OECD DEVELOPMENT CENTRE

Working Paper No. 226

(Formerly Webdoc No. 14)

GLOBALISATION AND POVERTY CHANGES IN COLOMBIA

by

Maurizio Bussolo and Jann Lay

OECD OCDE

November 2003
DEV/DOC(2003)24

DEVELOPMENT CENTRE
WORKING PAPERS

This series of working papers is intended to disseminate the Development Centre's research findings rapidly among specialists in the field concerned. These papers are generally available in the original English or French, with a summary in the other language.

Comments on this paper would be welcome and should be sent to the OECD Development Centre, Le Seine Saint-Germain, 12 boulevard des Îles, 92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux, France.

THE OPINIONS EXPRESSED AND ARGUMENTS EMPLOYED IN THIS DOCUMENT ARE THE SOLE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE AUTHOR AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THOSE OF THE OECD OR OF THE GOVERNMENTS OF ITS MEMBER COUNTRIES

CENTRE DE DÉVELOPPEMENT
DOCUMENTS DE TRAVAIL

Cette série de documents de travail a pour but de diffuser rapidement auprès des spécialistes dans les domaines concernés les résultats des travaux de recherche du Centre de Développement. Ces documents ne sont disponibles que dans leur langue originale, anglais ou français ; un résumé du document est rédigé dans l'autre langue.

Tout commentaire relatif à ce document peut être adressé au Centre de Développement de l'OCDE, Le Seine Saint-Germain, 12 boulevard des Îles, 92130 Issy-les-Moulineaux, France.

LES IDÉES EXPRIMÉES ET LES ARGUMENTS AVANCÉS DANS CE DOCUMENT SONT CEUX DE L'AUTEUR ET NE REFLÈTENT PAS NÉCESSAIREMENT CEUX DE L'OCDE OU DES GOUVERNEMENTS DE SES PAYS MEMBRES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

RÉSUMÉ

L'évaluation de l'impact ultime de la mondialisation sur la pauvreté est loin d'être aisée : *i)* la mondialisation affecte la pauvreté de diverses manières ; *ii)* certaines relations sont positives mais d'autres sont négatives, ce qui exclut une analyse qualitative et oblige à des évaluations quantitatives — donc à faire appel à des modèles numériques formels ; *iii)* le développement des échanges et la croissance (les caractéristiques clés de la mondialisation) sont surtout des phénomènes macro, alors que la pauvreté est par essence un phénomène micro. Les auteurs de ce document adoptent une nouvelle méthode, qui associe un modèle de micro-simulation à un modèle EGC classique. Les deux sont utilisés de manière séquentielle (à l'instar de l'étude récente de Robilliard *et al.*, 2002). Le modèle EGC et le modèle de micro-simulation sont calibrés à l'aide d'une MCS récente et d'une enquête auprès des ménages colombiens ; ensemble, ils restituent les caractéristiques structurelles de l'économie et le détail de ses mécanismes de formation du revenu. Les auteurs utilisent ce cadre pour analyser les importantes évolutions qui sont intervenues dans les années 1990, après la grande vague de libéralisation des échanges, dans la répartition des revenus et la pauvreté. Ils parviennent ainsi à une conclusion politique majeure : la libéralisation des échanges peut fortement contribuer à réduire la pauvreté. Indépendamment d'autres chocs simultanés et de la croissance de l'offre de main-d'œuvre, l'abaissement des tarifs douaniers du début des années 1990 semble avoir largement participé à la réduction totale du niveau de pauvreté enregistré entre 1988 et 1995. Cela est particulièrement vrai pour les zones rurales. En outre, les impacts distributifs varient profondément entre zones rurales et zones urbaines, et la méthodologie adoptée par les auteurs montre que les résultats agrégés nets — comme l'évolution du ratio de pauvreté (dénombrement) — masquent l'importance des mouvements de personnes qui passent au-dessus ou en dessous du seuil de pauvreté. Le cadre proposé ici permet de comprendre les principaux canaux empruntés par les chocs macro affectant le revenu des ménages ; il peut aussi contribuer à l'élaboration de mesures correctrices en faveur des pauvres.

SUMMARY

Assessing the final impact of globalisation on poverty is a difficult task: *i)* globalisation affects poverty through numerous channels; *ii)* some linkages are positive and some are negative and therefore cannot be analysed qualitatively but require quantitative assessments, i.e. formal numerical models; and *iii)* trade expansion and growth (key aspects of globalisation) are essentially macro phenomena, whereas poverty is fundamentally a micro phenomenon. In this paper we use a new method that combines a micro-simulation model and a standard CGE model. These two models are used in a sequential fashion (as in a recent paper by Robilliard *et al.*, 2002). The CGE model and the micro-simulation model are calibrated using a recent SAM and household survey for Colombia and together they capture the structural features of the economy and its detailed income generation mechanisms. We use this framework to analyse the important income distribution and poverty changes occurred with the great trade liberalisation of the 1990s. A major policy conclusion is that trade liberalisation can substantially contribute to improve the poverty situation. Abstracting from simultaneous additional shocks and labour supply growth, the beginning of the 1990s tariff abatement seems to have accounted for a very large share of the total reduction in poverty recorded from 1988 to 1995. This holds in particular for rural areas. Furthermore distributional impacts differ fundamentally between rural and urban areas, and our methodology highlights that aggregate net results, such as the change in the poverty ratio (headcount), conceal important flows in and out of poverty. This framework allows us to capture important channels through which macro shocks affect household incomes and possibly to help in designing corrective pro-poor policies.

I. INTRODUCTION

During the last two decades, bilateral and multilateral donors' policy advice to developing countries has been centred on greater market openness and better integration into the global economy. This advice is based on two major assumptions. First, that outward-oriented economies are not only more efficient and less prone to resource waste, but have also performed well in terms of overall development. Second, that raising average incomes benefit all groups within countries, i.e. the notion that as long as inequality is not increasing, economic progress will reduce poverty. However, these assumptions have recently been challenged, and the effects of globalisation on poverty are generating growing concern.

To address these concerns and, at the same time, to assist in the formulation of better pro-poor policies, a clearer understanding of the complex relationship between globalisation and poverty is needed. This paper's main objective is to determine the sign and strength of the effects of trade liberalisation, an important globalisation shock, on poverty in the context of a case-study for Colombia.

At the beginning of the 1990s Colombia abandoned its import substitution industrialisation policy and started a process of trade liberalisation which culminated with the drastic tariffs cuts of the 1990-91. Colombian trade reform has been one of the most swift import liberalisation of Latin America, within a few months tariffs were more than halved and a series of institutions delegated to regulate commercial policy, including the Ministry of Foreign trade, had been created or reformed. In addition to the trade liberalisation policy, the government implemented a series of other structural reforms ranging from labour reform and foreign exchange deregulation, to financial markets reforms, including establishing the independence of the central bank, and to the promulgation of a new constitution.

In the same period, poverty recorded some improvements in the urban areas but stagnated in the rural ones, and inequality registered a significant countrywide increase. Identifying the poverty and inequality effects of each of the mentioned reforms, as well as those originating from additional technology and external shocks that affected Colombia in the first half of the 1990s is a complex task, even when two well conducted households surveys provide data before and after the reform effort, namely for the years 1988 and 1995.

To tackle this task, this paper follows an approach quite different from that of a large, although not uncontroversial, literature that analyses the links between openness and growth (Rodriguez and Rodrik, 2000) and references cited therein), or from those studies that extend these links to include poverty (Dollar and Kraay, 2000). This literature relies on cross-national regressions and, although they provide some evidence on the

positive relationship linking openness to growth and poverty, in the words of Srinivasan and Bhagwati (1999) "nuanced, in-depth analyses of country experiences […] taking into account numerous country-specific factors" are needed to plausibly appraise the connections between openness and growth. Their arguments apply, even more strongly, to the case of the links between globalisation and poverty. In this case, country-specific characteristics — such as: *i)* the type and duration of globalisation shocks; *ii)* the structure of the economy (which can be resource abundant or labour abundant; rural agricultural economy or urban light manufactures exporting country); and *iii)* the poor' socio-economic characteristics — are crucial to assess the final effects of globalisation on poverty.

Single country studies have also their own limitations, though. They mainly suffer from having too few degrees of freedom, which makes identifying and separating the effects of simultaneous different shocks almost impossible. The use of detailed household surveys reveals many characteristics of the income distribution but it is not enough to understand whether trade opening improves or worsens income distribution for those countries, and they are the majority where, together with tariff abatement, other policy reforms are implemented, or other shocks affect them. Multi-year surveys that follow households for long periods of time overcome these problems by applying panel data techniques; however, these types of survey are still quite rare for most developing countries.

An alternative method allowing the analysis of single well-identified shocks is represented by numerical simulation models. When a shock is applied to these models, they determine sectoral production changes, resources reallocations, and factors and goods price changes. These macro adjustments can then be *translated* into micro effects on the level of individual and households' incomes. This "translation" normally relies on aggregating households in different groups according to the main sources of income or to other important socioeconomic characteristics of the head of the household. Finally, for each household group, a parametric income distribution is assumed, so that the initial shock is translated in changes of the average income of the household heads of each group, and, through the parametric distribution, poverty and inequality effects are assessed.

This method, known in the literature as the representative household group (RHG) approach, can produce insightful results with parsimonious data requirements and straightforward assumptions and it has therefore been applied in numerous cases (Robinson, 1978; Bussolo and Round, 2003). However it has two mayor drawbacks: firstly, the only endogenously determined income distribution variations are those due to changes *between* household groups, given that *within* household groups variance is fixed. Secondly, the composition of the household income is also fixed, therefore changes of occupational status, for instance, from formal wage-work to informal self-employment of the household head — or even increased labour participation or other important variations in income-generation processes of other non-head members of the households — are not accounted for. Often though, within groups income changes and alterations in the composition of income, such as the dramatic income shift due to a household member finding a job or becoming unemployed, are the crucial factors explaining poverty and inequality fluctuations.

This paper, following a pioneer study on Indonesia (Robilliard *et al.*, 2002), attempts to get the best of two worlds by using a novel methodology that links the macro numerical simulation model with a micro-simulation model, and thus it can estimate full sample poverty and inequality effects without the drawbacks of the multi-country or RHG approaches.

Beyond these important methodological innovations, this paper aims at providing policy-relevant results. By clarifying the mechanisms through which important reforms as trade liberalisation affect income distribution, policy makers can adopt counter-balancing strategies to assist the poorest or improve their chances to escape poverty altogether.

Summarising the main results for Colombia, we find that trade liberalisation triggers two types of changes: *i)* in the labour force composition, from self-employment to more wage-employment, and *ii)* in the levels of income, an increase of agricultural profits. This latter increase in income is found not to be sufficient to lift the poorest peasants out of poverty, however, moving from self-employment into much higher remunerated wage-employment however may do the job.

Besides these income-generation related changes, increased openness affects the expenditure side as well by altering the relative prices of consumption goods. A useful initial result is that the income channel, namely occupational status and factor prices fluctuations, is more important for the poor than the expenditure channel, i.e. the change in price of the goods bought by the poor.

Finally, compared to the full sample approach, we find that the RHG approach conceals the distributional impact of this important income channel. More importantly, the sign of the bias due to the RHG assumption cannot be established ex-ante and it entails overestimation of poverty effects for certain households and underestimation for others, thus making the implementation of pro-poor corrective measures very difficult.

Our dual-model methodology clearly illustrates which policy-induced changes are pro-poor, and through which channels the poor are negatively affected. Such detailed insights become essential for a successful pro-poor globalisation strategy.

The paper is organised as follows. The next section presents the main economic policy reforms and the simultaneous poverty and inequality changes for Colombia at the beginning of the 1990s, section III discusses the methodology more in detail, section IV presents the results and the final section concludes.

II. ECONOMIC POLICY, POVERTY AND INEQUALITY IN COLOMBIA

On the 7th of August 1990, Cesar Gaviria was inaugurated as Colombia constitutional president. During the next eighteen months a set of policies aimed at drastically changing the nature of Colombia's economic structure were put into effect. Even before elected, Gaviria was talking about a "revolcon" of the economy[1]. Among the various reforms the most relevant were the so-called "Apertura" or trade liberalisation and the labour reform.

Colombia's trade reform was announced as a gradual and selective process that should have liberalised imports during a five-year period lasting until the end of 1994. It is important to notice that Gaviria's strategy for smoothing the adjustments imposed by the liberalisation of imports was to accompany this liberalisation with a monetary policy aimed at a real depreciation of the peso. However, in 1990 the real exchange rate was at a most depreciated level in decades, and efforts to further depreciations were contrasted by increasing speculations of an appreciation, which were also fuelled by the discovery of new oil fields. Facilitated by the opening of the capital account (another of the structural reforms implemented in that period), large capital inflows and stagnating imports generated a balance of payment surplus that entailed international reserves accumulation. This situation created increasing difficulties of monetary management and, in September 1991, the government took the brave decision to drastically reduce tariffs almost overnight. Table 1 gives some indications of the magnitude of the "Apertura": in just a few months, nominal average tariffs went from almost 40 per cent to about 10 per cent and the sectoral dispersion of the protection rates also went down as shown by a dramatic reduction of the average effective rate from almost 70 to just 22 per cent. This move finally showed the government's commitment to free trade and imports surged. At a later stage in 1994, vested interests in protected sectors attempted to regroup and change the situation, but they just obtained small exemptions and minor benefits and Colombia's trade liberalisation could not be reversed.

Table 1. **Trade Liberalisation in Colombia**

Type of Goods \ Year	Nominal Tariff Rates %		Effective rates of Protection %	
	1990	1992	1990	1992
Consumption goods	53	17	109	37
Intermediate inputs	36	10	61	18
Capital goods	34	10	48	15
TOTAL	39	12	67	22

---

1.   This may be translated as "major shake-up".

Quantitative restrictions were almost completely eliminated, too. Before Gaviria took office 50 per cent of all imports were subject to import licensing, after one year less than 3 per cent of imports were still under the licensing scheme[2]. As mentioned in the introduction, trade tax reductions were complemented with other measures including: regulation of trade issues, as anti-dumping and other unfair competition; institutional reform, as the creation of a new independent Ministry of Foreign trade; stipulation of International trade treaties, as the free trade area (FTA) with Venezuela in 1991, the contemporary reviving of the Andean Pact, another FTA with Chile in 1993, and the Group of 3 treaty with Mexico and Venezuela in 1994.

The main objectives of the "Apertura" policy package were to stimulate growth and to improve the income distribution. A reallocation of resources towards more productive uses accompanied with a weakening of the oligopolistic structure of the domestic industries was expected to create new growth opportunities, additionally these were enhanced by increased private capital inflows. A specialisation towards labour intensive industries of the Colombian economy should also have helped with the income distribution objective; besides a clearer trade policy should have decreased rent seeking activities and their negative income distribution effects.

The second most relevant policy reform at the beginning of the 1990s was the labour market reform and, given that this reform has strong influences on a crucial income generation process and may thus directly affect income distribution, it deserve a brief digression. Colombia's traditional labour legislation was extremely rigid and one of its worst features was represented by the prohibitive severance payments that workers with more than 10 years of continuous employment in the same job were granted. These basically gave automatic tenure to workers with more than 10 years on the job, but also reduced the possibility of a worker to achieve that 10-year limit. In fact it has been calculated that only 2.5 workers out of 100 were continuously employed for more than 10 years. This rigidity created serious employment stability problems in the labour market and was eliminated with its reform. This also regulated more clearly the hiring of temporary workers generating new employment opportunities especially for unskilled workers. Kugler (1999) and Kugler and Cardenas (1999) provide empirical evidence that this reform increased the Colombian labour market flexibility and its employment turnover. In particular, due to the reduction of dismissal costs, the *formal* labour market registered an increase in employment exit rate and a reduction of the average job tenure: these effects did not occur in the informal sector given its initial greater flexibility (or larger non-compliance of the labour code).

As already mentioned, the late 1980s and the beginning of the 1990s witnessed a series of other important structural reforms such as those affecting taxes, housing policy, exchange controls, ports regulations, central bank independence, financial (de)regulation, decentralisation, social security and privatisation. Additionally, international prices for coffee and oil (the most important exports) fluctuated around a

---

2.   It should be noted that, due to data deficiencies, the abolition of quantitative restrictions is not simulated in the current version of the model. For more details on this sort of policy experiments see Bussolo and Roland-Holst (1999).

lowering trend and other external shocks (mainly capital flows volatility) affected the overall performance of Colombia.

Against this background of economic policy reforms and external shocks, the remaining part of this section summarises the evolution of poverty and inequality. At first sight, the described economic reforms seem to have brought substantial welfare gains to the Colombians. Between 1988 and 1995, mean per capita income had increased at a yearly rate of approximately 2.3 per cent. This increase only partially resulted in poverty reduction, since inequality, particularly between rural and urban populations, worsened. Whereas urban mean per capita income rose by 3.2 per cent per annum, rural incomes almost stagnated, growing at a rate lower than 1 per cent per annum[3].

As shown in Table 2, a recent World Bank Poverty report (2002) finds that urban poverty has declined significantly throughout the 1980s and the first half of the 1990s. According to this assessment, rural poverty has remained relatively stable at high levels between 1988 and 1995 after important improvements in the 1980s. A UNDP study (1998) comes to different conclusions. Overall poverty is found to be stable between 1988 and 1995. This stability is mainly due to slightly improving poverty situation in urban areas, whereas rural poverty increases significantly with a headcount ratio up from 63 to 69 per cent.

The World Bank poverty report (2002) finds extreme poverty to decrease faster than moderate poverty. In both urban and rural areas significant progress can be observed between 1988 and 1995.

Table 2. **Poverty Indicators, Colombia 1988-95**

Indicator	World Bank (2002)		UNDP (1998)	
	1988	*1995*	*1988*	*1995*
National values				
Poverty incidence	0.65	0.60	0.54	0.54
Poverty gap	0.32	0.29	0.25	0.23
Extreme poverty incidence	0.29	0.21		
Urban values				
Poverty incidence	0.55	0.48	0.44	0.43
Poverty gap	0.23	0.19	0.15	0.14
Extreme poverty incidence	0.17	0.10		
Rural values				
Poverty incidence	0.80	0.79	0.63	0.69
Poverty gap	0.43	0.40	0.33	0.36
Extreme poverty incidence	0.48	0.37		

---

3.   See World Bank (2002, p. 13). It should be noted that 1988 was an exceptionally prosperous year for agriculture due to the devaluation and a higher coffee production combined with higher coffee prices.

With regard to the trends in inequality, the reviewed studies come to similar conclusions although the magnitude of observed trends varies significantly[4]. They all note a significant increase in inequality in the first half of the 1990s. As might be already inferred from the development of mean per capita incomes discussed above, an important part of the overall deterioration of inequality is due to a widening gap *between* the urban and rural groups' incomes. Nevertheless, *within* group inequality remains the most important determinant of income inequality. All studies confirm opposite trends for *within* inequality in urban and rural areas with a decreasing rural inequality and a worsening urban inequality. It should be noted that the general pattern of inequality trends does not depend on whether one chooses individual earnings or per capita household incomes (Vélez *et al.*, 2001, p. 6). Based on Generalised Lorenz curve considerations, Vélez *et al.* (2001, p. 5) conclude that "despite income inequality fluctuations, social welfare in urban Colombia improved substantially and unambiguously […] from 1988 to 1995. In rural areas, welfare improvements are […] somewhat ambiguous."

Table 3. **Inequality Measures, Colombia 1988-95**

Indicator	World Bank (2002)		UNDP (1998)		Vélez et al. (2001)	
	1988	*1995*	*1988*	*1995*	*1988*	*1995*
	National values					
Gini	0.54	0.56	0.55	0.56		
Theil	0.54	0.57			0.55	0.75
Theil within	0.50	0.59			0.47	0.63
Theil between	0.10	0.11			0.08	0.11
	Urban values					
Gini	0.49	0.52	0.49	0.52	0.50	0.54
Theil	0.41	0.48			0.50	0.71
	Rural values					
Gini	0.47	0.45	0.51	0.49	0.44	0.41
Theil	0.40	0.36			0.35	0.29

To sum up, improvement in urban areas resulted from a decrease of both extreme and moderate poverty, despite increasing inequality. In rural areas, the poverty situation has not changed significantly between 1988 and 1995 even if all indicators point to a more even rural income distribution.

---

4.   See World Bank (2002), Vélez *et al.* (2001), Ocampo *et al.* (2000), and UNDP (1998).

III. THE MICRO-MACRO MODELLING FRAMEWORK

III.1. The Micro-Simulation Model

In the micro-simulation, we model the household income generation process[5]. Individuals make occupational choices and earn wages or profits accordingly. These labour market incomes plus exogenous other incomes, such as transfers and imputed housing rents, comprise household income. The micro-simulation enables us to take individual and household heterogeneity into account. Individual heterogeneity refers to personal characteristics which influence occupational choices and income generated on the labour market. Occupational choices are subject to a number of factors, which include gender, marital status, or age of children. Important determinants of labour income are education and experience. Household heterogeneity is reflected, for example, in different sources of income and demographic composition. Furthermore, the micro-simulation captures some household heterogeneity in terms of expenditure structure. In order to do so, households are classified into 5 household groups according to household per capita income with different expenditure shares with regard to food- and non-food items. The micro-simulation is based on Colombian household surveys[6].

Income Generation Model

The components of the income generation model on the individual level are an occupational choice and an earnings model. The individual can choose between inactivity, wage-employment, and self-employment. In rural areas, there is a fourth option of being both wage-employed and self-employed. The occupational choice is assumed to be different for household heads, spouses, and other family members. The labour market exhibits a high degree of segmentation, which runs across different types of activities, sectors, and personal characteristics. As the possible occupational choices imply, earnings are generated either in the form of wages or as profits for the self-employed.

---

5. The following section borrows heavily from Robilliard *et al.* (2001). A more detailed discussion of a similar labour market specification can be found in Alatas and Bourguignon (2000).

6. The household survey used for estimation of the micro-simulation parameters is the Colombian Encuesta Nacional de Hogares from 1988 (EH61). After the removal of outliers, removal of individuals with top-coded earnings, and observations with missing data the survey covers 29 729 individuals living in 12 092 households in urban areas, and 15 006 individuals in 5 384 households in rural areas. The expenditure shares are calculated from an income and expenditure survey and matched with the EH61 based on household groups. For the problems of these datasets see Núñez and Jiménez (1997).

Individuals in rural areas can receive a mixed income from both types of activities. This latter option will be ignored in the following illustration of the model. Being self-employed means being part of what might be called a "household-enterprise". All self-employed members of a household pool their incomes. This pooled income is then called profit. The mechanisms of profits earned in agriculture on the one hand side and other activities, such as petty trade, on the other are assumed to be different. Since agriculture plays a negligible role in urban areas, this differentiation is only implemented for rural areas. We also introduce segmentation in wage-employment market. The wage setting mechanisms are assumed to differ between urban and rural areas, for skilled and unskilled labour, and for females and males, which implies that the model has eight wage labour market segments.

Household income comprises the labour income of all active household members and other income. Wages and profits are thus the variable income sources of the household. All other incomes are assumed to be exogenous and constant over time. The resulting total household income is deflated with a household group specific price index, which takes into account the differences in budget shares for food and non-food.

The income generation process, which consists of the occupational choice and the earnings models, is first estimated using data from the Colombian household survey from 1988[7]. The estimated benchmark coefficients are then employed and changed in the micro-simulation.

Link to the CGE

The micro-simulation is linked to the CGE through wages, profits, the shares of different occupational choices, and the vector of consumption prices. The variables passed from the CGE to the micro-simulation include the average wage in each labour market segment, the average profits for different activities, the shares of self- and wage-employed for each segment (labour force composition), and finally the relative price of food and non-food. The micro-simulation now computes changes in earnings and labour force composition. These changes originate in coefficient changes in the occupational choice and the earnings models. Coefficients are adjusted, and occupational choices and earnings change accordingly, until the results of the micro-simulation are consistent with the results from the CGE model.

Elements of the Model

The following set of equations describes the model. Household m has k_m members, which are indexed by i.

$$log\ w_{mi} = a_{g(mi)} + x_{mi}\beta_{g(mi)} + e_{mi} \tag{1}$$

---

7. The occupational choice model was estimated using a multinomial logit. The wage equations were estimated by Ordinary Least Squares. Correcting for selection bias in these equations did not lead to major changes in the results and was hence dropped. In the estimation of the profit functions, the number of self-employed was instrumented. For a more detailed discussion of the estimation methods see Bourguignon and Alatas (2000).

$$log\ \pi_m = b_{f(m)} + z_m \delta_{f(m)} + \lambda_{f(m)} N_m + \varepsilon_m \tag{2}$$

$$Y_m = \frac{1}{P_m} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{k_m} w_{mi} IW_{mi} + \pi_m Ind(N_m > 0) + y_0 \right) \tag{3}$$

$$P_m = s_{d(m)} p_f + (1 - s_{d(m)}) p_{nf} \tag{4}$$

$$IW_{mi} = Ind\left[c_{h(mi)}^w + z_{mi}\alpha_{h(mi)}^w + u_{mi}^w > Sup\left(0, c_{h(mi)}^s + z_{mi}\alpha_{h(mi)}^s + u_{mi}^s\right)\right] \tag{5}$$

$$N_m = \sum_{i=1}^{k_m} Ind\left[c_{h(mi)}^s + z_{mi}\alpha_{h(mi)}^s + u_{mi}^s > Sup\left(0, c_{h(mi)}^w + z_{mi}\alpha_{h(mi)}^w + u_{mi}^w\right)\right] \tag{6}$$

The first equation is a Mincerian wage equation, where the log wage of member i of household m depends on his/her personal characteristics. The explanatory variables include schooling years, experience, the squared terms of these two variables, and a set of regional dummies. This wage equation is estimated for each labour market segment. The wage labour market consists of eight segments, which are defined according to area (urban or rural), gender, and skill level (primary schooling or secondary schooling and more). The index function $g(mi)$ assigns individual i in household m to a specific labour market segment. The residual term e_{mi} describes unobserved earnings determinants[8].

The second equation represents the profit function of household m. Profits are earned if at least one member of the household is self-employed. The profit function is of a Mincer type and includes as explanatory variables the schooling of the household head, her/his experience plus the squared terms the former two variables, and regional dummies. Of course, profits also depend on the number of self-employed in household m, N_m. The residual ε_m captures unobserved effects. The index function $f(m)$ denotes whether a household earns profits in urban or rural areas. Furthermore, different profit functions for agricultural, non-agricultural, and mixed activities are estimated in rural areas.

Family income is defined by the third equation. It consists of the wages and profits earned by the family members and an exogenous income y_{0m}. This exogenous income corresponds to "other income" in the survey and may include government transfers, transfers from abroad, capital income, etc.. IW_{mi} is a dummy variable that equals 1 if member i of the household is wage-employed and 0 otherwise. Likewise, profits will only be earned if at least one family member is self-employed ($N_m > 0$). Family income is deflated by a household specific price index.

This household specific price index is defined by equation (4). The parameter s denotes the expenditure shares for food- and non-food. These shares are calculated by household income quintiles. Note that the prices p_f for food and p_{nf} for non-food are generated in the CGE model. The index function $d(m)$ indicates to which of the five income brackets household m belongs and which food expenditure share is assigned to the household.

---

8. It is important to note that the micro-simulation as specified here does not generate a synthetic panel. It rather produces a second cross-section. As will be explained later in more detail, we need to differentiate between permanent and transitory components of the residual in order to analyse income mobility or poverty transitions.

The fifth equation explains the aforementioned dummy IW_{mi}. The individual will be wage-employed if the utility associated with wage-employment is higher than the utility of being self-employed or inactive. The utility of being inactive is arbitrarily set to zero, whereas the utilities of the employment options depend on a set of personal and family characteristics, z_{mi}. These characteristics include gender, marital status, education, experience, other income, the educational attainments of other family members, and the number of children. Unobserved determinants of occupational choices are represented by the residuals.

Equation (6) gives the number of self-employed. Similar to the choice in equation (5), the individual i of household k will prefer self-employment if the associated utility is higher than the utility of inactivity or wage-employment. The self-employed household members form the "household enterprise" with N_m working members. Thus, the last two equations represent the occupational choices of the household members. The occupational choice model is estimated separately for household heads, spouses, and other family members in urban and rural areas. The index function $h(mi)$ assigns the individual to the corresponding group.

The model just described gives the household income as a non-linear function of individual and household characteristics, unobserved characteristics, and the household budget shares. This function depends on three sets of parameters, which are estimated based on the 1988 survey. These parameters include (1) the parameters of the wage equation for each labour market segment, (2) the parameters of the profit function for "household enterprises" in urban areas and different activities in rural areas, (3) the parameters in the utility associated with different occupational choices for heads, spouses, and other family members. As will be explained later in more detail, some of these parameters are changed in order to produce the aggregate results with regard to wages, profits, and employment shares given by the CGE. The CGE also gives the price vector, which in a last step is used to deflate family income.

Remarks on the Labour Market Specification

The specification of the income generation model requires some remarks on the assumptions behind this formulation. Despite the availability of working time we decided to model the occupational choice as a discrete choice. Therefore, the estimated wage equations and profit functions may include a labour supply dimension[9]. Second, our model assumes that the Colombian labour market is highly segmented. The labour market is believed to be segmented along different lines. One line of segmentation results from distinguishing between wage-employment and self-employment. In a perfectly competitive labour market, the returns to labour would be equal for these two types of employment. Yet, a number of reasons justify this segmentation. Income from self-employment is likely to contain a rent from non-labour assets used. Information on these non-labour assets, land in rural areas and at least a small amount of capital in urban areas, is not available for Colombia. Hence, even if the labour market were

---

9. However, estimating wage equations based on hourly wages did not make a major difference in the coefficients.

competitive, we would have to estimate different equations. But there are also a number of reasons to assume that the labour market may be segmented in the sense that returns to labour are not equalised across self- and wage-employment. Wage-employment may be rationed. In this case, self-employment would "absorb" those who do not get a job in the preferred wage work. Conversely, self-employment might exhibit important externalities, for example for families in which children have to be taken care of. Furthermore, we assume segmentation within the wage labour market. This hypothesis of further segmentation of the wage labour market along the lines of different gender, skill, and area is strongly supported by the regression results. The same holds for the estimation of different profit functions for agricultural and non-agricultural activities in rural areas.

Estimation first

As mentioned above, the occupational choice model and the wage and profits equations are estimated in a first step in order to obtain an initial set of coefficients (a_G, β_G, b_F, δ_F, c_H^w, α_H^w, c_H^s, α_H^s) and unobserved characteristics (e_{mi}, ε_{mi}, u_{mi}^w, u_{mi}^s). Unobserved characteristics say for the wage equation can of course only be obtained for those who are actually wage-employed. For self-employed or inactive individuals the unobserved characteristics in the wage-equation are generated by drawing random numbers from a normal distribution. In the same way, we generate unobserved characteristics for the profit function for households in which nobody is self-employed. As we estimate wage and profit functions using ordinary least squares, we assume these unobserved characteristics to be normally distributed. Additionally, unobserved characteristics need to be generated for the occupational choice model. These residuals are assumed to be distributed according to the double exponential law since we estimate a multinomial logit model. They were drawn randomly consistent with the observed occupational choice, i.e. the utility a wage earner relates to wage-employment has to be higher than the utility she/he associates with inactivity or self-employment.

Macro-Micro Link in Detail

In the following, we explore the link between the micro-simulation and the CGE. The link is easy to understand if the sequential character of the model is remembered. The globalisation shock simulated in the CGE causes wages, profits, employment shares and prices to change. The CGE results of these changes are then passed on to the micro-simulation, which has to produce a population, whose aggregate characteristics in terms of wages, profits, and employment match with those given by the CGE. Therefore, consistency or equilibrium requires that (1) the changes in average wages in each segment, (2) the changes in average profits in each activity, (3) the changes in employment shares in each segment, i.e. the shares of wage-earners, self-employed, and inactive individuals per segment, and (4) the price changes must match the changes of these variables in the CGE.

The CGE is calibrated in such a way that it is consistent with the benchmark micro-simulation. This benchmark micro-simulation can be produced by using the set of

initial coefficients and unobserved characteristics obtained through the estimation work just described[10]. The following constraints describe the consistency requirements.

$$\sum_m \sum_{i,g(mi)=G} \hat{IW}_{mi} =$$

$$\sum_m \sum_{i,g(mi)=G} Ind\left[\hat{c}^w_{h(mi)} + z_{mi}\hat{\alpha}^w_{h(mi)} + \hat{u}^w_{mi} > Sup\left(0, \hat{c}^s_{h(mi)} + z_{mi}\hat{\alpha}^s_{h(mi)} + \hat{u}^s_{mi}\right)\right] = E_G \quad (7)$$

$$\sum_m \sum_{i,g(mi)=G} Ind\left[\hat{c}^s_{h(mi)} + z_{mi}\hat{\alpha}^s_{h(mi)} + \hat{u}^s_{mi} > Sup\left(0, \hat{c}^w_{h(mi)} + z_{mi}\hat{\alpha}^w_{h(mi)} + \hat{u}^w_{mi}\right)\right] = S_G \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_m \sum_{i,g(mi)=G} exp\left(\hat{a}_G + x_{mi}\hat{\beta}_G + \hat{e}_{mi}\right)\hat{IW}_{mi} = w_G \quad (9)$$

$$\sum_{m,f(m)=F} exp\left(\hat{b}_G + z_m\hat{\partial}_G + \hat{\varepsilon}_m\right)Ind(N_m > 0) = \pi_F \quad (10)$$

Equation (7) states that the number of wage-employed individuals has to be equal in the CGE (E_G) and the micro-simulation for each labour market segment. Remember that G stands for the eight labour market segments, i.e. urban male skilled and unskilled, urban female skilled and unskilled, rural male skilled and unskilled, rural female skilled and unskilled labour. The same holds for the number of self-employed in each segment, which is specified in equation (8).

Total wages paid in segment G in the CGE, w_G, have to be equal to the sum of wages over families and wage-employed individuals in the micro-simulation, as indicated by equation (9). This has to be fulfilled also for the profits in activity F as in equation (10). Thus, π_F denotes the total profits for self-employment activity F given by the CGE. The different self-employment activities include urban self-employment, rural agricultural, rural non-agricultural, and rural mixed activities. Note that ^ indicates that the coefficients, residuals, and indicator function values result from the estimation described above.

The globalisation shock now produces changes in E_G, the number of wage-employed, S_G, the number of self-employed, w_G, the sum of wages paid in segment G, π_F, the sum of profits paid in activity F, and q, the price vector. The result is a new vector of these variables, which will be identified by an asterisk (E^*_G, S^*_G, w^*_G, π^*_F, q^*). For the above constraints to hold, we now need a vector of coefficients and prices (a_G, β_G, b_F, δ_F, c_H^w, α_H^w, c_H^s, α_H^s, p). For the price vector this is trivial, as p equals q. For the coefficients, many solutions exist. Therefore, we have to introduce additional constraints. As in Robilliard *et al.* (2001) our choice is to vary the constants (a_G, b_F, c_H^w, c_H^s) and leave the other coefficients unchanged. We hence assume that the changes in occupational choices and earnings are dependent on personal and household characteristics only to a limited degree. Changing the intercept in one of the wage equations implies that all individuals of the respective segment experience the same increase in log earnings. This increase

---

10. By doing this, we simply reproduce the original dataset.

does not depend on individual characteristics. The same holds for the profit functions. With regard to the occupational choice, it should be noted that the CGE does not allow for distinguishing between the choices of heads, spouses, and others. The changes are thus the same across these groups.

Consistency of the micro-simulation and the CGE requires the solution of the following system of equations. The right hand side variables are those through which the macro model communicates with the micro-simulation. Additionally, the prices for food and non-food items are given by the CGE. However, the price vector is only finally applied in order to deflate household income.

$$\sum_m \sum_{i,g(mi)=G} \hat{IW}_{mi} =$$

$$\sum_m \sum_{i,g(mi)=G} Ind\left[c^{*w}_{h(mi)} + z_{mi}\hat{\alpha}^w_{h(mi)} + \hat{u}^w_{mi} > Sup\left(0, c^{*s}_{h(mi)} + z_{mi}\hat{\alpha}^s_{h(mi)} + \hat{u}^s_{mi}\right)\right] = E^*_G \tag{11}$$

$$\sum_m \sum_{i,g(mi)=G} Ind\left[c^{*s}_{h(mi)} + z_{mi}\hat{\alpha}^s_{h(mi)} + \hat{u}^s_{mi} > Sup\left(0, c^{*w}_{h(mi)} + z_{mi}\hat{\alpha}^w_{h(mi)} + \hat{u}^w_{mi}\right)\right] = S^*_G \tag{12}$$

$$\sum_m \sum_{i,g(mi)=G} exp\left(a^*_G + x_{mi}\hat{\beta}_G + \hat{e}_{mi}\right)\hat{IW}_{mi} = w^*_G \tag{13}$$

$$\sum_{m,f(m)=F} exp\left(b^*_G + z_m\hat{\partial}_G + \hat{\varepsilon}_m\right)Ind(N_m > 0) = \pi^*_F \tag{14}$$

Equations (11) and (12) require the number of self-employed and wage-employed (and both self-employed and wage-employed in rural areas) to be consistent with the CGE results for each of the eight segments (G). This also holds for the wage equation for each of the segments and the profit function for each of the four activities, as indicated by equations (13) and (14). Hence, the above system contains 28 restrictions. The system has eight unknown constants in the wage equations, four in the profit functions, and 16 in the occupational choice model[11]. Thus we have 28 unknown constants and 28 equations. We obtain the solution by applying standard Gauss-Newton techniques.

Solving the above system gives us a new set of constants (a^*_G, b^*_F, c^{*w}_H, c^{*s}_H), which is then used to compute occupational choices, wages, and profits. The resulting household incomes are deflated by the household group specific price index derived from the CGE results for food and non-food prices.

Linking the CGE and the micro-simulation in the way described above goes beyond simply rescaling various household income sources or reweighing households dependent on the occupation of its members. Rescaling and reweighing is what the representative household approach does. On the contrary, the simulation takes the different sources of household income into account, which represents a more accurate

---

11. Note that the constants of the occupational choice model – though estimated separately for heads, spouses, and others – are changed separately across the eight labour market segments. Therefore, we have 16 unknown constants in the occupational choice model, two occupational choices in each of the four urban labour market segments, and three in each of the four rural segments.

method than just rescaling household incomes of certain household groups. Furthermore, the simulation of occupational choices is a more complex operation than just reweighing occupational household groups. Occupational choices are made on an individual level and they are based on a wide range of characteristics of the individual.

Synthetic Panel?

At first sight, one may be inclined to think that our method generates a kind of synthetic panel, which would be most helpful and interesting from an analytical point of view. If we want to analyse poverty dynamics, we need to trace individuals and households across time. However, for producing a synthetic panel we need to introduce further assumptions as will be shown in the following. We will illustrate the arising problems based on the wage equation, but they apply to all the simulated relationships. In a dynamic context, the wage equation contains three components. Wages in period 0 consists of observed permanent earnings, i.e. the share of the earnings that can be explained by our model, unobserved permanent earnings e^p and unobserved transitory earnings e^t_0 in period 0.

$$log\, w_0 = a + x\beta + e = a + x\beta + e^p + e^t_0 \tag{15}$$

From period 0 to period 1, the constant a is modified due to the policy change that triggered the changes in the CGE, so that in the next period we have a^*. If we assume that the distribution of the transitory component is the same in both periods, we know that among the people with characteristics x and an unobserved permanent component, e^p, there will be *somebody* with a transitory component equal to e^t_0. This implies that to any individual in period 0 with earnings given by (15) we may associate *somebody* with earnings given by the following equation.

$$log\, w_1 = a^* + x\beta + e = a^* + x\beta + e^p + e^t_0 \tag{16}$$

The individual with earnings given by (16) is not the same as the individual whose earnings were represented by (15). Since this is what we do in the micro-simulation, as set up to this point, we do not generate a synthetic panel, but two cross-sections. Based on two-cross-sections it is of course not possible to trace individuals through time. Yet, there is no problem if we compute aggregate inequality and poverty indicators, which we compare across time. In order to study poverty dynamics though we would have to make sure that we could identify the individuals of the households who cross the poverty line. It is therefore not sufficient to associate somebody with unobserved earnings, but a specific individual.

The reason why we cannot simulate a panel arises from the fact that we cannot differentiate between the two unobserved components. However, introducing a set of assumptions with regard to these two terms helps. First, we assume the transitory component to be independent and identically distributed across time. Second, we have to make an assumption about the proportions of the variance of the entire residual term e that is due to the respective components. There are though a number of difficulties related to this method, in particular to the specification of the variance proportions. Some empirical estimates of these proportions can be found in Atkinson *et al.* (1992) where a number of empirical studies on earnings mobility are surveyed. They find the proportions

of the three components in an earnings panel model to differ substantially across different studies. Of course, the total unobserved component is smaller the better the model explains log earnings. The proportion of the transitory component in log earnings covariance varies between less than 10 and 30 per cent over long time horizons of more than 10 years. We are not aware of empirical work on earnings mobility in developing countries, which would analyse these issues in detail. There is scope for further research on earnings mobility as some panel datasets have become available. Assuming a small proportion of transitory earnings in developing economies in general may be justified by a number of arguments. Social mobility is generally lower in developing countries[12]. From this, we may infer that transitory earnings account for a smaller proportion of earnings. Additionally, recent research has shown that income shocks remain after a considerable period of time, which also would imply less importance of a transitory component, at least in the short run[13]. On the other hand, the transitory component may be particularly important for small farms, which are exposed to a number of transitory, primarily natural, risks.

For the purpose of the poverty transition analysis, we simulated a panel based on the aforementioned assumptions. These panel-based results are of a preliminary character and should be treated with caution, as further research in this field is needed. Experimenting with different proportions in the micro-simulation had a substantial impact on the results. Reducing the proportion of the variance of the residual term e, which is due to the transitory component, to 10 per cent produced results in the historical simulation, which were close to those of the original simulation of two cross-sections. Using higher proportions due to the transitory component resulted in considerable increases in inequality indicators. The poverty transition analysis is thus based on the assumption that only 10 per cent of the unobserved effects are transitory[14].

III.2. The CGE Model

The 1988 Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) has been used as the initial benchmark equilibrium for the CGE model. The SAM, which includes 36 sectors, 20 commodities, 9 factors (8 labour categories and 1 composite capital), 2 households (urban and rural), and other accounts (government, savings and investment, and rest of the world), has

---

12.   For social mobility in Latin America see Andersen (2000).

13.   See Newhouse (2001) who studies the persistence of transient income shocks to farm households in rural Indonesia. He finds, for example that "about 40 per cent of household income shocks remain after four years".

14.   As mentioned before, aggregate inequality indicators increased under the synthetic panel approach. This increase was more pronounced the higher the share of the transitory component. We understood these results when we had a look at the distribution of unobserved earnings. For lower incomes, the distribution of unobserved earnings is skewed to the right, hence implying relatively high unobserved earnings. For higher incomes, the distribution of the entire residual resembles a normal distribution. If we substitute these unobserved earnings or a portion of it by generated normally distributed unobserved earnings, we thus "redistribute" income from the poor to the rich, thereby increasing inequality.

been assembled from various sources incorporating data from the 1988 Input Output table, the 1988 households surveys and from a 1994 SAM[15].

The CGE model is based on a standard neoclassical general equilibrium model; however, to take into account special features of the Colombian economy, it differs from the typical specification in two important aspects: production sectors are distinguished between formal and informal activities, and the associated labour markets present structural imperfections with different clearing mechanisms for the formal and informal sectors[16].

Production

Output results from nested CES (Constant Elasticity of Substitution) functions that, at the top level, combine intermediate and value added aggregates. At the second level, on the one hand, the intermediate aggregate is obtained combining all products in fixed proportions (Leontief structure), and, on the other hand, value added results by aggregating the 9 primary factors. Formal and informal activities differ primarily by employing different labour types, with the former using exclusively wage-workers and the latter using exclusively self-employment. Additionally, informal activities are, on average, less capital intensive. These features, together with the disaggregation of 8 labour categories, allow to model in a more realistic way the segmented Colombian labour markets and to capture the dualistic nature of the economy of this country. On the demand side, each commodity is represented by a composite which includes outputs from formal and informal activities. Imperfect substitutability between formal and informal components of the same commodity is assumed and flexible domestic prices adjust to reach equilibrium between domestic demand and supply.

Income Distribution and Absorption

Labour income and capital revenues are allocated to households according to a fixed coefficient distribution matrix derived from the original SAM. Private consumption demand is obtained through maximisation of household specific utility function following the Linear Expenditure System (LES). Household utility is a function of consumption of different goods. Income elasticities are different for each household and product and vary in the range 0.20, for basic products consumed by the household with highest income, to 1.30 for services. Once their total value is determined, government and investment demands[17] are disaggregated in sectoral demands according to fixed coefficient functions.

---

15.   For more details on the SAM see Bussolo and Correa (1999).

16.   The CGE model used here is the result of merging the CGE model built for Colombia and described in Bussolo *et al.* (1998), and that constructed for the Indonesia case study mentioned in Robilliard *et al.* (2001) and more fully discussed in Löfgren *et al.* (2001).

17.   Aggregate investment is set equal to aggregate savings, while aggregate government expenditures are exogenously fixed.

International Trade

In the model we assume imperfect substitution among goods originating in different geographical areas[18]. Imports demand results from a CES aggregation function of domestic and imported goods. Export supply is symmetrically modelled as a Constant Elasticity of Transformation (CET) function. Producers decide to allocate their output to domestic or foreign markets responding to relative prices. As Colombia is unable to influence world prices, the small country assumption holds, and its imports and exports prices are treated as exogenous. The assumptions of imperfect substitution and imperfect transformability grant a certain degree of autonomy of domestic prices with respect to foreign prices and prevent the model to generate corner solutions; additionally they also permit to model cross-hauling a feature normally observed in real economies. The balance of payments equilibrium is determined by the equality of foreign savings (which are exogenous) to the value for the current account. With fixed world prices and capital inflows, all adjustments are accommodated by changes in the real exchange rate: increased import demand, due to trade liberalisation must be financed by increased exports, and these can expand owing to the improved resource allocation. Price decreases in importables drive resources towards export sectors and contribute to falling domestic resource costs (or real exchange rate depreciation).

Factor Markets

Labour is distinguished into 8 categories: Urban Male Skilled, Urban Male Unskilled, Urban Female Skilled, Urban Female Unskilled, Rural Male Skilled, Rural Male Unskilled, Rural Female Skilled, and Rural Female Unskilled. These categories are considered imperfectly substitutable inputs in the production process; additionally, to take into account the fact that the labour market for self-employment and that for wage-employment adjust differently, the model assumes that labour markets are segmented between formal and informal sectors. In particular, given that wage-employment enjoys *formal* protection, such as unions wage setting and minimum wages, a certain degree of formal wage inflexibility is implemented in the model through a wage curve. The equilibrium in the formal market is thus determined by the intersection of the firms' labour demand and this wage curve. The informal labour market adjusts residually so that, for each of the eight mentioned categories, total supply (formal plus informal labour) is kept fixed. Capital is an aggregate factor and includes fixed capital as well as land; formal sectors show higher capital intensities than informal ones.

To take into account the medium term horizon of the model, i.e. the time period considered necessary to a trade shock to work through the economy, both labour and capital are perfectly mobile across sectors but their aggregate supplies are fixed.

---

18. See Armington (1969) for details.

Model Closures

The equilibrium condition on the balance of payments is combined with other closure conditions so that the model can be solved for each period. Firstly consider the government budget. Its surplus is fixed and the household income tax schedule shifts in order to achieve the predetermined net government position. Secondly, investment must equal savings, which originate from households, corporations, government and rest of the world. Aggregate investment is set equal to aggregate savings, while aggregate government expenditures are exogenously fixed.

IV. SIMULATIONS AND RESULTS

In the analysis of the links between trade and poverty, the labour market represents a key transmission channel. The urban poor generate their incomes almost exclusively on the labour market. For rural populations, the income generation process is more complex; however, due to the lack of data on the quantity and quality of land, the current version of the model implements similar income generation mechanisms for rural and urban areas. Occupational choice behaviour and related labour income are the main determinants of the income distribution, in particular in the lower tails. This is supported for Colombia by the World Bank poverty report (2002).

The next subsection provides an overview of the poverty situation at the beginning of the 1990s and presents, at the *macro* level, the major changes in labour markets for two alternative scenarios: the overall historical scenario and the trade liberalisation scenario. The former is derived from the 1995 household survey and the latter corresponds to the general equilibrium model results. The second subsection is devoted to the discussion of the *micro* results.

IV.1. Poverty and its Recent Evolution, 1988-95 Trends and Trade Shock

A closer look at the poor and their income sources should facilitate the interpretation of the micro-simulation model results. Based on the labour market specification chosen for the model, we describe in which labour market segments and in which occupations the poor can be found. Their incomes sources are identified and contrasted with those of non-poor households. This poverty profile is based on the 1988 household survey.

In our reduced and reweighed sample the rural population accounts for 54.9 per cent of the population[19]. As Table 4 indicates, the rural poor constitute 60 per cent of total poverty; however, with a headcount of 60 per cent, urban poverty should not be overlooked.

---

19. This rural population also includes people living in "cabeceras", i.e. towns in rural areas, which are typically classified as urban. This is why the rural population share appears to be too high. However, the "cabecera" dummy turned out to be insignificant in wage and profit estimates, which is why we feel comfortable to include the population of "cabeceras" in rural areas.

Table 4. **Poverty in Rural and Urban Areas, 1988**

Area	Headcount	Contribution to national poverty
Urban	60	37
Rural	81	63
Total	72	100

Source: Authors' calculations based on the Colombian household survey.

Table 5 shows a poverty profile according to the occupational choice of the household head. Particularly high poverty incidence is observed in households headed by inactive or self-employed individuals. Still, wage-employed and self-employed headed households under the poverty line contribute equally to total poverty. Noteworthy is the relatively large group of poor household headed by inactive individuals.

Table 5.**Poverty by Occupational Choices of Household Heads, 1988**

Occupation of household head	Population shares	Headcount	Contribution to national poverty
Inactive	10	77	10
Wage-employed	48	65	44
Self-employed	40	78	43
Both	3	83	3
Total	100	72	100

Source: Authors' calculations based on the Colombian household survey.

Assessing poverty incidence according to labour market segment, as shown in Table 6 yields the expected results. Poverty incidence is higher among households headed by the unskilled. Gender differences appear to be of minor importance in urban areas. In rural areas, however, female headed households seem to be better off. Rural unskilled male headed households contribute more than 50 per cent to overall poverty. However, they also account for a major part of the total population.

Table 6. **Poverty by Labour Market Segment of the Household Head, 1988**

Segment	Population shares	Headcount	Contribution to national poverty
Urban Unskilled Male	16	76	17
Urban Skilled Male	19	46	12
Urban Unskilled Female	5	76	6
Urban Skilled Female	4	45	2
Rural Unskilled Male	43	84	50
Rural Skilled Male	6	60	5
Rural Unskilled Female	6	82	7
Rural Skilled Female	1	57	1
Total	100	72	100

Source: Authors' calculations based on the Colombian household survey.

Figure 1 and Figure 2 assess the income sources of the poor and contrast them with those of the non-poor. They represent simply the shares of different income sources averaged over all poor and non-poor households and hence give us an approximate idea of the relative importance of these sources. A more detailed analysis distinguishing the poor in different sub-groups would probably reveal important channels through which the income generation process and poverty are interlinked. However, such an assessment is beyond the scope of this paper.

As indicated in Figure 1, wages of the unskilled male account for a major portion of income earned by the poor. For the non-poor, male wage income is also important, but generated also by the skilled. Together with male skilled wages they account for more than 50 per cent of total income earned. Female wages are almost negligible for the poor in rural areas with 7 per cent. This share is only half of the share that we observe for non-poor households. Other income, which includes transfers and imputed housing rents as major components, plays a more prominent role for the non-poor. It should be noted that this income portion is exogenous in the micro-simulation. Finally, agricultural profits constitute a major income source of the rural poor.

Figure 1. **Income Sources of the Poor and the Non-Poor in Rural Areas, 1988**

Source: Authors' calculations based on the Colombian household survey.

The Historical Scenario

In urban areas, we also observe that male wage income accounts for a large share of both poor and non-poor households. This is illustrated in Figure 2. The Colombian urban labour force is quite skilled, which is why even for poor households a large share of wage income comes from skilled individuals. Female wages play a more important role for urban households than they do in rural areas. Again they are less important for the poor than for the non-poor. Other income is an important income source in urban areas, which is due to the imputed housing rents included. Self-employment income is a main urban income source especially for the poor.

Figure 2. **Income Sources of the Poor and the Non-Poor in Urban Areas, 1988**

Source: Authors' calculations based on the Colombian household survey.

The micro-simulation is based on a survey from 1988. This starting point is then compared to the 1995 survey, which includes data collected after most of Gaviria's structural reforms had been implemented. The 1988-95 comparison is summarised in Table 7 and Table 8. Remarkable differences in labour market trends between urban and rural areas are recorded and they are consistent with former studies, although the comparability of the results is limited due to the different segmentation chosen[20].

Table 7. **1988 Labour Force Composition and its Recent Evolution**

	1988 initial shares				1988-95 change in shares			
	Inactive	Wage-work	Self-empl.	Both	Inactive	Wage-work	Self-empl.	Both
Urban Unskilled Male	6.5	61.2	32.3		-0.5	-12.7	24.2	
Urban Skilled Male	7.6	72.9	19.5		-6.1	-5.9	24.3	
Urban Unskilled Female	64.3	21.8	13.9		-8.7	2.6	36.1	
Urban Skilled Female	48.6	42.1	9.3		-12.8	5.9	40.1	
Total Urban	32.5	50.2	17.3		-11.1	-1.6	25.6	
Rural Unskilled Male	4.7	45.9	45.8	3.6	-6.8	14.2	-13.5	-1.3
Rural Skilled Male	24	47.5	27.8	0.7	2.1	0.1	-3.6	59.2
Rural Unskilled Female	72.4	6.1	21.2	0.3	-4.8	42.6	3.4	53.9
Rural Skilled Female	66.9	22.1	10.8	0.2	-9.4	18.4	20	39.8
Total Rural	39.3	28.7	30.4	1.6	-5.9	17.1	-8.6	2.1

Source: Authors' calculations based on Colombian household surveys.
Note: The right panel of the table displays the percent change of the initial occupational category shares.

Table 7 illustrates the development of the composition of the labour force between 1988 and 1995. In urban areas, self-employment rises substantially across all labour market segments and the share of male wage-workers declines for both unskilled and skilled. Female labour market participation increases considerably, especially in self-employment activities.

In rural areas, females also increase their labour market participation although to a lesser extent and more in wage-work activities than in self-employment. The data suggests that, in rural areas, there is a general trend across almost all segments towards more wage-employment, in particular for the unskilled. More than 50 per cent of the rural male unskilled labour force was wage-employed in 1995. This implies a significant increase between 1988 and 1995, whereas self-employment declined correspondingly[21].

Table 8 sketches the evolution of average wages for different labour market segments and average self-employment income for different activities between 1988 and 1995. The differences across the labour market segments and between wage- and self-employment are striking. Surprisingly, income from self-employment exhibits the highest

---

20. For an overview of labour market indicators for 1988 and 1995 see Vélez *et al.* (2001). Ocampo *et al.* (2000) additionally consider the sectoral composition of employment.

21. As the occupational choice of being *both* self- and wage-employed in rural areas is of minor importance, we do comment on it.

increase in urban areas. With regard to wage-employment, the figures appear to confirm that the unskilled lose whereas the skilled gain. This is also true for rural areas, where wages seem to decline in all segments, but to a larger degree for the unskilled categories. Self-employment income from agricultural and mixed activities increases significantly, although this may have seasonal reasons. This is one reason why these results should be interpreted with caution, in particular for rural areas, as they are just based on two surveys.

Table 8. **Wages and Self-Employment Income, 1988 and 1988-95 Evolution**

	Initial values	1988-95 change
Wage		
Urban Unskilled Male	37,185	2.1
Urban Skilled Male	61,560	7.6
Urban Unskilled Female	26,784	-4.6
Urban Skilled Female	45,131	8.3
Rural Unskilled Male	28,320	-11.3
Rural Skilled Male	40,311	-4.6
Rural Unskilled Female	21,591	-8.6
Rural Skilled Female	36,523	-6.3
Self-empl. Income		
Urban	40,443	11.4
Rural Agricultural	17,628	13.1
Rural Non-Agricultural	19,969	-6.1
Rural Mixed	16,142	8.1

Source: Authors' calculations based on Colombian household surveys. Note: the second column shows percent changes.

The trade liberalisation scenario

The 1988-95 historical evolution described above serves as a benchmark against which a trade liberalisation scenario can be compared. As described in section II, the 1988-95 period witnessed numerous policy reforms and other shocks, so that to identify whether increased openness is pro-poor and improves income distribution, a counterfactual scenario that includes just trade policy is needed. Simulating in the CGE model tariff abatement as that of Table 1 provides this counterfactual scenario.

Table 9.**Trade Liberalisation Induced Changes in Employment Shares and Incomes**

	Employment		Income	
	Wage-work	Self-empl.	Wage	Self-empl.
Urban Unskilled Male	0.5	-1.1	1.1	
Urban Skilled Male	0.5	-2.6	0.9	
Urban Unskilled Female	0.3	-0.8	0.5	
Urban Skilled Female	0.5	-6.1	1.1	
Rural Unskilled Male	1.7	-0.5	3.4	
Rural Skilled Male	1.0	-1.8	2.1	
Rural Unskilled Female	1.2	-0.5	2.4	
Rural Skilled Female	0.7	-5.4	1.4	
Urban				3.8
Rural Agricultural				6.6
Rural Non-Agricultural				5.1
Rural Mixed				5.8

Table 9 summarises the aggregate changes in employment and income levels resulting from the CGE model runs. First of all it can be noticed that wage employment increases across all segments at the expenses of self-employment. This, at first, may seem surprising given that for many models the standard prediction is that trade openness leads to a rise in informality. The typical argument to justify this is that when formal firms are exposed to increased foreign competition they are forced to release employees, who then move to the informal sector, or to hire temporary workers (coming from the informal sector), or, still, to sub-contract activities to establishments in the informal sector. In all cases, informal employment grows[22]. However, in the model used here, a different adjustment mechanism is at work. As it was described above, formal and informal labour markets adjust to a new equilibrium differently, with the formal one showing a certain degree of wage rigidity. Accordingly — and due to the Colombian labour endowment, the initial shares of formality and informality across activities and their different labour inputs — the trade shock results in a shrinking informal employment. In particular, while both *formal* and *informal* import competing activities contract to a similar degree, *formal* export oriented activities expand considerably more than *informal* ones.

---

22. An alternative approach explaining the link between trade liberalization and increasing informality is presented by Goldberg, P. K. and N. Pavcnik (2003).

Figure 3. **Formal and Informal Labour markets**

Figure 3 illustrates the general equilibrium adjustment mechanism at work in the model. The sum of formal (wage-work) and informal (self-employed) labour endowments is fixed and represented by the horizontal segment $O^{nf} - O^f$. Two labour demand curves are depicted for the formal (D^f) and for the informal (D^{nf}) employment and they are negatively sloped with respect to the wages W^f and W^{nf}. The graph also shows two alternative wage curves for the formal market ($S1^f$ and $S2^f$) with different slopes reflecting a low and a high degree of stickiness. The initial equilibrium is at point E where wage w0 is equal for the formal and informal segments and where formal and informal employments are measured by the distances $O^f - P0$ and $O^{nf} - P0$ respectively. The trade shock is represented by an upward shift of the formal labour demand and, depending on the rigidity of the formal wage, the new equilibrium can be at points E1 or E2. Illustrating the case for E1, the new equilibrium of the formal market is found at the intersection of the formal labour demand and the wage curve: the new wage is set at $w1^f$ and formal employment increases from $O^f - P0$ to $O^f - P1$. Informal employment adjusts residually and decreases symmetrically to $O^{nf} - P1$; the informal wage is found on the labour demand (D^{nf}) at $w1^{nf}$. It can finally be noticed that the mechanism just described works in a very similar way to a rural-urban migration framework where, instead of considering movements from one region to another, flows between informal and formal market segments are taken into account.

The significant rises (shown in Table 9) of wages for unskilled workers, particularly in the rural area, and of income levels for rural agricultural self-employed are easily rationalised by the standard comparative advantage theory. Tariff abatement induces resources to move out of contracting import competing sectors and into expanding export oriented ones. These use intensively Colombian most abundant resources — unskilled (especially rural) wage and self-employed workers – which thus enjoy increasing returns.

In summary, implemented in isolation from any other shocks, the Colombian tariff abatement of the beginning of the 1990s would have produced significant employment gains for wage workers and a slight reduction of informal self-employment; more in details,

these gains would have been greater for the unskilled categories and more pronounced in the rural area. Correspondingly, wages for these categories would have recorded important increases. These results rest on two important assumptions: that the formal labour market shows a certain degree of wage rigidity and that labour supplies are fixed.

IV.2. Income Distribution and Poverty Results

The aggregate variables on employment, wage and income levels for the 1988-95 historical shock and for the trade liberalisation shock, as described in the above section, were used as inputs for the micro-simulation model. This then produces new income distributions that can be compared with the initial distribution or among themselves. This section describes in detail these micro-results.

Table 10 shows the change in a series of poverty and inequality indicators resulting from the trade and historical shocks. First of all it should be reiterated that the trade shock is of quite smaller proportions than the historical one and that explains why it produces, almost always, smaller effects. However, considering the headcount (P0), it can be stressed that a pure trade shock accounts for a large share of overall poverty reduction: for the whole population the P0 is reduced by 1.8 per cent with increased openness, more than half of the total decrease of 3.1 per cent. For the rural poor trade seems to be particularly beneficial given that it reduces the headcount more than in the historical case; the reverse is true for the urban poor. This result should not be too surprising given that trade liberalisation induces specialisation in agricultural exports and other activities requiring rural labour inputs and that this increased demand is reflected in increased wage and income levels (see Table 9).

Table 10. **Poverty and Inequality, percent changes with respect to 1988 benchmark**

	Trade Liberalization			1988-95 Historical Change		
	Country-wide	Urban	Rural	Country-wide	Urban	Rural
Per Capita Income	2.4	1.6	4.0	6.6	9.5	0.6
General Entropy (0)	-1.7	0.2	-1.6	0.5	-0.2	-8.7
General Entropy (1)	-1.2	0.1	-1.2	5.3	6.7	-6.8
Gini	-0.6	0.1	-0.6	2	2.4	-3.6
P0	-1.8	-1.3	-2.1	-3.1	-7.8	-0.2
P1	-2.7	-1.8	-3.1	-3.8	-7.3	-2.2
P2	-3.6	-2.2	-4.1	-4.2	-3.6	-4.4

Trade also scores well when the poverty severity (P2) index is examined. Even for the urban areas, trade-induced reduction of P2 is close to the overall historical reduction. This positive distributional effect is confirmed by looking at inequality indicators. The whole population' Gini is reduced with the trade shock, whereas it increases with the historical shock. Once again, the standard trade theory embedded in the CGE model can be used to explain this positive effect: unskilled labour, the main income source for the poor, records increased demand and raising wages (especially for the rural areas, see Table 9) and that helps to close the gap with higher wage earners, and, given that this is more pronounced for the rural area than for the urban, also *between* groups inequality is reduced.

These general distributional and poverty results of the trade liberalisation shock and their interpretation may seem somewhat too obvious and straightforward. One may be tempted to ask why such a complex empirical model needs to be constructed to produce just these results. In fact, the micro-simulation approach allows analysing income distribution changes in a much more detailed way than alternative methodologies and, to make this point convincingly, this sub-section illustrates some of the exclusive contributions of the micro-simulation approach. In particular, four contributions are discussed: *i)* more precision in the assessment of poverty and inequality effects of the trade and historical shocks, *ii)* decomposition analysis, *iii)* poverty transition analysis, and *iv)* expenditure side - relative prices analysis.

Precision issue

Often, distributional issues, questions of who wins and who loses from a certain reform, are of major interest to policy makers. However, in standard multisectoral applied models the estimation of distributional impacts relied very much on linking household incomes to factor rewards through the representative household group (RHG) assumption. In many applications of the representative household approach, the composition of household income is taken into account only rudimentarily. It is the average factor endowment of a specific household category that decides upon this composition. Here lies the major drawback of the representative household approach in distributional analyses as these averages of factor endowments are difficult to specify and ignore important information. If distributional and poverty impacts are to be quantified, then information regarding household heterogeneity cannot be ignored. Household surveys, which contain the necessary information are available for almost all developing countries.

We can take this information into account through different approaches. An easy way to use the survey data to improve distributional impact analysis is to take the survey of the base year and raise individual factor incomes by factors given by a CGE. The modeller only has to make sure that the specification of the factor markets in the CGE meaningfully corresponds to the income information available in the survey. This method would account for household heterogeneity with regard to income sources and can be easily implemented. However, if we allow individuals to switch for example between informal and formal activities, as we do in the above CGE, such developments could not be analysed within this simple survey based approach. Households could be reweighed to produce the changes in formal vs. informal employment observed in the CGE. Yet, as already explained above, a more accurate method takes into account individual characteristics, which decide upon which individual changes for example from formal into informal employment or vice versa. Furthermore, a different wage or profit setting mechanism may be relevant in the new type of employment. These aspects are considered in the micro-simulation module.

Whether the micro-simulation yields additional insights therefore depends very much on the kind of shock analysed. If the shock mainly produces income changes, the results of the simple household based approach will not be too different from the full simulation results. However, considering household heterogeneity in terms of income

sources by using household surveys as just explained should be imperative in distributional and poverty analysis as the implementation is straightforward. This should be done at least to check the validity of the representative household assumption made.

To illustrate the differences in results under different approaches we compare the results we obtain under the RHG assumption with those obtained using the full sample micro-simulation. In our experiments, the household income under the RHG assumption is calculated by scaling the income of all households belonging to a specific category by a factor estimated by the CGE. In order to keep matters simple, the household categories of the RHG approach are determined by the occupation and skill type of the head of the household. According to the labour market specification in the CGE 12 household groups are identified: households headed by urban unskilled, urban skilled, rural unskilled and rural skilled wage-workers, urban self-employed, and rural self-employed who are engaged in agricultural, non-agricultural, and mixed activities. It should be emphasised that in the current RHG approach the only occupational choice changes taken into account are those of the household head and not those of the household other members. This means that if, for example, wages for the urban unskilled male increase by 10 per cent, in a particular scenario, the income (except the exogenous component) of households *headed* by urban unskilled male wage-workers also increases by 10 per cent.

Table 11 records the results obtained for the trade shock and the historical simulation under the alternative full sample and RHG approaches. In the case of the trade shock, the two methods produce similar results: changes always show the same sign and are of similar magnitude.

There are two reasons for this outcome. First, occupational choice changes, a major source of income variation, do not play a prominent role, as later decomposition exercises will show. An example may clarify this. The RHG approach does not account for shifts of spouses from, say, self-employment in subsistence agriculture to highly-paid wage-employment. However, given that such shifts are of minor importance in the trade scenario, the RHG estimates are not strongly biased.

Second, the full sample and the RHG approaches would yield different results if large differences in income variations were observed across different source of income. In a case, such as the current trade scenario, where both wages of the unskilled and agricultural profits experience similar increases, the effect of accounting for full heterogeneity in sources of income will be less pronounced.

Table 11. **Full Sample vs. Representative Household Group**

	Full sample			Representative Household Group (RHG)		
	Country-wide	Urban	Rural	Country-wide	Urban	Rural
Trade Liberalization						
Per Capita Income	2.4	1.6	4.0	2.7	2.1	3.7
General Entropy (0)	-1.7	0.2	-1.6	-1.0	-0.1	-0.7
General Entropy (1)	-1.2	0.1	-1.2	-0.8	-0.1	-0.7
Gini	-0.6	0.1	-0.6	-0.4	0.0	-0.3
P0	-1.8	-1.3	-2.1	-1.0	-1.2	-0.9
P1	-2.7	-1.8	-3.1	-2.2	-2.2	-2.2
P2	-3.6	-2.2	-4.1	-3.0	-2.8	-3.1
1988-95 Historical Change						
Per Capita Income	6.6	9.5	0.6	7.3	10.3	1.2
General Entropy (0)	0.5	-0.2	-8.7	3.3	2.1	-2.8
General Entropy (1)	5.3	6.7	-6.8	4.7	2.2	-0.1
Gini	2.0	2.4	-3.6	2.1	1.1	-0.5
P0	-3.1	-7.8	-0.2	-3.0	-7.0	-0.5
P1	-3.8	-7.3	-2.2	-3.6	-9.9	-0.6
P2	-4.2	-3.6	-4.4	-4.5	-12.1	-1.6

Conversely, important differences between the results of the two methods arise for the historical simulation. As indicated in Table 11, many of the poverty and inequality indicators differ significantly. In general, the reasons for these differences are major occupational choice changes, which significantly altered the composition of household income, and large differences in the relative gains and losses across labour income sources. We will concentrate on the differences in poverty indicators.

Interestingly, the deviations between the two approaches appear to be minor on a country-wide level. Looking at urban and rural areas separately however reveals that this is coincidental. The reduction of the poverty gap and the poverty severity index are overestimated under the RHG approach in urban areas, whereas they are underestimated in rural areas. One should also note that the RHG approach does not introduce a systematic upward or downward bias. The bias is specific to the changes produced by the shock.

The overestimation of the decrease of the poverty gap and the severity index in urban areas obviously is due to the large increase of self-employment profits. Under the RHG assumption the entire household income rises by more than 10 per cent if the household head is self-employed — no matter if a substantial portion of income is earned by spouses or other household members in wage activities where gains are much smaller. However, decomposition exercises show that another effect is at work. Increased female labour market participation in urban areas is not taken into account under the RHG approach when the women entering the labour market are not household heads. We would therefore underestimate the decrease in poverty if self-employment income had not seen such an important increase. In rural areas, movement from self-employment into wage-employment is a major reason of rising incomes of the poor as is also the substantial increase in agricultural profits. Under the representative household approach we underestimate the positive impact of the occupational choice change, as we just consider the occupational choice change of the household head.

36

These few examples show the interplay of occupational choice and labour income changes and their impact on poverty. Depending on the type of shock the representative household approach might conceal the poverty impact of important labour market developments. It is important to note again that, ex-ante, the sign of the bias is unknown and therefore it is not clear whether the two approaches will produce significantly different results.

Decomposition Analysis

Above, we have already referred to decomposition exercises. Technically decomposition means that we shock the income distribution only with a subset of the variables that are passed from the CGE to the micro-module. This allows disentangling the distributional impact of occupational choice changes, on the one hand, and wage changes, on the other. It is important to point out that an occupational choice change – of *any* household member – typically implies quite a substantial variation in per capita household income, whereas changes due to income and profit fluctuations are relatively small.

Table 12. **Decomposition Analysis**

	Wage and Profit Change			Occupational Choice Change		
	Country-wide	Urban	Rural	Country-wide	Urban	Rural
	Trade Liberalization					
Per Capita Income	2.3	1.7	3.7	0.1	0.1	0.1
General Entropy (0)	-1.2	0.1	-0.9	0.3	0.3	0.3
General Entropy (1)	-0.8	0.2	-0.6	0.3	0.3	0.3
Gini	-0.4	0.1	-0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2
P0	-1.7	-1.4	-1.8	0.0	0.1	0.0
P1	-2.5	-2.0	-2.8	0.0	0.1	0.0
P2	-3.3	-2.4	-3.6	0.1	0.2	0.1
	1988-95 Historical Change					
Per Capita Income	2.8	5.7	-3.1	-0.4	-3.3	5.7
General Entropy (0)	0.2	-1.3	-7.0	-6.4	-1.3	-6.3
General Entropy (1)	2.1	-1.2	-3.2	-2.7	5.6	-7.2
Gini	0.9	-0.6	-2.3	-1.6	1.9	-3.3
P0	-0.9	-4.9	1.5	-0.6	1.7	-2.1
P1	-1.4	-7.9	1.6	-2.1	6.6	-6.2
P2	-2.5	-9.8	0.3	-2.4	13.5	-8.4

The interpretation of the results of such decomposition analyses has to be carried out carefully. The following example illustrates the difficulties involved. In urban areas, average self-employment profits are higher than average wages of the unskilled. On average, an individual changing from wage-employment into self-employment will hence gain. Since returns to education are much higher in self-employment than in wage-employment, a well educated individual will typically win from moving into self-employment, whereas the less educated individual will most likely lose. Even knowing this, the interpretation of occupational choice changes might not be straightforward. Consider a shock that produces a change in wages and profits such that all individuals

would gain from moving from wage- into self-employment. Obviously, the impact of the occupational choice change cannot be interpreted without simultaneously considering the income changes. It is the combination of both changes that matters, which is also why the sum of the values for the separate shocks shown in Table 12 does not exactly correspond to the values for the combined shocks shown in the initial Table 10.

Table 12 shows the changes in inequality and poverty indicators of the trade and the historical shock resulting from a decomposition exercise. A striking feature of the trade scenario is that almost only change of wage and profit count for the poverty and inequality improvements; changes of occupational choice seem to be of minor importance. It should also be emphasised that increased trade openness does not cause the deterioration of rural poverty observed in the historical scenario, but, on the contrary, trade seems to be quite helpful in reducing poverty in rural areas due to significant income increases. Additional non-trade-related shocks must then explain the worsening situation of the rural population in the historical scenario.

Consider now occupational choice changes for the historical scenario. As shown in the bottom right panel of Table 12, in urban areas, poverty indicators worsen substantially despite increasing female labour market participation. The positive effect of increased female participation is dominated by the negative effect of the massive movement into self-employment. For the poorer and less educated this occupational switch involves income losses, whereas the more educated may even gain. In rural areas, the historical occupational shock causes all indicators to decrease substantially. This is mainly due to the substantial gains of moving from self-employment in agriculture into wage-employment. The occupational choice effects dominate the overall impact on the poor.

Decomposition exercises can be used to analyse the contribution of developments in particular labour market segments to the overall distributional trends and this may provide valuable insight to policy makers interested, for example, in the effect of female labour market behaviour.

Poverty transition

As it was explained in the latter part of section III.1, the micro-simulation model was modified to allow tracing individuals through time so that poverty transition analyses could be conducted. One of the main advantages of this analysis is that it permits to observe movements in and out of poverty and not only the net final effect as described in Table 10, besides it also allows to study the characteristics of the persistent poor. According to their position with respect to the poverty line before and after the shock, households were grouped in four categories: *i)* households becoming non-poor, *ii)* households falling into poverty, *iii)* households remaining poor, and iv) households remaining non-poor. The first three columns of Table 13 show the size of these four categories for the trade liberalisation and historical shock.

Table 13. **Poverty Transition Results**

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Before Shock:	After Shock:	Country-wide	Urban	Rural	Country-wide	Urban	Rural	Active hh members / hh size[3]
		Population shares[1]			Initial distance from z[2]			
		Trade Liberalization						
Poor	Non Poor	3.7	4.1	3.3	0.145	0.127	0.162	
Non Poor	Poor	2.6	3.4	1.9	-0.148	-0.149	-0.147	
Poor	Poor	68.0	56.3	77.6	0.544	0.462	0.593	
Non Poor	Non Poor	25.7	36.2	17.2	-1.180	-1.359	-0.869	
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0				
		1988-95 Historical Change						
Poor	Non Poor	5.6	7.8	3.8	0.225	0.195	0.276	11.9
Non Poor	Poor	3.5	3.5	3.5	-0.247	-0.371	-0.145	1.7
Poor	Poor	66.1	52.6	77.2	0.548	0.475	0.589	3.9
Non Poor	Non Poor	24.9	36.1	15.6	-1.203	-1.339	-0.942	2.3
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0				3.5

Notes: (1) the first 3 columns show the percentages of the total population for each of the four groups; (2) initial distance from the poverty line is equal to: 1- househ. income / povline; (3) the last column shows the percent ratio of active household members on total household members.

It is noticeable that the movements out of poverty of the trade shock are a large proportion of those caused by the overall shock, but, most importantly, it seems that increased openness generates less poverty than the overall shock, especially in the rural area. The group of those who remained poor and especially that of the constantly non-poor show comparable sizes across the two scenarios. Different characteristics of these groups could be examined and columns 4, 5, 6 and 7 of the table show some preliminary results when the initial distance from the poverty line and the household's numbers of active members ratio are considered.

The table's figures show that, looking at country-wide averages, those escaping from and those falling into poverty appear to experience similar gains and losses. This is true for both scenarios with the only difference that, given the larger size of the historical shock the initial distance from the poverty line is larger in this case. Yet, a closer look at urban and rural areas again yields valuable insights. In the historical simulation, those who become poor in urban areas experience losses that are almost 50 per cent higher than the gains of those who become non-poor. In rural areas, the historical simulation produces the opposite result. Here, the gains of the "winners" are higher than the losses of the "losers". Thus the rural-urban disaggregation reveals that historically we observe a highly asymmetric shock. Furthermore, our analysis suggests that trade liberalisation may also contribute to this asymmetry as it produces similar results, even if they are of much smaller magnitude.

The last column shows, for the historical scenario, the only one with increasing labour supplies, that the considerable increase, of about 12 per cent, in the average number of active members is a distinguishing feature of those households who escape poverty. Notice also that increased participation is a common characteristic for all

households, and that for the category of those falling into poverty increased participation is well below the economy-wide average.

The combination of the poverty transition analysis with decomposition exercises yield an important insight. From the above decomposition exercise we have concluded that occupational choice changes are not a major channel through which trade liberalisation affects the income distribution. Yet, the poverty transition analysis carried out after shocking the distribution with only the occupational choice changes reveals that changes of occupational choice matter for the poor. Households, which become non-poor, have more members moving into wage-employment than other households. As explained before, this is very likely to be beneficial for the poor in both rural and urban areas. Although this result is somewhat tautological, it shows that the income gains large enough to lift people out of poverty are often related to occupational choice changes.

Expenditure side effects

The last point we want to make refers to the expenditure side effects of the trade and historical scenarios. We should note that expenditure side modelling is rather rudimentary as no substitution is allowed for. Furthermore, we only consider two price indices based on baskets of food and non-food items. Expenditure shares were calculated by income quintiles, thus household heterogeneity is limited. In this framework, the relative price changes after trade liberalisation has almost no distributional effect, as indicated in Table 14. The historical simulation, which uses historical relative price changes calculated from consumer price indices, suggests that the relative price decrease of food-items worked for the poor. Additionally, it has a favourable effect on the income distribution in general.

Table 14. **Expenditure Side Effects**

	With Relative Prices Change			No Relative Prices Change		
	Country-wide	Urban	Rural	Country-wide	Urban	Rural
	Trade Liberalization					
Per Capita Income	2.4	1.6	4.0	2.2	1.4	3.8
General Entropy (0)	-1.7	0.2	-1.6	-2.0	-0.2	-2.0
General Entropy (1)	-1.2	0.1	-1.2	-1.5	-0.3	-1.6
Gini	-0.6	0.1	-0.6	-0.7	-0.1	-0.7
P0	-1.8	-1.3	-2.1	-1.7	-1.2	-2.0
P1	-2.7	-1.8	-3.1	-2.8	-1.9	-3.2
P2	-3.6	-2.2	-4.1	-3.7	-2.5	-4.2
	1988-95 Historical Change					
Per Capita Income	6.6	9.5	0.6	7.4	10.4	1.3
General Entropy (0)	0.5	-0.2	-8.7	2.1	2.1	-6.8
General Entropy (1)	5.3	6.7	-6.8	7.0	8.9	-4.9
Gini	2.0	2.4	-3.6	2.8	3.5	-2.6
P0	-3.1	-7.8	-0.2	-3.3	-7.5	-0.7
P1	-3.8	-7.3	-2.2	-3.5	-6.5	-2.1
P2	-4.2	-3.6	-4.4	-3.5	-2.4	-4.0

The expenditure side offers could be modelled much more carefully. We focused on the income side, but we believe the expenditure side deserves further analysis. Full household heterogeneity could be considered if expenditure surveys were available. With regard to price changes the maximum level of disaggregation is set by the number of goods in the CGE. Furthermore, changes in expenditure shares could be passed from the CGE to the micro-simulation, or endogenised in the micro-simulation module.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This paper employs a novel methodology, pioneered for Indonesia by Robilliard *et al.* (2002), to study poverty and inequality consequences of trade liberalisation, a quintessential globalisation shock. This methodology entails combining in a sequential fashion a numerical simulation general equilibrium macro model with a micro simulation income distribution model. The former provides counter factual scenarios and estimates aggregate results, the latter evaluates the poverty and inequality micro impacts due to these scenarios. This approach overcomes the main difficulty of single-country case studies based on single year household survey or on multi year surveys where households cannot be identified through time. Namely our method allows to identify the income distribution effects due to a particular shock and to estimate the magnitude of these effects separately from other simultaneous shocks.

When this methodology is applied for Colombia and the particular shock under study is trade liberalisation our main results and policy conclusion can be summarised as follows. A major policy conclusion is that trade liberalisation can substantially contribute to improve the poverty situation. Abstracting from simultaneous additional shocks and labour supply growth, the beginning of the nineties tariff abatement seems to have accounted for a very large share of the total reduction in poverty recorded from 1988 to 1995. This holds in particular for rural areas. Furthermore distributional impacts differ fundamentally between rural and urban areas. Structural change and the corresponding occupational choice changes trigger large income gains in particular for the poor. Generating more wage-employment in formal sectors or increasing female labour market participation are identified as important sources of higher incomes. Given their diverting performances, and analysis aggregating rural and urban areas, would only estimate small net effects and potentially mislead policy decisions.

Among the results it should be emphasised that in the case of trade liberalisation, the income channel, i.e. employment status and wage levels, is more important to the poor than the expenditure channel, i.e. the variation in the price of consumption goods.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALATAS, V. and F. BOURGUIGNON (2000)," The Evolution of the Distribution of Income During Indonesian Fast Growth: 1980-96", mimeo, Princeton University.

ANDERSEN, L.E. (2000), "Social Mobility in Latin America", *IISEC Working Paper*.

ATKINSON, A.B., F. BOURGUIGNON and C. MORRISSON (1992), "Empirical Studies of Earnings Mobility", *Fundamentals of Pure and Applied Economics*, 52, Harwood Academic Publishers, Switzerland.

BUSSOLO, M. and D. ROLAND-HOLST. (1999), "Colombia and the NAFTA", *Integration and Trade*, September-December 99, INTAL, Washington, D. C.

BUSSOLO, M. and R. CORREA (1999), "A 1994 Detailed Social Accounting Matrix for Colombia", Technical Paper No 5, Fedesarrollo, Bogotá, 1999.

BUSSOLO M., D. ROLAND-HOLST and D. VAN DER MENSBRUGGHE (1998), "The Technical Specification of FEDESARROLLO's Long Run General Equilibrium Model", Technical Paper No. 4, Fedesarrollo, Bogotá, 1998.

DOLLAR, D. and A. KRAAY (2000), "Trade, Growth, and Poverty", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 2615.

GOLDBERG, P.K. and N. PAVCNIK (2003), "The Response of the Informal Sector to Trade Liberalization", *NBER Working Paper* No. 9443.

KUGLER, A. (1999), "The Impact of Firing Costs on Turnover and Unemployment: Evidence from The Colombian Labour Market Reform", International Tax and Public Finance Journal, Vol. 6, No. 3, pp. 389-410.

KUGLER, A. and M. CARDENAS (1999), "The Incidence of Job Security Regulation on Labour Market Flexibility and Compliance in Colombia", mimeo.

NEWHOUSE, D. (2001), "Do Negative Income Shocks Last Longer, and Do They Hurt the Poor More? Evidence from Rural Indonesia", mimeo, Cornell University.

NÚÑEZ, J.A. and J.A. JIMÉNEZ (1997), "Correcciones a los Ingresos de la Encuestas de Hogares y Distribución del Ingreso Urbano en Colombia", mimeo, República de Colombia, Departamento de Planeación.

OCAMPO, J.A., F. SÁNCHEZ and C.E. TOVAR (2000), "Mercado Laboral y Distribución del Ingreso en Colombia en los Años Noventa", Revista de la CEPAL, No. 72.

ROBILLIARD, A.-S., F. BOURGUIGNON and S. ROBINSON (2002), "Examining the Social Impact of the Indonesian Financial Crisis Using a Micro-Macro Model", mimeo.

RODRIGUEZ, F. and D. RODRIK (2000), "Trade Policy and Economic Growth: A Skeptic's Guide to the Cross-National Evidence," *in* Ben BERNANKE and K.S. ROGOFF (eds.), NBER Macro Annual 2000, Cambridge, MA.

SRINIVASAN, T.N. and J. BHAGWATI (1999), "Outward-Orientation and Development: Are Revisionists Right?" mimeo, Yale University.

UNDP (1998), "Informe de Desarrollo Humano para Colombia: 1998".

VÉLEZ, C.E., J. LEIBOVICH, A. KUGLER, C. BOUILLÓN and J. NÚÑEZ (2001), "The Reversal of Inequality Trends in Colombia 1978-1995: A Combination of Persistent and Fluctuating Forces", mimeo, World Bank.

WORLD BANK (2002), "Colombia Poverty Report".

OTHER TITLES IN THE SERIES/
AUTRES TITRES DANS LA SÉRIE

The former series known as "Technical Papers" and "Webdocs" merged in November 2003 into "Development Centre Working Papers". In the new series, former Webdocs 1-17 follow former Technical Papers 1-212 as Working Papers 213-229.

All these documents may be downloaded from:

http://www.oecd.org/dev/papers or *obtained via e-mail* (cendev.contact@oecd.org)

Working Paper No.1, *Macroeconomic Adjustment and Income Distribution: A Macro-Micro Simulation Model*, by François Bourguignon, William H. Branson and Jaime de Melo, March 1989.

Working Paper No. 2, *International Interactions in Food and Agricultural Policies: The Effect of Alternative Policies,* by Joachim Zietz and Alberto Valdés, April, 1989.

Working Paper No. 3, *The Impact of Budget Retrenchment on Income Distribution in Indonesia: A Social Accounting Matrix Application*, by Steven Keuning and Erik Thorbecke, June 1989.

Working Paper No. 3a, *Statistical Annex: The Impact of Budget Retrenchment,* June 1989.

Document de travail No. 4, *Le Rééquilibrage entre le secteur public et le secteur privé : le cas du Mexique*, par C.-A. Michalet, juin 1989.

Working Paper No. 5, *Rebalancing the Public and Private Sectors: The Case of Malaysia,* by R. Leeds, July 1989.

Working Paper No. 6, *Efficiency, Welfare Effects, and Political Feasibility of Alternative Antipoverty and Adjustment Programs,* by Alain de Janvry and Elisabeth Sadoulet, January 1990.

Document de travail No. 7, *Ajustement et distribution des revenus : application d'un modèle macro-micro au Maroc*, par Christian Morrisson, avec la collaboration de Sylvie Lambert et Akiko Suwa, décembre 1989.

Working Paper No. 8, *Emerging Maize Biotechnologies and their Potential Impact*, by W. Burt Sundquist, October 1989.

Document de travail No. 9, *Analyse des variables socio-culturelles et de l'ajustement en Côte d'Ivoire*, par W. Weekes-Vagliani, janvier 1990.

Working Paper No. 10, *A Financial Computable General Equilibrium Model for the Analysis of Ecuador's Stabilization Programs,* by André Fargeix and Elisabeth Sadoulet, February 1990.

Working Paper No. 11, *Macroeconomic Aspects, Foreign Flows and Domestic Savings Performance in Developing Countries: A "State of The Art" Report*, by Anand Chandavarkar, February 1990.

Working Paper No. 12, *Tax Revenue Implications of the Real Exchange Rate: Econometric Evidence from Korea and Mexico,* by Viriginia Fierro and Helmut Reisen, February 1990.

Working Paper No. 13, *Agricultural Growth and Economic Development: The Case of Pakistan*, by Naved Hamid and Wouter Tims, April 1990.

Working Paper No. 14, *Rebalancing the Public and Private Sectors in Developing Countries: The Case of Ghana,* by H. Akuoko-Frimpong, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 15, *Agriculture and the Economic Cycle: An Economic and Econometric Analysis with Special Reference to Brazil,* by Florence Contré and Ian Goldin, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 16, *Comparative Advantage: Theory and Application to Developing Country Agriculture,* by Ian Goldin, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 17, *Biotechnology and Developing Country Agriculture: Maize in Brazil,* by Bernardo Sorj and John Wilkinson, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 18, *Economic Policies and Sectoral Growth: Argentina 1913-1984,* by Yair Mundlak, Domingo Cavallo, Roberto Domenech, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 19, *Biotechnology and Developing Country Agriculture: Maize In Mexico,* by Jaime A. Matus Gardea, Arturo Puente Gonzalez and Cristina Lopez Peralta, June 1990.

Working Paper No. 20, *Biotechnology and Developing Country Agriculture: Maize in Thailand*, by Suthad Setboonsarng, July 1990.

Working Paper No. 21, *International Comparisons of Efficiency in Agricultural Production*, by Guillermo Flichmann, July 1990.

Working Paper No. 22, *Unemployment in Developing Countries: New Light on an Old Problem*, by David Turnham and Denizhan Eröcal, July 1990.

Working Paper No. 23, *Optimal Currency Composition of Foreign Debt: the Case of Five Developing Countries*, by Pier Giorgio Gawronski, August 1990.

Working Paper No. 24, *From Globalization to Regionalization: the Mexican Case*, by Wilson Peres Núñez, August 1990.

Working Paper No. 25, *Electronics and Development in Venezuela: A User-Oriented Strategy and its Policy Implications*, by Carlota Perez, October 1990.

Working Paper No. 26, *The Legal Protection of Software: Implications for Latecomer Strategies in Newly Industrialising Economies (NIEs) and Middle-Income Economies (MIEs)*, by Carlos Maria Correa, October 1990.

Working Paper No. 27, *Specialization, Technical Change and Competitiveness in the Brazilian Electronics Industry*, by Claudio R. Frischtak, October 1990.

Working Paper No. 28, *Internationalization Strategies of Japanese Electronics Companies: Implications for Asian Newly Industrializing Economies (NIEs)*, by Bundo Yamada, October 1990.

Working Paper No. 29, *The Status and an Evaluation of the Electronics Industry in Taiwan*, by Gee San, October 1990.

Working Paper No. 30, *The Indian Electronics Industry: Current Status, Perspectives and Policy Options*, by Ghayur Alam, October 1990.

Working Paper No. 31, *Comparative Advantage in Agriculture in Ghana*, by James Pickett and E. Shaeeldin, October 1990.

Working Paper No. 32, *Debt Overhang, Liquidity Constraints and Adjustment Incentives*, by Bert Hofman and Helmut Reisen, October 1990.

Working Paper No. 34, *Biotechnology and Developing Country Agriculture: Maize in Indonesia*, by Hidjat Nataatmadja *et al.*, January 1991.

Working Paper No. 35, *Changing Comparative Advantage in Thai Agriculture*, by Ammar Siamwalla, Suthad Setboonsarng and Prasong Werakarnjanapongs, March 1991.

Working Paper No. 36, *Capital Flows and the External Financing of Turkey's Imports*, by Ziya Önis and Süleyman Özmucur, July 1991.

Working Paper No. 37, *The External Financing of Indonesia's Imports*, by Glenn P. Jenkins and Henry B.F. Lim, July 1991.

Working Paper No. 38, *Long-term Capital Reflow under Macroeconomic Stabilization in Latin America*, by Beatriz Armendariz de Aghion, April 1991.

Working Paper No. 39, *Buybacks of LDC Debt and the Scope for Forgiveness*, by Beatriz Armendariz de Aghion, April 1991.

Working Paper No. 40, *Measuring and Modelling Non-Tariff Distortions with Special Reference to Trade in Agricultural Commodities*, by Peter J. Lloyd, July 1991.

Working Paper No. 41, *The Changing Nature of IMF Conditionality*, by Jacques J. Polak, August 1991.

Working Paper No. 42, *Time-Varying Estimates on the Openness of the Capital Account in Korea and Taiwan*, by Helmut Reisen and Hélène Yèches, August 1991.

Working Paper No. 43, *Toward a Concept of Development Agreements*, by F. Gerard Adams, August 1991.

Document de travail No. 44, *Le Partage du fardeau entre les créanciers de pays débiteurs défaillants*, par Jean-Claude Berthélemy et Ann Vourc'h, septembre 1991.

Working Paper No. 45, *The External Financing of Thailand's Imports*, by Supote Chunanunthathum, October 1991.

Working Paper No. 46, *The External Financing of Brazilian Imports*, by Enrico Colombatto, with Elisa Luciano, Luca Gargiulo, Pietro Garibaldi and Giuseppe Russo, October 1991.

Working Paper No. 47, *Scenarios for the World Trading System and their Implications for Developing Countries*, by Robert Z. Lawrence, November 1991.

Working Paper No. 48, *Trade Policies in a Global Context: Technical Specifications of the Rural/Urban-North/South (RUNS) Applied General Equilibrium Model*, by Jean-Marc Burniaux and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, November 1991.

Working Paper No. 49, *Macro-Micro Linkages: Structural Adjustment and Fertilizer Policy in Sub-Saharan Africa*, by Jean-Marc Fontaine with the collaboration of Alice Sindzingre, December 1991.

Working Paper No. 50, *Aggregation by Industry in General Equilibrium Models with International Trade*, by Peter J. Lloyd, December 1991.

Working Paper No. 51, *Policy and Entrepreneurial Responses to the Montreal Protocol: Some Evidence from the Dynamic Asian Economies*, by David C. O'Connor, December 1991.

Working Paper No. 52, *On the Pricing of LDC Debt: an Analysis Based on Historical Evidence from Latin America*, by Beatriz Armendariz de Aghion, February 1992.

Working Paper No. 53, *Economic Regionalisation and Intra-Industry Trade: Pacific-Asian Perspectives*, by Kiichiro Fukasaku, February 1992.

Working Paper No. 54, *Debt Conversions in Yugoslavia,* by Mojmir Mrak, February 1992.

Working Paper No. 55, *Evaluation of Nigeria's Debt-Relief Experience (1985-1990)*, by N.E. Ogbe, March 1992.

Document de travail No. 56, *L'Expérience de l'allégement de la dette du Mali*, par Jean-Claude Berthélemy, février 1992.

Working Paper No. 57, *Conflict or Indifference: US Multinationals in a World of Regional Trading Blocs*, by Louis T. Wells, Jr., March 1992.

Working Paper No. 58, *Japan's Rapidly Emerging Strategy Toward Asia*, by Edward J. Lincoln, April 1992.

Working Paper No. 59, *The Political Economy of Stabilization Programmes in Developing Countries*, by Bruno S. Frey and Reiner Eichenberger, April 1992.

Working Paper No. 60, *Some Implications of Europe 1992 for Developing Countries*, by Sheila Page, April 1992.

Working Paper No. 61, *Taiwanese Corporations in Globalisation and Regionalisation*, by Gee San, April 1992.

Working Paper No. 62, *Lessons from the Family Planning Experience for Community-Based Environmental Education*, by Winifred Weekes-Vagliani, April 1992.

Working Paper No. 63, *Mexican Agriculture in the Free Trade Agreement: Transition Problems in Economic Reform*, by Santiago Levy and Sweder van Wijnbergen, May 1992.

Working Paper No. 64, *Offensive and Defensive Responses by European Multinationals to a World of Trade Blocs*, by John M. Stopford, May 1992.

Working Paper No. 65, *Economic Integration in the Pacific Region*, by Richard Drobnick, May 1992.

Working Paper No. 66, *Latin America in a Changing Global Environment*, by Winston Fritsch, May 1992.

Working Paper No. 67, *An Assessment of the Brady Plan Agreements*, by Jean-Claude Berthélemy and Robert Lensink, May 1992.

Working Paper No. 68, *The Impact of Economic Reform on the Performance of the Seed Sector in Eastern and Southern Africa*, by Elizabeth Cromwell, June 1992.

Working Paper No. 69, *Impact of Structural Adjustment and Adoption of Technology on Competitiveness of Major Cocoa Producing Countries*, by Emily M. Bloomfield and R. Antony Lass, June 1992.

Working Paper No. 70, *Structural Adjustment and Moroccan Agriculture: an Assessment of the Reforms in the Sugar and Cereal Sectors*, by Jonathan Kydd and Sophie Thoyer, June 1992.

Document de travail No. 71, *L'Allégement de la dette au Club de Paris : les évolutions récentes en perspective*, par Ann Vourc'h, juin 1992.

Working Paper No. 72, *Biotechnology and the Changing Public/Private Sector Balance: Developments in Rice and Cocoa,* by Carliene Brenner, July 1992.

Working Paper No. 73, *Namibian Agriculture: Policies and Prospects*, by Walter Elkan, Peter Amutenya, Jochbeth Andima, Robin Sherbourne and Eline van der Linden, July 1992.

Working Paper No. 74, *Agriculture and the Policy Environment: Zambia and Zimbabwe*, by Doris J. Jansen and Andrew Rukovo, July 1992.

Working Paper No. 75, *Agricultural Productivity and Economic Policies: Concepts and Measurements*, by Yair Mundlak, August 1992.

Working Paper No. 76, *Structural Adjustment and the Institutional Dimensions of Agricultural Research and Development in Brazil: Soybeans, Wheat and Sugar Cane,* by John Wilkinson and Bernardo Sorj, August 1992.

Working Paper No. 77, *The Impact of Laws and Regulations on Micro and Small Enterprises in Niger and Swaziland*, by Isabelle Joumard, Carl Liedholm and Donald Mead, September 1992.

Working Paper No. 78, *Co-Financing Transactions between Multilateral Institutions and International Banks*, by Michel Bouchet and Amit Ghose, October 1992.

Document de travail No. 79, *Allégement de la dette et croissance : le cas mexicain*, par Jean-Claude Berthélemy et Ann Vourc'h, octobre 1992.

Document de travail No. 80, *Le Secteur informel en Tunisie : cadre réglementaire et pratique courante*, par Abderrahman Ben Zakour et Farouk Kria, novembre 1992.

Working Paper No. 81, *Small-Scale Industries and Institutional Framework in Thailand,* by Naruemol Bunjongjit and Xavier Oudin, November 1992.

Working Paper No. 81a, *Statistical Annex: Small-Scale Industries and Institutional Framework in Thailand,* by Naruemol Bunjongjit and Xavier Oudin, November 1992.

Document de travail No. 82, *L'Expérience de l'allégement de la dette du Niger,* par Ann Vourc'h et Maina Boukar Moussa*,* novembre 1992.

Working Paper No. 83, *Stabilization and Structural Adjustment in Indonesia: an Intertemporal General Equilibrium Analysis*, by David Roland-Holst, November 1992.

Working Paper No. 84, *Striving for International Competitiveness: Lessons from Electronics for Developing Countries*, by Jan Maarten de Vet, March 1993.

Document de travail No. 85, *Micro-entreprises et cadre institutionnel en Algérie,* par Hocine Benissad, mars 1993.

Working Paper No. 86, *Informal Sector and Regulations in Ecuador and Jamaica*, by Emilio Klein and Victor E. Tokman, August 1993.

Working Paper No. 87, *Alternative Explanations of the Trade-Output Correlation in the East Asian Economies*, by Colin I. Bradford Jr. and Naomi Chakwin, August 1993.

Document de travail No. 88, *La Faisabilité politique de l'ajustement dans les pays africains,* par Christian Morrisson, Jean-Dominique Lafay et Sébastien Dessus, novembre 1993.

Working Paper No. 89, *China as a Leading Pacific Economy*, by Kiichiro Fukasaku and Mingyuan Wu, November 1993.

Working Paper No. 90, *A Detailed Input-Output Table for Morocco*, 1990, by Maurizio Bussolo and David Roland-Holst November 1993.

Working Paper No. 91, *International Trade and the Transfer of Environmental Costs and Benefits*, by Hiro Lee and David Roland-Holst, December 1993.

Working Paper No. 92, *Economic Instruments in Environmental Policy: Lessons from the OECD Experience and their Relevance to Developing Economies*, by Jean-Philippe Barde, January 1994.

Working Paper No. 93, *What Can Developing Countries Learn from OECD Labour Market Programmes and Policies*?, by Åsa Sohlman with David Turnham, January 1994.

Working Paper No. 94, *Trade Liberalization and Employment Linkages in the Pacific Basin*, by Hiro Lee and David Roland-Holst, February 1994.

Working Paper No. 95, *Participatory Development and Gender: Articulating Concepts and Cases*, by Winifred Weekes-Vagliani, February 1994.

Document de travail No. 96, *Promouvoir la maîtrise locale et régionale du développement : une démarche participative à Madagascar*, par Philippe de Rham et Bernard Lecomte, juin 1994.

Working Paper No. 97, *The OECD Green Model: an Updated Overview*, by Hiro Lee, Joaquim Oliveira-Martins and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, August 1994.

Working Paper No. 98, *Pension Funds, Capital Controls and Macroeconomic Stability*, by Helmut Reisen and John Williamson, August 1994.

Working Paper No. 99, *Trade and Pollution Linkages: Piecemeal Reform and Optimal Intervention*, by John Beghin, David Roland-Holst and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, October 1994.

Working Paper No. 100, *International Initiatives in Biotechnology for Developing Country Agriculture: Promises and Problems*, by Carliene Brenner and John Komen, October 1994.

Working Paper No. 101, *Input-based Pollution Estimates for Environmental Assessment in Developing Countries*, by Sébastien Dessus, David Roland-Holst and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, October 1994.

Working Paper No. 102, *Transitional Problems from Reform to Growth: Safety Nets and Financial Efficiency in the Adjusting Egyptian Economy*, by Mahmoud Abdel-Fadil, December 1994.

Working Paper No. 103, *Biotechnology and Sustainable Agriculture: Lessons from India*, by Ghayur Alam, December 1994.

Working Paper No. 104, *Crop Biotechnology and Sustainability: a Case Study of Colombia*, by Luis R. Sanint, January 1995.

Working Paper No. 105, *Biotechnology and Sustainable Agriculture: the Case of Mexico*, by José Luis Solleiro Rebolledo, January 1995.

Working Paper No. 106, *Empirical Specifications for a General Equilibrium Analysis of Labor Market Policies and Adjustments*, by Andréa Maechler and David Roland-Holst, May 1995.

Document de travail No. 107, *Les Migrants, partenaires de la coopération internationale : le cas des Maliens de France*, par Christophe Daum, juillet 1995.

Document de travail No. 108, *Ouverture et croissance industrielle en Chine : étude empirique sur un échantillon de villes*, par Sylvie Démurger, septembre 1995.

Working Paper No. 109, *Biotechnology and Sustainable Crop Production in Zimbabwe*, by John J. Woodend, December 1995.

Document de travail No. 110, *Politiques de l'environnement et libéralisation des échanges au Costa Rica : une vue d'ensemble*, par Sébastien Dessus et Maurizio Bussolo, février 1996.

Working Paper No. 111, *Grow Now/Clean Later, or the Pursuit of Sustainable Development?*, by David O'Connor, March 1996.

Working Paper No. 112, *Economic Transition and Trade-Policy Reform: Lessons from China*, by Kiichiro Fukasaku and Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, July 1996.

Working Paper No. 113, *Chinese Outward Investment in Hong Kong: Trends, Prospects and Policy Implications*, by Yun-Wing Sung, July 1996.

Working Paper No. 114, *Vertical Intra-industry Trade between China and OECD Countries*, by Lisbeth Hellvin, July 1996.

Document de travail No. 115, *Le Rôle du capital public dans la croissance des pays en développement au cours des années 80*, par Sébastien Dessus et Rémy Herrera, juillet 1996.

Working Paper No. 116, *General Equilibrium Modelling of Trade and the Environment*, by John Beghin, Sébastien Dessus, David Roland-Holst and Dominique van der Mensbrugghe, September 1996.

Working Paper No. 117, *Labour Market Aspects of State Enterprise Reform in Viet Nam*, by David O'Connor, September 1996.

Document de travail No. 118, *Croissance et compétitivité de l'industrie manufacturière au Sénégal*, par Thierry Latreille et Aristomène Varoudakis, octobre 1996.

Working Paper No. 119, *Evidence on Trade and Wages in the Developing World*, by Donald J. Robbins, December 1996.

Working Paper No. 120, *Liberalising Foreign Investments by Pension Funds: Positive and Normative Aspects*, by Helmut Reisen, January 1997.

Document de travail No. 121, *Capital Humain, ouverture extérieure et croissance : estimation sur données de panel d'un modèle à coefficients variables*, par Jean-Claude Berthélemy, Sébastien Dessus et Aristomène Varoudakis, janvier 1997.

Working Paper No. 122, *Corruption: The Issues*, by Andrew W. Goudie and David Stasavage, January 1997.

Working Paper No. 123, *Outflows of Capital from China,* by David Wall, March 1997.

Working Paper No. 124, *Emerging Market Risk and Sovereign Credit Ratings,* by Guillermo Larraín, Helmut Reisen and Julia von Maltzan, April 1997.

Working Paper No. 125, *Urban Credit Co-operatives in China,* by Eric Girardin and Xie Ping, August 1997.

Working Paper No. 126, *Fiscal Alternatives of Moving from Unfunded to Funded Pensions,* by Robert Holzmann, August 1997.

Working Paper No. 127, *Trade Strategies for the Southern Mediterranean*, by Peter A. Petri, December 1997.

Working Paper No. 128, *The Case of Missing Foreign Investment in the Southern Mediterranean*, by Peter A. Petri, December 1997.

Working Paper No. 129, *Economic Reform in Egypt in a Changing Global Economy*, by Joseph Licari, December 1997.

Working Paper No. 130, *Do Funded Pensions Contribute to Higher Aggregate Savings? A Cross-Country Analysis*, by Jeanine Bailliu and Helmut Reisen, December 1997.

Working Paper No. 131, *Long-run Growth Trends and Convergence Across Indian States,* by Rayaprolu Nagaraj, Aristomène Varoudakis and Marie-Ange Véganzonès, January 1998.

Working Paper No. 132, *Sustainable and Excessive Current Account Deficits,* by Helmut Reisen, February 1998.

Working Paper No. 133, *Intellectual Property Rights and Technology Transfer in Developing Country Agriculture: Rhetoric and Reality,* by Carliene Brenner, March 1998.

Working Paper No. 134, *Exchange-rate Management and Manufactured Exports in Sub-Saharan Africa,* by Khalid Sekkat and Aristomène Varoudakis, March 1998.

Working Paper No. 135, *Trade Integration with Europe, Export Diversification and Economic Growth in Egypt,* by Sébastien Dessus and Akiko Suwa-Eisenmann, June 1998.

Working Paper No. 136, *Domestic Causes of Currency Crises: Policy Lessons for Crisis Avoidance,* by Helmut Reisen, June 1998.

Working Paper No. 137, *A Simulation Model of Global Pension Investment,* by Landis MacKellar and Helmut Reisen, August 1998.

Working Paper No. 138, *Determinants of Customs Fraud and Corruption: Evidence from Two African Countries,* by David Stasavage and Cécile Daubrée, August 1998.

Working Paper No. 139, *State Infrastructure and Productive Performance in Indian Manufacturing,* by Arup Mitra, Aristomène Varoudakis and Marie-Ange Véganzonès, August 1998.

Working Paper No. 140, *Rural Industrial Development in Viet Nam and China: A Study in Contrasts,* by David O'Connor, September 1998.

Working Paper No. 141,*Labour Market Aspects of State Enterprise Reform in China,* by Fan Gang,Maria Rosa Lunati and David O'Connor, October 1998.

Working Paper No. 142, *Fighting Extreme Poverty in Brazil: The Influence of Citizens' Action on Government Policies,* by Fernanda Lopes de Carvalho, November 1998.

Working Paper No. 143, *How Bad Governance Impedes Poverty Alleviation in Bangladesh,* by Rehman Sobhan, November 1998.

Document de travail No. 144, La libéralisation de l'agriculture tunisienne et l'Union européenne : une vue prospective, par Mohamed Abdelbasset Chemingui et Sébastien Dessus, février 1999.

Working Paper No. 145, *Economic Policy Reform and Growth Prospects in Emerging African Economies,* by Patrick Guillaumont, Sylviane Guillaumont Jeanneney and Aristomène Varoudakis, March 1999.

Working Paper No. 146, *Structural Policies for International Competitiveness in Manufacturing: The Case of Cameroon*, by Ludvig Söderling, March 1999.

Working Paper No. 147, *China's Unfinished Open-Economy Reforms: Liberalisation of Services*, by Kiichiro Fukasaku, Yu Ma and Qiumei Yang, April 1999.

Working Paper No. 148**,** *Boom and Bust and Sovereign Ratings*, by Helmut Reisen and Julia von Maltzan, June 1999.

Working Paper No. 149, *Economic Opening and the Demand for Skills in Developing Countries: A Review of Theory and Evidence*, by David O'Connor and Maria Rosa Lunati, June 1999.

Working Paper No. 150, *The Role of Capital Accumulation, Adjustment and Structural Change for Economic Take-off: Empirical Evidence from African Growth Episodes,* by Jean-Claude Berthélemy and Ludvig Söderling, July 1999.

Working Paper No. 151, *Gender, Human Capital and Growth: Evidence from Six Latin American Countries,* by Donald J. Robbins, September 1999.

Working Paper No. 152, *The Politics and Economics of Transition to an Open Market Economy in Viet Nam,* by James Riedel and William S. Turley, September 1999.

Working Paper No. 153, *The Economics and Politics of Transition to an Open Market Economy: China,* by Wing Thye Woo, October 1999.

Working Paper No. 154, *Infrastructure Development and Regulatory Reform in Sub-Saharan Africa: The Case of Air Transport,* by Andrea E. Goldstein, October 1999.

Working Paper No. 155, *The Economics and Politics of Transition to an Open Market Economy: India,* by Ashok V. Desai, October 1999.

Working Paper No. 156, *Climate Policy Without Tears: CGE-Based Ancillary Benefits Estimates for Chile,* by Sébastien Dessus and David O'Connor, November 1999.

Document de travail No. 157, *Dépenses d'éducation, qualité de l'éducation et pauvreté : l'exemple de cinq pays d'Afrique francophone*, par Katharina Michaelowa, avril 2000.

Document de travail No. 158, *Une estimation de la pauvreté en Afrique subsaharienne d'après les données anthropométriques*, par Christian Morrisson, Hélène Guilmeau et Charles Linskens, mai 2000.

Working Paper No. 159, *Converging European Transitions,* by Jorge Braga de Macedo, July 2000.

Working Paper No. 160, *Capital Flows and Growth in Developing Countries: Recent Empirical Evidence,* by Marcelo Soto, July 2000.

Working Paper No. 161, *Global Capital Flows and the Environment in the 21st Century,* by David O'Connor, July 2000.

Working Paper No. 162, *Financial Crises and International Architecture: A "Eurocentric" Perspective,* by Jorge Braga de Macedo, August 2000.

Document de travail No. 163, *Résoudre le problème de la dette : de l'initiative PPTE à Cologne*, par Anne Joseph, août 2000.

Working Paper No. 164, *E-Commerce for Development: Prospects and Policy Issues,* by Andrea Goldstein and David O'Connor, September 2000.

Working Paper No. 165, *Negative Alchemy? Corruption and Composition of Capital Flows,* by Shang-Jin Wei, October 2000.

Working Paper No. 166, *The HIPC Initiative: True and False Promises,* by Daniel Cohen, October 2000.

Document de travail No. 167, *Les facteurs explicatifs de la malnutrition en Afrique subsaharienne*, par Christian Morrisson et Charles Linskens, octobre 2000.

Working Paper No. 168, *Human Capital and Growth: A Synthesis Report,* by Christopher A. Pissarides, November 2000.

Working Paper No. 169, *Obstacles to Expanding Intra-African Trade,* by Roberto Longo and Khalid Sekkat, March 2001.

Working Paper No. 170, *Regional Integration In West Africa,* by Ernest Aryeetey, March 2001.

Working Paper No. 171, *Regional Integration Experience in the Eastern African Region,* by Andrea Goldstein and Njuguna S. Ndung'u, March 2001.

Working Paper No. 172, *Integration and Co-operation in Southern Africa,* by Carolyn Jenkins, March 2001.

Working Paper No. 173, *FDI in Sub-Saharan Africa,* by Ludger Odenthal, March 2001

Document de travail No. 174, *La réforme des télécommunications en Afrique subsaharienne,* par Patrick Plane, mars 2001.

Working Paper No. 175, *Fighting Corruption in Customs Administration: What Can We Learn from Recent Experiences?*, by Irène Hors; April 2001.

Working Paper No. 176, *Globalisation and Transformation: Illusions and Reality,* by Grzegorz W. Kolodko, May 2001.

Working Paper No. 177, *External Solvency, Dollarisation and Investment Grade: Towards a Virtuous Circle?,* by Martin Grandes, June 2001.

Document de travail No. 178, *Congo 1965-1999: Les espoirs déçus du « Brésil africain »*, par Joseph Maton avec Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, septembre 2001.

Working Paper No. 179, *Growth and Human Capital: Good Data, Good Results*, by Daniel Cohen and Marcelo Soto, September 2001.

Working Paper No. 180, *Corporate Governance and National Development,* by Charles P. Oman, October 2001.

Working Paper No. 181, *How Globalisation Improves Governance*, by Federico Bonaglia, Jorge Braga de Macedo and Maurizio Bussolo, November 2001.

Working Paper No. 182, *Clearing the Air in India: The Economics of Climate Policy with Ancillary Benefits,* by Maurizio Bussolo and David O'Connor, November 2001.

Working Paper No. 183, *Globalisation, Poverty and Inequality in sub-Saharan Africa: A Political Economy Appraisal*, by Yvonne M. Tsikata, December 2001.

Working Paper No. 184, *Distribution and Growth in Latin America in an Era of Structural Reform: The Impact of Globalisation*, by Samuel A. Morley, December 2001.

Working Paper No. 185*, Globalisation, Liberalisation, Poverty and Income Inequality in Southeast Asia,* by K.S. Jomo, December 2001.

Working Paper No. 186, *Globalisation, Growth and Income Inequality: The African Experience,* by Steve Kayizzi-Mugerwa, December 2001.

Working Paper No. 187, *The Social Impact of Globalisation in Southeast Asia*, by Mari Pangestu, December 2001.

Working Paper No. 188, *Where Does Inequality Come From? Ideas and Implications for Latin America*, by James A. Robinson, December 2001.

Working Paper No. 189, *Policies and Institutions for E-Commerce Readiness: What Can Developing Countries Learn from OECD Experience?*, by Paulo Bastos Tigre and David O'Connor, April 2002.

Document de travail No. 190, *La réforme du secteur financier en Afrique,* par Anne Joseph, juillet 2002.

Working Paper No. 191, *Virtuous Circles? Human Capital Formation, Economic Development and the Multinational Enterprise*, by Ethan B. Kapstein, August 2002.

Working Paper No. 192, *Skill Upgrading in Developing Countries: Has Inward Foreign Direct Investment Played a Role?*, by Matthew J. Slaughter, August 2002.

Working Paper No. 193, *Government Policies for Inward Foreign Direct Investment in Developing Countries: Implications for Human Capital Formation and Income Inequality*, by Dirk Willem te Velde, August 2002.

Working Paper No. 194, *Foreign Direct Investment and Intellectual Capital Formation in Southeast Asia*, by Bryan K. Ritchie, August 2002.

Working Paper No. 195, *FDI and Human Capital: A Research Agenda,* by Magnus Blomström and Ari Kokko, August 2002.

Working Paper No. 196, *Knowledge Diffusion from Multinational Enterprises: The Role of Domestic and Foreign Knowledge-Enhancing Activities*, by Yasuyuki Todo and Koji Miyamoto, August 2002.

Working Paper No. 197, *Why Are Some Countries So Poor? Another Look at the Evidence and a Message of Hope*, by Daniel Cohen and Marcelo Soto, October 2002.

Working Paper No. 198, *Choice of an Exchange-Rate Arrangement, Institutional Setting and Inflation: Empirical Evidence from Latin America*, by Andreas Freytag, October 2002.

Working Paper No. 199, *Will Basel II Affect International Capital Flows to Emerging Markets?*, by Beatrice Weder and Michael Wedow, October 2002.

Working Paper No. 200, *Convergence and Divergence of Sovereign Bond Spreads: Lessons from Latin America,* by Martin Grandes, October 2002.

Working Paper No. 201, *Prospects for Emerging-Market Flows amid Investor Concerns about Corporate Governance,* by Helmut Reisen, November 2002.

Working Paper No. 202, *Rediscovering Education in Growth Regressions,* by Marcelo Soto, November 2002.

Working Paper No. 203, *Incentive Bidding for Mobile Investment: Economic Consequences and Potential Responses,* by Andrew Charlton, January 2003.

Working Paper No. 204, *Health Insurance for the Poor? Determinants of participation Community-Based Health Insurance Schemes in Rural Senegal,* by Johannes Jütting, January 2003.

Working Paper No. 205, *China's Software Industry and its Implications for India,* by Ted Tschang, February 2003.

Working Paper No. 206, *Agricultural and Human Health Impacts of Climate Policy in China: A General Equilibrium Analysis with Special Reference to Guangdong,* by David O'Connor, Fan Zhai, Kristin Aunan, Terje Berntsen and Haakon Vennemo, March 2003.

Working Paper No. 207, *India's Information Technology Sector: What Contribution to Broader Economic Development?,* by Nirvikar Singh, March 2003.

Working Paper No. 208, *Public Procurement: Lessons from Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda,* by Walter Odhiambo and Paul Kamau, March 2003.

Working Paper No. 209, *Export Diversification in Low-Income Countries: An International Challenge after Doha,* by Federico Bonaglia and Kiichiro Fukasaku, June 2003.

Working Paper No. 210, *Institutions and Development: A Critical Review,* by Johannes Jütting, July 2003.

Working Paper No. 211, *Human Capital Formation and Foreign Direct Investment in Developing Countries,* by Koji Miyamoto, July 2003.

Working Paper No. 212, *Central Asia since 1991: The Experience of the New Independent States,* by Richard Pomfret, July 2003.

Working Paper No. 213, *A Multi-Region Social Accounting Matrix (1995) and Regional Environmental General Equilibrium Model for India (REGEMI),* by Maurizio Bussolo, Mohamed Chemingui and David O'Connor, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 214, *Ratings Since the Asian Crisis,* by Helmut Reisen, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 215, *Development Redux: Reflactions for a New Paradigm,* by Jorge Braga de Macedo, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 216, *The Political Economy of Regulatory Reform: Telecoms in the Southern Mediterranean,* by Andrea Goldstein, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 217, *The Impact of Education on Fertility and Child Mortality: Do Fathers Really Matter Less than Mothers?,* by Lucia Breierova and Esther Duflo, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 218, *Float in Order to Fix? Lessons from Emerging Markets for EU Accession Countries,* by Jorge Braga de Macedo and Helmut Reisen, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 219, *Globalisation in Developing Countries: The Role of Transaction Costs in Explaining Economic Performance in India,* by Maurizio Bussolo and John Whalley, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 220, *Poverty Reduction Strategies in a Budget-Constrained Economy: The Case of Ghana,* by Maurizio Bussolo and Jeffery I. Round, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 221, *Public-Private Partnerships in Development: Three Applications in Timor Leste,* by José Braz, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 222, *Public Opinion Research, Global Education and Development Co-operation Reform: In Search of a Virtuous Circle,* by Ida McDonnell, Henri-Bernard Solignac Lecomte and Liam Wegimont, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 223, *Building Capacity to Trade: What Are the Priorities?,* by Henry-Bernard Solignac Lecomte, November 2003.

Working Paper No. 224, *Of Flying Geeks and O-Rings: Locating Software and IT Services in India's Economic Development,* by David O'Connor, November 2003.

Document de travail No. 225, *Cap Vert: Gouvernance et Développement,* by Jaime Lourenço and Colm Foy, November 2003.