

OCTOBER 2019

Working Paper 165

Does Economic Globalisation Affect Income Inequality? A Meta-analysis

Philipp Heimberger



The Vienna Institute for International Economic Studies
Wiener Institut für Internationale Wirtschaftsvergleiche

Abstract

A large volume of econometric literature has studied the impact of economic globalisation on income inequality around the world. However, reported econometric estimates vary substantially which makes it difficult to draw valid conclusions. This paper presents a quantitative summary and analysis of existing estimates regarding the globalisation-inequality relationship. We used a new data set consisting of 1254 observations from 123 peer-reviewed papers. By applying meta-analysis and meta-regression methods, we obtained several main findings. First, globalisation has a (small-to-moderate) positive impact on income inequality considering the total population of estimates. The average effect is robustly different from zero suggesting that globalisation increases income inequality. Second, while the effect of trade globalisation is small, financial globalisation shows a more sizable and significantly stronger inequality-increasing impact. Third, the cumulative evidence rejects theoretical accounts according to which economic globalisation reduces within-country income inequality in developing countries as the meta-analysis establishes an average inequality-increasing impact in both advanced and developing countries. Fourth, education and technology moderate the impact of globalisation on income inequality. Fifth, we tested for various other factors that could cause heterogeneity in the reported estimates including differences in the econometric specifications, the income inequality measures and data set used and publication characteristics.

Keywords: Globalisation, trade openness, financial openness, income inequality, meta-analysis

JEL classification: D31, F6, O15

CONTENTS

1.	Introduction	1
2.	Theoretical background: The globalisation-inequality relationship	3
2.1.	Defining and measuring globalisation	3
2.2.	Theoretical views on how globalisation affects income inequality	4
3.	Meta-analysis: Data and summary results	6
3.1.	Meta-analysis data	6
3.2.	Summary statistics	7
4.	Meta-regression analysis	11
4.1.	Multivariate meta-regression results	14
4.2.	Publication selection bias	17
5.	Conclusions	20
	References	21
	Appendix A1	25
1.	Distinguishing trade globalisation, financial globalisation and overall economic globalisation	25
2.	Studies included in the meta-analysis	27
	References (the studies included in the meta-analysis)	28
	Appendix A2	34

TABLES AND FIGURES

Table 1 / Published globalisation-inequality effects (123 studies, 1254 estimates)	8
Table 2 / Variables used in the meta-regression analysis.....	13
Table 3 / Multivariate regression results (general-to-specific models)	16
Table 4 / Results: Testing for publication selection bias	19

Figure 1 / Kernel density estimates of the distribution of partial correlations	9
Figure 2 / Funnel plot regarding publication selection bias	18

Appendix

Appendix Table A 1 / Types of economic globalization indicators	25
Appendix Table A 2 / Published papers included in the meta-analysis (n=123)	27

1. Introduction

One of the most fundamental and robust trends since the 1980s has been the rise in within-country income inequality, which has been observed in both advanced as well as in developing countries (e.g. OECD 2015; Alvaredo et al. 2018). Several explanations have been put forward to explain rising income inequality. One of these explanations concerns economic globalisation: over recent decades, questions about how increasing market integration in the areas of international trade and finance have affected income inequality around the world have been at the centre of social science controversies. Several qualitative reviews show that academic scholars have contributed to a rapidly growing literature (e.g. Burtless 1995; Ravallion 2003; Winters et al. 2004; Anderson 2005; Demirguc-Kunt and Levine 2009; Mills 2009; Nissanke and Thorbecke 2010; Harrison et al. 2011; de Haan and Sturm 2017).

There seems to be a consensus among many analysts and observers that globalisation and income inequality have at least *some* type of relationship. However, despite a wave of research, the magnitude of the relationship between globalisation and inequality remains unclear. On a theoretical level, large parts of the extant literature concerned with the impact of trade globalisation on income inequality are framed as a test of the well-known Stolper-Samuelson theorem which predicts that increasing international trade integration reduces within-country income inequality in developing countries while it increases inequality in advanced countries (Stolper and Samuelson 1941). On an empirical level, however, the literature has not provided a general conclusion regarding the effect of trade globalisation: while several papers find (partial) empirical support for the Stolper-Samuelson theorem (e.g. Robertson 2004; Chiquiar 2008; Roser and Crespo Cuaresma 2016), others reject it based on econometric hypothesis tests (e.g. Goldberg and Pavcnik 2007; Meschi and Vivarelli 2009; Han et al. 2012). Researchers have also extensively theorised regarding the impact of financial globalisation on income inequality in both advanced and developing countries, however, reported econometric findings point to contradictory conclusions (e.g. Hamori and Hashiguchi 2012; Jaumotte et al. 2013; Asteriou et al. 2014). Furthermore, several scholars have voiced skepticism about the hypothesis that globalisation has had a sizeable impact on income inequality since domestic politics and institutions as well as other factors (such as technology, education or macroeconomic factors) may be seen to be much more important for explaining changes in inequality (e.g. Mahler et al. 1999; Pontusson et al. 2002; Abdullah et al. 2015; Huber et al. 2017). To sum up, the extant literature has not been able to present convincing econometric evidence to resolve conflicting theoretical arguments. Relevant studies often differ markedly based on the structure of the data and the details of the econometric specification. Considering the wide range of estimates reported in the literature, it is therefore quite challenging to undertake generalisations based on traditional literature reviews: in fact, qualitative reviews may lead to problematic conclusions due to 'casual methodological speculation' (Stanley 2001, p. 145).

This article contributes to the literature by presenting the first quantitative literature review of the impact of economic globalisation on income inequality. The paper aims to answer two research questions. First, what does the empirical evidence in all peer-reviewed published studies tell us about the effect of globalisation on income inequality? To provide answers to this first research question, we use meta-analysis tools (e.g. Stanley and Doucouliagos 2012) consisting of a comprehensive survey and

quantitative analysis of the relevant econometric estimates on the globalisation-inequality relationship (see section 3). The second research question is: what factors contribute to explaining the variation in the reported results on the globalisation-inequality relationship? To address this second question, we use meta-regression methods (e.g. Schmidt and Hunter 2014) that allow us to test for the impact of various factors that may cause heterogeneity in the reported globalisation-inequality results including the data set, econometric specification, estimation details and publication characteristics (see Section 4).

2. Theoretical background: The globalisation-inequality relationship

This section focuses on two main issues that are of central importance for conducting the quantitative literature review on how globalisation affects income inequality. First, we provide a discussion on how to define and measure the concept of economic globalisation. Second, we present a brief outline of important theoretical arguments on how globalisation may have an effect on income inequality.

2.1. DEFINING AND MEASURING GLOBALISATION

This paper limits the analysis to the economic dimension of globalisation capturing trade and financial openness. Although we focus only on 'economic globalisation', for the sake of simplicity we will generally refer to it as 'globalisation'. Brady et al. (2005) conceptualise economic globalisation as 'the intensification of international economic exchange and the label for the contemporary era of international economic integration. Thus, [economic] globalisation involves the current economic environment shaping welfare states and the heightening of concrete economic exchanges between countries.' (Brady et al. 2005, p. 922) The concept of 'economic globalisation' used in this paper is much narrower than (overall) 'globalisation', as the latter is a multifaceted concept that captures several aspects in the economic, political and social dimensions that go far beyond indicators that are typically used to capture trade openness or capital flows across borders (e.g. Dreher et al. 2008; Scholte 2008).

Narrowing the focus to the economic dimension of globalisation allows us to follow established typologies of economic globalisation indicators. These typologies regularly distinguish different dimensions of international market integration: trade globalisation, financial globalisation and overall economic globalisation, where measures of the latter combine the dimensions of trade and financial globalisation (e.g. Gräbner et al. 2018; Gygli et al. 2019). By far the most prominent trade globalisation indicator is trade openness which is typically measured as the sum of imports and exports in percent of GDP although there are also numerous other trade openness indicators (e.g. de jure measures of trade based on tariff rates). In the dimension of financial globalisation, researchers have used measures such as FDI flows and indices for capital account liberalisation. Furthermore, the KOF index of globalisation has emerged as the most popular overall economic globalisation index (Dreher 2006; Potrafke 2015). Gräbner et al. (2018) provide a comprehensive review of economic globalisation indicators used in previous empirical work. The meta-data coding used in this paper follows the typologies of relevant economic globalisation indicators provided in Gräbner et al. (2018) along the dimensions of trade globalisation, financial globalisation and overall economic globalisation measures. Appendix A1 includes a more detailed classification of the globalisation indicators that we used for the coding in the dimensions of trade and financial globalisation.

2.2. THEORETICAL VIEWS ON HOW GLOBALISATION AFFECTS INCOME INEQUALITY

This section does not provide a comprehensive review of the theoretical literature regarding the links between economic globalisation and income inequality; excellent review papers are abundant (e.g. Burtless 1995; Ravallion 2003; Winters et al. 2004; Anderson 2005; Mills 2009; Demircuc-Kunt and Levine 2009; Nissanke and Thorbecke 2010; Harrison et al. 2011; de Haan and Sturm 2017). We restrict the exposition to selected theoretical arguments regarding the impact of trade globalisation and financial globalisation on income inequality. In so doing, we focus on those theoretical links that have guided large parts of the literature using econometric hypothesis tests to estimate the effect of globalisation on income inequality in advanced and developing countries. Notably, existing typologies of economic globalisation indicators point out that trade openness and financial openness indeed capture different dimensions of economic globalisation (Gräbner et al. 2018; Gygli et al. 2019). As trade globalisation and financial globalisation may not have the same impact on income inequality (e.g. Feenstra and Hanson 1997; Figini and Görg 2011; Gozgor and Ranjan 2017), we discuss them separately in this section and subsequently also account for different economic globalisation dimensions in the meta-analysis.

As one of the central results of the standard Heckscher-Ohlin trade model, the Stolper-Samuelson theorem predicts that economic globalisation will narrow income disparities within developing countries (Stolper and Samuelson 1941). Trade openness will benefit a country's relatively abundant production factor because trade specialisation typically favours sectors that are intensive in the abundant factor. Compared with the rest of the world, developing countries typically have a comparative advantage in the relatively abundant factor of unskilled labour. Therefore, according to the Stolper-Samuelson theorem, international trade will increase demand for unskilled workers in developing countries which will push up their real wages and lead to a decrease in within-country income inequality. For advanced countries, the prediction is the opposite, as trade openness will increase income inequality by raising the real return to abundant skilled labour and by lowering the real rate of return to relatively scarce unskilled labour. Notably, the assumptions on which these theoretical predictions are based can only be described as very restrictive; several authors have extended the theorem beyond the assumptions on which it was originally based (e.g. Deardorff and Stern 1994; Beaulieu et al. 2011). Discussions in the literature regarding the impact of globalisation have certainly been much broader; for example, offshoring has been built into Heckscher-Ohler-Samuelson-type models (e.g. Arndt and Kierzkowski 2001) and such additional assumptions can lead to different model predictions. Nevertheless, the predictions of the original Stolper-Samuelson theorem have provided important guidance for setting up hypothesis tests in large parts of the econometric globalisation-inequality literature for advanced and developing countries (e.g. Milanovic 2005; Goldberg and Pavcnik 2007; Bigsten and Munshi 2014).

Moving from the dimension of trade globalisation to that of financial globalisation, a standard theoretical view is that increased financial openness can be expected to improve the allocation of funds. The protection of the domestic financial system can lead to credit constraints for households with relatively low incomes and unleashing these constraints will disproportionately benefit the incomes of poorer households (e.g. Aghion and Bolton 1997). In this view, the attraction of foreign capital allows countries to consume more than they produce and to invest more than they save which will boost economic growth, raise the incomes of the poor and reduce income inequality, especially in developing countries (e.g. Nafziger 1997; Beck et al. 2007). However, other theoretical accounts emphasise that the distributional effect of financial openness may depend on the level of economic development. At earlier

development stages, only households higher up the income distribution level are able to access and benefit from financial openness. At higher levels of economic development, many households access financial markets so that financial openness directly helps larger parts of society (Greenwood and Jovanovic 1990). Furthermore, it has been pointed out that the quality of political institutions may condition the impact of increased financial openness on income inequality (Rajan and Zingales 2003; Delis et al. 2014). The theoretical predictions regarding the effect of financial globalisation on income inequality are, therefore, not clear-cut; however, the standard view has mostly emphasised the potential of financial openness for a reduction in inequality: by routinely referring to the prediction that increased financial openness will support economic development and lift incomes of poorer households, international institutions pushed for capital account liberalisation in large parts of the developing world (e.g. Chang 2002; Rodrik 2007).

A different strand of literature is sceptical about theoretical claims that globalisation strongly affects income inequality – no matter in which direction. This skepticism mostly rests on theoretical arguments according to which other factors are more important determinants of income inequality. A comprehensive survey would be beyond the scope of this paper but additional explanatory factors for explaining income inequality that feature prominently in the literature include education (e.g. Abdullah et al. 2015), skill-biased technological change (e.g. Card and diNardo 2002), the structure of the political system (e.g. Reuveny and Li 2003), labour market institutions (e.g. Checchi and Garcia-Penalosa 2008), government spending (e.g. Rudra 2004) and macroeconomic factors (e.g. Li and Zou 2002).

Numerous papers have tried to test theories of how globalisation affects income inequality – with inconclusive results (e.g. Mills 2009; Harrison et al. 2011; de Haan and Sturm 2017). So far, academic research has not made the effort of systematically synthesising and exploring all the peer-reviewed published estimates on the globalisation-inequality relationship. This paper aims to close this gap in the literature by using meta-analysis and meta-regression methods. Meta-analysis is about identifying and calculating the effect size of globalisation on income inequality while meta-regression aims to uncover sources of heterogeneity in the reported globalisation-inequality estimates (e.g. Stanley and Doucouliagos 2012; Schmidt and Hunter 2014). One part of the value added of this paper is that applying the relevant methods allows us to explore whether there is a genuine effect consistent with standard theoretical predictions of how globalisation affects income inequality or whether there is indeed evidence for an inconclusive relationship. The other part of the value added involves new insights into the sources of heterogeneity in the published globalisation-inequality results, as we are able to provide (partial) answers to the question as to why the reported estimates are characterised by substantial variation.

3. Meta-analysis: Data and summary results

This section addresses the research question: what does the existing evidence tell us about the average effect of globalisation on income inequality? By providing a meta-analysis, we shed new light on the debate about whether the globalisation-inequality relationship is negative, positive or inconclusive. Section 3.1 discusses our data set in the context of the literature search and data collection process. Section 3.2 presents summary statistics which allow us to provide an overview of the research record on the impact of globalisation on income inequality.

3.1. META-ANALYSIS DATA

The systematic search and review of the literature for this paper began by tracking down all the relevant academic papers on the relationship between globalisation and income inequality. By doing so, we included papers from a variety of fields, most prominently economics, sociology and political science. To search for papers, we first used (i) Google Scholar, (ii) the EconLit database and (iii) the Scopus database. We used the following keywords in the search process: 'globalisation + income inequality'; 'openness + income inequality'¹ (we also substituted 'income inequality' with 'income distribution'). Furthermore, we followed up on references cited in empirical studies and reviews of this literature by screening the reference lists. The criteria for inclusion are as follows:

- a) *Income inequality as the dependent variable and globalisation as an explanatory variable*: As a condition for being included in our data set, papers used a measure of income inequality as the dependent variable and at least one measure of economic globalisation as an explanatory variable. In other words, studies had to report results from some variant of the following generic econometric model (note that we ignore subscripts for the purpose of simplification):

$$INEQ = \alpha + \beta_1 ECONGLOBAL + \beta_x Z_x + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

where INEQ is a measure of income inequality (see Section 4 on how we distinguish between different inequality measures), ECONGLOBAL is a measure of economic globalisation, Z is a vector of other explanatory variables, and ε is the error term. For example, papers that used globalisation measures that do not exclusively consider the dimension of economic globalisation but a hybrid measure with political and/or social dimensions had to be excluded (e.g. Huang et al. 2016). Likewise, we did not include studies that focussed on the impact of globalisation on regional inequality (e.g. Ma 2006) or other non-relevant inequality measures as the dependent variable.

- b) *Reported econometric estimates*: Only those empirical studies that presented regression results were considered. This restriction excluded numerous papers that reported descriptive statistics only (e.g. Robertson 2000).

¹ We also used the American English version ('Globalization') in the search process.

- c) *Published in peer-reviewed journals*: We excluded other works on the globalisation-inequality nexus (e.g. working papers, book chapters, etc.). First, peer-reviewed journal publications can be considered to have passed a certain 'quality' check by referees. Second, it is challenging to track down all potentially relevant book chapters and other non-peer-reviewed documents that touch upon the globalisation-inequality relationship. Therefore, the restriction on peer-reviewed journal papers contributed to ensuring that the coding process remained transparent and manageable.
- d) *Offered relevant statistics*: In order to be included, a paper had to fulfill certain reporting standards: the requirement was that the paper must have offered statistics (e.g. correlation coefficients and standard errors or t-statistics) from which standardised measures of the impact of globalisation on inequality could be calculated.
- e) *English language and publication date*: Finally, the considered papers had to be written in English and published prior to February 2019.

123 papers met these criteria, and they reported a total of 1254 comparable estimates which were included in the meta-analysis data set. In the accompanying Appendix A1, we provide a table listing all the 123 studies that were included. The estimates that were compiled from these studies are the total population of the published peer-reviewed econometric estimates on the impact of globalisation on income inequality.²

3.2. SUMMARY STATISTICS

To illustrate the magnitude of the effect of globalisation on income inequality, we calculate the average effect based on all the compiled estimates from the published globalisation-inequality literature; furthermore, we construct 95% confidence intervals around the calculated average (e.g. Schmidt and Hunter 2014). The partial correlation is used to standardise the effect size across studies, which allows the estimates to be made comparable. In our case, partial correlations measure the impact of globalisation on income inequality while holding other factors constant and they can be directly calculated from the regression results reported in the relevant papers. There are two big advantages of the partial correlation coefficient: first, partial correlation coefficients can be meaningfully compared across papers because they are based on a unitless measure bounded between -1 and 1. Second, they can be calculated for a much larger set of estimates than other measures of effect size. The partial correlation coefficient can be calculated based on this formula:

$$r = \frac{t}{\sqrt{t^2 + df}} \quad (2)$$

where t is the t-statistic of the relevant regression coefficient and df denotes the degrees of freedom of this t-statistic (Stanley and Doucouliagos 2012, p. 25). It is common practice to weight the partial correlations by a 'quality' indicator which we will do here by using the precision of the estimate (calculated as the inverse of the corresponding standard error).³ By including all globalisation-inequality

² A list of papers that were excluded from the meta-analysis because they did not meet at least one of the criteria for inclusion is available in Appendix A2.

³ The standard error of the partial correlation coefficient (ser) is given by: $ser = \sqrt{\frac{1-r^2}{df}}$, where r is the partial correlation coefficient and df denotes the degrees of freedom.

studies that were published in peer-reviewed journals and by using precision-weights, the average globalisation-inequality estimate derived from the meta-analysis is arguably the best estimate of the existing econometric literature on the effect of globalisation on income inequality.

Formally, the weighted average partial correlation is given by:

$$wr = \frac{\sum [P_{ij}r_{ij}]}{\sum [P_{ij}]} \quad (3)$$

where r is the partial correlation coefficient as in Equation (2) from the i^{th} regression estimate of the j^{th} study, and P is the associated precision, i.e. the inverse of the variances. We use the weighted partial correlation coefficient to answer two questions. First, is the average impact of globalisation on income inequality positive, negative or inconclusive? Second, is the effect small or large? According to the guidelines derived by Doucouliagos (2011), a partial correlation can be considered to be small if its absolute value is less than 0.07 while 0.17 is considered to be moderate and 0.33 is large.

Table 1 / Published globalisation-inequality effects (123 studies, 1254 estimates)

	All estimates	Excluding top and bottom 10%	Trade Globalisation	Financial Globalisation	Overall Economic Globalisation
Statistic					
Observations					
Number of estimates	1254	1005	732	473	49
Averages					
Median	0.089	0.074	0.041	0.136	0.108
Unweighted average	0.083	0.067	0.046	0.140	0.083
Precision-weighted average	0.074	0.061	0.045	0.123	0.124
Weighted average (RE)	0.086	0.067	0.048	0.141	0.110
Weighted average (FE)	0.079	0.036	0.078	0.114	0.123
Weighted average (HS)	0.079	0.067	0.043	0.137	0.119
Intervals					
95% Confidence	+0.072	+0.058	+0.031	+0.120	+0.044
Interval (RE)	+0.099	+0.075	+0.065	+0.162	+0.177
95% Confidence	+0.072	+0.059	+0.034	+0.120	+0.075
Interval (HS)	+0.085	+0.075	+0.051	+0.154	+0.163

Notes: RE - Random Effects; FE - Fixed effects; HS - Hunter-Schmidt (2014). We used the inverse of the variances as precision-weights.


Table 1 shows summary results for the meta-analysis data by reporting the median, unweighted and precision-weighted average of globalisation-inequality partial correlations. Furthermore, we report results from estimating a Random Effects Model and Fixed Effects Model.⁴ We also included two sets of confidence intervals. Column (1) of Table 1 reports the results for the whole set of estimates ($n=1254$). The results show that, on average, the impact of economic globalisation on income inequality is positive, i.e. globalisation increases income inequality. Based on the guideline in Doucouliagos (2011), a partial correlation should be considered to be small if its absolute value is less than 0.07. The precision-weighted average of the globalisation-inequality effect is 0.074 and the estimates based on the fixed

⁴ In Table 1, both the random effects models and the fixed effects models were specified without moderator variables, where the latter will be introduced in Section 4.

effects and random effects models only deviate slightly. Considering the total population of estimates, we therefore find evidence for a small-to-moderate positive impact of globalisation on income inequality. Notably, the possibility of a negative average partial correlation is ruled out by the reported 95% confidence intervals. The meta-analysis results in Table 1, therefore, allow us to reject the hypothesis that economic globalisation reduces income inequality, which would have required us to find negative average partial correlation coefficients.

As a first sensitivity check, Column (2) of Table 1 repeats the summary meta-analysis after removing the 10% of the smallest and highest partial correlation estimates. The results in Column (2) are not smaller, but in substance similar to those in Column (1), which suggests that outliers on the high and low end of the distribution of partial correlation coefficients do not markedly affect the results. Noticeably, the confidence intervals still clearly reject a negative average effect of globalisation on income inequality. Column (3) looks at only those estimates that have used a trade globalisation variable as the relevant regressor. We find that the precision-weighted mean average partial correlation of trade globalisation (0.045) is substantially smaller than in Column (1), which included all estimates. Column (4) considers only those estimates that use a financial globalisation variable as the regressor. Notably, the precision-weighted average for financial globalisation estimates of 0.123 in Column (4) is more than two and a half times larger than in Column (3). Finally, Column (5) includes estimates based on overall economic globalisation measures. Here, we again find a small-to-moderate positive weighted partial correlation (0.124). Overall, the summary statistics point to the preliminary result that when we look at subsets of our estimates, we find evidence that the magnitude of the impact of trade globalisation on income inequality is markedly smaller than the impact of globalisation measures that include the financial dimension. The meta-regression analysis in Section 4 will conduct additional hypothesis tests on this meta-analysis finding.

Figure 1 / Kernel density estimates of the distribution of partial correlations



Notes: The figure plots the kernel density estimates of the partial correlations.

Figure 1 shows the distribution of globalisation-inequality partial correlations in our meta-analysis data set. It can be seen that a range of estimates is reported, including positive, negative and close-to-zero

partial correlations with the vast majority of estimates within the interval of -0.3 and 0.4. The minimum partial correlation coefficient is -0.82 and the maximum is 0.94; the standard deviation is 0.25. While the unweighted mean (0.07) and median (0.09) are positive and of small-to-moderate magnitudes, Figure 1 reveals that there is clearly considerable dispersion in the results. Additionally, we conducted Cochran's Q-Test (e.g. Cooper and Hedges 1994), which provides clear evidence that there is excess heterogeneity in the results beyond what could be expected by measured random sampling ($p < 0.0001$).

4. Meta-regression analysis

This section addresses the question: what factors explain the heterogeneity in the reported results on the globalisation-inequality nexus? The last section presented estimates according to which the reported results on the globalisation-inequality relationship show more variation than could be expected by measured sampling error. Hence, we continue by identifying likely sources of heterogeneity.

In line with standard techniques for meta-regression analysis (e.g. Stanley and Doucouliagos 2012), we make the assumption that the i^{th} estimate of the globalisation-inequality partial correlation coefficient from study j , denoted r_{ij} , is influenced by a vector of variables (Z_{ki}) consisting of characteristics that capture differences in the underlying impact of globalisation on income inequality. ε_{ij} represents the stochastic error term. The meta-regression model can thus be written as follows:

$$r_{ij} = \beta_0 + \sum \beta_k Z_{ki} + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (4)$$

Notably, we estimate this model by Weighted Least Squares (WLS), using the inverse of the variances of the partial correlation coefficient for (optimal) precision weighting (). Stanley and Doucouliagos (2017) showed that the WLS estimator is preferable to other standard estimators that can be used for meta-regression: ‘in practical applications, an unrestricted WLS meta-regression is likely to give practically equivalent or superior estimates to fixed-effects, random-effects, and mixed-effects meta-regression approaches.’ (Stanley and Doucouliagos 2017, p. 19) WLS is preferred to OLS since the estimates do not have equal standard errors, and because it is important to assign more weight to those estimates that are more precise, since the information provided by more precise estimates can be said to be more valuable. However, we will also provide robustness checks based on applying different estimators.

We include the following groups of ‘moderator’ variables in the Z vector:

Measures of the dependent variable (income inequality): Recall that the dependent variable in the meta-analysis is a measure of income inequality (see Equation 1). We account for differences in the dependent variable by distinguishing estimates that use the Gini index, top income shares, bottom income shares, income share ratios, the Theil index, relative wages of different skill groups (HighLowSkilled) and other inequality measures. The interpretation of the estimates obtained from using different inequality measures may differ. For example, when a study uses the Gini coefficient, a positive coefficient of the globalisation variable indicates an increase in inequality. However, when the estimate is based on the bottom income share, the interpretation of a positive estimate would be the other way around: an increase in globalisation increases the bottom income share and, thus, reduces inequality. We deal with this potential confusion in the interpretation of estimates by transforming the partial correlations and their corresponding t-statistics of the bottom income shares by multiplying them with (-1). This transformation makes all estimates comparable (no matter which income inequality measure they use) and allows for the general interpretation that a positive partial correlation coefficient indicates a positive relationship between globalisation and income inequality.

Measures of economic globalisation: As explained in Section 2, numerous indicators have been used to capture different aspects of globalisation. We follow the accepted typologies of economic globalisation indicators described in Gräbner et al. (2018) distinguishing between trade globalisation (most prominently: trade to GDP and de jure measures such as tariff rates), financial globalisation (e.g. FDI flows to GDP and indices for capital account liberalisation) and overall economic globalisation indices (most prominently: the KOF economic globalisation index), where the latter combines both the trade and financial dimensions. A more detailed account on how we coded the economic globalisation indicators can be found in Appendix A1. Our meta-regression analysis tests whether these alternative measures of globalisation have an impact on the reported results.

Country composition: As we have seen in Section 2.2, theoretical arguments on how economic globalisation affects income inequality generally emphasise that the impact might be felt differently in advanced and developing countries. In particular, the Stolper-Samuelson theorem predicts that trade openness will decrease within-country income inequality in developing countries but increase inequality in advanced countries (see Section 2.2). If the level of development played a role, the globalisation-inequality relationship would be influenced by the underlying country sample. We thus control for whether an estimate is based on a country sample of advanced countries, developing countries or a mix of advanced and developing countries. To distinguish between these three groups, we make use of the IMF's country classification (IMF 2018).

Data characteristics: We also explore whether the type of data used has an impact on the reported results. Hence, we consider whether a study used cross-sectional data instead of panel data. Additionally, we include a dummy variable, which we set to one if only data from the 1990s onwards are used. The reason for including this variable named 'DataHyperGlobalisation' is that authors such as Rodrik (2011) argue that there was something special about the period of hyper-globalisation starting in the 1990s.

Estimator details: We also check whether it makes a difference for the reported results if estimates control for unobserved country heterogeneity by using country fixed effects. About 38% of the estimates use econometric methods other than OLS (e.g. GMM, Random Effects). With our meta-regression model, we can also explore whether these estimator differences have a significant impact once we control for other potential sources of heterogeneity as well.

Publication characteristics: We account for various dimensions of the publication process: differences between development journals and other types of journals; whether a study's primary focus is the globalisation-inequality relationship as opposed to including globalisation merely as an additional control variable; and whether the author(s) of a study have received comments or feedback from other authors publishing in the literature on the globalisation-inequality relationship.⁵

⁵ The information on the variables 'Primary' and 'CrossAuthor' was collected based on the footnotes and acknowledgment sections in the relevant studies.

Table 2 / Variables used in the meta-regression analysis

		(N=1254)	
Variable name	Variable description	Mean	S.D.
PartialCorrelation	Partial correlation of the impact of economic globalisation on income inequality (dependent variable in the MRA)	0.083	0.249
Income inequality measures			
Gini (used as the base)	BD=1: Gini index of income as dependent variable	0.707	0.455
TopIncomeShare	BD=1: Income share of the top quintile	0.103	0.304
BottomIncomeShare	BD=1: Income share of the bottom quintile	0.038	0.192
IncomeShareRatio	BD=1: Income ratio between top and bottom incomes	0.060	0.237
Theil	BD=1: Theil index	0.023	0.150
HighLowSkilled	BD=1: Relative wages (based on different skill levels)	0.013	0.112
OtherIneqVar	BD=1: Other income inequality measure used (e.g. Atkinson index or income share of quintiles other than top and bottom)	0.056	0.230
Economic globalisation measures			
TradeGlobalisation (base)	BD=1: Trade globalisation variable as relevant regressor	0.584	0.493
FinancialGlobalisation	BD=1: Financial globalisation variable as relevant regressor	0.377	0.485
OverallEconGlobalisation	BD=1: Overall economic globalisation variable as relevant regressor	0.039	0.194
Country composition			
AdvancedCountries (base)	BD=1: only advanced countries included in the data	0.207	0.406
DevelopingCountries	BD=1: only developing countries included in the data	0.368	0.483
MixofCountries	BD=1: mix of advanced and developing countries included in the data	0.424	0.494
Data characteristics			
CrossSection	BD=1: Cross sectional data used	0.123	0.328
DataHyperGlobalisation	BD=1: only data from 1990s onwards used	0.207	0.405
Estimator details			
CountryFixedEffects	BD=1: Country dummies included	0.552	0.498
NonOLS	BD=1: Non-OLS estimator used (e.g. GMM, Random Effects)	0.379	0.485
Publication characteristics			
StandardError	Standard error of partial correlation	0.106	0.057
NormalizedImpactFactor	Journal impact factor normalised to range between 0 and 1	0.245	0.215
DevelopmentJournal	BD=1: Study published in an economics journal	0.164	0.371
Primary	BD=1: Link globalisation-inequality is of primary interest	0.640	0.480
CrossAuthor	BD=1: Author declares receiving feedback from other authors who have published relevant peer-reviewed paper	0.154	0.361
Prior	BD=1: Author has published previously in this area	0.081	0.272
Macroeconomic, political and institutional control variables			
Technology	BD=1: Technology proxy included as control	0.108	0.310
GDPgrowth	BD=1: GDP growth included as control	0.140	0.347
Unemployment	BD=1: Unemployment included as control	0.049	0.217
IncomeLevel	BD=1: GDP per capita included as control	0.535	0.499
Population	BD=1: Population variable (e.g. population growth) included	0.182	0.386
Education	BD=1: Education variable (e.g. schooling) included	0.465	0.499
TradeUnion	BD=1: Trade union variable included as control	0.116	0.320
SocialSpending	BD=1: Government spending on social protection included	0.030	0.169
Democracy	BD=1: Democracy variable (e.g. democracy index) included	0.159	0.366
Partisan politics	BD=1: Partisan politics (e.g. government ideology) included	0.069	0.254

Notes: BD means binary dummy, which takes the value of 1 if the condition is fulfilled and zero otherwise.

Macroeconomic, political and institutional control variables: Finally, we consider whether the inclusion of potentially relevant control variables in primary studies has an impact on the reported partial correlation coefficient between globalisation and income inequality. It has been argued that rising income inequality can be traced back to skill-biased technologies, based on the notion that technological change is inherently skill-biased, so that the observed increases in inequality are due to exogenous technology shocks (e.g. Berman et al. 1998; Card and DiNardo 2002). Therefore, we check whether the impact of globalisation on income inequality is moderated by the inclusion of technology variables in the relevant econometric models. Macroeconomic factors, represented by the growth rate of GDP and the unemployment rate, may serve as significant moderators and we account for whether they were included in the estimations. The level of economic development could also influence the partial correlation, hence we check whether studies control for the income level (proxied by GDP per capita). Demographic change could also be relevant; hence, we test whether it matters if population variables are included in the regressions. Since numerous studies point out that the education system and education policies affect income inequality (e.g. Abdullah et al. 2015), we consider whether education variables are controlled for. The political science and sociology literature emphasises the importance of considering the institutional power of labour in the context of the determination of income inequality (e.g. Wallerstein 1999). We thus also check whether trade union density or the degree of collective bargaining is controlled for. Another important factor in the determination of disposable income inequality concerns how much the government is spending, especially on social protection (e.g. Rodrik 1998; Rudra 2004). We therefore consider whether variables on government spending are included in the relevant regressions. Furthermore, democracy is potentially a relevant factor in determining inequality because democracies provide more space for their citizens to establish trade unions and other political organisations. Democratic systems allow citizens to vote in elections (independent of their position in the income distribution) which may lead to political decisions that bring about a more equal income distribution (Gradstein and Milanovic 2004). We thus consider whether democracy variables were included in the primary studies. Finally, the political science literature has emphasised that it is relevant which parties are part of the government since their ideological leanings may lead to quite different responses to economic globalisation (e.g. Pontusson et al. 2002; Dorn and Schinke 2018). We thus also check whether the inclusion of controls for partisan politics moderates the impact of globalisation on income inequality.

We tried to be comprehensive in the coding of potential sources of heterogeneity. Some variables, however, had to be excluded entirely from the meta-regression analysis because they appeared only in a very small number of estimates. Details on the moderator variables included in the Z vector can be obtained from Table 2 which also presents summary statistics.

4.1. MULTIVARIATE META-REGRESSION RESULTS

A few preliminary remarks are in order regarding the interpretation of the coefficients in the multivariate meta-regression models presented below. The models always omit one category (as the reference category) from each group of mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive dummy variables (income inequality measures, economic globalisation measures and country composition). This is necessary because otherwise we would not be able to estimate the models due to perfect multicollinearity. This implies, however, that the intercept β_0 cannot be interpreted as the 'true' effect of globalisation on income inequality because it depends on the choice of the reference groups. Other reference

specifications would give different estimates of the intercept β_0 . Our reference specification is an estimate of the impact of trade globalisation on the Gini index based on data from advanced countries only. Note that the choice of the omitted dummies in no way influences any of the other estimated coefficients but it shifts the reference value of the intercept β_0 .⁶ Hence, the coefficients of the moderator variables from each group of mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive dummy variables allow us to make predictions regarding the impact of economic globalisation on income inequality in a given setting as compared to an alternative setting. For example, the estimated average partial correlation of DevelopingCountries compared to AdvancedCountries (which is the reference category) can be predicted by adding up the values of the intercept β_0 and of the DevelopingCountries coefficient.

Note also that we use a general-to-specific estimation approach which is also the suggestion in prominent guidelines to meta-analysis (e.g. Stanley and Doucouliagos 2012, p. 105). In particular, we remove the variable that had the largest p-value in the model with all the coded moderators included, (see Table 2 for the full list of moderator variables), and repeat this step until the p-values of all variables are smaller than 0.1.⁷ The advantage of this general-to-specific approach is 'that model construction proceeds from a very general model in a more structured, ordered and (statistically valid) fashion, and in this way avoids the worst of data mining.' (Charemza and Deadman 1997, p. 78) One additional complication for the meta-regression analysis regarding the effect of globalisation on inequality arises because of the presence of multiple estimates per study. It is probably too restrictive to assume that pairs of partial correlation coefficients and standard errors are independent within studies. We account for potential within-study dependency by clustering the standard errors at the study level.

Table 3 shows the general-to-specific results from the multivariate meta-regression analysis.⁸ The results are based on using WLS with the inverse of the variances as optimal precision weights. We start by examining the results in Column (1). The first notable finding is that estimates based on using the Theil index report markedly smaller estimates than those using the Gini index (which is the reference group). This first finding from the meta-regression suggests that the choice of the income inequality measure may be relevant.

The second main finding is that the dimension of economic globalisation moderates the impact of globalisation on income inequality. In particular, we find that FinancialGlobalisation has a highly significant and positive coefficient. Compared to estimates that use TradeGlobalisation, estimates that use FinancialGlobalisation report a significantly stronger (i.e. more positive) relationship between globalisation and income inequality. Our meta-regression model in Column (1) of Table 3 predicts a moderate positive impact of financial globalisation on income inequality of +0.16 (obtained by adding the FinancialGlobalisation coefficient to the intercept). Notably, these findings from the multivariate meta-regression model are in line with the meta-analysis results reported in Table 1.

There are several additional findings from the results in Column (1) of Table 3 that deserve to be highlighted. First, several publication characteristics are significant moderator variables: when the

⁶ See Gechert and Rannenberg (2018, p. 9).

⁷ Note that we did not exclude dummy variables from groups of variables (see the groups 'Income inequality measures', 'Economic globalization measures' and 'Country composition' in Table 2) even if they were statistically insignificant. The reason is that by excluding variables from these groups, the interpretation of the respective coefficients in comparison to the omitted reference category would not work properly anymore.

⁸ Regression results based on including all the coded moderator variables are available upon request.

globalisation-inequality nexus is the primary issue, when authors have received feedback from other authors publishing in the relevant literature and when authors have published previously in the globalisation-inequality area, the reported results tend to be smaller. Second, two regressors regularly used in empirical applications significantly moderate the impact of globalisation on income inequality: technology and education. In other words, the specification of the econometric model is important when it comes to selecting regressors that could potentially explain income inequality. Our findings suggest that the impact of globalisation on income inequality is significantly moderated by including technology and education variables in the regressions. Finally, it is noteworthy what we do not find evidence for: according to the meta-regression results, the composition of the country group is not a significant moderator variable. In other words: our findings reject the argument that globalisation contributes to reducing income inequality in developing countries as the results for developing countries also point to small-to-moderate positive effects of globalisation on income inequality (just as in the advanced country group).

Table 3 / Multivariate regression results (general-to-specific models)

Dependent variable	PartialCorr (1)	PartialCorr (2)	PartialCorr (3)	Fisher's z (4)	(5)
Estimator	WLS	Random Effects	Robust regression	WLS	Robust, statistically significant
Constant	0.062** (0.026)	0.038 (0.035)	0.017 (0.039)	0.066** (0.027)	no
TopIncomeShare	0.012 (0.036)	0.003 (0.044)	0.029 (0.051)	0.009 (0.038)	no
BottomIncomeShare	-0.039 (0.026)	-0.049* (0.030)	-0.060 (0.038)	-0.045 (0.030)	no
Theil	-0.118*** (0.020)	-0.110*** (0.031)	-0.105*** (0.040)	-0.126*** (0.022)	yes
IncomeShareRatio	-0.021 (0.046)	-0.019 (0.049)	-0.036 (0.037)	-0.023 (0.050)	no
HighLowSkilled	-0.035 (0.035)	-0.016 (0.061)	-0.028 (0.060)	-0.045 (0.041)	no
OtherIneqVar	0.073 (0.046)	0.088 (0.060)	0.103 (0.070)	0.095 (0.065)	no
FinancialGlobalisation	0.095*** (0.025)	0.100*** (0.030)	0.112*** (0.027)	0.102*** (0.027)	yes
OverallEconomicGlobalisation	0.081* (0.044)	0.067 (0.060)	0.033 (0.067)	0.081 (0.050)	no
DevelopingCountriesOnly	0.017 (0.028)	0.054* (0.032)	0.081** (0.032)	0.019 (0.030)	no
MixofCountries	-0.012 (0.023)	0.016 (0.029)	0.038 (0.029)	-0.016 (0.025)	no
Primary	-0.032* (0.019)	-0.031 (0.024)	-0.031 (0.024)	-0.031 (0.020)	no
Crossauthor	-0.052* (0.026)	-0.064** (0.025)	-0.071*** (0.022)	-0.060** (0.028)	yes
Prior	-0.049* (0.027)	-0.053 (0.032)	-0.036 (0.035)	-0.060** (0.030)	no
Technology	-0.051* (0.031)	-0.070*** (0.026)	-0.091*** (0.029)	-0.055* (0.032)	yes
Education	0.042** (0.020)	0.046** (0.023)	0.053** (0.023)	0.045** (0.022)	yes
Observations	1,254	1,254	1,254	1,254	
R squared	0.107	0.136	0.105	0.095	

Note: WLS - Weighted Least Squares (inverse of the variances used as weights). Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at the study level to deal with potential within-study interdependence: *p<0.1; **p<0.05; ***p<0.01.

In Columns (2)-(4) of Table 3, we test the robustness of the meta-regression results reported in Column (1). We do so by applying different estimators and by using a transformation of the dependent variable. More specifically, the random effects model in Column (2) introduces an additional between-study variance term to cover differences in the globalisation-inequality estimates that go beyond sampling error and those differences captured by the moderator variables (e.g. Schmidt and Hunter 2014). The robust regression estimator applied in Column (3) gives little weight to observations with large absolute residuals and, hence, is less fragile to the influence of outlier observations. Finally, Column (4) uses Fisher's z-transformed partial correlation coefficients to account for the potential problem that the distribution of the partial correlations is not normal when its values are close to -1 and +1. The results in Columns (2)-(4) show that our baseline results remain largely unaffected when we introduce these robustness checks. The size of some of the coefficients and their standard errors are subject to (slight) variations. However, there are three cases in which a variable whose coefficient was estimated to be significant in Column (1) turns out not to be significant in all the three additional models: the coefficients of OverallEconomicGlobalisation, Primary and Prior lose their significance when we apply Robust Regression and Random Effects, respectively. Besides that, the results in Columns (2)-(4) of Table 3 indicate robustness.


4.2. PUBLICATION SELECTION BIAS

We continue by assessing whether the econometric literature on the globalisation-inequality relationship is contaminated by publication selection bias which could be a severe problem for economic interpretation and statistical inference (e.g. DeLong and Lang 1992). Publication selection refers to a process in which results are chosen for their statistical significance (e.g. Brodeur et al. 2016; Andrews and Kasy 2019). The tendency of journal editors to publish only those results that show statistical significance, the researchers' willingness to take the presence of a statistically significant effect based on accepted theory and the general predisposition for treating statistically significant results more favourably than 'insignificant' evidence may lead to a distorted picture of the underlying empirical relationship (Card and Krueger 1995, p. 239). Here, we use established tests for detecting publication selection bias which are based on looking at the relationship between the estimated partial correlation and its standard error. If there were no publication bias, the partial correlation and its standard error would not show any systematic relationship. However, if the publication of results were biased, we would find a statistically significant relationship.

It has been argued that the 'simplest and most commonly used method to detect publication selection is an informal examination of a funnel plot' (Sutton et al. 2000, p. 1574). The funnel plot represents a scatter diagram consisting of all the econometric estimates of the globalisation-inequality relationship and the precision of these estimates which are calculated as the inverse of the standard errors of the partial correlation coefficients (see Figure 2). The most precise estimates on the globalisation-inequality nexus are at the top and they will be least affected by publication selection bias as their high precision makes it rather unlikely that they are statistically insignificant. In the absence of publication bias, the funnel plot should be symmetric which would imply that the most precise estimates are close to the true effect while low-precision estimates are characterised by wide dispersion. As a consequence, in the case of non-existent public selection bias the scatter plot should be shaped like an inverted 'funnel' (e.g. Sutton et al. 2000; Irsova and Havranek 2013). The visual inspection of Figure 2 suggests that there is indeed symmetry in the sense that negative, positive and close-to-zero estimates are reported in the

econometric literature on the globalisation-inequality relationship, although the right portion of the funnel might be a little heavier than the left portion. A visual inspection of the distribution of the reported estimates suggests that publication selection bias (in the form of suppressing insignificant results) is unlikely to be an important problem for the globalisation-inequality literature.

Figure 2 / Funnel plot regarding publication selection bias



Notes: The figure plots point estimates of the partial correlations against the inverse of the corresponding standard error. In essence, the funnel plot is supposed to visualise publication bias. The intuition is that in the absence of publication bias, low-precision estimates should be widely dispersed. We also conduct formal tests for publication selection bias.

Nevertheless, visual inspection of a funnel plot has to be seen as largely subjective. Therefore, we continue by using the Funnel-Asymmetry Precision-Effect test (FAT PET), which allows us to formally assess the presence of publication selection bias. In doing so, we run the following model:

$$r_{ij} = \beta_0 + \sum \beta_k Z_{ki} + \beta_1 SE_i + \varepsilon_{ij} \quad (5)$$

Equation (5) is basically the same as the baseline meta-regression model in Equation (4); the only difference is that we have included the standard error of the partial correlation coefficient (SE) as an additional control variable. We again estimate the model by using WLS (Stanley and Doucouliagos 2017). If we specify Equation (5) without the Z vector, we get the basic FAT-PET. By including the moderator variables in vector Z, we estimate the augmented FAT-PET. In either case, the relevant question is if $\beta_1 = 0$, because in this case we could conclude that there is no evidence for publication selection bias (Stanley 2008).

Table 4 displays the results from the models that we ran to test for publication selection bias. If we perform the basic FAT PET, which does not include any moderator variables (Column 1), we do not find evidence for publication selection bias as there is no statistically significant relationship between the partial correlation coefficient and its standard error. However, the constant remains positive and statistically significant, i.e. the precision-effect of globalisation on inequality is positive even after accounting for potential publication selection. Column (2) then includes the moderator variables as additional regressors to explain heterogeneity in the reported globalisation-inequality estimates which

can be seen as a test on publication bias and a genuine effect beyond publication selection within our most comprehensive meta-regression specification (e.g. Doucouliagos and Stanley 2009). The coefficient of StandardError is smaller than in Column (1), but it remains statistically insignificant.⁹ Furthermore, we analyse whether the picture changes when we also control for the Journal Impact Factor¹⁰ since publication bias could differ based on the ‘quality’ of the journal. However, the result that the standard error does not display a statistically significant parameter also holds when we control for the Journal Impact Factor.¹¹ Overall, the findings from the augmented FAT PET indicate an absence of publication selection in the literature on the globalisation-inequality relationship which strengthens the previous finding of an average positive relationship between globalisation and income inequality from the meta-analysis because the economic interpretations and statistical inferences we drew are unlikely to be biased.

Table 4 / Results: Testing for publication selection bias

	Dependent variable: Partial Correlation		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Constant	0.058*** (0.018)	0.061** (0.029)	0.055* (0.030)
Standard Error	0.262 (0.269)	0.023 (0.280)	0.013 (0.285)
Normalised Impact Factor			0.030 (0.057)
Additional moderators included	no	yes	yes
Observations	1,254	1,254	1,254

Notes: Columns (1)-(3) are estimated by WLS. Standard errors (in parentheses) are clustered at the study level. None of the variables shown in the table is statistically significant. However, Columns (2)-(3) include a set of additional moderator variables (the same as in Column (2) of table 3). The full results are available upon request.

⁹ Note that while the coefficient of the constant in Column (1) of Table 4 can be interpreted as the estimate of the ‘true precision-effect’ after correcting for publication selection bias, this interpretation is not valid for the coefficients of the constants in Columns (2) and (3). The reason is that the models with additional moderator variables always omit one category (as the reference category) from each group of mutually exclusive and jointly exhaustive dummy variables (e.g. income inequality measures or economic globalisation measures). The details are explained in Section 4.2.

¹⁰ The Journal Impact Factor was normalised to a range between 0 and 1.

¹¹ We confirm these results by running an additional robustness check using Fishers z-transformed instead of the partial correlation coefficient as the dependent variable (see Appendix A1).

5. Conclusions

Based on a large pool of independent estimations (e.g. Reuveny and Li 2003; Jaumotte et al. 2013; de Haan and Sturm 2017) and qualitative reviews (e.g. Anderson 2005; Goldberg and Pavcnik 2007; Harrison et al. 2011), previous literature has been unable to establish conclusively whether globalisation has a positive, negative or zero effect on income inequality. By using meta-analysis and meta-regression methods, this paper has provided the first quantitative review of the peer-reviewed econometric literature regarding the impact of economic globalisation on income inequality around the world.

The meta-analysis and meta-regression results presented in this paper suggest several main findings. First, we find that, on average, globalisation has a (small-to-moderate) positive effect on income inequality if we look at the total population of all estimates in peer-reviewed published papers. We find that this average effect is robustly different from zero (based on using 95% confidence intervals). Second, there is evidence that trade globalisation affected income inequality to a smaller extent than financial globalisation. We find that the overall effect of trade globalisation is relatively small (but positive); financial globalisation, however, shows a stronger impact on income inequality, i.e. on average the financial dimension of economic globalisation clearly pushed income inequality upwards. Third, we do not find econometric evidence that globalisation has contributed to pushing down income inequality in developing countries. In contrast, the results show that the inequality-increasing effect was similar to the impact found for advanced countries. This finding is clearly at odds with theoretical accounts according to which economic globalisation should be expected to reduce within-country income inequality in developing countries. Fourth, we find that technology and education moderate the impact of globalisation on income inequality. This finding indicates that researchers who are working on specifying econometric models for estimating the impact of globalisation on income inequality should especially focus on using proper variables that capture technological change and education.

Our meta-regression results consider various other factors that could cause heterogeneity in the reported estimates including differences in the econometric specification, the income inequality measure and data set used and publication characteristics. The tests on publication selection bias did not uncover evidence that the econometric estimates reported in the literature are significantly influenced by publication selection bias. Given the insignificance of publication selection tests, it is unlikely that our findings regarding the impact of globalisation on income inequality are biased by publication selection.

Although we find that economic globalisation is relevant and significant when it comes to explaining the evolution of income inequality around the world, other factors (such as technology, education, labour market institutions and specificities of the welfare state) certainly also affect income inequality. Future research could use meta-analysis and meta-regression tools to come up with valid statistical inference about the direct impact of factors other than economic globalisation on income inequality. Finally, this paper has focussed on income inequality as the dependent variable. Various theories suggest that globalisation may directly affect all sorts of other policy-relevant phenomena (e.g. economic growth and tax structures). Extensions of, and adaptations to, the meta-analysis approach proposed in this paper are arguably useful for addressing various other research questions regarding the effects of globalisation.

References

- Abdullah, A., Doucouliagos, H. and Manning, E. (2015). Does education reduce income inequality? A meta-regression analysis, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 29(2), 301-316.
- Aghion, P. and Bolton, P. (1997). A theory of trickle-down growth and development, *The Review of Economic Studies*, 64(2), 151-172.
- Alvaredo, F., Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E. and Zucman, G. (2018). *World inequality report 2018*, Paris: World Inequality Lab.
- Anderson, E. (2005). Openness and inequality in developing countries: A review of theory and recent evidence, *World Development*, 33(7), 1045-1063.
- Andrews, A. and Kasy, M. (2019). Identification of and correction for publication bias, *American Economic Review*, forthcoming.
- Arndt, S. and Kierzkowski, H. (2001). *Fragmentation: New production and trade patterns in the world economy*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Asteriou, D., Dimelis, S. and Moudatsou, A. (2014). Globalization and income inequality: A panel data econometric approach for the EU27 countries, *Economic Modelling*, 36(1), 592-599.
- Beaulieu, E., Bennaroch, M. and Gaisford, J. (2011). Intra-industry trade liberalization: Why skilled workers are more likely to support free trade, *Review of International Economics*, 19(3), 579-594.
- Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A. and Levine, R. (2007). Finance, inequality and the poor, *Journal of Economic Growth*, 12(1), 27-49.
- Berman, E., Bound, J., Machin, S. (1998). Implications of skill-biased technological change: International evidence, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113(4), 1245-1279.
- Bigsten, A.; Munshi, F. (2014). Globalisation and Inter-occupational Inequality: Empirical Evidence from OECD Countries, *The World Economy*, 37(3), 501-510.
- Brady, D., Beckfield, J. and Seeleib-Kaiser, M. (2005). Economic Globalization and the Welfare State in Affluent Democracies, 1975-2001, *American Sociological Review*, 70(6), 921-948.
- Brodeur, A., Le, M., Sangnier, M. and Zylberberg, Y. (2016). Star Wars: The Empirics Strike Back, *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 8(1), 1-32.
- Burtless, G. (1995). International trade and the rise in earnings inequality, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33(2), 800-816.
- Card, D. and Krueger, A. (1995). Time-series minimum wage studies: A meta-analysis, *American Economic Review*, 85(2), 238-243.
- Card, D. and diNardo, J. (2002). Skill-biased technological change and rising wage inequality: Some problems and puzzles, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20(4), 733-783.
- Chang, H. (2002). *Kicking away the ladder: Development strategy in historical perspective*, London: Anthem Press.
- Charemza, W. and Deadman, D. (1997). *New Directions in Econometric Practice*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Checchi, D. and Garcia-Penalosa, C. (2008). Labour market institutions and income inequality, *Economic Policy*, 23(56), 602-649.
- Chiquiar, D. (2008). Globalization, regional wage differentials and the Stolper-Samuelson theorem: evidence from Mexico, *Journal of International Economics*, 74(1), 70-93.
- Cooper, H. and Hedges, L. (1994). *The Handbook of Research Synthesis*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Deardorff, A. and Stern, R. (1994). *The Stolper-Samuelson Theorem: A Golden Jubilee*, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- De Haan, J. and Sturm, J. (2017). Finance and income inequality: A review and new evidence, *European Journal of Political Economy*, 50(3), 171-195.
- Delis, M., Hasan, I. and Kazakis, P. (2014). Bank regulations and income inequality: Empirical evidence, *Review of Finance*, 18(5), 1811-1846.
- DeLong, B. and Lang, K. (1992). Are all economic hypotheses false?, *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(6), 1257-1272.
- Demirguc-Kunt, A. and Levine, R. (2009). Finance and inequality: theory and evidence, *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 1(1), 287-318.
- Doucouliafos, H. (2011). How Large is Large? Preliminary and relative guidelines for interpreting partial correlations in economics, *Deakin University Working Paper SWP 2011/5*.
- Doucouliafos, C. and Stanley, D. (2009). Publication selection bias in minimum-wage research? A meta-regression analysis, *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 47(2), 406-428.
- Dorn, F.; Schinke, C. (2018). Top income shares in OECD countries: The role of government ideology and globalization, *The World Economy*, forthcoming, DOI: 10.1111/twec.12638.
- Dreher, A. (2006). The influence of globalization on taxes and social policy: An empirical analysis for OECD countries, *European Journal of Political Economy*, 22(1), 179-201.
- Dreher, A., Gaston, N. and Martens, P. (2008). *Measuring Globalisation. Gauging Its Consequences*, New York: Springer.
- Feenstra, R. and Hanson, G. (1997). Foreign direct investment and relative wages: Evidence from Mexico's maquiladoras, *Journal of International Economics*, 42(3-4), 371-393.
- Figini, P.; Görg, H. (2011). Does Foreign Direct Investment Affect Wage Inequality? An Empirical Investigation, *The World Economy*, 34(9), 1455-1475.
- Gechert, S. and Rannenberg, A. (2018). Which fiscal multipliers are regime-dependent? A meta-regression analysis, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, forthcoming, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12241>
- Goldberg, P. and Pavcnik, N. (2007). Distributional Effects of Globalization in Developing Countries, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 45(1), 39-82.
- Gozgor, G.; Ranjan, P. (2017). Globalisation, inequality and redistribution: Theory and evidence, *The World Economy*, 40(12), 2704-2751.
- Gräbner, C., Heimberger, P., Kapeller, J. and Springholz, F. (2018). Measuring economic openness: A review of existing measures and empirical practices, *ICAE Working Paper No. 86*.
- Gradstein, M. and Milanovic, B. (2004). Does liberte = egalite? A survey of the empirical links between democracy and inequality with some evidence on the transition economies, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 18(4), 515-537.

- Greenwood, J. and Jovanovic, B. (1990). Financial development, growth, and the distribution of income, *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 1076-1107.
- Gygly, S., Haelg, F. and Sturm, J. (2019). The KOF Globalisation Index – Revisited, The Review of International Organizations, forthcoming, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-019-09344-2>
- Hamori, S. and Hashiguchi, Y. (2012). The effect of financial deepening on inequality: Some international evidence, *Journal of Asian Economics*, 23(4), 353-359.
- Han, J., Liu, R. and Zhang, J. (2012). Globalization and wage inequality: Evidence from urban China, *Journal of International Economics*, 87(2), 288-297.
- Harrison, A., McLaren, J. and McMillan, M. (2011). Recent perspectives on trade and inequality, *Annual Review of Economics*, 3(1), 261-289.
- Huang, C., Teng, K. and Tsai, P. (2016). Inward and Outward Foreign Direct Investment and Inequality: Evidence from a group of middle-income countries, *Global Economy Journal*, 16(3), 511-538.
- Huber, E., Huo, J. and Stephens, J. (2017). Power, policy, and top income shares, *Socio-Economic Review*, forthcoming, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/ser/mwx027>
- IMF (2018). Challenges to steady growth, IMF World Economics Outlook October 2018, Washington, D.C.: International Monetary Fund.
- Irsova, Z. and Havranek, T. (2013). Determinants of horizontal spillovers from FDI: Evidence from a large meta-analysis, *World Development*, 42(1), 1-15.
- Jaumotte, F., Lall, S. and Papageorgiou, C. (2013). Rising Income Inequality: Technology, or Trade and Financial Globalization?, *IMF Economic Review*, 61(2), 271-309.
- Li, H. and Zou, H. (2002). Inflation, growth, and income distribution: A cross-country study, *Annals of Economics and Finance*, 3(1), 85-101.
- Ma, A. (2006). Geographical location of foreign direct investment and wage inequality in China, *The World Economy*, 29(8), 1031-1055.
- Mahler, V., Jeduit, D. and Roscoe, D. (1999). Exploring the impact of trade and investment on income inequality: A cross-national sectoral analysis of the developed countries, *Comparative Political Studies*, 32(3), 363-395.
- Milanovic, B. (2005). Can We Discern the Effect of Globalization on Income Distribution? Evidence from Household Surveys, *The World Bank Economic Review*, 19(1), 21-44.
- Meschi, E. and Vivarelli, M. (2009). Trade and Income Inequality in Developing Countries, *World Development*, 37(2), 287-302.
- Mills, M. (2009). Globalization and Inequality, *European Sociological Review*, 25(1), 1-8.
- Nafziger, W. (1997). *The economics of developing countries*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Nissanke, M. and Thorbecke, E. (2010). Globalization, Poverty, and Inequality in Latin America: Findings from Case Studies, *World Development*, 38(6), 797-802.
- OECD (2015). *In it together. Why less inequality benefits all*, OECD publication (May 2015).
- Pontusson, J., Rueda, D. and Way, C. (2002). Comparative political economy of wage distribution: The role of partisanship and labour market institutions, *British Journal of Political Science*, 32(2), 281-308.
- Potrafke, N. (2015). The Evidence on Globalisation, *The World Economy*, 38(3), 509-552.
- Rajan, R. and Zingales, L. (2003). The great reversals: the politics of financial development in the twentieth century, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 69(1), 5-50.

- Ravallion, M. (2003). The debate on globalization, poverty, and inequality: Why measurement matters, in: Anand, S.; Segal, P.; Stiglitz, J. (eds.): *Debates on the measurement of global poverty*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Reuveny, R. and Li, Q. (2003). Economic openness, democracy, and income inequality: An empirical analysis, *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(5), 575-601.
- Robertson, R. (2000). Trade liberalization and wage inequality: Lessons from the Mexican experience, *The World Economy*, 23(6), 827-849.
- Robertson, R. (2004). Relative prices and wage inequality: evidence from Mexico, *Journal of International Economics*, 64(2), 387-409.
- Rodrik, D. (1998). Why do More open Economies Have Bigger Governments?, *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(5), 997-1032.
- Rodrik, D. (2007). *One Economics, Many Recipes, Globalization, institutions, and economic growth*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rodrik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox: Democracy and the future of the world economy*, New York: W.W. Norton.
- Roser, M. and Crespo Cuaresma, J. (2016). Why is inequality increasing in the developed world?, *Review of Income and Wealth*, 62(1), 1-27.
- Rudra, N. (2004). Openness, Welfare Spending, and Inequality in the Developing World, *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(3), 683-709.
- Schmidt, J. and Hunter, F. (2014). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting Error and Bias in Research Findings*, Newbury Park: Sage Publications.
- Scholte, J. (2008). Defining Globalisation, *The World Economy*, 31(11), 1471-1502.
- Stanley, T. (2001). Wheat from Chaff: Meta-Analysis As Quantitative Literature Review, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(3), 131-150.
- Stanley, T. (2008). Meta-regression methods for detecting and estimating empirical effect in the presence of publication bias, *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 70(1), 103-127.
- Stanley, T. and Doucouliagos, H. (2012). *Meta-Regression Analysis in Economics and Business*, London and New York: Routledge Advances in Research Methods.
- Stanley, T. and Doucouliagos, H. (2017). Neither fixed nor random: weighted least squares meta-analysis, *Statistics in Medicine*, 34(13), 2116-2127.
- Stolper, W. and Samuelson, P. (1941). Protection and real wages, *The Review of Economic Studies*, 9(1), 58-73.
- Sutton, A., Abrams, K., Jones, D., Sheldon, T. and Song, F. (2000). *Methods for Meta-analysis in Medical Research*, Chichester: Wiley.
- Wallerstein, M. (1999). Wage-setting institutions and pay inequality in advanced industrial societies, *American Journal of Political Science*, 43(3), 649-680.
- Winters, A., McCulloch, N. and McKay, A. (2004). Trade liberalization and poverty: The evidence so far, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 42(1), 72-115.

Appendix A1

This appendix to the paper ‘Does economic globalization affect income inequality? A meta-analysis’ presents three additional aspects. First, we explain how we distinguished different dimensions of economic globalization (trade globalization, financial globalization and overall economic globalization), which was essential for the coding of globalization indicators in the meta-analysis. Second, we list all peer-reviewed econometric studies that were included in the meta-analysis based on the criteria of inclusion discussed in the paper. Third, we present additional results from the robustness checks of the meta-regression analysis. Fourth, we report the full tables from the publication selection bias tests (including moderator variables).

1. DISTINGUISHING TRADE GLOBALISATION, FINANCIAL GLOBALISATION AND OVERALL ECONOMIC GLOBALISATION

The coding of the economic globalization indicators was based on the classification provided in Gräbner et al. (2018). We distinguish trade globalization indicators, financial globalization indicators, and overall economic globalization indicators.

Existing measures of economic globalization can be grouped in two ways: first, according to the type of globalization – ‘trade’ or ‘financial’ – they aim to measure, and, second, according to the sources utilized in composing the globalization measure. These sources are either aggregate economic statistics (de-facto measures) or assessments of the institutional foundations of economic globalization, i.e. the legally established barriers to trade and financial transactions (de-jure measures).

In addition, overall economic globalization measures aim to incorporate information on both, real and financial aspects, while ‘combined’ measures also strive to integrate information on de-facto as well as de-jure aspects of economic globalization (see Table 1). ‘Hybrid’ measures aim to incorporate information on both, real and financial aspects.

Appendix Table A 1 / Types of economic globalization indicators

	Evaluation of economic globalisation with regard to real flows (goods and services)	Evaluation of economic globalisation with regard to financial flows	Overall economic globalisation measures
Evaluation of outcomes: De-facto measures of economic globalisation	De facto measures of trade globalisation, for example: <i>total imports or total exports (relative to GDP)</i>	De facto measures of financial globalisation, for example: <i>FDI inward/outward or foreign financial assets/liabilities</i>	Measures integrating trade and financial aspects
	Hybrid measures for de-facto globalisation		
Evaluation of legal framework: De-jure measures of economic globalisation	De jure measures of trade globalisation, for example: <i>tariff rates or non-tariff trade barriers</i>	De jure measures of financial globalisation, for example: <i>FDI restrictions or capital account restrictions</i>	
	Hybrid measures for de-jure globalisation		

De-facto measures are outcome-oriented indicators, reflecting a country's actual degree of integration into the world economy. De-jure measures, on the other hand, are based upon an evaluation of a country's legal framework: they reflect a country's willingness to be open as expressed by the prevailing regulatory environment. Typically, de-jure measures on trade are based on tariff rates (such as duties and surcharges), information on non-tariff trade barriers (such as licensing rules and quotas) or tax revenues emerging from trade activities relative to GDP. Financial de-jure measures indicate the extent to which a country imposes legal restrictions on its cross-border capital transactions. As de-jure indicators evaluate a country's regulatory environment, it is important to keep in mind that this environment is influenced not only by national policies; they are also shaped by the impact of supranational institutions like the European Union or the World Trade Organization.

For a more detailed exposition of the trade globalisation, financial globalisation and overall economic globalisation indicators used in the empirical literature, see Gräbner et al. (2018).

Reference

Gräbner, C.; Heimberger, P.; Kapeller, J.; Springholz, F. (2018): Measuring economic openness: A review of existing measures and empirical practices, ICAE Working Paper No. 86.

2. STUDIES INCLUDED IN THE META-ANALYSIS

Appendix Table A 2 / Published papers included in the meta-analysis (n=123)

Adams (2008)	Dreher and Gaston (2008)	Morley (2000)
Agnello et al. (2012)	Edwards (1997)	Muller (1989)
Alderson and Nielsen (1999)	Elmawazini et al. (2013)	Neal (2013)
Alderson and Nielsen (2002)	Feenstra and Hanson (1997)	Nel (2005)
Andres and Ramlogan-Dobson (2011)	Figini and Görg (2011)	Odedokun and Round (2004)
Asongu (2014)	Flaherty (2015)	Ogunyomi et al. (2013)
Asteriou et al. (2014)	Franco and Gerussi (2013)	Oliver (2008)
Avalos and Savvides (2006)	Fum and Hodler (2010)	Pontusson et al. (2002)
Baccaro (2011)	Gissinger and Gleditsch (1999)	Quinn (1997)
Bandelj and Mahutga (2010)	Gozgor and Ranjan (2017)	Rama (2002)
Barro (2000)	Gourdon et al. (2008)	Reuveny and Li (2003)
Beck et al. (2007)	Gustafsson and Johansson (1999)	Roine et al. (2009)
Beckfield (2006)	Ha (2012)	Roser and Crespo-Cuaresma (2016)
Beer (1999)	Han et al. (2012)	Rubinson (1976)
Bergh and Nilsson (2010)	Hermes (2014)	Rudra (2004)
Beyer et al. (1999)	Herzer and Nunnenkamp (2013)	Rueda and Pontusson (2000)
Birchfield and Crepaz (1998)	Herzer et al. (2014)	Sato and Fukushige (2009)
Bigsten and Durevall (2006)	Higgins and Williamson (2002)	Scheve and Stasavage (2009)
Bigsten and Munshi (2014)	Jacobs and Myers (2014)	Sepulveda and Martinez-Vazquez (2011)
Bhandari (2007)	Jalil (2012)	Sylwester (2003)
Bourguignon and Morrison (1990)	Jaumotte et al. (2013)	Sylwester (2005)
Borraz and Lopez-Cordova (2009)	Keller (2010)	Te Velde and Morrissey (2004)
Brady and Leicht (2008)	Kentor (2001)	Tian et al. (2008)
Bumann and Lensink (2016)	Kraay (2006)	Timmons (2010)
Bussmann et al. (2005)	Kratou and Goiaed (2016)	Thalassinios et al. (2012)
Calderon and Chong (2001)	Kus (2012)	Tridico (2018)
Cassette et al. (2012)	Lee (2005)	Tsai (1995)
Chakrabarti (2000)	Lee et al. (2007)	Tsai and Huang (2007)
Checchi and Garcia-Penalosa (2008)	Lee (2006)	Tselios et al. (2012)
Checchi and Garcia-Penalosa (2010)	Li et al. (1998)	Ucal et al. (2016)
Chintrakarn et al. (2012)	Li et al. (2000a)	Van Arnum and Naples (2013)
Choi (2006)	Li et al. (2000b)	Volscho and Kelly (2012)
Daudey and Garcia-Penalosa (2007)	Li and Zou (2002)	Wagle (2007)
de Haan and Sturm (2017)	Lundberg and Squire (2003)	Wallerstein (1999)
Delis et al. (2014)	Mah (2003)	Wan et al. (2006)
Demir et al. (2012)	Mah (2013)	Wong (2016)
Dobson and Ramlogan-Dobson (2010)	Mahler et al. (1999)	Wu and Hsu (2012)
Dobson and Ramlogan-Dobson (2012)	Mahler (2004)	Xu and Zou (2000)
Dollar and Kraay (2002)	Majeed (2015)	Zakaria and Fida (2016)
Dollar and Kraay (2004)	Meschi and Vivarelli (2009)	Zhuang and Griffith (2013)
Dorn and Schinke (2018)	Minnich (2003)	Zhang and Naceur (2018)

Notes: Studies published in peer-reviewed journals prior to October 2018 were included. Criteria of inclusion are described in the text.

REFERENCES (THE STUDIES INCLUDED IN THE META-ANALYSIS)

- Adams, S. (2008): Globalization and income inequality: Implications for intellectual property rights, *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 30(5), 725-735.
- Agnello, L.; Mallick, S.; Sousa, R. (2012): Financial reforms and income inequality, *Economics Letters*, 116(3), 583-587.
- Alderson, A.; Nielsen, F. (1999): Income inequality, development, and dependence: A reconsideration, *American Sociological Review*, 64(4), 606-631.
- Alderson, A.; Nielsen, F. (2002): Globalization and the Great U-Turn: Income Inequality Trends in 16 OECD Countries, *American Journal of Sociology*, 107(5), 1244-1299.
- Andres, A.; Ramlogan-Dobson, C. (2011): Is corruption really bad for inequality? Evidence from Latin America, *Journal of Development Studies*, 47(7), 959-976.
- Asongu, S. (2014): Software piracy, inequality and the poor: evidence from Africa, *Journal of Economic Studies*, 41(1), 526-553.
- Asteriou, D.; Dimelis, S.; Moudatsou, A. (2014): Globalization and income inequality: A panel data econometric approach for the EU27 countries, *Economic Modelling*, 36(1), 592-599.
- Avalos, A.; Savvides, A. (2006): The Manufacturing Wage Inequality in Latin America and East Asia: Openness, Technology Transfer, and Labor Supply, *Review of Development Economics*, 10(4), 553-576.
- Baccaro, L. (2011): Labor, Globalization and Inequality: Are Trade Unions Still Redistributive?, *Research in the Sociology of Work*, 22, 213-285.
- Bandelj, N.; Mahutga, M. (2010): How socio-economic change shapes income inequality in post-socialist Europe?, *Social Forces*, 88(5), 2133-2161.
- Barro, R.J. (2000). Inequality and Growth in a Panel of Countries, *Journal of Economic Growth*, 5(1), 5-32.
- Beck, T.; Demirgüç-Kunt, A.; Levine, R. (2007): Finance, inequality and the poor, *Journal of Economic Growth*, 12(1), 27-49.
- Beckfield, J. (2006): European Integration and Income Inequality, *American Sociological Review*, 71, 964-985.
- Beer, L. (1999): Income inequality and transnational corporate penetration, *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 5, 1-25.
- Bergh, A.; Nilsson, T. (2010): Do liberalization and globalization increase income inequality?, *European Journal of Political Economy*, 26(4), 488-505.
- Beyer, H.; Rojas, P.; Vergara, R. (1999): Trade liberalization and wage inequality, *Journal of Development Economics*, 59, 103-123.
- Bhandari, B. (2007): Effect of Inward foreign direct investment on income inequality in transition countries, *Journal of Economic Integration*, 22(4), 888-928.
- Bigsten, A.; Durevall, D. (2006): Openness and wage inequality in Kenya, 1964-2000, *World Development*, 34(3), 465-480.
- Bigsten, A.; Munshi, F. (2014): Globalisation and Inter-occupational Inequality: Empirical Evidence from OECD Countries, *The World Economy*, 37(3), 501-510.
- Birchfield, V.; Crepaz, M. (1998): The impact of constitutional structures and collective and competitive veto points on income inequality in industrialized democracies, *European Journal of Political Research*, 34(2), 175-200.

- Bourguignon, F.; Morrison, C. (1990): Income Distribution, Development and Foreign Trade: A Cross Sectional Analysis, *European Economic Review*, 34(6), 1113-1132.
- Borraz, F.; Lopez-Cordova, J. (2007): Has Globalization Deepened Income Inequality in Mexico?, *Global Economy Journal*, 7(1), 1524-1561.
- Brady, D.; Leicht, K. (2008): Party to inequality: Right party power and income inequality in affluent Western democracies, *Research in Social Stratification and Mobility*, 26(1), 77-106.
- Bumann, S.; Lensink, R. (2016): Capital account liberalization and income inequality, *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 61(3), 143-162.
- Bussmann, M.; de Soysa, I.; Oneal, J. (2005): The Effect of Globalization on National Income Inequality, *Comparative Sociology*, 4(3), 285-312.
- Calderon, C.; Chong, A. (2001): External sector and income inequality in interdependent economies using a dynamic panel data, *Economics Letters*, 71(2), 225-231.
- Cassette, A.; Fleury, N.; Petit, S. (2012): Income inequalities and international trade in goods and services: short and long run evidences, *The International Trade Journal*, 26(3), 223-254.
- Chakrabarti, A. (2000): Does Trade Cause Inequality?, *Journal of Economic Development*, 25(2), 1-21.
- Checchi, D.; Garcia-Penalosa, C. (2008): Labour market institutions and income inequality, *Economic Policy*, 23(56), 602-649.
- Checchi, D.; Garcia-Penalosa, C. (2010): Labor market institutions and the personal distribution of income in the OECD, *Economica*, 77(307), 413-450.
- Chintrakarn, P.; Herzer, D.; Nunnenkamp, P. (2012): FDI and income inequality: Evidence from a panel of U.S. States, *Economic Inquiry*, 50(3), 788-801.
- Choi, C. (2006): Does foreign direct investment affect domestic income inequality?, *Applied Economics Letters*, 13(12), 811-814.
- Daudey, E.; Garcia-Penalosa, C. (2007): The personal and the factor distributions of income in a cross-section of countries, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 43(5), 812-829.
- De Haan, J.; Sturm, J. (2017): Finance and income inequality: A review and new evidence, *European Journal of Political Economy*, 50(3), 171-195.
- Delis, M.; Hasan, I.; Kazakis, P. (2014): Bank regulations and income inequality: Empirical evidence, *Review of Finance*, 18(5), 1811-1846.
- Demir, F.; Ju, J.; Zhou, Y. (2012): Income inequality and structures of international trade, *Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting & Economics*, 19(2), 167-180.
- Dobson, S.; Ramlogan-Dobson, C. (2010): Is there a trade-off between income inequality and corruption? Evidence from Latin America, *Economics Letters*, 107(2), 102-104.
- Dobson, S.; Ramlogan-Dobson, C. (2012): Why is corruption less harmful to income inequality in Latin America?, *World Development*, 40(8), 1534-1545.
- Dollar, D.; Kraay, A. (2002): Growth is good for the poor, *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7(3), 195-225.
- Dollar, D.; Kraay, A. (2004): Trade, growth, and poverty, *The Economic Journal*, 114(493), F22-F49.
- Dorn, F.; Schinke, C. (2018): Top income shares in OECD countries: The role of government ideology and globalization, *The World Economy*, forthcoming, DOI: 10.1111/twec.12638.
- Dreher, A.; Gaston, N. (2008): Has Globalization Increased Inequality?, *Review of International Economics*, 16(3), 516-536.

- Edwards, S. (1997): Trade Policy, Growth, and Income Distribution, *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, 87(2), 205-210.
- Elmawazini, K.; Sharif, A.; Manga, P.; Drucker, P. (2013): Trade globalization, financial globalization and inequality within South-East Europe and CIS countries, *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 47(2), 303-317.
- Feenstra, R.; Hanson, G. (1997): Foreign direct investment and relative wages: Evidence from Mexico's maquiladoras, *Journal of International Economics*, 42(3-4), 371-393.
- Figini, P.; Görg, H. (2011): Does Foreign Direct Investment Affect Wage Inequality? An Empirical Investigation, *The World Economy*, 34(9), 1455-1475.
- Flaherty, E. (2015): Top Incomes Under Finance-Driven Capitalism, 1990-2010: Power Resources and Regulatory Orders, *Socio-Economic Review*, 13(3), 417-447.
- Franco, C.; Gerussi, E. (2013): Trade, foreign direct investment (FDI) and income inequality: empirical evidence from transition countries, *The Journal of International Trade and Economic Development*, 22(8), 1131-1160.
- Fum, R.; Hodler, R. (2010): Natural resources and income inequality: The role of ethnic divisions, *Economics Letters*, 107(3), 360-363.
- Gissinger, R.; Gleditsch, N. (1999): Globalization and conflict: Welfare, distribution, and political unrest, *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 5(2), 327-365.
- Gozgor, G.; Ranjan, P. (2017): Globalisation, inequality and redistribution: Theory and evidence, *The World Economy*, 40(12), 2704-2751.
- Gourdon, J.; Mayste, N.; de Melo, J. (2008): Openness, inequality and poverty: Endowments matter, *Journal of International Trade and Economic Development*, 17(3), 343-378.
- Gustafsson, B.; Johansson, M. (1999): In search of smoking guns: What makes income inequality vary over time in different countries, *American Sociological Review*, 64(4), 585-605.
- Ha, E. (2012): Globalization, Government Ideology, and Income Inequality in Developing Countries, *The Journal of Politics*, 74(2), 541-557.
- Han, J.; Liu, R.; Zhang, J. (2012): Globalization and wage inequality: Evidence from urban China, *Journal of International Economics*, 87, 288-297.
- Hermes, N. (2014): Does microfinance affect income inequality?, *Applied Economics*, 46(9), 1021-1034.
- Herzer, D.; Nunnenkamp, P. (2013): Inward and outward FDI and income inequality: Evidence from Europe, *Review of World Economics*, 149(2), 395-422.
- Herzer, D.; Hühne, P.; Nunnenkamp, P. (2014): FDI and Income Inequality – Evidence from Latin American Economies, *Review of Development Economics*, 18(4), 778-793.
- Higgins, M.; Williamson, J. (2002): Explaining inequality the World Round: Cohort Size, Kuznets Curves, and Openness, *Southeast Asian Studies*, 40(3), 268-302.
- Jacobs, D.; Myers, L. (2014): Union strength, neoliberalism, and inequality: Contingent political analyses of U.S. income differences since 1950, *American Sociological Review*, 79(4), 752-774.
- Jalil, A. (2012): Modeling income inequality and openness in the framework of Kuznets curve: New evidence from China, *Economic Modelling*, 29(2), 309-315.
- Jaumotte, F.; Lall, S.; Papageorgiou, C. (2013): Rising Income Inequality: Technology, or Trade and Financial Globalization?, *IMF Economic Review*, 61(2), 271-309.
- Keller, K. (2010): How Can Education Policy Improve Income Distribution? An Empirical Analysis of Education Stages and Measures on Income Inequality, *Journal of Developing Areas*, 43(2), 51-77.

- Kentor, J. (2001): The Long Term Effects of Globalization on Income Inequality, Population Growth, and Economic Development, *Social Problems*, 48(4), 435-455.
- Kraay, A. (2006): When is growth pro poor? Evidence from a panel of countries, *Journal of Development Economics*, 80(1), 198-227.
- Kratou, H.; Goaied, M. (2016): How can globalization affect income distribution? Evidence from developing countries, *The International Trade Journal*, 30(2), 132-158.
- Kus, B. (2012): Financialisation and Income Inequality in OECD Nations: 1995-2007, *The Economic and Social Review*, 43(4), 477-495.
- Lee, C. (2005): Income Inequality, Democracy, and Public Sector Size, *American Sociological Review*, 70(1), 158-181.
- Lee, C.; Nielsen, F.; Alderson, A. (2007): Income Inequality, Global Economy and the State, *Social Forces*, 86(1), 77-111.
- Lee, J. (2006): Inequality and globalization in Europe, *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 28(7), 791-796.
- Li, H.; Squire, L.; Zou, H. (1998): Explaining international and intertemporal variations in income inequality, *The Economic Journal*, 108(446), 26-43.
- Li, H.; Xu, L.; Zou, H. (2000a): Corruption, income distribution, and growth, *Economics and Politics*, 12(2), 155-182.
- Li, H.; Xie, D.; Zou, H. (2000b): Dynamics of income distribution, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 33(4), 937-961.
- Li, H.; Zou, H. (2002): Inflation, growth, and income distribution: A cross-country study, *Annals of Economics and Finance*, 3(1), 85-101.
- Lundberg, M.; Squire, L. (2003): The simultaneous evolution of growth and inequality, *The Economic Journal*, 113(487), 326-344.
- Mah, J. (2003): A note on globalization and income distribution – the case of Korea, 1975-1995, *Journal of Asian Economics*, 14(1), 157-164.
- Mah, J. (2013): Globalization, decentralization and income inequality: The case of China, *Economic Modelling*, 31(3), 653-658.
- Mahler, V.; Jeduit, D.; Roscoe, D. (1999): Exploring the impact of trade and investment on income inequality: A cross-national sectoral analysis of the developed countries, *Comparative Political Studies*, 32(3), 363-395.
- Mahler, V. (2004): Economic globalization, domestic politics, and income inequality in the developed countries, *Comparative Political Studies*, 37(9), 1025-1053.
- Majeed, M. (2015): Distributional Consequences of Globalization: Is Organization of the Islamic Conferences Countries Different?, *The International Trade Journal*, 29(3), 171-190.
- Meschi, E.; Vivarelli, M. (2009): Trade and Income Inequality in Developing Countries, *World Development*, 37(2), 287-302.
- Minnich, D. (2003): Corporatism and income inequality in the global economy: A panel study of 17 OECD countries, *European Journal of Political Research*, 42(1), 23-53.
- Morley, S. (2000): The effects of growth and economic reform on income distribution in Latin America, *CEPAL Review*, 71(1), 23-40.
- Muller, E. (1989): Distribution of income in advanced capitalist societies: Political parties, labor unions, and the international economy, *European Journal of Political Research*, 17(4), 367-400.

- Neal, T. (2013): Using panel co-integration methods to understand rising top income shares, *Economic Record*, 87(284), 93-98.
- Nel, P. (2005): Democratization and the dynamics of income distribution in low- and middle-income countries, *Politikon*, 32(1), 17-43.
- Odedokun, M.; Round, J. (2004): Determinants of Income Inequality and its Effects on Economic Growth: Evidence from African countries, *African Development Review*, 16(2), 287-327.
- Oliver, R. (2008): Diverging Developments in Wage Inequality: Which Institutions Matter?, *Comparative Political Studies*, 41(12), 1551-1582.
- Pontusson, J.; Rueda, D.; Way, C. (2002): Comparative political economy of wage distribution: The role of partisanship and labour market institutions, *British Journal of Political Science*, 32(2), 281-308.
- Quinn, D. (1997): The correlates of change in international financial regulation, *The American Political Science Review*, 91(3), 531-551.
- Rama, M. (2002): Globalization, inequality and labor market policies, *Revue d' Economie du Developpement*, 1-2(10), 43-84.
- Reuveny, R.; Li, Q. (2003): Economic openness, democracy, and income inequality: An empirical analysis, *Comparative Political Studies*, 36(5), 575-601.
- Roine, J.; Vlachos, J.; Waldenström, D. (2009): The long-run determinants of inequality: What can we learn from top income data?, *Journal of Public Economics*, 93(7), 974-988.
- Roser, M.; Crespo Cuaresma, J. (2016): Why is inequality increasing in the developed world?, *Review of Income and Wealth*, 62(1), 1-27.
- Rubinson, R. (1976): The world economy and the distribution of income within states: A cross-national study, *American Sociological Review*, 41(4), 638-659.
- Rudra, N. (2004): Openness, Welfare Spending, and Inequality in the Developing World, *International Studies Quarterly*, 49(3), 683-709.
- Rueda, D.; Pontusson, J. (2000): Wage Inequality and Varieties of Capitalism, *World Politics*, 52(3), 350-383.
- Sato, S.; Fukushige, M. (2009): Globalization and economic inequality in the short and long run: The case of South Korea 1975-1995, *Journal of Asian Economics*, 20, 62-68.
- Scheve, K.; Stasavage, D. (2009): Institutions, partisanship, and inequality in the long run, *World Politics*, 61(2), 215-253.
- Sepulveda, C.; Martinez-Vazquez, J. (2011): The consequences of fiscal decentralization on poverty and income inequality, *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 29(2), 321-343.
- Sylwester, K. (2003): Changes in Income Inequality and the Black Market Premium, *Applied Economics*, 35(4), 403-413.
- Sylwester, K. (2005): Foreign Direct Investment, Growth and Income Inequality in Less Developed Countries, *International Review of Applied Economics*, 19(3), 289-300.
- Te Velde, D.; Morrissey, O. (2004): Foreign direct investment, skills and wage inequality in East Asia, *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, 9(3), 348-369.
- Tian, X.; Wang, B.; Dayadanandan, A. (2008): The impact of economic globalization on income distribution: empirical evidence in China, *Economics Bulletin*, 4(35), 1-8.
- Timmons, J. (2010): Does democracy reduce economic inequality?, *British Journal of Political Science*, 40(4), 741-757.

- Thalassinos, E.; Ugurlu, E.; Muratoglu, Y. (2012): Income inequality and inflation in the EU, *European Research Studies Journal*, 15(1), 127-140.
- Tridico, P. (2018): The determinants of income inequality in OECD countries, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 42(4), 1009-1042.
- Tsai, P. (1995): Foreign direct investment and income inequality: Further evidence, *World Development*, 23(3), 469-483.
- Tsai, P.; Huang, C. (2007): Openness, growth and poverty: the case of Taiwan, *World Development*, 35(11), 1858-1871.
- Tselios, V.; Rodriguez-Pose, A.; Pike, A. (2012): Income inequality, decentralization and regional development in Western Europe, *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 44(6), 1278-1301.
- Ucal, M.; Haug, A.; Bilgin, M. (2016): Income inequality and FDI: evidence with Turkish data, *Applied Economics*, 48(11), 1030-1045.
- Van Arnum, B.; Naples, M. (2013): Financialization and income inequality in the United States, 1967-2010, *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 72(5), 1158-1182.
- Volscho, T.; Kelly, N. (2012): The Rise of the Super-Rich: Power resources, taxes, financial markets, and the dynamics of the top 1 percent, 1949 to 2008, *American Sociological Review*, 77(5), 679-699.
- Wagle, U. (2007): Are economic liberalization and equality compatible? Evidence from South Asia, *World Development*, 35(11), 1836-1857.
- Wallerstein, M. (1999): Wage-setting institutions and pay inequality in advanced industrial societies, *American Journal of Political Science*, 43(3), 649-680.
- Wan, G.; Lu, M.; Chen, Z. (2006): The inequality-growth nexus in the short and long run: Empirical evidence from China, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 34(4), 654-667.
- Wong, M. (2016): Globalization, spending and income inequality in Asia Pacific, *Journal of Comparative Asian Development*, 15(1), 1-18.
- Wu, J.; Hsu, C. (2012): Foreign direct investment and income inequality: Does the relationship vary with absorptive capacity?, *Economic Modelling*, 29(6), 2183-2189.
- Xu, L.; Zou, H. (2000): Explaining the changes of income distribution in China, *China Economic Review*, 11(2), 149-170.
- Zakaria, M.; Fida, B. (2016): Trade openness and income inequality in China and the SAARC Region, *Asian-Pacific Economic Literature*, 30(2), 33-44.
- Zhuang, H.; Griffith, D. (2013): The effect of merger & acquisitions and greenfield FDI on income inequality, *International Journal of Applied Economics*, 10(1), 29-38.
- Zhang, R.; Naceur, S. (2018): Financial development, inequality, and poverty: some international evidence, *International Review of Economics and Finance*, forthcoming, doi: 10.1016/j.iref.2018.12.015

Appendix A2

List of references for studies that were screened in the search process but were excluded from the meta-analysis because they did not meet at least one of the criteria for inclusion explained in the main text (see section 3.1):

- Beramendi, P.; Cusak, T. (2009): Diverse Disparities: The Politics and Economics of Wage, Market, and Disposable Income Inequalities, *Political Research Quarterly*, 62(2), 257-275.
- Bukhari, M.; Munir, K. (2016): Impact of Globalization on Income Inequality in Selected Asian Countries, MPRA Working Paper No. 74248.
- Dabla-Norris, E.; Kochhar, K.; Suphaphiphat, N.; Ricka, F.; Tsounta, E. (2015): Causes and Consequences of Income Inequality: A Global Perspective, IMF Staff Discussion Note 15/13.
- Dorn, F.; Fuest, C.; Potrafke, N. (2018): Globalization and Income Inequality Revisited, CESIFO Working Paper No. 6859.
- Huber, E.; Huo, J.; Stephens, J. (2017): Power, policy, and top income shares, *Socio-Economic Review*, forthcoming, 1-23.
- IMF (2007): Globalization and Inequality, *World Economic Outlook* October 2007, 135-170
- Lang, V.; Mendes Tavares, M. (2018): The Distribution of Gains from Globalization, IMF Working Paper No. 18/54.
- Smeeding, T. (2002): Globalization, Inequality, and the Rich Countries of the G-20: Evidence from the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), Working Paper Center for Policy Research No. 112.
- Dollar, D. (2004): Globalization, Poverty, and Inequality since 1980, World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3333.
- Krugman, P.; Venables, A. (1995): Globalization and the Inequality of Nations, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(4), 857-880.
- Wei, S.; Wu, Y. (2002): Globalization and Inequality: Evidence from Within China, Brookings Report.
- O'Rourke, K. (2002): Globalization and Inequality: Historical Trends, in: Pleskovic, B.; Stern, N. (2002): *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics* 2001/2002, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 39-68.
- Kremer, M. (2006): Globalization of Labor Markets and Inequality, in: *Brookings Trade Forum*, Brookings Institution Press, 211-228.
- Held, D.; Kaya, A. (2007): *Global Inequality. Patterns and Explanations*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bourguignon, F. (2017): *The globalization of inequality*, Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press
- Mills, M. (2009): Globalization and Inequality, *European Sociological Review*, 25(1), 1-8.
- Rama, M. (2003): Globalization and the Labor Market, *The World Bank Research Observer*, 18(2), 159-186.
- Kai, H.; Hamori, S. (2009): Globalization, financial depth, and inequality in Sub-Saharan Africa, *Economic Bulletin*, 29(3), 2025-2037.

- Nissanke, M.; Thorbecke, E. (2010): Globalization, Poverty, and Inequality in Latin America: Findings from Case Studies, *World Development*, 38(6), 797-802.
- Freeman, R. (2011): Globalization and Inequality, in: Nolan, B.; Salverda, W.; Smeeding, T. (2011): *The Oxford Handbook of Economic Inequality* (Online version).
- Baten, J.; Fraunholz, U. (2004): Did Partial Globalization Increase Inequality? The Case of the Latin American Periphery, 1950-2000, *CESifo Economic Studies*, 50(1), 45-84.
- Massey, D. (2009): Globalization and Inequality: Explaining American Exceptionalism, *European Sociological Review*, 25(1), 9-23.
- De Vogli, R.; Kouvonen, A.; Elovainio, M.; Marmot, M. (2014): Economic globalization, inequality and body mass index: a cross-national analysis of 127 countries, *Critical Public Health*, 24(1), 7-21.
- Dallmayr, F. (2002): Globalization and Inequality: A Plea for Global Justice, *International Studies Review*, 137-156.
- Das, S. (2005): Gradual globalization and inequality between and within countries, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 38(3), 852-869.
- Wade, R. (2004): Is globalization reducing poverty and inequality?, *International Journal of Health Services*, 34(3), 381-414.
- Wei, S.; Wu, Y. (2002): Globalization and Inequality Without Differences in Data Definition, Legal System and Other Institutions, *Brookings Report*.
- Dutt, A.; Mukhopadhyay, K. (2005): Globalization and the inequality among nations: A VAR approach, *Economics Letters*, 88, 295-299.
- Beer, L.; Boswell, T. (2002): The effects of globalization on inequality: a cross-national analysis, *Emory University Working Paper*.
- Ali, A. (2003): Globalization and Inequality in the Arab Region, *Arab Planning Institute Working Paper*.
- Kanbur, R. (2015): Globalization and Inequality, in: *Handbook of Income Distribution*, 2B, 1845-1881.
- Nissanke, M.; Thorbecke, E. (2007): *The impact of globalization in the world's poor*, Basingstoke: Palgrave macmillan.
- Aghion, P.; Williamson, J. (1998): *Growth, inequality and globalization*, Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Feenstra, R.; Hanson, G. (1996): Globalization, Outsourcing, and Wage Inequality, *American Economic Review*, 86(2), 240-245.
- Yudaeva, K. (2002): Globalization and Inequality in CIS Countries: Role of Institutions, *Working Paper*.
- Bhalla, S. (2002): *Imagine there's no country. Poverty, inequality, and growth in the era of globalization*, Institute for International Economics.
- Ravallion, M. (2003): The debate on globalization, poverty and inequality: why measurement matters, *International Affairs*, 79(4), 739-753.
- Nissanke, M.; Thorbecke, E. (2006): Channels and Policy Debate in the Globalization-Inequality-Poverty Nexus, *World Development*, 34(8), 1338-1360.
- Basu, K. (2006): Globalization, Poverty, and Inequality: What is the Relationship? What Can Be Done?, *World Development*, 34(8), 1361-1373.
- Matsuyama, K. (2004): Financial market globalization, symmetry-breaking and endogenous inequality of nations, *Econometrica*, 72(3), 853-884.

- Williamson, J. (1999): Real wages, inequality and globalization in Latin America before 1940, *Revista de Historia Economica*, 17(S1), 101-142.
- Galbraith, J. (2002): A Perfect Crime: Inequality in the Age of Globalization, *Daedalus*, 131(1), 11-25.
- Mah, J. (2002): The impact of globalization on income distribution: the Korean experience, *Applied Economics Letters*, 9(15), 1007-1009.
- Ravallion, M. (2014): Income Inequality in the developing world, *Science*, 344(6186), 851-855.
- Ravallion, M. (2018): Inequality and Globalization: A Review Essay, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 56(2), 620-642.
- Chusseau, N.; Hellier, J. (2012): Globalization and Inequality: Where do we stand?, *ECINEQ WP* 2012-279.
- Baek, I.; Shi, Q. (2016): Impact of Economic Globalization on Income Inequality: Developed Economies vs Emerging Economies, *Global Economy Journal*, 16(1), 49-61.
- Singh, A.; Dhumale, R. (2000): Globalization, Technology, and Income Inequality: A Critical Analysis, UNU WIDER Working Paper No. 210.
- Atif, S.; Srivastav, M.; Sauytbekova, M.; Arachchige, U. (2012): Globalization and Income Inequality: A Panel Data Analysis of 68 Developing Countries, *MPRA Working Paper No.* 42385.
- Haj, M.; Badshah, I.; Ahmad, I. (2017): Does Globalisation Shape Income Inequality? Empirical Evidence from Selected Developing Countries, *Pakistan Development Review*, 56(4), 251-280.
- Milanovic, B. (2005): Can We Discern the Effect of Globalization on Income Distribution? Evidence from Household Surveys, *The World Bank Economic Review*, 19(1), 21-44.
- Goldberg, P.; Pavcnik, N. (2007): Distributional Effects of Globalization in Developing Countries, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 45(1), 39-82.
- Brune, N.; Garrett, G. (2005): The Globalization Rorschach Test: International Economic Integration, Inequality, and the Role of Government, *Annual Review of Political Science*, 8, 399-423.
- Ezcurra, R.; Rodriguez-Pose, A. (2013): Does Economic Globalization affect Regional Inequality?, *World Development*, 52, 92-103.
- Hussain, S.; Chaudhry, I. (2009): Globalization and income distribution: Evidence from Pakistan, *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 8(4), 683-691.
- Pavcnik, N. (2011): Globalization and within-country income inequality, In: Bacchetta, M.; Jansen, M. (ed.): *Making Globalization Socially Sustainable*, Geneva: WTO Publication, 233-260.
- Koo, H. (2007): The Changing Faces of Inequality in South Korea in the Age of Globalization, *Korean Studies*, 31, 1-18.
- Williamson, J. (1998): Globalization, Labor Markets and Policy Backlash in the Past, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 12(4), 51-72.
- Topalova, P. (2007): Trade Liberalization, Poverty and Inequality: Evidence from Indian Districts, in Harrison, A. (ed.): *Globalization and Poverty*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 291-335.
- Firebaugh, G.; Goesling, B. (2004): Accounting for the Recent Decline in Global Income Inequality, *American Journal of Sociology*, 110(2), 283-312.
- Meyer, L. (2003): Economic globalization and women's status in the labor market: A cross-national investigation of occupational sex segregation and inequality, *The Sociological Quarterly*, 44(3), 351-383.
- Chen, Z.; Ge, Y.; Lai, H. (2013): Globalization and Gender Wage Inequality in China, *World Development*, 44, 256-266.

- Babones, S.; Vonada, D. (2009): Trade globalization and national income inequality – are they related?, *Journal of Sociology*, 45(1), 5-30.
- Birdsall, N. (2006): Rising inequality in the new global economy, *International Journal of Development Issues*, 5(1), 1-9.
- Murakami, Y. (2018): Globalization and Income Inequality in Latin America: A Review of Theoretical Developments and Recent Evidence, Kobe University Discussion Paper Series.
- Samy, Y.; Daudelin, J. (2013): Globalization and inequality: insights from municipal level data in Brazil, *Indian Growth and Development Review*, 6(1), 128-147.
- Tsai, P.; Huang, C.; Yang, C. (2012): Impact of Globalization on Income Distribution Inequality in 60 Countries: Comments, 12(3), 1-10.
- Zhou, L.; Biswas, B.; Bowles, T.; Saunders, P. (2011): Impact of Globalization on Income Distribution Inequality in 60 Countries, *Global Economy Journal*, 11(1), 1-16.
- Huang, C.; Teng, K.; Tsai, P. (2016): Inward and Outward Foreign Direct Investment and Inequality: Evidence from a group of middle-income countries, *Global Economy Journal*, 16(3), 511-538.
- Goldberg, P.; Pavcnik, N. (2004): Trade, Inequality and Poverty: What Do We Know? Evidence from Recent Trade Liberalization Episodes in Developing Countries, *Brookings Trade Forum*, 2014, 223-269.
- Amin, A. (2004): Regulating economic globalization, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 29(2), 217-233.
- Hung, H.; Kucinkas, J. (2011): Globalization and Global Inequality: Assessing the Impact of the Rise of China and India, 1980-2005, *American Journal of Sociology*, 116(5), 1478-1513.
- Celik, S.; Basdas, U. (2010): How does globalization affect income inequality? A panel data analysis, *International Advances in Economic Research*, 16(4), 358-370.
- Hanson, G. (2007): Globalization, Labor Income, and Poverty in Mexico, in: Harrison, A. (ed.): *Globalization and poverty*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hill, J. (2008): Globalization, Inequality, and Local-level Dynamics: Indonesia and the Phillipines, *Asian Economic Policy Review*, 3, 42-61.
- Hurrell, A.; Woods, N. (1995): Globalisation and Inequality, *Millenium: Journal of International Studies*, 24(3), 447-470.
- Bardhan, P. (2007): Poverty and inequality in China and India: Elusive Link with Globalisation, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 42(38), 3849-3852.
- Naude, W.; Coetzee, R. (2004): Globalisation and inequality in South Africa: modeling the labour market transmission, *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 26(8-9), 911-925.
- Schmidt, J. (1998): Globalisation and inequality in urban South-east Asia, *Third World Planning Review*, 20(2)
- Acharyya, R.; Marjit, S. (2000): Globalisation and Inequality: An Analytical Perspective, *Economic and Political Weekly*, 35(39), 3503-3510.
- Ulubasoglu, M. (2004): Globalisation and inequality, *The Australian Economic Review*, 37(1), 116-122.
- Heshmati, A. (2007): The relationship between income inequality, poverty and globalization, in: Nissanke, M.; Thorbecke, E. (eds.): *The impact of globalization on the World's Poor. Studies in development economics and policy*, London: Palgrave Macmillan, 59-93.
- Moore, M.; Ranjan, P. (2005): Globalisation vs skill-biased technological change: implications for unemployment and wage inequality, *The Economic Journal*, 115, 391-422.

- Kaplinsky, R. (2000): Globalisation and Unequalisation: What can be learned from value chain analysis?, *Journal of Development Studies*, 37(2), 117-146.
- Borghesi, S.; Vercelli, A. (2003): Sustainable globalisation, *Ecological Economics*, 44, 77-89.
- Quiggin, J. (1999): Globalisation, Neoliberalism and Inequality in Australia, *The Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 10(2), 240-259.
- Cornia, G. (2003): The Impact of Liberalisation and Globalisation on Within-Country Income Inequality, *CESifo Economic Studies*, 49(4), 581-616.
- Neutel, M.; Hesmathi, A. (2006): Globalisation, Inequality and Poverty Relationships: A Cross Country Evidence, IZA DP No. 223.
- Cox, H.; Mowatt, S.; Young, S.; Kahai, S.; Simmons, W. (2005): The impact of globalization on income inequality, *Global Business and Economics Review*, 7(1), 1-15.
- Wells, R. (2006): Education's effect on income inequality: an economic globalization perspective, *Globalisation, Societies and Education*, 4(3), 371-391.
- Badinger, H.; Nindl, E. (2014): Globalisation and corruption, revisited, *World Economy*, 37(10), 1424-1440.
- Henry, K.; O'Brien, T. (2003): Globalisation, Poverty and Inequality: Friends, Foes or Strangers?. *The Australian Economic Review*, 36(1), 3-21.
- Qureshi, M.; Guanghua, W. (2008): Distributional Consequences of Globalisation: Empirical Evidence from Panel Data, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 44(10), 1424-1449.
- Dutta, P. (2005): Accounting for wage inequality in India, *The Indian Journal of Labour Economics*, 48(2), 273-295.
- Milanovic, B.; Squire, L. (2007): Does Tariff Liberalization Increase Wage Inequality? Some Empirical Evidence, in: Harrison, A. (ed.): *Globalization and Poverty*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 143-181.
- Wu, Y.; Yao, H. (2012): Economic openness and income inequality: Chinese provincial evidence in the 1990s, *China Economic Policy Review*, 1(2)
- Spilimbergo, A.; Londono, J.; Szekely, M. (1999): Income distribution, factor endowments, and trade openness, *Journal of Development Economics*, 59, 77-101.
- Gupta, S.; Davoodi, H.; Alonso-Terme, R. (2002): Does corruption affect income inequality and poverty?, *Economics of Governance*, 3, 23-45.
- Anderson, E. (2005): Openness and inequality in developing countries: A review of theory and recent evidence, *World Development*, 33(7), 1045-1063.
- Wood, A. (1997): Openness and Wage Inequality in Developing Countries: The Latin American Challenge to East Asian Conventional Wisdom, *World Bank Economic Review*, 11(1), 33-57.
- Hao, R.; Wei, Z. (2010): Fundamental causes of inland-coastal income inequality in post-reform China, 45(1), 181-206.
- Tiwari, A.; Shahbaz, M.; Islam, F. (2013): Does financial development increase rural-urban income inequality? Cointegration analysis in the case of Indian economy, *International Journal of Social Economics*, 40(2), 151-168.
- Rigobon, R.; Rodrik, D. (2005): Rule of law, democracy, openness and income: Estimating the interrelationships, *Economics of Transition*, 13(3), 533-564.
- Al-Marhubi, F. (1997): A note on the link between income inequality and inflation, *Economics Letters*, 55(3), 317-319.

- Lim, G.; McNelis, P. (2016): Income growth and inequality: The threshold effects of trade and financial openness, *Economic Modelling*, 58, 403-412.
- Ahluwalia, M.S. (1976a). Inequality, Poverty and Development. *Journal of Development Economics* 3: 307-342.
- Ahluwalia, M.S. (1976b). Income Distribution and Development: Some Stylized Facts, *American Economic Review*, 66(2):128-135.
- Aigner, D.J. & Heins, A.J. (1967). On the Determinants of Income Equality, *American Economic Review*, 57(1):175-184.
- Ashby, N.J.y & Sobel, R.S. (2008). Income Inequality and Economic Freedom in the U.S. States, *Public Choice*, 134:329-346.
- Braun, D. (1991). Income Inequality and Economic Development: Geographic divergence, *Social Science Quarterly*, 72(3):520-536.
- Breen, R., & Peñalosa, C.G. (2005). Income Inequality and Macroeconomic Volatility: An empirical investigation, *Review of Development Economics*, 9(3):380-398.
- Brempong, K.G. (2002). Corruption, Economic Growth, and Income Inequality in Africa, *Economic of Governance*, 3:183-209.
- Calderón, C., & Chong, A. (2009). Labor Market Institutions and Income Inequality: An Empirical Exploration, *Public Choice* 138(1-2):65-81.
- Carter, J.R. (2006). An Empirical Note on Economic Freedom and Income Inequality, *Public Choice*, 130(1-2):163-177.
- Carvajal, M.J., & Geithman, D.T. (1978). Income Distribution and Economic Development: Some Intra-Country Evidence, *Southern Economic Journal*, 44(4):922-928.
- Chambers, D. (2010). Does a Rising Tide Raise All Ships? The Impact of Growth on Inequality, *Applied Economics Letters*, 17:581-586.
- Checchi, D. (2001). Education, Inequality and Income Inequality. *DARP*, 52. Suntory and Toyota International Centres for Economics and Related Disciplines, London School of Economics and Political Science, London, UK.
- Chiswick, B.R. (1968). The Average Level of Schooling and the Intra-Regional Inequality of Income: A Clarification, *American Economic Review*, 58(3):495-500.
- Chiswick, B.R. (1971). Earnings Inequality and Economic Development, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 85(1): 21-39.
- Chong, A. (2004). Inequality, Democracy, and Persistence: Is There a Political Kuznets Curve? *Economics & Politics*, 16(2): 189-212.
- Chong, A., Gradstein, M., & Calderon, C. (2009) Can Foreign Aid Reduce Income Inequality and Poverty? *Public Choice* 140(1-2): 59–84.
- Cloutier, N.R. (1996). Intra-racial Income Inequality: An Examination of Metropolitan Areas, 1990, *Review of Social Economy*, LIV (3).
- Cloutier, N.R. (1997). Metropolitan Income Inequality during the 1980s: The Impact of Urban Development, Industrial Mix and Family Structure, *Journal of Regional Science*, 37(3):459-478.
- Conlisk, J. (1967). Some Cross-State Evidence on Income Inequality, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 49(1):115-118.

- Glaeser, E.L., Resseger, M., & Tobio, K. (2009). Inequality in Cities, *Journal of Regional Science*, 49(4):617-646.
- Gregorio, J.D., & Lee, J.H. (2002). Education and Inequality: New Evidence from Cross Country Data, *Review of Income and Wealth*, 48(3):395-416.
- Gupta, G.S.; Singh, R. (1984): Income Inequality across Nations Over Time: How Much and Why, *Southern Economic Journal*, 51(1): 250-257.
- Gupta, S., Davoodi, H., & Terme, R.A. (2002). Does Corruption Affect Income Inequality and Poverty? *Economic of Governance*, 3: 23-45.
- Janvry, A.D., & Sadoulet, E. (2000). Growth, Poverty, and Inequality in Latin America: A Causal Analysis, 1970-94, *Review of Income and Wealth*, 46(3): 267-287.
- Jha, S.K. (1996). The Kuznets Curve: A Reassessment, *World Development* 24(4):773-780.
- Koechlin, V., & Gianmarco, L. (2007). International Remittances and Income Inequality: An Empirical Investigation, *Journal of Economic Policy Reform*, 10(2):123-141.
- Kumba, D. (2009). Education Inequality, Economic Growth, and Income Inequality: Evidence from Indonesia, 1996-2005, MPRA Paper No. 17792.
- Motonishi, T. (2006). Why has income inequality in Thailand increased? An analysis using surveys from 1975 to 1998, *Japan and the World Economy*, 18(4):464- 487.
- Nielsen, F., & Alderson, A.S. (1995). Income Inequality, Development, and Dualism: Results from an Unbalanced Cross-National Panel, *American Sociological Review*, 60(5):674-701.
- Nord, S. (1980a): An Empirical Analysis of Income Inequality and City Size, *Southern Economic Journal* 46(3):863-872.
- Nord, S. (1980b). Intra-Metropolitan Income Inequality, *Eastern Economic Journal*, 6 (3/4):195-202.
- Nord, S. (1980c). Income Inequality and City Size: An Examination of Alternative Hypotheses for Large and Small Cities, *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 62(4):502-508.
- Papanek, G.F., & Kyn, O. (1986). The Effect on Income Distribution of Development, the Growth Rate and Economic Strategy, *Journal of Development Economics* 23:55-65.
- Park, K.H. (1996). Educational expansion and educational inequality on income distribution, *Economics of Education Review* 15(1):51- 58.
- Park, K.H. (1998). Distribution and Growth: Cross-Country Evidence, *Applied Economics*, 30: 943-949.
- Partridge, J.S., Partridge, M.D., & Rickman, D.S. (1998). State Patterns in Family Income Inequality, *Contemporary Economic Policy*, XVI: 277-294.
- Pose, A.R., & Tselios, V. (2010) Inequalities in Income and Education and Regional Economic Growth in Western Europe, *Annals of Regional Science*, 44:349-375.
- Psacharopoulos, G. (1977). Unequal Access to Education and Income Distribution, *De Economist* 125(3):383-392.
- Rahmah, I. (2000). Educational and Income Inequality in Malaysia, *Humanomics*, 16(2):19-40.
- Ram, R. (1981). Inequalities in Income and Schooling: A Different Point Of View, *De Economist*, 129(2):253-261.
- Ram, R. (1984). Population Increase, Economic Growth, Educational Inequality, and Income Distribution: Some Recent Evidence, *Journal of Development Economics* 14(3):419-428.
- Rodgers, G. (1983). Population Growth, Inequality and Poverty, *International Labour Review* 122:443-459.

- Savvides, A. (1998). Trade Policy and Income Inequality: New Evidence, *Economics Letters* 61: 365-372.
- Scully, G.W. (2003). Optimal Taxation, Economic Growth and Income Inequality, *Public Choice*, 115, (3/4): 299-312.
- Silva, J.A. (2007). Trade and Income Inequality in a Less Developed Country: The Case of Mozambique, *Economic Geography*, 83(2): 111-136.
- Stano, M. (1981). State Variation in Income Inequality: A Multiple Equation Approach, *The American Economist*, 25(1):10-16.
- Sylwester, K. (2002). Can Education Expenditures Reduce Income Inequality? *Economics of Education Review* 21: 43-52.
- Sylwester, K. (2003b.) Enrolment in Higher Education and Changes in Income Inequality, *Bulletin of Economic Research*, 55 (3): 249-262.
- Tsakoglou, P.A. (1988). Development and Inequality Revisited, *Applied Economics*, 20: 509-531.
- Tselios, V. (2008). Income and Educational Inequalities in the Regions of the European Union: Geographical Spillovers Under Welfare State Restrictions, *Papers in Regional Science*, 87(3):403-430.
- Tselios, V. (2009). Growth and Convergence in Income Per Capita and Income Inequality in the Regions of the EU, *Spatial Economic Analysis*, 4(3):343-370.
- Winegarden, C.R. (1979). Schooling and Income Distribution: Evidence from International Data, *Economica*, 46(181): 83-87.
- Yorukoglu, M. (2002). The Decline of Cities and Inequality, *American Economic Review*, 92(2): 191-197.
- Wan, G.; Zhou, Z. (2005): Income Inequality in Rural China: Regression-based Decomposition Using Household Data, *Review of Development Economics*, 9(1), 107-120.
- Ortega, F.; Peri, G. (2014): Openness and income: The roles of trade and migration, *Journal of International Economics*, 92, 231-251.
- Esquivel, G.; Cruces, G. (2011): The Dynamics of Income Inequality in Mexico since NAFTA, *Economia*, 12(1), 155-188.
- Ravallion, M. (2001): Growth, inequality and poverty: Looking beyond averages, *World Development*, 29(11), 1803-1815.
- Jensen, N.; Rosas, G. (2007): Foreign direct investment and income inequality in Mexico, 1990-2000, *International Organization*, 61(3), 467-487.
- Shahbaz, M.; Aamir, N.; Butt, M. (2008): Rural-Urban Income Inequality under Financial Development and Trade Openness in Pakistan: The Econometric Evidence, *The Pakistan Development Review*, 46(4), 657-672.
- Simpson, M. (1990): Political Rights and Income Inequality: A Cross-National Test, *American Sociological Review*, 55(5), 682-693.
- Bleaney, M.; Nishiyama, A. (2004): Income inequality and growth – does the relationship vary with the income level?, *Economic Letters*, 84, 349-355.
- Yao, S. (1999): Economic growth, income inequality and poverty in China under economic reforms, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 35(6), 104-130.
- Kim, D.; Lin, S. (2011): Nonlinearity in the financial development-income inequality nexus, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 39, 310-325.
- Mocan, N. (1999): Structural Unemployment, Cyclical Unemployment, and Income Inequality, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, 81(1), 122-134.

- Pillai, A. (2011): Impact of Political Regime and Economic Openness on Income Inequality: A Tale of Low-Income and OECD Countries, *Journal of Financial Economics*, 9(4), 60-75.
- Bennett, D.; Vedder, R. (2013): A dynamic analysis of economic freedom and income inequality in the 50 U.S. states: Empirical evidence of a parabolic relationship, *Journal of Regional Analysis & Policy*, 43(1), 42-55.
- Ram, R. (1989): Level of development and income inequality: an extension of Kuznets-hypothesis to the world economy, *Kyklos*, 42(1), 73-88.
- Clark, J.; Lawson, R. (2008): The impact of economic growth, tax policy and economic freedom on income inequality, *Journal of Private Enterprise*, 24(1), 23-31.
- Beer, L.; Boswell, T. (2002): The resilience of dependency effects in explaining income inequality in the global economy: a cross national analysis, 1975-1995, *Journal of World-Systems Research*, 8(1), 30-59.
- Nissanke, M.; Thorbecke, E. (2010): Globalization, poverty and inequality in Latin America: Findings from Case Studies, *World Development*, 38(6), 797-802.
- Thorbecke, E.; Nissanke, M. (2008): The impact of globalization on the poor in Latin America, *Economia*, 9(1), 153-196.
- Suanes, M. (2016): Foreign direct investment and income inequality in Latin America: a sectoral analysis, *Cepal Review*, 118, 45-61.
- Jong-sung, Y.; Khagram, S. (2005): A comparative study of inequality and corruption, *American Sociological Review*, 70(1), 136-157.
- Basu, P.; Guariglia, A. (2007): Foreign direct investment, inequality, and growth, *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 29, 824-839.
- Clark, D.; Highfill, J. (2011): FDI, Technology Spillovers, growth, and income inequality: a selective survey, *Global Economy Journal*, 11(2), 1-42.
- Tanninen, H. (1999): Income inequality, government expenditures and growth, *Applied Economics*, 31(9), 1109-1117.
- Bornschier, V. (2002): Changing income inequality in the second half of the 20th century: preliminary findings and propositions for explanations, *Journal of World-systems Research*, 8(1).
- Sutherland, D.; Yao, S. (2011): Income inequality in China over 30 years of reform, *Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society*, 4, 91-105.
- Jeanneney, S.; Hua, P. (2001): How does real exchange rate influence income inequality between urban and rural areas in China?, *Journal of Development Economics*, 64, 529-545.
- Huber, E.; Stephens, J. (2014): Income inequality and redistribution in post-industrial democracies: demographic, economic and political determinants, *Socio-Economic Review*, 12, 245-267.
- Wang, C.; Wan, G. (2014): Income inequality in the People's Republic of China: Trends, determinants, and proposed remedies, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 28(4), 686-708.
- Beckfield, J. (2009): Remapping inequality in Europe: The net effect of regional integration on total income inequality in the European Union, *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 50(5-6), 486-509.
- Dobson, S.; Ramlogan, C. (2009): Is there an openness Kuznets curve?, *Kyklos*, 62(2), 226-238.
- Gimet, C.; Lagoarde-Segot, T. (2011): A closer look at financial development and income distribution, *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 35, 1698-1713.
- Babones, S.; Vonada, D. (2009): Trade globalization and national income inequality – are they related?, *Journal of Sociology*, 45(1), 5-30.

- Li, S.; Gao, L.; Wei, X. (2009): Trade openness and the widening income disparities in developing countries: Evidence from China, *Journal of Finance and Economics*
- Wood, A.; Ridao-Cano, C. (1999): Skill, trade, and international inequality, *Oxford Economic Papers*, 51, 89-119.
- Hamori, S.; Hashiguchi, Y. (2012): The effect of financial deepening on inequality: Some international evidence, *Journal of Asian Economics*, 23(4), 353-359.
- Magnani, E. (2000): The Environmental Kuznets Curve, environmental protection policy and income distribution, *Ecological Economics*, 32(3), 431-443.
- Seshanna, S.; Decornez, S. (2003): Income polarization and inequality across countries: an empirical study, *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 25, 335-358.
- Fisher, R. (2001): The evolution of inequality after trade liberalization, *Journal of Development Economics*, 66, 555-579.
- Ncube, M.; Anyanwu, J.; Hausken, K. (2014): Inequality, economic growth and poverty in the Middle East and North America (MENA), *African Development Review*, 26(3), 435-453.
- Asongu, S. (2015): The impact of mobile phone penetration on African inequality, *International Journal of Social Economics*, 42(8), 706-716.
- Lee, E.; Vivarelli, M. (2006): The social impact of globalization in the developing countries, *International Labour Review*, 145(3), 167-184.
- Macinko, J.; Shi, L.; Starfield, B. (2004): Wage inequality, the health system, and infant mortality in wealthy industrialized countries, 1970-1996, *Social Science & Medicine*, 58(2), 279-292.
- Huber, E.; Nielsen, F.; Pribble, J.; Stephens, J. (2006): Politics and Inequality in Latin America and the Caribbean, *American Sociological Review*, 71, 943-963.
- Munir, S.; Kiani, A.; Khan, A.; Jamal, A. (2013): The relationship between trade openness and income inequalities: Empirical evidences from Pakistan (1972-2008), *Academic Journal of Management Sciences*, 2(1), 21-35.
- Mahler, V. (2008): Electoral turnout and income redistribution by the state: A cross-national analysis of the developed democracies, *European Journal of Political Research*, 47, 161-183.
- Landa, D.; Kapstein, E. (2001): Inequality, growth, and democracy, *World Politics*, 53, 264-296.
- Johnson, G. (1997): Changes in earnings inequality: the role of demand shifts, *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11(2), 41-54.
- Sirowy, L.; Inkeles, A. (1990): The effects of democracy on economic growth and inequality: a review, *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 25(1), 126-157.
- Manasse, P.; Turrini, A. (2001): Trade, wages, and 'superstars', *Journal of International Economics*, 54, 97-117.
- Winters, A. (2004): Trade liberalization and economic performance: an overview, *The Economic Journal*, 114, F4-F21.
- Moran, T. (2005): Kuznets's inverted U-Curve Hypothesis: The rise, demise, and continued relevance of a socioeconomic law, *Sociological Forum*, 20(2), 209-244.
- Yu, G. (2010): The U-shape influence of trade openness on income inequality: A theoretical and empirical research based on panel co-integration, *International Economics and Trade Research*
- McNabb, R.; Said, R. (2013): Trade openness and wage inequality: Evidence for Malaysia, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 49(8), 1118-1132.

- Dong, F. (2014): The impact of economic openness on standard of living and income inequality in eight countries, *Emerging Markets Review*, 21, 234-264.
- Acemoglu, D. (2003): Cross-country inequality trends, *The Economic Journal*, 113, F121-F149.
- Feenstra, R.; Hanson, G. (1997): Foreign direct investment and relative wages: Evidence from Mexico's maquiladoras, *Journal of International Economics*, 42, 371-393.
- Claessens, S.; Perotti, E. (2007): Finance and inequality: Channels and evidence, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 35, 748-773.
- Ghose, A. (2004): Global inequality and international trade, *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 28, 229-252.
- Raiser, M. (1998): Subsidising inequality: Economic reforms, fiscal transfers and convergence across Chinese provinces, *The Journal of Development Studies*, 34(3), 1-26.
- Frazer, G. (2006): Inequality and development across and within countries, *World Development*, 34(9), 1459-1481.
- Robertson, R. (2000), Trade liberalization and wage inequality: Lessons from the Mexican experience, *The World Economy*, 23(6), 827-849.
- Afonso, A.; Schuknecht, L.; Tanzi, V. (2010): Income distribution determinants and public spending efficiency, *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 8, 367-389.
- Tyree, A.; Semyonov, M.; Hodge, R. (1979): Gaps and glissandos: Inequality, economic development, and social mobility in 24 countries, *American Sociological Review*, 44(3), 410-424.
- Chambers, D. (2007): Trading places: Does past growth impact inequality?, *Journal of Development Economics*, 82, 257-266.
- Goudie, A.; Ladd, P. (1999): Economic growth, poverty and inequality, *Journal of International Development*, 11, 177-195.
- Chong, A. (2004): Inequality, democracy, and persistence: Is there a political Kuznets curve?, *Economics & Politics*, 16(2), 189-212.
- Desai, R.; Olofsgard, A.; Yousef, T. (2003): Democracy, inequality, and inflation, *American Political Science Review*, 97(3), 391-406.
- Castello-Climent, A. (2010): Inequality and growth in advanced economies: an empirical investigation, *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 8, 293-321,
- Anderson, C.; Singer, M. (2008): The sensitive left and the impervious right: multilevel models and the politics of inequality, ideology, and legitimacy in Europe, *Comparative Politics*, 41(4-5)
- Godoy et al. (2004): Do markets worsen economic inequalities? Kuznets in the bush, *Human Ecology*, 32(3), 339-364.
- Acharyya, R. (2011): A note on quantitative trade restrictions, income effects and wage inequality, *Economic Modelling*, 28, 2628-2633.
- Brown, C.; Campbell, B. (2002): The impact of technological change on work and wages, *Industrial Relations*, 41(1), 1-33.
- Clarke, G. (1996): More evidence on income distribution and growth, *Journal of Development Economics*, 47, 403-427.
- Clarke, G.; Xu, L.; Zou, H. (2006): Finance and Income Distribution: What do the data tell us?, *Southern Economic Journal*, 72(3), 578-596.

- Acosta, P.; Montes-Roja, G. (2008): Trade reform and inequality: The case of Mexico and Argentina in the 1990s, *World Economy*
- Scully, G. (2002): Economic freedom, government policy and the trade-off between equity and economic growth, *Public Choice*, 113, 77-96.
- Anand, S.; Kanbur, S. (1993): Inequality and development, *Journal of Development Economics*, 41, 19-43.
- Chase-Dunn, C. (1975): The Effects of International Economic Dependence on Development and Inequality: A Cross-National Study, *American Sociological Review*, 40(6), 720-738.
- Evans, P.; Timberlake, M. (1980): Dependence, inequality, and the growth of the tertiary: A comparative analysis of less developed countries, *American Sociological Review*, 45(4), 532-552.
- Muller, E. (1988): Democracy, economic development, and income inequality, *American Sociological Review*, 53(1), 50-68.
- Nielsen, F. (1994): Income inequality and industrial development: Dualism revisited, *American Sociological Review*, 59(5), 654-677.
- Nielsen, F.; Alderson, A. (1995): Income inequality, development, and dualism: Results from an unbalanced cross-national panel, *American Sociological Review*, 60, 674-701.
- Weede, E. (1990): Democracy, party government and rent-seeking as determinants of distributional inequality in industrial societies, *European Journal of Political Research*, 18, 515-533.
- Weede, E. (1993): The impact of military participation on economic growth and income inequality, *Journal of Political and Military Sociology*, 21, 21-58.
- Weede, E.; Tiefenbach, H. (1981): Some recent explanations of income inequality, *International Studies Quarterly*, 23, 255-282.
- Bjornskov, C. (2008): The growth-inequality association: Government ideology matters, *Journal of Development Economics*, 87(2), 300-308.
- Doerrenberg, P.; Peichl, A. (2014): The impact of redistributive policies on inequality in OECD countries, *Applied Economics*, 46(17), 2066-2086.
- Esquivel, G.; Rodriguez-Lopez (2003): Technology, trade and wage inequality in Mexico before and after NAFTA, *Journal of Development Economics*, 72(2), 543-565.
- Gopinath, M.; Chen, W. (2003): Foreign direct investment and wages: a cross-sectional analysis, *Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 12(3), 285-309.
- Marjit, S.; Beladi, H.; Chakrabarti, A. (2004): Trade and wage inequality in developing countries, *Economic Inquiry*, 42(2), 295-303.
- Moore, M.; Ranjan, P. (2005): Globalisation vs skill-biased technological change: implications for unemployment and wage inequality, *The Economic Journal* 115, 391-422.
- Angeles, L. (2010): An alternative test of Kuznets' hypothesis, *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 8, 463-473.
- Cragg, M.; Epelbaum, M. (1996): Why has wage dispersion grown in Mexico? Is it the incidence of reforms of the growing demand for skills?, *Journal of Development Economics*, 51(1), 99-116.
- Greenwood, J.; Jovanovic, B. (1990): Financial development, growth, and the distribution of income, *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 1076-1107.
- Krugman, P. (2008): Trade and Wages, Reconsidered, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2008, 103-154.

- Robinson, S. (1976): A note on the U hypothesis relating income inequality and economic development, *The American Economic Review*, 66(3), 437-440.
- Sylwester, K. (2000): Income inequality, education expenditures, and growth, *Journal of Development Economics*, 63, 379-398.
- Perotti, R. (1996): Growth, income distribution, and democracy: What the data say, *Journal of Economic Growth*, 1(2), 149-187.
- Stolper, W.; Samuelson, P. (1941): Protection and real wages, *Review of Economic Studies*, 9(1), 58-73.
- Verhoogen, E. (2008): Trade, quality upgrading, and wage inequality in the Mexican manufacturing sector, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 123(2), 489-530.
- Burtless, G. (1995): International trade and the rise in earnings inequality, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 33(2), 800-816.
- Gottschalk, P.; Smeeding, T. (1997): Cross-national comparisons of earnings and income inequality, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 35, 633-687.
- Mahler, V. (2002): Exploring the subnational dimension of income inequality: An analysis of the relationship between inequality and electoral turnout in the developed countries, *International Studies Quarterly*, 46(1), 117-142.
- Moene, O.; Wallerstein, M. (2001): Inequality, Social Insurance, and Redistribution, *American Political Science Review*, 95(4), 859-874.
- Arbache, J.; Dickerson, A.; Green, F. (2004): Trade liberalisation and wages in developing countries, *The Economic Journal*, 114, F73-F96.
- Attanasio, O.; Goldberg, P.; Pavcnik, N. (2004): Trade reforms and wage inequality in Colombia, *Journal of Development Economics*, 74, 331-366.
- Chamrurbagwala, R. (2006): Economic liberalization and wage inequality in India, *World Development*, 34(12), 1997-2015.
- Feliciano, Z. (2001): Workers and trade liberalization: The impact of trade reforms in Mexico on wages and employment, *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 55(1), 95-115.
- Leamer, E.; Maul, H.; Rodriguez, S.; Schott, P. (1999): Does natural resource abundance increase Latin American income inequality?, *Journal of Development Economics*, 59, 3-42.
- Robbins, D.; Gindling, T. (1999): Trade liberalization and the relative wages for more-skilled workers in Costa Rica, *Review of Development Economics*, 3(2), 140-154.
- Zhu, S.; Trefler, D. (2005): Trade and inequality in developing countries: a general equilibrium analysis, *Journal of International Economics*, 65, 21-48.
- Xu, B. (2003): Trade liberalization, wage inequality, and endogenously determined non-traded goods, *Journal of International Economics*, 60, 417-431.
- Bardone, L.; Gittleman, M.; Keese, M. (1998): Causes and consequences of earnings inequality in OECD countries, *Lavoro e relazioni industriali*, 2, 13-58.
- Blau, F.; Kahn, L. (1996): International differences in male wage inequality: Institutions versus market forces, *Journal of Political Economy*, 104(4), 791-837.
- Bound, G.; Johnson, G. (1995): What are the causes of rising wage inequality in the United States?, *Federal Reserve Bank of New York Economic Policy Review*, 1(1), 1-17.
- Brauer, D.; Hickok, S. (1995): Explaining the growing inequality in wages across skill levels, *Federal Reserve Bank of New York Economic Policy Review*, 1, 61-75.

- Moene, K.; Wallerstein, M. (2003): Earnings inequality and welfare spending: A disaggregated analysis, *World Politics*, 55, 485-516.
- Bollen, K.; Jackman, R. (1985): Political democracy and the size distribution of income, *American Sociological Review*, 50, 438-457.
- Kuznets, S. (1955): Economic growth and income inequality, *American Economic Review*, 45, 1-28.
- Sullivan, G. (1983): Uneven development and national income inequality in Third World Countries: A cross-national study of the effects of external economic dependency, *Sociological Perspectives*, 26(2), 201-231.
- Western, B.; Rosenfeld, J. (2011): Unions, norms, and the rise in U.S. wage inequality, *American Sociological Review*, 76, 513-537.
- Kijima, Y. (2006): Why did wage inequality increase? Evidence from urban India 1983-99, *Journal of Development Economics*, 81, 97-117.
- Lemieux, T. (2008): The changing nature of wage inequality, *Journal of Population Economics*, 21(1), 21-48.
- Bourguignon, F.; Morrisson, C. (1998): The role of dualism, *Journal of Development Economics*, 57, 233-257.
- Hanson, G.; Harrison, A. (1999): Trade liberalization and wage inequality in Mexico, *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 52(2), 271-288.
- Wood, A. (2002): Globalization and wage inequalities: a synthesis of three theories, *Weltwirtschaftliches Archiv*, 138, 54-82.
- Atkinson, T. (2000): The changing distribution of income: evidence and explanations, *German Economic Review*, 1(1), 3-18.
- Birdsall, N.; Ross, D.; Sabot, R. (1995): Inequality and growth reconsidered: Lessons from East Asia, *World Bank Economic Review*, 9(3), 477-508.
- Frank, Z. (2001): Exports and inequality: Evidence from the Brazilian frontier, 1870-1937, *Journal of Economic History*, 61(1), 37-58.
- Schultz, T. (1998): Inequality in the distribution of personal income in the world: how is it changing and why?, *Journal of Population Economics*, 11, 307-344.
- Wood, A. (1998): Globalisation and the rise in labour market inequalities, *Economic Journal*, 108, 1463-1482.
- Crenshaw, E.; Ameen, A. (1994): The distribution of income across national populations: testing multiple paradigms, *Social Science Research*, 23, 1-22.
- Messerlin, P. (1995): The impact of trade and capital movements on labor: evidence on the French case, *OECD Economic Studies*, 24, 89-124.
- Akerman, A.; Helpman, E.; Itshoki, O.; Muendler, M.; Redding, S. (2013): Sources of wage inequality, *American Economic Review*, 103(3), 214-219.
- Bensidoun, I.; Jean, S.; Sztulman, A. (2011): International trade and income distribution: Reconsidering the evidence, *Review of World Economics*, 147(4), 593-619.
- Das, M.; Mohapatra, S. (2003): Income inequality: The aftermath of stock market liberalization in emerging markets, *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 10, 217-248.
- Harrison, A.; McLaren, J.; McMillan, M. (2011): Recent perspectives on trade and inequality, *Annual Review of Economics*, 3(1), 261-289.
- Van Reenen, J. (2011): Wage inequality, technology and trade: 21st century evidence, *Labour Economics*, 18(6), 730-741.

- Lee, K. (2014): Globalization, Income Inequality and Poverty: Theory and Empirics, *Social Systems Studies*, 28(2), 109-134.
- Bornschier, V.; Ballmer-Cao, T. (1979): Income inequality: A cross-national study of the relationships between MNC penetration, dimensions of the power structure, and income distribution, *American Sociological Review*, 44(3), 487-506.
- London, B.; Robinson, T. (1989): The effect of international dependence on income inequality and political violence, *American Sociological Review*, 54(2), 305-308.
- Perotti, R. (1994): Income distribution and investment, *European Economic Review*, 38, 149-187.
- Aghion, P.; Caroli, E.; Cecilia, G. (1999): Inequality and economic growth: The perspective of the new growth theories, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37, 1615-1660.
- Bowman, K. (1997): Should the Kuznets effect be relied on to induce equalizing growth? Evidence from post-1950 development, *World Development*, 25(1), 127-143.
- Chang, J.; Ram, R. (2000): Level of development, rate of economic growth, and income inequality, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 48(4), 787-799.
- Ghosh, K.; Saunders, P.; Biswas, B. (2000): Trade and wage inequality: Are they related?, *Atlantic Economic Journal*, 28(3), 364-376.
- Randolph, S.; Lott, W. (1993): Can the Kuznets effect be relied on to induce equalizing growth?, *World Development*, 21(5), 829-840.
- Chordokrak, C.; Chintrakarn, P. (2011): Globalization, technology, and income inequality: new evidence, *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 62, 7-14.
- Miller, T. (2001): Impact of globalization on U.S. wage inequality: Implications for policy, *North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 12, 219-242.
- Nascia, L.; Pianta, M. (2009): Forces of inequality? The impact of technology and globalization, *Intereconomics*, 44, 332-336.
- Ang, J. (2010): Finance and inequality: the case of India, *Southern Economic Journal*, 76(3), 738-761.
- Atkinson, A. (2003): Income inequality in OECD countries: Data and explanations, *CESifo Economic Studies*, 49(4), 479-513.
- Borjas, G.; Ramey, V. (1994): Time-series evidence on the sources of trends in wage inequality, *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, 84(2), 10-16.
- Francois, J.; Nelson, D. (1998): Trade, technology, and wages: General equilibrium mechanics, *The Economic Journal*, 108(450), 1483-1499.
- Glomm, G.; Kaganovich, M. (2008): Social security, public education and the growth-inequality relationship, *European Economic Review*, 52(6), 1009-1034.
- Green, F.; Dickerson, A.; Arbache, J. (2001): A picture of wage inequality and the allocation of labor through a period of trade liberalization: the case of Brazil, *World Development*, 29(11), 1923-1939.
- Ma, Y.; Dei, F. (2009): Product quality, wage inequality, and trade liberalization, *Review of International Economics*, 17(2), 244-260.
- Sachs, J.; Shatz, H. (1996): US trade with developing countries and wage inequality, *American Economic Review*, 86(2), 234-239.
- Wong, M. (2016): Globalization, spending and income inequality in Asia Pacific, *Journal of Comparative Asian Development*, 15(1), 1-18.

- Chan, S. (1989): Income inequality among LDCs: a comparative analysis of alternative perspectives, *International Studies Quarterly*, 33(1), 45-65.
- Gradstein, M.; Milanovic, B. (2004): Does Liberte=Egalite? A survey of the empirical evidence on the links between political democracy and income inequality, *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 18(4), 515-537.
- Chiquiar, D. (2008): Globalization, regional wage differentials and the Stolper-Samuelson theorem: evidence from Mexico, *Journal of International Economics*, 74(1), 70-93.
- Galiani, S.; Sanguinetti, P. (2003): The impact of trade liberalization on wage inequality: evidence from Argentina, *Journal of Development Economics*, 72(2), 497-513.
- Gustafsson, B.; Shi, L. (2001): The anatomy of rising earnings inequality in urban China, *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 29(1), 118-135.
- Ma, A. (2006): Geographical location of foreign direct investment and wage inequality in China, *The World Economy*, 29(8), 1031-1055.
- Zhao, Y. (2001): Foreign direct investment and relative wages: the case of China, *China Economic Review*, 12(1), 40-57.
- Braunstein, E.; Brenner, M. (2007): Foreign direct investment and gendered wages in urban China, *Feminist Economics*, 13, 213-237.
- Knight, J.; Song, L. (2003): Increasing urban wage inequality in China, *Economics of Transition*, 11(4), 597-619.
- Fluckiger, Y.; Ramirez, J.; Deutsch, J.; Silber, J. (2002): Inequality of income and openness to foreign trade, *Schweizerische Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 28(2), 241-265.
- Alderson, A.; Beckfield, J.; Nielsen, F. (2005): Exactly how has income inequality changed? Patterns of distributional change in core societies, *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 46, 405-423.
- Goesling, B. (2001): Changing income inequalities within and between nations: New evidence, *American Sociological Review*, 66, 745-761.
- Kenworthy, L.; Pontusson, J. (2005): Rising inequality and the politics of redistribution in affluent countries, *Perspectives on Politics*, 3, 449-471.
- Korpi, W.; Palme, J. (1998): The paradox of redistribution and strategies of equality: welfare state institutions, inequality, and poverty in the Western countries, *American Sociological Review*, 63, 661-688.
- Kuznets, S. (1963): Quantitative aspect of the economic growth of nations: VIII – distribution of income by size, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 12, 1-80.
- Lawrence, R.; Slaughter, M. (1993): Trade and US wages: great sucking sound or small hiccup?, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2, 161-226.
- Matins-Bekat, C.; Kulkarni, K. (2009): Income distribution and economic growth: the case of Brazil, *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 43(1), 341-351.
- Ram, R. (1989): Can educational expansion reduce income inequality in less-developed countries?, *Economics of Education Review*, 8(2), 185-195.
- Ram, R. (1991): Kuznets's inverted-U hypothesis: evidence from a highly developed country, *Southern Economic Journal*, 57(4), 1112-1123.
- Robertson, R. (2004): Relative prices and wage inequality: evidence from Mexico, *Journal of International Economics*, 64(2), 387-409.
- Savvides, A.; Stengos, T. (2000): Income inequality and economic development: evidence from the threshold regression model, *Economics Letters*, 69, 207-212.

- Blejer, M.; Guerrero, I. (1990): The impact of macroeconomic policies on income distribution: An empirical study of the Philippines, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 72, 414-423.
- Dawson, P. (1997): On testing Kuznets' economic growth hypothesis, *Applied Economics Letters*, 4, 409-410.
- Vanhoudt, P. (2000): An assessment of the macroeconomic determinants of inequality, *Applied Economics*, 32, 877-883.
- Tomaskovic-Dewey, D.; Lin, K. (2011): Income dynamics, economic rents, and the financialization of the U.S. economy, *American Sociological Review*, 76(4), 538-559.
- Anand, S.; Kanbur, R. (1993): The Kuznets process and the inequality-development relationship, *Journal of Development Economics*, 40, 25-52.
- Shabaz, M. (2010): Income inequality-economic growth and non-linearity: A case of Pakistan, *International Journal of Social Economics*, 37(9), 613-636.
- Tiwari, A. (2009): Globalization and wage inequality: an empirical study for a developing country, *Conference Issue of Indian Economic Society*, 1, 914.
- Tiwari, A. (2010): Liberalization and wage inequality: evidence from Indian manufacturing sector – a critical review of literature, *Asian Economic Review*, 52(3), 565-592.
- Tiwari, A.; Aruna, M. (2011): Is direction of trade responsible for wage inequality in India? An empirical analysis, *Indian Journal of Economics and Business*, 10(1), 73-90.
- Dias, J. (2005): Educational system, income inequality and growth: The median voter decision, *Estudos Economicos*, 35, 81-100.
- Wälde, K. (2000): Egalitarian and elitist education systems as the basis for international differences in wage inequality, *European Journal of Political Economy*, 16, 445-468.
- Thornton, J. (2001): The Kuznets inverted-U hypothesis: Panel data evidence from 96 countries, *Applied Economics Letters*, 8(1), 15-16.
- Webb, M.; Berger, M. (1992): Trade regimes and wages, *Journal of Development Economics*, 38, 119-131.
- Meyer, C. (1999): Globalization and rising inequality in developed countries, *Global Business and Economics Review*, 1, 108-118.
- Al-Marhubi, F. (2000): Income inequality and inflation: The cross-country evidence, *Contemporary Economic Policy*, 18(4), 428-439.
- Bertola, G. (2010): Inequality, integration and policy: Issues and evidence from EMU, *Journal of Economic Inequalities*, 8, 345-365.
- Bouvet, F. (2010): EMU and the dynamics of regional per capita income inequality in Europe, *Journal of Economic Inequalities*, 8, 323-344.
- Bulir, A. (2001): Income inequality: Does inflation matter?, *IMF Staff Papers*, 48(1), 139-159.
- Cysne, R.; Maldonado, W.; Monteiro, P. (2005): Inflation and income inequality: A shopping-time approach, *Journal of Development Economics*, 78, 516-528.
- Dolmas, J.; Huffman, W.; Wynne, M. (2000): Inequality, inflation and central bank independence, *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 33(1), 271-287.
- White, H.; Anderson, E. (2001): Growth versus distribution: Does the pattern of growth matter?, *Development Policy Review*, 16(3), 267-289.
- Carneiro, F.; Arbache, J. (2003): Assessing the impacts of trade on poverty and inequality, *Applied Economics Letters*, 10, 989-994.

- Albanesi, S. (2007): Inflation and inequality, *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 54, 1088-1114.
- Chong, A.; Calderon, C. (2000): Institutional quality and distribution of income, *Economic development and Cultural Change*, 42, 761-786.
- Chong, A.; Gradstein, M. (2007): Inequality and institutions, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89, 454-465.
- Sylwester, K. (2004): A note on geography, institutions, and income inequality, *Economic Letters*, 85(2), 235-240.
- Burkhart, R. (1997): Comparative democracy and income distribution: Shape and direction of the causal arrow, *Journal of Politics*, 59, 148-164.
- Deaton, A.; Paxson, C. (1997): The effects of economic and population growth on national saving and inequality, *Demography*, 34, 97-114.
- Koeninger, W.; Leonardi, M.; Nunziata, L. (2007): Labour market institutions and wage inequality, *Industrial & Labor Relations Review*, 60, 340-356.
- Muller, E. (1985): Income inequality, regime repressiveness, and political violence, *American Sociological Review*, 50, 47-61.
- Weede, E. (1989): Democracy and inequality reconsidered, *American Sociological Review*, 54, 865-868.
- Jackman, R. (1980): Socialist parties and income inequality in Western industrial societies, *Journal of Politics*, 42, 135-149.
- Crenshaw, D. (1992): Cross-national determinants of income inequality: A replication and extension using ecological-evolutionary theory, *Social Forces*, 71(2), 339-363.
- Cutright, P. (1967): Inequality: A cross-national analysis, *American Sociological Review*, 32(4), 562-578.
- Hewitt, C. (1977): The effect of political democracy and social democracy on equality in industrial societies: A cross-national comparison, *American Sociological Review*, 42(3), 450-464.
- Neyapti, B. (2006): Revenue decentralization and income distribution, *Economics Letters*, 92, 409-416.
- Weede, E.; Tiefenbach, H. (1981): Correlates of size distribution of income: a cross-national analysis, *Journal of Politics*, 48, 1029-1041.
- Chen, Z. (2007): Development and inequality: Evidence from an endogenous switching regression without regime separation, *Economic Letters*, 96, 269-274.
- Murphy, K.; Welch, F. (1993): Inequality and relative wages, *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, 83(2), 104-109.
- Topel, R. (1994): Regional labor markets and the determinants of wage inequality, *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, 84(2), 17-22.
- Card, D.; di Nardo, J. (2002): Skill biased technological change and rising wage inequality: Some problems and puzzles, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 20, 733-783.
- Katz, L.; Murphy, K. (1992): Changes in relative wages, 1963-1987: Supply and demand factors, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 107, 35-78.
- Lin, K.; Tomaskovic-Devey (2013): Financialization and U.S. income inequality, 1970-2008, *American Journal of Sociology*, 118(5), 1284-1329.
- Zalewski, D.; Whalen, C. (2010): Financialization and income inequality: A Post Keynesian Institutional Analysis, *Journal of Economic Issues*, 44(3), 757-777.
- Manda, D.; Sen, K. (2004): The labor market effects of globalization in Kenya, *Journal of International Development*, 16(1), 29-43.

- Kai, H.; Hamori, S. (2009): Microfinance and inequality, *Research in Applied Economics*, 1, 1-14.
- Knight, J.; Sabot, R. (1983): Educational expansion and the Kuznets effect, *American Economic Review*, 73, 1132-1136.
- Teulings, C.; van Rens, T. (2008): Education, growth and income inequality, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90, 89-104.
- Durham, J. (1999): Econometrics of income distribution: toward more comprehensive specification of institutional correlates, *Comparative Economic Studies*, 41, 43-74.
- Das, S. (2002): Foreign direct investment and the relative wage in a developing economy, *Journal of Development Economics*, 67, 55-77.
- Agenor, P. (2004): Does globalization hurt the poor?, *Journal of International Economics and Economic Policy*, 1(1), 21-51.
- Asongu, S. (2013): Investment and inequality: which financial channels are good for the poor?, *African Finance Journal*, 15(2), 43-65.
- Asongu, S. (2013): How do financial reforms affect inequality through financial sector competition? Evidence from Africa, *Economics Bulletin*, 33(1), 401-414.
- De La Croix, D.; Doepke, M. (2004): Inequality and growth: Why differential fertility matters, *American Economic Review*, 93(4), 1091-1113.
- Wan, G. (2004): Inequality and economic development in transition economies: Are nonlinear models needed?, *World Economic Papers*, 4, 1-13.
- Bashir, N.; Khan, A. (2011): Trade liberalization, poverty and inequality nexus: A case study of India, *Asian Economic and Financial Review*, 1(3), 114-119.
- Ekmekcioglu, E. (2012): The effects of globalization on world income inequality, *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 2(4).
- Figini, P. Santarelli, E. (2006): Openness, economic reforms, poverty and globalization in developing countries, *Journal of Developing Areas*, 39(2), 129-151.
- Georgantopoulos, G.; Tsamis, D. (2011): The impact of globalization on income distribution: The case of Hungary, *Research Journal of International Studies*, 21, 18-25.
- Kunieda, T.; Okada, K.; Shibata, A. (2014): Finance and inequality: How does globalization change their relationship?, *Macroeconomic Dynamics*, 18(5), 1091-1128.
- Pi, J.; Zhou, Y. (2014): Foreign capital, public infrastructure, and wage inequality in developing countries, *International Review of Economics & Finance*, 29, 195-207.
- Angeles, L. (2007): Income inequality and colonialism, *European Economic Review*, 51(5), 1155-1176.
- Bourguignon, F.; Verdier, T. (2000): Oligarchy, democracy, inequality, and growth, *Journal of Development Economics*, 62(2), 285-313.
- Chu, H. (2000): The impacts of educational expansion and schooling on income distribution, *Quarterly Journal of Business and Economics*, 39(2), 39-49.
- Yang, J.; Gao, M. (2018): The impact of education expansion on wage inequality, *Applied Economics*, 50(12), 1309-1323.
- Acosta, P.; Gasparini, L. (2007): Capital accumulation, trade liberalization, and rising wage inequality: The case of Argentina, *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 55(4), 793-812.

- Atolia, M. (2007): Trade liberalization and rising wage inequality in Latin America: Reconciliation with HOS theory, *Journal of International Economics*, 71(2), 467-494.
- Pavcnik, N.; Blom, A.; Goldberg, P.; Schady, N. (2004): Trade liberalization and industry wage structures: Evidence from Brazil, *The World Bank Economic Review*, 18(3), 319-344.
- Jäntti, M.; Jenkins, S. (2010): The impact of macroeconomic conditions on income inequality, *The Journal of Economic Inequality*, 8(2), 221-240.
- Jäntti, M. (1994): A more efficient estimate of the effects of macroeconomic activity on the distribution of income, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 76, 372-378.
- Kelly, N. (2004): Does politics really matter? Policy and government's equalizing influence in the United States, *American Politics Research*, 32, 264-284.
- Kelly, N. (2005): Political choice, public policy, and distributional outcomes, *American Journal of Political Science*, 49, 865-880.
- Nielsen, F.; Alderson, A. (1997): The Kuznets Curve and the Great U-Turn: Income Inequality in U.S. Counties, 1970-1990, *American Sociological Review*, 62, 12-33.
- Cancian, M.; Reed, D. (1999): The impact of wives' earnings on income inequality: issues and estimates, *Demography*, 36(2), 173-184.
- Muller, E.; Seligson, M. (1987): Inequality and insurgency, *American Political Science Review*, 82(2), 425-451.
- Muller, E. (1995): Income inequality and democratization: Reply to Bollen and Jackman, *American Sociological Review*, 60(6), 991-996.
- Papanek, G.; Kyn, O. (1987): Flattening the Kuznets curve: The consequences for income distribution of development strategy, government intervention, income and the rate of growth, *The Pakistan Development Review*, 26, 1-54.
- Christopoloulos, D.; McAdam, P. (2017): Do financial reforms help stabilize inequality? *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 70, 45-61.
- Li, J.; Yu, H. (2014): Income inequality and financial reform in Asia: the role of human capital, *Applied Economics*, 46, 2920-2935.
- Poterba, J. (2007): Income inequality and income taxation, *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 29, 623-633.
- Baldwin, R.; Cain, G. (2000): Shifts in relative U.S. wages: The role of trade, technology and factor endowments, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 82(4), 580-595.
- Berman, E.; Bound, J.; Machin, S. (1998): Implications of skill-biased technological change: international evidence, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 113, 1245-1280.
- Calmon, P.; Conceicao, P.; Galbraith, J.; Garza-Cantu, V.; Hibert, A. (2000): The evolution of industrial wage inequality in Mexico and Brazil: a comparative study, *Review of Development Economics*, 4(2), 194-203.
- Cortes, W. (2001): What is behind increasing wage inequality in Mexico?, *World Development*, 29(11), 1905-1922.
- Feenstra, R.; Hanson, G. (1999): The impact of outsourcing and high-technology capital on wages: estimates for the United States, 1979-1990, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 114(3), 907-940.
- Leamer, E. (1996): Wage inequality from international competition and technological change: theory and country experience, *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, May, 309-314.
- Bound, J.; Johnson, G. (1992): Changes in the structure of wages in the 1980s: An evaluation of alternative explanations, *American Economic Review*, 82, 371-392.

- Gottschalk, P. (1993): Changes in inequality of family income in seven industrialized countries, *American Economic Review: Papers and Proceedings*, 83, 136-142.
- Borjas, G.; Freeman, R.; Katz, L. (1997): How much do immigration and trade affect labor market outcomes?, *Brookings Paper on Economic Activity*, 1-67.
- Golden, M.; Londregan, J. (2006): Centralization of bargaining and wage inequality: A correction of Wallerstein, *American Journal of Political Science*, 50(1), 208-213.
- Glewwe, P. (1988): Economic liberalization and income inequality: Further evidence on the Sri Lankan experience, *Journal of Development Economics*, 28, 233-246.
- Crenshaw, E. (1993): Polity, economy and technology: Alternative explanations for income inequality, *Social Forces*, 71(3), 807-816.
- Simpson, M. (1990): Political rights and income inequality: A cross-national test, *American Sociological Review*, 55, 682-693.
- Boyd, R. (1988): Government involvement in the economy and the distribution of income: A cross-national study, *Population Research and Policy Review*, 7, 223-238.
- Meier, T. (1973): The effects of macroeconomic fluctuations on the distribution of income, *Review of Income and Wealth*, 21, 385-405.
- Weil, G. (1984): Cyclical and secular influences on the size distribution of personal incomes in the UK: Some econometric tests, *Applied Economics*, 16, 749-755.
- Schott, P. (2003): One size fits all? Heckscher-Ohlin specialization in global production, *American Economic Review*, 93(2), 686-708.
- Lemieux, T. (2006): Increasing residual wage inequality: composition effects, noisy data, or rising demand for skill?, *The American Economic Review*, 96(3), 461-498.
- Borjas, G.; Ramey, V. (1995): Foreign competition, market power, and wage inequality: Theory and practice, *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1075-1110.
- Krahn, H.; Gartrell, J. (1985): Effects of foreign trade, government spending, and world-system status on income distribution, *Rural Sociology*, 50(2), 181-192.
- Hasman, J.; Novotny, J. (2015): Cross-National Variation in Income Inequality and its determinants: An application of Bayesian Model Averaging on a New Standardized Inequality Data Set, *Prague Economic Papers*, 24(2), 211-224.
- Nolan, P. (1992): A standardized cross-national comparison of incomes, *Sociological Quarterly*, 33(4), 599-609.
- Nolan, P. (1983): Status in the world system, income inequality and economic growth, *American Journal of Sociology*, 89, 410-419.
- Prechel, H. (1985): The effects of exports, public debt and development on income inequality, *International Labor Review*, 108, 97-125.
- Simpson, M. (1993): Political power versus ecological evolutionary forces: What are the proximal sources of income distribution?, *Social Forces*, 71(3), 797-806.
- Stack, S. (1980): The political economy of income inequality: A comparative analysis, *Canada Journal of Political Science*, 13, 273-286.
- Bassett, W.; Burkett, J.; Puterman, L. (1999): Income distribution, government transfers, and the problem of unequal influence, *European Journal of Political Economy*, 15, 207-228.

- Lee, W.; Roemer, J. (1998): Income distribution, redistributive politics, and economic growth, *Journal of Economic Growth*, 3, 217-240.
- Aghion, P.; Commander, S. (1999): On the dynamics of inequality in the transition, *Economics of Transition*, 7(2), 275-298.
- Milanovic, B. (1999): Explaining the increase in inequality during transition, *Economics of Transition*, 7(2), 299-343.
- Ferreira, F. (1999): Economic transition and the distributions of income and wealth, *Economic of Transition*, 7(2), 377-410.
- Bornschieer, V. (1983): World economy, level development and income distribution: an integration of different approaches to the explanation of income inequality, *World Development*, 11, 11-20.
- Stewart, F. (1978): Inequality, technology and payment systems, *World Development*, 6, 275-293.
- Weede, E. (1980): Beyond misspecification in sociological analysis of income inequality, *American Sociological Review*, 45, 497-501.
- Bornschieer, V.; Chase-Dunn, C.; Robinson, R. (1978): Cross-national evidence of the effects of foreign investment and aid on economic growth and inequality: A survey of findings and reanalysis, *American Journal of Sociology*, 84(3), 651-683.
- Borg, S.; Castles, F. (1981): The influence of the political right on public income maintenance expenditure and equality, *Political Studies*, 29, 604-621.
- Woods, E. (1982): The effects of democracy and socialist strength on the size of distribution issues, *International Journal of Comparative Sociology*, 23, 1-51.
- Katz, C.; Mahler, V.; Franz, M. (1983): The impact of taxes on growth and distribution in developed capitalist countries: A cross-national study, *American Political Science Review*, 77, 871-886.
- Andres, A. (2006): Software piracy and income inequality, *Applied Economics Letters*, 13(2), 101-105.
- Asongu, S. (2013): Investment and inequality in Africa: which financial channels are good for the poor?, *African Finance Journal*, 15(2), 43-65.
- Wang, B.; Ajit, D. (2006): The impact of globalization on income inequality: Empirical evidence from Canada and India, *The ICFAI Journal of Applied Economics*, 5(6), 7-16.
- Aghion, P.; Howitt, P.; Violante, G. (2002): General purpose technology and wage inequality, *Journal of Economic Growth*, 7, 315-345.
- Lang, K. (1998): The effect of trade liberalization on wages and employment: The case of New Zealand, *Journal of Labor Economics*, 16(4), 792-814.
- Demirgüç-Kunt, A.; Levine, R. (2009): Finance and inequality: theory and evidence, *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 1(1), 287-318.
- Askenazy, P. (2005): Trade, services and wage inequality, *Oxford Economic Papers*, 57, 674-692.
- Blum, B. (2008): Trade, technology, and the rise of the service sector: The effects on US wage inequality, *Journal of International Economics*, 74, 441-458.
- Godechot, O. (2016): Financialization is marketization, *Sociological Science*, 3, 495-519.
- Enns, P.; Kelly, N.; Morgan, J.; Volscho, T.; Witko, C. (2014): Conditional Status Quo Bias and Top Income Shares: How U.S. Political Institutions Have Benefited the Rich, *Journal of Politics*, 76, 288-303.
- Hacker, J.; Pierson, P. (2010): Winner-Take-All-Politics: Public Policy, Political Organization, and the Precipitous Rise of Top Incomes in the United States, *Politics & Society*, 38, 152-204.

Kristal, T. (2013): The Capitalist Machine: Computerization, Workers' Power, and the Decline in Labor's Share with U.S. Industries, *American Sociological Review*, 78, 361-389.

Fischer, R. (2001): The evolution of inequality after trade liberalization, *Journal of Development Economics*, 66, 555-579.

Gindling, T.; Robbins, D. (2001): Patterns and sources of changing wage inequality in Chile and Costa Rica during structural adjustment, *World Development*, 29(4), 725-745.