

The Effect Of Globalization On National Income Inequality

Posted on October 12, 2022

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/the-effect-of-globalization-on-national-income-inequality/>

Introduction

Globalization can influence national income inequality through trade, foreign direct investment, technology transfer, migration, finance, taxation, and the bargaining power of workers and firms. Bussmann, Oneal, and de Soysa (2005) examined whether international economic integration, especially accumulated [accumulated foreign direct investment](#), was associated with greater income inequality or a smaller income share for the poorest fifth of the population. Using cross-national data for seventy-two countries largely covering 1970–1990, they found little robust evidence that foreign direct investment systematically worsened national income distribution. That finding is important because it challenged a categorical claim that multinational investment necessarily harms lower-income groups. It should not, however, be generalized into the conclusion that globalization is distributionally neutral in every country or period. Modern global value chains, digital technologies, intellectual-property concentration, financial integration, and changes in labor institutions have altered the mechanisms through which international integration affects households. The article is therefore most useful as evidence about a specific historical period and as a framework for asking which domestic institutions determine how the gains and adjustment costs of globalization are distributed.

Research Design and the Meaning of the Findings

The study evaluates two related but distinct outcomes: overall national income inequality and the income share received by the poorest twenty percent. Its cross-national time-series design allows the authors to compare many countries and years while controlling statistically for other factors, yet this breadth creates measurement challenges. Inequality estimates differ according to whether they use income or consumption, households or individuals, and market income or income after taxes and transfers. Foreign direct investment also cannot be reduced to one uniform phenomenon because extractive projects, manufacturing plants, financial acquisitions, and service-sector investment create different employment and distributional effects. Bussmann et al. (2005) found that FDI stock relative to gross domestic product was not robustly associated with higher inequality or a lower income share for the bottom quintile. “No robust adverse relationship” is more precise than “no effect.” Statistical insignificance may reflect a genuinely small average effect, offsetting country experiences,

measurement error, limited historical variation, or policy conditions that differ across cases. The article therefore weakens deterministic claims while leaving room for conditional effects that appear only in particular sectors, institutions, or stages of development.

Global Value Chains, Technology, and Skills

Later globalization has increasingly taken the form of global value chains in which design, components, assembly, marketing, logistics, and services occur across several countries. The World Bank (2020) argues that participation in these chains can raise productivity, support employment, and reduce poverty when countries have adequate infrastructure, skills, predictable institutions, and policies that help domestic firms connect with higher-value activities. Distributional outcomes remain uneven because technology and international production can increase demand for educated, digitally connected, or specialized workers while reducing demand for some routine tasks. A foreign-owned plant may pay wage premiums and create supplier opportunities, yet those gains can cluster in particular cities or among workers with specific qualifications. Countries that remain concentrated in low-margin assembly or commodity extraction may capture less value than those able to develop local suppliers, management capability, research, and advanced services. Globalization therefore interacts with education rather than simply rewarding or punishing one national labor force. Telling workers to acquire more skills is insufficient when training, transport, childcare, migration, or digital access constrain opportunity. Distribution depends partly on whether institutions help people participate in the sectors that international integration expands.

Labor Institutions, Taxation, and Market Power

The same trade or investment shock can produce different inequality outcomes under different labor-market and fiscal institutions. Minimum wages, collective bargaining, occupational safety, employment protection, unemployment insurance, and enforcement influence how productivity gains are divided among workers, managers, and owners. Subcontracting can spread employment while also moving risk and responsibility away from large lead firms, particularly when informal workers have weak legal protection. Tax systems create another channel. Globalization can enlarge the tax base by increasing production and income, but multinational structures can also facilitate profit shifting and intensify competition among governments seeking investment. Whether public revenue finances education, healthcare, infrastructure, childcare, or social insurance then affects post-tax inequality even when market-income inequality rises. Rodrik (2011) emphasizes that international economic integration operates within domestic political choices rather than replacing them. Market concentration also matters because globally successful firms may acquire bargaining power over suppliers, workers, and consumers. A country can therefore become more integrated and more productive while the distribution of gains depends heavily on competition policy, labor institutions, fiscal capacity, and the credibility of enforcement.

Geography, Gender, and Sectoral Differences

National averages can conceal large distributional differences across regions, genders, and industries. Foreign investment often clusters near ports, large cities, educated labor pools, reliable electricity, and established transport networks. This concentration can widen gaps between connected regions and places that lack infrastructure or access to expanding industries. Sector also changes the relationship. Labor-intensive manufacturing may create many jobs, while oil, minerals, or capital-intensive industries can generate large output with comparatively limited employment. Export-oriented production may increase women's paid employment and bargaining power in some settings but can also rely on insecure contracts, low wages, and unpaid care work that household income measures do not capture. Milanovic (2016) further distinguishes inequality within countries from inequality among people globally. Rapid growth in populous lower-income countries can reduce global inequality between nations while income differences widen inside individual countries. These patterns explain why competing accounts of globalization can each identify real outcomes. A national Gini coefficient may remain stable while one region or social group loses relative position, and the poorest quintile's income share may change differently from its absolute living standard.

Interpreting the Historical Study in the Contemporary Economy

The historical scope of Bussmann et al. (2005) is a major limitation for applying its estimates directly to the present. Much of the dataset predates the rapid expansion of China-centered manufacturing networks, digital platforms, global business services, widespread internet access, contemporary intellectual-property regimes, and the financial integration of the twenty-first century. These changes can alter both the type of investment countries receive and the bargaining relationships surrounding it. Contemporary research should therefore distinguish greenfield investment from mergers and acquisitions, separate sectors, examine domestic value added, and measure both pre-tax and post-tax inequality. It should also consider employment quality, gender, regional effects, environmental costs, and the distribution of market power. World Bank analysis of modern trade and value chains continues to emphasize that integration can support jobs and productivity while outcomes depend on domestic capabilities and complementary policies (World Bank, 2020). The older study remains valuable because it demonstrates the importance of testing distributional claims empirically. Its conclusion should function as a historical finding and methodological warning against simple generalization, not as a permanent law about globalization.

Conclusion

Bussmann, Oneal, and de Soysa provide evidence against the claim that globalization, particularly foreign direct investment, inevitably increases national income inequality. Their cross-national

analysis for the 1970–1990 period did not find a robust average adverse relationship between FDI and either the Gini coefficient or the income share of the poorest fifth (Bussmann et al., 2005). The appropriate conclusion is conditional rather than universal. Trade and investment interact with technology, skills, geography, sector, labor institutions, taxation, market concentration, gender, and public spending, so similar levels of international integration can produce different household outcomes. Global value-chain participation can support growth, productivity, employment, and poverty reduction, but countries capture more inclusive benefits when domestic firms can upgrade, workers can develop relevant skills, and public institutions distribute adjustment costs and opportunities effectively (World Bank, 2020). National averages should therefore be supplemented with evidence on regions, occupations, gender, employment quality, and post-tax income. Globalization is neither automatically equalizing nor inherently unequalizing. Its distributional consequences emerge from the interaction between cross-border economic forces and the institutions through which societies organize markets, taxation, labor rights, and social investment.

Works Cited

Bussmann, M., Oneal, J. R., & de Soysa, I. (2005). The effect of globalization on national income inequality. *Comparative Sociology*, 4(3–4), 285–312.

Milanovic, B. (2016). *Global inequality*. Harvard University Press.

Rodrik, D. (2011). *The globalization paradox*. W. W. Norton.

World Bank. (2020). *World Development Report 2020: Trading for development in the age of global value chains*.