

Income inequality in the uk

[Literature](#), [Russian Literature](#)



Summary of the Article: Income Inequality in the UK Inequality manifests in differently throughout and not just in income. Nonetheless, it is the income inequality that gets more attention. Economists measure income inequality using two methods; the Gini coefficient and the ratio of income. The Gini coefficient is a summary of the degree of inequality in the income distribution in one number. A higher number shows more unequal distribution of income. According to (Cribb, 2013) the rise in the level of income inequality in industrialized nations lead by the host of English speaking nations such as the UK, US, Australia and New Zealand have been as a result of a host of factors.

These factors are numerous and include; increases in the financial returns of education, the effects of trade liberalization, changes in government tax and welfare policy and changes in employment patterns (Cribb, 2013).

Technological progress has increased financial returns to education to which is thought of as the wage premium that more highly skilled workers enjoy over less skilled workers. Answers to profound income inequality have always been related to the four reasons; however, more baffling is the rapid increase in the income of the workers at the top, for instance (Cribb, 2013), asserts that those who are in the top 0. 1% have had their income rising faster than those who occupy the top 1%. Nonetheless, globalization and international labour mobility has been cited to be leading cause of the increasing disparity.

Evaluation of the Text in relation to the Assignment

The purpose of the text is to explore income inequality in the UK and achieves the purpose as it vividly provides the answer to the quest of the

assignment; causes of inequality in the UK. The paper, Income inequality in the UK, by Jonathan Cribb was published by a respectable institution, the Economic review on February 2013.

Reference List

Cribb, J. (2013). Income inequality in the UK. The Economic Review. 30, 16-19.