

INEQUALITY, POVERTY AND MOBILITY: CHOOSING INCOME OR CONSUMPTION AS WELFARE INDICATORS^(*)

Authors: *Carlos Gradín*^(a)
Olga Cantó
Coral del Río
Universidade de Vigo

P. T. N.º 18/04

(*) The authors acknowledge financial support from Instituto de Estudios Fiscales through project "Aspectos Metodológicos en la Medición de la Dinámica de la Pobreza: el Ingreso y el Gasto como indicadores del Bienestar individual". Olga Cantó thanks for finance from the Ministerio de Ciencia y Tecnología. *Programa Nacional de Promoción General del Conocimiento*. Proyecto BEC2000-415.

(a) Address for correspondence: Carlos Gradín. Departamento de Economía Aplicada. Facultad de CC. Económicas e Empresariales. Universidade de Vigo. Campus de Lagoas Marcosende, s/n. 36310 Vigo. Spain. Tel.: +34 986 81 24 01. e-mail: cgradin@uvigo.es.

N.B.: Las opiniones expresadas en este trabajo son de la exclusiva responsabilidad de los autores, pudiendo no coincidir con las del Instituto de Estudios Fiscales.

Desde el año 1998, la colección de Papeles de Trabajo del Instituto de Estudios Fiscales está disponible en versión electrónica, en la dirección: ><http://www.minhac.es/ief/principal.htm>.

Edita: Instituto de Estudios Fiscales

N.I.P.O.: 111-04-007-8

I.S.S.N.: 1578-0252

Depósito Legal: M-23772-2001

INDEX

1. INTRODUCTION
 2. CHANGING INCOME OR CHANGING CONSUMPTION?: THE ISSUES
 3. INCOME OR CONSUMPTION IN ANALYSING THE INCOME DISTRIBUTION: THE EVIDENCE
 4. INCOME OR CONSUMPTION: THE SPANISH CONTEXT
 5. THE LONGITUDINAL DATASET AND SOME RELEVANT DEFINITIONS
 - 5.1. The *Encuesta Continua de Presupuestos Familiares* (ECPF)
 - 5.2. Some relevant definitions
 6. INEQUALITY, POVERTY AND MOBILITY USING BOTH INDICATORS: THE RESULTS
 - 6.1. Inequality and Poverty using different indicators
 - 6.2. Mobility using different indicators
 7. CONCLUSIONS
- APPENDIX ON MOBILITY MEASURES USING THE ECPF
- REFERENCES

ABSTRACT

The literature on economic income distribution has largely debated the issue of which is the best indicator of individual welfare: income or consumption. The implications of the choice are not only a matter for theoretical discussion but are clearly very relevant when undertaking any empirical distributional analysis. The discussion has largely centred the debate on the implications of this choice on inequality and poverty statics while that on mobility and poverty dynamics is very scarce due, in many occasions, to the availability of consumption survey data in a longitudinal format. In this paper we analyse the effects of choosing income or consumption on household mobility and poverty dynamics using very detailed information on both household incomes and expenditures.

Keywords: income distribution, sensitivity analysis, expenditure, mobility, poverty dynamics, Spain.

JEL Classification: D1, D31, I32.

1. INTRODUCTION

An extensive literature on inequality and poverty has traditionally been devoted to the sensitivity of results to important methodological decisions such as the choice of equivalence scale [see Buhmann *et al.* (1988); Coulter *et al.* (1992a, 1992b); or Jenkins and Cowell (1994)¹], the accounting period [Cantó *et al.* (2002)] or the welfare indicator [see Mercader-Prats (1998)]. In all cases, the approach considered both the theoretical issues involved in the decision and the empirical effects of the choice on the *level* and *evolution* of inequality and on the *incidence, intensity* or *characterization* of poverty for cross-sectional survey data. In recent times the literature on income distribution is starting to develop an important amount of research on a dynamic approach to measuring inequality and poverty, thus, for example, adding the idea of *intradistributional mobility* and the concept of *persistence* or the *duration* dimension in poverty analysis. In this context, it is only recently that some authors are starting to be aware of the consequences of their methodological decisions on analysing the income distribution in a dynamic perspective.²

The aim of this paper is precisely that of considering in depth the effects on empirical analysis of the choice of welfare indicator on the dynamics of the income distribution which may also provide some light on the consistency of various theoretical assumptions. With that purpose in mind we undertake the analysis using a longitudinal survey: the Spanish *Encuesta Continua de Presupuestos Familiares* (ECPF). This survey yields quarterly information on a sequence of about two years long (eight interviews carried out every three months). Using this data source we are able to consider information from sub-annual periods and to reconstruct the household's complete picture on incomes and expenditures over the year.

The relevance of the choice of a welfare indicator is such that from the very first issue of *what one would like to measure* one has to decide on a certain approach. The reason underlying the relative scarceness of interest in the literature in discovering the implications of the choice of welfare indicator on welfare dynamics is, clearly, not the little relevance of the issue but the lack of availability of adequate data for analysis.³

¹ In the Spanish context consider Mercader (1993), Ruiz-Castillo (1993, 1998), Del Río and Ruiz-Castillo (1999, 2001) and Duclos and Mercader-Prats (1999).

² See Bradbury *et al.* (2001) or Cantó *et al.* (2002) for some research on methodological issues on analysing poverty dynamics.

³ In fact, very few longitudinal surveys in developed countries provide detailed information on both households' incomes and expenditures. Most precisely, apart from the American Consumer Expenditure Survey for the US, it is mostly countries in transition from a planned to a market economy those who hold reliable longitudinal datasets on incomes and expenditures - see Kapitany and Molnar (2002) on the use of data on incomes and expenditures for analysing the 'living standards' distribution with the Hungarian Household Panel or Klugman and Kolev (2001) on that of the Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey.



In principle, it appears that the more adequate monetary indicator to measure household welfare is the sum of all disposable incomes of its members following the idea that in our developed societies there is some 'minimum right to resources'. This has been the choice of most of the empirical literature in inequality and poverty that, also in order to make international comparisons, has generally chosen income as the most homogeneous variable in different countries' survey data. However, there is a strong argument on the option of measuring inequality and poverty using consumption as related to a 'minimum standard of living' – Atkinson (1998). Indeed, there are theoretical reasons why consumption is believed to be more accurate than income in measuring well-being. One of them is that the shorter the period income flows are measured, the more important its transitory component making the estimated inequality and the probability of classifying households as poor higher (even if their period below the poverty line is relatively short).

Therefore, if our 'standard of living' concept is more stable than annual household income and we also consider that life-cycle effects are strongly driving income differences between households, it appears reasonable to think that it is *permanent* income the notion of welfare we should aim to measure. In this context, and facing the fact that one seldomly finds survey information on incomes on long accounting periods (longer than a year), many authors have considered that current consumption is a more accurate indicator of the long-term household position than current income.⁴ Clearly here the relevant assumption is that households are able to smooth their consumption while facing fluctuating income flows. Therefore we must assume homogeneity of financial markets for households at all points of the income/consumption distribution.

In any case there are also some other reasons to believe that consumption may have important disadvantages in the measurement of household welfare given that it highly depends on the habits of individuals and on the demographic group the household is inserted in – for example young and old households have radically different consumption patterns most possibly due either to very different needs or to intergenerational differences in preferences.

Further problems that may arise using consumption as a welfare indicator are related to the different periodicity in which some expenditures are sampled in household surveys which imposes the simple annualisation of weekly or monthly purchases. Moreover, the presence of purchase infrequency in many of the items considered in surveys makes the estimation of real household consumption even less accurate.

However, it is not only conceptual considerations what may drive the choice of one of the two indicators but also the degree of reliability of the data available

⁴ See for example Slesnick (1991, 1993).

in household surveys. First, if we work with microdata, consumption may present a higher reliability than income given the expected underreporting of the latter. In fact, authors like Ruiz-Castillo (1987) or Ruiz-Huerta and Martínez (1994) have indicated that a large percentage of households in the Spanish Consumer Expenditure Survey (*Encuesta de Presupuestos Familiares*, EPF) report more expenditures than incomes. This result is also confirmed for the Spanish rotating panel survey (*Encuesta Continua de Presupuestos Familiares*, ECPF) data by Cantó (1998). Most precisely, in the Spanish context Sanz (1996) underlines the fact that using the EPF in 1990-91 it is not possible to recover Spanish National Account Data on household income. This is especially worrisome when we check that underreporting is not homogeneous in the population but is concentrated in capital incomes, self-employment incomes and social protection subsidies different from pensions.⁵

This paper is organized as follows. The next section revises the most important theoretical approaches on the choice of welfare indicator. Subsequently section three puts forward the most relevant issues of this choice for distributional dynamics and revises the literature on income distribution that uses each or both indicators. Section four focusses on the revision and comparison of previous results for Spain on the use of income or expenditure as a measure of well-being while section 5 presents details on both the definitions and the data source used. Section six deals with the sensitivity of inequality, poverty and mobility measures for Spain when changing indicator. Finally, the last section summarizes our main findings.

2. CHANGING INCOME OR CHANGING CONSUMPTION?: THE ISSUES

Consumption is ideally defined as the sum of expenditures on current purchases plus the value of self-consumed goods (self-produced or not), the use-value of the expenditures on consumer durables and the imputation value of owner-occupied housing [see World Bank (2000)]. This definition shows that using consumption has an important range of problems related to the estimation of use-value of consumer durables and the need to use imputations on the value of housing. In practice, most of the empirical literature uses monetary expenditures as a proxy of consumption given the difficulties in both estimating the va-

⁵ Note however that Sabelhaus and Schneider (1997) underline that consumption data are by no means less prone to measurement error than income data while none of the two indicators account for financial wealth or changes in relative asset prices over time which would really add information on the explanation of the trends of well-being.



lue of self-consumed goods, the use-value of durables⁶ and calculating some credible imputation value for housing.⁷

The theoretical justification of the use of expenditure as a good indicator of household welfare is based on the predictions of intertemporal models of the choice between current and future consumption. These models are integrated either in life-cycle models such as Modigliani and Brumberg (1954) or in “permanent income hypothesis” models such as Friedman (1957) and predict that, in the presence of uncertainty, the concavity of utility functions will lead individuals to smooth consumption along their lives through savings or incurring in temporary debt. These models suggest that, in this context, individuals’ consumption will only respond to *permanent* increases in incomes and not to merely *transitory* changes in their earnings which will, instead, be destined to savings.⁸

Most studies on these matters underline that there is a high similarity in the pattern of expenditures and incomes over the life-cycle. Some authors have then resumed that the predictions of the life-cycle hypothesis do not hold while others have tried to search for alternative explanations. Indeed, some authors indicate that the year-to-year variability in expenditures is partially explained by household’s changes in needs (changes in number of members and their composition) which implies that considering equivalent expenditures the pattern is slightly flatter, even if one still observes a large reduction of consumption at advanced ages (after retirement mostly). In line with Heckman (1974) this could be partially explained by the complementarity between the some goods’ consumption and labour market participation – See Attanasio and Banks (1997) for an analysis of demographic and labour market factors and the life-cycle. Also, some authors have indicated that the wish to save in order to heir, individuals risk aversion (precautionary reasons in an uncertain world) or individual liquidity constraints may explain a non-flat pattern of expenditures over the life-cycle. Most precisely, the existence of liquidity constraints in relevant parts of the income distribution may be one of the motives that may explain the existence of an excess reaction of expenditures to changes in net disposable incomes respect to the predictions of a life-cycle model. In fact, Japelli (1990) using the Survey of Consumer Finances for the US shows that household’s current income, current wealth and household member’s age are relevant variables in determining if a household considers a credit claim. Thus if low income individuals may face liquidity constraints, this reasoning becomes particularly important when analysing incomes or expenditures in a distributional perspective.

⁶ Slesnick (2001) tries to estimate the service flows from consumer durables for the US using various sources of information.

⁷ From now onwards we will use the wording “expenditures” and “consumption” as equivalents even if we are conscious of the differences.

⁸ The main difference between life-cycle and permanent income models is that while the former consider a finite time horizon, the latter are constructed with an infinite one.

Indeed, Mercader-Prats (1998) indicates that it is commonly recognized that in practice, liquidity constraints are important, particularly among poor households. The lower permanent income is the higher the need to increase savings to cover emergencies and thus the lower consumption will be. Also, age or social and cultural factors could be considered to explain low consumption of risk-averse consumers. She concludes that "*In sum, [...] consumption is more subject to individual idiosyncracies than income, the superiority of consumption over income as a proxy of the household long run welfare level can no longer be taken for granted*".

Zeldes (1989) is a relevant piece of empirical evidence on these matters. The author finds that for those in the lower tail of the income distribution the rate of consumption growth (on food and drink, PSID) is related with the retarded value of incomes while that is not true for those at the higher tail of the distribution. He interprets this result as evidence on low income liquidity constraints. Other authors show a high correlation between the increases in expenditures (on food and drink) and wages. The empirical literature here, however, is rather limited and it could be the case that, as Attanasio (1999) notes, "*once one controls for the influence that demographics and labour supply might have on the marginal utility of consumption, there is no evidence of excess sensitivity of consumption to income or rejection of the overidentifying restrictions. Female labour force participation and family size seem to be particularly important in this respect*" (page 791). In Attanasio's view the life cycle model, enriched to account for demographic and labour supply variables, is not rejected by the available data. However, the same author indicates that the validity of the model is limited to mid-aged individuals (around 45 years of age), while there is much work to be done on consumption patterns of either the young or the old-aged. Precisely the old-aged are to be specially difficult to model given their significant changes in labour status that brings in the discussion the non-separability of leisure and work in their utility function. This, together with other characteristics associated with these households such as changes in size, health and the increase in the probability of death, may clearly affect household consumption. Thus, evidence on the important decrease in consumption of the old-aged may be a result of an optimal life-cycle model once one makes all the previous considerations. Clearly, it may also be the case that savings during active life turn out as insufficient at old-age and thus consumption adjusts to this situation (this could take place if the individual overestimated his/her future pension).

Several empirical studies have tried to contrast the predictions of the models that imply that individuals' consumption should show a rather smoother pattern than income. However, there is a variety of methodological approaches in the studies that have tried to contrast empirically the life-cycle or the permanent income hypothesis. Basically, we find two types of approaches: those which analyse time-series of income and expenditure using National Accounts data and



those who analyse microdata on household incomes and expenditures from large household surveys. Attanasio (1999) notes that the first aggregate approach has serious problems in interpreting the estimated coefficients and this has led researchers to focus their efforts in microdata analysis.

However, the use of microdata is not free of difficulties. The lack of long enough household panels with sufficient information on expenditures and incomes has forced analysts to construct expenditures pseudo-panels from cross-sectional samples datasets such as the American Consumer Expenditure Survey. In this case researchers follow different cohorts as if it were the same individual i.e. constructing a pseudo-panel by grouping households in age cohorts. The other possibility has been the tentative to use a proper household panel such as the Panel Study of Income Dynamics (PSID) for the US, one of the worldwide's best long-term income panels available. The problem is that precisely this panel does not provide researchers with a reliable information on expenditures given that it has been proved to have strong biases because it only includes household's expenditures on food and drink.

Attanasio (1999) using National Accounts data for the UK (1965-1996) and the US (1959-1996), has showed that net incomes present a higher degree of variability than non-durable expenditures. In contrast, expenditure on durables, as one would expect, is subject to a high level of variability. Using cohort data this author shows also that both incomes and expenditures follow an inverted-U pattern where the maximum appears at the household's head age of 45, which seemingly seems to contrast with life-cycle theory which would predict a constant level of consumption. We should note, however, that, as expected, expenditures on non-durables show a significantly higher volatility than those on durables.

Blundell and Preston (1998) using British data (the British Family Expenditure Survey, FES) identify the increase in income variance due to either permanent shocks or temporary changes within the same cohort. They measure the temporary increase in the variance of incomes as the difference between the variance of incomes and the variance of expenditures (that approximate the permanent increase in the variance). Other similar studies that have decomposed income changes into transitory and permanent shocks are Gottshalk and Moffit (1994), Moffit and Gottschalk (1995), Gittleman and Joyce (1996) or Buchinsky and Hunt (1997). More recently, and using a similar methodology, Attanasio *et al.* (2002) widen the focus of previous studies in order to analyse the path from inequality in hourly wages to consumption inequality using information on labour participation decisions, savings possibilities, transfers and formal or informal insurances that allow for household's consumption smoothing. These authors try to relate the increase in wage inequality in the UK and the contemporary increase in consumption inequality in order to test the hypothesis that insured wages shocks are not reflected in consumption while those not in-

sured would be. They conclude that much of the growth in earnings inequality in the 1980s is attributable to growth in permanent wage inequality among younger cohorts.

3. INCOME OR CONSUMPTION IN ANALYSING THE INCOME DISTRIBUTION: THE EVIDENCE

The question is: should we use income or should we use consumption in order to measure individual's well-being? Both the use of expenditure and income data in order to measure inequality and poverty has been widespread. For example, until the mid-nineties Eurostat used consumption expenditure data to derive poverty ratios for each country in the UE [see Eurostat (1990)] while since the European Community Household Panel is available all results on poverty for UE countries are calculated using household income data.

As we indicated in the introduction there are advantages and disadvantages of choosing one of these indicators. Also, there are good reasons to suppose that consumption and income measures will differ across population subgroups (see Slesnick, 1991). Lyfe-cycle models have had a strong influence on the literature on income distribution by generating a large and increasing list of papers which use expenditure as an indicator of individual long-term welfare. Expenditure inequality in the US has been analysed by Attanasio and Davis (1996)⁹, Cutler and Katz (1991, 1992), Slesnick (1993, 2001) or recently by Krueger and Perri (2003) and in the UK by Goodman, Johnson and Webb (1997). Implicitly, the idea behind these pieces of research is that current household consumption is expected to be more associated with *permanent* income than current household income. Within the works on these matters we can also distinguish two groups of studies: those that use households' pseudo-panels and those that use household panel datasets.

In principle, one would predict that, due to consumption smoothing, non-durable consumption distributions should be less skewed than income distributions. However, there are less economic reasons to predict why income and consumption distributions differ by age for example. Cutler and Katz (1991) and Slesnick (2001) for the US using the Consumer Expenditure Survey confirm that total annual expenditures are distributed more equitably than annual incomes and, as expected, non-durable expenditures are even more equally distributed than total annual expenditures. Cutler and Katz (1991), however, also present evidence on the fact that income inequality is more sensitive to changes in unemployment and inflation than consumption inequality. Sabelhaus and Schnei-

⁹ These authors analyse the variability of wages to consumption.



der (1997) investigate the extent to which a consumption based measure of welfare differs from the, more traditional, income approach for Canadian households and obtain that the difference in dispersion of income and expenditure is small when opposing consumption to a relatively “permanent” income measure.

Regarding poverty, in his study for the US, Slesnick (1993) finds that current income overstates poverty respect to current consumption. A recent publication by Slesnick (2001) discusses specifically this matter for the US and claims that households classified as poor respect to disposable income are able to consume almost 1.7 times their annual income in 1985. He claims, even if it is not directly implied by his results, that this provides evidence on income smoothing of the poor. In any case, he finds that consumption poor households are less educated, have fewer physical assets and their relative expenditure on necessities is substantially larger than income poor households.

Recent research on income distribution has started to work on dynamics and has focussed on the mobility of household incomes and expenditures. For example Jappelli and Pistaferri (1999) try to evaluate the mobility in non-durable expenditures for Italian households by constructing transition matrices. They construct different models with decreasing levels of consumption smoothing. A complete consumption smoothing is rejected given that roughly 50 percent of Italian households move up or down in the consumption distribution between any two periods. They show that measurement error is unlikely to explain a large fraction of total cross-sectional variance of consumption and thus a great deal of consumption mobility is explained by idiosyncratic shocks that households are unable to insure. Fischer and Johnson (2002) undertake the same analysis for the US using both aggregate cohort data (Consumer Expenditure Survey, CEX) and longitudinal data from the PSID. They show that results are very similar using both sources of data and that the level of mobility of income and expenditure is remarkably similar.

One of the few studies that consider the effects of the choice of welfare indicator on poverty dynamics is that of Bradbury *et al.* (2001). These authors mention that the implications of the indicator of welfare used for the measurement of transitions into and out of poverty is relatively simple: if a household falls in income poverty only during a short time thus leaving poverty quickly after entrance, welfare during that period will crucially depend on the household possibilities of saving-dissaving in order to finance consumption during a low income period. Some works have considered the measurement of the capability of consumption smoothing of low income households but have reached contradictory results. For the US, Rodgers and Rodgers (1993) conclude that “*there is always more evidence that some poor households can save and dissave and they actually do so*”, while Kempson (1996) for the UK concludes that the households most vul-

nerable to poverty, especially those formed by young adults with children, often lack of savings or any other financial assets to finance consumption during low income periods. Other evidence for the US such as Ruggles and Williams (1989) underline that in the majority of cases households' savings do not permit maintaining consumption expenditures during the whole period of low income. In general, it looks as if households suffering from a decrease in their incomes tend to preferably retard their durable expenditures. Obviously, the longer the low income period the more difficult it will be for these households to maintain their previous level of consumption expenditures through either their savings or by incurring in financial debt.

4. INCOME OR CONSUMPTION: THE SPANISH CONTEXT

The detailed analysis of income and expenditure time series for Spain can be found in Estrada and Buisán (1999) whose conclusions are that non-durable consumption and services is the most important and stable component of consumption but, in the same way as residential investment, has reduced its weight in favour of durable consumption. The three components of consumption are pro-cyclical, but while durable goods go some time ahead National Gross Domestic Product cycle, non-durables move at the same time so that in booms it loses relative weight and it recovers it at the peak. Savings are slightly procyclical too confirming the theoretical idea that, under certain circumstances, savings are a good indicator of individual's expected incomes even after all changes in the extension and coverage of the Spanish Welfare State.

The main determinant of household long-term consumption is purchase power. However, while consumption on non-durables and residential investment present an income elasticity below one, durables consumption is estimated to be 1.4 which is near what one would expect for a luxury good. Other variables that seem to have a significant impact on household consumption expenditures are: the financial wealth-income *ratio* for non-durable goods; the use-value and the relative price of energy for durable goods and real interest rates and the relative price of housing in the case of residential investment. In the short-run, non-durables consumption decisions seem to be influenced by the financial wealth-income ratio, real interest rates, the unemployment rate and the evolution of inflation.

Regarding the effects of the choice of indicator on inequality and poverty in Spain we have that Ayala *et al.* (1993), Del Río and Ruiz-Castillo (1996), Gradín (2002) and Cantó (1998) find that using the cross-sectional data since 1973, or in the panel data since 1985, total annual consumption is more unequally distributed than total annual income. More exactly Del Río and Ruiz-Castillo (1996)

indicate that "*The comparison between expenditure and incomes from the 1980 and 1990 EPF confirms the surprising results obtained by other authors [see Ayala et al. (1993)], that total incomes show lower inequality than total expenditures. This is so even if we compare incomes with non-durable expenditures (eliminating investment components)...*". Most authors have thought that this is to be due to a large measurement error in household's declared incomes in Spain and has been recurrently referred to justify the use of expenditures as welfare indicator.

Further, using expenditure data from the ECPF on Spanish households and in the line initiated by Blundell and Preston (1998), Cutanda (2002) analyses inequality using expenditure information on households. He centres the discussion in a very restricted definition of expenditures including only strictly non-durable goods and services such as food and drink, energy, water, transport services and communications. Adjusting this household expenditure with an OECD scale, eliminating the lowest and highest percentiles of the distribution and using a household-specific price deflator he reports a higher variance in incomes than in expenditures and a reduction in expenditure inequality along the 1985-95 period in Spain.

In any case, the evolution of inequality and poverty using both indicators has not been deeply studied. The use of consumption was defended by authors such as Ruiz-Castillo following the work of Slesnick (1991, 1993) as the best approximation to permanent household well-being. Also, the works of Sanz (1996) and Mercader-Prats (1998) seem to offer solid arguments on the choice of consumption in order to measure well-being for Spanish households. We should mention the efforts made to improve the consumption expenditures indicator for Spain undertaken by Peña and Ruiz-Castillo (1998) where expenditure variables are corrected by the effect bulk-purchases for food and drink.

Income, however, has also been presented as an attractive source of information by various researchers on the Spanish distribution given its advantages in comparing results for Spain with those for other countries, the possibilities of decomposing inequality into the contributions of various income sources or in cases where authors aim to consider both the statics and the dynamics of the distribution. Indeed, the works undertaken by Pena (1996) or Cantó (2000) and those which focus the discussion on the choice of accounting period such as Cantó *et al.* (2002) use longitudinal income data in measuring mobility or poverty dynamics. These studies find that, during the 1980s and 1990s the level of household income mobility is significant in Spain given that 60 percent of households change decile from one year to the next. However, the change in incomes is rather limited given that only 14 percent of movers move two deciles or more. Income mobility shows in the 1985-1991 period a slightly increasing pattern while income inequality was consistently decreasing in Spain. Interestingly the levels of mobility obtained for Spain are outstandingly similar to those reported by Jarvis and Jenkins (1996) for the UK, in a period where both countries are

experiencing a radically different evolution of inequality. Also their results indicate that the shorter the accounting period the higher income poverty estimates.

5. THE LONGITUDINAL DATASET AND SOME RELEVANT DEFINITIONS

5.1. The *Encuesta Continua de Presupuestos Familiares* (ECPF)

In this paper we use a sub-annual panel of incomes and expenditures on a sample of Spanish households similar to the American Consumer Expenditure Survey (CEX) or the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). In our case we have a rotating panel survey which interviews 3,200 households every quarter (substituting 1/8 of its sample at each wave) and offers us information on seven different sources of incomes and very detailed information on expenditures. Further the panel includes a large amount of demographic and socio-economic household characteristics. Households are kept in the panel for a maximum of two years.

A first advantage of sub-annual panels (like SIPP and ECPF) over annual ones is that the former allow the researcher to define different income or expenditure accounting periods within the year. Moreover, sub-annual panels can be effectively used to measure income flows to households or households' expenditures with less errors. The quality of the information constructed summing up monthly or quarterly income or expenditure is expected to be higher than that computed on retrospective information referred to the year previous to the interview and/or on *current* levels, which are expected to cause more errors. Thus, the use of a quarterly panel for households *who answer at least four times* to the survey would assure a most accurate measurement of the total annual income flow to that household or its real annual expenditures.

A second advantage of sub-annual survey periods is that they provide income family composition information at shorter time intervals. This helps to identify more precisely the specific point in time at which demographic or socio-economic events take place in the household. This is useful to obtain more accurate equivalent income or expenditure since we can better fit changes in households' size or composition during the period of reference. In this sense, it becomes particularly useful in the study of mobility and poverty dynamics because it improves the expected correlation between these events and changes in household income or expenditure.

However, a clear drawback of a sub-annual interview structure of a panel is that household fatigue of answering to the survey various times a year imposes a

substantive attrition rate and short household tracing periods (32 months in the SIPP, 24 in the ECPF for those remaining all the time). In this context, and given the importance of attrition in the ECPF (approx. a 35 percent of households leave the panel earlier than a year after first interview and 72 percent of households leave the panel before two years), we apply longitudinal weights to the data in order to take account of possible bias arising from this unplanned sample attrition. Non-random attrition is a potentially serious problem which is recurrently noted in the literature [see Bradbury *et al.* (2001) or Luttmmer (2001)] but rarely taken into account. The procedure to obtain the relevant attrition weights consists in a probit regression of the probability of staying in the panel for a year (fourth interview) on household characteristics (age, level of education, civil status, sex and labour status of household head together with the number of household members and household residence township). Weights were constructed by predicting the inverse of the probability of being a “stayer”. This strategy of constructing attrition weights is one of the options proposed by Kalton and Brick (2000) who indicate that recent research obtains similar results on the value of weights using this methodology than using any of the other two proposed in the literature. We actually find that households with better economic positions living in urban areas, whose head is young and highly educated are more likely to drop out of the sample.¹⁰ Note also that these attrition weights are furtherly combined with representativity weights provided by the Spanish Statistical Office (INE) in order to construct a weighting method that takes into account, at the same time, the probability that a certain household type is selected from the Spanish population to be part of the ECPF sample and the probability of this household type of answering four or eight times to the panel survey [see Cantó *et al.* (2002) for a detailed description of the weighting procedure].

An important methodological consideration is that of the need of defining a treatment of outliers, Cowell and Schluter (1998) have underlined the necessity of trimming the distribution tails given that the majority of mobility indicators are very sensitive to the presence of data contamination (either the presence of zeros or incredibly high reported incomes or expenditures). In order to minimise the problem we follow the same procedure as Schluter and Trede (1999) and Ayala and Sastre (2002) and for each wave we eliminate households whose equivalent income or expenditure is situated below the first or above the 99th percentile. The number of observations we lose is relatively low: 2 percent of

¹⁰ Winkels and Davies (2000) indicate that in analysing panel data attrition in a Dutch dataset they found that it is residential mobility, couples marital separation and the departure of children from the household more than household characteristics what determined an individual's probability of attrition in the panel. Clearly, the difficulty in collecting information on these transitions leaves us with the only option of using household characteristics at first interview in order to predict the likelihood of non-response and thus obtain attrition weights.

the sample each quarter and 9 percent of the sample in the pool (in the case of the pool we eliminate all households that are *contaminated* in one of their interviews).

In the static analysis for each year we select the sample of households who are, at least, in their 4th interview the last quarter of the year in order to reconstruct their annual income and expenditures and calculate inequality and poverty indices. Further, to compare annual and quarterly information we consider their information for the second quarter of the corresponding year. After trimming the tails of the distributions, our mean sample for analysing distributional statics consists of 1,504 households. Note that all our calculations here are computed using on individuals.

For the dynamic analysis, instead, we need to reconstruct household's income and expenditure for two consecutive years. For this purpose we construct a *pool* sample of households observed in the panel during two years and we compute mobility measures comparing the first year's annual income or expenditure (the sum of their first four quarterly observations) with that of the second year (the sum of their last four quarterly observations). Finally we also calculate mobility measures for quarterly data by comparing this same households information at fourth and eighth interviews. After trimming the tails of the distributions, our *pool* sample consists of 7,177 households. Note that in all our results our samples will be systematically weighted for representativeness of the Spanish population and for attrition.

5.2. Some relevant definitions

The choice of the household as unit of study is based on the fact that an individual's well being is believed to strongly depend on total household welfare (if income is equally distributed within the household). Also, the shortage of demographic and socio-economic information (apart from age and sex) of individuals other than the head of household and the spouse in the data makes this choice advantageous. Following, to some extent, the terminology in Jenkins (2000), a clear way to write our economic measure of well being is to use the household income-equivalent or *HIE*. HIE_q^h is the needs-adjusted household h income or expenditure at quarter or year q . Thus:

$$HIE_q^h = \frac{\sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{k=1}^K x_{lkq}}{m(a,L)},$$

where l indicates the number of individuals in the household ($l = 1, 2, \dots, L$) and k is each money income source or each expenditure group. The denominator is an equivalence scale factor, which depends on household size L and on a vector



of household composition variables a (ages of individuals, etc.). Our welfare measure HIE_q^h is therefore adjusted by household needs using the parameterised Buhmann *et al.* (1988) scales, such that:

$$m(a,L) = (\text{household size})^s, \quad s \in [0,1],$$

with the value for the parameter fixed at an intermediate value, $s = 0.5$.

Income is monetary individual disposable income defined as the net sum of all monetary incomes which flow to the household in the reference period (quarter or year) and includes employment and self-employment income, income from regular transfers (including pensions and unemployment benefits), investment income and income from other sources. It excludes social insurance contributions and it is net of pay-as-you-earn taxes.

Consumption is approximated by two expenditure variables: the sum of expenditures on current purchases excluding the value of self-consumed goods and the imputation value of owner-occupied housing is *total monetary expenditure* and the sum of expenditures on current purchases minus expenditures on durables is *non-durable monetary expenditure* (avoiding the estimation of use-value of durables). Monetary expenditure excludes all expenditures on housing, in-kind wages and self-consumed goods. Non-durable monetary expenditure is monetary expenditure net of expenditures on new or second-hand vehicles or other personal means of transport and on housing conservation repairs of all kinds.¹¹ Non-durable expenditures are approximately a 7 percent smaller than total monetary household expenditures.

6. INEQUALITY, POVERTY AND MOBILITY USING BOTH INDICATORS: THE RESULTS

6.1. Inequality and Poverty using different indicators

We have analysed the distributions of total monetary income, total monetary expenditure and monetary expenditure in non-durables. First, in Figure 1 we present the evolution in time of the average annual and quarterly amounts of each of these variables in constant pesetas.


¹¹ We here follow the methodology proposed by Arévalo *et al.* (1995) where durable expenditures are purchases or repairs of vehicles and investment in housing repairs even if some very recent literature on consumption inequality using data on the US such as Krueger and Perri (2003) includes an estimation of service flows of vehicles and housing as part of household non-durable consumption.

As we can observe the evolution is that of a clear increase in average household incomes and expenditures during the period of economic boom (1985 and 1992) and a change of pattern from 1992 onwards as the Spanish economy enters in a period of economic crisis. It is important to note that expenditures averages have a much flatter path compared to incomes while the dissaving pattern (average incomes below average expenditures) observed between 1985 and 1988 starts to disappear from 1989 onwards. Moreover, in 1995 average incomes equal expenditures including durables. In the same graph we can check if these patterns hold when we consider quarterly information. Analysing the figure we can conclude that the evolution of annual and quarterly income and expenditure is essentially the same.

Figure 1

EXPENDITURE AND INCOME IN SPAIN: 1986-95

Annual (left axis) and quarterly (2nd quarter, right axis) amounts in cash, adjusted for household size ($s = 0.5$). Thousands of constant 1995 Pts.
Hhs with at least four interviews in last quarter



We are now ready to approach a first measurement of how the distribution of incomes and expenditures in Spain has evolved in the period. For this we present Figures 2 and 3 where we resume results on all variables' Gini index for both quarter and annual information.

Both figures show first that, as expected, the levels of income inequality are larger when we limit the information to the quarter, reflecting the sub-annual fluctuations of incomes and expenditures. Secondly, and most importantly, in the case of Spain we can see that consumption expenditures inequality is either equal or above income inequality. More precisely, in line with results for Spain in Del Río and Ruiz-Castillo (1996) and Ayala *et al.* (1993), in most years it is expenditure inequality that is higher than income inequality. However, considering


non-durable expenditure inequality instead, we go slightly towards the expected theoretical result and expenditure inequality is either equal or below income inequality. Thirdly, it is interesting to note also that using quarterly information instead, expenditure inequality is always larger than income inequality and the differences in the level of both indices are substantially larger to the case when we consider annual information.

Further, we must underline here that the evolution of expenditure inequality in Spain has been rather different to that of income inequality. While income inequality follows an u-shaped pattern with a decrease between 1986 and 1989, a stable pattern between 1989 and 1992 and a consistent increase from 1992 onwards, expenditure inequality (both total and non-durable expenditure), instead, increased in the initial years (1986-88), decreased from 1988 to 1990-91 and was relatively stable with some slight increase from then onwards.

Figure 2

ANNUAL EXPENDITURE AND INCOME INEQUALITY IN SPAIN: 1985-95

Gini index. Amounts in cash, adjusted for household size ($s = 0.5$). Hhs with at least fourth interview in the last quarter of each year



Turning now to the analysis of the different *incidence* of poverty when using income or expenditure as welfare indicators, we construct Figures 4 and 5 where we present results of the Headcount index: percentage of households below a certain level of income or expenditure (poverty line). We use here a relative concept of poverty and draw the line on the 60 percent of the contemporary median. As we can see, the incidence of poverty using expenditure variables is, almost consistently, higher than that when using income. Similarly to the analysis of inequality, the evolution of income poverty incidence follows a u-pattern while consumption expenditures poverty is, first, rather more stable and has a slightly decreasing trend.

The previous result confirms results on poverty in Cantó *et al.* (2002). In fact, in the lines indicated by these authors using income data we here see that, as expected, either income or expenditure quarterly data detects a higher incidence of poverty compared to using annual information. Thus, households may experience low income or may decide to spend exceptionally less during one quarter of the year but this is often compensated by incomes or expenditures over the usual in other quarters.

Figure 3

QUARTERLY EXPENDITURE AND INCOME INEQUALITY IN SPAIN: 1985-95
 Gini index. Amounts in cash, adjusted for household size ($s = 0.5$). 2nd quarter.
 Hhs with at least fourth interview in the last quarter of each year




Figure 4

ANNUAL EXPENDITURE AND INCOME POVERTY IN SPAIN: 1985-95
 Headcount ratios, poverty line: 60% current median




Figure 5

QUARTERLY EXPENDITURE AND INCOME POVERTY IN SPAIN: 1985-95
 Headcount ratios, poverty line: 60% current median





Figure 6

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE KERNEL DENSITIES IN SPAIN: 1985-95 POOL
 variables in logs



Plotting the complete distribution of incomes and expenditures will give us both detailed picture of the distribution and will explain how changes in the definition of poor may have using each variables. With this purpose we present Figure 6, 7 and 8 where we calculate kernel distribution estimates for annual income, expenditure and non-durable expenditures. The vertical line situates the poverty line. Figures 6 and 7 indicate that expenditures are more concentrated than incomes in the lowest part of the distribution and, therefore, expenditure poverty is significantly more extreme. This is consistent with Slesnick (2001) result on the

fact that consumption poor households are less educated, have fewer physical assets and their relative expenditure on necessities is substantially larger than income poor households, this could be the case because consumption expenditures poor are more probably situated in extreme poverty than income poor.

Figure 7
INCOME AND EXPENDITURE *KERNEL* DENSITIES IN SPAIN: 1985-95 POOL
 variables in logs





Figure 8
EXPENDITURE *KERNEL* DENSITIES IN SPAIN: 1985-95 POOL
 variables in logs



Household monetary income, instead, is more concentrated around the poverty line implying that when using income as welfare indicator results on



poverty for Spain are more sensible to changes in the definition of the poverty line. Viewing Figure 8 we confirm that the distribution of durable consumption is extremely similar to that of total consumption expenditures.¹²

6.2. Mobility using different indicators

A very relevant part of the aims of this work was that of adding evidence on the effects of using expenditures on the analysis of intra-distributional mobility. With this purpose we have calculated different mobility indices, which try to reflect different aspects of the concept. First we compute two indices obtained from transition matrices which will reflect transitions between income or expenditure states. Secondly we calculate an index that reflects the reduction in inequality dimension of mobility as the accounting period is extended: the Shorrocks index of immobility R . We finally conclude our battery of indices presenting some results using an index that reflects the *origin independence* dimension of mobility: the Hart index.

In Figures 9 and 10 we present the percentage of households remaining in the same decile one year later when we classify households by their corresponding decile. It is clear from both graphs that, as obtained in Cantó (2000), households in the middle of both distributions are more mobile than households in the extremes. Interestingly, and contrary to what one would expect in a life-cycle model, household incomes register less mobility than household expenditures, while household non-durable expenditures do not show a significantly lower level of mobility than total expenditures.

It is easy to observe also that this is not true for households in the first decile. First decile households have an outstanding behaviour both using quarterly and annual information. Further, the differences in mobility in low deciles are significantly smaller than over the sixth decile and the difference consistently increases with the deciles. Thus, contrary to what the theory suggests, we find here that, for our data on Spain expenditure is more unstable than income in time, even when we delete some important durable items from consumption.

Thus, it appears as if one would need to furtherly restrict expenditures by considering the deletion of other durable items so that we could approach the right theoretical pattern: less inequality and less mobility than using incomes. And here comes our actual point: this may be an adequate choice for other economic analysis purposes but if we are trying to measure well-being: would we regard it convenient to reduce welfare to the consumption of food, drink, tobacco, energy and little more?

¹² This is even more so if we were to consider the quarterly consumption expenditure distribution.

Figure 9

EXPENDITURE AND INCOME IMMOBILITY IN SPAIN: 1985-95 POOL
 Percentage of households remaining in the same decile one year later. Annual income and expenditure in cash, adjusted for household size ($s = 0.5$)





Figure 10

EXPENDITURE AND INCOME IMMOBILITY IN SPAIN: 1985-95 POOL
 Percentage of households remaining in the same decile one year later. Quarterly income and expenditure in cash, adjusted for household size ($s = 0.5$)



It is important to check, however, if these results hold when we define some other income groups given the limitations of the use of decile matrices in order to analyse transitions. One of the problems of decile transition matrices is that in the middle part of the distribution the limits between deciles are narrow in absolute terms and this clearly means that relatively small changes in household incomes or expenditure may imply a change of decile while this is much more unlikely as one approaches the bottom or the top of any of the two distributions.

With the purpose of checking our previous results we have constructed other transition matrices where groups are defined using percentages of incomes or expenditures medians. Results appear in Figures 11 and 12.

Figure 11

EXPENDITURE AND INCOME INMOBILITY IN SPAIN: 1985-95 POOL

Percentage of households remaining in the same interval one year later. Annual income and expenditure in cash, adjusted for household size ($s = 0.5$)





Figure 12

EXPENDITURE AND INCOME INMOBILITY IN SPAIN: 1985-95 POOL

Percentage of households remaining in the same interval one year later. Quarterly income and expenditure in cash, adjusted for household size ($s = 0.5$)



Here we confirm first, that mobility appears to be lower in the extremes than in the middle in the distribution. Secondly, we also confirm the differentiated behaviour of the extreme poor who, while the rest of households register higher expenditure than income mobility they exhibit the contrary or, at most, a similar level of both variables.

Note however that we also find some differences between the results using these matrices and regular decile matrices. First, our second group, which essentially includes the second and third decile, is now more persistent in incomes than the extreme poor, indicating that households near the poverty line may be less mobile in incomes those at the very bottom of the distribution. Further, we find

that, under these premises, relatively high income and expenditure groups show the highest levels of mobility. Indeed, the new division underlines the fact that those households situated between a 25 and a 50 percent over the value of the median in incomes or expenditures are the most mobile in all distributions, interestingly those households were previously included in the 8th decile group and showed more persistency than mid-distribution decile groups.

Again if we calculate mobility using quarterly income and expenditure we find, as expected, that a quarterly accounting period imposes a higher level of mobility. Interestingly the difference in mobility levels is significantly larger using expenditure than using income.

We have also computed, as indicated earlier, various mobility indices in order to compare the effect on different aspects of mobility when using a different indicator of household well-being.¹³ First, we calculate a transition matrix-based index: the Shorrocks-Prais M index which can be expressed as,

$$M = \frac{n - \text{tr}(P)}{n - 1},$$

where P is the transition matrix and n is the number of income or expenditure groups in which the distribution is divided (using deciles $n = 10$ for example). The index has a limit value of 0 when there is complete immobility and has no fixed upper-limit, even if given *origin independence* the index should reach the value of 1 (households have equal probability of being situated anywhere in the distribution at the second moment). Further, we compute the Shorrocks R index of mobility which measures the degree at which incomes or expenditures equalize as we increase the accounting period. This index can be expressed as,

$$R = \frac{I(Y)}{\sum_k w_k I(Y_k)} \quad \text{donde} \quad w_k = \frac{\mu_k}{\mu},$$

where $I(Y)$ is total period income or expenditure inequality and $I(Y_k)$ is sub-period inequality, w_k is weights each period by its contribution to the total mean income or expenditure.

Finally, an index that reflects *origin independence* is the Hart index expressed as:

$$M_{\text{HART}} = 1 - \rho(\log x, \log y),$$

where x is income or expenditure in the first sub-period and y is income or expenditure in the second period. This index could be seen as directly associated with income or expenditure volatility and probably also with the idea of "equality of opportunities".

Results including confidence intervals using 1000 replications bootstraps appear in Table 1. All indices confirm the previous results and thus, contrary to the pre-

¹³ See the Appendix for details on how to compute mobility indices in the *pool* of observations.

sented theoretical arguments, we find that, for our sample of Spanish households, mobility is significantly larger using expenditure than using income. However, in line with what would be expected, non-durable expenditure is significantly more stable than total expenditure, confirming the infrequency of expenditures on durables. In any case, if we choose to use a quarterly accounting period total and non-durable expenditure mobility results are outstandingly similar.

Table 1
ANNUAL AND QUARTERLY INCOME AND EXPENDITURE MOBILITY:
1985-95 POOL

INDEX	Expenditure			Non-durable Expenditure			Income		
	Estimate	Confidence interval -95%		Estimate	Confidence interval -95%		Estimate	Confidence interval -95%	
		Min	Max		Min	Max		Min	Max
ANNUAL									
Shorrocks (Gini)	0.050	0.047	0.053	0.041	0.039	0.044	0.029	0.027	0.031
Shorrocks (GE0)	0.105	0.099	0.110	0.091	0.087	0.097	0.081	0.072	0.094
Shorrocks (GE1)	0.099	0.094	0.104	0.083	0.079	0.088	0.065	0.060	0.070
Shorrocks (GE2)	0.106	0.100	0.113	0.086	0.081	0.092	0.061	0.056	0.067
Hart	0.278	0.259	0.306	0.222	0.199	0.258	0.148	0.128	0.181
Shorrocks-Prais M	0.210	0.200	0.221	0.175	0.167	0.185	0.133	0.124	0.143
QUARTERLY									
Shorrocks (Gini)	0.083	0.079	0.087	0.076	0.073	0.080	0.043	0.040	0.046
Shorrocks (GE0)	0.176	0.168	0.185	0.169	0.162	0.178	0.116	0.108	0.124
Shorrocks (GE1)	0.163	0.156	0.171	0.152	0.147	0.160	0.094	0.088	0.101
Shorrocks (GE2)	0.171	0.163	0.179	0.155	0.148	0.163	0.085	0.079	0.091
Hart	0.422	0.402	0.444	0.370	0.353	0.391	0.177	0.165	0.191
Shorrocks-Prais M	0.345	0.330	0.360	0.322	0.309	0.337	0.194	0.183	0.207

Considering the results obtained by Attanasio (1999) we wondered if it was the age of household members that was driving our results given that this author insists in the fact that life-cycle hypothesis would hold for households with middle-age individuals. Dividing the sample into groups defined by the head of household's age we have again calculated all previous mobility indices. Our results appear in Table 2 and indicate that whatever the household head's age mobility is significantly larger using expenditure than using income. Thus, it seems that this result does not directly depend on the household's life-cycle situation but on some other matters.

Table 2
ANNUAL INCOME AND EXPENDITURE MOBILITY BY HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD AGE:
1985-95 POOL

INDEX	Expenditure			Non-durable Expenditure			Income		
	Estimate	Confidence interval -95%		Estimate	Confidence interval -95%		Estimate	Confidence interval -95%	
		Min	Max		Min	Max		Min	Max
Head < 35 years									
Shorrocks (Gini)	0.056	0.049	0.065	0.045	0.039	0.053	0.034	0.027	0.044
Shorrocks (GE0)	0.110	0.096	0.125	0.093	0.080	0.107	0.095	0.076	0.117
Shorrocks (GE1)	0.111	0.097	0.125	0.090	0.077	0.104	0.076	0.060	0.093
Shorrocks (GE2)	0.122	0.106	0.140	0.096	0.082	0.111	0.067	0.052	0.083
Hart	0.299	0.256	0.340	0.223	0.188	0.256	0.134	0.108	0.170
Shorrocks-Prais M	0.225	0.198	0.253	0.180	0.159	0.204	0.147	0.123	0.175
Head 35-55 years									
Shorrocks (Gini)	0.052	0.047	0.057	0.041	0.037	0.045	0.028	0.025	0.032
Shorrocks (GE0)	0.109	0.099	0.118	0.093	0.086	0.101	0.098	0.079	0.130
Shorrocks (GE1)	0.103	0.095	0.111	0.084	0.078	0.091	0.070	0.062	0.080
Shorrocks (GE2)	0.109	0.100	0.119	0.085	0.077	0.093	0.063	0.054	0.076
Hart	0.280	0.254	0.306	0.212	0.188	0.249	0.151	0.114	0.214
Shorrocks-Prais M	0.225	0.208	0.242	0.182	0.168	0.196	0.142	0.127	0.159
Head > 55 years									
Shorrocks (Gini)	0.050	0.046	0.054	0.042	0.038	0.046	0.028	0.024	0.032
Shorrocks (GE0)	0.107	0.099	0.114	0.094	0.087	0.102	0.067	0.058	0.078
Shorrocks (GE1)	0.099	0.092	0.107	0.086	0.079	0.093	0.059	0.051	0.067
Shorrocks (GE2)	0.107	0.097	0.118	0.090	0.081	0.101	0.059	0.052	0.069
Hart	0.284	0.249	0.337	0.240	0.200	0.308	0.152	0.121	0.199
Shorrocks-Prais M	0.214	0.199	0.229	0.184	0.170	0.199	0.126	0.113	0.140

7. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have analysed the effects on empirical analysis of the choice of welfare indicator on the statics and dynamics of the income distribution. With that purpose in mind we undertook the analysis using a longitudinal survey: the



Spanish *Encuesta Continua de Presupuestos Familiares* (ECPF), a source with which we have been able both to consider information from sub-annual periods and to reconstruct the household's complete picture on incomes and expenditures over a period of two years.

Our results show that for a sample of Spanish households, contrary to the suggestions of most of the theory, consumption expenditures inequality is either equal or above income inequality. Further, the evolution of expenditure inequality observed in Spain in the 1985-95 period is significantly different to that of income inequality.

The study of poverty shows that the incidence of poverty using expenditure variables is, almost consistently throughout the period, higher than when using income. By plotting both distributions we conclude that Spanish households classified as consumption poor are more concentrated in the extremes poverty than those classified as income poor. This result is consistent with Slesnick (2001) who detects that consumption poor households in the US are less educated, have fewer physical assets and their relative expenditure on necessities is substantially larger than income poor households.

A very relevant part of the aim of this work has been also that of adding evidence on the effects of using expenditures on the analysis of intra-distributional mobility. Interestingly, and contrary to what one would expect in a life-cycle model, household incomes register less mobility than household expenditures, while household non-durable expenditures do not show a significantly lower level of mobility than total expenditures. This result is confirmed by a large battery of mobility indices and seems to be robust to different head of household's age, implying that the life-cycle moment the household is not decisively driving our results.

A complete evaluation of all our results would appear to suggest that it is only by furtherly restricting expenditures through the deletion of other durable items, that we could approach the right theoretical pattern: less inequality and less mobility using expenditure than income. Our point is: this may be an adequate choice for other economic analysis purposes but if we are trying to measure well-being: would we regard it convenient to reduce welfare to the consumption of food, drink, tobacco, energy and little more?

APPENDIX ON MOBILITY MEASURES USING THE ECPF

In the calculation of mobility measures our procedure differs slightly from the usual one given that we are using a rotating panel dataset. More precisely, for example, in order to calculate the Shorrocks' R index in order to measure mobility as *compensating inequality*, where mobility is defined as the degree in which inequality is reduced as we sum up the income that individuals receive in different consecutive periods –two in our case–, we need to compute:

$$R = \frac{I[Y(t_0, t_2)]}{w_1 I[Y(t_0, t_1)] + w_2 I[Y(t_1, t_2)]}$$

where $Y()$ is a vector of households' relative income between two moments in time:

$$Y(t_{k-1}, t_k) = (Y^1(t_{k-1}, t_k), \dots, Y^m(t_{k-1}, t_k)), \quad k = 1, 2, \quad \text{and} \quad Y(t_0, t_2) = (Y^1(t_0, t_2), \dots, Y^m(t_0, t_2))$$

Index R , compares inequality in two different sub-periods (t_{k-1}, t_k) , $k = 1, 2$, to that in the complete reference interval (t_0, t_2) . Note that $I(Y)$ is any strictly convex inequality index and w_k is weighting inequality levels by the share of aggregate incomes received in each period:

$$w_k = \frac{\mu(t_0, t_k)}{\mu(t_0, t_1) + \mu(t_1, t_2)}, \quad k = 1, 2.$$

Given that our data consists of a pool of households that were observed during eight consecutive quarters between 1985 and 1995, there are some details we must adjust in order to compute R soundly.

For each household i in the pool we compute income at 4th interview relative to average income that quarter, and this will be $Y^i(t_0, t_1)$:

$$Y^i(t_0, t_1) = \frac{Y_{t_1}^i}{\mu_{t_1}}, \quad t_1 = \text{quarter at which } i \text{ had its 4}^{\text{th}} \text{ interview.}$$

In the same way we compute household income one year later, 8th interview, $Y^i(t_1, t_2)$:

$$Y^i(t_1, t_2) = \frac{Y_{t_1+4}^i}{\mu_{t_1+4}},$$

and total income received during both sub-periods:

$$Y^i(t_0, t_2) = \frac{Y_{t_1}^i + Y_{t_1+4}^i}{\mu_{t_1} + \mu_{t_1+4}}$$

Doing this for all households in the pool we obtain three vectors of relative income: $Y(t_{k-1}, t_k)$, $k = 1, 2$, and $Y(t_0, t_2)$. The divergence of our procedure with



the standard one is that, since households in the pool were interviewed in different years, each household income is constructed as relative to its *contemporary* average and not to the average across the pool. Finally, we compute R weighting sub-period inequalities by the share of incomes in the fourth and eight interviews across the pool:

$$w_1 = \frac{\sum_i Y_{t_i}^i}{\sum_i Y_{t_i}^i + \sum_i Y_{t_i+4}^i} \quad \text{and} \quad w_2 = \frac{\sum_i Y_{t_i+4}^i}{\sum_i Y_{t_i}^i + \sum_i Y_{t_i+4}^i} .$$

REFERENCES

- ARÉVALO, R.; CARDELÚS, M. T., and RUIZ-CASTILLO, J. (1998): "La Encuesta de Presupuestos Familiares de 1990-91", *Documento de trabajo* de la Universidad Carlos III de Madrid, available in <http://www.eco.uc3m.es/epf90-91.html>.
- ATKINSON, A. (1998): *Poverty in Europe*, Blackwell Publishers.
- ATTANASIO, O. P. (1999):, "Consumption", in TAYLOR, J. B., and WOODFORD, M. *Handbook of Macroeconomics*, vol. 1, Elsevier Science.
- ATTANASIO, O. P., and BANKS, J. (1997): "Trends in household saving", *Economic Policy*, 27, 549-583.
- ATTANASIO, O. P.; BERLOFFA, G.; BLUNDELL, R., and Preston, I. (2002): "From earnings inequality to consumption inequality", *The Economic Policy*, 112, March, 52-59.
- ATTANASIO, O. P., and DAVIS, S. J. (1996): "Relative wage movements and the distribution of consumption", *Journal of Political Economy*, 104, 1227-1262.
- AYALA, L.; MARTÍNEZ, R., and RUIZ-HUERTA, J. (1993): "La distribución de la renta en España en los años ochenta: una perspectiva comparada", in ALMUNIA, J., and GUTIÉRREZ, L. (eds.): "Primer simposio sobre igualdad y distribución de la renta y la riqueza", *La distribución de la renta*, vol. II, Fundación Argentaria, pp. 101-136.
- AYALA, L., and SASTRE, M. (2002): "Europe vs. the United States: Is there a trade-off between mobility and inequality?", *ISER Working paper*, 2002-26.
- BLUNDELL, R., and PRESTON, I. (1992): "The distinction between income and consumption in measuring the distribution of household welfare", University College London, *Discussion Papers in Economics*, 92-01.
- (1998): "Consumption inequality and income uncertainty," *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 113, 603-640.
- BRADBURY, B.; JENKINS, S. P., and MICKLEWRIGHT, J. (2001): "Conceptual and measurement issues" in BRADBURY, B.; JENKINS, S. P., and MICKLEWRIGHT, J. (eds.): *The Dynamics of Child Poverty in Industrialised Countries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- BUCHINSKY, and HUNT (1997): *Wage Mobility in the U.S.*, Mimeo.
- BUHMANN, B.; RAINWATER, L.; SCHMAUS, G., and SMEEDING, T. M. (1988): "Equivalence Scales, well-being, inequality and poverty: sensitivity estimates across ten countries using the Luxembourg income study (LIS) database", *Review of Income and Wealth*, 33: 115-142.

- CANTÓ, O. (1998): *The Dynamics of Poverty in Spain: The Permanent and Transitory Poor*, Ph. D. Thesis. European University Institute, Mimeo.
- (2000), "Income mobility in Spain: How much is there?", *Review of Income and Wealth*, 46 (1): 85-101, March.
- CANTÓ, O.; DEL RÍO, C., and GRADÍN, C. (2002): "Poverty statics and dynamics: does the accounting period matter?", *Papeles de Trabajo* 22/02, Instituto de Estudios Fiscales.
- COULTER, F.; COWELL, F., and JENKINS, S. (1992a): "Differences in needs and assessment of income distributions", *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 44: 77-124.
- (1992b): "Equivalence scale relativities and the extent of inequality and poverty", *Economic Journal*, 102: 1067-1082.
- COWELL, F., and SCHLUTER, C. (1998): "Measuring income mobility with dirty data", *Casepaper*, number 16.
- CUTANDA, A. (2002): "La medición de la desigualdad a través de un modelo de elección intertemporal", *Hacienda Pública Española/Revista de Economía Pública* 163, 4/2002: 93-117.
- CUTLER, D., and KATZ, L. (1991): "Macroeconomic Performance and the Disadvantaged", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2.
- (1992): "Rising inequality? Changes in the distribution of income and consumption in the 1980s", *American Economic Review*, 82, 546-551.
- DEL RÍO, C., and RUIZ-CASTILLO, J. (1996): "Ordenaciones de bienestar e inferencia estadística. El caso de las EPF de 1980-81 y 1990-91", in *La desigualdad de recursos. II Simposio sobre Igualdad y Distribución de la Renta y la Riqueza*. Fundación Argentaria, colección *Igualdad*, volumen 6, Madrid, pp. 9-44.
- (1999), "El enfoque de la dominancia en el análisis de la pobreza", in *Dimensiones de la desigualdad, III Simposio sobre Igualdad y Distribución de la Renta y la Riqueza*. Volumen I, colección *Igualdad*, 13: 429-460. Fundación Argentaria, Madrid.
 - (2001): "TIPs for poverty analysis. The case of Spain, 1980-81 to 1990-91", *Investigaciones Económicas*, vol. XXV (1), January, 63-91.
- DUCLOS, J. Y., and MERCADER-PRATS, M. (1999): "Household needs and poverty: With application to Spain and the UK", *Review of Income and Wealth* 45 (1): 77-98.
- ESTRADA, A., and BUISÁN, A. (1999): "El gasto de las familias en España", *Estudios Económicos*, 65, Servicios de Estudios del Banco de España.
- EUROSTAT (1990): "Inequality and poverty in Europe 1980-1985", *Rapid Reports, Population and Social Conditions* 7.
- FISHER, J. D., and JOHNSON, D. S. (2002): "Consumption mobility in the United States: Evidence from two panel data sets", *Conference on Economic mobility in America and other advanced countries*.

- FRIEDMAN, M. (1957): *A Theory of the Consumption Function*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- GITTLEMAN, M., and JOYCE, M. (1996): "Earnings mobility and long-run inequality: An analysis using matched CPS data", *Industrial Relations*, 35, 180-196.
- GOODMAN, A.; JOHNSON, P., and WEBB, S. (1997): *Inequality in the UK*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- GOTTSCHALK, P., and MOFFIT, R. (1994): "The growth of earnings instability in the US Labor Market", *Brooking Papers on Economic Activity*, 2, 217-272.
- GRADÍN, C. (2002): "Polarization and Inequality in Spain: 1973-91", *Journal of Income Distribution*. Vol. 11 (1), 34-52.
- HECKMAN, J. (1974): "Life-cycle consumption and labor supply: An exploration of the relationship between income and consumption over the life cycle", *American Economic Review*, 64, 188-194.
- JAPPELLI, T. (1990): "Who is Credit Constrained in the US Economy?", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 105, 219-34.
- JAPPELLI, T., and PISTAFERRI, L. (1999): "Consumption Insurance or Consumption Mobility," *CSEF working paper*, 19.
- JARVIS, S., and JENKINS, S. P. (1996): "Changing places: Income mobility and poverty dynamics in Britain", *Working paper* ESRC Research Centre on Micro-Social Change, Number 96-19.
- JENKINS, S. P. (2000): "Modelling household income dynamics", *Journal of Population Economics*, 13: 529-567.
- JENKINS, S. P., and Cowell, F. A. (1994): "Parametric Equivalence Scales and Scale Relativities", *The Economic Journal* 104: 891-900.
- KALTON, G., and BRICK, M. (2000): "Weighting in household panel surveys" in ROSE, D. (ed.): *Researching social and economic change. The uses of household panel studies*, pp. 96-112, London: Routledge.
- KAPITANY, Z., and MOLNAR, G. (2002): *Inequalities and Mobility in Hungary, 1993-1998*, Institute of Economics, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Mimeo.
- KEMPSON, E. (1996): *Life on a Low Income*, Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.
- KLUGMAN, J., and KOLEV, A. (2001): "Mobility and poverty dynamics among Russian children" in BRADBURY, B.; JENKINS, S. P., and MICKLEWRIGHT, J. (eds.): *The Dynamics of Child Poverty in Industrialised Countries*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- KRUEGER, D., and PERRI, F. (2003): *Does income inequality lead to consumption inequality? Evidence and Theory*, Mimeo.
- LUTTMER, E. F. P. (2001): *Measuring Poverty Dynamics and Inequality in Transition Economies: Disentangling Real Events from Noisy Data*, unpublished manuscript, University of Chicago.

- MERCADER-PRATS, M. (1993): "Bajos niveles de renta en España y una comparación con el Reino Unido y Francia", in *La distribución de la renta, I Simposio sobre Igualdad y Distribución de la Renta y la Riqueza*, vol. II, pp. 137-149, Fundación Argentaria, Madrid.
- (1998): "Identifying Low Standards of Living: Evidence from Spain". *Research on Economic Inequality* 8: 155-73.
- MODIGLIANI, F., and BRUMBERG, R. (1954): "Utility analysis and the consumption function: An interpretation of cross-section data", in KURIHARA, K. (ed.): *Post-Keynesian Economics*, pp. 383–436, New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press.
- MOFFIT, R., and GOTTSCHALK, P. (1995): *Trends in the Autocovariance Structure of Earnings in the U.S.: 1969-1987*, Mimeo, Brown University, Providence, RI.
- PENA, B. (1996): *Distribución Personal de la Renta en España: correcciones y modelización de la información básica, desigualdad y análisis*. Ed. Pirámide, Madrid.
- PEÑA, D., and RUIZ-CASTILLO, J. (1998): "Inflation and Inequality Bias in the Presence of Bulk- Purchases for Food and Drinks", *Journal of Business and Economic Statistics*, 16: 292-303.
- RODGERS, J. R., and RODGERS, J. L. (1993): "Chronic poverty in the United States", *Journal of Human Resources*, 28: 25-54.
- RUGGLES, P., and WILLIAMS, R. (1989): "Longitudinal measures of poverty: accounting for income and assets over time", *Review of Income and Wealth* 35 (3), 225-244.
- RUIZ-CASTILLO, J. (1987): "La medición de la pobreza y la desigualdad en España 1980-1981", Servicio de Estudios del Banco de España, *Estudios Económicos* 42, Banco de España, Madrid.
- (1993): "La distribución del gasto en España de 1973-74 a 1980-81" in *La distribución de la renta, I Simposio sobre Igualdad y Distribución de la Renta y la Riqueza*, vol. II, pp. 51-89, Fundación Argentaria, Madrid.
- (1998): "A Simplified Model for Social Welfare Analysis. An Application to Spain, 1973-74 to 1980-81", *Review of Income and wealth* 44 (1): 123-141.
- RUIZ- HUERTA, J., and MARTÍNEZ, R. (1994), "La pobreza en España ¿Qué nos muestran las encuestas de presupuestos familiares?", *Documentación Social* 96: 15-109.
- SABELHAUS, J., and SCHNEIDER, U. (1997): "Measuring the distribution of well-being: why income and consumption give different answers", *Diskussionspapier* Nr. 201, Diskussionspapiere des Fachbereichs Wirtschaftswissenschaften der Universität Hannover.
- SANZ, B. (1996): "La articulación micro-macro en el sector hogares: de la Encuesta de Presupuestos Familiares a la Contabilidad Nacional", in *La desigualdad de recursos, II Simposio sobre Igualdad y Distribución de la Renta y la Riqueza*, Colección *Igualdad*, vol. 6: 45-86. Fundación Argentaria, Madrid.

- SLESNICK, D. (1991): "The Standard of Living in the United States", *Review of Income and Wealth* 37 (4): 363-86.
- (1993): "Gaining Ground: Poverty in the Postwar United States", *Journal of Political Economy* 10: 1-38.
 - (2001): *Consumption and Social Welfare*, Cambridge University Press.
- SCHLUTER, C., and TREDE, M. (1999): "Local versus global assessment of mobility", *Discussion papers in statistics and econometrics*, University of Cologne, No 4/99.
- WINKELS, J. W., and DAVIES, S. (2000), "Panel attrition", in ROSE, D. (ed.): *Researching social and economic change. The uses of household panel studies*, pp. 79-95, Routledge, London.
- WORLD BANK (2000): *Making transition work for everyone. Poverty and Inequality in Europe and Central Asia*, Washington.
- ZELDES, S. P. (1989): "Consumption and Liquidity Constraints: An Empirical Investigation," *Journal of Political Economy* 97 (2), 305-346.

NORMAS DE PUBLICACIÓN DE PAPELES DE TRABAJO DEL INSTITUTO DE ESTUDIOS FISCALES

Esta colección de *Papeles de Trabajo* tiene como objetivo ofrecer un vehículo de expresión a todas aquellas personas interesadas en los temas de Economía Pública. Las normas para la presentación y selección de originales son las siguientes:

1. Todos los originales que se presenten estarán sometidos a evaluación y podrán ser directamente aceptados para su publicación, aceptados sujetos a revisión, o rechazados.
2. Los trabajos deberán enviarse por duplicado a la Subdirección de Estudios Tributarios. Instituto de Estudios Fiscales. Avda. Cardenal Herrera Oria, 378. 28035 Madrid.
3. La extensión máxima de texto escrito, incluidos apéndices y referencias bibliográficas será de 7000 palabras.
4. Los originales deberán presentarse mecanografiados a doble espacio. En la primera página deberá aparecer el título del trabajo, el nombre del autor(es) y la institución a la que pertenece, así como su dirección postal y electrónica. Además, en la primera página aparecerá también un abstract de no más de 125 palabras, los códigos JEL y las palabras clave.
5. Los epígrafes irán numerados secuencialmente siguiendo la numeración arábica. Las notas al texto irán numeradas correlativamente y aparecerán al pie de la correspondiente página. Las fórmulas matemáticas se numerarán secuencialmente ajustadas al margen derecho de las mismas. La bibliografía aparecerá al final del trabajo, bajo la inscripción "Referencias" por orden alfabético de autores y, en cada una, ajustándose al siguiente orden: autor(es), año de publicación (distinguiendo a, b, c si hay varias correspondientes al mismo autor(es) y año), título del artículo o libro, título de la revista en cursiva, número de la revista y páginas.
6. En caso de que aparezcan tablas y gráficos, éstos podrán incorporarse directamente al texto o, alternativamente, presentarse todos juntos y debidamente numerados al final del trabajo, antes de la bibliografía.
7. En cualquier caso, se deberá adjuntar un disquete con el trabajo en formato word. Siempre que el documento presente tablas y/o gráficos, éstos deberán aparecer en ficheros independientes. Asimismo, en caso de que los gráficos procedan de tablas creadas en excel, estas deberán incorporarse en el disquete debidamente identificadas.

Junto al original del Papel de Trabajo se entregará también un resumen de un máximo de dos folios que contenga las principales implicaciones de política económica que se deriven de la investigación realizada.

PUBLISHING GUIDELINES OF WORKING PAPERS AT THE INSTITUTE FOR FISCAL STUDIES

This serie of *Papeles de Trabajo* (working papers) aims to provide those having an interest in Public Economics with a vehicle to publicize their ideas. The rules governing submission and selection of papers are the following:

1. The manuscripts submitted will all be assessed and may be directly accepted for publication, accepted with subjections for revision or rejected.
2. The papers shall be sent in duplicate to Subdirección General de Estudios Tributarios (The Deputy Direction of Tax Studies), Instituto de Estudios Fiscales (Institute for Fiscal Studies), Avenida del Cardenal Herrera Oria, nº 378, Madrid 28035.
3. The maximum length of the text including appendices and bibliography will be no more than 7000 words.
4. The originals should be double spaced. The first page of the manuscript should contain the following information: (1) the title; (2) the name and the institutional affiliation of the author(s); (3) an abstract of no more than 125 words; (4) JEL codes and keywords; (5) the postal and e-mail address of the corresponding author.
5. Sections will be numbered in sequence with arabic numerals. Footnotes will be numbered correlatively and will appear at the foot of the corresponding page. Mathematical formulae will be numbered on the right margin of the page in sequence. Bibliographical references will appear at the end of the paper under the heading "References" in alphabetical order of authors. Each reference will have to include in this order the following terms of references: author(s), publishing date (with an a, b or c in case there are several references to the same author(s) and year), title of the article or book, name of the journal in italics, number of the issue and pages.
6. If tables and graphs are necessary, they may be included directly in the text or alternatively presented altogether and duly numbered at the end of the paper, before the bibliography.
7. In any case, a floppy disk will be enclosed in Word format. Whenever the document provides tables and/or graphs, they must be contained in separate files. Furthermore, if graphs are drawn from tables within the Excell package, these must be included in the floppy disk and duly identified.

Together with the original copy of the working paper a brief two-page summary highlighting the main policy implications derived from the re-search is also requested.

ÚLTIMOS PAPELES DE TRABAJO EDITADOS POR EL INSTITUTO DE ESTUDIOS FISCALES

2000

- 1/00 Crédito fiscal a la inversión en el impuesto de sociedades y neutralidad impositiva: Más evidencia para un viejo debate.
Autor: Desiderio Romero Jordán.
Páginas: 40.
- 2/00 Estudio del consumo familiar de bienes y servicios públicos a partir de la encuesta de presupuestos familiares.
Autores: Ernesto Carrillo y Manuel Tamayo.
Páginas: 40.
- 3/00 Evidencia empírica de la convergencia real.
Autores: Lorenzo Escot y Miguel Ángel Galindo.
Páginas: 58.

Nueva Época

- 4/00 The effects of human capital depreciation on experience-earnings profiles: Evidence salaried spanish men.
Autores: M. Arrazola, J. de Hevia, M. Risueño y J. F. Sanz.
Páginas: 24.
- 5/00 Las ayudas fiscales a la adquisición de inmuebles residenciales en la nueva Ley del IRPF: Un análisis comparado a través del concepto de coste de uso.
Autor: José Félix Sanz Sanz.
Páginas: 44.
- 6/00 Las medidas fiscales de estímulo del ahorro contenidas en el Real Decreto-Ley 3/2000: análisis de sus efectos a través del tipo marginal efectivo.
Autores: José Manuel González Páramo y Nuria Badenes Plá.
Páginas: 28.
- 7/00 Análisis de las ganancias de bienestar asociadas a los efectos de la Reforma del IRPF sobre la oferta laboral de la familia española.
Autores: Juan Prieto Rodríguez y Santiago Álvarez García.
Páginas 32.
- 8/00 Un marco para la discusión de los efectos de la política impositiva sobre los precios y el *stock* de vivienda.
Autor: Miguel Ángel López García.
Páginas 36.
- 9/00 Descomposición de los efectos redistributivos de la Reforma del IRPF.
Autores: Jorge Onrubia Fernández y María del Carmen Rodado Ruiz.
Páginas 24.
- 10/00 Aspectos teóricos de la convergencia real, integración y política fiscal.
Autores: Lorenzo Escot y Miguel Ángel Galindo.
Páginas 28.

2001

- 1/01 Notas sobre desagregación temporal de series económicas.
Autor: Enrique M. Quilis.
Páginas 38.
- 2/01 Estimación y comparación de tasas de rendimiento de la educación en España.
Autores: M. Arrazola, J. de Hevia, M. Risueño y J. F. Sanz.
Páginas 28.
- 3/01 Doble imposición, “efecto clientela” y aversión al riesgo.
Autores: Antonio Bustos Gisbert y Francisco Pedraja Chaparro.
Páginas 34.
- 4/01 Non-Institutional Federalism in Spain.
Autor: Joan Rosselló Villalonga.
Páginas 32.
- 5/01 Estimating utilisation of Health care: A groupe data regression approach.
Autora: Mabel Amaya Amaya.
Páginas 30.
- 6/01 Shapley inequality decomposition by factor components.
Autores: Mercedes Sastre y Alain Trannoy.
Páginas 40.
- 7/01 An empirical analysis of the demand for physician services across the European Union.
Autores: Sergi Jiménez Martín, José M. Labeaga y Maite Martínez-Granado.
Páginas 40.
- 8/01 Demand, childbirth and the costs of babies: evidence from spanish panel data.
Autores: José M.^a Labeaga, Ian Preston y Juan A. Sanchis-Llopis.
Páginas 56.
- 9/01 Imposición marginal efectiva sobre el factor trabajo: Breve nota metodológica y comparación internacional.
Autores: Desiderio Romero Jordán y José Félix Sanz Sanz.
Páginas 40.
- 10/01 A non-parametric decomposition of redistribution into vertical and horizontal components.
Autores: Irene Perrote, Juan Gabriel Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
Páginas 28.
- 11/01 Efectos sobre la renta disponible y el bienestar de la deducción por rentas ganadas en el IRPF.
Autora: Nuria Badenes Plá.
Páginas 28.
- 12/01 Seguros sanitarios y gasto público en España. Un modelo de microsimulación para las políticas de gastos fiscales en sanidad.
Autor: Ángel López Nicolás.
Páginas 40.
- 13/01 A complete parametrical class of redistribution and progressivity measures.
Autores: Isabel Rabadán y Rafael Salas.
Páginas 20.
- 14/01 La medición de la desigualdad económica.
Autor: Rafael Salas.
Páginas 40.

- 15/01 Crecimiento económico y dinámica de distribución de la renta en las regiones de la UE: un análisis no paramétrico.
Autores: Julián Ramajo Hernández y María del Mar Salinas Jiménez.
Páginas 32.
- 16/01 La descentralización territorial de las prestaciones asistenciales: efectos sobre la igualdad.
Autores: Luis Ayala Cañón, Rosa Martínez López y Jesus Ruiz-Huerta.
Páginas 48.
- 17/01 Redistribution and labour supply.
Autores: Jorge Onrubia, Rafael Salas y José Félix Sanz.
Páginas 24.
- 18/01 Medición de la eficiencia técnica en la economía española: El papel de las infraestructuras productivas.
Autoras: M.^a Jesús Delgado Rodríguez e Inmaculada Álvarez Ayuso.
Páginas 32.
- 19/01 Inversión pública eficiente e impuestos distorsionantes en un contexto de equilibrio general.
Autores: José Manuel González-Páramo y Diego Martínez López.
Páginas 28.
- 20/01 La incidencia distributiva del gasto público social. Análisis general y tratamiento específico de la incidencia distributiva entre grupos sociales y entre grupos de edad.
Autor: Jorge Calero Martínez.
Páginas 36.
- 21/01 Crisis cambiarias: Teoría y evidencia.
Autor: Óscar Bajo Rubio.
Páginas 32.
- 22/01 Distributive impact and evaluation of devolution proposals in Japanese local public finance.
Autores: Kazuyuki Nakamura, Minoru Kunizaki y Masanori Tahira.
Páginas 36.
- 23/01 El funcionamiento de los sistemas de garantía en el modelo de financiación autonómica.
Autor: Alfonso Utrilla de la Hoz.
Páginas 48.
- 24/01 Rendimiento de la educación en España: Nueva evidencia de las diferencias entre Hombres y Mujeres.
Autores: M. Arrazola y J. de Hevia.
Páginas 36.
- 25/01 Fecundidad y beneficios fiscales y sociales por descendientes.
Autora: Anabel Zárate Marco.
Páginas 52.
- 26/01 Estimación de precios sombra a partir del análisis Input-Output: Aplicación a la economía española.
Autora: Guadalupe Souto Nieves.
Páginas 56.
- 27/01 Análisis empírico de la depreciación del capital humano para el caso de las Mujeres y los Hombres en España.
Autores: M. Arrazola y J. de Hevia.
Páginas 28.

- 28/01 Equivalence scales in tax and transfer policies.
Autores: Luis Ayala, Rosa Martínez y Jesús Ruiz-Huerta.
Páginas 44.
- 29/01 Un modelo de crecimiento con restricciones de demanda: el gasto público como amortiguador del desequilibrio externo.
Autora: Belén Fernández Castro.
Páginas 44.
- 30/01 A bi-stochastic nonparametric estimator.
Autores: Juan G. Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
Páginas 24.

2002

- 1/02 Las cestas autonómicas.
Autores: Alejandro Esteller, Jorge Navas y Pilar Sorribas.
Páginas 72.
- 2/02 Evolución del endeudamiento autonómico entre 1985 y 1997: la incidencia de los Escenarios de Consolidación Presupuestaria y de los límites de la LOFCA.
Autores: Julio López Laborda y Jaime Vallés Giménez.
Páginas 60.
- 3/02 Optimal Pricing and Grant Policies for Museums.
Autores: Juan Prieto Rodríguez y Víctor Fernández Blanco.
Páginas 28.
- 4/02 El mercado financiero y el racionamiento del endeudamiento autonómico.
Autores: Nuria Alcalde Fradejas y Jaime Vallés Giménez.
Páginas 36.
- 5/02 Experimentos secuenciales en la gestión de los recursos comunes.
Autores: Lluís Bru, Susana Cabrera, C. Mónica Capra y Rosario Gómez.
Páginas 32.
- 6/02 La eficiencia de la universidad medida a través de la función de distancia: Un análisis de las relaciones entre la docencia y la investigación.
Autores: Alfredo Moreno Sáez y David Trillo del Pozo.
Páginas 40.
- 7/02 Movilidad social y desigualdad económica.
Autores: Juan Prieto-Rodríguez, Rafael Salas y Santiago Álvarez-García.
Páginas 32.
- 8/02 Modelos BVAR: Especificación, estimación e inferencia.
Autor: Enrique M. Quilis.
Páginas 44.
- 9/02 Imposición lineal sobre la renta y equivalencia distributiva: Un ejercicio de microsimulación.
Autores: Juan Manuel Castañer Carrasco y José Félix Sanz Sanz.
Páginas 44.
- 10/02 The evolution of income inequality in the European Union during the period 1993-1996.
Autores: Santiago Álvarez García, Juan Prieto-Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
Páginas 36.

- 11/02 Una descomposición de la redistribución en sus componentes vertical y horizontal: Una aplicación al IRPF.
Autora: Irene Perrote.
Páginas 32.
- 12/02 Análisis de las políticas públicas de fomento de la innovación tecnológica en las regiones españolas.
Autor: Antonio Fonfría Mesa.
Páginas 40.
- 13/02 Los efectos de la política fiscal sobre el consumo privado: nueva evidencia para el caso español.
Autores: Agustín García y Julián Ramajo.
Páginas 52.
- 14/02 Micro-modelling of retirement behavior in Spain.
Autores: Michele Boldrin, Sergi Jiménez-Martín y Franco Peracchi.
Páginas 96.
- 15/02 Estado de salud y participación laboral de las personas mayores.
Autores: Juan Prieto Rodríguez, Desiderio Romero Jordán y Santiago Álvarez García.
Páginas 40.
- 16/02 Technological change, efficiency gains and capital accumulation in labour productivity growth and convergence: an application to the Spanish regions.
Autora: M.^a del Mar Salinas Jiménez.
Páginas 40.
- 17/02 Déficit público, masa monetaria e inflación. Evidencia empírica en la Unión Europea.
Autor: César Pérez López.
Páginas 40.
- 18/02 Tax evasion and relative contribution.
Autora: Judith Panadés i Martí.
Páginas 28.
- 19/02 Fiscal policy and growth revisited: the case of the Spanish regions.
Autores: Óscar Bajo Rubio, Carmen Díaz Roldán y M.^a Dolores Montávez Garcés.
Páginas 28.
- 20/02 Optimal endowments of public investment: an empirical analysis for the Spanish regions.
Autores: Óscar Bajo Rubio, Carmen Díaz Roldán y M.^a Dolores Montávez Garcés.
Páginas 28.
- 21/02 Régimen fiscal de la previsión social empresarial. Incentivos existentes y equidad del sistema.
Autor: Félix Domínguez Barrero.
Páginas 52.
- 22/02 Poverty statics and dynamics: does the accounting period matter?.
Autores: Olga Cantó, Coral del Río y Carlos Gradín.
Páginas 52.
- 23/02 Public employment and redistribution in Spain.
Autores: José Manuel Marqués Sevillano y Joan Rosselló Villalonga.
Páginas 36.

- 24/02 La evolución de la pobreza estática y dinámica en España en el periodo 1985-1995.
Autores: Olga Cantó, Coral del Río y Carlos Gradín.
Páginas: 76.
- 25/02 Estimación de los efectos de un "tratamiento": una aplicación a la Educación superior en España.
Autores: M. Arrazola y J. de Hevia.
Páginas 32.
- 26/02 Sensibilidad de las estimaciones del rendimiento de la educación a la elección de instrumentos y de forma funcional.
Autores: M. Arrazola y J. de Hevia.
Páginas 40.
- 27/02 Reforma fiscal verde y doble dividendo. Una revisión de la evidencia empírica.
Autor: Miguel Enrique Rodríguez Méndez.
Páginas 40.
- 28/02 Productividad y eficiencia en la gestión pública del transporte de ferrocarriles implicaciones de política económica.
Autor: Marcelino Martínez Cabrera.
Páginas 32.
- 29/02 Building stronger national movie industries: The case of Spain.
Autores: Víctor Fernández Blanco y Juan Prieto Rodríguez.
Páginas 52.
- 30/02 Análisis comparativo del gravamen efectivo sobre la renta empresarial entre países y activos en el contexto de la Unión Europea (2001).
Autora: Raquel Paredes Gómez.
Páginas 48.
- 31/02 Voting over taxes with endogenous altruism.
Autor: Joan Esteban.
Páginas 32.
- 32/02 Midiendo el coste marginal en bienestar de una reforma impositiva.
Autor: José Manuel González-Páramo.
Páginas 48.
- 33/02 Redistributive taxation with endogenous sentiments.
Autores: Joan Esteban y Laurence Kranich.
Páginas 40.
- 34/02 Una nota sobre la compensación de incentivos a la adquisición de vivienda habitual tras la reforma del IRPF de 1998.
Autores: Jorge Onrubia Fernández, Desiderio Romero Jordán y José Félix Sanz Sanz.
Páginas 36.
- 35/02 Simulación de políticas económicas: los modelos de equilibrio general aplicado.
Autor: Antonio Gómez Gómez-Plana.
Páginas 36.

2003

- 1/03 Análisis de la distribución de la renta a partir de funciones de cuantiles: robustez y sensibilidad de los resultados frente a escalas de equivalencia.
Autores: Marta Pascual Sáez y José María Sarabia Alegría.
Páginas 52.

- 2/03 Macroeconomic conditions, institutional factors and demographic structure: What causes welfare caseloads?
Autores: Luis Ayala y César Pérez.
Páginas 44.
- 3/03 Endeudamiento local y restricciones institucionales. De la ley reguladora de haciendas locales a la estabilidad presupuestaria.
Autores: Jaime Vallés Giménez, Pedro Pascual Arzoz y Fermín Cabasés Hita.
Páginas 56.
- 4/03 The dual tax as a flat tax with a surtax on labour income.
Autor: José María Durán Cabré.
Páginas 40.
- 5/03 La estimación de la función de producción educativa en valor añadido mediante redes neuronales: una aplicación para el caso español.
Autor: Daniel Santín González.
Páginas 52.
- 6/03 Privación relativa, imposición sobre la renta e índice de Gini generalizado.
Autores: Elena Bárcena Martín, Luis Imedio Olmedo y Guillermina Martín Reyes.
Páginas 36.
- 7/03 Fijación de precios óptimos en el sector público: una aplicación para el servicio municipal de agua.
Autora: M.^a Ángeles García Valiñas.
Páginas 44.
- 8/03 Tasas de descuento para la evaluación de inversiones públicas: Estimaciones para España.
Autora: Guadalupe Souto Nieves.
Páginas 40.
- 9/03 Una evaluación del grado de incumplimiento fiscal para las provincias españolas.
Autores: Ángel Alañón Pardo y Miguel Gómez de Antonio.
Páginas 44.
- 10/03 Extended bi-polarization and inequality measures.
Autores: Juan G. Rodríguez y Rafael Salas.
Páginas 32.
- 11/03 Fiscal decentralization, macrostability and growth.
Autores: Jorge Martínez-Vázquez y Robert M. McNab.
Páginas 44.
- 12/03 Valoración de bienes públicos en relación al patrimonio histórico cultural: aplicación comparada de métodos estadísticos de estimación.
Autores: Luis César Herrero Prieto, José Ángel Sanz Lara y Ana María Bedate Centeno.
Páginas 44.
- 13/03 Growth, convergence and public investment. A bayesian model averaging approach.
Autores: Roberto León-González y Daniel Montolio.
Páginas 44.
- 14/03 ¿Qué puede esperarse de una reducción de la imposición indirecta que recae sobre el consumo cultural?: Un análisis a partir de las técnicas de microsimulación.
Autores: José Félix Sanz Sanz, Desiderio Romero Jordán y Juan Prieto Rodríguez.
Páginas 40.

- 15/03 Estimaciones de la tasa de paro de equilibrio de la economía española a partir de la Ley de Okun.
Autores: Inés P. Murillo y Carlos Usabiaga.
Páginas 32.
- 16/03 La previsión social en la empresa, tras la Ley 46/2002, de reforma parcial del impuesto sobre la renta de las personas físicas.
Autor: Félix Domínguez Barrero.
Páginas 48.
- 17/03 The influence of previous labour market experiences on subsequent job tenure.
Autores: José María Arranz y Carlos García-Serrano.
Páginas 48.
- 18/03 Promoting student's effort: standards *versus* tournaments.
Autores: Pedro Landeras y J. M. Pérez de Villarreal.
Páginas 44.
- 19/03 Non-employment and subsequent wage losses.
Autores: José María Arranz y Carlos García-Serrano.
Páginas 52.
- 20/03 La medida de los ingresos públicos en la Agencia Tributaria. Caja, derechos reconocidos y devengo económico.
Autores: Rafael Frutos, Francisco Melis, M.^a Jesús Pérez de la Ossa y José Luis Ramos.
Páginas 80.
- 21/03 Tratamiento fiscal de la vivienda y exceso de gravamen.
Autor: Miguel Ángel López García.
Páginas 44.
- 22/03 Medición del capital humano y análisis de su rendimiento.
Autores: María Arrazola y José de Hevia.
Páginas 36.
- 23/03 Vivienda, reforma impositiva y coste en bienestar.
Autor: Miguel Ángel López García.
Páginas 52.
- 24/03 Algunos comentarios sobre la medición del capital humano.
Autores: María Arrazola y José de Hevia.
Páginas 40.
- 25/03 Exploring the spanish interbank yield curve.
Autores: Leandro Navarro y Enrique M. Quilis.
Páginas 32.
- 26/03 Redes neuronales y medición de eficiencia: aplicación al servicio de recogida de basuras.
Autor: Francisco J. Delgado Rivero.
Páginas 60.
- 27/03 Equivalencia ricardiana y tipos de interés.
Autores: Agustín García, Julián Ramajo e Inés Piedraescrita Murillo.
Páginas 40.
- 28/03 Instrumentos y objetivos de las políticas de apoyo a las PYME en España.
Autor: Antonio Fonfría Mesa.
Páginas 44.

- 29/03 Análisis de incidencia del gasto público en educación superior: enfoque transversal.
Autora: María Gil Izquierdo.
Páginas 48.
- 30/03 Rentabilidad social de la inversión pública española en infraestructuras.
Autores: Jaime Alonso-Carrera, María Jesús Freire-Serén y Baltasar Manzano.
Páginas 44.
- 31/03 Las rentas de capital en Phogue: análisis de su fiabilidad y corrección mediante fusión estadística.
Autor: Fidel Picos Sánchez.
Páginas 44.
- 32/03 Efecto de los sistemas de rentas mínimas autonómicas sobre la migración interregional.
Autora: María Martínez Torres.
Páginas 44.
- 33/03 Rentas mínimas autonómicas en España. Su dimensión espacial.
Autora: María Martínez Torres.
Páginas 76.
- 34/03 Un nuevo examen de las causas del déficit autonómico.
Autor: Santiago Lago Peñas.
Páginas 52.
- 35/03 Uncertainty and taxpayer compliance.
Autores: Jordi Caballé y Judith Panadés.
Páginas 44.

2004

- 1/04 Una propuesta para la regulación de precios en el sector del agua: el caso español.
Autores: M.^a Ángeles García Valiñas y Manuel Antonio Muñoz Pérez.
Páginas 40.
- 2/04 Eficiencia en educación secundaria e *inputs* no controlables: sensibilidad de los resultados ante modelos alternativos.
Autores: José Manuel Cordero Ferrera, Francisco Pedraja Chaparro y Javier Salinas Jiménez.
Páginas 40.
- 3/04 Los efectos de la política fiscal sobre el ahorro privado: evidencia para la OCDE.
Autores: Montserrat Ferre Carracedo, Agustín García García y Julián Ramajo Hernández.
Páginas 44.
- 4/04 ¿Qué ha sucedido con la estabilidad del empleo en España? Un análisis desagregado con datos de la EPA: 1987-2003.
Autores: José María Arranz y Carlos García-Serrano.
Páginas 80.
- 5/04 La seguridad del empleo en España: evidencia con datos de la EPA (1987-2003).
Autores: José María Arranz y Carlos García-Serrano.
Páginas 72.
- 6/04 La ley de Wagner: un análisis sintético.
Autor: Manuel Jaén García.
Páginas 60.

- 7/04 La vivienda y la reforma fiscal de 1998: un ejercicio de simulación.
Autor: Miguel Ángel López García.
Páginas 44.
- 8/04 Modelo dual de IRPF y equidad: un nuevo enfoque teórico y su aplicación al caso español.
Autor: Fidel Picos Sánchez.
Páginas 44.
- 9/04 Public expenditure dynamics in Spain: a simplified model of its determinants.
Autores: Manuel Jaén García y Luis Palma Martos.
Páginas 48.
- 10/04 Simulación sobre los hogares españoles de la reforma del IRPF de 2003. Efectos sobre la oferta laboral, recaudación, distribución y bienestar.
Autores: Juan Manuel Castañer Carrasco, Desiderio Romero Jordán y José Félix Sanz Sanz.
Páginas 56.
- 11/04 Financiación de las Haciendas regionales españolas y experiencia comparada.
Autor: David Cantarero Prieto.
Páginas 52.
- 12/04 Multidimensional indices of housing deprivation with application to Spain.
Autores: Luis Ayala y Carolina Navarro.
Páginas 44.
- 13/04 Multiple occurrence of welfare reciprocity: determinants and policy implications.
Autores: Luis Ayala y Magdalena Rodríguez.
Páginas 52.
- 14/04 Imposición efectiva sobre las rentas laborales en la reforma del impuesto sobre la renta personal (IRPF) de 2003 en España.
Autoras: María Pazos Morán y Teresa Pérez Barrasa.
Páginas 40.
- 15/04 Factores determinantes de la distribución personal de la renta: un estudio empírico a partir del PHOGUE.
Autores: Marta Pascual y José María Sarabia.
Páginas 56.
- 16/04 Política familiar, imposición efectiva e incentivos al trabajo en la reforma de la imposición sobre la renta personal (IRPF) de 2003 en España.
Autoras: María Pazos Morán y Teresa Pérez Barrasa.
Páginas 48.
- 17/04 Efectos del déficit público: evidencia empírica mediante un modelo de panel dinámico para los países de la Unión Europea.
Autor: César Pérez López.
Páginas 40.
- 18/04 Inequality, poverty and mobility: Choosing income or consumption as welfare indicators.
Autores: Carlos Gradín, Olga Cantó y Coral del Río.
Páginas 52.