

Leitner, Sebastian; Stehrer, Robert

Research Report

Drivers of Inequality and Poverty in the CEE and other EU Member States

wiiw Research Report, No. 398

Provided in Cooperation with:

The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies (wiiw) - Wiener Institut für Internationale Wirtschaftsvergleiche (wiiw)

Suggested Citation: Leitner, Sebastian; Stehrer, Robert (2014) : Drivers of Inequality and Poverty in the CEE and other EU Member States, wiiw Research Report, No. 398, The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies (wiiw), Vienna

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/204170>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

NOVEMBER 2014

Research Report 398

Drivers of Inequality and Poverty in the CEE and other EU Member States

A Shapley Value Decomposition Analysis

Sebastian Leitner and Robert Stehrer



Drivers of Inequality and Poverty in the CEE and other EU Member States

A Shapley Value Decomposition Analysis

SEBASTIAN LEITNER

ROBERT STEHRER

Sebastian Leitner is Research Economist at the Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies (wiiw). Robert Stehrer is wiiw Deputy Scientific Director.



This report is based upon research within the GRINCOH project which has received funding from the European Union's Seventh Framework Programme for research, technological development and demonstration under grant agreement no. 290657.



The project involves the following organisations: Centre for European Regional and Local Studies (EUROREG, Coordinator), Academia de Studii Economice Bucuresti (ASE), Building Environment, Science and Technology (BEST), European Policies Research Centre (EPRC), Institute of Baltic Studies (IBS), Centre

for Economic and Regional Studies, Hungarian Academy of Sciences (IEHAS), Institute for Economic Research (IER), Halle Institute for Economic Research (IWH), University College London (UCL), Karelian Institute – University of Eastern Finland (UEF), The Centre for Research in Economic Policy, University of Pécs (UP), The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies (wiiw)

For more information about GRINCOH please refer to the project's website: <http://www.grincob.eu>

Abstract

Inequality is a multidimensional phenomenon though it is often discussed along a single dimension such as income. This is also the case for the various decomposition approaches of inequality indices by recipients or income sources. In this paper we study one- and multidimensional indices on inequality on data for CEE EU Member States in comparison to other EU countries, including four dimensions in our measure of multidimensional inequality: income, health, education and housing, and apply various decomposition methods to these one- and multidimensional indices and also to a poverty index. In doing so, we apply standard decomposition techniques to the mean logarithmic deviation index (I_0) and decompositions based on regression analysis in conjunction with the Shapley value approach to Gini indices.

Keywords: inequality decomposition, multidimensional inequality, poverty

JEL classification: A13, D31, I32

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	One- and multidimensional inequality	2
3.	Data	4
4.	Descriptive results and subgroup decomposition	6
5.	A Shapley-value decomposition of multidimensional inequality indices	15
6.	Conclusions	22
	References	25
	Appendix	27

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1 / OLS regression results for subjective health status	5
Table 2 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: attribute household income, between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (I_0)	10
Table 3 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: attribute household health status, between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (I_0)	11
Table 4 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: attribute household education level, between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (I_0)	12
Table 5 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: attribute housing, between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (I_0)	13
Table 6 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: Maasoumi inequality index ($\beta = 0.25$), between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (I_0)	14
Table 7 / Regression results: Dependent variable: logarithm of equivalised household income (modified OECD equivalence scale)	18
Table A.1 / Regression results: Dependent variable: logarithm of multidimensional welfare indicator (modified OECD equivalence scale)	28
Figure 1 / Gini indices and poverty rates of disposable household income p. c. equivalised	6
Figure 2 / Gini indices and poverty rates of average conditional health status of households	6
Figure 3 / Gini indices and poverty rates of housing indicator	7
Figure 4 / Gini indices and poverty rates of average educational attainment levels of households	7
Figure 5 / Gini indices and poverty rates based on the Maasoumi index of household multidimensional welfare	8
Figure 6 / Shapley value decomposition of inequality in household income Contributions of variables to total Gini index	20
Figure 7 / Shapely value decomposition of multidimensional inequality Contributions of variables to total Gini-index	20
Figure 8 / Shapely value decomposition of poverty in household income Contributions of variables to total Poverty rate (headcount index: below 60% of median income)	21

1. Introduction

Inequality is a multidimensional phenomenon though it is often discussed along a single dimension such as income which is the variable most often under consideration. This focus on a single variable – and income in particular – is even more common when decompositions of inequality indices are applied. In this paper we instead consider inequality as a multidimensional concept for which different variables have to be taken into account simultaneously. Recently a large body of research has started to focus on this multidimensional character of inequality together with the development of appropriate indices including more than one dimension simultaneously (see Weymark, 2004; Justino, 2005; Lugo, 2005; Savaglio, 2006a and 2006b; Cowell and Fiori, 2009). In this paper we provide a brief discussion of the commonly suggested multidimensional indices on inequality and apply these using EU-SILC data for CEE EU Member States and other EU countries (except for Cyprus and Ireland) for 2010. In doing so, we include four dimensions to study inequality: income, health, education and housing. This exercise yields important insights into dimensions of inequality and changes in the respective measures when more than one perspective is taken into account.

The measurement of inequality along these dimensions and the cross-country comparisons are, however, only a first step. In a second step, we contribute to explanations of the single- and multidimensional inequality indices by using decomposition methods (in line with the decomposition techniques known for one-dimensional decomposition methods with respect to income recipients). We apply various decomposition methods to these multidimensional indices: First, we apply standard decomposition techniques to the mean logarithmic deviation index (I_0) – i.e. subgroup decompositions – and, second, a decomposition approach based on the Shapley value approach which allows to assess the relative importance of explanatory factors for inequality. The latter gained some attention in the one-dimensional case (see, for example, Shorrocks, 1999; Wan, 2004; Israeli, 2007; Molini and Wan, 2008). To our knowledge this is the first attempt to apply this regression-based technique to multidimensional inequality indices for a multitude of EU countries.

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2 we provide a brief discussion of important one- and multi-dimensional inequality indices used throughout the paper. We then discuss the most important aspects of the data we use (sources, measurement issues and definitions) in Section 3. Section 4 summarises some descriptive statistics on the data used, the results from the subgroup decomposition analysis to each of the four dimensions of inequality considered in this paper and the results from the subgroup decomposition for the multidimensional mean logarithmic deviation index. In Section 5 we then introduce the concept of the Shapley decomposition and discuss the way we apply this method in the single- and multi-dimensional case. Further we present the results of this decomposition method for the one- and multidimensional case and a decomposition of the poverty headcount index for the one-dimensional case of household income. Section 6 concludes.

2. One- and multidimensional inequality

2.1. THE ONE-DIMENSIONAL CASE

Measuring and detecting the determinants of inequality based on household survey data has a long tradition in the literature. Already in the 1970s a wide range of inequality measures existed and their properties were described in detail e.g. in two essential publications of that strand of research, Sen's 'On Economic Inequality' (1973) and Atkinson's 'The Economics of Inequality' (1975). In general, inequality measurement is based on two different (classes of) measures, the first being the well-known and most frequently used Gini index,

$$G = \frac{N+1}{N-1} - \frac{2}{N(N-1)\mu} \sum_{i=1}^N \rho_i y_i$$

Here N denotes the number of observations, y_i is the variable under consideration (e.g. income) and ρ_i denotes the share of units with a specific income (or expenditure) value in the total population¹. The second group of indices considered is the generalised class of entropy measures defined as

$$I_\alpha = \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[1 - \left(\frac{y_i}{\mu} \right)^\alpha \right] \quad \text{for } \alpha \neq 0, 1$$

In both equations y_i denotes the income or expenditures (consumption) of the unit (individuals or households i), N is the number of units and μ is average income (or expenditure) in the total sample. In the formula of the generalised class of entropy measures, the parameter α can be seen as an indicator of inequality aversion and it also indicates the sensitivity to transfers at different parts of the distribution (for a negative α the index is sensitive to changes in the distribution that affect the lower tail); see Sen (1997) for a discussion and the frequently cited Jenkins (1995) for application and discussion. This allows, e.g., to focus on changes in the lower part of the income distribution, which might be more problematic with respect to social cohesion. For the limiting cases of $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ the entropy measure becomes Theil's second measure or the mean logarithmic deviation

$$I_0 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \ln \frac{\mu}{y_i}$$

which we apply in the single- and multidimensional case (see Section 4.2 below). For $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ it becomes the well-known Theil measure (I_1). For $\alpha = 2$ the measure becomes the half squared coefficient of variation (I_2).

2.2. THE MULTIDIMENSIONAL CASE

One of the first authors to introduce a measure of multidimensional distributions of well-being based on the theory of information was Maasoumi (1986, 1999); see also Lugo (2005) for a detailed discussion.

1 Note that the Gini index can be expressed in different ways.

He proposed to construct a multivariate inequality index in a two-stage procedure. First, the attributes for each unit (e.g. individuals or households) are aggregated via an aggregator function yielding a real number S_i for each person. Second, a one-dimensional measure of inequality of the family of Generalised Entropy measures is calculated. This is based on the idea that different indicators of economic welfare are distributed differently; therefore Maasoumi suggests an aggregator with a distribution that most closely represents the distributional information in each attribute. In particular he proposes a multivariate generalisation of the generalised entropy measure of divergence (the Kullback-Leibler distance) or closeness between the k densities (weighted sum of the pairwise divergence terms) and arrives at a distance measure D of the following form:

$$D_\beta(S, X, w) = \sum_{k=1}^K d_k \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N S_i \left[\left(\frac{S_i}{x_{ik}} \right)^{-\beta} \right] / \beta(\beta - 1) \right\} \quad \text{for } \beta \neq 1$$

It is shown that the optimal aggregation function of S which minimises D_β becomes

$$S_i = \left(\sum_{k=1}^K w_k x_{ik}^\beta \right)^{1/\beta}$$

where w_k is the weight given to the k -th attribute in the total aggregator function. The real number S_i denotes then the general weighted mean, called the 'well-being indicator' for unit i , with the Cobb-Duglas function as a special case (for $\beta \rightarrow 0$). The parameter β is related to the degree of substitutability between attributes and determines the shape of the contours for all pairs of attributes, identical for all pairs. The elasticity of substitution is given by $1/(1 - \beta)$. The smaller β , the smaller is the elasticity of substitution between the attributes under consideration. For the second stage an index of the generalised entropy family is applied to these weighted means S_i . In this paper we apply the index of mean logarithmic deviation in Section 4.3, which in this case becomes (see also above)

$$I_{M0} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \ln \frac{\mu}{S_i}$$

In Section 5 however, the results of the Shapley value decomposition presented stem from a Gini index for income inequality and a multidimensional (Maasoumi-based) Gini index.

3. Data

The data for the analysis presented in this paper are drawn from EU-SILC for the year 2010. The four variables used as attributes for calculating the multidimensional welfare levels and the respective inequality indices thereof are: household income, household health status, household education level and housing level. Let us discuss them in turn.

The first dimension of multidimensional welfare considered is household income: In order to apply methodologically comparable household income data for all countries we adjusted the variable 'Total disposable household income' (HY020) by adding the variable 'Non-cash employee income' (PY020N). The resulting household income variable was then divided by the modified OECD equivalence scale (1-0.5-0.3), in order to obtain a household income variable adjusted for household composition differences. Obviously the needs of a household grow with each additional member but – due to economies of scale in consumption – not in a proportional way, e.g. for housing space, electricity, etc. With the help of equivalence scales each household type in the population is assigned a value in proportion to its needs. In our case a weight of 1 is assigned to the household head, a weight of 0.5 to all further members of the household aged 14 years or above and a weight of 0.3 to household members aged 0-13 years.

Household health status: For the analysis we used data on the subjective health status of all household members. We drew on the EU-SILC variable 'General health' (PH010). The variable presents the subjective health status of a household member ranging from 1 (very good) to 5 (very bad). Since the health status of an individual obviously depends very much upon the age of the person, we calculated a 'conditional health status'. Thus we estimated for each individual country the linear age effect on subjective health with an OLS regression (see Table 1 below) and used the estimation results to calculate a projected health status for every individual. The residual between the projected health status and the actual health status is taken as the 'conditional health status' of a person. The average of the 'conditional health status' over all household members is then used as the household health status. In addition we rescaled the variable from 0 to 1.

Household education level: For this indicator we use the mean level of years in education of all household members above 15 years of age who finished schooling or education in general. The years in education were calculated by using the variable highest education level attained by individuals (EU-SILC variable 'PE040: Highest ISCED level attained'). The household members were then assigned with the years in education needed to attain their respective education level. The household education level is then calculated as the average over those household members.

Housing level: Here we calculate a combined attribute from two variables: dwelling space and dwelling problems of the household. We used the number of rooms in the dwelling divided by the equivalised household size. The EU-SILC (HH040, HH080/081, HH090/091 and HS160 to HS190) variables contain information on problems with the dwelling (e.g. not enough daylight, noise from neighbours or outside, etc.). For the variable dwelling problems we summed up the indicated problems for each household.

Both variables, dwelling space and dwelling problems, were scaled from 0 to 1 and the mean of both taken to result in the final housing level of the respective household.

For the decomposition analysis by subgroups of the four above-described attributes of the multidimensional inequality analysis in Section 4 and the Shapley value decomposition in Section 5 we used the following variables: gender and age group of the head of the household, urban versus rural household (EU-SILC: DB100), educational attainment group (PE040) and activity status (PL031: employee, self-employed, unemployed, retired, other inactive) of the head of the household and household level employment rate (calculated as employed as a share of total household members above 15 years of age and not in education).

Table 1 / OLS regression results for subjective health status

country	age		constant		R2
	coefficient	p-value	coefficient	p-value	
AT	-0.027	0.000	5.177	0.000	0.232
BE	-0.021	0.000	4.881	0.000	0.164
BG	-0.035	0.000	5.306	0.000	0.440
CZ	-0.035	0.000	5.316	0.000	0.374
DE	-0.021	0.000	4.768	0.000	0.183
DK	-0.012	0.000	4.516	0.000	0.052
EE	-0.029	0.000	4.794	0.000	0.337
ES	-0.024	0.000	4.858	0.000	0.242
FI	-0.022	0.000	4.893	0.000	0.200
FR	-0.024	0.000	4.925	0.000	0.226
GR	-0.038	0.000	5.892	0.000	0.413
HU	-0.036	0.000	5.145	0.000	0.401
IT	-0.026	0.000	4.937	0.000	0.291
LT	-0.032	0.000	4.865	0.000	0.399
LU	-0.021	0.000	4.891	0.000	0.149
LV	-0.027	0.000	4.547	0.000	0.343
MT	-0.022	0.000	4.797	0.000	0.243
NL	-0.014	0.000	4.635	0.000	0.086
PL	-0.036	0.000	5.171	0.000	0.419
PT	-0.029	0.000	4.673	0.000	0.313
RO	-0.035	0.000	5.436	0.000	0.436
SE	-0.014	0.000	4.744	0.000	0.085
SI	-0.028	0.000	4.900	0.000	0.257
SK	-0.037	0.000	5.283	0.000	0.427
UK	-0.016	0.000	4.896	0.000	0.111


Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

4. Descriptive results and subgroup decomposition

4.1. DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS


In Figures 1 to 4 we present the Gini coefficients of one-dimensional inequality and poverty in the four attributes income, health status, housing and education for all EU countries (except for Cyprus and Ireland for which no EU-SILC data are available for 2010). As can be seen, income inequality is, when measured by the Gini index, quite low in 2010 in most Central European and Scandinavian countries (see Figure 1) and much higher in e.g. Bulgaria, Lithuania and Latvia as well as the United Kingdom and the crisis-hit Southern EU rim (Spain, Portugal and Greece). The ranking of the countries does not change too much when ordered by poverty rates. Nevertheless, Bulgaria and Romania are those two CEE EU Member States that together with Spain account for the highest income poverty levels in the EU.

Figure 1 / Gini indices and poverty rates of disposable household income p. c. equivalised



Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations; Note: CEE Countries are highlighted in blue.


Figure 2 / Gini indices and poverty rates of average conditional health status of households



Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations; Note: CEE Countries are highlighted in blue.


Obviously the inequality for the attributes conditional household health status and housing is lower than for the attribute income (see Figures 2 and 3). However, inequality in the conditional health status of households is in all CEE EU Member States (as in Portugal and Greece) higher than in the rest of the EU. Concerning the level of inequality in housing quality (and space) a similar picture emerges. However, inequality in housing in the Czech Republic, Slovenia and Slovakia again equals that in the Scandinavian countries as was the case for the attribute income. Although inequality is in general much lower for housing compared to income, it should be pointed out that e.g. in Latvia the level of inequality in housing is almost double that in most Scandinavian countries.

Figure 3 / Gini indices and poverty rates of housing indicator



Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations; Note: CEE Countries are highlighted in blue.

Figure 4 / Gini indices and poverty rates of average educational attainment levels of households




Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations; Note: CEE Countries are highlighted in blue.

The average household education level however is also quite unequally distributed over the population (see Figure 4). Here, the level of inequality is much higher especially in South European countries than in Central and North European countries. Remarkably, the CEE EU Member States have comparably low levels of inequality in this respect, although in Poland and Romania a relatively large share of households have substantially lower levels of education compared to the level of the median household in their country as shown by the respective poverty rates.

In order to study multidimensional inequality, Figure 5 presents the Gini indices based on the Maasoumi index as discussed above. For the aggregation one has to specify a weight for each of the attributes considered. We applied the same weights to the four above-described attributes² which we scaled from 0 to 1. Another choice has to be made on the degree of substitutability in the aggregation function. The higher the elasticity of substitution, the lower is the level of the multidimensional inequality index. A higher degree of substitutability means that low levels on one of the attributes can be compensated more easily by high levels on another (Lugo, 2005). For Figure 5 the presented Gini indices were based on a Maasoumi index for $\beta = 0.25$. This value was chosen in order to present results for a case where some, but not perfect, substitution is possible.

Figure 5 / Gini indices and poverty rates based on the Maasoumi index of household multidimensional welfare



Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations; Note: CEE Countries are highlighted in blue.

As can be seen from Figure 5, the results of the Gini indices with respect to the ranking of countries is very much driven by the attributes that have the highest levels in inequality, which are the income inequality and the inequality in educational attainment levels of households. Thus, again Slovakia and the Czech Republic are to be found in the group of EU countries with low levels of inequality, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland and the two Baltic countries Latvia and Lithuania among those with comparably high levels, and Slovenia, Hungary and Estonia in the middle group.

4.2. SUBGROUP DECOMPOSITION

In this section we present results from the decomposition analysis based on the mean logarithmic deviation as discussed above. The decomposition of the mean logarithmic deviation (MLD) inequality index can be applied in the one-dimensional case as well as in the multi-dimensional case for an analysis of the determinants of inequality observed by income recipients. The MLD can be decomposed in two terms, the within and the between component:

$$I_0 = \sum_k v_k I_{0,k} + \sum_k v_k \ln(1/\lambda_k)$$

2 Changing the weight of an attribute obviously raises or lowers the Maasoumi index depending on whether the level of inequality of the attribute is higher or lower than that of the overall Maasoumi index. A change of weights however does not alter the structure of the results of the decomposition analysis presented below, only the magnitude of the results change.

where v_k denotes population shares and $\lambda_k = \mu_k/\mu$. The first term, the within component of the MLD, represents the part of the total inequality that is due to variations within the population subgroups, whereas the between component represents the part of the total inequality that accrues from differences between the means of the population subgroups.

In Tables 2-6 we present the results of the decomposition into between and within group effects of the individual attributes of the multidimensional inequality indicator as well as the results of the decomposition when applying it to the Maasoumi index for $\beta = 0.25$. The decomposition of inequality is performed by population subgroups according to different characteristics of the household or the head of the household observed. These are the gender of the head of household, the age group, urban versus rural location, education level and employment status of the head of the household as well as the household level employment rate (calculated as employed as a share of total household members above 15 years of age not being in education anymore).

The higher the between component as a share of the total inequality index, in our case the mean logarithmic deviation (I_0), the more the respective characteristic can be seen as a source of inequality in an attribute. However, the magnitude of the within and between component also depends on the partition of the population into subgroups. The higher the number of subgroups which are considered in the decomposition analysis of a specific characteristic, the higher the between group component will become by definition. Therefore the results of the decomposition analysis into within and between group components should be interpreted with caution. Comparisons over time or cross country with the same number of subgroups however can be interpreted without difficulty. In this paper we compare the results of the decomposition analysis for all EU countries (except for Cyprus and Ireland for which no data are available for that year) for 2010 in a cross-country perspective. In our analysis the number of dimensions in each subgroup does not differ too much, such that also a comparison across dimensions is done, though with care.

4.2.1. DECOMPOSITION OF EQUIVALISED PER CAPITA HOUSEHOLD INCOME

As can be seen from Table 2, the results for the EU countries differ quite substantially concerning the characteristics of heads of households influencing household income levels. In about half of the countries analysed, household income is most strongly influenced by the education level of the head of the household. On average of all countries about 16% of the income differences are accrued from that characteristic. About 15% of the income differences can be explained by the employment rates of the individual households. Further, also the characteristic of the employment status of the head of the household explains with about 10% quite a large part of income differentiation. Differences between the mean income levels of the seven age groups of the heads of household account for only about 5% of the total mean logarithmic deviation (I_0). Much lower differences can be detected when looking at the decomposition by rural and urban households (accounting for about 3% of income differences). However, in Bulgaria, Hungary, Poland and Romania alike, households residing in the countryside face a markedly worse income position than urban households. Only in the Czech Republic households headed by women face a substantially lower income position in general than those headed by men.

Table 2 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: attribute household income, between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (I_0)

Decomposition by	AT	BE	BG	CZ	DE	DK	EE
gender	1.18	2.27	0.36	6.03	1.42	0.05	1.44
age	4.20	5.11	9.62	9.15	3.01	15.39	6.06
urban / rural regions	0.45	0.01	10.96	1.57	0.21	0.61	2.52
education	12.74	18.15	24.33	16.36	11.79	9.31	11.27
empl. status	8.34	14.31	14.81	19.35	12.91	10.66	15.07
hh-empl-rate	10.85	19.71	25.47	26.67	12.01	19.54	25.14
Decomposition by	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IT	LT
gender	0.27	0.24	1.12	1.90	1.60	0.64	0.55
age	1.96	10.78	5.44	3.67	0.92	2.35	1.05
urban / rural regions	2.00	2.64	.	1.61	6.80	0.57	2.39
education	10.79	14.95	12.46	16.48	22.48	9.73	9.10
empl. status	6.88	12.65	4.14	3.42	9.98	5.55	8.55
hh-empl-rate	9.04	18.78	2.20	7.23	13.01	8.11	10.44
Decomposition by	LU	LV	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO
gender	0.67	0.29	1.10	1.05	0.67	1.33	2.26
age	1.72	5.29	3.54	5.30	1.53	3.52	2.65
urban / rural regions	0.59	2.39	.	.	7.12	3.33	14.12
education	21.50	14.60	12.02	13.34	20.42	33.70	32.68
empl. status	7.14	10.96	11.22	6.00	9.41	7.32	11.64
hh-empl-rate	7.14	16.61	25.22	8.59	12.12	7.93	6.14
Decomposition by	SE	SI	SK	UK			
gender	0.21	0.24	1.88	1.62			
age	10.88	3.26	6.60	6.06			
urban / rural regions	1.07	.	3.02	0.44			
education	5.78	23.54	9.39	13.85			
empl. status	6.38	10.74	13.37	17.30			
hh-empl-rate	13.39	17.56	24.08	20.25			

Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

4.2.2. DECOMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD HEALTH STATUS

The decomposition of inequality according to the aggregated health status of households showed that subjective health is obviously strongly influenced by the age characteristic of the household head. Since this fact may distort also other decomposition results, we calculated a conditional health variable, being the divergence of subjective health from a health status projected according to age, as already discussed above. This conditional health status was rescaled from 0 to 1. As we know from Figure 2, the conditional health status is quite equally distributed across households in all countries. Moreover, the health status of households varies only very little by gender of the head of the household and between urban and rural regions in all countries.

Nevertheless, as can be seen from Table 3 below, in all countries the education level of the head of the household seems to have some influence also on the health status of the respective household. Also those households with higher household employment rates and those headed by employed persons face a better health status.

Table 3 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: attribute household health status, between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (I_0)

Decomposition by	AT	BE	BG	CZ	DE	DK	EE
gender	0.34	0.59	0.15	0.62	0.02	0.01	0.35
age	8.17	4.87	10.01	9.96	6.57	1.11	11.16
urban / rural regions	0.00	0.02	0.44	0.02	0.03	0.03	0.00
education	3.50	3.45	2.54	2.36	1.15	1.08	2.66
empl. status	7.25	6.19	7.99	7.98	6.59	1.90	9.97
hh-empl-rate	7.04	6.20	9.64	7.77	6.67	1.53	7.59
Decomposition by	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IT	LT
gender	0.23	0.00	0.42	1.20	0.70	0.52	0.14
age	8.68	7.88	9.13	13.03	10.02	10.27	9.96
urban / rural regions	0.04	0.24	0.05	0.32	0.16	0.03	0.12
education	5.97	2.89	5.47	7.31	3.51	5.87	5.46
empl. status	7.08	5.20	6.79	7.45	7.92	6.58	8.80
hh-empl-rate	7.20	3.78	6.80	8.04	8.46	8.02	8.21
Decomposition by	LU	LV	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO
gender	0.25	0.19	1.59	0.27	0.55	0.36	2.01
age	5.14	7.38	12.38	3.37	11.82	9.04	11.83
urban / rural regions	0.13	0.18	0.09	.	0.06	0.17	0.06
education	3.50	2.78	7.90	2.29	3.50	5.86	4.38
empl. status	6.03	6.57	9.40	3.68	8.74	7.58	9.84
hh-empl-rate	6.11	6.25	10.32	3.71	10.05	7.75	10.76
Decomposition by	SE	SI	SK	UK			
gender	0.19	0.14	0.95	0.12			
age	2.71	4.30	11.97	3.70			
urban / rural regions	0.06	.	0.25	0.17			
education	1.78	1.98	3.88	2.80			
empl. status	2.50	3.72	10.24	5.53			
hh-empl-rate	2.33	3.66	11.89	5.93			

Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

4.2.3. DECOMPOSITION OF HOUSEHOLD EDUCATION LEVEL

Decomposing household education levels by the age group of the head of household indicates that obviously younger age cohorts had the chance to attain higher education levels (see Table 4). However, in most South European and some transition countries, i.e. Spain, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Malta, Lithuania, Slovakia, Romania but also France and Sweden, the differences in education between younger and older age cohorts are much more pronounced. Moreover, in Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia and Romania there are substantially higher differences between urban and rural households than in other EU countries. The decomposition by level of education of the head of the household shows that educational segregation differs quite a lot in EU countries. It is particularly high in the Czech Republic, Germany and Hungary. This also means that the level of formal education of children in those countries strongly depends upon the educational level attained by their parents. In France, Hungary, Malta, Sweden and Slovakia households with higher employment levels also have substantially higher aggregate education levels.

Table 4 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: attribute household education level, between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (l_0)

Decomposition by	AT	BE	BG	CZ	DE	DK	EE
gender	0.28	0.21	0.04	2.19	0.64	0.00	0.19
age	2.50	4.09	2.39	6.17	3.65	3.03	6.08
urban / rural regions	0.09	0.01	4.66	2.04	0.00	0.00	2.14
education	36.36	35.03	43.15	76.67	78.64	33.89	52.66
empl. status	3.39	5.17	3.28	8.91	5.69	4.59	7.01
hh-empl-rate	4.41	5.83	4.66	9.53	4.86	6.80	7.96
Decomposition by	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IT	LT
gender	0.06	0.00	0.24	0.68	1.26	0.12	0.07
age	9.60	5.64	12.66	7.35	8.75	9.48	8.67
urban / rural regions	1.17	0.44	0.62	1.31	4.99	0.45	2.18
education	33.90	37.84	54.45	28.89	77.54	33.38	41.90
empl. status	8.79	5.70	11.48	5.78	8.47	6.90	7.96
hh-empl-rate	9.39	9.33	11.88	7.46	11.03	8.62	8.42
Decomposition by	LU	LV	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO
gender	0.17	0.00	1.08	0.33	0.16	0.11	1.92
age	3.31	3.76	10.77	6.18	5.04	6.59	8.84
urban / rural regions	0.22	1.74	0.00	.	1.78	0.87	5.83
education	65.66	40.68	42.37	52.57	35.06	27.44	41.30
empl. status	5.17	4.29	9.60	8.55	5.91	5.15	7.11
hh-empl-rate	5.26	5.33	11.86	8.10	7.10	5.82	5.55
Decomposition by	SE	SI	SK	UK			
gender	0.01	0.03	1.16	0.02			
age	7.89	3.86	9.05	1.24			
urban / rural regions	0.53	.	3.45	0.11			
education	48.97	50.74	57.78	22.01			
empl. status	7.79	4.61	9.02	1.50			
hh-empl-rate	12.41	4.72	10.57	1.49			

Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

4.2.4. DECOMPOSITION OF HOUSING LEVEL

The data underlying the fourth attribute, housing level (quality and space per capita), show quite low differentiation between households in general (see Figure 3 above). From Table 5 we can see that the characteristics used in the decomposition analysis do not give much insight into the existing inequality with respect to housing. In some countries, especially North European countries but also France, older age cohorts seem to face higher levels of housing, most probably due to more dwelling space. Furthermore, in Bulgaria, Estonia, Greece, Lithuania and Portugal the level of housing of households in urban areas is lower than that of rural households. This result is obviously driven by less living space of dwellings in urban areas. Only in Romania and Bulgaria the housing quality varies markedly between education levels. However, here the higher the education level, the lower the floor space of dwellings on average, since e.g. people with tertiary education most probably live in urban areas. Only in some EU countries those households being more active on the labour market face better housing levels (according to the constructed index).

Table 5 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: attribute housing, between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (I_0)

Decomposition by	AT	BE	BG	CZ	DE	DK	EE
gender	0.03	0.77	0.00	0.15	0.11	0.21	0.11
age	3.72	8.15	1.84	2.84	9.06	12.65	0.65
urban / rural regions	7.04	3.74	0.47	2.67	3.93	2.99	0.01
education	0.35	0.94	4.24	0.04	0.93	0.29	3.05
empl. status	2.72	7.25	2.15	1.99	7.43	7.16	2.18
hh-empl-rate	2.60	7.09	2.23	2.98	1.86	5.89	3.49
Decomposition by	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IT	LT
gender	1.05	0.03	0.31	1.30	0.12	1.02	0.01
age	7.96	9.78	10.59	2.67	2.01	3.01	0.65
urban / rural regions	0.32	2.62	5.23	4.27	0.00	2.21	0.04
education	0.93	1.03	1.14	0.87	2.02	1.02	2.22
empl. status	4.34	5.05	8.04	1.76	2.94	2.11	1.43
hh-empl-rate	15.09	2.47	6.23	4.23	1.69	6.70	2.02
Decomposition by	LU	LV	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO
gender	0.44	0.00	2.48	0.64	0.06	1.04	0.18
age	10.50	0.50	4.64	9.50	0.87	3.90	0.42
urban / rural regions	4.01	0.03	0.39	.	0.16	3.65	1.52
education	1.00	2.39	1.27	0.39	2.53	0.72	6.31
empl. status	7.68	0.99	1.96	3.92	1.47	3.16	3.00
hh-empl-rate	10.06	1.49	11.15	10.74	1.20	5.82	1.08
Decomposition by	SE	SI	SK	UK			
gender	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.22			
age	10.80	0.57	4.10	11.06			
urban / rural regions	2.49	.	1.10	1.11			
education	0.62	1.45	0.00	0.94			
empl. status	5.58	0.89	2.93	9.51			
hh-empl-rate	2.17	0.81	2.52	7.13			

Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

4.3. DECOMPOSITION OF MULTIDIMENSIONAL INEQUALITY

Finally, we present the results for the decomposition of the multidimensional index in Table 6. As already mentioned above, all attributes considered (equivalised per capita household income, the mean of the conditional health status of all household members, the mean of the education levels of household members and the housing indicator) are given the same weights. The parameter β is set 0.25³, which offers a medium substitutability between the four attributes. The mean logarithmic deviation (I_0) inequality index was then calculated and decomposed by the respective characteristics of the head of the household and the household characteristics as reported in Table 6.

As we can see from Table 6 and the findings above, the decomposition results of multidimensional inequality are strongly driven by those attributes with the highest inequality levels, which in our case are the household income and the household education level. Hence, in the case of the multitude of countries analysed, the multidimensional welfare levels of households are mostly influenced by the

3 A lower value of β would obviously raise the value of the inequality index.

differentiation with respect to the education level of the head of the household. On average, differences between education groups account for almost 40% of total differences in household welfare variations. The employment status of the head of the household (on average 17%) and the level of labour market activity of household members (on average 21%) also exert strong influence on the level of well-being, less so the age of the head of the household (13%). The other characteristics of the households analysed, i.e. gender (1.4%) and rural versus urban households (1.2%), have only minor or negligible effects. Somewhat stronger differences in multidimensional welfare levels between urban areas and the countryside are only evident in Romania (6.4%) and Bulgaria (4%). However, the explanatory value of the characteristics of heads of households and household members used in the decomposition analysis vary quite strongly among the individual EU countries.

Table 6 / Multidimensional inequality decomposition: Maasoumi inequality index ($\beta = 0.25$), between group components as % of mean logarithmic deviation (I_0)

Decomposition by	AT	BE	BG	CZ	DE	DK	EE
gender	1.49	1.44	0.23	3.07	0.96	0.15	1.17
age	7.66	7.89	12.37	15.29	3.87	7.28	14.63
urban / rural regions	0.12	0.43	4.04	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.74
education	32.08	48.15	42.38	19.37	28.09	29.84	30.38
empl. status	15.69	16.89	13.03	19.19	21.22	20.97	21.96
hh-empl-rate	19.33	18.73	20.64	20.80	16.81	20.59	26.06
Decomposition by	ES	FI	FR	GR	HU	IT	LT
gender	0.34	0.00	1.21	4.21	2.43	1.14	0.48
age	16.36	13.71	11.72	21.20	14.52	18.30	16.91
urban / rural regions	1.78	0.57	0.00	1.14	2.01	0.27	2.05
education	50.66	43.37	46.78	52.33	33.83	49.17	41.29
empl. status	17.77	26.71	14.93	18.16	16.04	15.51	19.43
hh-empl-rate	21.32	34.82	16.55	26.52	22.14	22.62	23.45
Decomposition by	LU	LV	MT	NL	PL	PT	RO
gender	0.56	0.29	2.44	1.02	1.29	1.25	4.51
age	2.19	11.61	19.13	7.40	15.74	18.89	18.80
urban / rural regions	1.40	1.66	0.01	.	1.46	1.23	6.43
education	53.08	30.60	52.90	42.13	34.57	52.47	50.90
empl. status	9.17	14.77	19.86	17.05	16.97	14.89	17.95
hh-empl-rate	8.83	19.57	25.96	15.45	22.14	18.12	17.50
Decomposition by	SE	SI	SK	UK			
gender	0.32	0.33	3.29	0.41			
age	13.59	8.22	21.75	3.85			
urban / rural regions	0.00	.	2.01	0.87			
education	32.85	24.64	31.17	33.05			
empl. status	17.14	10.09	21.57	12.77			
hh-empl-rate	26.63	12.33	33.60	12.71			

Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

5. A Shapley-value decomposition of multidimensional inequality indices

5.1. OUTLINE OF DECOMPOSITION PROCEDURE

In this section we undertake a decomposition analysis based on regression analysis, the Shapley value approach described below.⁴ To our knowledge such a regression-based approach to one- and multidimensional inequality decomposition has not yet been undertaken in the literature at least for a multitude of EU countries. Compared to the subgroup decomposition approach undertaken in Section 4, the advantage of a regression-based approach is that the relative importance of many variables and groups of them to explain inequality (such as age, gender, educational attainment, employment status etc.) are taken into account simultaneously. Thus, the regression approach (step 1) allows assessing the importance of each of these explanatory variables conditional on all other variables for each of the respective dimension of inequality considered (income, health, education and housing). The Shapley value approach (step 2) then further allows calculating the contribution of each of these explanatory variables to the respective inequality measure and via the aggregator function as outlined above also to the multidimensional inequality measure.

Recently, the literature on inequality analysis has provided various decomposition methods which are based on regression results like the Shapley value approach as introduced by Shorrocks (1999) but also others; see Fields and Yoo (2000), Morduch and Sicular (2002), Fields (2003), Wan (2004), Gunatilaka and Chotikapanich (2006) or Molini and Wan (2008) for such applications; see also Cowell and Fiorio (2009) for a critical review. Finally, Israeli (2007) shows how the Shapley approach is related to the method proposed by Fields (2003) and also points to some advantages of the former which is applied in this paper. The most important advantage of the Shapley value approach is that this takes the potential correlation amongst regressors into account. One should however note that the latter two contributions aim at decomposing the R², i.e. the explained part of the regressions, whereas in this paper we decompose the resulting inequality measure. This is more similar to the contributions by Wan (2004), Gunatilaka and Chotikapanich (2006) and Molini and Wan (2008).

The Shapley value approach can be illustrated by using a simple example with three explanatory variables. We first regress individual income levels y on these explanatory variables x_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$),

$$y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \varepsilon,$$

where ε denotes the error term. The predicted income level is then given by

$$\hat{y}_{123} = \hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 x_1 + \hat{\beta}_2 x_2 + \hat{\beta}_3 x_3.$$

4 The authors already applied the approach in the one-dimensional case to Western Balkan countries: see Leitner and Stehrer (2009).

This predicted value is then used to calculate the Gini coefficient $\hat{G}_{\{123\}}^{(0)}$, where subscripts denote the variables included. In the first round we then eliminate one variable and calculate the predicted income levels $\hat{y}_{\{23\}}$, $\hat{y}_{\{13\}}$ and $\hat{y}_{\{12\}}$. The corresponding Gini coefficients are then given by $\hat{G}_{\{23\}}^{(1)}$, $\hat{G}_{\{13\}}^{(1)}$ and $\hat{G}_{\{12\}}^{(1)}$ respectively. Analogously, in a second round we eliminate two variables, thus calculating $\hat{y}_{\{1\}}$, $\hat{y}_{\{2\}}$ and $\hat{y}_{\{3\}}$. The resulting Gini coefficients are $\hat{G}_{\{1\}}^{(2)}$, $\hat{G}_{\{2\}}^{(2)}$ and $\hat{G}_{\{3\}}^{(2)}$. The final round would then be to include the constant only; the resulting Gini coefficient would thus be $\hat{G}_{\{\}}^{(3)} = 0$.

The marginal contributions are then calculated using the Gini coefficients. The first round marginal contributions for each variable are $C_1^{(1)} = \hat{G}_{\{123\}}^{(0)} - \hat{G}_{\{23\}}^{(1)}$, $C_2^{(1)} = \hat{G}_{\{123\}}^{(0)} - \hat{G}_{\{13\}}^{(1)}$ and $C_3^{(1)} = \hat{G}_{\{123\}}^{(0)} - \hat{G}_{\{12\}}^{(1)}$. The marginal contributions in the second round of the first variable are given by

$$C_1^{(2,1)} = \hat{G}_{\{12\}}^{(1)} - \hat{G}_{\{2\}}^{(2)} \text{ and } C_1^{(2,2)} = \hat{G}_{\{13\}}^{(1)} - \hat{G}_{\{3\}}^{(2)}$$

The average of these contributions is the marginal contribution of the first variable in the second round,

i.e. $C_1^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2}(C_1^{(2,1)} + C_1^{(2,2)})$. Similarly we calculate $C_2^{(2)}$ and $C_3^{(2)}$. The third round contribution is given by $C_1^{(3)} = \hat{G}_{\{1\}}^{(2)} - \hat{G}_{\{\}}^{(3)} = \hat{G}_{\{1\}}^{(2)}$ as $\hat{G}_{\{\}}^{(3)} = 0$ and analogously for $C_2^{(3)} = \hat{G}_{\{2\}}^{(2)}$ and $C_3^{(3)} = \hat{G}_{\{3\}}^{(2)}$.

Finally, averaging the marginal contributions of each variable over all rounds results in the total marginal effect of each variable $j = 1, 2, 3$, i.e.

$$C_j = \frac{1}{3} \cdot (C_j^{(1)} + C_j^{(2)} + C_j^{(3)})$$

The proportion of inequality not explained is then given by

$$C_R = G - \hat{G}_{\{123\}}^{(0)}$$

The approach can easily be extended to any number of explanatory factors and to other inequality measures. The Shapley value method can furthermore be applied to the decomposition of a poverty indicator, as will also be done in Section 5.

Wan (2002) points to the fact that the presence of a negative constant in the regression equation may lead to negative predicted individual income levels. In that case the calculation of a Gini coefficient and thus the contributions of individual variables to overall inequality would be impossible. To overcome this pitfall he shows in Wan (2004) that different model specifications can be used for the underlying estimated income generating function, delivering moreover better log-likelihood values than the linear estimation model. Following his approach, we choose for the analysis in this paper a semilog model:

$$\ln y = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \beta_2 x_2 + \beta_3 x_3 + \varepsilon$$

Since we are not interested in the decomposition of the log of income, but income, we have to take the antilog of the above model resulting in

$$e^{\ln y} = e^{\beta_0} * (e^{\beta_1})^{x_1} * (e^{\beta_2})^{x_2} * (e^{\beta_3})^{x_3} * e^{\varepsilon}, \text{ which is}$$

$$y = e^{\beta_0} * (e^{\beta_1})^{x_1} * (e^{\beta_2})^{x_2} * (e^{\beta_3})^{x_3} * e^{\varepsilon}.$$

The simple advantage of this model is that the constant e^{β_0} is now a positive scalar, which does not influence the magnitude of the calculated Gini coefficient. The elimination procedure as described above however remains unchanged.

5.2. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

5.2.1. STEP 1: REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Following the above-described approach we first regress the logarithm of equivalised household income on the variables age, gender, employment status and highest education level attained of the head of the household as well as the calculated employment share of the household and a regional dummy. Since for the latter variable no data were available for the Netherlands, Malta and Slovenia (apart from Ireland and Cyprus for which no EU-SILC data for 2010 are available at all) we had to drop those countries for the analysis. The results are reported in Table 7 below. The explained part of the variance is on average slightly above 24% as shown by R². In general the coefficients of the variables applied have the expected signs and are significant. Coefficients for Age and Age2 show that household incomes rise with increasing age of the head of the household. Households headed by men accrue higher incomes, and higher education levels are correlated with higher income levels. The same significant result is to be found for the variable household employment share. The dummy variables for the employment status of the head of the household (differences in income to the employment status unemployed) deliver the expected signs in almost all countries; however, the results are not always significant. The regression results for the multidimensional case can be found in Appendix Table A.1. The results are similar to those with respect to household income (coefficient signs remain in general the same, whilst the share of the explained variance rises to about 40% on average). The final output of the Shapley decomposition of multidimensional inequality is discussed in the next section.

Table 7 / Regression results: Dependent variable: logarithm of equivalised household income (modified OECD equivalence scale)

		AT	BE	BG	CZ	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR
Age		0.0255***	0.0235***	0.0075*	0.0101***	0.0129***	0.0555***	-0.0159***	0.0332***	0.0409***	0.0425***	0.0449***
Age ² /100		-0.0172***	-0.0208***	-0.0083**	-0.0079***	-0.0080***	-0.0500***	0.0139**	-0.0216***	-0.0348***	-0.0296***	-0.0320***
Male		0.0192	0.1105***	0.0909***	0.1504***	0.0877***	0.0049	0.1086***	0.0509	0.0453***	0.1139***	0.1462***
Education level	Upper secondary	0.2682***	0.1171***	0.2895***	0.1071***	0.1241***	0.1140***	0.0395	0.2685***	0.1201***	0.1763***	0.3248***
	Tertiary	0.4549***	0.3625***	0.5514***	0.3818***	0.3648***	0.2771***	0.2919***	0.4814***	0.3935***	0.5079***	0.6488***
Household employment share		0.4669***	0.5703***	0.8307***	0.5267***	0.4798***	0.4713***	0.7492***	0.9388***	0.5501***	0.4017***	0.6174***
Rural region		-0.0316**	0.0399**	-0.1836***	-0.0575***	-0.0345***	-0.0382***	-0.0813***	-0.1080***	-0.1131***	-0.0278**	-0.0805**
Employment status	Employee	0.0491	-0.1103**	0.1922***	0.1578***	0.2060***	-0.0806**	0.0596	0.1519*	0.1000***	-0.0058	0.3801***
	Self-employed	0.1930***	0.1502***	0.1712***	0.1917***	0.3980***	-0.0359	0.2726***	0.4450***	0.2061***	0.1339***	0.3697***
	Retired	0.1206**	-0.0499	0.1292**	0.2084***	0.4709***	-0.1617***	-0.0184	-0.4722***	0.1042***	0.1674***	0.2176**
	Other inactive	0.2225***	0.2850***	0.4050***	0.2534***	0.4390***	0.0708*	0.3313***	0.6023***	0.3136***	0.2849***	0.5594***
Constant		8.4782***	8.5921***	7.0189***	7.9171***	8.5398***	8.4705***	8.3514***	7.3473***	8.3156***	7.9956***	6.9154***
R2		0.2613	0.2274	0.3717	0.3629	0.2447	0.3146	0.1940	0.0885	0.2300	0.2215	0.1050
Observations		6187	6125	6161	9096	12900	5804	4963	13500	11000	11000	6967
		HU	IT	LT	LU	LV	PL	PT	RO	SE	SK	UK
Age		0.0043*	0.0465***	-0.0179	0.0069*	-0.0105	0.0075**	0.0307***	0.0020	0.0598***	0.0085**	0.0112***
Age ² /100		-0.0006	-0.0262***	0.0280*	0.0039	0.0059	-0.0013	-0.0268***	0.0020	-0.0524***	-0.0073**	-0.0087**
Male		0.1007***	0.1366***	0.0726	-0.0001	-0.0178	0.1099***	0.1532***	0.1334***	0.0003	0.0896***	0.0818***
Education level	Upper secondary	0.1873***	0.2739***	0.3344***	0.2004***	0.1671***	0.1784***	0.4724***	0.3431***	0.1262***	0.1067***	0.0986***
	Tertiary	0.4981***	0.6028***	0.6154***	0.5568***	0.5924***	0.6075***	0.9186***	0.8669***	0.2676***	0.3074***	0.3233***
Household employment share		0.5073***	0.9787***	1.0346***	0.4758***	0.8550***	0.5388***	0.6629***	0.5466***	0.4209***	0.7717***	0.5559***
Rural region		-0.1138***	-0.0130	-0.1376**	0.0501***	-0.1159***	-0.1775***	-0.1233***	-0.2426***	-0.0685**	-0.0868***	0.0235
Employment status	Employee	0.1503***	0.9221***	0.0481	0.1474***	0.4854***	0.2279***	0.0696	0.1252*	0.0333	0.3524***	0.3075***
	Self-employed	0.2179***	1.1504***	0.7243***	0.2197***	0.6245***	0.3285***	0.1005**	0.4294***	0.1973***	0.3139***	0.5082***
	Retired	0.1773***	1.0590***	0.6780***	0.0746	0.3185**	0.0702*	-0.1910***	-0.0267	0.0237	-0.0720*	0.4159***
	Other inactive	0.4159***	1.3209***	0.9747***	0.3284***	0.8961***	0.3883***	0.4165***	0.7215***	0.3009***	0.5436***	0.5030***
Constant		7.4813***	6.1261***	6.8544***	9.2486***	7.5355***	7.3347***	7.6213***	6.4829***	7.7961***	7.6763***	8.4893***
R2		0.2792	0.1240	0.1132	0.2885	0.1367	0.2209	0.3517	0.4446	0.1304	0.3741	0.2257
Observations		9812	19100	5300	4864	6224	12900	5172	7669	7155	5361	7892

Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

5.2.2. STEP 2: SHAPLEY VALUE DECOMPOSITION


In this section we present the final results for the Shapley value decomposition of income inequality and multidimensional inequality. In addition we apply the Shapley approach to the poverty headcount index for the case of household income (see Figure 8).

Figure 6 presents the decomposition results for equivalised household income. On average, about a third of the Gini index remains unexplained in the analysis. As expected from the simple decomposition analysis in Section 4, the countries where differences between rural and urban regions are an appreciable driver of overall inequality are Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Latvia and Lithuania and some South European countries. As expected and in line with the results above, educational differences of the heads of households are important drivers of income inequality between households, irrespective of the overall inequality level of the respective country, but much stronger in Poland, the Baltics, Bulgaria, Romania and South European EU Member States compared to the rest of the EU. The same applies to the individual employment share of households. In all countries analysed this variable contributes strongly positively to income inequality. Especially in crisis-hit countries such as Italy, Romania, Spain, Latvia and Lithuania the differences between incomes of households are moreover driven by the employment status of the head of the household, or to put it simply, by the fact that he or she is employed or unemployed/inactive.

The results for the Shapley decomposition of the multidimensional inequality index are presented in Figure 7. For inequality in multidimensional well-being, educational differences are the most important single explanatory factor. Only in two countries, Greece and Portugal, the age of the head of the household is as important in explaining inequality. Contrary to the results for income inequality, differences between urban and rural areas are not explaining much of total inequality in all countries. The importance of the individual employment shares of the households is somewhat lower in the case of multidimensional inequality compared to inequality of household income. Furthermore, in most of the countries the employment status of the head of the household is not an important predictor for differences in the level of multidimensional inequality.


In order to derive a clearer picture of the drivers of inequality we apply the Shapley decomposition approach in the case of income inequality to another, much simpler inequality measure – the poverty headcount index. Households are classified as poor if their equivalised per capita income is below 60% of the median income of the total population. In the group of countries analysed, the Czech Republic features the lowest poverty rate with about 7% of households below 60% of the median income, whilst in Bulgaria about 23% of the households can be identified as poor. For the decomposition analysis we can use the same regression results as for the decomposition approach for the Gini index of inequality of household incomes described above. The only difference here is that out of the predicted incomes we do not calculate Gini indices but poverty indices and thus calculate the marginal contributions of the explanatory variables to those poverty rates. Figure 8 shows that overall poverty rates can be explained much worse with the applied decomposition approach than in the case of Gini indices. For almost all countries where we have a higher explanatory power (mostly crisis-hit countries) the employment status of the head of the household is the most important explanatory variable.

Figure 6 / Shapley value decomposition of inequality in household income Contributions of variables to total Gini index




Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

Figure 7 / Shapely value decomposition of multidimensional inequality Contributions of variables to total Gini-index



Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

Figure 8 / Shapely value decomposition of poverty in household income Contributions of variables to total Poverty rate (headcount index: below 60% of median income)



Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

6. Conclusions

6.1. GENERAL FINDINGS

In this paper we analysed single- and multidimensional inequality in the EU countries for the year 2010. In order to construct a multidimensional inequality index, we included four dimensions: household income, household health status, household education level and housing level (quality and space per capita) and applied various decomposition methods to one- and multidimensional indices of inequality.

Income inequality, when measured by the Gini index, is quite low in most Central European and Scandinavian countries within the EU and highest in East European Member States (Latvia, Lithuania and Bulgaria), South European countries (Portugal, Spain and Greece) and the UK. Inequality in the measured household health status and in the housing indicator did not differ strongly between countries; however the CEE EU Member States show above-average inequality levels in both cases (except for Slovakia, Slovenia and the Czech Republic in the case of the housing indicator). As for household educational attainment levels, we found that while inequality is quite low in Central European and Scandinavian countries but also the Baltic States, the differences are much more pronounced in the South European countries. The combined index of multidimensional inequality highlights the fact that the South European countries Greece and Portugal feature the highest level of welfare dispersion, while Central European and Scandinavian countries are those with the lowest level of inequality.

In Section 4 we applied standard decomposition techniques to the mean logarithmic deviation of all four single dimensions and to the multidimensional index as suggested by Maasoumi (1986, 1999). The results indicate that household income is most strongly influenced by the education level of the head of the household. On the average of all countries, about 16% of the income differences accrue from that characteristic, while about 15% of the income differences can be explained by the employment rates of the individual households. Further, also the characteristic employment status of the head of the household explains with about 10% quite a large part of income differentiation. In the case of health inequality, also those households with higher household employment rates and those headed by employed persons faced a somewhat better health status on average. In the case of housing quality, the simple decomposition analysis did not give much insight into the driving factors of inequality and the results were rather ambiguous across countries. The decomposition results of multidimensional inequality are strongly driven by those attributes with the highest inequality levels, which in our case are household income and household education level. On average, differences between education groups account for almost 40% of total differences in household welfare variations. The employment status of the head of the household (on average 17%) and the level of labour market activity of household members (on average 21%) also exert a strong influence on the level of well-being, less so the age of the head of the household (13%). The other household characteristics analysed have only minor effects.

In Section 5 we applied the Shapley value decomposition to household income inequality, the multidimensional inequality measure and a poverty index of household income inequality. This method is based on a regression approach which allows considering all explanatory variables simultaneously and conditional on each other. Further the Shapley value approach allows calculating the contribution of

groups of these variables to the respective inequality measure. This approach seems to work best for the Gini coefficient. In the case of income inequality we can explain on average about two third of the Gini index by our approach. In general the household-specific employment rate is the most important driver of income inequality in the EU countries. Second most influential are differences in the educational attainment level of the head of the household. In all countries the combined effect of gender and age is explaining just a small part of inequality levels. The same is the case for differences between urban and rural areas for most of the EU countries. Only in Poland, Bulgaria and Romania regional differences are remarkable additional drivers of the level of income inequality.

The results of the decomposition approach look somewhat different when we apply the method to the multidimensional case, not just to income inequality. In many countries the importance of education as a trigger of inequality increases, while the impact of differences in labour market participation declines. Likewise, differences between rural and urban areas (also for those countries where important for income inequality) become negligible. In some countries, in particular Portugal and Greece, age differences are strongly driving overall inequality of multidimensional welfare.

We not only applied the decomposition approach to inequality indices that consider the whole income distribution, but also to a poverty index which takes into account only a distinct part of the distribution (in our case we used a headcount index for all those households with an equivalised per capita income of less than 60% of the median income). However, the results were somewhat disappointing since the decomposition analysis could for most countries only explain a very small part of the existing poverty levels. For those countries where we have a higher explanatory power (mostly countries that are hit hard by the economic crisis) the employment status of the head of the household is the most important variable driving overall income poverty.

6.2. INEQUALITY AND POVERTY IN THE CEE EU MEMBER STATES IN COMPARISON

The comparative analysis of single- and multidimensional inequality and poverty with respect to the CEE EU Member States shows the following:

- › Regarding income inequality the CEE EU members comprise different subgroups, the first consisting of the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Slovakia and Hungary, with features very much resembling those of Scandinavian/Central European EU-15 countries. The relatively low income differences between households are mostly driven by disparities in labour market participation. Differences between rural and urban regions are an additional driver of income inequality. The highest levels of income inequality in the EU are to be found in Latvia, Lithuania and Bulgaria while Estonia, Poland and Romania also have levels above the EU-27 average. This group of new EU Member States has features comparable to South European countries. Their higher levels of income inequality are, apart from differences in labour market participation, driven in addition by variations between educational attainment groups. Furthermore, households in the countryside have on average lower income levels than those in urban areas (also conditional on all other factors accounted for as shown by the Shapley value decomposition analysis). The analysis of poverty levels and their decomposition did not deliver additional insights.

- › Inequality by health status of households is in general lower than income differences. However, all CEE EU Member States have above-EU average levels of inequality comparable only to those of Greece and Portugal. The decomposition analysis did not deliver much insight into the sources of inequality although the health status in the CEE and South European countries is influenced more strongly by variables describing labour market participation.
- › Inequality according to our housing indicator (including information on housing quality and space per capita) is also at a much lower level than income inequality. Again there are two different subgroups among the CEE EU Member States, the first including Slovakia, Slovenia and the Czech Republic, with a very low level of housing inequality, and the second containing the Baltic States, Bulgaria, Romania, Poland and also Hungary. The decomposition approach did not tell us much about the sources of inequality in this attribute of the multidimensional analysis in the CEE region; only in some countries such as Bulgaria and Romania stronger differences between educational attainment groups can be detected.
- › Educational differences between households are generally much lower in the CEE EU Member States than in South European countries. However, also among the CEE countries the situation varies. Especially in Romania and Poland (to a lesser extent in Bulgaria and Lithuania) a substantial share of the population can be characterised as poor according to their educational attainment levels (below 60% of the median educational level of households). In general, in CEE countries educational segregation is as eminent as in the rest of the EU. Stronger educational differences are evident between urban and rural households in Bulgaria, Romania but also Hungary and Slovakia.
- › The analysis of multidimensional inequality sums up the findings of the various attributes discussed above. Thus, again Slovakia and the Czech Republic feature very low inequality levels comparable to Scandinavian/Central European EU-15 countries, closely followed by Estonia, Slovenia and Hungary. Bulgaria, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania and Poland form a subgroup of countries similar to South Europe. However, Greece and Portugal feature inequality levels that are considerably above those of the latter subgroup of CEE EU Member States. Particularly differences between age and educational attainment are more pronounced in this latter subgroup of countries.
- › The analysis shows that with respect to income and multidimensional inequality the region of the CEE EU Member States is comprised of at least two distinct country groups. The first consists of the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Slovenia, which feature low levels of inequality in all attributes (except for our constructed indicator of conditional health status) when compared with the rest of the EU. The second group, comprising Bulgaria, Romania, Poland and the two Baltic countries Latvia and Lithuania, has inequality levels at the upper end of the ranking of EU countries according to all attributes (except for educational attainment levels). The two countries in-between are Hungary and Estonia, the first featuring low levels of income inequality but quite high levels of inequality in the attributes health and housing. Estonia, although showing a high level of inequality with respect to the housing indicator and a level of income inequality resembling the EU average, features a low level of inequality according to educational attainment levels of households.

References

- Atkinson, A. B. (1975), *The Economics of Inequality*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Atkinson, A. B. and E. Marlier (eds) (2010), *Income and living conditions in Europe*, Publication Office of the European Union, Luxembourg.
- Bourguignon, F. (1999), 'Comment to: Multidimensional approaches to welfare analysis', in J. Silber (ed.), *Handbook of Inequality Measurement*, Kluwer, Boston, MA.
- Cowell, F. A. and C. V. Fiorio (2009), 'Inequality decompositions. A reconciliation', ECINEQ Working Paper Series WP 2009-117.
- Fields, G.S. (2003), *Accounting for income inequality and its change: a new method, with application to the distribution of earnings in the United States*, in S. W. Polachek (ed.), *Worker Well-Being and Public Policy (Research in Labor Economics, Volume 22)*, Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 1-38.
- Fields, G. S. and G. Yoo (2000), 'Falling labor income inequality in Korea's economic growth: Patterns and underlying causes', *Review of Income and Wealth*, Vol. 46, No. 2, pp. 139-159.
- Gunatilaka, R. and D. Chotikapanich (2006), 'Inequality Trends and Determinants in Sri Lanka 1980-2002: A Shapley Approach to Decomposition', Monash Econometrics and Business Statistics Working Papers 6/06, Monash University, Department of Econometrics and Business Statistics.
- Israeli, O. (2007), 'A Shapley-based decomposition of the R-square of a linear regression', *Journal of Economic Inequality*, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 199-212.
- Jenkins, S. P. (1995), 'Accounting for inequality trends: Decomposition analysis for the UK, 1971-86', *Economica*, Vol. 62, pp. 29-63.
- Justino, P. (2005), 'Empirical Applications of Multidimensional Inequality Analysis', PRUS Working Paper, No. 23.
- Leitner, S. and R. Stehrer (2009), 'Determinants of inequality in selected SEE countries: Results from Shapley value decompositions', GDN research paper, mimeo.
- Lugo, M. A. (2005), 'Comparing multidimensional indices of inequality: Methods and applications', ECINEQ Working Paper 2005-14.
- Maasoumi, E. (1986), 'The measurement and decomposition of multidimensional inequality', *Econometrica*, Vol. 54, No. 4, pp. 991-997.

- Maasoumi, E. (1999), 'Multidimensional approaches to welfare analysis', in J. Silber (ed.), *Handbook of Income Inequality Measurement*, Kluwer Academic, Boston, MA.
- Molini, V. and G. Wan (2008), 'Discovering sources of inequality in transition economies: a case study of rural Vietnam', *Journal of Economic Change*, Vol. 41, No. 1, pp. 75-96.
- Morduch, J. and T. Sicular (2002), 'Rethinking Inequality Decomposition, With Evidence from Rural China', *The Economic Journal*, Royal Economic Society, Vol. 112, No. 476, pp. 93-106.
- Savaglio, E. (2006a), 'On multidimensional inequality with variable population size', *Economic Theory*, Vol. 28, pp. 85-94.
- Savaglio, E. (2006b), 'Three approaches to the analysis of multidimensional inequality', in F. Farina and E. Savaglio (eds), *Inequality and Economic Integration*, Routledge, London.
- Sen, A. (1997), *On Economic Inequality*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK.
- Shorrocks, A. F. (1999), 'Decomposition procedures for distributional analysis: A unified framework based on the Shapley value', Draft paper, University of Essex.
- Wan, G. (2002), 'Regression-based Inequality Decomposition: Pitfalls and a Solution Procedure', UNU-WIDER, Discussion Paper No. 2002/101.
- Wan, G. (2004), 'Accounting for income inequality in rural China: A regression-based approach', *Journal of Comparative Economics*, Vol. 32, pp. 348-363.
- Weymark, J. A. (2004), 'The normative approach to the measurement of multidimensional inequality', Working Paper 03-W14R, Vanderbilt University, Nashville.

Appendix

Table A.1 / Regression results: Dependent variable: logarithm of multidimensional welfare indicator (modified OECD equivalence scale)

		AT	BE	BG	CZ	DE	DK	EE	ES	FI	FR	GR
Age		0.0036**	0.0096***	0.0094***	0.0069***	-0.0010	0.0122***	-0.0022	0.0151***	0.0083***	0.0117***	0.0394***
Age ² /100		-0.0044***	-0.0105***	-0.0129***	-0.0113***	0.0001	-0.0124***	-0.0014	-0.0181***	-0.0097***	-0.0126***	-0.0446***
Male		-0.0041	0.0539***	0.0489***	0.0263***	-0.0020	0.0129*	0.0452***	0.0174**	0.0116**	0.0274***	0.1771***
Education level	Upper secondary	0.2286***	0.2728***	0.2739***	0.1828***	0.1633***	0.1818***	0.1868***	0.2263***	0.1391***	0.2452***	0.3558***
	Tertiary	0.3642***	0.4059***	0.4172***	0.3349***	0.2998***	0.3111***	0.3280***	0.3482***	0.2970***	0.4176***	0.5007***
Household employment share		0.1362***	0.2110***	0.3378***	0.1499***	0.1097***	0.1547***	0.2000***	0.2673***	0.1363***	0.1224***	0.2962***
Rural region		0.0412***	0.0553***	-0.0057	0.0176***	0.0171***	0.0241***	0.0074	-0.0280***	0.0116*	0.0232***	-0.0399***
Employment status	Employee	0.0188	-0.1370***	-0.0705***	-0.0700***	0.0247**	-0.0350	-0.0644***	-0.0287*	-0.0077	-0.0510***	0.0744**
	Self-employed	0.0701***	0.0143	-0.0441**	0.0297*	0.1354***	0.0794***	-0.0047	-0.0123	0.0496***	0.0249*	-0.0966***
	Retired	0.0701***	-0.0128	-0.0206	0.0491***	0.1680***	0.0684**	-0.0017	-0.0475***	0.0621***	0.0532***	-0.0833**
	Other inactive	0.0704***	0.0834***	0.1255***	0.1108***	0.1513***	0.1462***	0.0167	0.0682***	0.1003***	0.0908***	0.0756**
Constant		-1.4305***	-1.6311***	-1.8434***	-1.5278***	-1.3425***	-1.5875***	-1.3808***	-1.6584***	-1.4178***	-1.6283***	-2.3841***
R2		0.3333	0.4230	0.3979	0.3532	0.3619	0.2948	0.4073	0.4118	0.3632	0.4427	0.4970
Observations		6104	6048	6152	9065	12700	5618	4937	13400	10300	10900	6800
		HU	IT	LT	LU	LV	PL	PT	RO	SE	SK	UK
Age		0.0084***	0.0251***	0.0117***	0.0004	0.0030	0.0124***	0.0332***	0.0170***	0.0131***	0.0082***	0.0022
Age ² /100		-0.0129***	-0.0275***	-0.0167***	0.0008	-0.0077***	-0.0165***	-0.0408***	-0.0200***	-0.0133***	-0.0122***	-0.0017
Male		0.0289***	0.0562***	0.0644***	-0.0072	0.0420***	0.0570***	0.1447***	0.0490***	0.0319***	0.0316***	0.0031
Education level	Upper secondary	0.2106***	0.2391***	0.2714***	0.2611***	0.2424***	0.3306***	0.3779***	0.2565***	0.2062***	0.1661***	0.2418***
	Tertiary	0.3707***	0.3773***	0.4288***	0.4346***	0.4111***	0.5032***	0.5936***	0.4455***	0.3290***	0.2973***	0.3748***
Household employment share		0.2072***	0.2521***	0.2564***	0.1547***	0.2697***	0.3032***	0.4233***	0.2446***	0.1344***	0.2208***	0.1363***
Rural region		-0.0151**	-0.0104*	-0.0271**	0.0546***	-0.0297***	-0.0203***	-0.0532***	-0.0280***	0.0023	0.0000	0.0265***
Employment status	Employee	-0.0484***	0.0543***	-0.0864***	0.0483**	-0.0406*	0.0339*	-0.0706	-0.1022**	-0.0108	-0.0517**	-0.0314
	Self-employed	-0.0003	0.0040	-0.0369*	0.0929***	-0.0283	-0.0071	-0.1059***	0.0009	0.0465**	-0.0016	0.0770***
	Retired	0.0287	0.0262	-0.0308	0.0811***	-0.0507*	-0.0234	-0.1013**	-0.0556*	0.0679*	-0.0269	0.0967***
	Other inactive	0.0863***	0.1358***	0.0970***	0.1242***	0.0767***	0.1142***	0.0809*	0.1247***	0.0955***	0.0910***	0.1002***
Constant		-1.6537***	-1.9744***	-1.8020***	-1.4166***	-1.6194***	-1.9420***	-2.2705***	-2.0358***	-1.6160***	-1.5709***	-1.4583***
R2		0.4182	0.4128	0.4114	0.5045	0.3596	0.4634	0.4137	0.4474	0.3346	0.3989	0.3456
Observations		9752	18900	5290	4855	6179	12900	5169	7646	6949	5208	7854

Source: EU-SILC 2010, own calculations.

SHORT LIST OF THE MOST RECENT WIIW PUBLICATIONS

(AS OF NOVEMBER 2014)

For current updates and summaries see also wiiw's website at www.wiiw.ac.at

DRIVERS OF INEQUALITY AND POVERTY IN THE CEE AND OTHER EU MEMBER STATES – A SHAPLEY VALUE DECOMPOSITION ANALYSIS

by Sebastian Leitner and Robert Stehrer

wiiw Research Reports, No. 398, November 2014

31 pages including 8 Tables and 8 Figures

hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

TRADE INTEGRATION, PRODUCTION FRAGMENTATION AND PERFORMANCE IN EUROPE – BLESSING OR CURSE? A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE NEW MEMBER STATES AND THE EU-15

by Sandra M. Leitner and Robert Stehrer

wiiw Research Reports, No. 397, November 2014

41 pages including 28 Tables and 4 Figures

hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

WIIW MONTHLY REPORT 11/14

edited by Mario Holzner and Sándor Richter

- › Graph of the month: Inequalities in hourly earnings at PPP measured by the Gini index, 2002-2010
- › Opinion corner: Presidential elections in Romania: will the new broom sweep cleaner?
- › Earnings levels, inequality and coverage rates of collective agreements
- › Determinants of earnings inequalities in Europe
- › Developments of the gender wage gap in the European Union – reason for hope?
- › Recommended reading
- › Statistical Annex: Monthly and quarterly statistics for Central, East and Southeast Europe

wiiw, November 2014

37 pages including 25 Figures

(exclusively for Members of wiiw)

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES OF THE UKRAINE CONFLICT

by Peter Havlik

Policy Notes and Reports, No. 14, November 2014

19 pages including 2 Tables, 10 Figures and 1 Box

hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

ON THIN ICE: CESEE CORE RESILIENT IN THE FACE OF EU STAGNATION AND THE UKRAINE CRISIS

by Sándor Richter, Vasily Astrov, Vladimir Gligorov, Doris Hanzl-Weiss, Peter Havlik, Mario Holzner, Hermine Vidovic et al.

wiiw Forecast Report. Economic Analysis and Outlook for Central, East and Southeast Europe, Autumn 2014

141 pages including 31 Tables, 30 Figures and 4 Box

hardcopy: EUR 80.00 (PDF: EUR 65.00)

WIIW MONTHLY REPORT 10/14

edited by Mario Holzner and Sándor Richter

- › Graph of the month: Europe Brent Spot Price, fob per barrel
- › Opinion corner: Russia-Ukraine conflict: do Western sanctions have any effect?
- › Agricultural imports from LDCs: a comparison across EU-27 Member States
- › Green industries for Europe: mission abandoned
- › Determinants of SMEs' funding obstacles – a comparative analysis of EU-15 and NMS-13 countries
- › Recommended reading
- › Statistical Annex: Monthly and quarterly statistics for Central, East and Southeast Europe

wiiw, October 2014

44 pages including 21 Tables and 5 Figures

(exclusively for Members of wiiw)

REDUCING PRODUCTIVITY AND EFFICIENCY GAPS: THE ROLE OF KNOWLEDGE ASSETS, ABSORPTIVE CAPACITY AND INSTITUTIONS

by Ana Rincon-Aznar, Neil Foster-McGregor, Johannes Pöschl, Robert Stehrer, Michaela Vecchi and Francesco Venturini

wiiw Research Reports, No. 396, September 2014

165 pages including 38 Tables, 83 Figures and 8 Boxes

hardcopy: EUR 24.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

WIIW MONTHLY REPORT 9/14

edited by Mario Holzner and Sándor Richter

- › Graph of the month: Regional gross value added in Turkey
- › Opinion corner: Turkey and the EU
- › The Turkish economic conundrum
- › Regional disparities in Turkey
- › Turkey: a 'great power' of migration?
- › Recommended reading
- › Statistical Annex: Monthly and quarterly statistics for Central, East and Southeast Europe

wiiw, September 2014

39 pages including 2 Table and 8 Figures

(exclusively for Members of wiiw)

WIIW MONTHLY REPORT 7-8/14

edited by Mario Holzner and Sándor Richter

- › Table: Overview 2013 and outlook 2014-2016
- › Figure: 2013 estimate and 2014 forecast for CESEE growth drivers
- › Bulgaria: upcoming early elections take centre stage
- › Croatia: recession continues
- › Czech Republic: fiscal relaxation to strengthen the recovery
- › Estonia: ongoing stagnation
- › Hungary: EU funds support accelerating growth
- › Latvia: consumers keep the wheel turning
- › Lithuania: investing in growth
- › Poland: abrupt acceleration of investment activities
- › Romania: consumption-driven growth
- › Slovakia: domestic demand on the rise
- › Slovenia: : first signs of recovery

- › Albania: candidate, at last
- › Macedonia: monuments and elections
- › Montenegro: tourism and elections
- › Serbia: floods and reforms
- › Turkey: economic adjustment in progress, political tussle continues
- › Bosnia and Herzegovina: floods and elections
- › Kosovo: unstable government in a stable economy?
- › Russian Federation: stuck in stagnation
- › Ukraine: in search of stability

wiiw, July-August 2014

23 pages including 1 Table and 2 Figures

(exclusively for Members of wiiw)

CHARTING WAYS OUT OF EUROPE'S IMPASSE – A POLICY MEMORANDUM

by Francis Cripps, Michael Landesmann, Jacques Mazier, Robert McDowell, Terry McKinley, Pascal Petit, Terry Ward and Enrico Wolleb

wiiw Policy Notes and Reports, No. 13, June 2014

26 pages including 14 Tables

hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

WACHSTUMSBESCHLEUNIGUNG DANK INVESTITIONSWENDE IN MITTEL-, OST- UND SÜDOSTEUROPA

by Vladimir Gligorov, Mario Holzner und Sándor Richter

wiiw Research Papers in German language, June 2014

(reprinted from: WIFO-Monatsberichte, Vol. 87, No. 5, May 2014)

8 pages including 1 Table and 6 Figures

hardcopy: EUR 8.00 (PDF: free download from wiiw's website)

WIIW FDI REPORT, CENTRAL, EAST AND SOUTHEAST EUROPE, 2014: HIT BY DELEVERAGING

by Gábor Hunya. Database and layout by Monika Schwarzhappel

wiiw FDI Report, Central, East and Southeast Europe, June 2014

123 pages including 95 Tables and 6 Figures

hardcopy: EUR 70.00 (PDF: EUR 65.00)

WIIW HANDBOOK OF STATISTICS 2013: CENTRAL, EAST AND SOUTHEAST EUROPE

covers key economic data on Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russia, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Ukraine

wiiw, Vienna, November 2013 (ISBN 978-3-85209-035-1)

436 pages including 250 Tables and 124 Figures

Hardcopy + CD-ROM with PDF: EUR 92.00

(time series given for 2000, 2005, 2009-2012, graphs range from 2008 to September 2013)

Download PDF: EUR 70.00

(PDF with identical content as hardcopy)

Hardcopy + CD-ROM with Excel tables and PDF: EUR 250.00

Download Excel tables and PDF: EUR 245.00

(time series in MS Excel format run from 1990-2012 (as far as available))

IMPRESSUM

Herausgeber, Verleger, Eigentümer und Hersteller:

Verein „Wiener Institut für Internationale Wirtschaftsvergleiche“ (wiiw),
Wien 6, Rahlgasse 3

ZVR-Zahl: 329995655

Postanschrift:: A 1060 Wien, Rahlgasse 3, Tel: [+431] 533 66 10, Telefax: [+431] 533 66 10 50
Internet Homepage: www.wiiw.ac.at

Nachdruck nur auszugsweise und mit genauer Quellenangabe gestattet.

P.b.b. Verlagspostamt 1060 Wien

Offenlegung nach § 25 Mediengesetz: Medieninhaber (Verleger): Verein "Wiener Institut für Internationale Wirtschaftsvergleiche", A 1060 Wien, Rahlgasse 3. Vereinszweck: Analyse der wirtschaftlichen Entwicklung der zentral- und osteuropäischen Länder sowie anderer Transformationswirtschaften sowohl mittels empirischer als auch theoretischer Studien und ihre Veröffentlichung; Erbringung von Beratungsleistungen für Regierungs- und Verwaltungsstellen, Firmen und Institutionen.

