



Informality and Development

Gary Fields
Cornell University and IZA

March, 2011





- Q: What do we know about economic growth and change in poverty in the developing world? Two lessons:
- 1. In the great majority of cases, when economic growth takes place, the rate of poverty falls.
- 2. When the rate of poverty has not fallen, typically it is because economic growth has not taken place.

Note:

- Not all individuals
 - Not all groups





But:

Little is known about the growth-poverty-informality nexus.

Q: Why don't we know more?

A: Inconsistent links between definition and measurement.





Headline numbers:

1) Levels of informality:

India: 93% according to NCEUS.

Mexico: About 60% using ICLS method.

South Africa: About 20% using Stats SA Method A.

2) Changes over time:
Just a few percentage points in any of the three.
"Wobble"





What to do to remedy the problem of multiple and ambiguous definitions:

Antecedents:

- "Unemployment"
- "Income distribution"
- "Socioeconomic mobility"

Use words like "ICLS informal employment," "unprotected," "unregistered," "not covered by social security," and so on.

But let's move on beyond semantics.





Questions I'd like to see answered;

- 1. How does the extent of informal employment change with economic growth?
- 2. How do earnings among those in informal employment change with economic growth a) absolutely and b) relative to earnings elsewhere?
 - 3. To what extent do households that escape poverty do so by a) earning more within informal employment

VS.

b) getting out of informal employment?





The South African conjecture: "The only way to get ahead in today's South Africa is to acquire a formal sector job."

Evidence: Not so.





What is so in South Africa?

- 1. A sizeable number of workers have gotten ahead by moving *out* of casual work, non-professional self-employment, or domestic service and *into* paid employment.
 - 2. Another sizeable number have gotten ahead by earning more *within* self-employment.
- 3. Still others have gotten ahead through education and training.





Re: "policy implications":

False syllogisms.

No one of these three policy areas

- increasing paid employment, raising the returns to selfemployment, and investing in education and skills —
is obviously the best way of using scarce resources to stimulate
economic growth and reduce poverty.





For deciding how best to intervene, social cost-benefit analysis is needed.





Helpful questions to ask ourselves and to ask policy-makers:

- 1. What specific labor market objective or objectives are you trying to achieve and by what welfare economic criterion or criteria will you decide if your objective(s) is/are being achieved?
- 2. What is the labor market model you are using to analyze the effects of the proposed policy?
- 3. What is the empirical evidence favoring one view of labor market functioning over another?

If we can't answer these ourselves, we need to do more thinking! And if the policy-makers can't answer them, let's push them to!