

Returns to Education and Earning Inequality Nexus: A Microeconometric Analysis for Pakistan

¹Ghulam Sarwar, ²Maqbool Hussain Sial and ³Touqeer Abbas

¹Department of Business Administration, University of Sargodha, Pakistan

²Department of Economics, University of Sargodha, Pakistan

³Punjab Group Colleges, Johrabad, Pakistan

Submitted: Jul 18, 2013; **Accepted:** Aug 28, 2013; **Published:** Aug 29, 2013

Abstract: This study intends to shed light on the nexus between returns to education and earning inequality in Pakistan. For this purpose, the study utilizes two estimation methods namely ordinary least square and quantile regression method to demonstrate how returns to different level of education contribute towards earning inequality. The results show that education plays a significant role in determination of within group earning inequality at all level of education. Within group earning inequality is higher within the individuals having tertiary education as compared to the individuals having secondary and primary education. Inter-temporal analysis shows that the earning inequality does not remain constant within the education groups during 2005-07. Moreover, education also causes earning inequality between educational groups. The findings of the study reveal that education has a positive effect on within as well as between groups earning inequality.

JEL Classification: C21, D31, I24, J31

Key words: Returns to education • Earnings distribution • Quantile regression • Labor market

INTRODUCTION

Distribution of earnings has long been an area of interest among the economists. Initially, concentration was focused on relationship between earnings inequality and economic development. The most important idea on this relationship was established by [1]. Since the work of Kuznets, there has been an interest in understanding the determinants of distribution of earnings. The current literature on inequality underlines education as a contributing factor towards earning inequality [2-4]. Human capital model illustrates that level and distribution of education determines earning distribution of a society [5].

The contemporary research on returns to education has exposed that there exists a relationship between returns to education and earnings inequality [6-8]. They have taken into account the heterogeneity in earnings due to education. To provide the evidence on whether education is a contributing factor towards earning inequality or not, they provide a distributional analysis of earnings of educated workers. In doing so, they utilize quantile regression to understand that

whether returns to education for individuals at upper tail of earning distribution are different from returns to education for those who are at lower tail of earning distribution with same level of education. If there is a difference then it is concluded that earning inequality is present due to education. The presence of such differences in returns to education has obvious implication for the labor market.

The main objective of this study is to examine relationship between returns to education and earning inequality in Pakistan. The present study contributes to the existing literature on earning inequality by analyzing the returns to different levels of education as a source of earning inequality. To this end, earning distribution is characterized by using two methods namely ordinary least squares (OLS) and quantile regression methods. OLS method assumes that the marginal effect of education on earnings is constant over the earning distribution. Therefore, the effect of an extra year of education can be represented by a right word shift of the conditional earning distribution. On other hand, quantile regression method measures effect of education on earnings at

different parts of the distribution. As a result, it can describe changes not only in the location but also in the shape of the earning distribution. By combining the two methods, we attempt to measure the effect of education on earnings inequality within and between groups. That is, OLS returns measure the difference between education groups, while differences in quantile returns show the earning differences between individuals having the same level of education but are located at different quantile.

The layout of study is as follows: section 2 provides a brief review of literature on subject matter of the study. The empirical specification of earning function based on quantile regression is presented in section 3. Results and discussion are given in section 4. Finally in section 5, concluding remarks are provided.

Literature Review: The most referred study in context of quantile regression is [9]. They estimated earning functions for Portugal over the period 1982-94. The most important focus of study was the evaluation of returns to education and their relation in increasing earning inequality. Returns to secondary and college education increased at all quantiles of the earning distribution during the period under study. The difference in returns at upper and lower quantiles had widened. The results suggested that earning inequality due to education had increased during the period.

Changes in returns to education over the period 1982-92 for Portugal was examined by [10]. Estimates of quantile regression model revealed that the impact of education was not same across the conditional earnings distribution. The findings indicated that the returns to different level of education have increased.

[11] found the relation of schooling and wage inequality for the period 1994-2001 in Spain. They found that higher education was related with higher wage inequality.

[12] estimated returns to education in urban Argentina for period 1992-2002. The results showed that men at higher quantiles had higher returns to education compared to those at the lower quantiles. For women returns were highest at the lowest quantiles. Moreover, the returns to education had increased during the period under study.

Quantile Regression Model: Quantile regression model can be written as follows:

$$y_i = x_i' \beta_\theta + u_{\theta i}$$

$$\text{with } Quant_\theta(y_i | x_i) = x_i' \beta_\theta$$

where x is the vector of explanatory variables and β is the vector of parameters and u_θ is random error term. $Quant_\theta(y_i | x_i)$ denotes the θ^{th} conditional quantile of y given x . It is assumed that. In addition, it is also assumed that above model is correctly specified and y_i and x_i are observed with no errors. The θ^{th} quantile regression, $0 < \theta < 1$, is defined as a solution to the problem:

$$\min \left[\sum_{i:Lnw_i \geq x_i \beta} \theta |Lnw_i - x_i \beta_\theta| + \sum_{i:Lnw_i < x_i \beta} (1-\theta) |Lnw_i - x_i \beta_\theta| \right]$$

By variation of θ , any quantile of the conditional distribution of y can be obtained. We use β_θ instead of β to make clear that different values of θ give different values of β . This problem has no explicit form of solution. For the minimization of problem, linear programming techniques are utilized to solve the problem by using complete sample. Robust standard errors of vector of coefficients are obtained by using bootstrapping procedure.

Empirical Specification of Model: Following [13], the quantile regression earning function can be written as follows:

$$Lnw_i = x_i \beta_\theta + u_{\theta i}$$

$$\text{with } Quant_\theta(Lnw_i | x_i) = x_i \beta_\theta$$

To examine effect of different levels of education on earning, we estimate the extended Mincerian earning function. The empirical earning function is specified as follows:

$$Lnw_i = \alpha + \beta_{\theta 1} primary + \beta_{\theta 2} secondary + \beta_{\theta 3} tertiary + \sum_i \delta_{\theta i} Z_i + u_{\theta i}$$

where, θ is quantile being analyzed, LnW is the natural log of monthly earnings for the i th individual. Primary, secondary and tertiary refer to dummy variables for primary, secondary and tertiary education. These variables are defined as follows:

$$Primary = \begin{cases} x, 0 \leq x \leq 5 \\ 5, x > 5 \end{cases}, Secondary = \begin{cases} 0, x \leq 5 \\ x - 5, 5 < x \leq 12 \\ 7, x > 12 \end{cases}, Tertiary = \begin{cases} 0, x < 12 \\ x - 12, x \geq 12 \end{cases}$$

where, x is completed years of schooling of the individuals. Primary is equal to 1 if individual has education from 1 to 5 years of schooling and zero otherwise. Secondary is equal to 1 if individual has education from 6 to 12 years of schooling and zero otherwise while tertiary is equal to 1 if individual has education higher than 12 years of schooling (or higher than secondary education) and zero otherwise. No education is omitted category here. Z includes labor market experience, square of labor market experience, dummies for gender, marital status, region of residence, occupation and province of residence. The above specified earning model is estimated at nine deciles of conditional earnings distribution. The standard errors of estimates are obtained by bootstrapping with 100 repetitions. In addition to quantile estimations, we also perform OLS regression.

The study uses Pakistan Social and Living Standards Measurement (PSLM) Survey data for the period 2005-06 and 2007-08. Keeping in the view the standard definition of labor force, only individuals ranging from age 15 to 65 are kept in the samples.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The specified earning function has been estimated at nine deciles for each of the two years. Only coefficients of primary, secondary and tertiary dummies in the earning function and their respective t-statistics are presented in Table 1. These results show that effect of each level of education on earnings is positive and statistically significant at each of the deciles analyzed for both of the years. Returns to each level of education are not equal at each decile. In other words, each level of education has a different effect on earnings across earning distribution.

It reveals that effect of each level of education on earning increases as we move from lower to upper quantiles of the earnings distribution. It implies that there is heterogeneity in returns to each level of education. However, this heterogeneity in returns for primary and secondary education is less as compared to tertiary education. The results show that effect of education at upper tail of earning distribution is higher than at the lower tail of earning distribution in the two years. Therefore, we can conclude that education is a factor which promotes within group earning inequality.

Changes in the returns to education for different levels of education over time can also be observed from the table. For primary education, there is an increase in returns at all deciles during 2005-07. The returns to secondary education have increased at almost all deciles except at 0.1 decile during the period under study. For the period 2005-07, returns to tertiary education are higher in 2007 than in 2005 until 0.3 decile while returns are identical at median of the distribution in 2005 and 2007. However, higher returns are obvious after 0.6 deciles in 2005 over 2007. This implies that returns to tertiary education have decreased at upper part of the earning distribution during 2005-07. This may be attributed to increase in supply of university graduates in labor market during this period. These results follow the findings of studies of [10-12] and [14-17].

Furthermore, in both the years, returns to education are convex that is, effect of education on earnings tends to increase as the level of education increases. These returns are higher for tertiary education as compared to primary and secondary levels across all quantiles of earnings distribution. The pattern of higher returns as level of education becomes higher is also obvious by the OLS results. This confirms that education also causes earning inequality between different education groups.

Table 1: Estimated Coefficients on Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Education Dummies for 2005-06 and 2007-08

Deciles	Primary		Secondary		Tertiary	
	2005	2007	2005	2007	2005	2007
$\theta=0.1$	0.133* (5.27)	0.147* (5.46)	0.384* (13.12)	0.379* (18.75)	0.800* (21.45)	0.802* (23.46)
$\theta=0.2$	0.135* (9.30)	0.172* (9.74)	0.364* (18.05)	0.423* (28.78)	0.830* (29.43)	0.855* (34.16)
$\theta=0.3$	0.151* (11.02)	0.188* (12.70)	0.390* (23.33)	0.442* (35.95)	0.860* (35.54)	0.858* (46.12)
$\theta=0.4$	0.151* (12.15)	0.191* (12.05)	0.397* (26.90)	0.452* (41.12)	0.895* (30.10)	0.875* (41.70)
$\theta=0.5$	0.165* (15.32)	0.209* (16.33)	0.423* (31.15)	0.471* (46.56)	0.920* (35.82)	0.924* (49.57)
$\theta=0.6$	0.187* (17.04)	0.222* (13.85)	0.454* (39.88)	0.492* (40.71)	0.983* (43.89)	0.978* (50.18)
$\theta=0.7$	0.194* (17.74)	0.221* (16.08)	0.485* (34.33)	0.507* (47.61)	1.030* (30.97)	1.014* (36.21)
$\theta=0.8$	0.192* (12.46)	0.235* (14.12)	0.519* (31.98)	0.542* (35.52)	1.087* (37.41)	1.073* (41.04)
$\theta=0.9$	0.219* (13.79)	0.257* (12.47)	0.600* (19.84)	0.564* (25.37)	1.220* (30.17)	1.142* (29.76)
OLS	0.175* (12.74)	0.220* (16.74)	0.466* (35.75)	0.519* (42.36)	0.996* (46.20)	1.014* (49.53)

Note: t-statistics are in parentheses; * significant at 1%

CONCLUSION

The study analyzes the role of education in raising earning inequality in Pakistan over the period 2005-07. This issue has not received much attention so far in the literature on earning inequality. By employing quantile regression method, the results show that the effect of each level of education at upper tail of earning distribution is higher than at lower tail of earning distribution. Moreover, returns to education for different levels of education have changed during the period under study. Based on the econometric findings, we conclude that education is a factor which promotes within group earning inequality. In addition, returns to education are convex which confirm that education also causes earning inequality between educational groups.

The findings of study unveils that goal of fair income distribution through education is conflicting, that is, it rings alarm bells for policy design which based on the ground that investing in education reduces earnings inequality. Moreover, these findings have obvious implication for labor market of Pakistan.

REFERENCES

1. Kuznets, S., 1955. Economic Growth and Income Inequality. *The American Economic Review*, 45: 1-28.
2. Checchi, D., 2003. Inequality in Incomes and Access to Education: A Cross-country analysis (1960-95). *Labour*, 17: 153-201.
3. De Gregorio, J. and J. Lee, 2002. Education and Income Distribution: New Evidence from Cross-country Data. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 48: 395-416.
4. Sylwester, K., 2002. Can Education Expenditures Reduce Income Inequality?. *Economics of Education Review*, 21: 43-52.
5. Becker, G.S., 1993. *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
6. Buchinsky, M., 1994. Changes in the US Wage Structure 1963-1987: Application of Quantile Regression. *Econometrica*, 62: 405-458.
7. Machado, J. A. and J. Mata, 2001. Earning Functions in Portugal 1982-1994: Evidence from Quantile Regressions. *Empirical Economics*, 26: 115-134.
8. Fersterer, J. and R. Winter-Ebmer, 2003. Are Austrian Returns to Education Falling Over Time?. *Labour Economics*, 10: 73-89.
9. Machado, J.A. and J. Mata, 2001. Earning Functions in Portugal 1982-1994: Evidence from Quantile Regressions. *Empirical Economics*, 26: 115-134.
10. Hartog, J., P.T. Pereira and A.C. Vieira, 2001. Changing Returns to Education in Portugal During the 1980s and Early 1990s: OLS and Quantile Regression Estimators. *Applied Economics*, 33: 1021-1037.
11. Budría, S. and A.M. Egido, 2005. Education, Educational Mismatch and Wage Inequality: Evidence for Spain. Working Paper No. 06, University of Madeira.
12. Fiszbein, A. and H. Patrinos, 2005. Estimating the Returns to Education in Argentina: 1992-2002. Working Paper No. 3715, World Bank.
13. Buchinsky, M., 1998. The Dynamic of Changes in the Female Wage Distribution in the US: A Quantile Regression Approach. *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 13: 1-30.
14. Stefani, P. and C. Biderman, 2006. Returns to Education and Wage Differentials in Brazil: A Quantile Approach. *Economics Bulletin*, 9: 1-6.
15. Bargain, O., S.K. Bhaumik, M. Chakrabarty and Z. Zhao, 2009. Earnings Differences between Chinese and Indian Wage Earners, 1987-2004. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 55: 562-587.
16. Budría, S., 2010. Schooling and the Distribution of Wages in the European Private and Public Sectors. *Applied Economics*, 42(8): 1045-1054.
17. Mwabu, G. and T.P. Schultz, 1996. Education Returns across Quantiles of the Wage Function: Alternative Explanations for Returns to Education by Race in South Africa. *American Economic Review*, 86: 335-339.