, they find unambiguous deterioration of income distribution in rural PRC, but they acknowledge the difficulty of drawing inferences from their micro findings to macro conditions.
6 Due to panel data shortage, it is impossible to endogenise the inequality measures to study the effects of growth or government fiscal policy on these inequality measures.
7 Some of the model properties are exhibited in two applied studies: Qin et al. (2005); and Qin, Cagas, He, and Quising (2006).
8 Beijing, Shanghai, and Tianjin are counted as independent entries, but Chongqing, a relatively new autonomous municipality, is still regarded as part of Sichuan in our sample.
the literature. Table 1 gives the formula for some of the more prevalently used ones, which are the Gini coefficient ($G$), variance ($V$), coefficient of variation ($c$), log of variance ($v1$), variance of logarithms ($v2$), Atkinson’s Index ($A$), Dalton’s Index ($D$), Theil’s Index ($T$), and Herfindahl’s Index ($H$). In Figure 2, time-series graphs of each of these measures are plotted using panel data set for the period 1992–2003.

### Table 1

**Income Inequality Measures and their Properties**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Formula</th>
<th>Properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gini coefficient</strong></td>
<td>$G = \frac{2 \text{cov} \left( y, r_y \right)}{\bar{y}}$</td>
<td>a,b,c</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance</strong></td>
<td>$V = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left( y_i - \bar{y} \right)^2$</td>
<td>a,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coefficient of variation</strong></td>
<td>$c = \frac{\sqrt{V}}{\bar{y}}$</td>
<td>a,b,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Log of variance</strong></td>
<td>$v1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \log \left( \frac{y_i}{\bar{y}} \right) \right]^2$</td>
<td>c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Variance of logarithms</strong></td>
<td>$v2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \log(y_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \log(y_i) \right]^2$</td>
<td>c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Atkinson’s Index</strong></td>
<td>$A = 1 - \frac{1}{\bar{y}} U\left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} U(y_i) \right)$</td>
<td>a,b,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dalton’s Index</strong></td>
<td>$D = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{y_i}{U(\bar{y})}$</td>
<td>a,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theil’s Index</strong></td>
<td>$T = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{y_i}{\bar{y}} \log \left( \frac{y_i}{\bar{y}} \right)$</td>
<td>a,b,c,d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Herfindahl’s Index</strong></td>
<td>$H = \left( \frac{y_i}{n \bar{y}} \right)^2$</td>
<td>a,b,d</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a means weak principle of transfers.  
b means scale independence.  
c means principle of population.  
d means decomposability.  

**Note:** For all measures $y$ denotes income.  
1. $r_y$ is the correlation coefficient between income and the ranks of all individuals according to their income from poorest to richest, $n$ is the population size;  
2. $\bar{y}$ is mean income;  
3. $U(\cdot)$ denotes a social utility function, which in this paper we assumed to take the form of a constant relative inequality aversion utility function.
FIGURE 2
URBAN, RURAL AND OVERALL INTERPROVINCIAL PER CAPITA INCOME INEQUALITY

Source: Authors’ computations. Gini ratios were computed using the Distribution Alaysis Software (DAD).
Four basic properties are commonly used to evaluate the goodness of various income inequality measures (e.g., see Cowell 1995, Deininger and Squire 1998, Chakravarty 1999, and Fields 2001). These properties are most widely known as “anonymity”; “population homogeneity” or “population independence”; “transfer principle” or “the Pigou-Dalton condition”; and “income homogeneity” or “scale independence” or “normalization.” “Anonymity” means that the names of the individuals are irrelevant to the question of inequality. “Population homogeneity” refers to the situation where one income distribution is an \( n \)-fold replication of another, and the two distributions are regarded as equal. “Transfer principle” is an income transfer from a rich person to a poor person that does not make the poor richer of the two, and which reduces inequality. “Income homogeneity” is a relative inequality measure that is scale-invariant or homogeneous of degree zero in incomes.\(^9\) Alternatively, these properties are referred to, respectively, as “weak principle of transfers”, “principle of population”, “decomposability”, and “income scale independence”.\(^10\)

Of the above income inequality measures, the weak principle of transfers is satisfied by \( G, V, c, T, H, A, \) and \( D \) and failed by \( v1 \) and \( v2 \). The property of income scale independence is satisfied by all aforementioned inequality measures except \( V \) and \( D \). All measures except \( D \) and \( H \) satisfy the principle of population. Decomposability is satisfied by all except \( v1 \), \( v2 \), and \( G \). Although the Gini coefficient is the most popular income inequality measure, we consider only the three measures that satisfy all four properties, \( c, T, \) and \( A \).

Once the income inequality measures are selected, we incorporate them into the model through the private consumption equations, similar to what Qin (2003) has done. The consumption equations are of the form:

\[
PCON_i = f(PCINC_i, IR\%_i, P\#C_i, PCINC_i - INEQ_i, INEQ_i) i = r, u
\]

where \( PCON \) denotes per capita consumption, \( PCINC \) denotes per capita income, \( P\#C \) denotes the consumer price index, \( INEQ \) denotes income inequality measures, \( IR\% \) denotes the interest rate on demand deposits, the subscript \( i \) denotes subgroup of rural and urban households, and \( t \) denotes time. To get rid of the scale factors, we assume there are log-linear relationships between the variables, except for the interest rate and income inequality variables.

The effect of income inequality on consumption (and therefore savings) is of uncertain sign a priori; see for example, Ray (1998). If marginal savings increase with income, then an increase in income inequality, insofar as it is equivalent to a transfer of income to the relatively rich, will mean an increase in aggregate savings \textit{ceteris paribus}. On the other hand, if marginal savings decrease with income, an increase in income inequality could lower savings.

In practice, regressions directly based on the log-linear form of equation (1) risks nonsense results due to the nonstationarity of most economic time series. Hence, we adopt the general → specific dynamic modeling approach of Hendry (1995). Specifically, we start with an autoregressive distributed-lag model based on equation (1), gradually reduce and re-parameterize it into a

---

\(^9\) Absolute inequality and relative inequality are not alternative measures of the same underlying concepts; they measure fundamentally different concepts. Absolute inequality relies on dollar differences in real incomes, whereas relative inequality is measured in terms of income ratios.

\(^10\) Cowell (1995) identifies an additional property: strong principle of transfers. An inequality measure satisfies this property if any transfer of income from a “rich” household to a “poor” one generates a reduction in inequality that increases as the distance between the two households’ incomes increases.
parsimonious, data-congruent, and economically interpretable ECM. Statistical diagnostic tests, parameter constancy tests, and economic interpretability of individual coefficients are used extensively as the main criteria in the model reduction.\footnote{The softwares PcGive 10.0 and PcGETS 1.0 are used in the model reduction and estimation (see Doornik and Hendry 2001).} We pay particular attention to individual parameter constancy, as this is vital in ensuring relatively high confidence in model forecasts and simulations.

V. ECONOMETRIC MODEL RESULTS

As mentioned in Section 4, three types of income inequality measures that satisfy all the four properties are chosen to be included in the PRC model, and these are the coefficient of variation, Theil’s index, and Atkinson’s index. Through modeling experiments, we find that the results are consistent for all three measures but that using Theil’s index generally produces a more parsimonious model. For this reason, we decide to use Theil’s index as the inequality measure in the model. The sample size is 1992Q1–2003Q4. A simple smoothing method is used to interpolate annual income inequality measures into quarterly series.

Tables 2 and 3 present the final model reduction and estimation results of the two consumption equations based on equation (1) together with the original equations and the relevant diagnostic test statistics.\footnote{The original equations are from the 2004 version of the PRC model, which is also used for the later simulations. The model presented in Qin et al. (2006) contains some modifications of that version.} The original equations are simply formulated without the inequality measures, i.e.:

\[
P_{\text{CON}it} = f(P_{\text{INC}it}, P_{\text{IR}it}, P_{\text{UR}it})
\]

A number of interesting observations are discernible from the tables. First, the encompassing test statistics show that the inclusion of income inequality measures improves the equations significantly. Second, changes in Theil’s inequality measures are found to exert only short-run impact. These two results corroborate the classical finding of Staehle (1937 and 1938) that income inequality cannot be ignored in determining aggregate consumption, especially when income inequality is changing over time. Noticeably, urban and rural households react to the changing gap between urban and rural income inequality measures and, in addition, urban households also react to changes in urban income inequality. The short-run, positive reaction of rural households toward consumption with respect to increasing income inequality may be explained by the fact that the rural households became more dependent on cash consumption rather than self-sustained consumption during the sample period. Finally, an increase in average income level of the urban/rural households relative to the rural/urban households is found to exert significantly negative long-run impact on the urban/rural consumption. This suggests that urban/rural households exhibit a greater savings motive when they perceive their income growing steadily faster than their rural/urban counterparts. This result partly conforms to the theory that income inequality affects aggregate demand negatively in the long run (see Zweimüller 2000).
### TABLE 2

**PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF URBAN HOUSEHOLDS**

**Without income inequality measure (Model 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta_2 \ln(\text{PCON}_u)_t$</td>
<td>-0.0305</td>
<td>(0.0107)</td>
<td>-3.05</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ $0.3742 * \Delta_2 \ln(\text{PCINC}_u)_t$</td>
<td>0.2628</td>
<td>(0.0608)</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ $0.5805 * \Delta_4 \ln(\text{PCINC}_u)_t$</td>
<td>18.5771</td>
<td>(6.306)</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 43.72 * $\Delta \text{INEQ}_u \text{t-1} - 0.7333$</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0752)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residual (standard error) 0.0245413

No autocorrelation $F(3,32) = 1.5187 \ [0.2285]$

Normality $\chi^2(2) = 3.2946 \ [0.1926]$

Homoscedasticity $F(9,25) = 1.7550 \ [0.1285]$

RESET $F(1,34) = 1.5233 \ [0.2256]$

**With income inequality measure (Model 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\Delta_3 \ln(\text{PCON}_r)_t$</td>
<td>-1.0056</td>
<td>(0.0629)</td>
<td>-16.22</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ $0.2338 * \Delta_3 \ln(\text{PCINC}_r)_t$</td>
<td>-0.0095</td>
<td>(0.0329)</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residual (standard error) 0.0245413

No autocorrelation $F(3,28) = 1.6566 \ [0.1989]$

Normality $\chi^2(2) = 3.2946 \ [0.1926]$

Homoscedasticity $F(16,14) = 1.7550 \ [0.0615]$

RESET $F(1,30) = 0.9166 \ [0.3460]$

Note: The variable notations are given in the appendix. As $\Delta_k$ denotes second-order difference, i.e., $x_{t-k} - x_{t-k-2}$. SQ denotes quarterly seasonal dummy. The statistics in the brackets below coefficient estimates are standard errors. The statistics in the squared brackets following test statistics are the associated probabilities; the ** mark indicates that the probability is smaller than 1%, i.e., strongly rejecting the null hypothesis.
**TABLE 3**

**PER CAPITA CONSUMPTION OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS**

Without income inequality measure (Model 1)

\[
\Delta_3 \ln(\text{PCONr})_t = -1.0056 + 0.2338 * \text{SQ1} - 0.0095 * \Delta_3 \left( \text{IR\%} - 100 * \Delta_4 \ln(\text{P#C}) \right)_t + 0.0058 * \Delta_3 \left( \text{IR\%} - 100 * \Delta_4 \ln(\text{P#C}) \right)_{t-3} + 0.3755 * \Delta_3 \ln(\text{PCINCr})_t + 0.3537 * \Delta_3 \left( \ln \left( \frac{\text{PCINCr}}{\text{PCINCu}} \right) \right)_{t-1} + 0.1525 * \Delta \left( \ln \left( \frac{\text{PCINCr}}{\text{PCINCu}} \right) \right)_{t-2} + 16.939 * \Delta(\text{INEQr} - \text{INEQu})_t - 0.9921 * (0.0659)
\]

Residual diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostics</th>
<th>Value (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(standard error)</td>
<td>0.03896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No autocorrelation</td>
<td>F(3,30) = 1.7641 [0.1753]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normality</td>
<td>F(11,21) = 0.9133 [0.5451]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homoscedasticity</td>
<td>F(1,32) = 0.1853 [0.6697]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With income inequality measure (Model 2)

\[
\Delta_3 \ln(\text{PCONr})_t = -1.0056 + 0.2338 * \text{SQ1} - 0.0095 * \Delta_3 \left( \text{IR\%} - 100 * \Delta_4 \ln(\text{P#C}) \right)_t + 0.0058 * \Delta_3 \left( \text{IR\%} - 100 * \Delta_4 \ln(\text{P#C}) \right)_{t-3} + 0.3755 * \Delta_3 \ln(\text{PCINCr})_t + 0.3537 * \Delta_3 \left( \ln \left( \frac{\text{PCINCr}}{\text{PCINCu}} \right) \right)_{t-1} + 0.1525 * \Delta \left( \ln \left( \frac{\text{PCINCr}}{\text{PCINCu}} \right) \right)_{t-2} + 16.939 * \Delta(\text{INEQr} - \text{INEQu})_t - 0.9921 * (0.0659)
\]

Residual diagnostics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostics</th>
<th>Value (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(standard error)</td>
<td>0.03023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No autocorrelation</td>
<td>F(3,26) = 0.8101 [0.4998]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normality</td>
<td>F(15,13) = 0.6528 [0.7869]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homoscedasticity</td>
<td>F(1,28) = 0.2033 [0.6556]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Encompassing test Cox

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>Value (P-value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ericsson IV</td>
<td>N(0,1) = -6.590 [0.0000]**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sargan</td>
<td>N(0,1) = 3.871 [0.0001]**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Model</td>
<td>2 (6) = 15.470 [0.0169]**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See the note in Table 2.
Of course, it is inconclusive to infer that income inequality is definitely harmful for long-run aggregate demand by looking at the consumption effects alone. One also needs to take into account the effect of income inequality—even indirect ones—on the other variables. For instance, suppressed consumption will raise savings and hence may encourage investment, and eventually enhance future consumption. To investigate the overall macro impact of income inequality, we carry out a number of model simulations, which are presented in the next section.

VI. MODEL SIMULATIONS

In order to study how income inequality affects growth and the macro economy, we substitute, in the ADB PRC model, the two consumption equations without inequality measures (Model 1 in Tables 2 and 3) by the two equations with the measures (Model 2 in Tables 2 and 3), and carry out two sets of model simulations. The base run assumes that income inequality is constant at the 2003Q4 level from the beginning of 2004 up to the end of the simulation period, which covers 2005Q1–2010Q4.

13 The simulations are carried out using WinSolve. See Pierse (2001) for a detailed description of the software.
14 The simulations start from 2005Q1 to avoid the periods where there are already actual values for the variables of interest, even though the data series of the inequality measures end at 2003Q4.
The first set of simulations is the conventional impulse, step, and trend shocks on each of the urban and rural inequality measures. These shocks are defined below.

(i) Impulse shock is the increase in inequality for one year (2005Q1–2005Q4) by 10% from its 2003Q4 level; upon which it returns to the 2003Q4 level at 2006Q1 and remains so to the end of the simulation period.

(ii) Step shock is the increase in inequality by 10% from its 2003Q4 level at 2005Q1, and remains so to the end of the simulation period.

(iii) Trend shock is the linear increase in inequality at 10% per annum starting from 2005Q1. The growth rate is chosen with reference to the increase in overall Theil index during recent years, e.g., 9% in 2002 and 13% in 2003 (see also the bottom left panel of Figure 2).

Notice that $INEQu$ and $INEQr$, the inequality measures, are calculated from panel data whereas $PCINCu$ and $PCINCr$, the household per capita income series, are taken from China Monthly Economic Indicators (NBS 2005). Therefore, the shocks defined above implicitly assume that changes in $INEQu$ and $INEQr$ do not affect $PCINCu$ and $PCINCr$ directly. However, as the income variables are endogenous in the model, they will be affected indirectly by changes in the inequality measures. Hence, the only assumption we need to make is that the shocks do not affect the income levels at the initial point when they first occur. In Figures 4 and 5, the indirect effect of the shocks on $PCINCu$ and $PCINCr$ are plotted (top panels). It is interesting to see that increasing urban income inequality would, to a large extent, stimulate the growth of both urban and rural average income level whereas both urban and rural average incomes would decline from increasing rural income inequality. More interestingly, the rural household income growth would not be significantly affected downward if the inequality situation keeps evolving at the present pace (the trend shock case), unless there is an abrupt deterioration in income inequality (the impulse and step shock cases). Nevertheless, this result highlights the need, at the macro level, to address rural income inequality, especially considering that much of the poverty is concentrated in the rural areas in the PRC.

Figures 4 and 5 also demonstrate, for the urban and rural sectors respectively, the effects of the inequality shocks on GDP, its supply-side components of the three sector output, and its demand-side components of private consumption and capital formation, all measured in constant price. In the urban scenario (Figure 4), rural inequality is assumed to remain at its 2003Q4 level throughout the simulation period. The same applies to the rural scenario (Figure 5). It can be seen that the overall effects of rising inequality on GDP growth are almost negligibly small. In the urban scenario, rising inequality appears to stimulate slightly the production of the industry and services sectors if viewed from the supply side of GDP. Agriculture seems to be the only sector that would get virtually no long-run benefit. In comparison, agriculture is slightly worse off and the other two sectors are significantly worse off in the rural scenario.

From the demand side of GDP, private consumption is the most responsive to income inequality shocks in terms of both velocity and volatility, with the response rapidly tapering off to virtually zero. This is not surprising given the household consumption equations reported in Tables 2 and 3. The volatility in aggregate consumption undulates on to aggregate investment, whose responses oscillate more persistently and more strongly than those of the three sectors. In a recent study by Qin, Cagas, He, and Quising (2006), impulse shocks in investment are found to affect the
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output growth in the industry and services sectors far more than that of the agricultural sector. This helps to explain why the output growth of the three sectors responds so differently to the inequality shocks. If judged by economic stability, the simulation results show that changing inequality adversely affects the stability by encouraging more volatility in the growth of aggregate consumption, investment, and GDP.

The second set of simulations tests the effects of income inequality as measured by the urban and rural income gap, $\text{PCINC}_u/\text{PCINC}_r$. Default forecasting shows that this gap remains at about 2.5 (i.e., urban per capita income is two and half times of rural per capita income on average) for the foreseeable future. Here the interest is to see what happens to the economy when the current gap narrows versus the situation when it widens. The simulations are designed as follows: the narrowing gap scenario assumes that beginning 2005Q1, the government gives a lump-sum transfer to the rural households equivalent to 1% of the previous year’s GDP; the widening gap scenario, on the other hand, assumes that the government taxes the rural household income an amount equivalent to 1% of the previous year’s GDP. The two scenarios amount to shifting the existing income gap by 0.15 roughly during the simulation period, as shown in Figure 6. It is clear from the figure that, for the most part, the two scenarios result in opposite effects. Narrowing the income gap has an immediate and sustained positive impact on GDP growth over the simulation period, whereas widening the gap has a negative immediate effect that eventually tapers off and becomes positive toward the end of the simulation period. On the whole, the narrowing-gap scenario results in weaker macroeconomic responses in terms of magnitude as rural households account for a smaller share of aggregate private consumption than urban households.

In terms of dynamics, the step shocks of changing urban and rural income gaps affect private consumption almost immediately and very significantly, and in turn its responses are transmitted to investment, agricultural production, industrial production, and services supply. The narrowing-gap scenario initially boosts aggregate private consumption by up to around 2.7% in the short run, whereas the widening-gap scenario depresses it, and both effects recede quickly to about 0.15~0.19% in absolute value in the long run. Consumption responses in turn are transmitted to demand for sectoral output, especially for agricultural produce and services, and these undulate on to investment demand as well. Notice that the responses of the secondary sector follow closely those of investment, only on a smaller scale, as this is the sector that is most dependent on investment. In comparison, the primary and tertiary sectors are more demand-driven. Hence their growths are buoyed by the increase in disposable income in the narrowing-gap scenario, and vice versa in the widening-gap scenario.

Compared to the results from the first set of simulations, the results of the second set show evidently that further widening of rural-urban income inequality would hinder economic growth, while narrowing the inequality would actually boost long-run growth. Overall, the simulations suggest that further disparate income distribution is unlikely to contribute favorably to sustaining steady economic growth in the long run, even though the likely adverse impact may not yet be very significant at the macro level.

---

15 The simulations implicitly assume that the taxes and transfers are proportional to household incomes so that within-urban and within-rural inequalities are unaffected.
VI. CONCLUSION

Macroeconometric models are incapable of tackling the issue of how income inequality affects growth empirically for lack of explicit channels relating aggregate income and consumption to income distribution. The present study runs a pilot experiment to incorporate panel data information into a macro econometric model so that the issue of how income inequality affects growth can be studied through model simulations. The PRC is used as the pilot field. A panel of provincial urban and rural household income data is used to construct income inequality measures, which are used to augment the urban and rural consumption equations of the ADB PRC model. Simulations are then carried out on the modified model to show how future changes in income inequality would affect the macro economy.

Through model augmentation, the rapidly changing income inequality is found to exert significant impact on consumption of both urban and rural households. While rising urban income inequality holds back urban consumption in the short run, increase in the relative income level between rural and urban areas is found to stimulate household savings in the long run.

Through model simulations, we observe several interesting results. We find that significant changes in income inequality—whether within-urban, within-rural, or urban-rural—carry negative effects on macroeconomic stability as they cause consumption and then investment to undulate. Comparing the effects of shocking each of the urban and rural inequality measures, we find that increases in urban inequality carry more favorable (or less negative) effects to the macro economy than increases in rural inequality. In simulating the impact of changing urban-rural average income disparity, we see that GDP growth is highest in the long run when urban-rural income gap is narrowed (i.e., rural-favorable growth), as compared with the scenario where it is widened; and that the urban-favorable growth scenario (widening urban-rural gap) would only benefit the industrial sector in the long run.

Several extensions of the present study are desirable. First, it is desirable to extend the consumption block to base it on panel data entirely so as to achieve data consistency between aggregate income levels and income inequality measures. Secondly, it is desirable to explore explicit links between income inequality and employment distribution among the three sectors of GDP. More data would be needed for this extension. Thirdly, it is desirable to extend the fiscal block of the model to establish explicit links between income inequality and income redistribution policies. The last aspect is especially important since significant alleviation of income inequality entails powerful fiscal policy measures (see Besley and Burgess 2003). Whichever direction of extension, a wider mix of time-series and panel data in macroeconometric modeling seems the desirable way forward.
## APPENDIX

### MAIN DATA SOURCES AND VARIABLE DEFINITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLES</th>
<th>DEFINITION</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GDP</strong>&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Gross domestic product, quarterly frequency (million yuan, in 1992Q1 price)</td>
<td>CMEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INEQ&lt;sub&gt;u&lt;/sub&gt;</strong>, <strong>INEQ&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;</strong></td>
<td>Income inequality measures, quarterly frequency interpolated from annual data (Theil’s index is the final choice)</td>
<td>Authors’ calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IR</strong>&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Interest rate on demand deposits, quarterly frequency</td>
<td>CMEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PC</strong></td>
<td>Consumer price index, quarterly frequency 1992Q1=100</td>
<td>CMEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCINC&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;r</strong></td>
<td>Provincial per capita net income of rural households of the PRC, annual frequency (yuan)</td>
<td>CSDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCINC</strong>&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Per capita net income of rural households of the PRC, quarterly frequency (yuan)</td>
<td>CMEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCINC&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;u</strong></td>
<td>Provincial per capita disposable income of urban households of the PRC, annual frequency (yuan)</td>
<td>CSDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCINC</strong>&lt;sub&gt;u&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Per capita disposable income of urban households of the PRC (yuan)</td>
<td>CMEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCON&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;</strong></td>
<td>Per capita living consumption of rural households of the PRC, quarterly frequency (yuan)</td>
<td>CSDM &amp; CMEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCON</strong>&lt;sub&gt;u&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Per capita living consumption of urban households of the PRC, quarterly frequency (yuan)</td>
<td>CSDM &amp; CMEI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POP&lt;sub&gt;r&lt;/sub&gt;</strong></td>
<td>Population of rural PRC, annual frequency (1000 persons)</td>
<td>SYC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POP&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;r</strong></td>
<td>Provincial population of rural PRC, annual frequency (1000 persons)</td>
<td>CSDM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POP&lt;sub&gt;u&lt;/sub&gt;</strong></td>
<td>Population of urban PRC, annual frequency (1000 persons)</td>
<td>SYC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>POP&lt;sub&gt;i&lt;/sub&gt;u</strong></td>
<td>Provincial population of urban PRC, annual frequency (1000 persons)</td>
<td>CSDM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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