



EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

EUROSYSTEM

---

ECB/CEPR LABOUR  
MARKET WORKSHOP ON  
WAGE AND LABOUR  
COST DYNAMICS

---

**WORKING PAPER SERIES**

**NO 781 / JULY 2007**

**WAGE INEQUALITY  
IN SPAIN**


**RECENT DEVELOPMENTS**

by Mario Izquierdo  
and Aitor Lacuesta



EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

EUROSYSTEM



## WORKING PAPER SERIES

NO 781 / JULY 2007

---

ECB/CEPR LABOUR  
MARKET WORKSHOP ON  
WAGE AND LABOUR  
COST DYNAMICS

---

### WAGE INEQUALITY IN SPAIN RECENT DEVELOPMENTS <sup>1</sup>

by Mario Izquierdo  
and Aitor Lacuesta <sup>2</sup>



In 2007 all ECB publications feature a motif taken from the €20 banknote.

This paper can be downloaded without charge from <http://www.ecb.int> or from the Social Science Research Network electronic library at [http://ssrn.com/abstract\\_id=925810](http://ssrn.com/abstract_id=925810).

<sup>1</sup> The authors would like to thank the comments received at the seminars at the Banco de España, FEDEA, BBVA Research, the ECB/CEPR Labour Market Workshop 2006 and EALE 2006 Conference and specially to S. Bentolila, R. Carrasco, G.A. Pfann, J. F. Jimeno, P. L'Hotellerie, and E. Ortega for their useful suggestions. The opinions and views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of the Banco de España.

<sup>2</sup> Both authors: DG Economics, Statistics and Research, Banco de España, C/ Alcalá, n.º 48, 28014 Madrid, Spain; e-mail: [mizquierdo@bde.es](mailto:mizquierdo@bde.es) and [Aitor.lacuesta@bde.es](mailto:Aitor.lacuesta@bde.es)

## ECB/CEPR Labour Market Workshop on “Wage and Labour Cost Dynamics”

This paper was presented at the ECB/CEPR Labour Market Workshop on "Wage and Labour Cost Dynamics", held on 14-15 December 2006 in Frankfurt am Main, Germany. The workshop was organized by Torben M Andersen (Universitet Aarhus and CEPR), Samuel Bentolila (CEMFI and CEPR), Ana Lamo (ECB) and Jarkko Turunen (ECB). The conference programme, including papers, can be found on the ECB's web site [http://www.ecb.int/events/conferences/html/wage\\_and\\_labour.en.html](http://www.ecb.int/events/conferences/html/wage_and_labour.en.html)

The views expressed in the paper are the author's own and do not necessarily reflect those of the Eurosystem.

© European Central Bank, 2007

**Address**

Kaiserstrasse 29  
60311 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

**Postal address**

Postfach 16 03 19  
60066 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

**Telephone**

+49 69 1344 0

**Internet**

<http://www.ecb.int>

**Fax**

+49 69 1344 6000

**Telex**

411 144 ecb d

*All rights reserved.*

*Any reproduction, publication and reprint in the form of a different publication, whether printed or produced electronically, in whole or in part, is permitted only with the explicit written authorisation of the ECB or the author(s).*

*The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of the European Central Bank.*

*The statement of purpose for the ECB Working Paper Series is available from the ECB website, <http://www.ecb.int>.*

ISSN 1561-0810 (print)  
ISSN 1725-2806 (online)

# CONTENTS

Abstract	4
Non-technical summary	5
1 Introduction	7
2 Data	9
3 Changes in wage inequality	10
4 Factorial decomposition of inequality	12
5 Effect on wage distribution of changes in the proportion of different factors	14
5.1 Change in female participation	14
5.2 Change in educational attainment	16
5.3 Change in the tenure distribution	17
5.4 Importance of changes in the labour force composition	18
6 Effects on inequality of changes in the wage structure	20
6.1 The gender wage gap	20
6.2 Returns to education	22
6.3 Returns to age and tenure	24
6.4 The wage structure of alternative factors	25
6.5 Importance of changes in returns	26
7 Contributions to inequality of changes in the composition and the wage structure	28
8 Conclusions	30
Appendices	31
References	38
European Central Bank Working Paper Series	39

## Abstract

This paper analyses wage inequality in Spain from 1995 to 2002. Inequality has decreased slightly in this period although the fall has not been constant over the whole distribution. We use non-parametric techniques to distinguish the effect on inequality of changes in the composition of the labour force and changes in relative returns. We focus mainly on three factors that have varied substantially between 1995 and 2002: female participation, educational attainment and changes in the tenure level. On one hand, changes in the composition of the labour force would have increased inequality had the structure of wages not changed in relation to the 1995 level. Changes in education and especially tenure would have been responsible for most of the higher dispersion. On the other, changes in relative returns between 1995 and 2002 are predominant and are responsible for the lower dispersion observed in the latter year. Changes in the returns to education are the main important factor underlying this decrease in inequality.

JEL Classification: J30, J00.

Keywords: Inequality, wage distribution, labour force composition

## Non-technical summary

This paper analyses wage inequality in Spain between 1995 and 2002, and the significance of the different factors underlying this change. Several studies have analysed developments in aggregate income or wage inequality in Spain [Alcaide (1980), Goerlich and Mas (1999), among others]. One shortcoming of these datasets is the reduced information on either the individual or the firm side in order to study how changes in different factors affect inequality. The recent Wage Structure Survey (hereafter, WSS) provides this previously lacking piece of information since it is very rich in terms of characteristics both from the worker and from the firm side.

The interest of the paper relies on the important compositional changes of the Spanish labour force in the last few years. In particular, we are interested in seeing how the recent changes in the composition of the labour force have affected the distribution of wages. For instance, women and workers with a university degree have increased their weight in the labour force significantly over this period. Moreover, there has been a large decrease in unemployment that leads an incorporation of workers with low tenure levels.

Even if the structure of wages does not change during a period of time, an increase in the participation in the labour market of a particular group of the population would lead to changes in inequality. This is the case because there are differences in wages between groups and because there are also differences in the heterogeneity of wages within each particular group. On top of that, wage inequality will be affected by changes in the wage structure as a consequence of changes in the labour supply or demand or, for instance, in institutional factors that affect wage bargaining.

This paper pools information from the WSS in 1995 and 2002 to isolate the change in inequality that would be attributed to changes in the composition of the labour force and to changes in the wage structure. Although we are not able to identify whether the underlying changes in the wage structure are coming from the supply or the demand side, the decomposition will give us some hints about this issue. This paper shows that wage inequality in Spain has slightly decreased between 1995 and 2002. This change is attributed to a higher concentration of wages in the middle and lower part of the distribution. On the other hand, there is an increase in inequality in the upper tail.

Many factors have changed in the Spanish labour market between 1995 and 2002 that have affected inequality in different ways. The three main changes in the composition of the labour force during these years have been the increase in female participation, the increase in university degree-holders and the increase in workers with lower levels of tenure.

Our empirical analysis shows that given the structure of wages in 1995, an increase in the participation of females would have led to an increase in inequality. In other words, the fact that female's wages were below the unconditional mean dominates the fact that wage inequality within females is lower than within males. With respect to changes in the wage structure, the large increase in the participation of women has not been followed by a change in their relative wage respect to men. This means that changes in the structure of wages would have not led to relevant changes in inequality; therefore, female participation does not appear to be able to explain the decrease in overall inequality during these years.

Regarding the impact of changes in the tenure distribution, by one hand, the entrance of individuals with lower levels of tenure would have increased inequality between 1995 and 2002, maintaining the 1995 wage distribution. This is the case because although they present more homogeneous wages than individuals with high levels of tenure, their wages are far below the unconditional mean. On the other hand, wage distribution has changed and wage differentials across tenure levels have decreased, thus contributing to a decrease in wage inequality. However, we observe a different behaviour at different parts of the distribution. At the lower part of the distribution, returns to tenure decreased, while they increased at the top part of it. This change in the returns to tenure might hide a different composition of the new entrants at different parts of the wage distribution. It is possible that young new entrants with relatively high skills would concentrate at the bottom part of the distribution; whereas old workers that have found a new job offer after a short unemployment spell would concentrate at the top part of the distribution.

Finally, the increase in university degree holders would have increased inequality in Spain between 1995 and 2002, keeping constant the wage structure in 1995. This was expected a priori since their wage was much higher than the unconditional mean and also within inequality among university degree holders is higher than in other population groups. However, returns to schooling have decreased 5% during these years and more than compensates the previous increase in inequality due to composition alone. Actually, this factor is one of the most important mechanisms underlying the overall decrease in inequality between 1995 and 2002. This evolution of returns to schooling is quite surprising since other countries experiencing a similar increase in the supply of university degree holders have also experienced an increase the returns to schooling that is usually associated with an increase in labour demand for this type of workers. Future research could be devoted to analysing this phenomenon in depth in order to look at alternative explanations. For instance, institutional factors such as the bargaining mechanism, which in Spain has been producing a high homogeneity of wage increases [Izquierdo et al. (2003)], may play a role in this decrease in the returns to education.

On top of the decrease in inequality coming from a contraction of returns to schooling, our results indicate that wage differentials of many other characteristics that do not change much their composition between 1995 and 2002 have also decreased between those two years. These additional changes help to explain the higher concentration of wages in 2002 respect to 1995. Again, future research should be devoted to analysing whether institutional factors are generating this concentration of wages or it is simply a matter of changes in the labour demand of workers with some specific characteristics.

## 1 Introduction

This paper analyses wage inequality between 1995 and 2002, and the significance of the different factors underlying this change. Several studies have analysed developments in aggregate income or wage inequality in Spain [Alcaide (1980), Goerlich and Mas (1999), among others]. Some have used different waves of the Household Budget Survey. This survey conducted by INE (the Spanish National Statistics Institute) provides useful information at the household level about earnings and expenditures that enables researchers to compute several inequality indices. With this information, Alcaide found that income inequality in Spain did not change much between 1967 and 1974, but it started to decrease from that moment on. The continuous reduction in inequality is also confirmed by Goerlich and Mas (1999) and ran until the 90s.

Another group of papers reached similar conclusions using the Wage Survey by INE [Garcia-Perea (1991), Jimeno and Toharia (1994)]. One shortcoming of these datasets is the reduced information on either the individual or the firm side in order to study how changes in different factors affect inequality. The recent Wage Structure Survey (hereafter, WSS) provides this previously lacking piece of information. This data set is very rich in terms of wages and characteristics both from the worker and from the firm side. Jimeno et al. (2002) use the initial wave in 1995, analysing the importance of several factors on determining the level of inequality. Among the most important factors they highlight are certain labour force characteristics (mainly educational level and occupational category) and certain *institutional factors* (mainly the type of contract and the level at which the collective agreement was signed).

This paper builds on this previous research to analyse wage inequality between 1995 and 2002. We pool information from the WSS in 1995 and 2002 to analyse which changes in the Spanish labour market were most significant in explaining recent developments in inequality. During this period there have been several changes that may affect the distribution of wages. On one hand, there are changes in the composition of the labour force. For instance, women and workers with a university degree have increased relative to other groups. On the other, in this period several labour market reforms brought about changes in the institutional setting of the labour market. On top of these two types of changes, the value of specific abilities may vary over time<sup>1</sup>. The only study that has analyzed this issue in Spain is Arellano, Bentolila and Bover (2000) but is referred to a previous period of time and they use a different data set. They studied the factors underlying the evolution of wage inequality in Spain between 1980 and 1987 with a sample drawn using the Social Security records. During those years they found that there is an increase in inequality over the upper part of the distribution whereas the lower and the middle part did not change much. They also found that this is due to an increase of returns to schooling during that period of time. In comparison to that paper, ours benefits from using the WSS. These data sets allows us to analyze a much recent period of time and has better information in terms of wages and individual characteristics than Social Security records<sup>2</sup>

---

1. There might be changes in the demand for a specific ability and changes in the composition of abilities that one subset of the population has.

<sup>2</sup> In Social Security records high wages are top-coded and there is no information on education per se but a proxy for it (the group of contribution that should be understood as a combination of education and the type of occupation).



Apart from being a new characterization of evolution of wage inequality in Spain the decomposition that is done helps us to identify differences or similarities between the Spanish case and what happened in other countries. Empirical research in the United States has found an increase in wage inequality during the 90's although at a lower rate than in the 80's<sup>3</sup>. Acemoglu (2002) and Katz and Autor (1999) conclude that within groups wage inequality kept growing while Card and DiNardo (2002) and Beaudry and Green (2004) show that the college-high school wage premium was relatively stable. However, Lemieux (2004) shows that this increase in residual wage inequality is mainly due to a change in the composition of the labour force. On the other hand, Acemoglu (2003) concludes that continental Europe wage inequality is relatively stable during the 90's or even decrease, and he suggests that the main difference respect to the United States is the smaller increase in the returns to schooling<sup>4</sup>. The results on the paper will help us answering questions such as whether changes in the composition of the labour force are important in order to understand the recent evolution of inequality in Spain as it seems to be in United States, or whether returns to schooling in Spain behave the same way as in other countries in Europe.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. In the second section we briefly describe the data used while in the third section we offer a descriptive analysis of wage inequality between 1995 and 2002. In the fourth and fifth sections we analyse the impact on wage inequality produced by a change in the composition of the labour force, estimating counterfactual wage distributions using non-parametric techniques. In the sixth section we use quantile regressions to describe changes in the wage structure at different points of the distribution and we estimate the relative importance of those changes to characterize the evolution of inequality. Finally, section seven concludes.

The main results show that inequality decreased slightly between 1995 and 2002. This decrease was more significant at the medium section of the distribution, whereas in the upper tail there was an increase in inequality. We also find that changes in the composition of the labour force in respect of educational attainment and tenure would have increased inequality if the wage structure had not varied. Other factors, including female participation, do not appear to have much importance. Finally, we show that the change in the wage structure drove the decrease in inequality. The reduction of the dispersion in relative wages is significant for most of the characteristics in the data set. We can conclude that the main factor underlying the decrease in wage inequality observed in Spain is the compression of wages across groups.

---

<sup>3</sup> During the 80's anglosaxon countries increased inequality a lot (Juhn, Murphy and Pierce (1993)) due to an increase both in terms of the wage differential per schooling group and within-groups wage inequality.

<sup>4</sup> He suggests three explanations for this Fac.: either a higher increase in the supply of high skilled, lower demand due to technology differences or the existence of institutions that force the compression of wages .

## 2 Data

The data pool the first and the second waves of the WSS. This survey only includes workers who were on the payroll of a firm on 31<sup>st</sup> October of the corresponding year. The firm should be made up of at least 10 workers<sup>5</sup> and the sample contains only workers whose main source of income is their salary. Thus, this restriction means that the members of the Board of Directors are not considered.

In order to study wage inequality we should previously decide on a wage definition from our data. The information on payments is quite precise in the survey and we include as wages the gross ordinary salary plus the extraordinary payments made by the firm on an annual basis<sup>6</sup>. It does not include non-monetary payments, arrears, indemnifications or other expenses. We will study the worker's hourly wage so we need information about working time. However, the hours of work are measured in the WSS more imprecisely than the salary. We have data about the agreed regular schedule and the hours that someone worked in a non-regular fashion. Since we only have information about non-regular hours of work in October, we extrapolate the number in that particular month to the rest of the year<sup>7</sup>. It is important to note that a large fraction of the sample did not work the whole year in the firm<sup>8</sup>. In order to compute the hourly wage for those workers, we divide the payments by the actual time at work for that person.

Finally, in order to gather the two samples we had to take into account several differences between the two cross-sections. In particular, in 2002 there is some additional information not present in the previous wave<sup>9</sup>. In terms of the sample, in 2002 the coverage of the survey was extended to some non-market services (educational, health and social services sectors) and we dropped these observations in order to obtain a homogeneous sample with 1995. The final sample includes observations for manufacturing, construction and market services in both years.

---

5. The absence of small firms should be taken into account when we draw conclusions from our analysis.

6. We also convert the 1995 salaries to euro.

7. We must assume that October is a regular month in order to perform the extrapolation correctly.

8. At least one-third of workers did not work the whole year. There are various reasons: either they were hired or fired in the course of the year, injured or required a maternity break.

9. For example it includes the nationality of the worker or the position at the firm.

### 3 Changes in wage inequality

Traditionally, researchers have measured inequality using different indices. The comparison of these indices over time sheds some light on wage dispersion. Table 1 shows different indices that have been used in the literature. The first two rows present two indices that are independent of the scale: the coefficient of variation and the ratio of percentiles. The two measures show a smaller index in 2002 than in 1995. We may interpret this result as a reduction of inequality in recent years.

However, note that the reduction appears to be quite small. We want to have as many indices as we can in order to see the robustness of this finding. The literature has extensively used the standard deviation of log wages, the Theil and the Gini index. However, neither of them is independent of the scale. In order to homogenize both series, we compute the ratio of means and we multiply each observation in 1995 by this factor<sup>10</sup>.

TABLE 1: Wage Inequality Indices

	1995	2002	Change %
<b>Original data</b>			
Coefficient of variation	<b>1,3780</b>	1,2861	-6,67%
P90/P10	<b>3,7527</b>	3,6446	-2,88%
<b>Re-weighted data*</b>			
SD	<b>0,5431</b>	0,5270	-2,96%
SD of log wages	<b>0,5417</b>	0,5225	-3,54%
P90/P10	<b>3,7527</b>	3,6446	-2,88%
Theil	<b>0,1770</b>	0,1763	-0,40%
Gini	<b>0,3178</b>	0,3141	-1,16%
P50/P10	<b>1,6828</b>	1,6019	-4,81%
P75/P25	<b>2,0702</b>	1,9724	-4,72%
P90/P50	2,2301	<b>2,2752</b>	2,02%

Source: Wage Structure Survey

The biggest number is bolded

\* The reweighted factor takes the 1995 series and multiplies every observation by the ratio of mean wages between 2002 and 1995

The rows in the middle of the table confirm that inequality has decreased between 1995 and 2002. Again, it appears that the reduction has not been very substantial. One problem with these indices is that they do not show the changes in inequality at different points of the distribution. The last three rows in Table 1 cover this shortcoming. We show three ratios of different quantiles. The first represents an inequality measure at the bottom part of the distribution, the second relates to the middle part and the third shows the dispersion at the upper tail. It appears from these measures that inequality decreased at the bottom and the middle part of the distribution, especially at the latter, whereas it increased slightly at the upper part.

The latest evidence suggests that in order to analyse inequality we should consider the whole distribution of wages. We estimate non-parametrically the distribution of log wages

<sup>10</sup>. The factor is 1.1952, which would mean that hourly wages have increased by approximately 2.8% per year.

using a Gaussian Kernel<sup>11</sup>. If  $K$  stands for the density of the normal distribution,  $n$  for the number of observations, and  $h$  for the bandwidth, the non-parametric estimation of wages  $g(w)$  follows from:


$$g(w) = \frac{1}{nh} \sum_i K\left(\frac{w - W_i}{h}\right)$$

$$W_i = \ln(\text{wage}_i)$$

Figure 1 shows that the two wage distributions are fairly similar. It is clear from the representation that there are two parts of the wage distribution in 2002 that lose some weight with respect to 1995. First, the lower part of the distribution appears to lose some significance, although this change is not very sizeable. Instead, much clearer is the amount of observations that are lost in the range 2.3-3.2, a range of log-wages which falls above the median and the mean<sup>12</sup>. However, there are two parts of the distribution in 2002 that gain more weight with respect to the 1995 distribution. First, the upper part of the distribution appears to gain some individuals although the increase is very subtle; but second, there is a significant gain in 2002 in the weight of observations around the mode of log-wages.

As expected, this figure is consistent with the results in Table 1 in different parts of the distribution. The median for both distributions is therefore around 2.15 (the shaded line in the chart). Wages at the lower part of the distribution are more concentrated towards the median in 2002, whereas wages at the upper part of the distribution are more concentrated towards the median in 1995. In the following section we will explore different mechanisms that might be underlying these changes in wage distribution.

**FIGURE 1**  
Wage distribution in 1995 and 2002



**11.** We have tried different bandwidths. The optimal bandwidth according to Silverman's rule of thumb produces a very smooth distribution; that is why we finally choose 0.07. We decided to conduct the analysis in log-terms for three reasons. First, the literature has overwhelmingly used log-wages when studying inequality. Second, the distribution of wages is fairly well represented by a log-normal distribution; therefore, log-wages are very suitable for analysing the problem graphically. Finally, it is fairly easy to change from a distribution in logs to the distribution in levels if required.

**12.** The median is lower than the mean. This indicates that the distribution is skewed to the left.



#### 4 Factorial decomposition of inequality

The Spanish labour market has experienced many changes lately. On one hand there have been significant variations in the composition of the labour force. In particular, females and university degree-holders increased their weight between 1995 and 2002. Moreover, several reforms have been implemented in the labour market affecting both hiring and firing costs. As we have seen in the previous section, the effect on inequality of those changes as a whole has been small. This section presents some preliminary evidence about how each of these changes taken in isolation may have affected inequality between 1995 and 2002.

We can identify significant changes in gender, education and tenure whereas the composition of the labour force in terms of other factors does not change that much<sup>13</sup>. Therefore, we will focus on changes on those three variables<sup>14</sup>. The first row of Table 2 shows the proportion of each subset of the population in a particular year. The first column shows that the proportion of female workers within the labour force increased by 7% between 1995 and 2002. At a constant 1995 wage structure, this affects inequality in two different ways: as observed in the second row, the mean wage of females is further away than the mean wage of males from the unconditional mean; therefore, an increase in female participation should increase inequality.

On the other hand, as seen in the third row, women present less wage heterogeneity than males. Thus a higher female participation should reduce aggregate wage inequality. The next section will disentangle which effect has dominated over this period. Table 2 also shows that the wage structure has varied over time. However, there do not appear to be many changes between 1995 and 2002 in the relative wage of females and males and their wage heterogeneity.

The second column shows that the proportion of university degree-holders in 2002 has increased by 4%. At the wage structure of 1995, this alone has a clear effect on inequality. First, this group's mean wage lies fairly far away from the unconditional mean. Second, the group of university degree-holders is the most heterogeneous group in terms of intra-group inequality. These two effects would have increased inequality. On top of the changes on composition, Table 2 shows variations in relative wages between the two years, although it is not clear from it how those changes would have affected inequality.

Finally, the third column presents changes in tenure. It is interesting to see that the proportion of workers with less than 3 years of experience at the same firm increased substantially between 1995 and 2002. The group with more than 7 years of experience is the one that lost most weight. Since the groups that are gaining more weight lie further away from the unconditional mean with respect to other groups, changes in composition should increase inequality. However, individuals with over 4 years' experience are more heterogeneous than individuals with less than 4 years' experience; hence this variation would

---

<sup>13</sup>. Appendix A shows the changes in the composition of the labour force in terms of the main variables available in our data.

<sup>14</sup>. The labour market reforms may have affected tenure. The reforms implemented in 1997 and 2001 changed the type of contracts and firing costs. Therefore, it is likely that the reform had an impact on the proportion of temporary contracts and the number of years that a worker spends in a particular firm (tenure).

decrease inequality. Therefore, it is again an empirical issue which effect will dominate; this will be discussed in the next section.

TABLE 2: Summary Statistics

	Gender		Education				Tenure				
	Males	Females	Primary	1st cycle Secondary	2nd cycle secondary	Tertiary	<1 year	1-3 years	4-7 years	>7 years	
Proportion	1995	0,759	0,242	0,332	0,320	0,165	0,182	0,109	0,239	0,195	0,458
	2002	0,688	0,312	0,289	0,316	0,171	0,224	0,129	0,373	0,165	0,333
Relative salary	1995	1,049	0,914	0,968	0,914	1,077	1,191	0,774	0,899	1,024	1,134
	2002	1,042	0,909	0,926	0,927	1,041	1,163	0,824	0,927	1,021	1,162
Inequality within groups	1995	0,324	0,290	0,251	0,278	0,319	0,349	0,257	0,281	0,303	0,296
	2002	0,325	0,288	0,253	0,253	0,316	0,356	0,212	0,261	0,298	0,314

Source: WSS 1995-2002

Relative salary is the ratio between the mean of the particular group and the unconditional mean  
 Within group inequality is computed using the Gini's index

## 5 Effect on wage distribution of changes in the proportion of different factors

This section analyses how isolated changes in the proportions of particular subsets of the population affect the distribution of wages. We use the technique of DiNardo et al. (1996). They estimate the counterfactual wage distribution in a particular year assuming that nothing changes with respect to the previous period except the conditional distribution of one factor given the others.

Let us assume that we have information about wages ( $w$ ), one particular factor ( $x$ ), a set of characteristics ( $z$ ) and time ( $t$ ). The density of wages at one point in time  $g(w|t)$  could be written as the integral of the conditional density of wages given a set of characteristics in a certain period  $f(w|x,z,t)$  over the distribution of characteristics at that same moment  $h(x|z,t)dF(z|t)$ :

$$g(w|t) = \int_z f(w|x,z,t)h(x|z,t)dF(z|t)$$

The construction of the counterfactual density entails using a different date for different parts of the integral. Therefore, while  $g(w|t=95)$  represents the actual density of wages in 1995,  $g(w|t_w|x,z=95,t_{x|z}=02,t_z=95)$  would represent the density of wages that would have occurred keeping the wage structure constant and the composition of the labour force at that of 1995 and changing the factor to its 2002 distribution  $h(x|z,t=02)$ . DiNardo et al. show that the distribution of wages that would have prevailed if workers had had the characteristics of 2002 and been paid according to the schedule of 1995 is:

$$g(w|t_w = 95, t_{x|z} = 02, t_z = 95) = \int f(w|x,z,t_{w|x,z} = 95)h(x|t_{x|z} = 02)dF(z|t_z = 95) = \int f(w|x,t_w = 95)\theta(x)h(x|t_{x|z} = 95)dF(z|t_z = 95)$$

where  $\theta = \frac{h(x|z,t_{x|z} = 02)}{h(x|z,t_{x|z} = 95)}$

This means that the counterfactual density could be rewritten as the actual density with the help of a re-weighting function. We will focus on those factors that changed most between 1995 and 2002 in Spain: female participation, educational attainment and tenure<sup>15</sup>.


### 5.1 Change in female participation

Figure 2 shows the actual distributions of wages in 1995 and 2002 and the counterfactual distribution that would have prevailed in 2002 if only female participation had changed. The counterfactual distribution of wages shows very few changes with respect to the distribution in 1995. Appendix C presents the differences in terms of the probability density function between the counterfactual and the 1995 wage distributions. Wages below the mode increase very slightly in weight, whereas wages above the mode decrease in weight. This was expected because, on average, women earn less than males for identical

<sup>15</sup>. Appendix B contains a description of how weights are computed depending on the continuity of the regressor and how we estimate the indices of inequality used in Table 1.

characteristics, and because the group of women whose participation increases most (older women) have relatively low wages because they are, on average, less educated<sup>16</sup>.

However, it is not very clear how inequality would have changed due to the increase in women's participation. On one hand, females' wages are much further away than males' from the mean, which would tend to increase inequality. On the other hand, women are more homogeneous. Graphically it is also difficult to see the direction of inequality from inspection of Figure 2: the hump goes slightly up which would indicate a decrease in inequality if the mean is kept. However, the skewness of the distribution slightly increases which would produce higher inequality<sup>17</sup>.



To shed some light on this issue, Table 3 shows different inequality measures. The standard deviation, the Theil and the Gini index present a small decrease in dispersion. However, as was stated in the third section, those indices depend to a limited extent on the scale of the series and the mean of the distribution is decreasing too. Very interestingly, the ratio of percentiles, which is free of scale, shows an increase in inequality<sup>18</sup>. This increase is concentrated in the lowest part of the distribution and it is due to the fact that below the median, the distribution is more concentrated towards it. This would mean that the increase in inequality stemming from the fact that females are far away from the mean was more important than the fact that women were more homogeneous than men.

**16.** Notice that the methodology takes into account the fact that female participation has increased more for older women, because the counterfactual distribution uses the conditional distribution of female participation given other characteristics.

**17.** The median of the distribution is located to the left of the mean. If we increase the skewness, the median will be further away from the mean, which would increase inequality.

**18.** This is also confirmed by the change in the coefficient of variation of the two series.



TABLE 3: Wage inequality if female participation changed

	1995	1995 + Change in Female Part.	Change respect to 1995 %	2002
SD of log wages	<b>0,5417</b>	0,5382	-0,65%	0,5225
P90/P10	<b>3,7527</b>	3,7686	0,42%	3,6446
Theil	<b>0,1770</b>	0,1737	-1,86%	0,1763
Gini	<b>0,3178</b>	0,3149	-0,91%	0,3141
P50/P10	1,6828	<b>1,7037</b>	1,24%	1,6019
P75/P25	<b>2,0702</b>	2,0685	-0,08%	1,9724
P90/P50	<b>2,2301</b>	2,2120	-0,81%	2,2752

Source: Wage Structure Survey

The biggest number is bolded

Percentiles from the log distribution

## 5.2 Change in educational attainment

Figure 3 shows the counterfactual wage distribution when educational attainment of the labour force is the only factor that increases between 1995 and 2002. The distribution again does not change much. The part of the counterfactual distribution above the mode increases its weight with respect to the 1995 level. The change is more important for the middle part of the distribution, but the upper part of the distribution increases its weight for a big part of the distribution. This result was expected since university degree-holders are the group which most increases and which earns higher wages.

In the previous section it was suggested that this change should increase wage dispersion. Table 4 confirms this prior since all indicators show higher inequality. However, the increase is not very significant. An explanation for this fact is the way it is constructed the counterfactual distribution. Notice that the analysis considers changes in the distribution of education conditional on many other characteristics (gender and experience but also sector, size of the firm, type of contract or bargaining system). Although, as it was shown in table 2, the proportion of university degree holders has increased, this increase has been concentrated in specific sectors, occupations and firms, where university degree holders were already working before. Therefore, the conditional distribution of education on all the other factors has not changed as much as the unconditional proportion of university degree holders. That is the reason why the shock is not very significant in conditional terms but it is fairly big in unconditional terms. Instead, female participation and low-experienced workers have increased in almost all sectors, firms and types of jobs, making the distinction between unconditional or conditional shocks of no interest. If we redo the exercise only conditioning to gender, age and tenure we get a much bigger impact of increasing education around 3% in terms of the standard deviation. Instead, the effect of the other two factors does not change much respect to the effect presented here.

The impact of education is concentrated at the bottom part of the distribution. This is the case because the mode is shifted to the right due to an increase in the level of educational attainment while there is a concentration of individuals above the mode. The middle part of the distribution does not change inequality much because the shock affects more or less symmetrically above and below the mode.

FIGURE 3  
Wage distribution with changes in the educational achievement




TABLE 4: Wage inequality if education changed

	1995	1995 + Change in Educational Attainment	Change respect to 1995 %	2002
SD of log wages	0,5417	<b>0,5439</b>	0,41%	0,5225
P90/P10	3,7527	<b>3,8313</b>	2,09%	3,6446
Theil	0,1770	<b>0,1791</b>	1,19%	0,1763
Gini	0,3178	<b>0,3275</b>	3,05%	0,3141
P50/P10	1,6828	<b>1,7116</b>	1,71%	1,6019
P75/P25	<b>2,0702</b>	2,0784	0,40%	1,9724
P90/P50	<b>2,2301</b>	2,2385	0,38%	2,2752


Source: Wage Structure Survey  
The biggest number is bolded  
Percentiles from the log distribution

### 5.3 Change in the tenure distribution

Figure 4 shows how wages would have varied if tenure had been the only factor changing between 1995 and 2002<sup>19</sup>. The effect obtained is qualitatively similar to that observed with female participation although it is quantitatively more significant. With respect to the 1995 distribution, the counterfactual distribution shows a higher weight at the lower part of the distribution, whereas there is a decrease in the upper-middle part. The reason behind this is that the group that increases the most is the group of individuals with less than one year of experience in the firm who are concentrated in the lower part of the distribution of wages.

<sup>19</sup> We do not considering experience in general because the age distribution of the labour workforce has not changed much between 1995 and 2002. The effect on inequality of changes in the age of the workforce is qualitatively similar to the one obtained in this sub-section although the magnitude is fairly small.

FIGURE 4  
Wage distribution with changes in tenure



All inequality indices calculated in Table 5 show an increase in inequality. The effect arising from homogeneity is smaller than the effect from a bigger distance of wages relating to low tenure with respect to the mean. However, in contrast to what was found with female participation, different parts of the distribution do not behave the same way. The lower part of the distribution decreases its concentration while the others increase.

TABLE 5: Wage inequality if tenure changed

	1995	1995 + Change in Tenure	Change respect to 1995 %	2002
SD of log wages	0,5417	<b>0,5719</b>	5,58%	0,5225
P90/P10	3,7527	<b>4,1017</b>	9,30%	3,6446
Theil	0,1770	<b>0,1977</b>	11,69%	0,1763
Gini	0,3178	<b>0,3351</b>	5,44%	0,3141
P50/P10	1,6828	<b>1,7313</b>	2,89%	1,6019
P75/P25	2,0702	<b>2,1406</b>	3,40%	1,9724
P90/P50	2,2301	<b>2,3691</b>	6,23%	2,2752

Source: Wage Structure Survey  
The biggest number is bolded  
Percentiles from the log distribution

#### 5.4 Importance of changes in the labour force composition

Changes of factors do not occur in isolation. The previous three changes interact with each other. In isolation each of them produced an increase in inequality, however; the overall effect might be different. Moreover, as we saw in Appendix A other factors changed at the same time. For instance, in 2002 we find a higher proportion of large firms which usually have high wages compared to smaller firms. We also find less bargaining agreements at the firm level and, as Izquierdo et al. (2005) shows, these types of agreements tend to result in lower wage growth for the worker.

Figure 5 shows how the counterfactual distribution of wages varies when adding the three changes<sup>20</sup>. It is clear that tenure and female participation increase the importance of the left tail, while educational attainment increases the weight in the right tail. These two facts together generate an increase in the overall inequality but smaller than the one produced by tenure alone. This is confirmed in Table 6.

Going back to Figure 5, we observe how the distribution varies when all observed variables change according to their levels in 2002. We can see that the small changes that in aggregate terms distribution of wages shifted to the right mainly thanks to the improvement of the number of big firms. In terms of inequality we get a higher inequality derived from the changes in the upper part of the distribution. However, the three factors previously considered account for a big part of the variation in the standard deviation.

Concluding, changes in female participation, educational attainment and tenure may have affected inequality importantly respect to the way other factors have done it. Actually, tenure and educational attainment are the two factors that move inequality the most. However, the actual change in their proportions would have lead to an increase in inequality between 1995 and 2002 instead of the observed decrease. In order to understand this lower dispersion we should incorporate in the analysis changes in the wage structure. This is done in next section.




TABLE 6: Wage inequality if some and all factors changed together

	1995	1995 + Cumulative Effects	Change respect to 1995 %	1995 + Changes in all regressors	Change respect to 1995 %	2002
SD of log wages	0,5417	<b>0,5578</b>	2,97%	<b>0,5531</b>	2,10%	0,5225
P90/P10	3,7527	<b>3,9318</b>	4,77%	<b>3,9310</b>	4,75%	3,6446
Theil	0,1770	<b>0,1861</b>	5,14%	<b>0,1866</b>	5,42%	0,1763
Gini	0,3178	<b>0,3250</b>	2,27%	<b>0,3258</b>	2,52%	0,3141
P50/P10	1,6828	<b>1,7395</b>	3,37%	<b>1,7042</b>	1,27%	1,6019
P75/P25	2,0702	<b>2,0947</b>	1,18%	<b>2,1064</b>	1,75%	1,9724
P90/P50	2,2301	<b>2,2603</b>	1,36%	<b>2,3067</b>	3,43%	2,2752

Source: Wage Structure Survey  
The biggest number is bolded  
Percentiles from the log distribution

20. The methodology for this exercise is described in Appendix B.

## 6 Effects on inequality of changes in the wage structure

In the previous section we saw that changes in the composition of the labour force keeping constant the 1995 wage structure would have led to an increase in inequality. This is the reason why the observed lower dispersion in 2002 should be driven by significant changes in the wage structure<sup>21</sup>.

In this section we analyse these changes using multivariate regression analysis. The coefficient of one variable in a regression identifies the way this particular factor affects the conditional mean wage. By comparing the coefficients of two different points in time, we shed some light on how one characteristic changes its correlation with the conditional mean wage over time. Notice that the interpretation of the coefficient should not be causal. In fact, if we observe that university degree-holders earn relatively less in 2002 than in 1995, it could be due to a decrease in the value of the services that this group supplies, to a change in the relative abilities of this type of worker or to the impact of institutional factors on the relative returns of this group.

If we want to analyse changes in the whole distribution of conditional wages, we should use quantile regressions. Quantile regressions have been widely used to analyse the conditional wage distribution in Chamberlain (1994), Buchinsky (1994 and 1995) and Abadie (1997). In a quantile regression model  $Q_T(y|x)$  is the T-th quantile of the conditional distribution of wages ( $y$ ) given certain characteristics ( $x$ ). Then we specify a functional form for the quantile such as:

$$Q_T(y|x) = X\beta_T$$

The goal of the exercise is to estimate the parameters  $\beta_T$  that define the conditional quantile function<sup>22</sup>. Table 7 shows the results for the empirical specification. In the first two columns the changes in the mean of the conditional distribution are shown. In the following columns are the results for the 10<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, 50<sup>th</sup>, 75<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> quantiles.

In order to organise the information better, we are going to analyse different factors one by one. We will start by considering the wage gap by gender, education level and tenure, as these were the three factors that changed most in the composition of the labour force. We will then continue by considering changes in the wage structure according to the rest of the characteristics that are observed in the data set: age, type of contract, size of the firm, public or private ownership and bargaining system.

### 6.1 The gender wage gap

The first row of Table 7 in Appendix D shows the wage differential between males and females, revealing that women earned 22% less than men in 1995. In a particular year, the wage gap is increasing over quantiles. This evidence was also found in Gardeazabal and Ugidos (2005) and Garcia (2001)<sup>23</sup>. The difference between men and women has practically

---

<sup>21</sup>. It is beyond the scope of this paper to identify whether the observed changes in wages are attributed to the above-mentioned movements in supply or to additional movements in demand.

<sup>22</sup>. To see different solving strategies see Manski (1988) and Chamberlain (1994).

<sup>23</sup>. De la Rica et al. (2005) challenged this idea by considering different types of jobs. We will discuss this possibility later.

not varied between 1995 and 2002<sup>24</sup>. This result is different compared to other studies in other countries, where a declining segregation is observed [Dolado et al. (2002) and Mulligan (2005)]. Moreover, the quantile regressions show that the change is very small for all parts of the conditional distribution. The increase in inequality is slightly bigger in the middle part of the distribution (median and 75<sup>th</sup> quantile), although the variation is also very small.

De la Rica et al. (2005) show the importance of considering the type of job when analysing the wage gap between males and females. They found that the wage gap increases along quantiles only when considering highly skilled activities. The data set allows a simple test for the previous hypothesis. We analyse the wage gap over the distribution of skilled non-manual jobs vs. unskilled manual jobs. Table 8 shows the gender wage gap by occupation using the same regressions as in Table 7 and including interaction terms between gender and occupation. It is clear from that Table that, as de la Rica et al. pointed out, the gender wage gap behaves differently depending on the type of job held. The wage gap for skilled non-manual jobs increases along the distribution whereas for unskilled manual jobs decreases<sup>25</sup>.

TABLE 8: Levels and changes in Female coefficient by Occupation

	Mean		10th Quantile		25th Quantile	
	Non qualified manual	Qualified non-manual	Non qualified manual	Qualified non-manual	Non qualified manual	Qualified non-manual
1995	-0,2359	-0,1965	-0,1689	-0,2262	-0,1884	-0,1929
2002	-0,2569	-0,1736	-0,1929	-0,1719	-0,2125	-0,1568
Change	-0,021	0,0229	-0,024	0,0543	-0,0241	0,0361

	50th Quantile		75th Quantile		90th Quantile	
	Non qualified manual	Qualified non-manual	Non qualified manual	Qualified non-manual	Non qualified manual	Qualified non-manual
1995	-0,2297	-0,1679	-0,2682	-0,1711	-0,3063	-0,2068
2002	-0,2484	-0,1562	-0,2775	-0,1837	-0,3013	-0,212
Change	-0,0187	0,0117	-0,0093	-0,0126	0,005	-0,0052

Moreover, the pattern between 1995 and 2002 is also different depending on the job held. Whereas the gender wage gap slightly increased for skilled non-manual jobs, it slightly decreased for unskilled manual jobs (especially at the bottom part of the distribution). This would generate lower inequality at the bottom part of the distribution of wages and higher inequality at the top.

The different evolution of the gender wage gap by occupation is related to the cohort of the female worker. This could be seen with an interaction between age and gender. In Table 9 is evident that the gender wage gap increases the most for old women at the higher quantiles (this is the group that increased the participation the most). Instead, young women of different quantiles kept the wage gap that was observed in 1995.

<sup>24</sup> There is a small increase in the wage gap that is statistically significant.

<sup>25</sup> This is not true for the very top quintiles of non-qualified manual.

In sum, the gender wage gap did not change much in mean between 1995 and 2002. If anything, it slightly decreased at the bottom part of the distribution and it slightly increased at the upper part.

TABLE 9: Changes in the Female coefficient by cohort

	Mean			10th Quantile			25th Quantile		
	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64
Female	0,0091	-0,0031	-0,023	0,0148	-0,0025	-0,0007	0,008	-0,0058	-0,0207

	50th Quantile			75th Quantile			90th Quantile		
	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64
Female	0,0073	-0,0051	-0,0341	0,0126	-0,01	-0,0441	0,0123	0,0076	-0,0455

## 6.2 Returns to education

The second, third and fourth row of table 7 in Appendix D show the results for different levels of education. The coefficient of each variable represents the wage differential of a worker with a particular educational level with respect to a worker who studied up to primary level. As was expected, the more educated someone is, the higher his/her wage. Moreover, this difference is increasing as long as we move toward the upper part of the distribution. This regularity has been found in other studies and is explained by heterogeneity and the complementarities between the ability and the characteristics of the job [Buchinsky (1994), Martins and Pereira (2004)].

Interestingly, the wage differential across educational levels decreases by 5% between 1995 and 2002<sup>26</sup>. This phenomenon has been observed since the 80s by Del Rio and Ruiz-Castillo (2001), Abadie (2002), and Febrer and Mora (2005). All of them argue that the increase in the supply of university degree-holders has not been offset by increases in demand. This idea appears to fit very well into our findings for the period 1995-2002. Moreover, the quantile regressions show that the reduction of the differential is similar for all parts of the distribution of wages. Nevertheless, it appears that the evolution of returns to schooling over the distribution hides some composition effects.

<sup>26</sup> The difference is significant for all levels of education.

TABLE 10: Changes in education coefficients respect to primary by gender

	Mean		10th Quantile		25th Quantile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1st Cycle of Secondary	-0,0172	-0,02	-0,0038	0,0018	-0,0072	-0,0101
2nd Cycle of Secondary	-0,0368	-0,0572	-0,0222	-0,0233	-0,0224	-0,0364
University or more	-0,0545	-0,0075	-0,0239	0,0141	-0,0466	0,0097

	50th Quantile		75th Quantile		90th Quantile	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
1st Cycle of Secondary	-0,0154	-0,0101	-0,0156	-0,0213	-0,0246	-0,0133
2nd Cycle of Secondary	-0,0384	-0,0354	-0,0393	-0,0486	-0,0505	-0,0542
University or more	-0,0648	-0,0098	-0,0743	-0,0174	-0,0791	0,0206

Actually, there are statistical differences between the evolution of the wage gap for men and women. When we interact education with gender (table 10) it is evident that the wage gap decreased for male but not for female workers. This was already found in Amuedo-Dorantes and de la Rica (2006)<sup>27</sup>.

TABLE 11: Changes in the education coefficients respect to primary by cohort

	Mean			10th Quantile			25th Quantile		
	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64
1st Cycle of Secondary	0,0176	0,011	-0,0432	0,0245	0,0243	-0,0363	0,0226	0,018	-0,035
2nd Cycle of Secondary	-0,0154	-0,0285	-0,083	-0,0074	-0,0076	-0,0451	-0,0042	-0,0123	-0,0622
University or more	0,0074	-0,021	-0,0782	0,0155	0,0072	-0,0673	0,0125	-0,0095	-0,1037

	50th Quantile			75th Quantile			90th Quantile		
	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64
1st Cycle of Secondary	0,0199	0,0118	-0,0458	0,0228	0,006	-0,0469	0,0305	-0,0065	-0,0529
2nd Cycle of Secondary	-0,0064	-0,0229	-0,0864	-0,0149	-0,0337	-0,0978	-0,0185	-0,0467	-0,0987
University or more	0,0131	-0,0328	-0,0952	0,0034	-0,0366	-0,096	0,0041	-0,0387	-0,0487

Something similar happens in table 11 where it is shown the changes in the educational premium between 1995 and 2002 by different age cohorts. The loss is much higher for old than for young cohorts. Abadie also found big losses for old university degree-holders at the top quantiles.

The empirical evidence for other countries has found a recent increase in the wage premium for university degree holders instead of the loss that is found in Spain [see, for instance Katz and Murphy (1992) for the US]. This increase is actually concentrated at the top part of the distribution [Lemieux (2006)] whereas in Spain there is a loss even in the top quantiles. The big increase in the participation of university degree holders makes the Spanish case a singular one and indicates the possibility that the demand of skilled labor

27. They considered a different definition of wages and they actually saw that women's returns to schooling increased.



(that could have increased in Spain as in other countries increased) has not been able to absorb the supply.

Summarizing, the concentration of the wage structure regarding educational attainment has been intense in the period of study and compensates, at least partially, the increase in inequality produced by more university degree holders in the Spanish labor market.

### **6.3 Returns to age and tenure**

Rows 5 to 6 in table 7 in Appendix D are devoted to age and rows 7 to 9 to tenure. In section 4 we pointed out that the age of the labor force almost did not suffer any change, while tenure decreased enormously. That is the reason why section 5 analyzed the effects of changes in the tenure composition instead of the age composition. However as we will see below there are important changes on the returns of age and that is why we will study both variables together.

Age accounts for general experience in the labour market whereas tenure stands for specific experience within the firm. As expected, the higher someone's experience of any kind, the higher his wage. However, the effect of each type of experience is different at different parts of the distribution. Whereas returns to general experience (age) increased along quantiles, tenure is seen to be more valuable at the bottom part of the distribution than at the top. This result means that firm-specific knowledge is a better asset for workers at the bottom part of the distribution whereas general experience appears to be more valuable at the top part of it.

Between 1995 and 2002, the wage differential between workers of different ages has decreased<sup>28</sup>. This decrease has been similarly distributed along different quantiles. The fact that the quality of young workers may have increased between 1995 and 2002 could help to explain the depreciation of the differentials at every part of the distribution. At the same time, returns to tenure increased over time<sup>29</sup>. This is consistent with the high supply of workers with no specific experience at all. More specifically, tenure increased its value especially at the top part of the distribution.

A part of this behaviour could be explained by cohort effects. Tenure loses importance for young workers, whereas it increases its importance for old workers. However, within each particular age there is still a different behaviour according to different quantiles.

---

<sup>28</sup> The difference is significant for all levels of age.

<sup>29</sup> The difference is significant for all levels of tenure.

TABLE 12: Changes in tenure coefficient respect to less than 1 year by cohort

	Mean			10th Quantile			25th Quantile		
	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64
Tenure 1-3 years	-0,0226	-0,0036	-0,0019	-0,115	-0,0661	-0,0271	-0,0463	-0,0102	-0,0128
Tenure 4-7 years	-0,04	0,0131	0,0612	-0,1586	-0,1003	-0,0074	-0,0731	-0,0305	0,017
Tenure > 7 years	-0,0474	0,0329	0,0923	-0,2329	-0,0974	-0,0094	-0,0934	-0,0172	0,0274

	50th Quantile			75th Quantile			90th Quantile		
	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64	Age <30	Age 30-45	Age 46-64
Tenure 1-3 years	-0,0117	-0,0008	-0,0226	0,0059	0,0189	0,0007	0,0431	0,083	0,0538
Tenure 4-7 years	-0,0305	0,0071	0,0134	0,0031	0,061	0,0596	0,0697	0,1447	0,1548
Tenure > 7 years	-0,028	0,0274	0,0454	0,024	0,0906	0,1047	0,1087	0,1837	0,2142

#### 6.4 The wage structure of alternative factors

The wage structure has changed significantly in other dimensions apart from gender, education, age and tenure, as opposed to what happened with the labour force structure. In particular, Table 7 presents evidence on changes in the wage structure with respect to type of contract, public ownership, type of collective agreement and size of the firm. This subsection presents a brief description of the results, paying particular attention to the changes in differentials<sup>30</sup>.

The 10<sup>th</sup> row shows the wage differences between indefinite and temporary contracts. Temporary workers earn 10% less than indefinite workers on average. This gap is equal to the results obtained in de la Rica (2005). The differential is higher at the upper tail of the distribution. Comparing the two cross-sections, the wage differential between temporary and indefinite contracts has decreased over time by almost 5%. This decrease has mainly come about at the top part of the distribution. One possible explanation for this fact is the increasing use of temporary contracts for older workers. Indeed, when interacting age and type of contract, we do not observe substantial changes in the wage gap for young workers.

The next variable we consider is public ownership of the firm. According to the results in Table 8 there are no statistical differences between public and private firms once we control for the previous characteristics. We are just considering public firms and not the public sector as a whole [Jimeno (2005)<sup>31</sup>]. When we allow variations in the wage differential depending on the quantile, we find a small wage premium of the public firm at the lower part of the distribution. Instead, private firms pay more than public firms at the upper tail. There are not many changes in this dimension between 1995 and 2002. If anything, it appears that the differential has been reduced. However, the reduction is very small.

Another interesting variable that may affect the wage level is the level under which the collective agreement is negotiated in the firm. Our results show a wage differential

<sup>30</sup>. There are many interactions between those variables and the previous ones that could be analyzed. For example Card and de la Rica (2005) found that the level of bargaining affected inequality for female more than for male. Since in this paper we focus on female participation, education and tenure we are not going to go more deeply in those interactions.

<sup>31</sup>. They found that the public sector paid a positive premium.

between agreements signed at the firm-level and those signed at a sectoral level. In particular, in the first type of contract, wages are 12% higher than in the second. This is qualitatively similar to the results in Izquierdo et al. (2003), although they use a different dataset. Moreover, the differential is evident in all parts of the distribution. Over time it appears that the differential slightly decreases for all quantiles.

Finally, we observe higher wages in bigger firms. The differential is similar in all parts of the distribution. With respect to this differential over time, bigger firms decreased the premium respect to small firms.

In summary, results for this subsection indicate that there is a squeeze on wages in several dimensions apart from females, educational levels and age. This fact also helps to drive the lower dispersion in 2002 and the next sub-section will quantify the importance of each factor.

### 6.5 Importance of changes in returns

In order to capture how the previous changes in returns affect the variance of wages we use the formula of the variance decomposition:

$$Var(\ln W) = \text{var}[E(\ln W | X, \beta)] + E[\text{var}(\ln W | X, \beta)]$$

The first part of the equation is the way the variance varies between different groups. The second part of the equation is the way inequality varies within each group. We are going to assume that returns only affect the between component while it does not affect the within component. This is not an innocuous assumption, actually Lemieux (2006) estimates a model where returns to education and age affect both the between and the within components<sup>32</sup>. In a world with heterogeneous returns, if the price of the factor increases, the variance within a specific category also increases. Therefore, in this case where most of returns went down it is likely that the within component also decreased. Consequently, the estimated effect would be a lower bound for the real one.

The between component is approximated by the variance of the predicted wages once returns are changed (using an OLS regression).

$$E(\ln W | X_{1995}, \beta_{1995}) = X_i^{1995} \beta^{1995}$$

$$E(\ln W | X_{2002}, \beta_{2002}) = X_i^{2002} \beta^{2002}$$

$$E(\ln W | X_{1995}, \beta_{1995}(k-1), \beta_{2002}(k)) = X_i^{1995}(k-1) \beta^{1995}(k-1) + X_i^{1995}(k) \beta^{2002}(k)$$

Notice that using the previous results and the formula we may also estimate the components of the total change in the variance as a consequence of changes in the composition. In the previous section it was computed the counterfactual standard deviation

---

<sup>32</sup>. The justification was the different behaviour of returns to schooling at different parts of the distribution. Actually his model is based in heterogeneity of returns over the population.

when returns were kept constant<sup>33</sup>. Moreover, the between component could be computed using:

$$E(\ln W | X_{2002}, \beta_{1995}) = X_i^{2002} \beta^{1995}$$

Therefore the within component will be the residual.

Table 13 shows that the between component experiences a great decline due to changes in all returns. This decline is much bigger than the increase produced in the between component due to changes in the labour force composition. Even in the case when we allow the within component to vary with the labour force composition, the total change in variance will be higher when changing the returns. Notice that the total change in the variance is not the sum of these two components since there are interactions between the two that are not taken into account.

Table 13: Variance decomposition

	1995	Changing all returns	Change respect to 1995 %	Changing in composition	Change respect to 1995 %	2000
Between	0,1768	0,1531	-13,41%	0,18558	4,95%	0,1636
Within	0,1166	0,1166	0%	0,12034	3,20%	0,1094
<b>Total</b>	<b>0,2934</b>	<b>0,2697</b>	<b>-8,08%</b>	<b>0,3059</b>	<b>4,25%</b>	<b>0,2730</b>
Total Standard Deviation	0,5417	0,5193	-4,13%	0,5531	2,10%	0,5225

Table 14 shows the relative importance of each return in isolation. Most of the returns have an impact decreasing the variance. Only returns to tenure appear to have a sizeable positive effect in the variance (gender and property do not produce any important increase). Among the returns that reduce the variance the most we should highlight the change in the wage gap between different types of contract and the changes in returns to education and general experience.

Table 14: Effect on Standard Deviation

	Standard Deviation	Change respect to 1995 %
1995	0,5417	-
2002	0,5225	<b>-0,0354</b>
Gender	0,5427	0,19%
Education	0,5364	<b>-0,98%</b>
Tenure	0,5495	1,45%
Age	0,5330	<b>-1,61%</b>
Occupation	0,5376	<b>-0,76%</b>
Type of contract	0,5332	<b>-1,57%</b>
Size	0,5389	<b>-0,52%</b>
Property	0,5417	0,00%
Bargaining	0,5398	<b>-0,34%</b>
<b>Total Standard Deviation</b>	<b>0,5193</b>	<b>-4,14%</b>

<sup>33</sup> the counterfactual variance will be the square of the standard deviation.

## 7 Contributions to inequality of changes in the composition and the wage structure

In order to capture the importance of each of the previous factors in the evolution of aggregate inequality we use the formula of the variance decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned} Var(\ln W) &= \text{var}[E(\ln W | X, \beta)] + E[\text{var}(\ln W | X, \beta)] \\ Var_{t_2}(\ln W) - Var_{t_1}(\ln W) &= [\text{var}_{X_2}[E_{t_2}(\ln W | X, \beta)] - \text{var}_{X_1}[E_{t_1}(\ln W | X, \beta)]] + \\ &\quad + [E_{X_2}[\text{var}_{t_2}(\ln W | X, \beta)] - E_{X_1}[\text{var}_{t_1}(\ln W | X, \beta)]] \end{aligned}$$

The variance can be decomposed in two components. The first part of the equation is the way the variance varies between different groups. The second part of the equation is the way inequality varies within each group.

As it has been argued, the variance might change because of changes in the composition of the labour force or because of changes in the structure of wages. The components inside the brackets represent the structure of wages in a certain moment of time while the variance and the expectation of each of the two components is taken on a particular population.

We are going to decompose the change in the variance in four terms:

$$\begin{aligned} Var_{t_2}(\ln W) - Var_{t_1}(\ln W) &= [\text{var}_{X_2}[E_{t_1}(\ln W | X, \beta)] - \text{var}_{X_1}[E_{t_1}(\ln W | X, \beta)]] + \\ &\quad + [E_{X_2}[\text{var}_{t_1}(\ln W | X, \beta)] - E_{X_1}[\text{var}_{t_1}(\ln W | X, \beta)]] + \\ &\quad + [\text{var}_{X_2}[E_{t_2}(\ln W | X, \beta)] - \text{var}_{X_2}[E_{t_1}(\ln W | X, \beta)]] + \\ &\quad + [E_{X_2}[\text{var}_{t_2}(\ln W | X, \beta)] - E_{X_2}[\text{var}_{t_1}(\ln W | X, \beta)]] \end{aligned}$$

The first two terms represent the change in the variance attributed to changes in the composition of the labour force, while the last two terms represent changes in the structure of wages. In a sense, we can decompose the within and the between component in two parts, one related to the change in the composition and one related to the change in returns. Using the results from section 4 and 5 we can get the contributions of each component to the decrease in inequality.

Table 15: Contribution to the overall decrease in the variance

	Changes in composition	Changes in the wage structure
Between groups inequality	-42,82%	107,40%
Within groups inequality	-18,26%	53,69%
Total	-61,08%	161,08%

As it was suggested in the text, changes in the composition of the labour force would have led to an increase in inequality whereas changes in the wage structure are responsible for the overall decrease. Moreover, the results show that given all the factors considered the between component is the more important factor underlying the decrease. However, this is not a really big surprise given the big amount of factors considered. In any case, it is remarkable that residual inequality has also contributed to the decrease in overall dispersion and it appears that changes in composition cannot explain all this decrease as it was suggested for the American case by Lemieux (2002).

## 8 Conclusions

The paper has shown that wage inequality in Spain has decreased slightly between 1995 and 2002. This change is mainly attributed to a higher concentration of wages in the middle part of the distribution and, to a lesser extent, to a smaller dispersion in the lower tail. On the other hand, there is an increase in inequality in the upper tail.

Many factors have changed in the Spanish labour market between 1995 and 2002 that have affected inequality in different ways. Regarding changes in the composition of the labour force, we have carefully analysed three of them: the increase in female participation, the increase in university degree-holders and the reduction in the tenure level. We have estimated non-parametrically the counterfactual wage distribution had only one of these factors changed to the corresponding level in 2002. According to this methodology, we have found that the labour force is more heterogeneous in 2002 than in 1995, especially in the upper part of the distribution. In other words, the observed changes in the composition of the labour force would have generated a significant increase in wage inequality. In particular, changes in education and mainly tenure have a large impact increasing inequality. Conversely, changes in female participation have almost no impact on the aggregate dispersion of wages.

Regarding changes in the wage structure, we use quantile regressions to estimate the change in the price of different factors at different parts of the distribution, holding everything else constant. According to this methodology, we find that in many dimensions there is a reduction in wage dispersion which has offset the higher inequality derived from the changes in the composition of the labour force. It is beyond the scope of this paper to conclude whether the changes in prices stem from changes in supply, demand or other institutional factors. However, it is evident from the paper that the change in the wage structure finally dominates the potential effect produced by changes in the composition of the labour force.

In particular, our empirical analysis shows that in this period there has been a significant decrease in the returns to education. This phenomenon has been observed in the Spanish economy since the 80s and would be consistent with a situation where the intense increase in the supply of university degree-holders has not been offset by similar increases in demand. Those results contrast with the available empirical evidence for other countries, where an increase in the wage premium for university degree-holders has been found for the recent period. Future research could be devoted to analysing this phenomenon in depth in order to look at alternative explanations. For instance, institutional factors such as the bargaining mechanism, which in Spain has been producing a high homogeneity of wage increases [Izquierdo et al. (2003)], would also have played a role in this decrease in the returns to education.

## APPENDIX A

LOGARITHM OF HOURLY WAGE DEMEANED	1995			2002		
	Proportion	Relative Wage	Within inequality	Proportion	Relative Wage	Within inequality
TOTAL		2,21			2,21	
SEX						
Males	0,76	1,05	0,32	0,69	1,04	0,33
Females	0,24	0,91	0,29	0,31	0,91	0,29
AGE						
16-29	0,26	0,85	0,24	0,28	0,89	0,22
30-45	0,47	1,04	0,31	0,47	1,02	0,32
>46	0,27	1,12	0,32	0,25	1,10	0,35
EDUCATION						
At most primary	0,33	0,97	0,25	0,29	0,93	0,25
1st cycle of Secondary	0,32	0,91	0,28	0,32	0,93	0,25
2nd cycle Secondary and VT	0,17	1,08	0,32	0,17	1,04	0,32
Tertiary	0,18	1,19	0,35	0,22	1,16	0,36
SIZE OF THE FIRM						
10-49 workers	0,49	0,94	0,29	0,40	0,94	0,28
50-200 workers	0,29	1,02	0,32	0,31	1,01	0,32
More than 200 workers	0,22	1,16	0,32	0,29	1,09	0,35
SECTOR						
Mining	0,01	1,03	0,30	0,01	1,01	0,27
Manufactures	0,52	1,01	0,31	0,45	1,03	0,30
Energy and water	0,02	1,29	0,28	0,02	1,26	0,32
Construction	0,08	0,96	0,30	0,09	0,95	0,27
Commerce, reparation	0,11	0,95	0,32	0,12	0,96	0,31
Hotels and restaurants	0,06	0,87	0,24	0,07	0,88	0,23
Transportation	0,06	1,12	0,28	0,07	1,09	0,32
Financial intermediation	0,08	1,30	0,27	0,06	1,33	0,28
Real estate agencies	0,06	1,01	0,36	0,11	0,94	0,31

Relative salary is the ratio between the mean of the particular group and the unconditional mean

Within group inequality is computed using the Gini's index



LOGARITHM OF HOURLY WAGE Demeaned (Cont)		1995			2002		
		Proportion	Relative Wage	Within inequality	Proportion	Relative Wage	Within inequality
Region							
	Andalucía	0,09	0,99	0,32	0,09	0,95	0,32
	Aragón	0,05	1,01	0,29	0,05	0,99	0,29
	Asturias	0,03	0,99	0,29	0,04	1,00	0,29
	Baleares	0,03	0,94	0,28	0,04	0,96	0,33
	Canarias	0,05	0,92	0,34	0,05	0,91	0,34
	Cantabria	0,02	0,92	0,26	0,02	0,96	0,30
	Castilla león	0,05	0,90	0,31	0,05	0,91	0,30
	Castilla La Mancha	0,06	0,99	0,31	0,06	0,97	0,31
	Cataluña	0,16	1,05	0,32	0,15	1,04	0,32
	Comunidad Valenciana	0,09	0,95	0,30	0,10	0,96	0,30
	Extremadura	0,02	0,87	0,30	0,02	0,89	0,29
	Galicia	0,06	0,93	0,31	0,06	0,93	0,31
	Madrid	0,13	1,10	0,35	0,13	1,06	0,38
	Murcia	0,04	0,87	0,27	0,04	0,92	0,27
	Navarra	0,03	1,01	0,26	0,03	1,06	0,25
	País Vasco	0,07	1,09	0,27	0,06	1,09	0,28
	La Rioja	0,02	0,92	0,25	0,02	0,95	0,26
TYPE OF FIRM							
	Public	0,01	1,22	0,24	0,02	1,20	0,33
	Private	0,99	1,01	0,32	0,98	1,00	0,32
OCUPATION CATEGORIES							
	Qualified Non-manual	0,19	1,27	0,31	0,22	1,23	0,33
	Non Qualified-Non Manual	0,23	0,97	0,27	0,22	0,93	0,27
	Qualified Manual	0,39	0,98	0,25	0,36	0,97	0,23
	Non Qualified-Manual	0,19	0,87	0,23	0,20	0,86	0,21
BARGAINING WAGE SETTING							
	Sector nationwide or region	0,80	0,98	0,32	0,84	0,98	0,31
	Firm	0,20	1,16	0,29	0,16	1,12	0,32
TYPE OF CONTRACT							
	Long term	0,73	1,09	0,31	0,74	1,06	0,33
	Fixed term	0,27	0,83	0,23	0,26	0,85	0,21
TENURE							
	<1 year	0,11	0,13	0,77	0,82	0,26	0,21
	1-3 years	0,24	0,37	0,90	0,93	0,28	0,26
	4-7 years	0,19	0,16	1,02	1,02	0,30	0,30
	>7 years	0,46	0,33	1,13	1,16	0,30	0,31

Relative salary is the ratio between the mean of the particular group and the unconditional mean

Within group inequality is computed using the Gini's index

## APPENDIX B. Mathematical Appendix

### B.1) Methodology

Let's assume there is one continuous variable  $z$  and one discrete variable  $x$  and we want to change the distribution of  $x$ . Hence, using non-parametric techniques and Bayes' rule the counterfactual density may be estimated by:

$$\hat{\theta}_i = 1(x=0) \frac{\Pr(x=0 | z, t_{x|z} = 02)}{\Pr(x=0 | z, t_{x|z} = 95)} + (1 - 1(x=0)) \frac{\Pr(x=1 | z, t_{x|z} = 02)}{\Pr(x=1 | z, t_{x|z} = 95)}$$

### B.2) Indexes

The formulas for the indexes are<sup>34</sup>:

$$sd\_log\_wage = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} (w - \bar{w})^2 f(w) dw \quad \text{where } \bar{w} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} wf(w) dw$$

$$\text{quintile}(x) \text{ is } \exp(w^*) \text{ that solves } \int_{-\infty}^{w^*} f(w) dw = x$$

$$\text{Theil} = \int_0^{\infty} \ln\left(\frac{v}{\bar{v}}\right) \frac{v}{\bar{v}} f(v) dv \quad \text{where } v = \exp(w) \text{ and } f(v) = \frac{f_w(v^{-1})}{v} \bar{w} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} wf(w) dw$$

$$\text{Gini} = 1 - 2 \int_0^{\infty} F_1(v) f(v) dv \quad \text{where } F_1(v) = \frac{\int_0^v yf(y) dy}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} vf(v) dv}$$




### B.3) All changes together

In order to account for all changes:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}(w|t_w = 1995, t_z = 2002) &= \int f(w|z, t_{w|z} = 95) dF(z|t_z = 02) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\hat{\theta}_i}{h} K\left(\frac{w - W_i^{95}}{h}\right) \\ \hat{\theta}_i &= \frac{dF(z|t_z = 02)}{dF(z|t_z = 95)} \frac{\Pr(t = 02 | z_i)}{\Pr(t = 95 | z_i)} \end{aligned}$$

34. All the integrals are computed using a Gauss Legendre algorithm.

**APPENDIX C**



APPENDIX D

TABLE 7: Quantile regression (First Column)

	Mean		Quantile 10%	
	1995	2002	1995	2002
Sex (1=Female)	-0,2202 (0.0023)**	-0,2303 (0.0020)**	-0,2045 (0.0034)**	-0,2045 (0.0029)**
1st Cycle of Secondary	0,0272 (0.0023)**	0,0078 (0.0020)**	0,0167 (0.0034)**	0,0105 (0.0031)**
2nd Cycle of Secondary	0,1271 (0.0033)**	0,0791 (0.0027)**	0,093 (0.0045)**	0,066 (0.0039)**
University or more	0,24 (0.0035)**	0,1938 (0.0031)**	0,1606 (0.0047)**	0,1383 (0.0042)**
Age 30-45	0,1563 (0.0026)**	0,1042 (0.0021)**	0,1278 (0.0036)**	0,0687 (0.0030)**
Age 46-64	0,2551 (0.0033)**	0,1955 (0.0028)**	0,1985 (0.0045)**	0,1298 (0.0040)**
Tenure 1-3 years	0,1121 (0.0040)**	0,0957 (0.0026)**	0,2149 (0.0050)**	0,1316 (0.0038)**
Tenure 4-7 years	0,1827 (0.0050)**	0,1758 (0.0034)**	0,3153 (0.0064)**	0,1979 (0.0048)**
Tenure > 7 years	0,2883 (0.0052)**	0,3184 (0.0034)**	0,43 (0.0065)**	0,326 (0.0048)**
Type of contract (1=Temporal)	-0,1023 (0.0036)**	-0,0545 (0.0026)**	-0,0593 (0.0049)**	-0,0522 (0.0039)**
Size between 50-200 workers	0,119 (0.0023)**	0,1212 (0.0021)**	0,1034 (0.0032)**	0,0962 (0.0029)**
Size >200 workers	0,2018 (0.0030)**	0,1766 (0.0025)**	0,2081 (0.0040)**	0,17 (0.0033)**
Public property (1=public)	-0,0106 (0,0084)	-0,0087 (0,0077)	0,0346 (0,0121)**	0,0032 (0,009)
Bargaining system (1=sector)	-0,1151 (0.0029)**	-0,0982 (0.0029)**	-0,0939 (0.0040)**	-0,0666 (0.0038)**
Constant	7,3588 (0.0115)**	2,48 (0.0096)**	6,678 (0.0148)**	1,9324 (0.0126)**
Observations	133619	156966	133619	156966
R-squared	0,6	0,59		

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

Source: Wage Structure Survey

The regressions include dummies for Type of work, region of firm and sector

TABLE 7: Quantile regression (Cont)

	Quantile 25%		Quantile 50%	
	1995	2002	1995	2002
Sex (1=Female)	-0,2004 (0.0026)**	-0,2079 (0.0022)**	-0,2058 (0.0024)**	-0,2195 (0.0021)**
1st Cycle of Secondary	0,0174 (0.0027)**	0,0075 (0.0024)**	0,0215 (0.0025)**	0,0048 (0.0023)*
2nd Cycle of Secondary	0,0996 (0.0035)**	0,0678 (0.0030)**	0,1161 (0.0033)**	0,0739 (0.0029)**
University or more	0,1837 (0.0036)**	0,1488 (0.0032)**	0,2214 (0.0034)**	0,1675 (0.0031)**
Age 30-45	0,1159 (0.0029)**	0,0687 (0.0023)**	0,1284 (0.0027)**	0,0755 (0.0023)**
Age 46-64	0,1918 (0.0036)**	0,1358 (0.0030)**	0,2103 (0.0033)**	0,1561 (0.0029)**
Tenure 1-3 years	0,1468 (0.0039)**	0,1131 (0.0029)**	0,1041 (0.0036)**	0,0942 (0.0028)**
Tenure 4-7 years	0,2329 (0.0050)**	0,1802 (0.0037)**	0,1733 (0.0046)**	0,1623 (0.0036)**
Tenure > 7 years	0,3428 (0.0051)**	0,3168 (0.0036)**	0,2824 (0.0047)**	0,3126 (0.0034)**
Type of contract (1=Temporal)	-0,0604 (0.0038)**	-0,0425 (0.0030)**	-0,083 (0.0035)**	-0,0437 (0.0028)**
Size between 50-200 workers	0,1103 (0.0025)**	0,1054 (0.0022)**	0,12 (0.0023)**	0,1211 (0.0022)**
Size >200 workers	0,2052 (0.0031)**	0,1748 (0.0025)**	0,2029 (0.0029)**	0,1803 (0.0025)**
Public property (1=public)	0,0178 (0,0094)	-0,0151 (0.0070)*	-0,0139 (0,0087)	-0,0181 (0.0069)**
Bargaining system (1=sector)	-0,1245 (0.0031)**	-0,1048 (0.0029)**	-0,1457 (0.0028)**	-0,1238 (0.0027)**
Constant	7,0183 (0.0115)**	2,1708 (0.0098)**	7,3671 (0.0106)**	2,465 (0.0094)**
Observations	133619	156966	133619	156966

R-squared

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

Source: Wage Structure Survey

The regressions include dummies for Type of work, region of firm and sector

TABLE 7: Quantile regression (Final Columns)

	Quantile 75%		Quantile 90%	
	1995	2002	1995	2002
Sex (1=Female)	-0,2252 (0.0033)**	-0,2366 (0.0026)**	-0,2537 (0.0042)**	-0,2588 (0.0038)**
1st Cycle of Secondary	0,0244 (0.0035)**	0,0071 (0.0030)*	0,0242 (0.0046)**	0,0016 -0,0044
2nd Cycle of Secondary	0,1366 (0.0046)**	0,0886 (0.0038)**	0,1526 (0.0060)**	0,0903 (0.0055)**
University or more	0,2553 (0.0047)**	0,1966 (0.0039)**	0,28 (0.0061)**	0,2226 (0.0056)**
Age 30-45	0,1524 (0.0037)**	0,102 (0.0029)**	0,1802 (0.0048)**	0,1291 (0.0042)**
Age 46-64	0,2536 (0.0046)**	0,1973 (0.0036)**	0,3063 (0.0060)**	0,2401 (0.0053)**
Tenure 1-3 years	0,0726 (0.0050)**	0,0813 (0.0035)**	0,0179 (0.0065)**	0,0577 (0.0051)**
Tenure 4-7 years	0,1278 (0.0065)**	0,1584 (0.0045)**	0,0552 (0.0084)**	0,1432 (0.0066)**
Tenure > 7 years	0,2291 (0.0066)**	0,3069 (0.0043)**	0,1501 (0.0086)**	0,2891 (0.0062)**
Type of contract (1=Temporal)	-0,1123 (0.0048)**	-0,0484 (0.0035)**	-0,1293 (0.0062)**	-0,0585 (0.0051)**
Size between 50-200 workers	0,127 (0.0032)**	0,1298 (0.0028)**	0,1222 (0.0042)**	0,1356 (0.0040)**
Size >200 workers	0,199 (0.0041)**	0,1818 (0.0032)**	0,1846 (0.0054)**	0,1773 (0.0047)**
Public property (1=public)	-0,0355 (0.0121)**	-0,0229 (0.0088)**	-0,0489 (0.0156)**	-0,0091 (0,0129)
Bargaining system (1=sector)	-0,1395 (0.0038)**	-0,1226 (0.0035)**	-0,1252 (0.0050)**	-0,1119 (0.0051)**
Constant	7,7384 (0.0147)**	2,7751 (0.0119)**	8,1045 (0.0191)**	3,1429 (0.0173)**
Observations	133619	156966	133619	156966

R-squared

Robust standard errors in parentheses

\* significant at 5%; \*\* significant at 1%

Source: Wage Structure Survey

The regressions include dummies for Type of work, region of firm and sector

## REFERENCES

- ABADIE, A. (1997). "Changes in Spanish labor income structure during the 1980's: A quantile regression approach", *Investigaciones Económicas*, Vol. XXI (2), pp. 253-272.
- ACEMOGLU, D. (2002) "Technical change, inequality and the labour market" *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 40, pp. 7-72.
- ACEMOGLU, D. (2003) "Cross-country inequality trends" *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 113, pp. 121-149
- ALCAIDE, J. (1980). "Política de distribución de la renta", in Luis Gamir (ed.), *Política económica de España*, Vol. 2, Madrid Alianza, pp. 929-946.
- AMUEDO-DORANTES, C., and S. DE LA RICA (2006). "The role of segregation and pay structure on the gender wage gap: evidence from matched employer-employee data for Spain", *Contributions to Economic Analysis and Policy, Berkeley Electronic Press Journals*, Vol. 5 (1).
- ARELLANO M, S. BENTOLILA Y O. BOVER (2000) *The distribution of earnings in Spain during the 1980s: The effect of skill, unemployment and union power*, Banco de España Working Paper, No. 0015.
- BEAUDRY, P. AND D. GREEN (2004) "Changes in US wages, 1976-2000: Ongoing skill bias or major technological changes" *Journal of Labor Economics*, vol. 23, pp. 609-648.
- BUCHINSKY, M. (1994). "Changes in the U.S. wage structure 1963-1987: Application of quantile regression", *Econometrica*, Vol. 62, pp. 405-458.
- CARD, D., and J. DINARDO (2002). "Skilled biased technological change and rising wage inequality: some problems and puzzles", *Journal of Labor Economics*, Vol. 9, pp.773-783.
- CARD, D., and S. DE LA RICA (2005). *The effect of firm-level contracts on the structure of wages: evidence from matched employer-employee data*, NBER Working Paper, No. 11829. Forthcoming in *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*.
- CHAMBERLAIN, G. (1994). "Quantile regression, censoring, and the structure of wages", in C. A. Sims (ed.), *Advances in Econometrics, Sixth World Congress*, Vol. 1., Cambridge University Press.
- DE LA RICA, S. (2005). *Wage gaps between worker with indefinite and fixed-term contracts: The impact of firm and occupational segregation*, Working Paper UPV.
- DE LA RICA, S., J. DOLADO and V. LLORENS (2005). *Ceiling and floors: Gender wage gaps by education in Spain*, Discussion Paper IZA, No. 1483.
- DEL RÍO, C., and J. RUIZ-CASTILLO (2001). "Intermediate inequality and welfare: the case of Spain, 1980-81 to 1990-91", *Review of Income and Wealth*, Vol. 47, pp. 221-238.
- DINARDO, J., N. FORTIN and T. LEMIEUX (1996). "Labor market institutions and the distribution of wages, 1973-1992: a semiparametric approach", *Econometrica*, Vol. 64, pp. 1001-1044.
- DOLADO, J., F. FELGUEROSO and J. F. JIMENO (2002). *Recent trends in occupational segregation by gender: a look across the Atlantic*, Discussion Paper IZA, No. 524.
- FEBRER, A., and J. MORA (2005). *Wage distribution in Spain 1994-1999: An application of a flexible estimator of conditional distributions*, Working Paper IVIE.
- GARCIA-PEREA, P. (1991). "Evolución de la estructura salarial española desde 1963", in S. Betolilla and L. Toharia (MTAS ed.), *Estudios de Economía del trabajo en España III: El problema del paro*.
- GARCIA, J., P. J. HERNÁNDEZ and A. LÓPEZ-NICOLÁS (2001). "How wide is the gap? An investigation of gender wage differences using quantile regression", *Empirical Economics*, Vol. 26, pp. 149-168.
- GARDEAZABAL, J., and A. UGIDOS (2005). "Gender wage discrimination at quantiles", *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 18, pp. 165-179.
- GOERLICH, F. J., and M. MAS (1999). *Medición de la desigualdad: contribución a una base de datos regional*, Working Paper IVIE .
- IZQUIERDO, M., E. MORAL and A. URTASUN (2003). *Collective bargaining in Spain: an individual data analysis*, Banco de España Occasional Paper, No. 0302.
- JIMENO, J. F., and J. I. GARCÍA-PÉREZ (2005). *Public sector wage gaps in Spanish regions*, Banco de España Working Paper, No. 0526.
- JIMENO, J. F., M. IZQUIERDO and V. HERRANZ (2001). "La desigualdad salarial en España: descomposición y variación por niveles de salarios", *Papeles de Economía Española*, Vol. 88.
- JIMENO, J. F., and L. TOHARIA (1994). "Unemployment and labor market flexibility: Spain". *International Labor Office*.
- JUHN, C., k. MURPHY and B. PIERCE (1993) "Wage inequality and the rise in returns to skill", *Journal of Political Economy* vol. 101, pp. 410-412.
- KATZ, L., and K. MURPHY (1992). "Changes in Relative Wages, 1963-1987: Supply and demand factors", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, CVII, pp. 35-78.
- KATZ, L., and D. AUTOR (1999). "Changes in the wage structure and earnings inequality", in O. Ashenfelter and D. Card (eds) *Handbook of Labor Economics*, vol. 3A. Amsterdam Elsevier.
- LEMIEUX, T. (2004), "Increasing Residual Wage Inequality: Composition Effects, Noisy Data, or Rising Demand for Skill?" Working Paper, University of British Columbia, May 2004.
- LEMIEUX, T. (2006). "Post-secondary education and increasing wage inequality", *Forthcoming American Economic Review*.
- MANSKI, C. F. (1988). *Analog estimation methods in econometrics*, New York, Chapman and Hall.
- MARTINS, P. S., and P. T. PEREIRA (2004). "Does education reduce wage inequality? Quantile regressions evidence from sixteen countries", *Labor Economics*, Vol. 11, pp. 355-371.
- MULLIGAN, C., and Y. RUBINSTEIN (2005). *The closing of the gender gap as a Roy model illusion*, NBER Working Paper, No. 10892.

## European Central Bank Working Paper Series

For a complete list of Working Papers published by the ECB, please visit the ECB's website (<http://www.ecb.int>)

- 745 "Market discipline, financial integration and fiscal rules: what drives spreads in the euro area government bond market?" by S. Manganelli and G. Wolswijk, April 2007.
- 746 "U.S. evolving macroeconomic dynamics: a structural investigation" by L. Benati and H. Mumtaz, April 2007.
- 747 "Tax reform and labour-market performance in the euro area: a simulation-based analysis using the New Area-Wide Model" by G. Coenen, P. McAdam and R. Straub, April 2007.
- 748 "Financial dollarization: the role of banks and interest rates" by H. S. Basso, O. Calvo-Gonzalez and M. Jurgilas, May 2007.
- 749 "Excess money growth and inflation dynamics" by B. Roffia and A. Zaghini, May 2007.
- 750 "Long run macroeconomic relations in the global economy" by S. Dees, S. Holly, M. H. Pesaran and L.V. Smith, May 2007.
- 751 "A look into the factor model black box: publication lags and the role of hard and soft data in forecasting GDP" by M. Bańbura and G. Rünstler, May 2007.
- 752 "Econometric analyses with backdated data: unified Germany and the euro area" by E. Angelini and M. Marcellino, May 2007.
- 753 "Trade credit defaults and liquidity provision by firms" by F. Boissay and R. Gropp, May 2007.
- 754 "Euro area inflation persistence in an estimated nonlinear DSGE model" by G. Amisano and O. Tristani, May 2007.
- 755 "Durable goods and their effect on household saving ratios in the euro area" by J. Jalava and I. K. Kavonius, May 2007.
- 756 "Maintaining low inflation: money, interest rates, and policy stance" by S. Reynard, May 2007.
- 757 "The cyclicity of consumption, wages and employment of the public sector in the euro area" by A. Lamo, J. J. Pérez and L. Schuknecht, May 2007.
- 758 "Red tape and delayed entry" by A. Ciccone and E. Papaioannou, June 2007.
- 759 "Linear-quadratic approximation, external habit and targeting rules" by P. Levine, J. Pearlman and R. Pierse, June 2007.
- 760 "Modelling intra- and extra-area trade substitution and exchange rate pass-through in the euro area" by A. Dieppe and T. Warmedinger, June 2007.
- 761 "External imbalances and the US current account: how supply-side changes affect an exchange rate adjustment" by P. Engler, M. Fidora and C. Thimann, June 2007.
- 762 "Patterns of current account adjustment: insights from past experience" by B. Algieri and T. Bracke, June 2007.
- 763 "Short- and long-run tax elasticities: the case of the Netherlands" by G. Wolswijk, June 2007.
- 764 "Robust monetary policy with imperfect knowledge" by A. Orphanides and J. C. Williams, June 2007.



- 765 “Sequential optimization, front-loaded information, and U.S. consumption” by A. Willman, June 2007.
- 766 “How and when do markets tip? Lessons from the Battle of the Bund” by E. Cantillon and P.-L. Yin, June 2007.
- 767 “Explaining monetary policy in press conferences” by M. Ehrmann and M. Fratzscher, June 2007.
- 768 “A new approach to measuring competition in the loan markets of the euro area” by M. van Leuvensteijn, J.A. Bikker, A. van Rixtel and C. Kok Sørensen, June 2007.
- 769 “The ‘Great Moderation’ in the United Kingdom” by L. Benati, June 2007.
- 770 “Welfare implications of Calvo vs. Rotemberg pricing assumptions” by G. Lombardo and D. Vestin, June 2007.
- 771 “Policy rate decisions and unbiased parameter estimation in typical monetary policy rules” by J. Podpiera, June 2007.
- 772 “Can adjustment costs explain the variability and counter-cyclicality of the labour share at the firm and aggregate level?” by P. Vermeulen, June 2007.
- 773 “Exchange rate volatility and growth in small open economies at the EMU periphery” by G. Schnabl, July 2007.
- 774 “Shocks, structures or monetary policies? The euro area and US after 2001” by L. Christiano, R. Motto and M. Rostagno, July 2007.
- 775 “The dynamic behaviour of budget components and output” by A. Afonso and P. Claeys, July 2007.
- 776 “Insights gained from conversations with labor market decision makers” by T. F. Bewley, July 2007.
- 777 “Downward nominal wage rigidity in the OECD” by S. Holden and F. Wulfsberg, July 2007.
- 778 “Employment protection legislation and wages” by M. Leonardi and G. Pica, July 2007.
- 779 “On-the-job search and the cyclical dynamics of the labor market” by M. U. Krause and T.A. Lubik, July 2007.
- 780 “Dynamics and monetary policy in a fair wage model of the business cycle” by D. de la Croix, G. de Walque and R. Wouters, July 2007.
- 781 “Wage inequality in Spain: recent developments” by M. Izquierdo and A. Lacuesta, July 2007.

ISSN 1561081-0



9 771561 081005