*Selected Paper prepared for presentation at the*
*Southern Agricultural Economics Association Annual Meetings*
*Little Rock, Arkansas, February 5-9, 2005*

# ASSESSING DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES AND INCOME INEQUALITIES: A CASE STUDY OF WEST VIRGINIA

Yohannes G. Hailu, Ph.D. Student
Division of Resource Management, West Virginia University
P.O.Box 6108, Morgantown, WV 26505-6108
Yohannes.Hailu@mail.wvu.edu

Tesfa G. Gebremedhin, Professor
Division of Resource Management, West Virginia University
Tesfa.Gebremedhin@mail.wvu.edu

Randall W. Jackson, Professor
Director, Regional Research Institute, West Virginia University
randall.jackson@mail.wvu.edu

January 14, 2005

**Abstract**:- This study investigates demographic change and income inequalities, and relationship between economic growth and income inequality in West Virginia. Income growth was positively related with population and employment growth, but is significantly and negatively related with income inequality. This indicates that higher income inequality is associated with slower economic growth.

**Key Words**: Income inequality, growth modeling, population change, per capita income.

*Assessing Demographic Changes and Income Inequalities:*
*A Case Study of West Virginia*

## Introduction

Historically, changes in the structure of demographic characteristics of communities have attracted interest to understand the causes and implication of such demographic changes. These changes in demographic structure have serious economic implications at the local, regional, and national levels; consequently, greater attention has been placed in understanding population dynamics.

Increased attention has recently been focused on the relative economic well-being of older and younger generations (Gist and Wu, 1996; Palmer, et al., 1988; Radner 1994). Different studies concluded that higher income inequality is observed in aged as compared to younger population cohorts (Radner, 1995; Hurd, 1990; Crystal and Shea, 1990). However, Rubin, et al. (2000) argued that based on their data analysis between 1967 and 1997, elderly households achieved greater equality in income distribution and converged with the distribution of non-elderly groups. Similarly, Radner (1995) argues that for the 1967 to 1992 period analysis, income inequality among the elderly declined while it rose in the non-elderly cohorts. Though there are contradictory conclusions in different studies, the implication is far more important to restructuring current transfer programs in response to current income distribution and inequality by different age cohorts.

The distribution of income in demographic groups and the extent of its inequality are determined by a vector of different socio-economic factors. Rubin, et al. (2000) argue that income distribution and inequality are in part explained by the functioning of market systems, government policies, household choices, economic opportunities, and labor market experiences. For demographic cohorts in the labor force, income inequalities are primarily wage driven (Burtless, 1990; Danzinger and Gottshalk, 1995; Levy and Murnane, 1992).

The traditional economic theories of “life cycle analysis” and “permanent-income hypothesis” are important theories that explain income and consumption patterns. However, they offer little help in explaining income inequalities. More recent theories focus on household economic behavior and decision making that influences household income and inequality. Gary Becker (1991) argues that human capital is the main determinant of adult income, which is significantly influenced by parental economic endowment and public expenditure on children. Hence, the income of parents is a determining factor of later life income distribution and inequality. On the contrary, Frank (1997) concludes that in addition to absolute incomes, relative household position in income distribution significantly affects household decision-making and inequality.

At the macro level, skewed income distribution among population cohorts has significant impact on regional development and poverty. Alesni and Rodrik (1994) regressed average growth rates against a measure of inequality and demonstrated that greater inequality in the distribution of income slows down economic growth. Similarly, Persson and Tabellini (1994) used time series data from 1830-1985 to conclude that more equality in the distribution of income accelerates growth. Some possible explanations for these conclusions are provided by Aghion, et al. (1999). They argue that inequality reduces investment opportunities, worsens borrowers’ incentives, and creates macroeconomic volatility that impact economic growth.

On the contrary, a regional study of Ngarambe et al. (1998) examined determinants of Southern US county level income growth and income inequality in the 1970s and 1980s. Their result indicated a positive relationship between family income growth and income inequality in the 1980s. The study of Lozier (1993) on the relationship of income inequality and economic growth in West Virginia found no significant evidence that economic growth determine household income inequality.

The main objective of this study is: (1) to estimate and analyze changes in income inequality in population cohorts in West Virginia for the 1990-2000 period, (2) to develop a simultaneous system econometric model to empirically test the relationship between economic growth (growth in per capita income) and measured income inequality, and (3) to draw relevant conclusions that contribute to existing literature.

**Theoretical Models**

*Gini Coefficient as a Measure of Income Inequality*

There are a number of approaches to measure income inequality intertemporally across population cohorts. The Lorenz concentration curve is one such widely applied technique that have received acceptance in income inequality studies. The Lorenz curve measures the cumulative share of income as a function of cumulative population proportions. Gini coefficient, used as a measure of income inequality in this study, is one measure in the family of inequality or dispersion measures that is widely used to measure income inequality in population cohorts based on the Lorenz curve.

Mathematically, the Lorenz curve can be estimated as follows. Let $P(x)$ be defined as population density function of a given income $x$. Then, the cumulative share of population for income less or equal to $x$ is given by:

$$P(x) = \int_0^x p(y)dy \cdot$$

The share of total income received by this population group can be estimated as:

$$\psi(x) = (1/\mu)\int_0^x yp(y)dy$$

where the mean $\mu = \int_0^\infty yp(y)dy$

The Lorenz curve function runs from 0 to 1. For perfect equality of distribution, the Lorenz curve becomes the diagonal horizontal line and the associated inequality measure becomes 0. To derive the Gini coefficient from the Lorenz curve, the following computation can be used:

$$G = 1 - 2\int_0^1 \psi(z)dz, where...z = P(x)$$

To estimate this Gini coefficient, data on population share of each age group in the population and their associated income shares is collected. Data used for Gini Coefficient estimation includes US Population Census Data for household income and population in West Virginia.

*Growth Equilibrium Model*

Modeling the relationship between economic growth and income inequality requires the proper understanding of the factors that affect differences in regional economic growth. One proxy measure of economic growth that is used in this study is growth in per capita income. By definition, per capita income is mathematically related to changes in income and population, i.e., *PCI = GDP/POP* where *PCI* is per capita income, *GDP* is gross domestic product, and *POP* is population of the geographic area of interest. It can be argued that growth in income is significantly related to growth in employment opportunity hence employment growth can be used as proxy to income growth. The relationship between economic growth and income inequality can thus be modeled as:

(1) $$PCI_i = f(POP, E, Gi, \Omega^{PCI})$$

where all the variables are as previously defined, $E$ is employment density, $G_i$ is measured Gini coefficient for county $i$, and $\Omega^{PCI}$ is the vector of all other variables that affect per capita income growth.

Estimation of equation (1) poses econometric problems of endogeneity and simultaneity as some of the explanatory variables are endogenous to the system. Not only do counties with higher population base affect the growth of per capita income through the provision of larger markets and agglomeration benefits to firms, but counties with higher per capita income affect migration patterns and influence demographic changes. Similarly, not only do counties with higher per capita income attract new businesses and employment opportunities, but counties with high employment opportunities also experience a growing per capita income. Furthermore, a number of studies argued for a simultaneous relationship between population and employment in a region (Roback, 1982; Carlino and Mills, 1987; Duffy-Deno, 1998; Deller et al., 2001; Hailu and Rosenberger 2004).

Growth equilibrium modeling enables to simultaneously estimate endogenous growth variables. In their early applications, these models were used to resolve the debate over whether people follow jobs or jobs follow people (Carlino and Mills, 1987). Following the early work of Carlino and Mills (1987) and further developments by Deller et al. (2001) and Hailu and Rosenberger (2004), a simultaneous growth equilibrium model of income growth can be specified as:

(2) $PCI_i^* = f(POP^*, E^*, Gi \mid \Omega^{PCI})$

(3) $POP^* = f(E^*, PCI_i^* \mid \Omega^{POP})$

(4) $E^* = f(POP^*, PCI_i^* \mid \Omega^{E})$

where $POP^*$, $E^*$, and $PCI_i^*$ refer to equilibrium levels of population, employment, and per capita income respectively; $\Omega^{POP}$, $\Omega^{E}$, and $\Omega^{PCI}$ refer to a vectors of other exogenous variables having a direct or indirect relationship with population, employment and per capita income respectively.

Population and employment are likely to adjust to their equilibrium values with substantial lags (Mills and Price 1984). Similarly, per capita income also adjusts to its equilibrium value with lags. Therefore, distributed lag equations may be specified as:

(5) $PCI_i^* = PCI_{t-1} + \lambda_{PCI}(PCI_i^* - PCI_{t-1})$

(6) $POP_t^* = POP_{t-1} + \lambda_{POP}(POP^* - POP_{t-1})$

(7) $E^*_t = E_{t-1} + \lambda_E(E^* - E_{t-1})$

where $\lambda_{E,}$ $\lambda_{POP}$ and $\lambda_{PCI}$ are speed-of-adjustment coefficients with $0 \leq \lambda_{E,}\ \lambda_{POP,}\ \lambda_{AgL} \leq 1$, and t-1 is a one period lag. This indicates that current employment, population, and per capita income are dependent on their one period lags and on the change between equilibrium values and one lag period values adjusted at speed-of-adjustment values of $\lambda_{E,}$ $\lambda_P$ and $\lambda_{AgL}$.

Rearranging terms:

(8) $\Delta PCI = A\ PCI_t - PCI_{t-1} = \lambda_{PCI}(PCI_i^* - PCI_{t-1})$

(9) $\Delta POP = POP_t - POP_{t-1} = \lambda_{POP}(POP^* - POP_{t-1})$

(10) $\Delta E = E_t - E_{t-1} = \lambda_E(E^* - E_{t-1})$

where $\Delta PCI$, $\Delta POP$, and $\Delta E$ are changes in per capita income, population and employment respectively. With substitution and rearranging of terms, linearized equations of the model may be given as:

(11) $$\Delta PCI = \alpha_{0PCI} + \beta_{1PCI}PCI_{t-1} + \beta_{2PCI}\Delta POP + \beta_{3PCI}\Delta E + \beta_{4PCI}G_i + \sum\delta_{iPCI}\Omega_{AgL} + e_i$$

(12) $$\Delta POP = \alpha_{0POP} + \beta_{1POP}POP_{t-1} + \beta_{2POP}\Delta E + \beta_{3POP}\Delta PCI + \sum\delta_{iPOP}\Omega^{POP} + e_i$$

(13) $$\Delta E = \alpha_{0E} + \beta_{1E}E_{t-1} + \beta_{2E}\Delta P + \beta_{3E}\Delta PCI + \sum\delta_{iE}\Omega^{E} + e_i$$

Equations (11), (12), and (13) indicate that per capita income, population and employment changes are dependent on their initial levels and changes of the other two endogenous variables, and vectors of other variables that affect the endogenous variables. In such a system, the simultaneous interaction of per capita income, population, and employment can be identified.

**Application to West Virginia**

The Gini measure method and the system-of-equations model are estimated using state and county level data for West Virginia. For the study period of 1990-2000, there was a 13 percent increase in per capita income, a 0.4 percent increase in population, and a 10 percent increase in employment, though there is variation at the county level.

Table 1 provides definition of variables used in the econometric model and compiles their statistical summary based on mean and standard deviation. The endogenous variables in the model ($\Delta PCI$, $\Delta POP$, *and* $\Delta E$) are measured as per capita income directly given by census data, population density per square mile, and employment density per square mile for the 1990 – 2000 periods, respectively. The changes in Per capita income of West Virginia counties range from a maximum decline of $1,204 to a maximum gain of $5,137.00. The average change in per capita income for the period was an increase of $2,208.60.

The changes in population density range from a maximum gain of 40 people per square mile to a maximum loss of 29 people per square mile. The average change in population density was 0.43 people per square mile. The change in employment density varied from a maximum gain of 33 jobs to a decline of 23 jobs per square mile. The mean change in employment density was 4.4 jobs per square mile.

**Model Results**

*Gini Income Inequality Estimates*

Using county level data from US Census of Population, the cumulative proportions of income shared by cumulative population groups is computed, and Gini coefficients are estimated for different age cohorts for the period 1990 and 2000 as provided in Tables 2 and 3. The upper boundary of the highest income group is reported in open ended bracket of $100,000 or more for the 1990 Census period, and $200,000 or more for the 2000 period. To make similar reference in both time periods and to estimate Gini coefficients for grouped data with closed upper income brackets, creating and regrouping of income brackets is introduced. Following Rubin et al. (2000), an upper income boundary is defined for the top income group by introducing the upper limit as twice the upper limit of the next-to-last income group. This approach is demonstrated to closely approximate other approaches for grouped data.

The result on Table 2 indicates that for all age groups, except those 65 years and older, income inequality in West Virginia increased in 2000 from its 1990 state. The highest increase in inequality is in the age groups under 25 years (an increase of 0.035) and 35 to 44 years (an increase of 0.026). While all other age groups experienced increased income inequality, particularly the retirement age group experienced improvement in income distribution. The increasing disparity in income distribution in age groups under 25 years and between 35 to 44 years may be explained by differences in human capital accumulation and resulting disparities in labor market compensation. Increased government transfer programs to retired citizens may explain the decline in income distribution among older West Virginians.

Table 3 provides Gini coefficient estimates for a reclassified age group. The data on income distribution by age is classified among younger age groups with little labor market experience, early labor market experience and career development, pre-retirement years, and retirement age categories. In this classification, age groups under 25 years and 25 to 44 years experienced increased income inequality by 0.035 and 0.014, respectively. Income for pre-retirement ages of 45 to 64 and post retirement years of 65 and older indicate a slight decline in income inequality.

*Econometric Model Results*

The estimated coefficients of the simultaneous equation system and the statistical properties are given in Table 4. To maximize the information gain and to simultaneously estimate all the endogenous variables in the equations system, a three-stage-least-square method is used. The model is corrected for heteroskedasticity using White's Heteroskedasticity Consistent Computation routine.

Based on adjusted $R^2$ statistics, the estimated model explains 52 percent, 66 percent, and 76 percent of the variations in Per capita income, change in population density, and change in employment density, respectively. First for change in population density equation, the model result shows a number of significant relationships. The endogenous variables, change in per capita incomes ($\Delta PCI$) and change in employment density ($\Delta E$), are significantly and positively related to changes in population density ($\Delta POP$) at 95 percent confidence level. A one percent increase in per capita income and employment density is expected to increase population density by 0.2 percent and 34.5 percent, respectively, *ceteris paribus*. Counties with high income growth and growing job opportunities are expected to experience population growth, one way being through in-migration.

The initial condition of population ($DPOP_{90}$) is negatively and significantly related to population growth. This finding supports previous finding of Deller et al. (2001) that areas with high population densities experience low growth, reinforcing the case for rural renaissance. The fiscal factors of per capita taxes ($PCTAX_{90}$) and property taxes (*PROPTAX*) are negatively related to population growth, however, both were not significant for our data set. Similarly, per capita government spending (*GPERCAP*) was not significant in determining population growth.

The local characteristics variables of median housing value ($MEDHVA_{90}$) and median income (*MEDINC90*) were both positively and significantly related to population growth. High median housing values were expected to be negatively associated with slow population growth due to high cost of housing. However, this may be capturing the reverse impact that communities of high property value may be those with high population density and higher demand for housing property. The positive relationship of population growth to median income is as expected; counties with high median incomes may attract population growth through regional migration adjustments. A one percent increase in median income is expected to result in a 0.002 percent density change in population percent, *ceteris paribus*.

Finally, the percent of families below poverty (*FAMBPOV*) is positively related to population growth. This finding indicates that in West Virginia, population growth is more concentrated in rural communities where unemployment rates and percent of families under poverty are high. This result reinforces the previous finding that counties with high initial population densities experienced a slow population growth indicating rural renaissance.

The employment density change equation is also explained by a number of endogenous and exogenous variables. The endogenous variables of per capita income and population density changes are significantly and positively related to employment growth as may be expected. A one percent increase in per capita income and population density is expected to result in a 0.002 percent and 0.267 percent increases in employment growth, respectively, *ceteris paribus*. Growing incomes and population densities may attract new investment to capture growing markets also support the economic base for new businesses to emerge.

The fiscal factors that may affect employment growth include per capita taxes ($PCTAX_{90}$), property taxes (*PROPTAX*), and government expenditure (*GPERCAP*). The signs of these variables are as expected, that high taxes are expected to discourage job creation, and government spending in social capital is expected to encourage employment growth. However, except for property taxes, the other two variables were not significant in the model in determining employment growth. A one percent increase in property taxes is expected to result in a job loss of 0.0003 percent, *ceteris paribus*.

Local factors that may affect employment growth include community commuting patterns and the extent of investment in access measured by interstate highway density. Development of interstate highway density ($HWYDEN_{99}$) is associated with a highly significant gain in employment growth, reaffirming similar conclusions in previous studies. The commuting characteristics is measured by the proportion of employed residents working outside of county of residence ($POUTWORK_{90}$) and the proportion of total jobs in a county held by people residing outside of county ($PINMIGRT_{90}$). Counties with high proportion of total jobs held by people residing outside county showed a significant and positive relationship to employment growth. The fact that these counties attract workers from neighboring counties with given commuting cost may indicate the relative distribution of employment opportunities across counties.

The number of business establishments (*NUMESTAB*) as a measure of threshold economic base, the percent of population above age 25 with a Bachelor's degree or higher (*BACHDG*) as a measure of human capital formation, and poverty rates (*POVRT*) as a measure of economic disparity, are also introduced to explain employment growth. The result matches prior expectation that a county with a large threshold business establishment significantly experiences better employment growth; counties with higher human capital accumulation significantly experience better job growth; and high economic disparity significantly discourages employment growth. A one percent increase in the number of county business establishments, in the percent of county population with a Bachelor's degree or higher, or in the poverty rate are expected to result in an increase of 0.009 percent, 0.86 percent, and a decline of 0.96 percent in employment growth, respectively, *ceteris paribus*.

The main objective of this study is to examine the relationship between economic growth and income inequality. The analysis of population and employment growth equations was to develop a better understanding of the endogenous forces that affect the time path of economic growth. The per capita income growth equation is also modeled as a function of endogenous variables, initial conditions of endogenous variables, and exogenous variables that are hypothesized to interact with income growth. The endogenous variables, population ($\Delta POP$) and employment ($\Delta E$) density growth, are significantly and positively related to per capita income growth. This may indicate that counties with high employment opportunities experience income growth, and similarly counties with high population densities that support such employment growth may experience per capita income growth. The result indicates that a one percent increase in population and employment density is expected to have a 29.83 percent and 66.8 percent increase in change in per capita income. A growing employment opportunity may expand income opportunities, and an increase in population density may provide a market incentive for investment and a tax base for social investment. The initial per capita income condition ($PCI_{90}$) is negatively related to income growth, indicating a declining trend in per capita income growth.

The fiscal variable of per capita government spending is not significant in explaining income growth trends in West Virginia during the study period. The county demographic structure variable is denoted by the percentage of county population with age 65 and above is not also significant in explaining income growth differences across counties. However, the percent of families below poverty line in a county is slightly significant in explaining per capita income changes. The result indicates that counties with high percentages of families below poverty line (*FAMBPOV*) may experience slow per capita income growth. A one percent increase in the percent of families below poverty line in counties is estimated to result a 62.33 percent decline in per capita income changes, *ceteris paribus*.

A similar measure of economic disparity generated to measure the relationship between income growth and income inequality is the Gini index. The variable is computed for counties to proxy income distribution disparities that enable to measure its relationship to income growth. The result indicates a highly significant negative relationship between income inequality and economic growth. It is expected from this result that counties with high income inequality may experience comparatively low growth in per capita income confirming similar findings in previous studies (Alesina and Rodrik, 1994, Persson and Tabellini, 1994, and Aghion, et al., 1999). These previous studies argue that inequality may negatively impact economic growth due to the facts that inequality reduces investment opportunities, worsens borrowers' incentives, and creates macroeconomic volatility that impact economic growth.

**Conclusion**

This study investigates trends in demographic changes and income inequalities in West Virginia for the study period 1990 – 2000. A Gini index income inequality measure is computed both at the state and county level to determine trends in income inequality in the state. Our result indicates that for all age groups, except those 65 years and above, income inequality increased from its state in 1990. Using a simultaneous equation system for the endogenous variables of change in per capita income, population growth, and employment growth, a system of equations model is estimated using 3-stage-least-squares. The result of the model indicates that per capita income growth is positively related with population and employment growth, but it is significantly and negatively related with income inequality measured by Gini index. This indicates that higher income inequality is associated with slower economic growth in West Virginia.

## References


Aghion, P., Carola, E., and Garcia-Penalosa, C. (1999). "Inequality and Economic Growth: The Perspective of the New Growth Theories." *Journal of Economic Literature*. 37(4), 1615-1660.

Alesina, A. and Rodrik, D. (1994). "Distributive Politics and Economics Growth." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. 109(2), 465-490.

Becker, G. (1991). "A Treatise on the Family." Cambridge, MA, Harvard University Press.

Burtless, G. (1990). "Earnings Inequality over the Business and Demographic Cycles," in G. Burtless (ed.) A Future of Lousy Jobs? The Brookings Institution,Washington, DC, 77-122.

Carlino, G. A., and Mills, E. S. (1987). "The Determinants of County Growth." *Journal of Regional Science.* 27, 39-54.

Chandra, A and Thompson, E. (2000). "Does Public Infrastructure affect economic activity? Evidence from the rural interstate highway system." *Regional Science and Urban Economics*. 30: 457-490.

Crystal, S. and Shea, D. (1990). "Cumulative Advantage, Cumulative Disadvantage, and Inequality among Elderly People." *The Gerntologist*. 30(4), 437-443.

Deller, S.C., T-H Tsai, Marcouiller, D.W., and English, D.B.K.. (2001). "The Role of Amenities and Quality of Life in Rural Economic Growth." *American Journal of Agricultural Economics.* 83, 352-365.

Duffy-Deno, K.T. (1998). "The Effect of Federal Wilderness on County Growth in the Intermountain Western United States." *Journal of Regional Science.* 38, 109-136.

Frank, Robert. (1997). "Microeconomics and Behavior." New York, McGraw-Hill.

Garcia-Mila, T. and McGuire, T.J. (1992). "The Contribution of Publicly Provided Inputs to States' Economies." *Regional Science and Urban Economics*. 22, 229-241.

Gist, J. R. and Wu K. B. (1999). "Income Growth And Inequality Among Aged And Non-aged Cohorts, 1975 – 1996." AARP Public Policy Institute, Washington DC.

Hailu, Yohannes G. and Rosenberger, R. (2004). "Modeling Migration Effects on Agricultural Lands." *Agricultural and Resource Economics Review*. 33(1), 50-60.

Hurd, M. (1990). "Research on the Elderly: Economic Status, Retirement, and Consumption and Saving." *Journal of Economic Literature.* 28(June), 565-637.

Keeler, T. E. and Ying, J. S. (1988). "Measuring the Benefits of a Large Public Investment: the Case of the U.S. Federal-aid Highway System." *Journal of Public Economics*. 36, 69-85.

Lee, R. D. "Population." Library of Economics and Liberty. Retrieved September 26, 2004 from the World Wide Web: http://www.econlib.org/index.html.

Levy, F. and Murnane, R. (1992). "U.S. Earnings Levels and Earnings Inequality: A Review of Recent Trends and Proposed Explanations." *Journal of Economic Literature*. 30(September), 1333-81.

Lozier, John. (1993). "Inequality and Economic Growth in West Virginia Counties." M.S. Thesis, Division of Resource Management, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV.

Mills, E.S., and R. Price. (1984). "Metropolitan Suburbanization and Central City Problems." *Journal of Urban Economics.* 15, 1-17.

Ngarambe, O., Goetz, S. J., and Debertin, D. L. (1998). "Regional Economic Growth and Income Distribution: County Level-Evidence from the U.S. South." *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*. 30: 325-337.

Palmer, J., Smeeding, T., and Torrey, B. (1988). "The Vulnerable." The Urban Institute, Washington, DC.

Persson, T. and Tabellini, G. (1994). "Is Inequality Harmful for Growth?" *American Economic Review*. 84(3), 600-621.

Radner, D. (1995). "Incomes of the Elderly and Nonelderly, 1967-92." Social Security Bulletin. 58, 82-97.

Roback, J. (1982). "Wages, Rents, and the Quality of Life." *Journal of Political Economy.* 90, 1257-1278.

Rose M. R., White-Means S. I., and Daniel L. M. (2000). "*Income Distribution of Older Americans*." *Monthly Labor Review*. 123(11), 19-30.

## Appendix

Table 1. Definition and Descriptive Statistics of Variables, West Virginia (N=55).

| Variable | Definition | Mean | Std Dev |
|---|---|---|---|
| ***Endogenous Variables*** | | | |
| $\Delta PCI$ | *Change in Per Capita Income ($PCI_{99}$ – $PCI_{90}$)* | 2208.60 | 1270.84 |
| $\Delta POP$ | *Change in population density ($DPOP_{99}$ – $DPOP_{90}$)* | 0.426 | 9.724 |
| $\Delta E$ | *Change in employment density ($DEMP_{99}$ – $DEMP_{90}$)* | 4.391 | 9.030 |
| ***Initial Conditions*** | | | |
| $DPOP_{90}$ | *Population density in 1990* | 94.403 | 102.886 |
| $DEMP_{90}$ | *Employment density in 1990* | 42.665 | 59.916 |
| $PCI_{90}$ | *Per Capita Income in 1990* | 13073.51 | 2300.70 |
| ***Fiscal Factors*** | | | |
| $PCTAX_{90}$ | *Per capita local taxes in 1990* | 315.109 | 126.389 |
| *PROPTAX* | *Property Tax in 1990* | 13892.96 | 18447.04 |
| *GPERCAP* | *Government direct expenditure per person* | 1800.49 | 606.13 |
| ***Local and Business Factors*** | | | |
| $HWYDEN_{99}$ | *Interstate highway density in 1999* | 0.022 | 0.036 |
| $MEDHVA_{90}$ | *Median housing value in 1990* | 44,614 | 10,725 |
| *MEDINC90* | *Median income in 1990* | 19557.47 | 3829.39 |
| $UNEMRT_{90}$ | *Unemployment rate in 1990* | 11.11 | 3.98 |
| $POUTWORK_{90}$ | *Proportion of employed residents working outside of county in 1990* | 0.33 | 0.15 |
| $PINMIGRT_{90}$ | *Proportion of county jobs held by people residing outside county in 1990* | 0.18 | 0.08 |
| *CRIME10K* | *Crimes reported per 10,000 people in 1990* | 1689.89 | 1035.57 |
| ***Other Exogenous Factors*** | | | |
| *NUMESTAB* | *Number of non-farm business establishments in 1990* | 684.07 | 878.37 |
| *FAMBPOV* | *Per cent of families below poverty line* | 17.68 | 6.37 |
| *BACHDG* | *Per cent of 25 years and older population with Bachelor's Degree +* | 10.05 | 4.09 |
| *P65PLUSY* | *Per cent of population with age 65 and above in 1990* | 15.10 | 2.07 |
| *POVRT* | *Rate of Poverty in 1990* | 21.55 | 6.84 |
| *TGINI90* | *Calculated Gini measure for 1990* | 0.16 | 0.034 |

**Table 2. Gini Estimates for Age Groups in WV for 1990 and 2000**

| Age Group | Gini Estimates 1990 | Gini Estimates 2000 | Net Inequality Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| Under 25 years: | 0.416 | 0.451 | 0.035 |
| 25 to 34 years: | 0.386 | 0.389 | 0.003 |
| 35 to 44 Years: | 0.376 | 0.402 | 0.026 |
| 45 to 54 Years: | 0.403 | 0.404 | 0.001 |
| 55 to 64 years: | 0.441 | 0.445 | 0.004 |
| 65 to 74 years: | 0.444 | 0.437 | -0.007 |
| 75 years and over: | 0.461 | 0.460 | -0.001 |

**Table 3. Gini Estimates for Regrouped Age Groups in WV for 1990 and 2000**

| Age Group | Gini Measure 1990 | Gini Measure 2000 | Net Change |
|---|---|---|---|
| Under 25 years: | 0.416 | 0.451 | 0.035 |
| 25 to 44 years: | 0.388 | 0.402 | 0.014 |
| 45 to 64 Years: | 0.426 | 0.423 | -0.003 |
| 65 years and over: | 0.457 | 0.451 | -0.006 |

Table 4. Empirical Results for System of Equations Model, West Virginia (N=55)

| **Variable** | **ΔP Equation** | | **ΔE Equation** | | **ΔPCI Equation** | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Coefficient | p-Value | Coefficient | p-Value | Coefficient | p-Value |
| *Endogenous Variables* | | | | | | |
| *ΔPCI* | *0.002* | *0.025*** | *0.002* | *0.002*** | --- | --- |
| *ΔP* | --- | --- | *0.267* | *0.001**** | *29.837* | *0.067** |
| *ΔE* | *0.345* | *0.002*** | --- | --- | *66.826* | *0.002*** |
| *Initial Conditions* | | | | | | |
| $PCI_{90}$ | --- | --- | --- | --- | *-0.367* | *0.000**** |
| $DPOP_{90}$ | *-0.059* | *0.000**** | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $DEMP_{90}$ | --- | --- | *00002* | *0.514* | --- | --- |
| *Fiscal Factors* | | | | | | |
| $PCTAX_{90}$ | *-0.012* | *0.169* | *0.005* | *0.508* | --- | --- |
| *PROPTAX* | *-0.0001* | *0.447* | *-0.0003* | *0.056** | --- | --- |
| *GPERCAP* | *0.001* | *0.600* | *-0.001* | *0.594* | *0.016* | *0.936* |
| *Business and Local Factors* | | | | | | |
| $HWYDEN_{99}$ | --- | --- | *120.02* | *0.000**** | --- | --- |
| $MEDHVA_{90}$ | *0.0003* | *0.015*** | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *MEDINC90* | *0.002* | *0.001**** | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| $POUTWORK_{90}$ | --- | --- | *1.174* | *0.183* | --- | --- |
| $PINMIGRT_{90}$ | --- | --- | *26.037* | *0.001**** | --- | --- |
| *Other Exogenous Factors* | | | | | | |
| *NUMESTAB* | --- | --- | *0.009* | *0.023*** | --- | --- |
| *FAMBPOV* | *0.843* | *0.000**** | --- | --- | *-62.331* | *0.139* |
| *BACHDG* | --- | --- | *0.866* | *0.001**** | --- | --- |
| *P65PLUSY* | --- | --- | --- | --- | *6.305* | *0.919* |
| *POVRT* | --- | --- | *-0.965* | *0.073** | --- | --- |
| *CGINI90* | --- | --- | --- | --- | *-18490* | *0.055** |
| *Constant* | *-63.772* | *0.000**** | *-17.511* | *0.001**** | *15950* | *0.000**** |
| $adjR^2$ | *0.66* | | *0.76* | | *0.52* | |

Note: An asterisk (*) denotes statistical significance at the 0.10 level, (**) at the 0.50 level, and (***) at the 0.01 level. Model is estimated using 3-stage-least-squares method and is corrected for heteroskedasticity using White's HCCM routine.