



Financial Market Integration and Income Inequality

Jae Wook Jung and Kyunghun Kim



Working Paper 18-02

Financial Market Integration and Income Inequality

Jae Wook Jung and Kyunghun Kim

Working Paper 18-02

Financial Market Integration and Income Inequality

**KOREA INSTITUTE FOR
INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY (KIEP)**

Building C, Sejong National Research Complex, 370,
Sicheong-daero, Sejong-si, Korea

Tel: (822) 82-44-414-1251 Fax: 82-44-414-1144

URL: <http://www.kiep.go.kr>

Jae-Young Lee, President

Published July 20, 2018 in Korea by KIEP

ISBN 978-89-322-4276-7 94320

978-89-322-4026-8 (set)

Price USD 3

© 2018 KIEP

Executive Summary

Benefits of financial market integration include cheaper and alternative options of saving and borrowing for households and entrepreneurs. In the global financial market, asset choices for households widen so that individuals can manage their idiosyncratic income risk more effectively. On the other hand, financial market integration makes investors who hold foreign assets more vulnerable to global financial shocks. In the recent financial crisis, financial market distress which initially arose in the U.S. had an enormous impact on the peripheral countries. This example shows that the strong shock propagation occurs via integrated financial markets.

The existing literature shows that financial market integration has a sizable impact not only on business cycles in the short run, but also on economic growth in the long run. However, there has been little attention to income distribution, specifically in related to the financial market integration. In this paper, we fill the void in the literature by focusing on the following two stylized facts: income inequality has been exacerbated in most countries over the past two decades, and the financial market has been integrated across countries during the same period. In particular, we answer three research questions to investigate the relationship between the two facts. First, how does financial market integration affect income inequality? Second, how do financial market integration and financial market development interact to change income inequality? Third, what components do theoretical model need to explain the interaction effect of financial market development and integration on income inequality?

We test hypotheses that the effect of financial market openness on inequality is conditional on the level of domestic financial market development when the financial market opens. An empirical study with panel data comprised of 174 countries for the period 1995-2017 finds that the overall effect of financial integration on income inequality is nonlinear. Financial market integration creates the intensive and extensive margins of credit supply which may depend on the development level of financial market disproportionately. This paper uncovers a novel empirical evidence that financial market integration and financial market development interact to change income inequality. When other things are controlled, the effect of financial market integration on income inequality depends on financial market development. In a country with underdeveloped financial market, income inequality gets worse as financial

market opens. On the other hand, when financial market is highly developed, the effect of financial market openness on income inequality is mostly insignificant in a statistical sense. The results are still valid with different measures of financial market development, integration, and income inequality. We check that the results are robust as an endogeneity issue among financial market development and integration is controlled.

We also suggest some important structures for the conventional economic model to account for our empirical finding as theoretical implications. Based on these implications, extensions of the conventional small open economy model with financial constraints having suggested components such as heterogeneous holdings of foreign assets across income and asset levels and entrepreneurial shocks will be necessary to understand an interaction of financial market openness and domestic market development on the distribution of income in a country. Our finding also echoes that studying an economic mechanism in which economic growth, financial market outcomes, and inequality are endogenously determined.

Keywords: Financial market development, Financial market integration, Income inequality

JEL Classification: D63, F36, O11, O16

Contributors

Jae Wook Jung

Associate Research Fellow of the Africa and the Middle East Team at the Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP). His research covers international trade and finance, specifically the effect of trade liberalization policy with a financial market condition. He also studies economic development in Africa and trade between the region and South Korea. He received a B.S. in Engineering and M.A. in Economics from Yonsei University. He holds Ph.D. in Economics from University of California, Davis.

Kyunghun Kim

Associate Research Fellow of the Department of International Macroeconomics and Finance at the Korea Institute for International Economic Policy (KIEP). His field of interest is the international finance and macroeconomics. He holds a Ph.D. degree in Economics from University of California, Davis.

Contents

Executive Summary ·····	3
1. Introduction ·····	9
2. Literature Review ·····	13
3. Empirical Analysis ·····	17
3-1. Variables and Data ·····	17
3-2. Empirical Specification ·····	19
3-3. Empirical Results ·····	21
3-4. Robustness Tests ·····	32
4. Theoretical Implications ·····	35
5. Conclusions ·····	38
References ·····	39

Tables

Table 1. Variable Definition and Data Source	18
Table 2. Summary Statistics	20
Table 3. Panel Regression with Time and Country Fixed Effects	22
Table 4. Panel Regression with Alternative Gini Coefficient and Financial Openness	23
Table 5. Country Group by Liquid Liability	24
Table 6. Averages of Variables by Quartile Country Groups	26
Table 7. Panel Regression by Country Group	27
Table 8. Panel Regression with Alternative Gini Coefficient	28
Table 9. Panel Regression with Alternative Financial Development: <i>PRIV_CREDIT</i>	29
Table 10. Panel Regression with Alternative Financial Development: <i>STOCK_CAPITAL</i>	30
Table 11. Panel Regression with Alternative Capital Account Openness: <i>KA_ED</i>	31
Table 12. IV Regression	33
Table 13. Dynamic Panel	34

Financial Market Integration and Income Inequality*

Jae Wook Jung[†] and Kyunghun Kim^{††}

1. Introduction

Over the past decades, financial markets have become integrated across countries. Benefits of financial market integration include cheaper and alternative options of saving and borrowing for households and entrepreneurs. In the global financial market, asset choices for households widen so that individuals can manage their idiosyncratic income risk more effectively. On the other hand, financial market integration makes investors who hold foreign assets more vulnerable to global financial shocks. In the recent financial crisis, financial market distress which initially arose in the U.S. had an enormous impact on the peripheral countries. This example shows that the strong shock propagation occurs via integrated financial markets.

* We thank Sungbae An, Yongsung Chang, Sun-Bin Kim, Dukgyoo Kim, and participants in the Economic Department seminar at University of Mannheim and KIEP Brownbag seminar for their helpful comments and suggestions. All remaining errors are entirely our own.

[†] Associate Research Fellow, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy, Email: jwjung@kiep.go.kr; Building C, Sejong National Research Complex, 370 Sicheongdaero, Sejong-si 30147, Korea.

^{††} Associate Research Fellow, Korea Institute for International Economic Policy, Email: khkim@kiep.go.kr; Building C, Sejong National Research Complex, 370 Sicheongdaero, Sejong-si 30147, Korea.

The existing literature shows that financial market integration has a sizable impact not only on business cycles in the short run, but also on economic growth in the long run. However, there has been little attention on income distribution, specifically in related to the financial market integration. In this paper, we fill the void in the literature by focusing on the following two stylized facts: income inequality has been exacerbated in most countries over the past two decades, and the financial market has been integrated across countries during the same period¹. In particular, we answer three research questions to investigate the relationship between the two facts. First, how does financial market integration affect income inequality? Second, how does financial market integration and financial market development interact to change income inequality? Third, what components do theoretical model need to explain the interaction effect of financial market development and integration on income inequality?

Why does financial market development matter to understand the effect of financial market integration on economic systems? The standard neoclassical growth model of a small open economy treats financial market integration as a synchronization of the domestic interest rate with the world interest rate. Since interest rates in developing countries are mostly higher than the interest rate of the international bond market, financial market integration of emerging countries into the global financial market is considered as lowering an interest rate due to more accessible credit in economic theory. In this sense, financial market openness would have the similar effect of domestic financial market development on economies. Also financial market integration allows more diverse financial securities that one can deal with so that the financial market would become more complete. More complete financial market is likely to decrease precautionary savings so that income inequality might be lower.

Nevertheless, there is a controversy in empirical studies on the relationship between financial market integration and income inequality, specifically it is about whether the financial market integration and development have the same effect on economic systems and the distribution of income in the systems. Some empirical studies show that financial globalization is associated with an increase in income inequality while the others find counter-evidences. At least, it is hard to tell that the

¹ Azzimonti, de Francisco, and Quadrini (2014) document the comovements of financial market globalization and income inequality during recent decades with increasing public debt.

effect of financial globalization on income inequality is linear.

How the effect of financial integration on income inequality can be different from the effect of financial market development? First, even the effect of financial market development on inequality is unclear due to different mechanisms of operating across borrowers and lenders. Following Demirgüç-Kunt and Levine (2009), separating margins of financial market development is useful to understand the different mechanisms. The intensive margin of financial market development rises because cheaper credit becomes available for people who have already participated in the financial market. Inequality gets worsen because of the intensive margin effect. On the other hand, financial market development allows newly available financial services for borrowers or lenders who have been excluded from financial market. The extensive margin effect enhances inequality.

Financial market openness also works on the extensive and intensive margins. Financial market integration allows households and firms that have already employed financial services to have diverse sources of insuring risks, while outsiders face more income risks without hedging tools if financial market participation structure is conservative. Especially diversification opportunities become more valuable as agents have different saving and investment motivations such as precautionary saving for idiosyncratic risk, permanent income hypothesis-base saving motive, or self-financing motive to avoid using expensive external finance. As conventional economic theory suggests, cheaper and more credit from international market can enrich potential market participants who have not been employing financial services with a newly access to financial market.

We test hypotheses that the effect of financial market openness on inequality is conditional on the level of domestic financial market development when the financial market opens, and the overall effect of financial integration on income inequality is nonlinear. Financial market integration creates the intensive and extensive margins of credit supply which may depend on the development level of financial market disproportionately.² This paper finds a novel empirical evidence that financial market integration and financial market interact to change income inequality. Specifically, the effect of financial market integration on income inequality is nonlinear and depends

² See Demirgüç-Kunt and Levine (2009) for comprehensive review over the disproportional effect of financial market development on inequality.

on financial market development level. Opening financial market worsens income inequality in the countries holding the underdeveloped state of financial market, however, the effect of capital account openness on income inequality is statistically insignificant in the countries with developed financial market.

The idea behind the hypotheses is that financial market openness does not guarantee more abundant credit in domestic credit market. In general, capital inflow from foreign markets to domestic market takes place. Capital outflow also occurs especially when domestic agents prefer foreign assets to domestic assets for some reasons. As domestic financial market is more developed and deeper, capital inflow tends to be larger while capital outflow tends to be smaller. Net capital inflow can be negative when domestic financial market is underdeveloped so it tends to exclude current participants in credit market and the cost of fund can rise even with integrated financial market. The effect may be more severe to marginal participants in the financial market.

The structure of the rest of this paper is as follows. Next section surveys the related literature. In Section III, we conduct an empirical study to find a relationship between inequality and financial market openness and perform robustness check tests to rebut possible claims on empirical specification. Section IV discusses the result and suggests economic intuitions for the results as theoretical implications. Section V concludes.

2. Literature Review

The relationship between inequality and economic growth is one of the oldest economic research questions in economic history but it still attracts the attention of economists. Kuznets (1955, 1963) pioneers the research on this uncovered question with economic data. Recently, Lundberg and Squire (2003) investigate the relationship between inequality and economic growth and find fundamental variables that influence both inequality and growth simultaneously. García-Peñalosa and Turnovsky (2006) emphasize that economic growth and income distribution are endogeneously determined in the economic system. They develop an endogenous growth model *à la* Romer (1986) with the heterogeneity of agents that allows the distribution of income and other resources across agents. In their model income inequality stems from how each agent allocates their time resource between work and leisure for given their own relative wealth. Turnovsky (2015) expands the canonical model with public investment decision and provides an analytical tool to investigate the distributional consequences of macroeconomic policy and other exogenous shocks in a closed economy.

Economic literature that introduces heterogeneity of households in macroeconomic model also studies the source of inequality. Major difference of this literature to the former one is that ex-ante each economic agent is identical but still the distribution of income and asset holding arises due to uninsurable idiosyncratic shocks. Huggett (1993) and Aiyagari (1994), following Bewley (1986) and Imrohoroglu (1989) first study the general equilibrium models of wealth inequality based on uninsurable idiosyncratic risk. Krusell and Smith (1998) incorporate aggregate shocks in a heterogeneous agent general equilibrium model. Castañeda, Díaz-Giménez, and Ríos-Rull (1998) employ a neoclassical growth model with heterogeneous households to study the U.S. income distribution dynamics. Caselli and Ventura (2000) introduce consumer heterogeneity into representative consumer growth models to examine the distribution of consumptions, assets, and incomes.

The relationship between globalization and inequality has been recently highlighted in the economic literature as the world economy has been more integrated. Most literature that studies the effect of globalization on inequality focuses on the effect of goods market openness, i.e., international trade on inequality. There is a

long line of literature studying the relationship between trade and inequality.³ Recent research focuses on mechanisms of international trade affecting income across industries, occupations, and locations as the impact of international trade on jobs has surged as one of the most controversial issues in politics over the recent decade. Even though international trade theorists have large literature that supports trade liberalization increases social welfare, but a fear of unemployment is still the strongest reason for objection to trade. Davidson, Martin, and Matusz (1999), Helpman and Itskhoki (2010), Helpman, Itskhoki, and Redding (2010) and many papers introduce search and matching friction in the labor market to traditional international trade model that assumes frictionless adjustment in factor inputs and find a mechanism how trade changes sectoral productivity and demands for input, so that affects income distribution and unemployment.

A few recent studies examine the effect of both trade and financial openness on inequality. Jaumotte, Lall, and Papageorgiou (2013) find mostly insignificant effect of globalization in trade and finance on income inequality with a panel of 51 countries over a period from 1981 to 2003. They explain the insignificance comes from that trade and financial liberalization have offsetting effects: While technological progress and trade tend to decrease inequality, financial liberalization has the opposite effect, i.e., inequality worsened. Lim and McNelis (2016) suggest a model of small open economy with heterogenous agents earning different incomes, which follows Turnovsky (2015), and production technology using traded and non-traded goods.⁴ They argue that empirical evidence on the relationship between inequality and globalization is ambiguous because the relationship depends on the stage of economic development represented by the mixture of production source between traded and non-traded goods in the model. In their model, more integration of goods and financial markets tend to improve inequality for economies which have attained a sufficient level of economic development and the nature of the production structure such as high capital-intensity and low imported intermediate goods content in

³ See Goldberg and Pavcnik (2007) for a comprehensive survey on the relationship between inequality and globalization in developing countries.

⁴ Chen and Turnovsky (2010) extend Romer-type endogenous growth models for a small open economy, but their main focus is to analyze how differently policies and structural changes influence on inequality compared to the outcomes in a closed economy rather than the relationship between openness and inequality.

production that may lead high income growth. Access to imported goods and foreign capital resources can enhance marginal product of labor that decreases income inequality in the model. Kim *et al.* (2017) survey the literature on inequality and globalization and use a country-level panel data to show trade liberalization improves income distribution in South Korea while capital liberalization increases income share of top percentile so that inequality is deteriorated. Grossman and Helpman (2018) more rigorously investigate the link between trade and inequality with their novel model that extends endogenous growth model with firm and worker heterogeneity and positive assortative matching mechanism between heterogeneous firms and workers. Their model suggests a complicate interaction among international knowledge spillovers, trade in intermediate goods, and capital mobility across countries.

Some recent papers that find nonlinear relationship between financial market integration, financial market development, and inequality have similar finding to our evidence in different assumptions and environments. Kunieda, Okada, and Shibata (2016) perform a panel study to argue that the effect of financial market development on inequality depends on the international integration of domestic financial markets with the global financial market. They argue that financial market development widens inequality if domestic financial market is categorized an open economy, while inequality is reduced as financial market matures in a closed economy. Abiad, Oomes, and Ueda (2008) empirically find financial liberalization strengthens the efficiency of allocation in a financial market, more than financial market deepening so that inequality narrows as financial market opens. Kose, Prasad, and Taylor (2011) support a hypothesis that there are threshold levels of financial market development in terms of institutional quality where financial market openness improve income distribution. In particular, the financial market development reduces the costs of financial market openness such as a probability of financial crisis and increases its benefit like better source for consumption smoothing. Kim, Lin, and Suen (2011) also find a nonlinear relationship between financial development and income inequality. They separate financial market development from financial depth and argue that financial depth reduces income inequality only if the country has exceeded a certain level of financial development.

Bumann and Lensink (2016) is one of the closest studies to our work. They empirically find that capital market liberalization tends to improve income inequality only if the level of financial depth as measured by relative size of private credit supply

in a market is sufficiently high. They also build a model with different scenarios of liberalizing banking sectors. In the model, banking sector liberalization enhances financial market efficiency that decreases inequality. The effect of financial liberalization on financial market efficiency, which is defined as the difference between lending and deposit rates, is positive only if financial market is sufficiently deepened. Thus, overall the effect of banking sector liberalization on inequality is ambiguous but the effect conditional on financial depth is not.

3. Empirical Analysis

The panel data used comprise 174 countries for the period 1995-2017. We examine the impact of capital account openness on income inequality and investigate whether this effect varies with the degree of financial market development.

3-1. Variables and Data

The income inequality measure used in the analysis is the Gini coefficient. We collect the Standardized World Income Inequality Database (SWIID) from Solt (2016). There are two types of Gini coefficients: market income Gini coefficient and disposable income Gini Coefficient. The Gini coefficient based on disposable income is used in our baseline empirical model, and market income Gini coefficient is used for a robustness test.

Main explanatory variables are capital account openness and financial development measures. We use a *de-jure* financial openness measure from Fernández *et al.* (2016). This reflects a capital control indicator constructed based on IMF's AREAER (Annual Report on Exchange Arrangements and Exchange Restrictions). A *de-facto* financial integration measure used in the robustness check is constructed following Lane and Milesi-Ferretti (2001). This is a quantity based financial integration measure defined by the ratio of foreign assets and liabilities to GDP.

Variables measuring the financial development level are liquid liabilities in the baseline model, and private credit and stock market capitalization are used in the robustness test. Those are all expressed in terms of percentage of GDP. Other control variables that might affect income inequality are trade integration, employment in agriculture sector, export ratio of high technology products, CPI inflation rate, primary school enrollment, and government expenditure on education. The description and source of variables are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Variable Definition and Data Source

Variables	Definition	Source
<i>Dependent Variables</i>		
<i>GINI_DISP</i>	Gini coefficient, disposable (natural logarithm of Gini)	Solt (2016)
<i>GINI_MKT</i>	Gini coefficient, market (natural logarithm of Gini)	Solt (2016)
<i>Explanatory Variables</i>		
<i>GDPPC</i>	GDP: per capita, PPP (constant 2011 international \$, natural logarithm of GDPPC)	World Development Indicators, World Bank
<i>KA_FS</i>	Capital Market Restriction Measure	Fernández <i>et al.</i> (2016)
<i>KA_ED</i>	Gross portfolio(equity and debt) assets and liabilities to GDP (%)	Global Financial Development Database, World Bank
<i>LIQUID_LIAB</i>	Liquid liabilities to GDP (%)	Global Financial Development Database, World Bank
<i>PRIV_CREDIT</i>	Private credit by deposit money banks and other financial institutions to GDP (%)	Global Financial Development Database, World Bank
<i>STOCK_CAPITAL</i>	Stock market capitalization to GDP (%)	Global Financial Development Database, World Bank
<i>Other Control Variables</i>		
<i>TI</i>	Exports and imports of goods and services (% of GDP)	World Development Indicators, World Bank
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	Employment in agriculture (% of total employment)	World Development Indicators, World Bank
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	High-technology exports (% of manufactured exports)	World Development Indicators, World Bank
<i>CPI</i>	Inflation, consumer prices (annual %)	World Development Indicators, World Bank
<i>SCHOOL</i>	School enrollment, primary (% gross)	World Development Indicators, World Bank
<i>GOVT</i>	Government expenditure on education, total (% of GDP)	World Development Indicators, World Bank

3-2. Empirical Specification

The empirical model specification is given by Equation (1). The square term of GDP per capita, $GDPPC_{it}^2$, is included to test the Kuznets hypothesis. According to Kuznets (1955) the relationship between states of economic development and income inequality is nonlinear. Income inequality gets worsen at early stages of economic development, but income inequality gets improved as an economy reaches its steady state. Kuznets hypothesis expects the inverse-U shape relationship of Gini coefficient and GDP per capita, which results in a positive estimate for $GDPPC_{it}$ and a negative estimated coefficient for $GDPPC_{it}^2$.

In addition to the Kuznets hypothesis, Piketty and Saez (2003) find that income inequality has worsened in most advanced countries since 1970s. To capture Picketty and Saez (2003)'s finding, we include the cubic term of GDP per capita, $GDPPC_{it}^3$, as expecting to have a positive coefficient with a sufficient condition on other terms in our model specification.

$$\begin{aligned}
 GINI_DISP_{it} = & \alpha + \underbrace{\beta_1 GDPPC_{it} + \beta_2 GDPPC_{it}^2}_{\text{Kuznets Hypothesis}} + \underbrace{\beta_3 GDPPC_{it}^3}_{\text{Piketty-Saez Hypothesis}} \\
 & + \beta_4 KA_FS_{it} + \beta_5 LIQUID_LIAB_{it} + \beta_6 KA_FS_{it} \times LIQUID_LIAB_{it} \\
 & + X_{it}\gamma_{it} + \mu_t + \eta_i + \varepsilon_{it}
 \end{aligned}$$

Equation (1)

The subscript i and t represent country i and year t , respectively. KA_FS denotes capital market restriction measure reflecting capital account openness taken from Fernández *et al.* (2016). $LIQUID_LIAB$ denotes liquid liabilities representing the degree of financial market development. The interaction terms of the two variables, $KA_FS \times LIQUID_LIAB$ is also included. The coefficient of the interaction term is expected to be negative meaning that the impact of capital account openness on income equality is nonlinear, specifically opening capital market worsens income inequality at the low degree of financial development, but opening capital market improves income inequality at the high degree of financial development.

X_{it} denote other control variables such as trade integration measure, employment in agriculture sector, export ratio of high technology products, CPI inflation rate, primary school enrollment, and government expenditure on education. μ_t and η_i denote time fixed effects and country fixed effects, respectively. Summary statistics are reported in Table 2.

Table 2. Summary Statistics

	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max	P1	P5	P25	P50	P75	P95	P99
<i>Dependent Variables</i>												
<i>GINI_DISP</i>	4,949	3.605	0.236	2.912	4.111	3.077	3.178	3.447	3.619	3.791	3.947	4.057
<i>GINI_MKT</i>	4,949	3.801	0.152	3.049	4.227	3.350	3.532	3.716	3.811	3.894	4.029	4.167
<i>Explanatory Variables</i>												
<i>GDPPC</i>	4,878	8.959	1.251	5.511	11.815	6.440	6.912	7.946	9.025	9.954	10.816	11.433
<i>KA_FS</i>	1,898	0.632	0.340	0	1	0	0.05	0.3	0.775	0.95	1	1
<i>KA_ED</i>	1,231	88.566	118.456	0.077	987.555	0.400	2.086	12.587	36.732	123.994	334.244	554.930
<i>LIQUID_LIAB</i>	7,747	46.051	37.978	0.0001	399.114	6.695	11.601	21.600	35.927	58.363	113.369	197.273
<i>PRIV_CREDIT</i>	7,811	36.811	35.055	0.00002	262.458	1.475	3.942	12.969	24.713	49.672	109.38	170.122
<i>STOCK_CAPITAL</i>	2,649	48.708	80.477	0.010	1086.34	0.390	1.895	11.822	27.983	61.828	143.312	255.616
<i>Other Control Variables</i>												
<i>TI</i>	8,240	78.059	51.061	0	531.737	11.087	22.093	45.017	68.020	99.302	157.920	305.931
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	4,883	29.648	24.573	0.1	91.9	0.3	1.5	7.4	23.2	48.5	74.3	85.7
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	3,556	9.746	12.201	0	83.640	0.003	0.100	1.655	5.312	13.322	35.347	58.946
<i>CPI</i>	7,487	33.346	477.432	-35.837	24411	-3.104	-0.222	2.367	5.572	11.430	44.736	282.380
<i>SCHOOL</i>	6,879	96.792	23.132	2.831	221.992	23.367	44.943	92.525	101.323	108.425	124.099	143.384
<i>GOVT</i>	3,476	4.431	1.937	0	44.334	1.160	1.794	3.155	4.313	5.458	7.395	10.097

3-3. Empirical Results

In Section 3, we discuss the empirical result based on Equation (1). This empirical model includes the financial development measure (*LIQUID_LIAB*), financial openness index (*KA_FS*), and the interaction terms of those two variables. We also conduct a panel regression in which we use financial development measure, *LIQUID_LIAB*, to divide sample countries into four groups, and then examine how capital account openness affects income inequality in each country group.

The main empirical result based on Equation (1) is presented in Table 3. The result confirms the Kuznets hypothesis and Picketty and Saez (2003)'s finding with the inverse-S curve of the relationship between GDPs per capita and Gini coefficients. For instance, the model (1) has $Gini_{it} = 0.006 GDPPC_{it}^3 - 0.140 GDPPC_{it}^2 + 1.119 GDPPC_{it} + constant$, which has three real roots with a positive coefficient on the cubic term.⁵

The result also shows that the financial development and capital account openness are associated with the increased income inequality, but the estimated coefficient of interaction terms of those two variables turns out to be negative, which supports our research hypothesis. We can calculate a threshold point of the degree of financial market development to change the effect of financial market openness on income inequality when other things are fixed. For example, in model (4) solving $\beta_4 + \beta_6 LIQUID_LIAB_{it} = 0$ gives the threshold of Liquid Liability/GDP = 124% which is around 95th percentile of Liquid Liability/GDP. If other variables' effects are controlled, in a country with the Liquidity Liability/GDP less than 124% financial market openness may increase the income inequality measure while in others the openness may reduce the Gini coefficient.

The size of estimates seems small, which are thousands or less, but it is important to notice that the estimates are statistically significant and most dependent variables are measure in percentages. For example, Gini coefficient in the country with 95th percentile of Liquid Liability/GDP (=113.4%) is higher than Gini coefficient in the country with 5th percentile of Liquid Liability/GDP (= 11.6%) by 0.027, which is relatively large compared to the mean of Gini coefficient as of 3.605.

⁵ The necessary condition for the Kuznets-Picketty-Saez hypothesis is $\beta_2^2 - 3\beta_1\beta_2 > 0$ and $\beta_3 > 0$.

Table 3. Panel Regression with Time and Country Fixed Effects

Dependent Variable	<i>GINL_DISP</i>					
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>GDPPC</i>	1.119482*** (0.251)	1.549557*** (0.253)	1.634294*** (0.454)	2.151241*** (0.783)	1.635036** (0.762)	5.335873*** (1.019)
<i>GDPPC^c</i>	-0.140339*** (0.029)	-0.188911*** (0.029)	-0.189777*** (0.051)	-0.271766*** (0.086)	-0.207385** (0.084)	-0.613697*** (0.110)
<i>GDPPC^d</i>	0.005669*** (0.001)	0.007663*** (0.001)	0.007384*** (0.002)	0.010993*** (0.003)	0.008349*** (0.003)	0.023147*** (0.004)
<i>KA_FS</i>			0.028706*** (0.010)	0.040674*** (0.014)	0.035341*** (0.013)	0.044947*** (0.011)
<i>LIQUID_LIAB</i>			0.000265** (0.000)	0.000632*** (0.000)		
<i>KA_FS×LIQUID_LIAB</i>			-0.000037 (0.000)	-0.000328** (0.000)		
<i>PRIV_CREDIT</i>					0.000760*** (0.000)	
<i>KA_FS×PRIV_CREDIT</i>					-0.000298** (0.000)	
<i>STOCK_CAPITAL</i>						0.000731*** (0.000)
<i>KA_FS×STOCK_CAPITAL</i>						-0.000783*** (0.000)
<i>TI</i>				0.000131 (0.000)	0.000182* (0.000)	0.000148 (0.000)
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>				-0.001606*** (0.000)	-0.001383*** (0.000)	-0.001829*** (0.000)
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>				0.000591*** (0.000)	0.000339* (0.000)	0.000480** (0.000)
<i>CPI</i>				0.000248* (0.000)	0.000207 (0.000)	0.000278 (0.000)
<i>SCHOOL</i>				0.000974*** (0.000)	0.001046*** (0.000)	0.001124*** (0.000)
<i>GOVT</i>				-0.007147*** (0.002)	-0.008274*** (0.002)	-0.006469*** (0.002)
Time Fixed Effect	X	O	O	O	O	O
Country Fixed Effect	O	O	O	O	O	O
Observations	2,934	2,934	1,649	1,039	1,038	945
Country Groups	174	174	94	86	86	80
R-squared	0.024	0.061	0.070	0.168	0.218	0.210

Note: Standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10, 5, and 1-percent levels, respectively.

Table 4. Panel Regression with Alternative Gini Coefficient and Financial Openness

	Dependent Variable: GINI_MKT & Capital Account Openness(KA): KA_FS			Dependent Variable: GINI_DISP & Capital Account Openness(KA): KA_ED		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>GDPPC</i>	2.652829*** (0.712)	2.455122*** (0.699)	5.825007*** (0.943)	-0.60675043 (1.325)	-0.52486149 (1.289)	7.79403077*** (1.640)
<i>GDPPC</i> ²	-0.325118*** (0.078)	-0.299679*** (0.077)	-0.669997*** (0.102)	0.04524455 (0.146)	0.04186788 (0.142)	-0.84268769*** (0.177)
<i>GDPPC</i> ³	0.012795*** (0.003)	0.011705*** (0.003)	0.025206*** (0.004)	-0.00122718 (0.005)	-0.00130126 (0.005)	0.02986154*** (0.006)
<i>KA</i>	0.040627*** (0.013)	0.049649*** (0.012)	0.056138*** (0.010)	0.00004763 (0.000)	-0.00002677 (0.000)	0.00011352*** (0.000)
<i>LIQUID_LIAB</i>	0.000943*** (0.000)			0.00037425** (0.000)		
<i>KA</i> × <i>LIQUID_LIAB</i>	-0.000263* (0.000)			0.00000014 (0.000)		
<i>PRIV_CREDIT</i>		0.000856*** (0.000)			0.00018545** (0.000)	
<i>KA</i> × <i>PRIV_CREDIT</i>		-0.000435*** (0.000)			0.00000097*** (0.000)	
<i>STOCK_CAPITAL</i>			0.000723*** (0.000)			0.00016658* (0.000)
<i>KA</i> × <i>STOCK_CAPITAL</i>			-0.000929*** (0.000)			-0.00000002 (0.000)
<i>TI</i>	0.000351*** (0.000)	0.000372*** (0.000)	0.000392*** (0.000)	0.00041345*** (0.000)	0.00046741*** (0.000)	0.00044946*** (0.000)
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	-0.001619*** (0.000)	-0.001382*** (0.000)	-0.001687*** (0.000)	-0.00292636*** (0.000)	-0.00276976*** (0.000)	-0.00316284*** (0.000)
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	0.000302 (0.000)	0.000101 (0.000)	0.000331* (0.000)	-0.00009555 (0.000)	-0.00035613 (0.000)	0.00015964 (0.000)
<i>CPI</i>	0.000143 (0.000)	0.000131 (0.000)	0.000187 (0.000)	0.00004061 (0.000)	-0.00008803 (0.000)	-0.00038139 (0.000)
<i>SCHOOL</i>	0.000655*** (0.000)	0.000780*** (0.000)	0.000953*** (0.000)	-0.00011831 (0.000)	-0.00002664 (0.000)	-0.00008478 (0.000)
<i>GOVT</i>	-0.003195* (0.002)	-0.003321** (0.002)	-0.001943 (0.002)	-0.01125856*** (0.002)	-0.01092912*** (0.002)	-0.01164090*** (0.002)
Observations	1,039	1,038	945	777	784	679
Country Groups	86	86	80	73	73	64
R-squared	0.207	0.242	0.249	0.219	0.251	0.292

Note: Time and country fixed effects are included. Standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10, 5, and 1-percent levels, respectively.

As Table 4 shows, the main result stays consistent when we use the Gini coefficient evaluated in market values ($GINI_MKT$). The estimated coefficient of the interaction term becomes insignificant when quantity-based de-facto financial integration measure, KA_ED is used instead of KA_FS .

We also perform a panel regression over different groups by the degree of financial development. It alleviates a concern that financial market openness and financial market development may comove in the same direction. When we divide sample countries into four groups by the degree of financial development, we use the 5-year (1990~1994) averages of $LIQUID_LIAB$. Note that our sample period starts in 1995 so the financial market development used to divide sample countries is given information over the sample period. Countries in each group are presented in Table 5, and the basic statistics are reported in Table 6.

Table 5. Country Group by Liquid Liability

1 st quartile (0~25%)	2 nd quartile (25~50%)	3 rd quartile (50~75%)	4 th quartile (75~100%)
Argentina	Bangladesh	Albania	Antigua and Barbuda
Azerbaijan	Benin	Algeria	Austria
Burkina Faso	Bhutan	Armenia	Bahrain
Burundi	Bolivia	Aruba	Barbados
Cambodia	Botswana	Australia	Belgium
Cameroon	Brazil	Bahamas, The	Bulgaria
Central African Republic	Chile	Belarus	Canada
Chad	Colombia	Belize	China
Congo, Dem. Rep.	Comoros	Cabo Verde	Cyprus
Congo, Rep.	Costa Rica	Denmark	Czech Republic
Croatia	Cote d'Ivoire	Dominica	Djibouti
Dominican Republic	El Salvador	Ethiopia	Egypt, Arab Rep.
Ecuador	Gambia, The	Fiji	Germany
Equatorial Guinea	Honduras	Finland	Grenada

Table 5. Continued

1 st quartile (0~25%)	2 nd quartile (25~50%)	3 rd quartile (50~75%)	4 th quartile (75~100%)
Gabon	Kenya	France	Hong Kong SAR, China
Ghana	Korea, Rep.	Greece	Israel
Guatemala	Latvia	Guyana	Italy
Guinea	Lesotho	Haiti	Japan
Guinea-Bissau	Maldives	Hungary	Jordan
Kazakhstan	Mauritania	Iceland	Kuwait
Lao PDR	Mexico	India	Lebanon
Lithuania	Moldova	Indonesia	Luxembourg
Madagascar	Myanmar	Iran, Islamic Rep.	Macao SAR, China
Malawi	Namibia	Ireland	Malaysia
Mali	Nepal	Jamaica	Malta
Mongolia	Oman	Macedonia, FYR	Mauritius
Mozambique	Papua New Guinea	Morocco	Netherlands
Nicaragua	Paraguay	Norway	New Zealand
Niger	Poland	Pakistan	Portugal
Nigeria	Romania	Panama	Singapore
Peru	Samoa	Philippines	Spain
Russian Federation	Slovenia	Saudi Arabia	St. Kitts and Nevis
Rwanda	Solomon Islands	Seychelles	St. Lucia
Senegal	Sri Lanka	South Africa	St. Vincent and the Grenadines
Sierra Leone	Sudan	Sweden	Suriname
Tanzania	Swaziland	Syrian Arab Republic	Switzerland
Turkey	Togo	Trinidad and Tobago	Thailand
Uganda	Tonga	Tunisia	United Kingdom
Ukraine	Venezuela, RB	United Arab Emirates	United States
Vietnam	Zimbabwe	Uruguay	Vanuatu
Zambia		Yemen, Rep.	

Note: Country groups are divided into four based on average of liquid liabilities (% of GDP) in 1990~1994.

Table 6. Averages of Variables by Quartile Country Groups

	25 th	50 th	75 th	100 th
<i>LIQUID_LIAB</i>	20.782 (11.491)	29.901 (12.379)	46.322 (19.852)	86.072 (51.133)
<i>Dependent Variables</i>				
<i>GINI_DISP</i>	3.675 (0.176)	3.729 (0.220)	3.549 (0.269)	3.515 (0.208)
<i>GINI_MKT</i>	3.785 (0.158)	3.836 (0.169)	3.815 (0.151)	3.796 (0.104)
<i>Explanatory Variables</i>				
<i>GDPPC</i>	8.063 (1.106)	8.554 (0.946)	9.369 (1.048)	9.956 (0.849)
<i>KA_FS</i>	0.597 (0.340)	0.527 (0.324)	0.595 (0.356)	0.769 (0.285)
<i>KA_ED</i>	15.691 (12.011)	24.907 (20.859)	113.645 (142.152)	149.358 (127.431)
<i>PRIV_CREDIT</i>	14.607 (12.557)	24.184 (24.184)	40.369 (32.097)	69.488 (42.381)
<i>STOCK_CAPITAL</i>	16.069 (14.879)	29.401 (68.103)	44.083 (43.210)	77.857 (111.277)

Note: Standard deviations are reported in parentheses.

Table 7 shows that the impact of capital account openness on income inequality is positive and statistically significant only in the first quartile of the degree of financial development. In other words, open capital market worsens income inequality in the first quartile country group only.

Table 7. Panel Regression by Country Group

Dependent Variable	<i>GINI_DISP</i>			
	(1) 25 th	(2) 50 th	(3) 75 th	(4) 100 th
<i>GDPPC</i>	-0.0334 (0.064)	0.1297 (0.087)	-0.0779 (0.092)	-0.0483 (0.048)
<i>KA_FS</i>	0.0657* (0.031)	0.0090 (0.055)	-0.0386** (0.017)	0.0056 (0.019)
<i>TI</i>	-0.0005 (0.000)	0.0004 (0.001)	-0.0002 (0.000)	0.0002 (0.000)
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	-0.0011 (0.001)	-0.0012 (0.003)	-0.0019 (0.003)	0.0074*** (0.002)
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	0.0000 (0.001)	0.0012*** (0.000)	0.0012 (0.001)	0.0002 (0.000)
<i>CPI</i>	0.0003 (0.000)	-0.0011 (0.001)	0.0008 (0.001)	-0.0004** (0.000)
<i>SCHOOL</i>	0.0009 (0.001)	0.0019** (0.001)	-0.0001 (0.001)	-0.0023** (0.001)
<i>GOVT</i>	-0.0090 (0.006)	-0.0115** (0.005)	0.0156 (0.011)	-0.0042 (0.004)
Observations	154	238	284	335
Country Groups	16	20	24	24
R-squared	0.685	0.375	0.271	0.341

Note: Year and country fixed-effects are included. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10, 5, and 1-percent levels, respectively.

The result from Table 7 is robust to alternative Gini coefficient, which is *GINI_MKT* (Table 8). The empirical result from the different country group divided by alternative financial development measure, *PRIV_CREDIT* is also consistent with the result from Table 7, though the significant coefficient of capital account is found in the 2nd quartile of the country group, not the first quartile (Table 9). The country group sorted by *STOCK_CAPITAL* turns out to be insignificant in any of 1st and 2nd quartile of country groups (Table 10). The result from Table 7 is also robust to alternative capital account openness measure, *KA_ED* (Table 11).

Table 8. Panel Regression with Alternative Gini Coefficient

Dependent Variable	<i>GINI_MKT</i>			
	(1) 25 th	(2) 50 th	(3) 75 th	(4) 100 th
<i>GDPPC</i>	-0.0290 (0.058)	0.0779 (0.073)	-0.0592 (0.063)	-0.1059** (0.050)
<i>KA_FS</i>	0.0640** (0.025)	0.0046 (0.046)	-0.0190 (0.025)	0.0042 (0.023)
<i>TI</i>	-0.0004 (0.000)	0.0003 (0.001)	0.0006* (0.000)	0.0004** (0.000)
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	-0.0012** (0.001)	-0.0010 (0.003)	-0.0038 (0.002)	0.0064*** (0.002)
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	-0.0002 (0.001)	0.0010*** (0.000)	0.0003 (0.001)	0.0006 (0.000)
<i>CPI</i>	0.0003 (0.000)	-0.0018* (0.001)	-0.0008 (0.001)	-0.0003* (0.000)
<i>SCHOOL</i>	0.0005 (0.001)	0.0015* (0.001)	0.0001 (0.001)	-0.0010 (0.001)
<i>GOVT</i>	-0.0049 (0.005)	-0.0056 (0.005)	0.0246** (0.011)	-0.0027 (0.003)
Observations	154	238	284	335
Country Groups	16	20	24	24
R-squared	0.661	0.311	0.465	0.427

Note: Year and country fixed-effects are included. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10, 5, and 1-percent levels, respectively.

Table 9. Panel Regression with Alternative Financial Development: *PRIV_CREDIT*

Dependent Variable	<i>GINI_DISP</i>			
	(1) 25 th	(2) 50 th	(3) 75 th	(4) 100 th
<i>GDPPC</i>	-0.0886 (0.083)	0.0783 (0.096)	-0.1343 (0.114)	-0.0564 (0.065)
<i>KA_FS</i>	0.0295 (0.059)	0.0681*** (0.018)	-0.0234 (0.033)	0.0203 (0.029)
<i>TI</i>	-0.0012 (0.001)	0.0011** (0.000)	-0.0008 (0.000)	0.0003 (0.000)
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	-0.0016* (0.001)	-0.0029** (0.001)	0.0075 (0.010)	0.0025 (0.003)
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	0.0016** (0.001)	-0.0015 (0.001)	0.0017* (0.001)	0.0001 (0.000)
<i>CPI</i>	0.0004 (0.001)	0.0004 (0.000)	-0.0001 (0.003)	-0.0006 (0.001)
<i>SCHOOL</i>	0.0007 (0.001)	0.0012* (0.001)	0.0012 (0.002)	-0.0002 (0.001)
<i>GOVT</i>	-0.0074 (0.006)	-0.0053 (0.006)	0.0095 (0.015)	-0.0060 (0.004)
Observations	118	211	213	469
Country Groups	12	23	18	31
R-squared	0.550	0.553	0.231	0.160

Note: Year and country fixed-effects are included. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10, 5, and 1-percent levels, respectively.

Table 10. Panel Regression with Alternative Financial Development: *STOCK_CAPITAL*

Dependent Variable	<i>GINI_DISP</i>			
	(1) 25 th	(2) 50 th	(3) 75 th	(4) 100 th
<i>GDPPC</i>	-0.0372 (0.058)	-0.1062 (0.081)	0.0303 (0.058)	-0.2212** (0.078)
<i>KA_FS</i>	0.0463 (0.043)	0.0560 (0.040)	0.0356 (0.024)	-0.0089 (0.023)
<i>TI</i>	-0.0002 (0.001)	-0.0003 (0.001)	0.0014** (0.000)	0.0002 (0.000)
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	-0.0041*** (0.001)	-0.0023* (0.001)	0.0029 (0.003)	0.0039 (0.003)
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	0.0011*** (0.000)	-0.0023 (0.002)	-0.0002 (0.001)	-0.0008 (0.001)
<i>CPI</i>	-0.0001 (0.000)	0.0010 (0.001)	0.0013 (0.001)	-0.0001 (0.002)
<i>SCHOOL</i>	0.0020 (0.001)	0.0017** (0.001)	0.0006 (0.001)	-0.0012 (0.001)
<i>GOVT</i>	-0.0027 (0.008)	-0.0086 (0.008)	-0.0105* (0.006)	-0.0017 (0.006)
Observations	175	188	213	221
Country Groups	16	15	16	14
R-squared	0.452	0.438	0.543	0.400

Note: Year and country fixed-effects are included. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10, 5, and 1-percent levels, respectively.

Table 11. Panel Regression with Alternative Capital Account Openness: *KA_ED*

Dependent Variable	<i>GINL_DISP</i>			
	(1) 25 th	(2) 50 th	(3) 75 th	(4) 100 th
<i>GDPPC</i>	-0.2724 (0.161)	-0.1758 (0.137)	-0.1580** (0.066)	-0.0375 (0.057)
<i>KA_ED</i>	0.0016* (0.001)	0.0003 (0.001)	0.0000 (0.000)	0.0001 (0.000)
<i>TI</i>	0.0005 (0.001)	0.0010* (0.001)	-0.0004 (0.000)	0.0002 (0.000)
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	-0.0022** (0.001)	0.0016 (0.004)	-0.0095* (0.005)	0.0057* (0.003)
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	0.0003 (0.000)	0.0003 (0.001)	0.0015** (0.001)	0.0006 (0.000)
<i>CPI</i>	-0.0004 (0.001)	-0.0001 (0.002)	0.0005 (0.000)	-0.0036*** (0.001)
<i>SCHOOL</i>	-0.0031** (0.001)	0.0009* (0.000)	-0.0000 (0.001)	-0.0016 (0.001)
<i>GOVT</i>	-0.0095 (0.008)	-0.0069** (0.003)	-0.0061 (0.009)	-0.0086** (0.004)
Observations	114	123	179	253
Country Groups	13	16	18	23
R-squared	0.690	0.546	0.416	0.320

Note: Two-year lagged *KA_ED*, year and country fixed-effects are included. Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10, 5, and 1-percent levels, respectively.

3-4. Robustness Tests

We conduct two robustness tests. Specifically focusing on a panel regression with different groups divided by the degree of financial development. First, instrumental variables are introduced in the main model to address endogeneity problems since income inequality might be able to affect the capital account openness and financial development. Second, we test whether our main result is robust to different model specifications. A dynamic panel is taken into consideration.

Instrument Variable Regression

We use instrumental variables for potential endogeneity problems.⁶ One of concerns is that the dependent variable, Gini coefficient may affect explanatory variables. IVs used are dummy variables for legal system origin, classified into English common law, French commercial code, German commercial code, Scandinavian commercial code, and socialist laws from La Porta *et al.* (1999). The IV regression result is presented in Table 12, which shows that the capital account openness worsens income inequality in the first and second quartile of country group, which is consistent with the main result.

⁶ A correlation between LIQUID_LIAB and KA_FS is about 0.2. Correlations between KA_FS and alternative measures of financial development such as PRIV_CREDIT and STOCK_CAPITAL are 0.31 and 0.16, respectively.

Table 12. IV Regression

Dependent Variable	<i>GINI_DISP</i>			
	(1) 25 th	(2) 50 th	(3) 75 th	(4) 100 th
<i>GDPPC</i>	0.0211 (0.041)	-0.3633*** (0.036)	0.1776 (0.111)	-0.2897*** (0.021)
<i>KA_FS</i>	0.9820*** (0.211)	0.9804*** (0.162)	-1.4751*** (0.318)	-0.0862 (0.056)
<i>TI</i>	-0.0008 (0.001)	-0.0087*** (0.001)	0.0019*** (0.000)	-0.0022*** (0.000)
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	-0.0001 (0.002)	-0.0125*** (0.002)	-0.0156*** (0.002)	0.0034*** (0.001)
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	0.0066 (0.005)	-0.0059*** (0.002)	-0.0044*** (0.001)	0.0053*** (0.001)
<i>CPI</i>	0.0024** (0.001)	0.0094*** (0.002)	-0.0083* (0.005)	-0.0008 (0.001)
<i>SCHOOL</i>	-0.0039* (0.002)	-0.0039** (0.002)	-0.0081** (0.004)	0.0019 (0.001)
<i>GOVT</i>	0.0659** (0.031)	-0.0030 (0.010)	-0.1806*** (0.023)	0.0437*** (0.006)
Observations	154	238	284	335

Note: Year fixed-effects are included. Instrument variables are dummy variables for legal system origin, classified into English common law, French commercial code, German commercial code, Scandinavian commercial code, and socialist laws from La Porta *et al.* (1999). Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10, 5, and 1-percent levels, respectively.

Alternative Model Specification

To test the robustness of model specification we introduce the dynamic panel model. In the dynamic panel model, the lagged dependent variable is included in the set of explanatory variables. The result shows that open capital market worsens income inequality in the countries with low financial development, which is also consistent with the main result.

Table 13. Dynamic Panel

Dependent Variable	<i>GINI_DISP</i>			
	(1) 25 th	(2) 50 th	(3) 75 th	(4) 100 th
<i>L.GINI_DISP</i>	0.8749*** (0.035)	0.9404*** (0.036)	0.8878*** (0.029)	0.8736*** (0.029)
<i>GDPPC</i>	0.0041 (0.014)	-0.0066 (0.010)	-0.0524*** (0.019)	-0.0199 (0.014)
<i>KA_FS</i>	0.0183*** (0.007)	-0.0088 (0.005)	0.0233** (0.010)	-0.0006 (0.005)
<i>TI</i>	0.0000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	-0.0001** (0.000)	-0.0000 (0.000)
<i>EMPL_AGG</i>	0.0001 (0.000)	-0.0004 (0.000)	-0.0004 (0.000)	0.0001 (0.001)
<i>HTECH_EXP</i>	-0.0000 (0.000)	0.0004** (0.000)	-0.0000 (0.000)	0.0003*** (0.000)
<i>CPI</i>	-0.0000 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	-0.0001 (0.000)	-0.0006* (0.000)
<i>SCHOOL</i>	0.0001 (0.000)	0.0000 (0.000)	-0.0002 (0.000)	-0.0001 (0.000)
<i>GOVT</i>	-0.0002 (0.001)	-0.0034*** (0.001)	0.0009 (0.002)	-0.0006 (0.001)
Observations	106	189	232	279

Note: Year fixed-effects are included. Instrument variables are dummy variables for legal system origin, classified into English common law, French commercial code, German commercial code, Scandinavian commercial code, and socialist laws from La Porta *et al.* (1999). Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. *, **, and *** indicate significance at the 10, 5, and 1-percent levels, respectively.

4. Theoretical Implications

In previous sections, we find financial market development as a key conditional factor that interacts with financial market openness on income inequality. Our novel empirical evidence indicates that the effect of financial market integration on income inequality is nonlinear in general and depends on financial market development. As mentioned in the introduction, the conventional economic model cannot account for the nonlinear and conditional effect of financial market openness on inequality because the theory considers financial market integration similar to financial market development. Some ingredients may help economic models to support the empirical evidence shown in previous sections.

First, participation in financial market and holdings of foreign assets should be different across households. Guiso, Jappelli, and Terlizzese (1996) use the households' finance survey of the Bank of Italy to show that higher income risk and more restrictive borrowing constraint decreases the holding of risky asset of households such as foreign assets. Sanelli (2018) also shows the share of foreign securities in financial asset portfolio composition increases as households' net wealth increases using Survey on Household Income and Wealth by the Bank of Italy. The evidence suggests a possibility of heterogenous "home bias" in asset positions.⁷ Limited participations in domestic financial market due to underdeveloped financial market and market inefficiency can be amplified as domestic financial market becomes integrated with global financial market due to information barrier or entry costs.⁸ Theoretical literature may incorporate the mechanism of Greenwood and Jovanovic (1990) in its economic model. They introduce financial intermediaries providing assets that pay higher expected rate of return on investment from more opportunity of pooling risk

⁷ Black (1974), Stulz (1981), French and Poterba (1991), Coval and Moskowitz (1999), and Stockman and Dellas (1989) find home bias of asset investments and suggest several sources of the bias such as asymmetric information, barriers to international investment, and a tool of hedging nontraded goods consumption.

⁸ Greenwood, Sanchez, and Wang (2010) suggest information cost as a source of financial market inefficiency and limited participations of households.

and acquiring important information but charging once-and-for-all lump-sum membership cost of joining “organizational capital” based on Townsend (1978, 1983).

Introducing heterogeneity in entrepreneurship, “the degree to which the opportunity to start or own a business affects the household’s saving behavior”⁹ among households can have a similar result of heterogeneous home bias of international asset position across agents. Quadrini (1999, 2000) emphasize entrepreneurship for wealth concentration and different motivation of saving while financial constraint exists. Idiosyncratic process of entrepreneurial productivity shock allows different saving motivations for households with different entrepreneurial productivity. In Quadrini (2000) and Buera and Shin (2017) which extend Lucas (1978) span of control model, agents face an idiosyncratic entrepreneurial productivity shock and hold individual assets that can be used an interest earning asset or a collateral for production capital rental. Suppose one agent expects positive entrepreneurial productivity shock in the future but holds small assets so that faces a borrowing constraint. Then the would-be entrepreneur will save more than others who may want to remain as labor workers to smooth their income stream. The would-be entrepreneur is still a labor worker but she has a strong incentive to save more to overcome financial constraint as well as pooling entrepreneurial risk than other workers who have low entrepreneurial ability and want to save only for consumption smoothing.¹⁰ Probably normal workers who want to remain as workers save little as possible because saving only transfers today’s consumption to tomorrow. Financial market integration introduces several assets into the market but they are different in risks and returns. Then, households who have large assets that can be used as internal financing for production have more incentive to hold foreign assets because foreign assets that have rate of returns moving differently from domestic assets’ returns are better assets for pooling domestic aggregate risks. Normal workers, would-be entrepreneurs, and entrepreneurs who have sufficient assets have different motives of saving and demands for foreign asset holdings. Buera and Shin (2017) show that capital outflows occur in transition period of structural reform due to self-financing motive of entrepreneurs

⁹ Quadrini (1999), p. 1.

¹⁰ Song, Storesletten, and Zilibotti (2011) show an evidence that potential entrepreneurs who face financial restriction save more in China because of underdeveloped financial market.

and would-be entrepreneurs.¹¹

Another component that can be added into conventional models to support the different effects of financial market integration over inequality conditional on financial market development is financial market quality or financial depth of domestic market. Broner and Ventura (2016) shed light on the importance of domestic financial market depth in the globalization period. The probability of “capital flight” from domestic markets depends on domestic financial depth. They argue that “globalization not only adds new foreign sources of financing that are cheap but risky, also subtracts domestic source of financing that were expensive but safe.” That happens because financial integration occurs two-ways: opening to not only foreign investors but also domestic investors. Since the preference over risks is different between domestic and foreign investors, opening financial market may result in net capital inflow or net capital outflow depending on domestic financial market quality and development level. In this setting, large domestic saving or financial market depth fosters foreign capital inflows. Broner and Ventura (2016) emphasize that financial market openness actually benefits emerging economies only if the countries hold relatively better institutions, more developed domestic financial markets, and high initial income per capita. Mendoza *et al.* (2007) also support the role of developed domestic financial market. They build a multi-country model where countries differ in the degree of asset market incompleteness and concludes that globalization can widen the distribution of wealth if financial market liberalization does not result in financial development.¹²

¹¹ Buera and Shin (2017) originally answer the allocation puzzle (Gourinchas and Jeanne 2013; Prasad, Rajan, and Subramanian 2007) on the reason of capital net outflows from fast-growing countries with dynamics of TFP from saving and investment lags.

¹² Arteta, Eichengreen, and Wyplosz (2001), Edwards (2001), Bekaert, Harvey, and Lundblad (2005), Alfaro, Kalemli-Ozcan, and Volosovych (2008), Papaioannou, Yanacopoulos, and Aksoy (2009), and Kose, Prasad, and Taylor (2011) support the argument of Broner and Ventura (2016). Balmaceda, Fischer, and Ramirez (2014) also point out that the imperfect competition in financial markets in developing countries makes the markets unfair, i.e., less credit penetration as markets open. Liberalization can kick out domestic wealth entrepreneurs from the credit market if the market structure is insufficiently competitive.

5. Conclusions

This paper studies the effect of financial market integration on income inequality within a country that opens the financial market. We find a novel empirical evidence that financial market integration and financial market development interact to change income inequality. Specifically, the effect of financial market integration on income inequality is nonlinear and depends on financial market development level. When financial market is underdeveloped, income inequality gets worse as financial market opens. Opening financial market, however, may have ambiguous effect on income inequality in countries with developed financial market. We also suggest some important structures for the conventional economic model to account for our empirical finding as theoretical implications. Based on these implications, extensions of the conventional small open economy model with financial constraints need to include suggested components such as heterogeneous holding of foreign assets across income and asset levels and entrepreneurial shocks to understand the interaction of financial market openness and domestic market development on the distribution of income in a country. Our finding also echoes that studying an economic mechanism in which economic growth, financial market outcomes, and inequality are endogenously determined as García-Peñalosa and Turnovsky (2006) emphasize, and Grossman and Helpman (2018) reiterate recently.

References

- Abiad, Abdul, Nienke Oomes, and Kenichi Ueda. 2008. "The Quality Effect: Does Financial Liberalization Improve the Allocation of Capital?" *Journal of Development Economics*, 87(2): 270-282.
- Aiyagari, S. Rao. 1994. "Uninsured Idiosyncratic Risk and Aggregate Saving." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(3): 659-684.
- Alfaro, Laura, Sebnem Kalemli-Ozcan, and Vadym Volosovych. 2008. "Why Doesn't Capital Flow from Rich to Poor Countries? An Empirical Investigation." *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90: 347-368.
- Arteta, Carlos, Barry Eichengreen, and Charles Wyplosz. 2001. "When Does Capital Account Liberalization Help More than It Hurts?" National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 8414.
- Azzimonti, Marina, Eva de Francisco, and Vincenzo Quadrini. 2014. "Financial Globalization, Inequality, and the Rising Public Debt." *American Economic Review*, 104(8): 2267-2302.
- Balmaceda, Felipe, Ronald D. Fischer, and Felipe Ramirez. 2014. "Financial Liberalization, Market Structure and Credit Penetration." *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 23(1): 47-75.
- Bekaert, Geert, Campbell R. Harvey, and Christian Lundblad. 2005. "Does Financial Liberalization Spur Growth?" *Journal of Financial Economics*, 77(1): 3-55.
- Bewley, Truman. 1986. "Stationary Monetary Equilibrium with a Continuum of Independently Fluctuating Consumers." *Contributions to Mathematical Economics in Honor of Gerard Debreu*, 79.
- Black, Fischer. 1974. "International Capital Market Equilibrium with Investment Barriers." *Journal of Financial Economics*, 1(4): 337-352.
- Broner, Fernando, and Jaume Ventura. 2016. "Rethinking the Effects of Financial Globalization." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(3): 1497-1542.
- Buera, Francisco J., and Yongseok Shin. 2017. "Productivity Growth and Capital Flows: The Dynamics of Reforms." *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 9(3): 147-85.

- Bumann, Silke, and Robert Lensink. 2016. "Capital Account Liberalization and Income Inequality." *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 61: 143-162.
- Caselli, Francesco, and Jaume Ventura. 2000. "A Representative Consumer Theory of Distribution." *American Economic Review*, 90(4): 909-926.
- Castañeda, Ana, Javier Díaz-Giménez, and José-Victor Ríos-Rull. 1998. "Exploring the Income Distribution Business Cycle Dynamics." *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 42(1): 93-130.
- Chen, Yu-chin, and Stephen J. Turnovsky. 2010. "Growth and Inequality in a Small Open Economy." *Journal of Macroeconomics*, 32(2): 497-514.
- Coval, Joshua D., and Tobias J. Moskowitz. 1999. "Home Bias at Home: Local Equity Preference in Domestic Portfolios." *Journal of Finance*, 54(6): 2045-2073.
- Davidson, Carl, Lawrence Martin, and Steven Matusz. 1999. "Trade and Search Generated Unemployment." *Journal of International Economics*, 48(2): 271-299.
- Demirgüç-Kunt, Asli, and Ross Levine. 2009. "Finance and Inequality: Theory and Evidence." *Annual Review of Financial Economics*, 1(1): 287-318.
- Edwards, Sebastian. 2001. "Capital Mobility and Economic Performance: Are Emerging Economies Different?" National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper 8076.
- Fernández, Andrés, Michael W. Klein, Alessandro Rebucci, Martin Schindler, and Martín Uribe. 2016. "Capital Control Measures: A New Dataset." *IMF Economic Review*, 64(3): 548-574.
- French, Kenneth R., and James M. Poterba. 1991. "Investor Diversification and International Equity Markets." *American Economic Review*, 81(2): 222-226.
- García-Peñalosa, Cecilia, and Stephen J. Turnovsky. 2006. "Growth and Income Inequality: A Canonical Model." *Economic Theory*, 28(1): 25-49.
- Goldberg, Pinelopi Koujianou, and Nina Pavcnik. 2007. "Distributional Effects of Globalization in Developing Countries." *Journal of Economic Literature*, 45(1): 39-82.
- Gourinchas, Pierre-Olivier, and Olivier Jeanne. 2013. "Capital Flows to Developing Countries: The Allocation Puzzle." *Review of Economic Studies*, 80(4(285)): 1484-1515.
- Greenwood, Jeremy, and Boyan Jovanovic. 1990. "Financial Development, Growth, and the Distribution of Income." *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5, Part 1): 1076-1107.

- Greenwood, Jeremy, Juan M. Sanchez, and Cheng Wang. 2010. "Financing Development: The Role of Information Costs." *American Economic Review*, 100(4): 1875-91.
- Grossman, Gene M., and Elhanan Helpman. 2018. "Growth, Trade, and Inequality." *Econometrica*, 86(1): 37-83.
- Guiso, Luigi, Tullio Jappelli, and Daniele Terlizzese. 1996. "Income Risk, Borrowing Constraints, and Portfolio Choice." *American Economic Review*, 86(1): 158-172.
- Helpman, Elhanan, and Oleg Itskhoki. 2010. "Labour Market Rigidities, Trade and Unemployment." *Review of Economic Studies*, 77(3): 1100-1137.
- Helpman, Elhanan, Oleg Itskhoki, and Stephen Redding. 2010. "Inequality and Unemployment in a Global Economy." *Econometrica*, 78(4): 1239-1283.
- Huggett, Mark. 1993. "The Risk-free Rate in Heterogeneous-agent Incomplete-insurance Economies." *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 17(5-6): 953-969.
- Imrohoroglu, Ayşe. 1989. "Cost of Business Cycles with Indivisibilities and Liquidity Constraints." *Journal of Political Economy*, 97(6): 1364-1383.
- Jaumotte, Florence, Subir Lall, and Chris Papageorgiou. 2013. "Rising Income Inequality: Technology, or Trade and Financial Globalization?" *IMF Economic Review*, 61(2): 271-309.
- Kim, Dong-Hyeon, Shu-Chin Lin, and Yu-Bo Suen. 2011. "Nonlinearity between Trade Openness and Economic Development." *Review of Development Economics*, 15(2): 279-292.
- Kim, Young gui, Sihoon Nahm, Hyeyoon Keum, and Nak Nyeon Kim. 2017. *A Study on the Effects of Economic Openness on Korea's Income Distribution*. KIEP Policy Analysis, 17-22. Korea Institute for International Economic Policy.
- Kose, M. Ayhan, Eswar S. Prasad, and Ashley D. Taylor. 2011. "Thresholds in the Process of International Financial Integration." *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 30(1): 147-179.
- Krusell, Per, and Anthony A. Smith Jr. 1998. "Income and Wealth Heterogeneity in the Macroeconomy." *Journal of Political Economy*, 106(5): 867-896.
- Kunieda, Takuma, Keisuke Okada, and Akihisa Shibata. 2016. "Collateral Constraints and the Current Account: Theory and Evidence." *Economic Inquiry*, 54(1): 633-651.
- Kuznets, Simon. 1955. "Economic Growth and Income Inequality." *American Economic Review*, 45(1): 1-28.

- _____. 1963. "Quantitative Aspects of the Economic Growth of Nations: VIII. Distribution of Income by Size." *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 11(2): 1-80.
- La Porta, Rafael, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, Andrei Shleifer, and Robert Vishny. 1999. "The Quality of Government." *Journal of Law, Economics, and Organization*, 15(1): 222-279.
- Lane, Philip R. and Gian Maria Milesi-Ferretti. 2001. "The External Wealth of Nations: Measures of Foreign Assets and Liabilities for Industrial and Developing Countries." *Journal of International Economics*, 55(2): 263-294.
- Lim, G.C, and Paul D. McNelis. 2016. "Income Growth and Inequality: The Threshold Effects of Trade and Financial Openness." *Economic Modelling*, 58: 403-412.
- Lucas, Robert E. Jr. 1978. "On the Size Distribution of Business Firms." *Bell Journal of Economics*, 9(2): 508-523.
- Lundberg, Mattias, and Lyn Squire. 2003. "The Simultaneous Evolution of Growth and Inequality." *Economic Journal*, 113(487): 326-344.
- Mendoza, Enrique G., Vincenzo Quadrini, José-Victor Ríos-Rull, Giancarlo Corsetti, and Memet Yorukoglu. 2007. "On the Welfare Implications of Financial Globalization without Financial Development [with Comments]." NBER International Seminar on Macroeconomics, 283-322.
- Papaioannou, Theo, Helen Yanacopoulos, and Zuhre Aksoy. 2009. "Global Justice: From Theory to Development Action." *Journal of International Development*, 21(6): 805-818.
- Piketty, Thomas and Emmanuel Saez. 2003. "Income Inequality in the United States, 1913-1998." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(1): 1-39.
- Prasad, Eswar S., Raghuram G. Rajan, and Arvind Subramanian. 2007. "Foreign Capital and Economic Growth." *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 38(1): 153-230.
- Quadrini, Vincenzo. 1999. "The Importance of Entrepreneurship for Wealth Concentration and Mobility." *Review of Income and Wealth*, 45: 1-19.
- _____. 2000. "Entrepreneurship, Saving, and Social Mobility." *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 3(1): 1-40.
- Romer, Paul M. 1986. "Increasing Returns and Long-Run Growth." *Journal of Political Economy*, 94(5): 1002-1037.
- Sanelli, Alessandra. 2018. "Financial Income and Wealth Taxation in Italy: Efficiency and Equity Issues." Presentation Material at the OECD Conference on Wealth

Inequalities: Measurement and Policies.

- Solt, Frederick. 2016. "The Standardized World Income Inequality Database." *Social Science Quarterly*, 97(5): 1267-1281.
- Song, Zheng, Kjetil Storesletten, and Fabrizio Zilibotti. 2011. "Growing Like China." *American Economic Review*, 101(1): 196-233.
- Stockman, Alan C., and Harris Dellas. 1989. "International Portfolio Nondiversification and Exchange Rate Variability." *Journal of International Economics*, 26(3): 271-289.
- Stulz, René M. 1981. "On the Effects of Barriers to International Investment." *Journal of Finance*, 36(4): 923-934.
- Townsend, Robert M. 1978. "Intermediation with Costly Bilateral Exchange." *Review of Economic Studies*, 45(3): 417-425.
- _____. 1983. "Theories of Intermediated Structures." *Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy*, 18: 221-272.
- Turnovsky, Stephen J. 2015. "Economic Growth and Inequality: The Role of Public Investment." *Journal of Economic Dynamics and Control*, 61: 204-221.

KIEP List of KIEP Working Papers (2016–2018)

■ 2018	18-01	Vietnam's Low National Competitiveness: Causes, Implications and Suggestions for Improvement LE Quoc Phuong
	18-02	Financial Market Integration and Income Inequality Jae Wook Jung and Kyunghun Kim
■ 2017	17-01	Determinants and Consequences of Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from the Revision of the Company Act in India Woong Lee
	17-02	Investment Puzzle: Deeper Roots Sujin Kim
	17-03	Anatomy of the Trade Collapse, Recovery, and Slowdown: Evidence from Korea Sooyoung Lee
	17-04	The Effect of Restructuring on Labor Reallocation and Productivity Growth: An Estimation for Korea Hyelin Choi, Sung Chun Jung and Subin Kim
	17-05	The Impact of Trade Liberalization in Africa Jae Wook Jung
	17-06	Ecommerce and Firm Performance: Evidence from Korea Kyu Yub Lee
	17-07	Empirical Assessment of Trade Engagements: Africa, China and the Maritime Belt and Road Initiative Igbinoba Emmanuel
	17-08	What Determined 2015 TPA Voting Pattern?: The Role of Trade Negotiating Objectives Yeo Joon Yoon and Woong Lee
■ 2016	16-01	Access to Credit and Quality of Education in Vietnam Yoon Sun Hur
	16-02	A Short-term Export Forecasting Model using Input-Output Tables Hak K. Pyo and Soo Hyun Oh

- 16-03 A Predictive System for International Trade Growth
Sora Chon
- 16-04 The Impact of Chinese Economic Structural Changes on Korea's Export to China
Kotbee Shin and Bo-Young Choi
- 16-05 International Transmission of U.S. Monetary Policy Surprises
Kyunghun Kim and Eunjung Kang
- 16-06 Labor Market Flexibility and FDI: Evidence From OECD Countries
Hyelin Choi
- 16-07 To Whom does Outward FDI Give Jobs?
Youngho Kang and Unjung Whang
- 16-08 The Effect of Exchange Rate Volatility on Productivity of Korean Manufacturing Plants: Market Average Exchange Rate Regime vs. Free Floating
Bo-Young Choi and Ju Hyun Pyun
- 16-09 Comparative Advantage of Value Added in Exports: The Role of Offshoring and Transaction Cost
Nakgyoon Choi and Soonchan Park
- 16-10 A Government Spending Policy Uncertainty and Economic Activity: U.S. Time Series Evidence
Wongi Kim
- 16-11 A New Measure of Inter-industry Distance and Its Application to the U.S. Regional Growth
Yeo Joon Yoon and Unjung Whang
- 16-12 China's Development Finance to Asia: Characteristics and Implication
Yoon Ah Oh
- 16-13 Economic Effects of Anti-Dumping Duties: Protectionist Measures or Trade Remedies?
Nakgyoon Choi
- 16-14 Trade in Intermediate Goods: Implications for Productivity and Welfare in Korea
Young Gui Kim and Hak K. Pyo

국문요약

최근 수십 년간 전 세계적으로 자본시장은 빠른 속도로 통합되었다. 같은 시기 많은 국가의 소득 및 자산 불평등은 악화되는 경향을 보였다. 자본시장 개방에 따라 경제 주체인 가계 및 기업은 국제금융시장에서 다양한 금융자산을 통해 소득 불확실성과 위험을 좀 더 효과적으로 분산시킬 수 있다. 반면에 국가 간 자본시장 통합에 따라 해외자산 투자자들이 국제금융충격에 더 취약해지는 문제도 발생한다. 2008년 글로벌 금융위기 당시 미국에서 시작된 금융시장 충격이 주변국을 거쳐 전 세계로 전이되었던 것처럼 자본시장 통합에 따라 금융충격 전이 경로는 점차 강화되고 있다.

본 연구는 국제 자본시장 통합과 소득 불평등의 상관관계에 대한 계량경제학적 분석을 담고 있다. 특히 자본시장 통합이 각국의 자본시장 발달 정도와 어떻게 상호작용하여 소득 불평등에 영향을 주는지에 주목하였다. 자본시장 통합에 따른 경기변동의 변화나 자본시장 개방과 경제성장의 관계에 대해 오랫동안 다양한 선행연구가 수행된 반면, 자본시장 개방에 따른 소득분포의 변화에 대한 국제금융 분야의 연구는 비교적 최근에 이루어지고 있다. 전통적인 경제학 모형에 근거하여 예상해볼 때 자본시장 통합에 따라 자본조달비용이 낮아지고 위험분산수단이 다양해지면서 상대적으로 자본시장에 대한 접근성이 낮은 저소득 계층에 긍정적인 효과를 보이게 된다. 그러나 자본시장 개방과 소득 불평등의 상관관계에 대한 최근의 실증분석연구에서는 그 방향이 일관적이지 않았다.

본 연구는 자본시장 개방 정도와 소득 불평등의 상관관계에 대한 이론과 실증의 불일치를 해소하기 위하여 세 가지 질문에 대답하고자 하였다. 첫째, 자본시장 통합은 소득 불평등과 어떤 관계가 있는가? 둘째, 국내 자본시장의 발달 수준은 자본시장 통합과 소득 불평등의 관계에 어떤 영향을 미치는가? 셋째, 국제 자본시장 통합과 국내 자본시장의 발달 정도, 소득 불평등의 관계를 설명하기 위해 국제경제학 모형은 어떤 방향으로 발전해야 하는가?

본 연구는 자본시장 개방 정도와 소득 불평등의 상관관계가 시장 개방국가의 자본시장 발달 정도와 관련이 있다는 가설을 제시하고, 이를 확인하기 위하여 1995~2017년 23년간 17개국의 소득불평등지표, 자본시장개방도, 자본시장발달수준지표를 가지고 계량

분석을 시행하였다. 그 결과 자본시장 개방 정도와 소득 불평등의 상관관계는 비선형적이며 자본시장 발달 정도의 역할이 상당히 중요하게 나타났다. 구체적으로 국내 자본시장 발달 정도가 낮은 경우에는 자본시장 개방이 소득 불평등도를 악화시키는 방향으로 작용하는 반면, 국내 자본시장 발달 정도가 높은 경우에는 대체로 자본시장 개방과 소득 불평등도의 상관관계가 통계적으로 유의하지 않았다. 이 결과는 자본시장 발달 정도에 따라 소표본 분석을 하거나 자본시장 발달과 개방 간의 내생성 문제를 고려하더라도 비슷하였다. 국제 자본시장 통합 수준이나 자본시장 발달 정도, 소득 불평등의 대체변수를 사용하더라도 유사한 결과를 얻었다.

본 연구의 실증분석 결과에 따라 경제학 모형의 개선 방향에 대한 시사점 또한 제시하였다. 앞서 언급한 것처럼 전통적인 소규모 개방경제 모형으로는 이번 연구의 실증분석 결과를 설명하기 어렵다. 개방경제 모형에 해외자산보유의 불균등이나 소득이나 자산에 따른 해외자산보유 유인의 차이를 도입하기 위하여 기업의 자산축적 유인을 반영하는 금융차입제약조건이 필요할 것으로 보인다. 본 연구의 결과는 최근 경제발전과 소득 불평등에 대한 선행연구에서 시사하는 것처럼 경제발전과 자본시장의 역할, 소득 불평등을 포괄하는 내생적 경제 모형 분석의 중요성을 강조하고 있다.

핵심용어: 자본시장 통합, 소득 불평등, 자본시장 개방, 자본시장 발달, 경제 모형

정재욱(鄭載旭)

연세대학교 전기전자공학 학사 및 동 대학원 경제학 석사
University of California, Davis 경제학 박사
대외경제정책연구원 세계지역연구센터 신북방경제실 이종동팀 부연구위원
(現, E-Mail: jwjung@kiep.go.kr)

저서 및 논문

『아프리카 모바일 헬스케어 서비스 현황과 한국의 협력방안: 동아프리카 지역을 중심으로』 (공저, 2017)
『아프리카 소비시장 특성 분석과 산업단지를 통한 진출방안』 (공저, 2017) 외

김경훈(金景勳)

연세대학교 사회학/경제학 학사
University of California, Davis 경제학 박사
대외경제정책연구원 국제거시금융실 국제금융팀 부연구위원
(現, E-Mail: khkim@kiep.go.kr)

저서 및 논문

『수출기업의 금융구조와 수출 간의 관계에 관한 연구』 (공저, 2016)
『국제금융시장 통합이 한국 통화정책과 장기금리에 미치는 영향 및 정책 시사점』 (공저, 2017) 외



Financial Market Integration and Income Inequality

Jae Wook Jung and Kyunghun Kim

Over the past decades, financial markets have been integrated across countries while income inequality has increased in most countries. This paper studies the effect of financial market integration on income inequality and investigates whether the effect varies with the degree of financial market development. We find an empirical evidence that financial market integration and financial market development interact to change income inequality. Specifically, the effect of financial market integration on income inequality is nonlinear, and the degree of financial market development plays an important role. Opening financial market worsens income inequality in the countries holding the underdeveloped state of financial market, however, the effect of capital account openness on income inequality is statistically insignificant in the countries with developed financial market.

