



The Gini Coefficient and Negative Income: A Comment

Z. M. Berrebi; Jacques Silber

Oxford Economic Papers, New Series, Vol. 37, No. 3 (Sep., 1985), 525-526.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0030-7653%28198509%292%3A37%3A3%3C525%3ATGCANI%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0>

Oxford Economic Papers is currently published by Oxford University Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/oup.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE GINI COEFFICIENT AND NEGATIVE INCOME: A COMMENT

By Z. M. BERREBI and JACQUES SILBER

In a paper published recently (1982) Chau-Nan Chen, Tien-Wang Tsaur and Tong-Shiang Rhai (henceforth C.T.R.) proposed a modified expression of the Gini coefficient for the case where some incomes Y_i are negative. Their analysis was limited to the case where there exists a k such that $\sum_{i=1}^k Y_i = 0$, although in a footnote C.T.R. proposed an expression for the case where $\sum_{i=1}^k Y_i < 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{k+1} Y_i > 0$. The latter expression however, is not correct and should be written, using their notations, as

$$G^* = \frac{1 + 2(A - C)}{1 + 2A} = \frac{(2/n) \sum_{j=1}^n jy_j - \frac{n+1}{n}}{1 + (2/n) \sum_{j=1}^k jy_j + (1/n) \sum_{j=1}^k y_j \left[\frac{\sum_{j=1}^k y_j}{y_{k+1}} - (1 + 2k) \right]}$$

since in such a case

$$A = -\frac{1}{n} \left[\frac{1}{2}y_1 + \left(\frac{1}{2}y_2 + y_1\right) + \dots + \left(\frac{1}{2}y_k + y_{k-1} + \dots + y_1\right) \right] + \frac{1}{2n} \frac{\left(\sum_{j=1}^k y_j\right)^2}{y_{k+1}}.$$

Another possible, eventually simpler, solution to this problem is to apply Dalton's principle of population (which the Gini coefficient verifies) as follows.

Define

$$\frac{-\sum_{j=1}^k y_j}{\sum_{j=1}^{k+1} y_j - \sum_{j=1}^k y_j} = \frac{f}{m}$$

where m and f are (positive) integers and f/m is a fraction without common factors. If a new population, of size $n \times m$, is now defined where m individuals earn each the income Y_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$), it can be easily proved that in such a case there exists a number k' ($0 < k' = mk + f < n$) such that $\sum_{j=1}^{k'} y_j = 0$, in

which case the general expression (9) of C.T.R. can be applied without difficulty.

Bar-Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

REFERENCE

CHAU-NAN CHEN, TIEN-WANG TSAUR and TONG-SHIENG RHAI. "The Gini Coefficient and Negative Income", *Oxford Economic Papers*, XXXIV (November 1982), 473-76.