Intro	duction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
	Male Ind	come Inequalit	cy & Female Ma	rital Outco	omes
			v Lange former builty		
		EVIO	rence from India		

A.V. Chari Annemie Maertens Sinduja V. Srinivasan

APPAM International Conference, Segovia

September 29-30, 2014

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Motivation				

Increasing income inequality in India

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Motivation				



#### Increasing income inequality in India

2 / 11

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Motivation				



#### And women's age at marriage rising









How are two trends related?

Introduction

# Does male income income affect female marital outcomes?

## Increased (upper tail) earnings inequality: Women delay marriage

Increased (upper tail) earnings inequality: Women delay marriage

 $\cdot$  Marriage propensity decreases by 2 percentage points

## Increased (upper tail) earnings inequality: Women delay marriage

- $\cdot$  Marriage propensity decreases by 2 percentage points
- $\cdot$  Age at marriage increases by 0.4 years

## Increased (upper tail) earnings inequality: Women delay marriage

- · Marriage propensity decreases by 2 percentage points
- $\cdot$  Age at marriage increases by 0.4 years

#### While searching, women remain in school

## Increased (upper tail) earnings inequality: Women delay marriage

- · Marriage propensity decreases by 2 percentage points
- · Age at marriage increases by 0.4 years

#### While searching, women remain in school

 $\cdot$  Women get additional 0.6 years of education

## Increased (upper tail) earnings inequality: Women delay marriage

- · Marriage propensity decreases by 2 percentage points
- $\cdot$  Age at marriage increases by 0.4 years

#### While searching, women remain in school

- $\cdot$  Women get additional 0.6 years of education
- · Complete high school; Matriculate into college

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Overview				

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Overview				

Model: Marital Search

Data: Indian Human Development Survey (2005)

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Overview				

Model: Marital Search

Data: Indian Human Development Survey (2005)

**Empirical Strategy** 

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Overview				

Model: Marital Search

Data: Indian Human Development Survey (2005)

Empirical Strategy

Results: Impact of male income inequality on female marital outcomes

Educational attainment

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Overview				

Model: Marital Search

Data: Indian Human Development Survey (2005)

Empirical Strategy

Results: Impact of male income inequality on female marital outcomes · Educational attainment

Summary & Conclusion

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model				

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model				

## Woman faces male earnings distribution

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model				

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model				

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{a}$

Intro duction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model				

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{q}$

Rising inequality often asymmetric

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model				

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{a}$

Rising inequality often asymmetric



Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model				

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{q}$

Rising inequality often asymmetric

 $\cdot$  Upper-tail inequality increases R and search time for most women

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model				

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{q}$

Rising inequality often asymmetric

- $\cdot$  Upper-tail inequality increases R and search time for most women
- · Inequality in lower-tail will not affect most women

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model & Da	nta			

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{q}$

Rising inequality often asymmetric

- $\cdot$  Upper-tail inequality increases R and search time for most women
- · Inequality in lower-tail will not affect most women

## Indian Human Development Survey (2005): nationally representative

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model &	Data			

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{q}$

Rising inequality often asymmetric

- $\cdot$  Upper-tail inequality increases R and search time for most women
- · Inequality in lower-tail will not affect most women

Indian Human Development Survey (2005): nationally representative

- · Full sample: Impact on marital status (probability)
- · Ever-married sample: Impact on age at marriage

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model &	Data			

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{q}$

Rising inequality often asymmetric

- $\cdot$  Upper-tail inequality increases R and search time for most women
- · Inequality in lower-tail will not affect most women

Indian Human Development Survey (2005): nationally representative

- · Full sample: Impact on marital status (probability)
- · Ever-married sample: Impact on age at marriage

Measures

- $\cdot$  Male earnings: Outside earnings + farm/business income
- · Earnings distribution: Eligible men in each marriage market

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model &	Data			

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{q}$

Rising inequality often asymmetric

- $\cdot$  Upper-tail inequality increases R and search time for most women
- · Inequality in lower-tail will not affect most women

Indian Human Development Survey (2005): nationally representative

- · Full sample: Impact on marital status (probability)
- · Ever-married sample: Impact on age at marriage

Measures

- $\cdot$  Male earnings: Outside earnings + farm/business income
- · Earnings distribution: Eligible men in each marriage market
- →Unmarried; ages 18-35; not enrolled in school

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Model &	Data			

- $\cdot$  Reservation earnings level R
- $\cdot$  Probability of marriage q
- · Search time (age at marriage)  $\frac{1}{q}$

Rising inequality often asymmetric

- $\cdot$  Upper-tail inequality increases R and search time for most women
- · Inequality in lower-tail will not affect most women

Indian Human Development Survey (2005): nationally representative

- $\cdot$  Full sample: Impact on marital status (probability)
- $\cdot$  Ever-married sample: Impact on age at marriage

Measures

- $\cdot$  Male earnings: Outside earnings + farm/business income
- · Earnings distribution: Eligible men in each marriage market
- $\hookrightarrow$ Unmarried; ages 18-35; not enrolled in school

Marriage markets: Community (caste) and state

· Exploits regional and occupational earnings differences

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Empirical St	trategy			

#### Full sample: Regress marital status on male earnings inequality (LPM)

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Empirical	Strategy			

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Empirical	Strategy			

 $y_{ics} = 1$  if woman *i* in community *c* and state *s* is married

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Empirical	Strategy			

 $y_{ics} = 1$  if woman *i* in community *c* and state *s* is married  $(e^{90} - e^{50})_{cs}, (e^{50} - e^{10})_{cs}$ : male earnings inequality measures

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Empirical	Strategy			

 $y_{ics} = 1$  if woman *i* in community *c* and state *s* is married  $(e^{90} - e^{50})_{cs}, (e^{50} - e^{10})_{cs}$ : male earnings inequality measures  $e_{cs}^{50}$ : male earnings distribution location

 $y_{ics} = 1$  if woman *i* in community *c* and state *s* is married  $(e^{90} - e^{50})_{cs}, (e^{50} - e^{10})_{cs}$ : male earnings inequality measures  $e^{50}_{cs}$ : male earnings distribution location  $Age_{ics}$ : individual's age

 $y_{ics} = 1$  if woman *i* in community *c* and state *s* is married  $(e^{90} - e^{50})_{cs}, (e^{50} - e^{10})_{cs}$ : male earnings inequality measures  $e^{50}_{cs}$ : male earnings distribution location  $Age_{ics}$ : individual's age  $\eta_c$ : community fixed effects;  $\eta_s$ : state fixed effects

 $y_{ics} = 1$  if woman *i* in community *c* and state *s* is married  $(e^{90} - e^{50})_{cs}, (e^{50} - e^{10})_{cs}$ : male earnings inequality measures  $e^{50}_{cs}$ : male earnings distribution location  $Age_{ics}$ : individual's age  $\eta_c$ : community fixed effects;  $\eta_s$ : state fixed effects  $u_{ics}$ : error Ever-married sample: Regress age at marriage on male earnings inequality  $AgeMarriage_{ics} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50})_{cs} + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10})_{cs} + \beta_3e^{50}_{cs} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{ics}$ 

AgeMarriage<sub>ics</sub> age at marriage for woman *i* in caste *c* and state *s*  $(e^{90} - e^{50})_{cs}, (e^{50} - e^{10})_{cs}$ : male earnings inequality measures  $e_{cs}^{50}$ : male earnings distribution location  $Age_{ics}$ : individual's age  $\eta_c$ : community fixed effects;  $\eta_s$ : state fixed effects  $u_{ics}$ : error

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
↑Male income	inequality:	Female marriage rates		
	moquanty. v			
Driven by upper-ha	If inequality			

	Probability of marriage	
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.016***	_
	(0.006)	
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.007	
	(0.009)	
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.014	
	(0.013)	
Age of woman (years)	0.068***	
	(0.001)	
Community fixed effects?	Yes	
State fixed effects?	Yes	
N (women)	25,550	
R-squared	0.451	

	Probability of marriage	Age at marriage
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.016***	0.343***
	(0.006)	(0.109)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.007	0.055
	(0.009)	(0.287)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.014	-0.476**
- · ·	(0.013)	(0.233)
Age of woman (years)	0.068***	
,	(0.001)	
Community fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
N (women)	25,550	646
R-squared	0.451	0.174

Introduction

Model & Measures

Empirical Strategy

Results

Conclusion

# Testing alternative hypotheses

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Testing a	alternative hypoth	eses		

AH1: Are men searching longer for women?

No

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Testing	alternative hypothe	ses		
AH1: A	Are men searching longer f	or women?		No
AH2: /	Are women different across	high- and low-ineq	uality markets?	No

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Testing al	ternative hypothe	ses		
AH1: Are	e men searching longer fo	or women?		No
AH2: Are	women different across	high- and low-ineq	uality markets?	No
AH3: Are	e men absent from marria	age market?		No

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Testing alt	ternative hypothe	ses		
AH1: Are	men searching longer fo	or women?		No
AH2: Are	women different across	high- and low-inequa	ality markets?	No

No

No

- AH3: Are men absent from marriage market?
- AH4: Are male earnings proxying for (expected) female earnings?

# Testing alternative hypotheses

AH1: Are men searching longer for women?
AH2: Are women different across high- and low-inequality markets?
AH3: Are men absent from marriage market?
AH4: Are male earnings proxying for (expected) female earnings?
AH5: Are marriages delayed due to wedding expenditures (dowry)?

## Human capital implications of delayed marriage (ever-married sample)

## Human capital implications of delayed marriage (ever-married sample)

Impact on completed years of education

$$\textit{EduYears}_{\textit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\textit{ics}}$$

 Introduction
 Model & Measures
 Empirical Strategy
 Results
 Conclusion

 Human capital implications of delayed marriage (ever-married sample)

Impact on completed years of education

$$\textit{EduYears}_{\textit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\textit{ics}}$$

Identify level where additional education accrues

$$\mathit{level}_{\mathit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\mathit{ics}}$$

Introduction Model & Measures Empirical Strategy Results Conclusion Human capital implications of delayed marriage (ever-married sample)

Impact on completed years of education

$$\textit{EduYears}_{\textit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\textit{ics}}$$

Identify level where additional education accrues

$$\mathit{level}_{\mathit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3 e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\mathit{ics}}$$

Women attain more education, at high school/college

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirica	l Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Human capit	al implications	of delayed	marriage	(ever-married	sample)
	a a ma m l at a d' v a a ma d	. f			

Impact on completed years of education

$$\textit{EduYears}_{\textit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\textit{ics}}$$

Identify level where additional education accrues

$$\mathit{level}_{\mathit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3 e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\mathit{ics}}$$

#### Women attain more education, at high school/college

· Women accrue 0.6 additional years of education

	Years of education
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.607*
	(0.313)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.270
	(0.590)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.656
	(0.541)
Caste fixed effects?	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes
N (women)	627
R-squared	0.201

Impact on completed years of education

$$\textit{EduYears}_{\textit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\textit{ics}}$$

Identify level where additional education accrues

$$\mathit{level}_{\mathit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\mathit{ics}}$$

#### Women attain more education, at high school/college

- · Women accrue 0.6 additional years of education
- · Complete high school; Matriculate into college

	Years of education	Any education	5+ years	8+ years	10+ years	12+ years	15+years
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.607*	0.013	0.016	0.052	0.042	0.076***	0.057***
	(0.313)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.035)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.021)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.270	0.052	0.035	-0.042	0.009	0.057	-0.010
	(0.590)	(0.047)	(0.049)	(0.066)	(0.060)	(0.058)	(0.053)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.656	- 0.1 24**	-0.104**	-0.068	- 0. 065	-0.041	0.099*
	(0.541)	(0.051)	(0.048)	(0.047)	(0.045)	(0.057)	(0.056)
Caste fixed effects?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N (women)	627	627	627	627	627	627	627
R-squared	0.201	0.1 39	0.130	0.164	0.176	0.167	0.232

Impact on completed years of education

$$\textit{EduYears}_{\textit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\textit{ics}}$$

Identify level where additional education accrues

$$\mathit{level}_{\mathit{ics}} = \beta_1(e^{90} - e^{50}) + \beta_2(e^{50} - e^{10}) + \beta_3 e^{50} + \eta_c + \eta_s + u_{\mathit{ics}}$$

#### Women attain more education, at high school/college

- · Women accrue 0.6 additional years of education
- · Complete high school; Matriculate into college

	Years of education	Any education	5+ years	8+ ye ars	10+ years	12+ years	15+years
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.607*	0.013	0.016	0.052	0.042	0.076***	0.057***
	(0.313)	(0.026)	(0.027)	(0.035)	(0.029)	(0.027)	(0.021)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.270	0.052	0.035	-0.042	0.009	0.057	-0.010
	(0.590)	(0.047)	(0.049)	(0.066)	(0.060)	(0.058)	(0.053)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.656	- 0.1 24**	-0.104**	-0.068	- 0. 065	-0.041	0.099*
	(0.541)	(0.051)	(0.048)	(0.047)	(0.045)	(0.057)	(0.056)
Caste fixed effects?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
N (women)	627	627	627	627	627	627	627
R-squared	0.201	0.1 39	0.130	0.164	0.176	0.167	0.232

Women w/o education delay ma	rriage	Young girls' education unaffected	)
V. Chari, A. Maertens, S.V. Srinivasan	Income Inequality and Marital Outcomes	September 29-30, 2014	9/1

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Conclusion				

Earnings inequality impacts female marital outcomes in India

- $\cdot$  Increases in upper-half inequality delay marriage; no effect from lower-half
- $\cdot$  Results robust to alternative hypotheses, measures, regression samples

Introduction	Model & Measures	Empirical Strategy	Results	Conclusion
Conclusion				

Earnings inequality impacts female marital outcomes in India

- $\cdot$  Increases in upper-half inequality delay marriage; no effect from lower-half
- $\cdot$  Results robust to alternative hypotheses, measures, regression samples

Corresponding effect on educational attainment, at higher levels

# Thank you!

A.V. Chari, A. Maertens, S.V. Srinivasan Income Inequality and Marital Outcomes September 29-30, 2014 11 / 11





Back

## AH1: Male marriage uncorrelated with female earnings dispersion

	Probability of marriage
Female earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.001
	(0.004)
Female earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.004
	(0.008)
Female earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.020
	(0.012)
Age of man (years)	0.047***
	(0.000)
Community fixed effects?	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes
N (men)	37,841
R-squared	0.546



Introduction Model & Measures Empirical Strategy Results Conclusion

## AH2: Women in high-inequality markets are not observably different

## AH2: Women in high-inequality markets are not observably different

	Age at menarche	Height (cm)	
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.035	1.106	
	(0.080)	(1.310)	
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.153	-0.831	
	(0.179)	(3.878)	
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.091	1.590	
	(0.237)	(3.706)	

Community fixed effects?	Yes	Yes	
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes	
N (women)	646	646	
R-squared	0.235	0.086	

## AH2: Women in high-inequality markets are not observably different

	Age at menarche	Height (cm)	Age at marriage
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.035	1.106	0.335***
	(0.080)	(1.310)	(0.106)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.153	-0.831	0.054
	(0.179)	(3.878)	(0.289)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.091	1.590	-0.489**
-	(0.237)	(3.706)	(0.240)
Age at menarche			0.041
			(0.060)
Height (cm)			0.006**
			(0.002)
Community fixed effects?	Yes	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes	Yes
N (women)	646	646	646
R-squared	0.235	0.086	0.180



# AH3: Men are not absent from marriage market

	Probability of marriage	Age at marriage
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.014**	0.339***
	(0.005)	(0.109)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.002	0.048
	(0.008)	(0.296)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.002	-0.460
	(0.011)	(0.245)
Age of woman (years)	0.068***	
	(0.001)	
Male:Female ratio	0.044***	-0.239
	(0.011)	(0.332)
Community fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
N (women)	25,530	644
R-squared	0.451	0.174



Conclusion

Back

# AH4: Male earnings not proxying for female earnings

	Probability of marriage	Age at marriage
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.021***	0.467***
	(0.007)	(0.139)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.012	0.191
	(0.009)	(0.312)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.010	-0.328
	(0.013)	(0.274)
Age of woman (years)	0.068***	
	(0.001)	
Female earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.012**	-0.283
	(0.006)	(0.182)
Female earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.006	0.199
	(0.010)	(0.321)
Female earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.017	-0.581
	(0.014)	(0.527)
Community fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
N (women)	25,550	646
R-squared	0.451	0.179

Back

# AH5: Wedding expenditures are not prohibitive

	Probability of marriage	Age at marriage
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.013**	0.386***
	(0.006)	(0.129)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.005	0.066
	(0.009)	(0.281)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.011	-0.506**
	(0.013)	(0.230)
Age of woman (years)	0.068***	
	(0.001)	
Wedding expenditure	-0.003	-0.041
	(0.002)	(0.076)
Community fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
N (women)	25,550	646
R-squared	0.451	0.175



Conclusi<u>on</u>

# Women with no education still delay marriage

 $\textbf{Channel: Income inequality} \rightarrow \textbf{education}$ 

	Age at marriage	
	(1)	(2)
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.311***	0.311**
	(0.117)	(0.119)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.017	-0.076
	(0.283)	(0.291)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.377	-0.348
-	(0.231)	(0.236)
Female no education indicator	-0.868***	
	(0.224)	
Female less than primary indicator		-0.934***
		(0.205)
Male 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> * No education	0.282	
	(0.239)	
Male 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> * No education	0.097	
	(0.179)	
Male 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> * Less than primary		0.183
		(0.217)
Male 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> * Less than primary		0.287
		(0.169)
Net effect	0.593**	0.494**
	(0.236)	(0.209)
Community fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
N (women)	627	627
R-squared	0.202	0.208

A.V. Chari, A. Maertens, S.V. Srinivasan Income Inequality and Marital Outcomes

Back

# Education outcomes unchanged for young girls

	Currently enrolled in school	Completed years of education
Male earnings: 90 <sup>th</sup> -50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.011	0.023
	(0.012)	(0.017)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> -10 <sup>th</sup> percentile	0.023	0.001
	(0.018)	(0.039)
Male earnings: 50 <sup>th</sup> percentile	-0.045	-0.022
	(0.024)	(0.054)
Age of woman (years)	0.219***	0.389***
	(0.003)	(0.014)
Community fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
State fixed effects?	Yes	Yes
N (girls)	19,446	19,446
R-squared	0.552	0.571

Back