



AgEcon SEARCH
RESEARCH IN AGRICULTURAL & APPLIED ECONOMICS

The World's Largest Open Access Agricultural & Applied Economics Digital Library

This document is discoverable and free to researchers across the globe due to the work of AgEcon Search.

Help ensure our sustainability.

Give to AgEcon Search

AgEcon Search
<http://ageconsearch.umn.edu>
aesearch@umn.edu

*Papers downloaded from **AgEcon Search** may be used for non-commercial purposes and personal study only. No other use, including posting to another Internet site, is permitted without permission from the copyright owner (not AgEcon Search), or as allowed under the provisions of Fair Use, U.S. Copyright Act, Title 17 U.S.C.*

האוניברסיטה העברית בירושלים
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem



המרכז למחקר בכלכלה חקלאית
The Center for Agricultural
Economic Research

המחלקה לכלכלה חקלאית ומנהל
The Department of Agricultural
Economics and Management

Discussion Paper No. 2.10

**International Remittances, Domestic Remittances,
and Income Inequality in the Dominican Republic**

by

Ayal Kimhi

Papers by members of the Department
can be found in their home sites:

מאמרים של חברי המחלקה נמצאים
גם באתרי הבית שלהם:

<http://departments.agri.huji.ac.il/economics/indexe.html>

P.O. Box 12, Rehovot 76100

ת.ד. 12, רחובות 76100

International Remittances, Domestic Remittances, and Income Inequality in the Dominican Republic^{*}

by

Ayal Kimhi

Department of Agricultural Economics and Management
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, P.O. Box 12, Rehovot 76100, Israel
kimhi@agri.huji.ac.il

February 2010

Abstract

Inequality decomposition techniques are used to analyze the different impacts of domestic and international remittances on household income inequality in the Dominican Republic. Domestic remittances seem more likely to be equalizing than international remittances. The negative marginal effect on inequality of domestic remittances is more prominent among rural households, and in particular among landless rural households, while the negative marginal effect on inequality of international remittances is more prominent among urban households, and in particular outside of the Santo Domingo area. Stronger marginal effects of remittances were found among female-headed households, the elderly and the less educated. Both domestic and international remittances are higher among female-headed households and the elderly. Education is associated with lower domestic remittances and higher international remittances, probably reflecting the role of education in promoting international versus domestic migration. An increase in schooling increases inequality through domestic remittances and decreases inequality through international remittances, while a reduction in household size reduces inequality through both domestic and international remittances. This analysis highlights the importance of the distinction between domestic and international remittances as drivers of inequality as well as the importance of identifying and quantifying the determinants of remittances and their subsequent impact on inequality.

^{*} This research was supported in part by the Center for Agricultural Economic Research.

Introduction

Despite evidence for negative impact of out-migration on the economy due to brain drain (Adams, 2003), remittances from migrants have contributed significantly to income in sending communities. Adams and Page (2005) have shown that an increase in international remittances reduces poverty in developing countries. However, other studies have found both positive and negative effects of remittances on poverty and inequality in various countries (Taylor, 1999; Acosta et al., 2008). Theoretically, remittances are likely to increase inequality at initial stages of the migration process and increase inequality at later stages (Özden and Schiff, 2006; Rapoport and Docquier, 2006). This prediction is supported by the empirical findings of Stark, Taylor and Yitzhaki (1986, 1988) and Taylor et al. (2005). The latter also differentiated between domestic and international remittances, and showed that they had different effects on inequality and poverty in rural Mexico.

The purpose of this paper is to investigate the impact of domestic and international remittances on household income inequality in the Dominican Republic. Despite impressive growth performance since about 1970, poverty and inequality remain important issues in the Dominican Republic, with 42% of the population below the poverty line in 2004 (World Bank, 2006). The country has a rich history of rural-to-urban migration as well as international out-migration, especially to the U.S. (Pessar, 1982). International remittances have increased dramatically since the mid-1980s to more than 10% of GNP (figure 1), and are conceived as a potentially equalizing income source. However, the Gini index of inequality hardly changed over the years (figure 1). Fajnzylber and Lopez (2008) even found that the observed Gini index in the Dominican Republic is slightly higher than what it would have been without migration and remittances. They used a comparison of the actual and counterfactual income distributions, with the latter based on simulating household incomes in the absence of migration and remittances, and did not distinguish between domestic and international remittances. While total remittances as a fraction of household income was roughly constant across income quintiles in the Dominican Republic in 1998, the share of international remittances in total remittances was 60% in the highest quintile but only 20% in the lowest quintile (World Bank, 2000). Therefore, the distinction between domestic and international remittances is very important for the analysis of inequality.

This paper uses inequality decomposition techniques in order to obtain marginal effects of domestic and international remittances on inequality, a method that has been applied to other countries before (e.g., Stark, Taylor and Yitzhaki, 1986). Two decomposition rules are used. Shorrocks (1982) and Fields (2003) suggested that the squared coefficient of variation has superior theoretical properties. On the other hand, the decomposition of the Gini index of inequality is more intuitively appealing and offers an analytic formula for the marginal effects (Lerman and Yitzhaki, 1985). Previous research has shown that the results of the two decomposition rules are mostly but not always consistent (Shorrocks, 1983; Morduch and Sicular, 2002; Kimhi, 2007). This paper compares the results of the two rules, by obtaining marginal effects for the squared CV rule using a simulation exercise.

The next section describes the methodology of inequality decomposition by income sources. The following section presents the decomposition results and the marginal effects. After that we analyze the determinants of remittances and their inequality implications. Subsequently, we decompose the contributions of remittances to inequality further, by the determinants of remittances. The final section summarizes the results.

Methodology

Shorrocks (1982,1983) suggested focusing on inequality measures that can be written as a weighted sum of incomes:

$$(1) \quad I(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_i a_i(\mathbf{y}) y_i,$$

where a_i are the weights, y_i is the income of household i , and \mathbf{y} is the vector of household incomes. If income is observed as the sum of incomes from k different sources, $y_i = \sum_k y_i^k$, the inequality measure (1) can be written as the sum of source-specific components S^k :

$$(2) \quad I(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_i a_i(\mathbf{y}) \sum_k y_i^k = \sum_k [\sum_i a_i(\mathbf{y}) y_i^k] \equiv \sum_k S^k.$$

Dividing (2) through by $I(\mathbf{y})$, one obtains the proportional contribution of income source k to overall inequality as:

$$(3) \quad s^k = \sum_i a_i(\mathbf{y}) y_i^k / I(\mathbf{y}).$$

Shorrocks (1982) noted that the decomposition procedure (3) yields an infinite number of potential decomposition rules for each inequality index, because in principle, the weights $a_i(\mathbf{y})$ can be chosen in numerous ways, so that the proportional contribution assigned to any income source can be made to take any value between minus and plus infinity. He further showed how additional intuitive restrictions on the choice of weights can reduce the number of potential decomposition rules, and came up with a unique decomposition rule based on the squared coefficient of variation inequality index. Fields (2003) reached the same conclusion in a different way. However, Shorrocks (1983) still suggested not to rely solely on this decomposition rule in empirical analyses.

The decomposition results indicate how changes in the variability of income from each source are likely to affect total income inequality (Kimhi, 2007). Perhaps a more policy-relevant result is the impact on inequality of a uniform change in a particular income source. Shorrocks (1983) has noted that comparing s^k , the contribution of income source k to inequality, and μ^k/μ , the income share of source k , is useful for knowing whether the k^{th} income source is equalizing or disequalizing. Lerman and Yitzhaki (1985) have shown that the relative change in the Gini inequality index following a uniform percentage change in \mathbf{y}^k is $(s^k - \mu^k/\mu)G(\mathbf{y})$. Kimhi (2007) has shown that a similar result can be obtained for other inequality measures, including the squared coefficient of variation, using simulations.

Inequality impacts of domestic and international remittances

The data used in this research is obtained from the 1992 Family Expenditure Survey in the Dominican Republic. The survey included about 1,200 households. Besides detailed income and expenditure data, it included demographic and socio-economic data such as age, education, and labor supply of all household members, detailed information on agricultural activities, and indices of living conditions. The first column in table 1 shows the distribution of per-capita income across income sources. Labor income comprises the lion's share of per-capita income, with capital income (pensions, insurance and interest) in second place. Domestic remittances account for only one percent of per-capita income, while international remittances account for six percent.

The last two columns in table 1 show the inequality decomposition results (top) and marginal effects (bottom). The decomposition results show that the relative contributions of the income sources roughly correspond to their income shares. The two decomposition rules mostly agree on these relative contributions, with the exception of family business income, which accounts for 13% of inequality under the Gini decomposition rule and 30% under the squared CV rule. The contribution of domestic remittances to inequality is negative. This implies that an increase in the variance of domestic remittances is expected to reduce income inequality. Given that domestic remittances are much more important for poor households (World Bank, 2000), this result is expected. The contribution of international remittances, on the other hand, is positive.

The marginal effects show the percentage impact on inequality of a uniform one-percent increase in each income source. Here we find differences in statistical significance across the two decomposition rules. The income sources that have positive marginal effects on inequality are self-employment, family business, and pensions, insurance and interest income. However, these marginal effects are statistically significant only under the Gini decomposition rule. The negative marginal effects of wage labor and agricultural income are statistically significant under both decomposition rules, and the same is true for domestic remittances. International remittances also have a negative marginal effect, but this effect is statistically significant only under the square CV decomposition rule. Moreover, the marginal effect of domestic remittances is nine times larger than the marginal effect of international remittances (in absolute value) under the Gini decomposition rule, but it is 60% smaller under the squared CV decomposition rule.

The results are therefore quite vague with respect to the relative contributions to inequality of domestic and international remittances. However, it is pretty clear that uniform increases in remittances are likely to reduce income inequality. In fact, when the analysis was repeated with total remittances rather than differentiating between domestic and international remittances, the marginal effect of remittances on inequality was significantly negative under both decomposition rules. Combining the decomposition results and the marginal effects, we can say that an increase in domestic remittances is likely to reduce inequality unless the increase is concentrated among households with the lowest levels of domestic remittances (which are likely to be richer overall). An increase in international remittances, on the other hand, is likely

to reduce inequality *only* if it is concentrated among households with the lowest levels of international remittances (which are likely to be poor). The impact of changes in domestic and international migration on income inequality in the Dominican Republic should be evaluated differentially according to these results.

Differentiating by population sub-groups

To delve deeper into the issue of differential effects of domestic and international remittances, we recall that the relative importance of domestic and international remittances is not homogeneous across population sub-groups. In particular, domestic remittances are more important as a source of income for poor households, while international remittances are more important for richer households (World Bank, 2000). Poverty and inequality are also not homogeneous across population sub-groups. In particular, they have a strong geographic dimension (World Bank, 2006). Table 2 shows the relative importance of income sources to household income of different population sub-groups. Comparing urban and rural households, we find that relatively more rural households enjoy domestic remittances, while many more urban households enjoy international remittances. This is explained by the inability of poor rural households to afford sending a migrant out of the country, and by the fact that many urban households are already residing not far from a well-developed labor market, hence domestic migration is not relevant for them. This last argument is supported by the fact that among urban households, fewer households enjoy domestic remittances in the Santo Domingo area (the major urban center in the country) than elsewhere. We also find that among rural households, households with land (which are supposedly more affluent) are more likely to enjoy domestic remittances than landless households, and the fraction of their international remittances out of total income is twice as high as the same fraction for landless households.

Another population sub-group that seems to be unique with respect to the composition of income is female-headed households. These households are much more likely to obtain domestic and international remittances, and the fraction of remittances in total household income is also much higher. It could be that the mere fact that many of these households are headed by a female is a result of the migration of the male spouse either domestically or internationally. Differentiating by households according to the age of the head of household, we find that older

households are more likely to obtain remittances, and the difference is particularly notable with respect to domestic remittances. Similar differences are observed with respect to the share of remittances out of total household income. Finally, differentiating by households according to the schooling of the head of household, we find that more educated households are less likely to obtain domestic remittances and more likely to obtain international remittances. Despite that, the share of international remittances out of total household income is lower in more educated households.

It would thus be interesting to look at the differential marginal effects of income from domestic and international remittances on inequality for each population sub-group. Table 3 shows simulated marginal effects of uniform increases in remittances broken down by those same population sub-groups that were presented in table 2. Comparing rural and urban households, we observe that using the Gini inequality index, the negative marginal effect of domestic remittances is much larger for rural than for urban households. However, the marginal effect on the squared CV inequality index is split almost evenly between these sub-groups. On the other hand, the marginal effect of international remittances is much larger (in absolute value) among urban households, using the squared CV inequality index. The marginal effects under the Gini index are not statistically significant. This is consistent with our earlier result that domestic remittances are more important for rural households, while international remittances are more important for urban households.

The marginal effects of remittances among rural households are further broken down to households with land and landless households. It is easy to see that the negative marginal effects of both domestic and international remittances are larger in absolute value among landless households, for both inequality measures. The marginal effects of remittances among urban households are further broken down to households in the Santo Domingo area and in other areas. We find that marginal effects of remittances in the Santo Domingo area are weaker than in other urban areas, and the marginal effect of international remittances on the Gini inequality index even becomes positive for these households.

Looking at female-headed and male-headed households, we find that the negative marginal effects of remittances on inequality are stronger for female-headed households. Although the differences in table 3 do not seem to be impressive, note that female-headed households are less than a quarter of all households (table 2), and hence their relative marginal effects are indeed stronger. Differentiating by the age of

head of household, we find that the negative marginal effect of domestic remittances is stronger for older households, while the marginal effects of international remittances do not seem to vary by the age of head of household. Differentiating by the schooling of head of household, we find that the marginal effects of domestic remittances are consistently and significantly negative only for lower-educated households. This difference is also observed with respect to international remittances, but in this case it is not very consistent across the two inequality measures.

The results of this simulation exercise imply that while the equalizing nature of uniform increases in remittances is valid for almost all population sub-groups, it is stronger for population sub-groups that are comprised of relatively low-income households, such as rural landless households, urban households outside of the Santo-Domingo area, female-headed households, and the less educated. This implies that understanding the determinants of both rural-to-urban and international migration of low-income households is critical to the design of inequality-reducing policy measures. For example, education is known to be an important determinant of migration (Adams, 2003), although its effect varies considerably across countries (Acosta et al., 2008). If education stimulates migration, as seems to be the case for the Dominican Republic, then enhancing education among poorer households could have an equalizing effect on income through its effect on remittances. In the next section, we attempt to identify the determinants of remittances and their inequality implications.

The determinants of remittances and their inequality implications

A regression analysis is used to identify and quantify the effects of the determinants of remittances. Per-capita domestic and international remittances are analyzed separately, and a Tobit model is used since both types of remittances are censored from below at zero. The results are in table 4. The models were estimated with and without a log-transformation of the dependent variables. The results were not too different, therefore only the log-transformation results are presented. The results show that both domestic and international remittances are higher in female-headed households and in households in which the head of household is older. Schooling, on the other hand, affects domestic remittances negatively and international remittances positively. This implies selectivity on schooling in the migration decision, with the less educated migrating internally and the more educated

migrating internationally. This conclusion, of course, depends on the presumption that schooling of the household head is a good proxy for the schooling of migrant household members. Family size and landholdings do not have statistically significant effects on per-capita remittances. The geographic differences in migration patterns are also visible here, with domestic remittances lower in the Santo Domingo area, and international remittances lower in rural areas and higher in the Santiago area (the secondary urban center in the Dominican Republic).

The estimated regression coefficients can now be used in order to further decompose the part of income inequality that operates through remittances. Morduch and Sicular (2002) and Fields (2003) suggested a regression-based inequality decomposition by income determinants. In particular, total household income is specified as a linear regression:

$$(4) \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon},$$

where \mathbf{X} is a matrix of explanatory variables, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a vector of coefficients, and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is a vector of residuals. Given a vector of consistently estimated coefficients \mathbf{b} , income can be expressed as a sum of predicted income and a prediction error according to:

$$(5) \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{e}.$$

Substituting (5) into (1) and dividing through by $I(\mathbf{y})$, the share of inequality attributed to explanatory variable m is obtained as:

$$(6) \quad s^m = b_m \sum_i a_i(\mathbf{y}) x_i^m / I(\mathbf{y}).$$

Arayama et al. (2006) develop this decomposition method further in order to differentiate between contributions of explanatory variables through different income sources. In particular, they specify the k^{th} source-specific income-generating function as:

$$(7) \quad \mathbf{y}_k = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}_k + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_k,$$

where β_k could include zero elements corresponding to explanatory variables that do not affect the k 'th source of income. Since $y = \sum_k y_k = X \sum_k \beta_k + \sum_k \epsilon_k$, using consistent estimates \mathbf{b}_k of β_k and substituting into (1), the share of inequality attributed to explanatory variable m in overall inequality becomes:

$$(6)' \quad s^m = (\sum_k b_{km}) \sum_i a_i(y) x_i^m / I(y).$$

This can be broken down to source-specific contributions of each explanatory variable to overall inequality, denoted s^{mk} , which is implicitly defined by:

$$(8) \quad s^m = \sum_k [b_{km} \sum_i a_i(y) x_i^m / I(y)] = \sum_k s^{mk}.$$

The tobit coefficients in table 4 are used for \mathbf{b}_k in (8). The results are in table 5. Recall that the contributions of domestic and international remittances to total income inequality were negative and positive, respectively (table 1). Table 5 shows that these contributions are mostly driven by the distributions of schooling and geographical location. The distribution of family size, on the other hand, contributes positively to inequality through both domestic and international remittances, while the distribution of landholdings (in particular, households with and without land) contributes negatively to inequality through both domestic and international remittances.

Another way to look at the impact of explanatory variables on inequality is through marginal effects. We use simulations to compute marginal effects in the following way. First, we make a change in an explanatory variable. Then, we use the regression coefficients in order to predict the resulting change in income from remittances. Finally, we compute the level of inequality of total income after incorporating this change. The changes in the explanatory variables used in this case are the following. Family size is increased by one person for the whole sample, landholdings per capita are increased by 1%, and each of the categorical variables is changed to 1 for the whole sample. Note that the results are not comparable to those reported in table 3. There, remittance income was increased by 1% for all rural households (for example), while here, remittance income of urban households is changed as if they were rural. Also, in the case of the categorical variables, the simulation obviously reduces the variance of the variable to zero, and hence the results are not independent of the inequality contributions reported in table 5.

However, note that the variance can be reduced to zero by either changing the categorical variable to one or to zero, and the marginal effects are going to be of opposite signs in those two cases.

The results are in table 6. Marginal effects of female-headed households, age above 50, and land ownership are negative for both domestic and international remittances. On the other hand, marginal effects of family size and landholdings are positive for both domestic and international remittances. The marginal effect of higher education is positive in the case of domestic remittances and negative in the case of international remittances, and the same is true for the marginal effects of the urban centers (Santo Domingo and Santiago). The marginal effect of rural households is negative in the case of domestic remittances and positive in the case of international remittances.

These results have a number of policy implications. Increasing the variance of schooling (by increasing schooling of households who are already more educated than the average) is expected to decrease domestic remittances and increase international remittances, probably through substitution of international migration for domestic migration. This is expected to increase income of these households, but since the impacts of schooling through domestic and international remittances are opposite in signs, the overall impact on income inequality is ambiguous. It depends on the initial position of these households within the income distribution. Similarly, migration of entire households from remote rural areas to central urban areas is expected to reduce domestic remittances and increase international remittances for these households, and the resulting effect on income inequality is ambiguous. A family planning policy that reduces fertility and therefore household size especially among the larger households is expected to reduce household size inequality, and according to table 5 this would reduce inequality through its impact on remittances. This policy would also reduce average household size and this would also reduce inequality through its effect on remittances (table 6). Hence, the impact of this policy on inequality (through remittances) is unambiguously negative. Finally, consider a land reform that allocates farmland to some landless households. This increases the variance of landlessness to the extent that less than half of the households own land, and hence reduces inequality according to table 5. This policy also reduces inequality according to table 6 because it increases the fraction of households with land. The bottom line seems to be

unambiguous, but note that this policy would also change the distribution of landholdings per capita, and this could change the picture.

Summary and conclusions

This paper used inequality decomposition techniques to analyze the differential roles of domestic and international remittances in determining household income inequality in the Dominican Republic. Decomposing total income inequality by income sources reveals that the variability of international remittances contributes positively to inequality, while the contribution of the variability of domestic remittances is negative. However, the marginal effect on inequality of a uniform increase in remittances is negative for both domestic and international remittances. Combining the results of the decomposition and the marginal effects, one can conclude that domestic remittances are more likely to be equalizing than international remittances. Breaking down the marginal effects by population sub-groups, we found that the negative marginal effect on inequality of domestic remittances is more prominent among rural households, and in particular among landless rural households, while the negative marginal effect on inequality of international remittances is more prominent among urban households, and in particular outside of the Santo Domingo area. Stronger marginal effects of remittances were also found among female-headed households, the elderly and the less educated. The conclusion is that the impact of remittances on inequality is far from being uniform across the population.

Analyzing the determinants of remittances, we found that both domestic and international remittances are higher among female-headed households and the elderly. Education seems to be associated with lower domestic remittances and higher international remittances, probably reflecting the role of education in promoting international versus domestic migration. Geographic differences in the levels of remittances are also observed. Breaking down the contributions of remittances to inequality into shares attributed to these inequality determinants, we found that an increase in schooling increases inequality through domestic remittances and decreases inequality through international remittances, while a reduction in household size is likely to reduce inequality through both domestic and international remittances. These results could be useful for policy evaluations.

The analysis of this paper highlights the importance of the distinction between domestic and international remittances as drivers of inequality in the case of the

Dominican Republic. It also emphasized the importance of identifying and quantifying the determinants of remittances and their subsequent impact on inequality. Still, the analysis is partial in the sense that it does not explicitly model the incidence of remittances. Recall that a Tobit model was used to estimate the determinants of remittances, but the coefficients were used in the decomposition procedure as if remittances are not censored. A more complete analysis should evaluate the marginal effects of determinants of remittances on the incidence of remittances as well as their level. In addition, the analysis focused on remittances and somewhat neglected the changes in other income sources as remittances change. This topic is left for future research.

References

Acosta, Pablo, Cesar Calderón, Pablo Fajnzylber, and Humberto Lopez (2008). "What is the Impact of International Remittances on Poverty and Inequality in Latin America?" *World Development* 36, 89-114.

Adams, Jr., Richard H. (2003). *International Migration, Remittances, and the Brain Drain: A Study of 24 Labor-Exporting Countries*. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3069.

Adams, Jr., Richard H., and John Page (2005). "Do International Migration and Remittances Reduce Poverty in Developing Countries?" *World Development* 33, 1645–1669.

Fajnzylber, Pablo, and J. Humberto Lopez (2008). "The Development Impact of Remittances in Latin America." In Pablo Fajnzylber and J. Humberto Lopez, eds., *Remittances and Development: Lessons from Latin America*. Washington: The World Bank, 1-19.

Fields, Gary (2003). "Accounting for Income Inequality and Its Change: A New Method, with Application to the Distribution of Earnings in the United States." *Research in Labor Economics* 22, 1-38.

Kimhi, Ayal (2007). *Regression-Based Inequality Decomposition: A Critical Review and Application to Farm-Household Income Data*. Discussion Paper No. 16.07, The Center for Agricultural Economic Research, Rehovot, Israel.

Lerman, Robert I., and Shlomo Yitzhaki (1985). "Income Inequality Effects by Income Source: A New Approach and Applications to the United States." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 67, 151-156.

Morduch, Jonathan, and Terry Sicular (2002). "Rethinking Inequality Decomposition, with Evidence from Rural China." *The Economic Journal* 112, 93-106.

Özden, Coglar, and Maurice Schiff (2006). "Overview". In Coglar Özden and Maurice Schiff, Eds., *International Migration, Remittances, and the Brain Drain*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Pessar, Patricia R. (1982). "The Role of Households in International Migration and the Case of U.S.-Bound Migration from the Dominican Republic." *International Migration Review* 16, 342-364.

Rapoport, Hillel, and Frederic Docquier (2006). "The Economics of Migrants' Remittances." In Serge-Christophe Kolm and Jean Mercier Ythier, Eds., *Handbook on the Economics of Reciprocity, Giving and Altruism, Vol. 2*. Amsterdam: Elsevier-North Holland.

Shorrocks, Anthony F. (1982). "Inequality Decomposition by Factor Components." *Econometrica* 50, 193-211.

Shorrocks, Anthony F. (1983). "The Impact of Income Components on the Distribution of Family Incomes." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 98, 311-326.

Stark, Oded, J. Edward Taylor, and Shlomo Yitzhaki (1986). "Remittances and Inequality", *Economic Journal*, 28, 309-22.

Stark, Oded, J. Edward Taylor, and Shlomo Yitzhaki (1988). "Migration, Remittances and Inequality: A Sensitivity Analysis Using the Extended Gini Index." *Journal of Development Economics*, 28, 309-22.

Taylor, J. Edward (1999). "The New Economics of Labour Migration and the Role of Remittances in the Migration Process." *International Migration* 37, 63-88.

Taylor, J. Edward, Jorge Mora, Richard Adams, and Alejandro Lopez-Feldman (2005). *Remittances, Inequality and Poverty: Evidence from Rural Mexico*. Working Paper No. 05-003, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, University of California, Davis.

World Bank (2000). *Dominican Republic Social and Structural Policy Review*. Report No. 20192, Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit, Latin America and the Caribbean.

World Bank (2006). *Dominican Republic Poverty Assessment: Achieving More Pro-Poor Growth*. Report No. 32422-DO, Caribbean Country Management Unit, Latin America and the Caribbean Region.




Figure 1: Growth, Remittances and Inequality in the Dominican Republic

Sources:

World Development Indicators 2006 (<http://go.worldbank.org/RVW6YTLQH0>).

Missing inequality data was obtained from the Socio-Economic Database for Latin America and the Caribbean (CEDLAS and The World Bank, www.depeco.econo.unlp.edu.ar/cedlas/)

Table 1. Inequality decomposition by income source

	Share of source-specific per-capita income	Inequality measures	
		Gini	Squared CV
<i>Inequality index</i>		0.5149	2.4219
<u><i>Inequality contributions</i></u>			
Wage labor income	32%	0.2460 (8.35)	0.1704 (2.94)
Self-employment income	30%	0.3628 (9.23)	0.3642 (3.27)
Agricultural income	7%	0.0522 (3.60)	0.0308 (1.77)
Family business income	7%	0.1302 (3.29)	0.3013 (2.00)
Pensions, insurance and interest income	4%	0.0678 (4.34)	0.0514 (2.44)
Domestic remittances	1%	-0.0029 (-2.49)	-0.0015 (-2.77)
International remittances	6%	0.0563 (5.35)	0.0232 (2.43)
<i>Total</i>	<i>100%</i>	<i>1.00</i>	<i>1.00</i>
<u><i>Marginal effects</i></u>			
Wage labor income		-0.0445% (-3.12)	-0.2545% (-1.96)
Self-employment income		0.0680% (3.68)	0.1200% (0.67)
Agricultural income		-0.0113% (-1.62)	-0.0684% (-2.07)
Family business income		0.0443% (2.37)	0.4744% (1.39)
Pensions, insurance and interest income		0.0201% (2.77)	0.0028% (0.11)
Domestic remittances		-0.0155% (-7.80)	-0.0280% (-4.70)
International remittances		-0.0017% (-0.37)	-0.0714% (-2.81)

Note: bootstrapped t-statistics in parentheses.

Table 2. The distribution of income sources by population sub-groups

	urban			rural		
	total	Santo Domingo area	other	total	landed	landless
<i>Percentage of households</i>	53	25	28	47	23	24
<i>Percentage of households with income from:</i>						
Wage labor	67	73	60	56	51	61
Self-employment	51	57	48	38	29	45
Agriculture	12	2	25	55	91	24
Family business	13	13	14	20	20	20
Pensions, insurance and interest	39	43	34	22	16	27
Domestic remittances	17	11	26	26	29	22
International remittances	39	40	36	21	21	21
<i>Percentage of household income from:</i>						
Wage labor	40	39	41	30	21	39
Self-employment	37	38	37	27	17	37
Agriculture	2	1	1	23	44	2
Family business	8	10	9	9	7	12
Pensions, insurance and interest	5	5	6	2	1	2
Domestic remittances	1	0	1	2	2	2
International remittances	7	6	6	6	8	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

Continued on next page

Table 2. (continued)

	Gender*		Age*		Schooling*	
	Male	Female	Up to 50	51 plus	Up to 8	9 plus
<i>Percentage of households</i>	78	22	61	39	78	22
<i>Percentage of households with income from:</i>						
Wage labor	64	55	67	55	59	73
Self-employment	47	40	49	39	43	53
Agriculture	36	15	28	37	36	14
Family business	17	14	17	15	17	14
Pensions, insurance and interest	31	32	28	36	27	46
Domestic remittances	18	33	14	31	25	8
International remittances	25	48	28	34	29	37
<i>Percentage of household income from:</i>						
Wage labor	36	44	32	32	29	37
Self-employment	36	23	32	25	25	36
Agriculture	9	2	6	8	10	1
Family business	9	6	10	3	7	7
Pensions, insurance and interest	4	5	2	6	3	5
Domestic remittances	1	4	1	2	2	0
International remittances	5	16	5	7	6	4
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100

* Gender, age and schooling relate to the head of household.

Table 3. Breaking down the marginal effects of remittances on inequality

	Domestic remittances		International remittances	
	Gini	Squared CV	Gini	Squared CV
<i>Total marginal effect</i>	-0.0155% (-7.80)	-0.0280% (-4.70)	-0.0017% (-0.37)	-0.0714% (-2.81)
Rural	-0.0099% (-6.83)	-0.0146% (-4.53)	-0.0020% (-0.75)	-0.0197% (-2.82)
With land	-0.0039% (-4.57)	-0.0053% (-4.06)	0.0004% (0.16)	-0.0076% (-1.75)
Landless	-0.0060% (-2.49)	-0.0094% (-3.77)	-0.0024% (-2.44)	-0.0121% (-3.11)
Urban	-0.0057% (-4.79)	-0.0126% (-3.65)	0.0009% (0.21)	-0.0450% (-1.99)
Santo Domingo area	-0.0015% (-2.07)	-0.0034% (-2.13)	0.0062% (1.66)	-0.0165% (-1.01)
Other areas	-0.0043% (-4.48)	-0.0092% (-3.60)	-0.0053% (-3.55)	-0.0286% (-3.62)
Female-headed	-0.0082% (-5.05)	-0.0152% (-3.84)	-0.0024% (-0.68)	-0.0357% (-2.37)
Male-headed	-0.0075% (-6.25)	-0.0121% (-4.31)	0.0014% (0.38)	-0.0291% (-1.93)
Age up to 50	-0.0050% (-4.36)	-0.0079% (-3.44)	0.0008% (0.22)	-0.00315% (-1.86)
Age 51 and up	-0.0101% (-6.95)	-0.0184% (-3.82)	-0.0002% (-0.05)	-0.0332% (-2.17)
Schooling up to 8 years	-0.0151% (-8.02)	-0.0252% (-4.14)	-0.0039% (-0.88)	-0.0543% (-2.58)
Schooling 9 years and up	-0.0000% (-0.22)	-0.0011% (-1.82)	0.0044% (1.68)	-0.0104% (-0.91)

Notes:

Bootstrapped t-statistics in parentheses.

Age and schooling are of the head of household.

Table 4. Tobit results

Explanatory variable	Sample mean	<i>ln</i> (remittances per capita)	
		Domestic	International
Intercept	1.00	-6.81 (-4.75)**	-6.98 (-5.28)**
Female-headed household	0.22	4.07 (5.00)**	4.29 (6.06)**
Age above 50	0.39	3.66 (4.95)**	1.62 (2.50)*
Schooling 1 to 8 years	0.59	-0.42 (-0.49)	2.19 (2.53)**
Schooling above 8 years	0.22	-3.65 (-2.87)**	3.30 (3.11)**
Family size	5.15	-0.14 (-0.99)	0.04 (0.28)
Household with land	0.31	1.54 (1.48)	1.54 (1.53)
<i>ln</i> (landholdings per capita)	0.51	-0.28 (-0.72)	0.01 (0.02)
Rural	0.47	0.62 (0.80)	-3.16 (-4.41)**
Santo Domingo area	0.30	-3.11 (-3.37)**	0.83 (1.11)
Santiago area	0.09	-1.30 (-1.01)	3.26 (3.09)**
Sigma		8.03	7.89
Pseudo R ²		0.0515	0.0333
Likelihood ratio		126.83**	105.56**
Number of observations		1089	1089
% censored		79%	69%

* significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%.

Table 5. Source-specific contributions to total income inequality of determinants of remittances

Explanatory variable	Domestic remittances		International remittances	
	Gini	CV ²	Gini	CV ²
Intercept	0.00000 (0.13)	0.00000 (0.06)	0.00000 (0.13)	0.00000 (0.10)
Female-headed household	-0.00098 (-0.96)	-0.00082 (-1.66)	-0.00316 (-0.95)	-0.00272 (-1.62)
Age above 50	-0.00087 (-0.94)	-0.00027 (-0.54)	-0.00099 (-0.66)	-0.00030 (-0.34)
Schooling 1 to 8 years	0.00014 (1.97)	0.00013 (2.30)	-0.00524 (-2.11)	-0.00495 (-2.55)
Schooling above 8 years	-0.00753 (-8.23)	-0.00373 (-3.37)	0.02665 (9.55)	0.01357 (3.75)
Family size	0.00361 (8.68)	0.00120 (4.64)	0.00771 (8.64)	0.00260 (4.86)
Household with land	-0.00095 (-5.92)	-0.00027 (-2.60)	-0.01249 (-5.37)	-0.00360 (-2.72)
<i>ln</i> (landholdings per capita)	0.00011 (1.25)	0.00002 (0.32)	0.00069 (1.07)	0.00010 (0.29)
Rural	-0.00140 (-9.53)	-0.00052 (-4.62)	0.02738 (9.57)	0.01033 (4.83)
Santo Domingo area	-0.00717 (-8.29)	-0.00341 (-4.38)	0.01262 (8.72)	0.00609 (4.64)
Santiago area	-0.00035 (-1.77)	0.00001 (0.15)	0.00235 (1.63)	0.00010 (0.17)
Residual	0.01214 (6.40)	0.00633 (3.87)	0.11160 (15.8)	0.00418 (0.76)
Total (from table 1)	-0.00298 (-2.44)	-0.00140 (-2.27)	0.05630 (5.35)	0.02323 (2.43)

Notes:

Bootstrapped t-statistics in parentheses.

Table 6. Marginal effects of determinants of remittances on total income inequality

Explanatory variable	Domestic remittances		International remittances	
	Gini	CV ²	Gini	CV ²
Female-headed household	-5.072%	-9.917%	-14.922%	-28.889%
Age above 50	-3.251%	-6.513%	-4.859%	-9.790%
Schooling 1 to 8 years	-0.323%	-1.453%	-2.963%	-4.177%
Schooling above 8 years	5.027%	9.216%	-7.709%	-13.135%
Family size	0.407%	0.802%	0.869%	1.712%
Household with land	-0.596%	-1.303%	-6.823%	-14.998%
<i>ln</i> (landholdings per capita)	0.002%	0.005%	0.016%	0.031%
Rural	-0.274%	-0.717%	6.700%	16.121%
Santo Domingo area	3.973%	6.990%	-5.359%	-9.043%
Santiago area	1.305%	1.659%	-11.097%	-19.513%

Notes:

All marginal effects are highly significant; t-values were suppressed.

PREVIOUS DISCUSSION PAPERS

- 1.01 Yoav Kislev - Water Markets (Hebrew).
- 2.01 Or Goldfarb and Yoav Kislev - Incorporating Uncertainty in Water Management (Hebrew).
- 3.01 Zvi Lerman, Yoav Kislev, Alon Kriss and David Biton - Agricultural Output and Productivity in the Former Soviet Republics.
- 4.01 Jonathan Lipow & Yakir Plessner - The Identification of Enemy Intentions through Observation of Long Lead-Time Military Preparations.
- 5.01 Csaba Csaki & Zvi Lerman - Land Reform and Farm Restructuring in Moldova: A Real Breakthrough?
- 6.01 Zvi Lerman - Perspectives on Future Research in Central and Eastern European Transition Agriculture.
- 7.01 Zvi Lerman - A Decade of Land Reform and Farm Restructuring: What Russia Can Learn from the World Experience.
- 8.01 Zvi Lerman - Institutions and Technologies for Subsistence Agriculture: How to Increase Commercialization.
- 9.01 Yoav Kislev & Evgeniya Vaksin - The Water Economy of Israel--An Illustrated Review. (Hebrew).
- 10.01 Csaba Csaki & Zvi Lerman - Land and Farm Structure in Poland.
- 11.01 Yoav Kislev - The Water Economy of Israel.
- 12.01 Or Goldfarb and Yoav Kislev - Water Management in Israel: Rules vs. Discretion.
- 1.02 Or Goldfarb and Yoav Kislev - A Sustainable Salt Regime in the Coastal Aquifer (Hebrew).
- 2.02 Aliza Fleischer and Yacov Tsur - Measuring the Recreational Value of Open Spaces.
- 3.02 Yair Mundlak, Donald F. Larson and Rita Butzer - Determinants of Agricultural Growth in Thailand, Indonesia and The Philippines.
- 4.02 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel - Growth, Scarcity and R&D.
- 5.02 Ayal Kimhi - Socio-Economic Determinants of Health and Physical Fitness in Southern Ethiopia.
- 6.02 Yoav Kislev - Urban Water in Israel.
- 7.02 Yoav Kislev - A Lecture: Prices of Water in the Time of Desalination. (Hebrew).

- 8.02 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel - On Knowledge-Based Economic Growth.
- 9.02 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel - Endangered aquifers: Groundwater management under threats of catastrophic events.
- 10.02 Uri Shani, Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel - Optimal Dynamic Irrigation Schemes.
- 1.03 Yoav Kislev - The Reform in the Prices of Water for Agriculture (Hebrew).
- 2.03 Yair Mundlak - Economic growth: Lessons from two centuries of American Agriculture.
- 3.03 Yoav Kislev - Sub-Optimal Allocation of Fresh Water. (Hebrew).
- 4.03 Dirk J. Bezemer & Zvi Lerman - Rural Livelihoods in Armenia.
- 5.03 Catherine Benjamin and Ayal Kimhi - Farm Work, Off-Farm Work, and Hired Farm Labor: Estimating a Discrete-Choice Model of French Farm Couples' Labor Decisions.
- 6.03 Eli Feinerman, Israel Finkelshtain and Iddo Kan - On a Political Solution to the Nimby Conflict.
- 7.03 Arthur Fishman and Avi Simhon - Can Income Equality Increase Competitiveness?
- 8.03 Zvika Neeman, Daniele Paserman and Avi Simhon - Corruption and Openness.
- 9.03 Eric D. Gould, Omer Moav and Avi Simhon - The Mystery of Monogamy.
- 10.03 Ayal Kimhi - Plot Size and Maize Productivity in Zambia: The Inverse Relationship Re-examined.
- 11.03 Zvi Lerman and Ivan Stanchin - New Contract Arrangements in Turkmen Agriculture: Impacts on Productivity and Rural Incomes.
- 12.03 Yoav Kislev and Evgeniya Vaksin - Statistical Atlas of Agriculture in Israel - 2003-Update (Hebrew).
- 1.04 Sanjaya DeSilva, Robert E. Evenson, Ayal Kimhi - Labor Supervision and Transaction Costs: Evidence from Bicol Rice Farms.
- 2.04 Ayal Kimhi - Economic Well-Being in Rural Communities in Israel.
- 3.04 Ayal Kimhi - The Role of Agriculture in Rural Well-Being in Israel.
- 4.04 Ayal Kimhi - Gender Differences in Health and Nutrition in Southern Ethiopia.
- 5.04 Aliza Fleischer and Yacov Tsur - The Amenity Value of Agricultural Landscape and Rural-Urban Land Allocation.

- 6.04 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – Resource Exploitation, Biodiversity and Ecological Events.
- 7.04 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – Knowledge Spillover, Learning Incentives And Economic Growth.
- 8.04 Ayal Kimhi – Growth, Inequality and Labor Markets in LDCs: A Survey.
- 9.04 Ayal Kimhi – Gender and Intrahousehold Food Allocation in Southern Ethiopia
- 10.04 Yael Kachel, Yoav Kislev & Israel Finkelshtain – Equilibrium Contracts in The Israeli Citrus Industry.
- 11.04 Zvi Lerman, Csaba Csaki & Gershon Feder – Evolving Farm Structures and Land Use Patterns in Former Socialist Countries.
- 12.04 Margarita Grazhdaninova and Zvi Lerman – Allocative and Technical Efficiency of Corporate Farms.
- 13.04 Ruerd Ruben and Zvi Lerman – Why Nicaraguan Peasants Stay in Agricultural Production Cooperatives.
- 14.04 William M. Liefert, Zvi Lerman, Bruce Gardner and Eugenia Serova - Agricultural Labor in Russia: Efficiency and Profitability.
- 1.05 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – Resource Exploitation, Biodiversity Loss and Ecological Events.
- 2.05 Zvi Lerman and Natalya Shagaida – Land Reform and Development of Agricultural Land Markets in Russia.
- 3.05 Ziv Bar-Shira, Israel Finkelshtain and Avi Simhon – Regulating Irrigation via Block-Rate Pricing: An Econometric Analysis.
- 4.05 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – Welfare Measurement under Threats of Environmental Catastrophes.
- 5.05 Avner Ahituv and Ayal Kimhi – The Joint Dynamics of Off-Farm Employment and the Level of Farm Activity.
- 6.05 Aliza Fleischer and Marcelo Sternberg – The Economic Impact of Global Climate Change on Mediterranean Rangeland Ecosystems: A Space-for-Time Approach.
- 7.05 Yael Kachel and Israel Finkelshtain – Antitrust in the Agricultural Sector: A Comparative Review of Legislation in Israel, the United States and the European Union.
- 8.05 Zvi Lerman – Farm Fragmentation and Productivity Evidence from Georgia.
- 9.05 Zvi Lerman – The Impact of Land Reform on Rural Household Incomes in Transcaucasia and Central Asia.

- 10.05 Zvi Lerman and Dragos Cimpoeas – Land Consolidation as a Factor for Successful Development of Agriculture in Moldova.
- 11.05 Rimma Glukhikh, Zvi Lerman and Moshe Schwartz – Vulnerability and Risk Management among Turkmen Leaseholders.
- 12.05 R. Glukhikh, M. Schwartz, and Z. Lerman – Turkmenistan's New Private Farmers: The Effect of Human Capital on Performance.
- 13.05 Ayal Kimhi and Hila Rekah – The Simultaneous Evolution of Farm Size and Specialization: Dynamic Panel Data Evidence from Israeli Farm Communities.
- 14.05 Jonathan Lipow and Yakir Plessner - Death (Machines) and Taxes.
- 1.06 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – Regulating Environmental Threats.
- 2.06 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel - Endogenous Recombinant Growth.
- 3.06 Yuval Dolev and Ayal Kimhi – Survival and Growth of Family Farms in Israel: 1971-1995.
- 4.06 Saul Lach, Yaacov Ritov and Avi Simhon – Longevity across Generations.
- 5.06 Anat Tchetchik, Aliza Fleischer and Israel Finkelshtain – Differentiation & Synergies in Rural Tourism: Evidence from Israel.
- 6.06 Israel Finkelshtain and Yael Kachel – The Organization of Agricultural Exports: Lessons from Reforms in Israel.
- 7.06 Zvi Lerman, David Sedik, Nikolai Pugachev and Aleksandr Goncharuk – Ukraine after 2000: A Fundamental Change in Land and Farm Policy?
- 8.06 Zvi Lerman and William R. Sutton – Productivity and Efficiency of Small and Large Farms in Moldova.
- 9.06 Bruce Gardner and Zvi Lerman – Agricultural Cooperative Enterprise in the Transition from Socialist Collective Farming.
- 10.06 Zvi Lerman and Dragos Cimpoeas - Duality of Farm Structure in Transition Agriculture: The Case of Moldova.
- 11.06 Yael Kachel and Israel Finkelshtain – Economic Analysis of Cooperation In Fish Marketing. (Hebrew)
- 12.06 Anat Tchetchik, Aliza Fleischer and Israel Finkelshtain – Rural Tourism: Development, Public Intervention and Lessons from the Israeli Experience.
- 13.06 Gregory Brock, Margarita Grazhdaninova, Zvi Lerman, and Vasilii Uzun - Technical Efficiency in Russian Agriculture.

- 14.06 Amir Heiman and Oded Lowengart - Ostrich or a Leopard – Communication Response Strategies to Post-Exposure of Negative Information about Health Hazards in Foods
 - 15.06 Ayal Kimhi and Ofir D. Rubin – Assessing the Response of Farm Households to Dairy Policy Reform in Israel.
 - 16.06 Iddo Kan, Ayal Kimhi and Zvi Lerman – Farm Output, Non-Farm Income, and Commercialization in Rural Georgia.
 - 17.06 Aliza Fleishcer and Judith Rivlin – Quality, Quantity and Time Issues in Demand for Vacations.
-
- 1.07 Joseph Gogodze, Iddo Kan and Ayal Kimhi – Land Reform and Rural Well Being in the Republic of Georgia: 1996-2003.
 - 2.07 Uri Shani, Yacov Tsur, Amos Zemel & David Zilberman – Irrigation Production Functions with Water-Capital Substitution.
 - 3.07 Masahiko Gemma and Yacov Tsur – The Stabilization Value of Groundwater and Conjunctive Water Management under Uncertainty.
 - 4.07 Ayal Kimhi – Does Land Reform in Transition Countries Increase Child Labor? Evidence from the Republic of Georgia.
 - 5.07 Larry Karp and Yacov Tsur – Climate Policy When the Distant Future Matters: Catastrophic Events with Hyperbolic Discounting.
 - 6.07 Gilad Axelrad and Eli Feinerman – Regional Planning of Wastewater Reuse for Irrigation and River Rehabilitation.
 - 7.07 Zvi Lerman – Land Reform, Farm Structure, and Agricultural Performance in CIS Countries.
 - 8.07 Ivan Stanchin and Zvi Lerman – Water in Turkmenistan.
 - 9.07 Larry Karp and Yacov Tsur – Discounting and Climate Change Policy.
 - 10.07 Xinshen Diao, Ariel Dinar, Terry Roe and Yacov Tsur – A General Equilibrium Analysis of Conjunctive Ground and Surface Water Use with an Application To Morocco.
 - 11.07 Barry K. Goodwin, Ashok K. Mishra and Ayal Kimhi – Household Time Allocation and Endogenous Farm Structure: Implications for the Design of Agricultural Policies.
 - 12.07 Iddo Kan, Arie Leizarowitz and Yacov Tsur - Dynamic-spatial management of coastal aquifers.
 - 13.07 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – Climate change policy in a growing economy under catastrophic risks.

- 14.07 Zvi Lerman and David J. Sedik – Productivity and Efficiency of Corporate and Individual Farms in Ukraine.
- 15.07 Zvi Lerman and David J. Sedik – The Role of Land Markets in Improving Rural Incomes.
- 16.07 Ayal Kimhi – Regression-Based Inequality Decomposition: A Critical Review And Application to Farm-Household Income Data.
- 17.07 Ayal Kimhi and Hila Rekah – Are Changes in Farm Size and Labor Allocation Structurally Related? Dynamic Panel Evidence from Israel.
- 18.07 Larry Karp and Yacov Tsur – Time Perspective, Discounting and Climate Change Policy.
- 1.08 Yair Mundlak, Rita Butzer and Donald F. Larson – Heterogeneous Technology and Panel Data: The Case of the Agricultural Production Function.
- 2.08 Zvi Lerman – Tajikistan: An Overview of Land and Farm Structure Reforms.
- 3.08 Dmitry Zvyagintsev, Olga Shick, Eugenia Serova and Zvi Lerman – Diversification of Rural Incomes and Non-Farm Rural Employment: Evidence from Russia.
- 4.08 Dragos Cimpoeies and Zvi Lerman – Land Policy and Farm Efficiency: The Lessons of Moldova.
- 5.08 Ayal Kimhi – Has Debt Restructuring Facilitated Structural Transformation on Israeli Family Farms?.
- 6.08 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – Endogenous Discounting and Climate Policy.
- 7.08 Zvi Lerman – Agricultural Development in Uzbekistan: The Effect of Ongoing Reforms.
- 8.08 Iddo Kan, Ofira Ayalon and Roy Federman – Economic Efficiency of Compost Production: The Case of Israel.
- 9.08 Iddo Kan, David Haim, Mickey Rapoport-Rom and Mordechai Shechter – Environmental Amenities and Optimal Agricultural Land Use: The Case of Israel.
- 10.08 Goetz, Linde, von Cramon-Taubadel, Stephan and Kachel, Yael - Measuring Price Transmission in the International Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Supply Chain: The Case of Israeli Grapefruit Exports to the EU.
- 11.08 Yuval Dolev and Ayal Kimhi – Does Farm Size Really Converge? The Role Of Unobserved Farm Efficiency.
- 12.08 Jonathan Kaminski – Changing Incentives to Sow Cotton for African Farmers: Evidence from the Burkina Faso Reform.
- 13.08 Jonathan Kaminski – Wealth, Living Standards and Perceptions in a Cotton Economy: Evidence from the Cotton Reform in Burkina Faso.

- 14.08 Arthur Fishman, Israel Finkelshtain, Avi Simhon & Nira Yacouel – The Economics of Collective Brands.
- 15.08 Zvi Lerman - Farm Debt in Transition: The Problem and Possible Solutions.
- 16.08 Zvi Lerman and David Sedik – The Economic Effects of Land Reform in Central Asia: The Case of Tajikistan.
- 17.08 Ayal Kimhi – Male Income, Female Income, and Household Income Inequality in Israel: A Decomposition Analysis
- 1.09 Yacov Tsur – On the Theory and Practice of Water Regulation.
- 2.09 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – Market Structure and the Penetration of Alternative Energy Technologies.
- 3.09 Ayal Kimhi – Entrepreneurship and Income Inequality in Southern Ethiopia.
- 4.09 Ayal Kimhi – Revitalizing and Modernizing Smallholder Agriculture for Food Security, Rural Development and Demobilization in a Post-War Country: The Case of the Aldeia Nova Project in Angola.
- 5.09 Jonathan Kaminski, Derek Headey, and Tanguy Bernard – Institutional Reform in the Burkinabe Cotton Sector and its Impacts on Incomes and Food Security: 1996-2006.
- 6.09 Yuko Arayama, Jong Moo Kim, and Ayal Kimhi – Identifying Determinants of Income Inequality in the Presence of Multiple Income Sources: The Case of Korean Farm Households.
- 7.09 Arie Leizarowitz and Yacov Tsur – Resource Management with Stochastic Recharge and Environmental Threats.
- 8.09 Ayal Kimhi - Demand for On-Farm Permanent Hired Labor in Family Holdings: A Comment.
- 9.09 Ayal Kimhi – On the Interpretation (and Misinterpretation) of Inequality Decompositions by Income Sources.
- 10.09 Ayal Kimhi – Land Reform and Farm-Household Income Inequality: The Case of Georgia.
- 11.09 Zvi Lerman and David Sedik – Agrarian Reform in Kyrgyzstan: Achievements and the Unfinished Agenda.
- 12.09 Zvi Lerman and David Sedik – Farm Debt in Transition Countries: Lessons for Tajikistan.
- 13.09 Zvi Lerman and David Sedik – Sources of Agricultural Productivity Growth in Central Asia: The Case of Tajikistan and Uzbekistan.
- 14.09 Zvi Lerman – Agricultural Recovery and Individual Land Tenure: Lessons from Central Asia.

- 15.9 Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – On the Dynamics of Competing Energy Sources.
- 16.09 Jonathan Kaminski – Contracting with Smallholders under Joint Liability.
- 1.10 Sjak Smulders, Yacov Tsur and Amos Zemel – Uncertain Climate Policy and the Green Paradox.
- 2.10 Ayal Kimhi – International Remittances, Domestic Remittances, and Income Inequality in the Dominican Republic.