JBEO, Vol. 3(4), 167-175

Journal of Business and Economic Options

Trade and Poverty in Developing Countries: Beyond Assumptions to Nuanced Understanding

Yeneng Sun[a]
Youngho Chang[b]

Abstract
The paper offers a nuanced examination of the complex relationship between international trade and poverty in developing countries, drawing on a thorough review of recent literature in the field. By synthesizing diverse perspectives, the paper aims to provide a balanced understanding of the potential impacts of trade on poverty alleviation. One key finding of the paper is the recognition that while international trade has the potential to generate economic growth, the distribution of these gains is often unequal, particularly between different income groups within developing countries. This challenges the traditional assumptions of the Heckscher-Ohlin-Samuelson theorem, which posits that trade should benefit all segments of society. Instead, the paper identifies multiple channels through which trade can exacerbate inequality, highlighting the need for a more nuanced understanding of its effects. The paper identifies at least eight distinct mechanisms by which international trade can lead to unequal outcomes, including factors such as unequal access to markets, differential impacts on employment, and unequal bargaining power between trading partners. These findings underscore the complexity of the trade-poverty nexus and caution against simplistic interpretations of its implications for poverty reduction. Importantly, the paper emphasizes the need for further empirical research to better understand the relationship between trade and inequality, particularly through single-country case studies. By examining the specific contexts and dynamics at play within individual countries, researchers can gain insights into the nuanced ways in which trade policies impact poverty outcomes. In conclusion, the paper calls for a more nuanced and context-specific approach to analyzing the relationship between international trade and poverty in developing countries. By acknowledging the potential for unequal outcomes and advocating for rigorous empirical research, the paper aims to contribute to a more informed and evidence-based debate on trade policy and poverty alleviation.
Keywords: International Trade, Poverty, Inequality, Developing Countries, Heckscher-Ohlin-Samuelson Theorem
JEL Codes: F63, I32, O19

1. INTRODUCTION

Globalization holds the promise of prosperity and development for all nations, regardless of their economic status or geographical location. However, this promise remains largely unfulfilled for many people living in underdeveloped and impoverished regions, particularly in the Global South. Despite the rhetoric surrounding the benefits of globalization, significant disparities persist between the wealthy and the impoverished, the developed and the underdeveloped. Numerous studies have highlighted the pivotal role of trade in driving economic growth and sustaining it over time. Scholars such as Sirnivasan and Bhagwati (2001), Dollar and Kraay (2004), and Mamoon and Murshed (2005a) have underscored the importance of trade as the engine of growth, emphasizing its capacity to stimulate economic activity, create employment opportunities, and foster innovation and technological advancement. However, while trade has the potential to generate widespread benefits, its benefits have not been equally distributed across regions and socio-economic groups. Many individuals and communities in underdeveloped and distant lands continue to face significant barriers to participating fully in the global economy. Structural inequalities, inadequate infrastructure, limited access to education and healthcare, and unequal distribution of resources have hindered their ability to harness the opportunities presented by globalization. Addressing these challenges requires concerted efforts from both national governments and the international community. Policies aimed at promoting inclusive and sustainable development, enhancing access to education and healthcare, strengthening infrastructure, and fostering equitable distribution of resources are essential for unlocking the full potential of globalization and ensuring that its benefits are shared more equitably across all segments of society.

Proponents of free markets argue that countries, whether developing or developed, that have embraced economic globalization and opened up their economies have experienced superior economic performance. This belief is supported by empirical evidence showing that developing nations that embarked on economic liberalization in the 1990s achieved faster rates of economic growth compared to their wealthier counterparts, thereby narrowing the gap between them. Conversely, it is asserted that those parts of the developing world that have resisted globalization are falling further behind in terms of economic development. Studies such as those by Dollar and Kraay (2004) have documented the positive correlation between economic openness and economic growth, highlighting the potential of globalization to

[a] Department of Economics, National University of Singapore, Singapore
[b] School of Applied Economics, Renmin University of China, Beijing, China

spur economic progress and enhance living standards. The integration of countries into the global economy has facilitated increased trade, investment, and technological transfer, thereby creating opportunities for economic diversification and expansion. Moreover, proponents of globalization argue that the accession to the global economy has brought about prosperity in various regions of the world. Scholars like Sen (2002) have emphasized the transformative impact of globalization on poverty reduction, human development, and social progress. By facilitating greater access to markets, capital, and knowledge, globalization has enabled countries to tap into global supply chains, attract foreign investment, and leverage technology to drive productivity gains and innovation. However, it is important to recognize that the benefits of globalization have not been evenly distributed, and certain segments of society have been left behind or marginalized in the process. The rise of income inequality, job displacement, and social dislocation in some regions underscores the need for policies that ensure inclusive and equitable growth. Additionally, concerns about the environmental and social consequences of unfettered globalization have prompted calls for greater regulation and oversight to mitigate negative externalities and promote sustainable development. Contrary to the prevailing notion of worsening poverty and inequality, there exists evidence suggesting a decline in global poverty and inequality levels. Sala-i-Martin (2002) conducted a comprehensive analysis that garnered significant attention, revealing a notable reduction in poverty rates and overall inequality worldwide. Sala-i-Martin's research indicated a substantial decrease in the proportion of the world's population living below the poverty line. Specifically, he found that the fraction of individuals living on less than $2 a day (measured in constant 1985 dollars) declined from 44% in 1970 to 18% in 1998. This marked reduction in poverty incidence over the span of nearly three decades underscores the potential progress made in addressing global poverty. Moreover, Sala-i-Martin's study also highlighted a decline in overall inequality, as measured by the Gini coefficient. The Gini coefficient is a widely used indicator of income distribution, with higher values indicating greater inequality. According to Sala-i-Martin's findings, the global Gini coefficient decreased from 0.66 in 1970 to 0.63 in 1998, indicating a modest but discernible trend towards greater income equality on a global scale.

These findings challenge the prevailing narrative of widening income disparities and suggest that efforts to alleviate poverty and promote economic development may have yielded tangible results on a global scale. However, it is important to interpret these findings with caution and acknowledge that regional disparities, as well as disparities within countries, may persist or even worsen despite improvements at the global level. Furthermore, the methods and data used to measure poverty and inequality may vary across studies, which can influence the interpretation of trends over time. Nevertheless, Sala-i-Martin's research provides valuable insights into the potential progress made in addressing poverty and inequality on a global scale, offering hope for continued efforts towards a more equitable and prosperous world. Recent research by Dollar and Kraay (2004) further supports the notion that openness to international trade can benefit impoverished populations to the same extent as other segments of society. Their study highlighted the experiences of countries in the Asia-Pacific region, such as the Republic of Korea, Singapore, and Taipei, China, which have implemented trade liberalization measures alongside significant strides in poverty reduction. These examples underscore the potential of trade openness as a viable strategy for addressing poverty at both the national and regional levels. Moreover, Dollar and Kraay's analysis suggested that, on average, economic reforms have had limited impact on income distribution. While reforms aimed at promoting trade openness have shown promise in alleviating poverty, their effects on income distribution have been less pronounced. This underscores the need for comprehensive policy approaches that address both poverty reduction and income inequality. In line with Dollar and Kraay's findings, other recent cross-country studies have also emphasized the importance of trade liberalization as a crucial policy tool for poverty alleviation. Anderson (1999), for instance, highlighted the role of opening up economies to international trade in fostering economic development and reducing poverty levels across diverse contexts.

These research findings collectively reinforce the argument that trade openness can play a significant role in poverty reduction efforts, particularly in developing countries. By fostering greater integration into the global economy and facilitating access to international markets, trade liberalization has the potential to generate employment opportunities, stimulate economic growth, and improve living standards for impoverished communities. However, it is essential to complement trade liberalization with targeted policies aimed at addressing the specific needs and challenges faced by vulnerable populations, ensuring that the benefits of globalization are inclusive and equitable. While some studies, such as Dollar and Kraay (2004), suggest that trade liberalization has negligible effects on income distribution, other empirical evidence presents a different perspective. Indeed, numerous studies have attempted to investigate the relationship between trade liberalization and income inequality, yielding varied findings. Contrary to the notion of neutral distributional effects, empirical evidence suggests that trade liberalization can have discernible impacts on income inequality. Behrman et al. (2001), for instance, observed that in 7 out of 18 Latin American countries that implemented market reforms in the mid-1980s, income inequality actually increased in subsequent years. Similarly, in the remaining economies studied, income inequality remained relatively unchanged from the 1980s to the 1990s. These findings challenge the assumption of neutral distributional effects and highlight the potential for trade liberalization to exacerbate income disparities in certain contexts.

Furthermore, Jayasuriya (2002) echoed these concerns, acknowledging that while liberalization may have contributed to reducing consumption poverty in South Asia, it has not necessarily translated into equitable income distribution. This critical perspective underscores the need for nuanced analysis when assessing the distributional impacts of trade liberalization policies. Critiques of cross-country analyses, such as that conducted by Dollar and Kraay (2004), highlight inherent limitations in capturing nuanced relationships between trade liberalization and poverty reduction. Indeed, cross-country studies are often subject to criticism for their reliance on aggregate data and the potential for

sample selection bias, among other methodological challenges. One significant limitation of cross-country analyses is their tendency to provide only average effects, overlooking heterogeneity across countries and within populations. As noted by Sirinivasan and Bhagwati (2002), the choice of sample, time period, and proxies can introduce substantial degrees of freedom, potentially leading to biased or misleading conclusions. This limitation underscores the need for caution when interpreting the findings of such studies, particularly regarding their relevance to specific contexts or policy implications. Moreover, critiques of Dollar and Kraay (2004) specifically have raised concerns about sample selection bias. Murshed (2003), for instance, argued that Dollar and Kraay's analysis primarily focused on successful globalizers, predominantly from Asia, while excluding unsuccessful globalizers from their sample. This selective approach may skew the results, potentially overestimating the positive relationship between trade liberalization and poverty reduction. These critiques underscore the importance of adopting a critical perspective when interpreting the findings of cross-country studies on trade and poverty. While such analyses can provide valuable insights into broad trends, they must be complemented by context-specific research and rigorous methodologies to ensure robust and reliable conclusions. Additionally, efforts to address methodological limitations, such as sample selection bias, are essential for advancing our understanding of the complex relationship between trade liberalization and poverty alleviation. Srinivasan and Bhagwati (2001) advocate for a complementary approach to cross-country analysis by emphasizing the importance of country-specific case studies. While acknowledging the value of cross-country analyses in providing broad insights into global trends, they argue that such studies may overlook the nuanced and context-specific dynamics at play within individual countries. Country-specific case studies offer a more detailed and granular examination of the distributional effects of reforms within specific national contexts. By focusing on the unique economic, social, and political factors influencing the relationship between trade liberalization and poverty reduction in each country, these case studies can provide a more comprehensive understanding of the impacts of policy reforms on different segments of the population. By delving into the specific mechanisms through which trade liberalization affects poverty, inequality, and other dimensions of well-being within individual countries, such studies can offer valuable insights that may not be captured in cross-country analyses. Moreover, they allow for a deeper exploration of the heterogeneity of outcomes across regions, communities, and socioeconomic groups, shedding light on disparities and highlighting potential areas for targeted policy interventions.

Recent single-country case studies have provided valuable insights into the distributional effects of liberalization, revealing a pattern where the benefits tend to favor urban and wealthier households over rural and poorer ones. Moreover, there is evidence to suggest that the liberalization process in many developing countries may exacerbate inequalities, particularly by disadvantaging low-skilled labor. These findings are particularly prominent in the Latin American region, where rigorous reform policies were implemented in the mid-1980s as part of broader structural adjustment plans. In the aftermath of these reforms, many countries in the region experienced significant increases in inequality, raising concerns about the distributional impacts of liberalization. By focusing on specific countries and examining the outcomes of liberalization within their unique socioeconomic contexts, these case studies have been able to uncover nuanced patterns of inequality and shed light on the mechanisms driving these disparities. They highlight the importance of considering factors such as urban-rural divides, income levels, and labor market dynamics in understanding how liberalization affects different segments of the population. The findings of Ligovini et al. (2001) highlight a significant increase in inequality in Mexico during the period from 1984 to 1994, with rising returns to skilled labor accounting for a substantial portion of this rise. Specifically, they estimate that approximately 20 percent of the increase in household per capita income inequality can be attributed to the growing wage gap between skilled and unskilled workers.

Similarly, Hanson and Harrison (1999) provide evidence of the role of liberalization in driving inequality in Mexico. Their study suggests that the reduction in tariffs and the elimination of import licenses contributed to a 23 percent increase in the relative wages of skilled labor between 1986 and 1990. This finding underscores the impact of trade liberalization policies on exacerbating disparities in wages and income distribution. Moreover, country-specific studies on Brazil, Chile, Colombia, and Venezuela further support the notion that liberalization tends to benefit skilled workers disproportionately. These studies, as highlighted by the World Bank (2001a), indicate that skilled workers experienced increased wage premiums relative to their unskilled counterparts following liberalization measures. Taken together, these findings underscore the importance of considering the distributional consequences of liberalization policies, particularly their impact on wage differentials between skilled and unskilled workers. By understanding how liberalization affects income distribution within specific countries, policymakers can better design interventions to mitigate inequalities and ensure that the benefits of economic reforms are more equitably shared across society. The empirical evidence highlighting the exacerbation of inequality following trade liberalization contradicts the conventional trade theory, which posits that such liberalization would lead to increased demand for low-skilled labor in developing countries, thereby improving the relative earnings of this group compared to the more skilled. This discrepancy between theory and reality underscores the complexity of the relationship between trade liberalization and income distribution.

Ravallion (2003) expressed concerns about the potential for openness to trade to exacerbate inequality by disproportionately increasing the demand for relatively skilled labor, which tends to be more unequally distributed in poor countries compared to rich ones. This perspective aligns with the findings of empirical studies that have documented the widening wage gap between skilled and unskilled workers following trade liberalization measures. Additionally, Ravallion cautioned against interpreting the results of studies such as those by David and Dollar (2004), which suggest neutral or minimal inequality effects of trade reforms. He questioned the methodology employed in such

studies and referred to his own empirical research, which found evidence of unequal distributional effects associated with the reform process. Indeed, the ultimate aim of any economic policy is to enhance the welfare and well-being of the public, and economic growth is often considered a key strategy in achieving this objective. The underlying assumption is that growth should benefit everyone, particularly the poor. However, the relationship between growth and poverty alleviation is not always straightforward. Economic theory suggests that there are two main channels through which poverty is affected: growth and inequality. While economic growth can potentially lift people out of poverty by creating employment opportunities and increasing incomes, rising inequality can undermine these benefits by concentrating wealth in the hands of a few. Therefore, the challenge lies in ensuring that economic growth is not only robust but also inclusive and equitable. The concept of "chaste pro-poor growth" refers to growth that not only fosters economic development but also reduces poverty and narrows inequality. Achieving such growth requires careful policy interventions aimed at mitigating the adverse distributional effects of economic growth. However, implementing such policies is often complex and challenging in practice. Policy measures to promote pro-poor growth may include investments in education and healthcare to enhance human capital, targeted social welfare programs to support the most vulnerable populations, and progressive taxation to redistribute wealth and reduce income inequality. Additionally, policies that promote inclusive economic growth, such as providing access to credit and markets for small-scale entrepreneurs and marginalized communities, can help ensure that the benefits of growth are shared more equitably across society.

2. INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND UNEVEN DEVELOPMENT

Fischer (2001) developed a comprehensive framework to analyze the impact of trade liberalization on income distribution, emphasizing the role of capital gains or losses in influencing inequality. In his model, an individual's income comprises two main components: wages, which are uniform across all individuals, and wealth, which is distributed unequally. Wages represent the compensation for unskilled labor, while wealth encompasses various assets such as capital, human capital, land, and natural resources. Central to Fischer's model is the notion that individuals inherit unequal amounts of wealth from their parents, contributing to intergenerational inequality. Therefore, any changes in group inequality influence the distribution of bequests to subsequent generations. Fischer argues that shifts in inequality are time-sensitive, meaning that alterations in the relative importance of wages and wealth can impact income distribution. According to Fischer's framework, an increase in wages relative to wealth tends to reduce inequality by elevating the significance of the income component that is evenly distributed (i.e., wages). This aspect of the model aligns well with the dynamics observed in developing countries, where the income of unskilled labor tends to be distributed more equitably compared to wealth. Therefore, any rise in the income of unskilled labor would likely lead to a decrease in overall inequality.

Indeed, Fischer's model incorporates the intricate dynamics of consumption, savings, and intergenerational wealth transmission. Each economic agent allocates their income between consumption and savings, with the latter contributing to the accumulation of assets and the provision of bequests to future generations. Importantly, there exists a diverse spectrum of agents within each generation, characterized by varying propensities for consumption and inheritances received from their predecessors. The inequality observed in the income distribution of a society is inherently linked to the initial distribution of wealth or inheritance among individuals. Those who inherit greater wealth are likely to enjoy higher socioeconomic status throughout their lives, while those with less affluent inheritances may face greater challenges in accumulating wealth and achieving economic prosperity. In this context, trade liberalization can exert significant influence on income inequality by affecting the assets and opportunities available to different segments of society. If the liberalization process disproportionately benefits certain groups, such as those already endowed with substantial wealth or assets, it can exacerbate inequality by increasing the relative importance of inherited wealth in determining individuals' socioeconomic status. This dynamic underscores the critical role of policy interventions in mitigating the adverse distributional effects of trade liberalization. By promoting inclusive economic growth and equitable access to opportunities, policymakers can help ensure that the benefits of trade are shared more broadly across society, thereby fostering greater social cohesion and reducing disparities in wealth and income.

Tinbergen's insights highlight the intricate relationship between technological change, education, and the distribution of income. In the context of trade liberalization, the dynamics of skilled and unskilled labor markets play a crucial role in determining income inequality within a society. If trade liberalization leads to an increased demand for skilled labor relative to unskilled labor, this can exacerbate existing inequalities in income and wealth. The framework proposed by Tinbergen suggests that technological advancements and changes in the composition of the labor force can influence the relative wages of skilled and unskilled workers. If a developing country experiences an increase in the demand for skilled labor due to trade liberalization, but fails to adequately invest in education and training to meet this demand, the wages of skilled workers may rise disproportionately compared to those of unskilled workers. This scenario would contribute to widening income disparities within the population. Conversely, if trade liberalization leads to an increase in the wages of unskilled labor, it could result in a more equitable distribution of income. However, this outcome depends on various factors, including the skill composition of the workforce and the extent to which trade policies promote inclusive growth. Empirical studies, such as those conducted by Spilimbergo et al. (1999), have indeed found a positive correlation between inequality and the interaction effect between trade openness and human capital. This suggests that if human capital is distributed unequally within a society, trade liberalization may exacerbate existing inequalities, particularly if it disproportionately benefits skilled or more educated individuals.

3. INEQUALITY AS AN OUTCOME OF EDUCATION POLICY

The uneven distribution of human capital, particularly in developing regions like Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, the Middle East, and North Africa, has been highlighted by various studies. Researchers such as Thomas, Wang, and Fan (2000), Castello, and Domenech (2002), and Berthelemy (2004) have pointed out that the Gini coefficient, a measure of inequality, for the distribution of human capital in these regions is among the highest globally. The high levels of inequality in human capital distribution can have significant implications for income inequality and overall economic development. In many developing countries, government policies have often prioritized secondary and tertiary education over primary education. Berthelemy (2004) specifically attributes the unequal distribution of income in these regions to government policies that favor higher education at the expense of primary education. Chowdhury (1994) further emphasizes the misallocation of resources by governments in developing countries, which tend to allocate more resources to higher education while neglecting primary education. This misallocation perpetuates disparities in human capital accumulation, as individuals from wealthier backgrounds are more likely to access higher education, exacerbating income inequality. The unequal distribution of human capital underscores the importance of targeted policies aimed at improving access to education, particularly at the primary level, and addressing disparities in educational opportunities. Investing in primary education can help reduce inequality in human capital accumulation, promote social mobility, and contribute to long-term economic growth and development in these regions. The allocation of public expenditures for education often disproportionately benefits middle- and upper-income families, contributing to the perpetuation of inequality in many countries. This is because wealthier groups are overrepresented at all levels of education, particularly at the university level, where public expenditure per student tends to be significantly higher. In African countries, disparities in public expenditure per student between higher education and primary education are particularly stark. Public expenditure per student on higher education in Francophone Africa is 28 times that of primary education, while in Anglophone Africa, it is 50 times higher. This disproportionate allocation of resources toward higher education exacerbates inequalities in access to quality education, as primary education is often underfunded despite serving a larger portion of the population.

Moreover, the benefits of high public expenditure per student in higher education are often enjoyed by only a small segment of the population. In developing countries as a whole, only around 7% of the school-age population enrolls in higher education, highlighting the limited reach of these investments in terms of broader societal impact. These findings underscore the need for more equitable allocation of public education spending, with a focus on increasing access to quality primary and secondary education for all segments of society. Investing in foundational education can help address inequality in educational attainment and contribute to more inclusive economic development. Additionally, policies should aim to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of education spending to ensure that resources are allocated where they are most needed and can have the greatest impact on social mobility and economic prosperity. The bias in education policies toward higher education in developing countries may stem from the perception that elementary education has limited direct impact on economic growth. According to Barro (1999), economic growth is more responsive to levels of secondary or higher education than to elementary schooling. In developing countries, participation in international trade, a key driver of growth, often favors individuals with higher qualifications, such as university graduates or those who have completed high school.

Given this context, it is understandable that many developing countries prioritize investment in higher education in pursuit of greater economic growth and competitiveness. The belief is that by focusing resources on higher education, countries can better equip their workforce with the skills and qualifications needed to participate in and benefit from global trade and technological advancements. However, this approach neglects the critical role that primary and secondary education play in laying the foundation for future educational attainment and economic success. Primary education, in particular, is essential for building basic literacy, numeracy, and critical thinking skills among populations, which are crucial for overall human development and social mobility. While investment in higher education is important, it should not come at the expense of primary education. A balanced approach to education policy is needed, one that ensures adequate resources are allocated to all levels of education to promote inclusive and sustainable development. By investing in both higher education and primary education, countries can foster a skilled and knowledgeable workforce that is equipped to drive economic growth and prosperity while also promoting social equity and opportunity for all.

Indeed, the government plays a crucial role in addressing the imbalance in education policies and promoting equitable access to education. By investing in the education sector and implementing a balanced education policy, governments can improve human capital development on a more equitable basis. A balanced education policy involves giving special attention to rural areas and marginalized communities, where access to education and levels of human capital are often lower compared to urban areas and affluent regions. This approach recognizes the importance of targeting resources and interventions to address the specific needs and challenges faced by disadvantaged populations. In rural areas and shanty towns, for example, infrastructure for schools may be inadequate, teacher shortages may be prevalent, and socio-economic barriers to education may be significant. By prioritizing investment in education infrastructure, teacher training programs, and initiatives to promote enrollment and retention in schools, governments can help bridge the education gap between rural and urban areas. Moreover, a balanced education policy should also focus on improving the quality and relevance of education offered, ensuring that students receive a well-rounded education that equips them with the skills and knowledge needed for success in the modern economy. This may involve curriculum reforms, vocational training programs, and initiatives to enhance teaching standards and learning outcomes. By adopting a balanced education policy that targets resources effectively and addresses the needs of marginalized communities,

governments can contribute to reducing inequality, promoting social mobility, and fostering inclusive economic growth. Education is not only a fundamental human right but also a powerful tool for empowerment and development, and governments have a responsibility to ensure that all citizens have access to quality education opportunities, regardless of their socio-economic background or geographic location.

4. ENDOWMENT EFFECT

This observation highlights the complexity of the relationship between trade liberalization, wage inequality, and skill abundance, particularly in the context of different countries' relative endowments and comparative advantages. Even within the category of "unskilled abundant" countries in a global sense, there can be variations in skill abundance at the regional level. For example, a middle-income developing country may be relatively skill abundant compared to low-income developing countries but still unskilled abundant compared to developed countries. This regional variation in skill abundance can influence the comparative advantages of different countries and the impact of trade liberalization on wage inequality. In some cases, trade liberalization may lead to a decrease in wages for unskilled labor in certain middle-income developing countries. This outcome can occur if these countries, despite being unskilled abundant globally, face competition from low-income developing countries that are even more unskilled abundant or have other comparative advantages in unskilled labor-intensive industries. As tariffs are abolished and trade barriers removed, the wages of unskilled labor in these middle-income countries may face downward pressure due to increased competition from lower-cost producers elsewhere. The example of Mexico, as highlighted by Leamer (1998), illustrates this phenomenon. Despite being unskilled abundant in a global sense, Mexico may face competition from countries that are even more unskilled abundant or have other advantages in unskilled labor-intensive industries. As a result, protecting unskilled labor through tariffs or other trade barriers may be a natural policy response in such cases.

Wood's argument highlights the dynamic effects of trade liberalization on income inequality, particularly in middle-income countries. The entry of countries such as China, India, Bangladesh, Pakistan, and Indonesia into global markets for goods intensive in unskilled labor has reshaped the global supply of such goods. This increase in supply has led to lower prices for these goods and reduced returns to factors of production involved in their production. Middle-income countries, especially those in Latin America, which previously had some comparative advantage in producing these goods, have been adversely affected. As a result of this increased competition and loss of competitiveness in global markets, middle-income countries may be pressured to shift their production techniques toward goods that use semi-skilled labor, as noted by Vos (2003). This shift can lead to an increase in demand for semi-skilled labor and, consequently, wage dispersion within these countries. While this explanation provides insights into inequality dynamics in middle-income countries, it does not fully address the issue of inequality in low-income countries. The question of inequality in low-income countries remains complex and multifaceted. Factors such as institutional quality, governance, access to education and healthcare, and structural barriers to economic opportunities all play crucial roles in determining income distribution within these countries. Additionally, the impact of trade liberalization on low-income countries may vary depending on their specific circumstances, including their level of development, industrial structure, and integration into global value chains.

5. TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER EFFECT

The trade-technology nexus provides a framework for understanding the dynamics of technological diffusion and its impact on labor markets in developing countries, particularly in the context of globalization and trade liberalization. According to this perspective, greater openness to trade leads to increased inflows of technology, which may be biased towards skilled labor, thus driving up the demand for skilled workers. In this framework, developing countries, often referred to as the "South," improve their technological capabilities by learning from advanced technologies available in developed countries, or the "North." This learning process can occur through various channels, including technology transfers, imitation of technologies, or importing capital goods from the North. As developing countries integrate into global markets through trade liberalization, they gain access to Northern technologies, either through direct imports of technology-intensive goods or through competition with Northern firms in export markets. The introduction of new technologies in the South typically requires skilled labor for implementation and operation. As a result, the demand for skilled workers increases, leading to higher wages for this group. This phenomenon can contribute to rising wage inequality within developing countries, as skilled workers benefit disproportionately from technological upgrading and globalization.

The trade-technology nexus highlights the complex interactions between trade, technology, and labor markets, emphasizing the importance of skills and human capital development for sustainable economic growth and development. To address the challenges posed by increasing wage inequality, policymakers may need to focus on policies that promote inclusive growth, such as investing in education and training programs to enhance the skills of the workforce and ensure that the benefits of globalization are more broadly shared across different segments of society.

6. PRICE ELASTICITY EFFECT

Rodrik (1997) and Slaughter (2001) present compelling arguments regarding how trade liberalization can contribute to increasing inequality through changes in labor demand elasticities and product market competition. Rodrik highlights the impact of greater trade openness on labor demand elasticities, suggesting that in imperfectly competitive markets, the elasticity of demand for labor tends to increase with trade liberalization. This means that labor markets become more responsive to changes in demand, which can have several implications for wage determination and employment

dynamics. Firstly, the shift in labor demand elasticities can put pressure on labor markets, as higher elasticities may result in a greater incidence of non-wage labor costs being shifted onto workers rather than being absorbed by employers. This can lead to a squeeze on wages and employment conditions for workers. Secondly, higher elasticities can also lead to more volatile responses of wages and employment to external shocks, such as fluctuations in productivity or output demand. This increased volatility can make labor markets more unstable and uncertain for workers, exacerbating income inequality. Additionally, the increase in elasticities may erode the bargaining power of labor relative to capital, as workers may find themselves in a weaker position to negotiate wages and working conditions in the face of heightened competition and market pressures.

Slaughter builds on this argument by highlighting the relationship between factor demand elasticities and product market competition, as articulated in Hicks' fundamental law of factor demand. This law suggests that the demand for a factor of production, such as labor, is more elastic when the demand for the final goods it helps produce is also more elastic. The findings of Hasan, Mitra, and Ramaswamy (2003) provide evidence of a positive impact of trade liberalization on labor demand elasticities within the Indian manufacturing sector. This suggests that greater openness to trade has led to increased responsiveness of labor demand to changes in market conditions. Importantly, they observe that these elasticities are negatively correlated with protection levels across industries and over time. This indicates that industries facing higher levels of protection prior to liberalization experienced smaller changes in labor demand elasticities compared to those facing lower levels of protection. Moreover, Hasan et al. find that states in India with more flexible regulations tend to exhibit higher labor demand elasticities, and these elasticities are significantly influenced by trade reforms. This highlights the role of regulatory flexibility and trade policy in shaping labor market dynamics in response to changes in market conditions. Additionally, the study reveals that following trade reforms, volatility in productivity and output levels translates into larger fluctuations in wages and employment. This suggests that the increased labor demand elasticities associated with trade liberalization contribute to greater volatility in labor market outcomes, potentially leading to increased uncertainty for workers. In contrast, Krishna, Mitra, and Chinoy (2001) present findings for Turkey indicating a weaker linkage between greater trade openness and labor demand elasticities. They attribute this weakness to various frictions that affect firms' decisions regarding labor demand. This suggests that the impact of trade liberalization on labor market dynamics may vary across countries and be influenced by a range of factors beyond trade policy alone, including institutional and structural characteristics of the economy.

7. CONCLUSIONS

The paper sheds light on the nuanced relationship between globalization, economic growth, and their impacts on poverty alleviation. By highlighting the potential welfare-distorting effects of increased trade in the long run, especially due to unequal distributional outcomes, it contributes to a more comprehensive understanding of the complexities involved in pro-poor growth strategies. The recognition that inequality is a significant factor in the pro-poor growth debate is crucial. While globalization and trade liberalization may initially offer opportunities for poverty reduction, it's essential to consider the distributional consequences over time. Unequal effects of trade can exacerbate income disparities and hinder sustainable poverty reduction efforts. Emphasizing the importance of addressing inequality alongside promoting economic growth, the paper underscores the need for policies that ensure the benefits of globalization are equitably distributed. This could involve targeted interventions to support vulnerable groups, investment in education and skill development, and measures to promote inclusive economic growth. The United Nations report highlights the correlation between globalization and increasing inequalities, both among countries and within them. This phenomenon has manifested in various negative outcomes, such as disparities in employment opportunities, job security, and wages. However, the report also acknowledges that there is ongoing debate regarding the precise contribution of liberalization policies to these trends. In essence, the paper emerges from a growing concern within policy circles regarding the trade-off between the anticipated advantages of trade liberalization and the potential drawbacks of implementing trade reforms. This concern underscores the need for a thorough examination of the impacts of globalization and liberalization policies on inequality, employment, and economic stability. By engaging with this debate, the paper aims to contribute to a better understanding of the complex dynamics at play in the context of contemporary economic policies. This paper endeavors to make a constructive contribution to the ongoing discourse by delineating various channels through which international trade tends to benefit skilled or affluent individuals in developing countries, thereby exacerbating inequality. It is important to note that many of the empirical approaches and methodologies discussed in our paper are still in nascent stages, and further empirical evidence is anticipated to emerge in this regard. By shedding light on these mechanisms and frameworks, this paper aims to enrich the understanding of how trade liberalization impacts inequality within developing countries. Through continued research and analysis, we anticipate that a more comprehensive understanding of these dynamics will emerge, informing more effective policy interventions aimed at mitigating inequality and promoting inclusive economic growth.

REFERENCES

Aghion, P. Eve, C. and Garcia-Penalosa, C. (1999). Inequality and Economic Growth: The Perspective of the New Growth Theories. *Journal of Economic Literature,* XXXVII, 1615-60.

Amann, E., N. Aslnindis, F. N. and Walters, B. (2002). Economic Growth and Poverty Alleviation: A Reconsideration of Dollar and Kraay," *Development Economic Discussion Papers*, No. 0407.

Anderson, J. E. and Marcouiller, D. (1999). Trade, Insecurity, and Home Bias: An Empirical Investigation", NBER Working Paper, No. 7000.

Aisbett, E. (2003). Globalization, Poverty and Inequality: are the criticisms vague, vested, or valid?", NBER Pre-Conference Paper, NBER Pre-Conference on Globalization, Poverty and Inequality Oct 24-25, 2003.Anderson, Kim, 2003, "Trade Librelaisation, Agriculture and Poverty in Low-income Countries", UNU/WIDER Discussion paper, No. 25.

Arndt, S. W. (2000). Trade, Technical Change, and Welfare. Working Paper, Claremont Colleges, California, USA.

Barro, R. J. (1999). Does an Income Gap Put a Hex on Growth' Business Week.

Behrman, J. R. Birdsall, N. and Szelely, M. (2001). Pobreza, Desigualdad, Liberalizacion Comercially Financiera en America Latina. Inter American Development Bank (IADB), Washington D.C.

Berthelemy, J. (2004). To What Extent are African Education Policies Pro-Poor.

Bourguignon, F. and Morrison, C. (1999). Income Distribution, Development and Foreign Trade: A Cross Section Analysis. *European Economic Review*, 34(6), 1113-1132.

Castello, C. Maria, A. and R. Domenech, (2002). Human Capital Inequality and Economic Growth: Some New Evidence. *Economic Journal*, 112, C187-C200

Chowdhury, K., P. (1994). Literacy and Primary Education", Human Capital Development and Operations Policy Working Paper (HCOWP) 50.

Cockburn, J. (2002). Trade Liberalization and Poverty in Nepal: A Computable General Equilibrium Micro Simulation Analysis," The Centre for the Study of African Economies Working Paper Series. Working Paper 170.

Dollar, D. and Kraay, A. (2004). Trade, Growth, and Poverty. *Economic Journal*, 114, F22-F49.

Dollar, D. and Kraay, (2002). Institutions, Trade and Growth," Carnegie Rochester Conference on Public Policy.

Dutta, V., Puja. (2003). Trade Liberalisation and the Indian Labor Market. School of Social Sciences, University of Sussex, UK.

Fischer, R. D. (2001). The Evolution of Inequality after Trade Liberalization," *Journal of Development Economics*, 66, 555-579.

Friedman, J. (2000). Differential Impacts of Trade Liberalisation on Indonesia's Poor and Non-Poor. Conference on International Trade and poverty, Stockholm.

Galor, O. and Moav, O. (2000). Das Human Capital', Brown University Mimeo.

Galor, O. and Tsiddon, D. (1996). Income Distribution and Growth: The Kuznets hypothesis revisited". *Economica* 63, 103-117.

Goldberg, P. K. and Pavcnik, N. (2004). Trade, Inequality and Poverty: What Do We Know? Evidence From Recent Trade Liberalization Episodes in Developing Countries," Conference Paper Brooking Trade Forum.

Gorg, H., and E. Strobl, (2002). Relative Wages, Openness and Skill-Biased Technological Change. Discussion paper No. 596, Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA), Bonn, Germany.

Gould, E. Moav, O. and Weinberg, B. A. (2000). Precautionary Demand for Education, Inequality and Technological press', mimeo.

Hasan, R. Mitra, D. and Ramaswamy, K.V. (2003). Trade reforms, labor Regulations and Labor Demand Elasticities: Empirical Evidence From India", NBER Working Paper, 9879.

Hanson, G. and Harisson, A. (1999). Trade and Wage Inequality in Mexico," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, 52(2), 271-288.

Ianchovichina, E. and Walmsley, T. (2003). Impact of China's WTO Accession on East Asia. Working Paper 3109, World bank, Washington DC.

Jayasuriya, S. (2002). Globalisation, Equity and Poverty: The South Asian Experience," Annual Global Conference of GDN, Cairo, Egypt.

Jensen, H. T. and Finn, T. (2003). Trade Liberalisation and Spatial Inequality: Methodological Innovations in a Vietnamese Perspective", UNU/WIDER Conference, United Nations University Center, Tokyo, 28-29.

Kakwani, N. B. Prakash, and Son, H. (2000). Growth, Inequality, and Poverty: An Introduction", *Asian Development Review*, 18(2), 1-21.

Krishna P. Mitra, D. and Chinoy, S. (2001). Trade Liberalisation and labor demand Elasticities: Evidence from Turkey. *Journal of International Economics*, 55, 391-409.

Kwan, C. H. (2003). China's Immiserizing Growth', China in Transition.

Leamer, E. E. (1998). In Search of Stolper-Samuelson Linkages between International Trade and Lower Wages", in Susan. Collins (ed), Import, Exports, and the American Worker, Washington, D.C. Brookings Institution Press, 141-202.

Legovini A. C. Bouillon and Lustig, N. (2001). Can Education Explain Income Inequality Changes in Mexico?" Inter-American development Bank (IADB), Washington D.C.

Lofgren, H. (1999). Trade Reform and the poor in morocco: A Rural-Urban General Equilibrium Analysis of Reduced Protection," TMD Discussion paper, IFPRI, Washington DC, No. 38.

Mamoon, D. (2005). Education for all is central to Higher Education Reforms in Developing Countries" in Boeren, Ad and Gerrit Holtland (eds) 'A Changing Landscape - making support to higher education and research in developing countries more effective', NUFFIC, the Netherlands.

Mamoon, D. (2004). Poverty and Prosperity in Pakistan', Asia Times, Honk Kong.

Mamoon, D., and Murshed, S. M. (2005). Are Institutions more important than Integration", Institute of Social Studies, Working Paper.

Murshed, S. M. (2003). Globalization is not always good: An Economists Perspective," *Tilburg Lustrum Conference*.

Milanovic, B. (2003). The Two Faces of Globalization: Against Globalization as We Know It. *World Development*, 31(4), 667-683.

Milanovic, B. (2002). The Ricardian Vice: Why Sala-i-Martin's Calculations of World Income Inequality are Wrong.

Pavcnik, N. A. Bloom, P. Goldberg and N. Shady, (2003). Trade Liberalisation and Industry Wage Structure: Evidence from Brazil", Dartmouth College, NBER and CEPR.

Ravallion, M. (2003). The Debate on Globalization, Poverty, and Inequality: Why Measurement Matters" World Bank Policy Research Working Paper 3038, Washington. D. C.

Rodriguez, F. and Rodrik, D. (2000). Trade Policy and Economic Growth: A Skeptic's Guide to the Cross- National Evidence. NBER Macroeconomics Annual 2000.

Rodrik, D. (1997). Has Globalisation Gone too far?" Institute of International Economics, Washington D.C.

Sala-i-Martin, X. (2002). The Disturbing "Rise" of Global Income Inequality", NBER Working Paper Series, No. w8904.

Sen, A. (2002). Globalization and Poverty' Public lecture, Santa Clara University, California, 29.

Slaughter, M. J. (2001). International Trade and labor Demand Elasticities", *Journal of International Economics*, 54, 27-56.

Slaughetr, M. J. (2000). What are the results of product-price studies and what can we learn from their differences?" in R.C. Feenstra (ed.) The Impact of International Trade on Wages, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 129-165.

Slaughter, M. J. (2000). Trade and Labor-Market Outcomes: What About Developing Countries?", Conference paper, NBER, Inter-American Seminar on Economics.

Spilimbergo, A. L. Londono, and M. Skezely, (1999). Income Distribution, Factor Endowments and Trade Openness". *Journal of Development Economics*, 59, 77-101.

Srinivasan, T. N. and B. Jadgish (2000). Trade and Poverty in the Poor Countries. AEA Papers and Proceedings, 92(2), 180-183.

Srinivasan, T. N. and B. Jadgish, (2001). Outward-Orientation and Development: Are Revisionists Right?" in Deepak lal and Richard Shape (Eds), *Trade, development and Political Economy: Essays in Honour of Anne Krueger*, London, Palgrave.

Tharakan, P. K. M., and I. V. Beveren, (2003). *Fast Track and Slow track: determinants of India's Software Exports and Goods Exports*", Conference paper, Institute of Social Studies (ISS), The Hague, The Netherlands.

Thoma, V. Y. Wang and X. Fan, (2000). Measuring Education Inequality: Gini Coefficients of Education," *Mimeo*, Banque Mondiale,.

Tinbergen, J. (1975). Income Distribution: Analysis and Policies', Amsterdam: American Elsevier.

World bank, (2001). A Globalized Market – Opportunities and Risks for the Poor', Global Poverty Report, Washington D. C.

World Development Report (2000/1). Attacking Poverty.

World Development Report (2006). Equity and Development.

Wood, A. (1999). Openness and Wage Inequality in Developing Countries: The latin American Challenege to East Asian Conventional Wisdom", in R.E. Baldwin, D. Cohen, A. Sapir and A. Venables (eds.), Market Integration, Regionalism and Global the Economy, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

United Nations Report on the World Social Situation. (2005). The Inequality Predicament.

Vos, R. (2003). Shocks, Adjustment and Growth Slowdown in Latin America in the 1990s", Economic research Seminar, Institute of Social Studies, Den hague, The Netherlands.

Zhu, S. C. and D. Trefler, (2003). Trade and Inequality in developing Countries: A general Equilibrium Analysis", Canadian Institute of Advanced research.