UNIVERSIDAD DE LA REPÚBLICA

FACULTAD DE CIENCIAS SOCIALES

DEPARTAMENTO DE ECONOMÍA

Tesis Maestría en Economía Internacional

Changes in wage inequality in Uruguay: A study considering technological change impact on occupational tasks

Sandra Rodríguez López

Tutor: Graciela Sanromán





ABSTRACT

Changes in wage inequality in Uruguay: A study considering technological change impact on occupational tasks

Based on the "task approach" to labor markets this research seeks to test Autor, Levy and Murnane's routinization hypothesis analyzing the contribution of technology content of tasks as another explanation factor to the distribution of men wages in Uruguay during the nineties and the first decade of the 2000s. To do so, using O*NET data, we construct two indexes of the task content of occupations to capture the potential effect of technological change on wage distribution. We use unconditional quantile regressions (UQR) and a decomposition method based on the recentered influence function (RIF) regression approach of Firpo, Fortin and Lemieux (2007, 2010). Our estimates suggest that during the nineties as well as the 2000s changes in the distribution of men wages have been led by changes at the top end of the distribution explaining the increase in inequality during the first period and its decrease in the second. Technological task content of occupations contributes to explain changes in the distribution of men wages, but these effects are better capture by the information content of task rather than the automation content, so we cannot confirm ALM routinization hypothesis.

JEL Classification: J3, J5

KEYWORDS: wage inequality, occupational tasks, RIF-regressions, technology.

Esta investigación busca testear la hipótesis de rutinización de Autor, Levy y Murnane analizando la contribución del contenido tecnológico de las tareas como otro factor para explicar los cambios en la distribución de los salarios de los hombres en Uruguay en las últimas dos décadas, basando la aproximación al mercado de trabajo en el "enfoque de tareas". Para ello se construyen dos índices del contenido de tareas de las ocupaciones a fin de capturar el efecto del cambio tecnológico sobre la distribución salarial. Se estiman regresiones quantílicas no condicionales y se descompone la distribución salarial utilizando un método de descomposición basado en el enfoque de Regresiones RIF de Firpo, Fortin y Lemieux (2007,2010). Nuestras estimaciones sugieren que que tanto en los noventa como en la primera década del 2000 los cambios en la distribución salarial de los hombres han sido liderados por el tramo superior de la distribución explicando el aumento de la desigualdad en el primer período y su reducción en el segundo. El contenido tecnológico de las tareas de las ocupaciones contribuye a explicar los cambios en la distribución salarial, sin embargo estos cambios son mejor captados por el contenido de información de las tareas más que por su contenido de automatización, por lo que no es posible confirmar la hipótesis de rutinización de ALM.

PALABRAS CLAVES: desigualdad salarial, tareas ocupacionales, regresiones RIF, tecnología

Table of contents

I.	Introduction
II.	Literature review
III.	Data9
	III.1 Task content measures11
IV.	Wage dispersion in Uruguay – Descriptive evidence
V.	Decomposition methodology
VI.	Decomposition results: Occupational Characteristics vs. Other Factors
	IV.1 RIF – regressions
	IV.2 Decomposition results
	IV.2.1 Overall Decomposition Results
	IV.2.2 Detailed Decomposition Results
VII. Concluding remarks	
References	
Tables	
Figures	
Methodological appendix63	
Appendix tables	
Appendix figures	

.

iv

.

I. Introduction

Labor markets, both in developed and developing countries had shown an increasing demand for highly educated workers and had paid increasing wages for skilled workers. Therefore, studies on inequality in labor markets had focus on changes in the returns to skills. For many decades along the 20th century, the employment perspectives as well as the wage level had had a direct increasing relationship with each additional year or education. From the theoretical point of view this evolution has been explained by what Acemoglu and Autor (2011) had called the "canonical model", which assumes two distinct skill groups that perform two different and imperfectly substitutable tasks or produce two imperfectly substitutable goods. Technology is assumed to take a factor-augmenting form which, by complementing either high or low skill workers, can generate skill biased demand shifts (Autor and Dorn, 2012).

However, the canonical model cannot explain certain patterns observed during the nineties in labor markets of industrialized economies, which contradict the traditional hypothesis of a monotonic increasing demand for those more qualified together with a decreasing demand for the less skilled. Notably, the continuous rise in wage inequality at the top of the wage distribution and the stagnant or even decreasing wage dispersion at the bottom (which has been referred as "polarization"); the broad-based increases in employment in both high-education, high-wage occupations and low-education low-wage occupations relative to middle skilled occupation; the rapid diffusion of new technologies that directly substitute capital for labor in tasks previously performed by moderately-skilled workers (Acemoglu and Autor, 2011).

The main hypothesis of Autor, Levy and Murnane (2003) (from here on ALM) - commonly known as the "routinization hypothesis" - later formalized by Acemoglu and Autor (2011), is that the polarization in the labor market – that is the fallen in the employment and wages in the

middle of the skill distribution relative to the top and the bottom of the skilled distribution – is explained by the fact that technological change complement and enhance the productivity of analytical tasks performed mostly by highly educated workers, substitute the routine tasks often performed by middle educated workers and have a relatively minor effect in the cost of performing manual non-routine tasks related to personal services that demand low educated workers. Therefore, according to ALM's hypothesis the returns to occupational tasks have a role to explain changes in wage distribution, increasing wages at the extremes of the distribution relative to those at the middle.

Although the polarization pattern is less evident in Latin-American countries, the evolution on wage distribution during the 2000s also contradicts the predictions of the canonical model. While the raise in returns to tertiary education during nineties is in line with the ALM's hypothesis that ICTs complement the productivity of task mostly associated to be performed by highly educated workers, after a decade of increasing inequality in labor earnings, Latin-American labor markets, including the Uruguayan one, have assisted to a sharp decline in inequality of wages during the 2000s mainly due to a reduction in the returns to skills and in particular the return to secondary education (World Bank, 2012).

For the case of Uruguay, many studies have analyzed the distribution of wages in the labor market (Alves, Amarante, Salas and Vigorito, 2012; Alves, Brum, and Yapor, 2009; Alves, Arim, Salas and Vigorito, 2009; Arim and Zoppolo, 2002; Gradín and Rossi, 2000, 2001 and 2006; Gonzalez and Miles, 1999; Sanguinetti, 2007; Vigorito, 1994; among others). Depending on the period of analysis some have found evidence of polarization (Gradín and Rossi, 2000, 2001 and 2006) and of increasing returns to skill associated to a greater demand for skilled workers. However, these studies had focused on the qualification of workers rather than on the task content of the occupations that they perform, which under ALM's hypothesis have a role to explain changes in the distribution of labor earnings.

As the increasing use of technology is a global phenomenon it is expected that its impacts also affect labor markets in emerging economies, such as Uruguay, although certain lag may exist. However, while in developed countries the task approach and the ALM routinization

hypothesis have attracted a large amount of interest recently, mainly because of the polarization observed in the distribution of wages, there is no (at least we have not found) study considering the task content of job to analyze the distribution of wages in developing countries.

The goal of this paper is to consider the technology content of tasks as another explanation factor to the distribution of men wages in Uruguay and test ALM's routinization hypothesis. We are particularly interested in addressing the following questions: To what extent did the technology task content of occupations contribute to changes in the distribution of wages in Uruguay in the last two decades? Did the change in wage distribution was due to changes in observed characteristics of individual or because the returns to these characteristics changed over time?

To answer these questions we follow Firpo, Fortin and Lemieux (2011). First, we measure the task content of occupations using O*NET data and construct two indexes of tasks content to capture the potential effect of technological change on wage distribution. This allowed us to rank each occupation¹ according to the grade of automation and information required to perform the tasks associated to them, and then to incorporate this indexes into the decomposition analysis. An advantage of the task-based framework is that it can be use to investigate the implications of capital (embodied in machines) directly displacing workers from tasks that they previously performed. Although, in general, it is expected that task performed by workers with any level of skills are subject to machine displacement, the set of task most subject to machine displacement in the last decades are those that are routine or codifiable. That is, tasks that are primarily, though not exclusively, performed by medium skill (semiskilled) workers (Acemoglu and Autor, 2011).

Second, we estimate unconditional quantile effects using the recentered influence function (RIF) regression approach of Firpo, Fortin and Lemieux (2007, 2009, 2010) (Firpo, Fortin and

^{1.} For the period 1991-1999 we create the task content indexes of occupations classified according to the COTA 70, while for the period 2001-2010 we used the CIUO-88 according to the codifiers used by the INE to classify occupations in the different Current Household Survey.

Lemieux, 2009) and decompose them to quantify the contribution of occupations, as summarized by the task content of jobs, in overall changes in the unconditional distribution of wages over the last two decades. An important advantage of this methodology is that unlike other decomposition methods, this one allows us to perform detailed decompositions for any distributional statistic for which an influence function can be computed, including quantiles, variance and the Gini index. At the same time, while the aggregate decomposition separates the effect of changes in characteristics and coefficients, the detailed decomposition allows a partition of the overall components into the contribution of each individual covariate (or group of covariates) to the differences in the distributional statistic, which let us compare the contribution of changes in the returns to occupational tasks to other explanations such as changes in the labor market returns to general skills (experience and education), which have been the most common explanations to changes in wage distribution.

We consider two periods with completely different characteristics regarding the evolution of wage inequality. Indeed, while during the nineties wage inequality in Uruguay increased systematically, during the 2000s the difference between the extremes of the distribution decreased. This allows us to evaluate the "routinization" hypothesis in light of two very distinct processes.

Up to our knowledge, this is the first study to use UQR and the RIF-regression decomposition approach to analyze the distribution of wages in Uruguay. It is also the first attempt to introduce the "task approach" as an explanation to the evolution in the distribution of wages in Uruguay, a relatively new approach which, though still incipient, has been gaining growing attention.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II, summarizes the main results find in the literature. In Section III we describe the wage data used and introduce the measures of task content computed from the O*NET data. In Section IV, we document the changes in the level and dispersion of wages across the different periods of analysis and Section V presents the decomposition methodology based on recentered influence function regressions. In section VI, we show the empirical results and we conclude in Section VII.

II. Literature review

Since the nineties the wage structure in many developed countries, reflect a polarization pattern where the employments that require middle educated people started to decline as a proportion of total employment, while the share in employment of low and high specialization levels increased.² Simultaneously, the evolution of the respective wages have followed a U shape, with bigger increases in the "upper tail" of the distribution of wages, moderate increases in the "lower tail" and relative lower increases in the median of the distribution (Autor and Dorn, 2012). This pattern contradicts the premise of skilled biased technology change which leads to a greater demand for skilled workers creating a permanent increase in inequality among skilled and unskilled workers.

According to Autor et al. (2003), a hypothesis to explain this "polarization" is related to the new information and communication technology (ICT), and to the non-neutrality of the technology progress. Critically, computers do not compete directly with abstract and/or analytical and coordination tasks that characterize tasks performed by highly skilled workers like professionals or managers, enhancing their productivity while performing the routine part of their work faster. However, this same technology directly compete with routine tasks, which although requiring middle qualified workers, can be reduced to a group of instructions that can be easily codified and followed by a machine and therefore can be automatized. On the other extreme, occupations that rely on "manual" tasks and flexible interpersonal communication may require very little specialization and may not require a lot of skill but may be difficult to automatize. Consequently, in these occupations (which are generally associated to personal services occupations³) the automation of routine tasks has no substitution or

^{2.} See Autor, Levy and Murnane (2003), Autor, Katz and Kearney (2006), Goos and Manning (2007), Antonczyk, Fitzemberger and Leuschner (2009), Goos, Manning and Salomons (2009, 2011), Dorn (2009), Michaels, Natraj and Van Reenen (2010), Jung and Mercenier (2010), Antonczyk, DeLeire and Fitzenberger (2010), Firpo, Fortin and Lemieux (2011). 3. The secular rise in employment and wages in service occupations with low qualification is caused by the interaction between consumer preferences, which favor variety instead of specialization, and non-neutral technology progress, that reduces the cost of performing routine tasks but has a relative minor effect on the cost of performing personal services tasks. If consumer preferences do not admit substitutes for tangible products of service occupations – such as meals in restaurants, house cleaning, security services and home health service – non neutral technology progress concentrated in the production of goods (that is non-service occupations) has the potential to increase aggregated demand for services and to rise the employment and wages of services occupations (Autor and Dorn, 2012).

complementation effect. Therefore, information and communication technology raise the aggregated demand for skilled work and reduce the demand for routine work reducing its wages and moving unskilled workers to service occupations. So in this last sector the effect over wages is ambiguous because while it increases the demand for unskilled workers it also raises its offer, so it is not possible to determinate in advance what will happen with wages.

Autor et al. (2003) and Autor and Dorn (2012) find evidence to support ALM 's routinization hypothesis in the US labor market. Using information from the United State Labor Department regarding tasks involved in different occupations, they classify the different occupations into routine or non-routine and evaluate their vulnerability to automation. They find evidence that the polarization of the US labor market between 1980 and 2005 was more evident in those employments with tasks more vulnerable to automation.

Similar "polarization" patterns can also be seen in the nineties in different industrialized countries. Michaels et al. (2010) using industry level data for 11 industrial economies – 9 Europeans, US and Japan –test ALM's ICT- based polarization hypothesis for the period 1980 - 2004. They find that ICTs can explain up to a quarter of the raise in the demand for college educated since 1980. The industries with faster growth in ICT technologies (measured by their expenses on ICT and their expenses on R&D) also had a greater increase in their demand for high educated workers and greater reductions in their demand for middle educated workers.

Goos et al. (2009, 2011), describe polarization for several OECD countries in the nineties similar to that found for the US and the UK, with an increase in the share in employment of managers, professionals an low educated service personnel relative to manufacturing workers and occupations with routine clerk tasks. Using a model to capture the effects of technology, globalization, institutions and the demand for goods in the demand of different occupations, they find evidence that the ALM routinization hypothesis is the main factor to explain the heaps observed in the employment structure.

More recently, Acemoglu and Autor (2011) developed a Ricardian model of the labor market based on the task content of jobs to explain the effect of technological change on wage

inequality. They extend and adapt the canonical model to allow the endogenous allocation of skill groups across tasks and workers across skill groups. In the context of this model, technical change can affect both the productivity of different types of workers in all tasks, such as the canonical model predicts, but also in specific tasks, thus changing the comparative advantage of the different types of workers with low, medium or high skills. As the model distinguish between "tasks" and "skills", it treats skills, technologies, and trade or offshoring as offering competing inputs for accomplishing various tasks, and the final use of each input to perform a certain task depends on its costs and comparative advantage. Therefore, the relative wages of low, medium and high skilled workers are determined by relative supplies and tasks allocations. Although, the canonical model fits as a especial case of this task-based model, while in the canonical model one factor-augmenting technical progress always increases all wages, in this more general model it can reduce the wage of certain groups. Thus, technological change could explain why wages in the middle of the distribution fell in relation to wages at the "upper" and the "bottom" tail.

Like industrialized economies Uruguay has also experienced a growing inequality process in wage distribution especially during the nineties and the first years of the 2000s. Most studies have attributed this increased inequality to increasing returns to education.

Vigorito (1994) and Gradín and Rossi (2000, 2006) observe an increase in the first and last wage quantile relative to the middle of the distribution. In particular, Gradín and Rossi (2000, 2006) find that for the period 1989-1997 in the case of wages there was redistribution from the middle to the extremes that turned out in an increased polarization of wages, similarly to what is observed in the US since the second half of the eighties. In Montevideo, these authors explained polarization by education and age, which they consider to be consistent with increasing returns to education and experience. In the case of the rest of the country polarization is explained by public versus private sector and activity sector. Besides, for the period 2001-2009 Espino (2011) finds that regarding employment creation the most dynamic occupations were those that require primary school or tertiary.

Contrary to Gradín and Rossi (2000, 2006), Alves, Arim et al. (2009), using data for a longer period that takes into account data since 1981 to 2007, find that the polarization pattern is less clear. Moreover, the evolution of inequality, as well as its determinants, is different in the upper and the lower end of the wage distribution. While for wages above the median of the distribution, the increase in inequality took place mainly during the nineties and was due to increasing returns to observed characteristics, especially to education. At the lower end, the increase in inequality occurred during the economic crises (1981 and 2002) and was explained by changes in unobserved characteristics.

Alves et al. (2009) and Sanguinetti (2007) using conditional quantile regressions find that wage differences among workers in Uruguay are not homogeneous along the wage distribution, highlighting the growing profile in the distribution of sex wage gap and the returns to education. Regarding this last issue, they observe a differentiated structure among education levels, and also that this differentials raise with wages, especially for the upper levels, which reflects a bigger wage dispersion not only between but also within the education levels, meaning that there are different returns to individuals that share the same formal level of education.

Therefore, there is evidence that the evolution of inequality in Uruguayan labor market has not followed a monotonic pattern in the upper and the lower ends of wage distribution. Until now, studies have attributed the increase in inequality in the upper tail of the distribution to changes in return to skill, supporting the skilled biased technology hypothesis. But this does not explain changes at the lower end of the distribution where, according to the routinization hypothesis, technology has a role to play and the task approach can shed light to explain changes in the distribution of wages.

III. Data

The empirical analysis is based on data from the Current Household Survey (Encuesta Continua de Hogares, ECH), collected by the National Statistics Institute (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, INE). The ECH provides information about socio-demographic variables, labor characteristics and income. For every year of analysis we pool two years of data together to improve the precision of the estimates. We consider two different periods 1991 to 1999 and 2001 to 2010. In the first case, we use 1991-92 as the base year and 1998-99 as the end year⁴, and in the second case we use 2001-02 as the base year and 2009-10 as the end year. The reason for choosing these different periods is that there was a methodological change in the classification of occupations, so by choosing these two periods we avoid distortions in the analysis due to changes in coding of occupations.⁵

During the different periods of analysis there were some changes in the ECH's samples that could cause some incompatibility problems. In 1991, 1992 and 1998 the ECH's sample considered locations from 900 and more inhabitants. In 1999, based on the General Census of Population and Housing from 1996, the sample started considering locations from 5,000 and more inhabitants. In 2006 the sample changed again based on the information of the 2004 Census Phase 1. The samples for 2009 and 2010 include the whole country: all the locations and rural zones. To avoid problems with the changes in the sample we only consider the observations corresponding to locations of 5,000 or more inhabitants.

Like all reference studies regarding the "task approach", to carry out this research we focus on men to avoid self selection issues. Including women would introduce bias into the analysis and therefore would require implementing some not trivial methodological changes. Moreover, as previous research on our specific topic of interest focus on men we considered it better to make the research as similar as possible to studies for other countries so as to get comparable

^{4.} Alves, Arim et al. (2009) analyze the wage distribution inequality between 1981 and 2007. They find that the greater increase in wage distribution inequality during the period of analysis occurred between 1991 and 1999.

^{5.} We also analyze the evolution of wages during the period 2001 to 2006 to avoid including into the analysis institutional changes such as the Tax Reform implemented in July 2007 and the Health Reform implemented in 2008, both o which had a direct impact on wages received and declared in the ECH.

results. This does not mean that the difference between men and women are irrelevant in the labor market or that the reduction that is observed in the sex wage gap has no importance to explain the reduction of wage inequality. On the contrary, considering this issue is an interesting route for future research.

The study considers active men workers under a dependence relationship - i.e. workers that receive a salary whether they work for the private or public sector – between the ages of 25 to 64. As wage measure we used the real log hourly wage, obtained by dividing earnings⁶ deflated by Consumer Price Index and divided by hours of work. The ECH inquires the hours worked the week before the interview but the wage received the previous month. Thus, we assumed that hours worked during the week previous to the interview are the same for the whole month before the interview, and divide the wages by 4.3, before calculating the hourly wage.⁷ We consider only wages and hours worked at the main occupation.

To compute measures of technological change we classify occupations according to their task content. As for Uruguay there are no studies nor a systematic database of task content of occupations, we use for this purpose the O*NET 15.0 data available from the National Center for O*NET Development⁸ and construct a crosswalk between the Classification of Occupation for the Americas (COTA-70) occupation coding, used for the nineties period, and the Standard Occupational Classification Code used in the O*NET classification of occupations (O*NET – SOC), with currently 974 occupations data. For the period 2001-2010 we repeat the same procedure with the International Uniform Classification of Occupation (CIUO-88)⁹, which

^{6.} To avoid differences due to changes on data available to compute monthly earnings we only consider salaries without other benefits such as earnings in species, holiday salaries, tips, commissions, etc.

^{7.} To avoid getting hourly wages atypically high, due to wrong declarations of hours of work, we eliminate the observations with less than six hours of work during the week.

^{8.} Available at www.onetonline.org The O*Net is the successor of the Dictionary of Occupational Titles (DOT), the database mostly used in research related to the ALM routinization hypothesis. The O*NET program constructs a database (now of 974 occupations), containing information on standardized and occupation-specific descriptors, which is continually updated by surveying a broad range of workers from each occupation. The O*NET database was initially elaborated by a group of occupation analysts; this information is augmented by ongoing surveys of each occupation's worker population and occupation experts. These statistical results are incorporated into new versions of the database on an annual schedule, to provide up-to-date information on occupations as they evolve over time.

^{9.} Actually, what is used is a national adaptation of the CIUO-88 (CNUO-95). The CIUO-88 presents a pyramidal hierarchical structure formed by 10 mayor groups at the mayor level of aggregation, subdivided in 28 main subgroups, 116 subgroups and 390 primary groups. According to the Guide to Codify Occupations published by INE (1996), the statistic unit for the CIUO-88 is the job, defined as the group of tasks performed or that should be performed by a person to accomplish it. A group of

was used by the INE to classify occupations since the 2001 ECH. In particular, we consider information and automation content using O*NET data. We construct indexes for 285 of 3-digit occupations available in the COTA-70 and used in the ECH (1991-1999) and 115 indexes for 3-digit occupations available in the CIUO-88. As there is no exact correspondence between the SOC codes and those of the COTA-70 or CIUO-88, when more than one SOC code corresponds to only one COTA-70 or CIUO-88 codes, its task content index is the simple average of the correspondent SOC task content indexes.¹⁰

Although, the mapping might be imperfect, and the way of performing tasks in the US might not be exactly the same as in Uruguay, therefore the characteristics of occupations between one country and the other being different, we believe - as it is shown below - that the main characteristics regarding the possible influence of technology change on occupations remain similar especially when we consider the classification at a more aggregated level.

III.1 Task content measures

We construct the task content measures using the O*NET 15.0 database. The O*NET content model organizes the key features of an occupation into a standardized, measurable set of variables called "descriptors". The job information is classified into a structured system of six major categories describing the day – to – day aspects of the job and the qualifications and interests of the typical worker:

- Worker Characteristics (Abilities; Occupational Interests and Work Values; Work Styles)
- Worker Requirements (Skills; Knowledge; Education)
- Experience Requirements (Experience and Training; Skills and Entry Requirements; Licensing)

jobs with very similar tasks is defined as an occupation. The ability to perform the tasks inherent to a specific job defines the competency. The important thing to define an occupation are the competences needed to perform the tasks inherent to it, and not to know if the worker that performs certain occupation acquired its skills through formal or informal education and experience; it does not matter either if the worker is better or worse qualified that another one in the same occupation. 10. See Appendix Table A.1.

- Occupational requirements (Generalized Work Activities; Organizational Context; Work Context)
- Occupation-Specific Information (Task; Tools and Technology).

· ..-

• Workforce Characteristics (Labor Market Information; Occupational Outlook)

Following Firpo et al. (2011) and Jensen and Kletzer (2010) we focus on the "Occupational Requirements" of occupations designed to provide "a comprehensive set of variables or detailed elements that describe what various occupations require" (National Center for O*NET Development 2006, 20, cited in Jensen and Kletzer, 2010). In the spirit of Autor et al. (2003) to measure routine versus non routine and cognitive versus non cognitive aspects of occupation, we consider two categories thought to be positively related to technology: "Information content" and "automation/routinization". The first one intends to identify occupations with high information content that are likely to be affected by ICTs, and within the Generalized and Detailed Work Activities subdomain we consider the following work activities: "Getting information", "Processing information", "Analyzing data or information", "Interacting with computers" and "Documenting/Recording information".

The second one is constructed using the Work Context subdomain, to reflect the degree of potential automation: "degree of automation", "importance of repeating same tasks", "structured versus unstructured work (reverse)", "pace determined by speed of equipment", and "spend time making repetitive motions".

We compute two different measures of task content: i) the information content of jobs and, ii) the degree of automation of the job and whether it represents routine tasks. For the construction of these indexes we follow Firpo (2011). For each occupation, the O*NET provides information on the "importance" and "level" of required work activity and on the frequency of five categorical level of work context.¹¹ "Importance" is the rating of answers to

^{11.} We consider the following work activities: "Getting information" (4.A.1.a.1), "Processing information" (4.A.2.a.2), "Analyzing data or information" (4.A.2.a.4), "Interacting with computers" (4.A.3.b.1), "Documenting/Recording information" (4.A.3.b.6) and the following work context categories: "degree of automation" (4.C.3.b.2), "importance of repeating same tasks" (4.C.3.b.7), "structured versus unstructured work (reverse)" (4.C.3.b.8), "pace determined by speed of equipment" (4.C.3.d.3) and "spend time making repetitive motions" (4.C.2.d.1.i).

the question: "How important is this skill to performance of the job?" Answers vary from "not important" to "extremely important", on a scale of 1 to 5. "Level" is the response to "What level of this skill is needed to perform this job?" ranging from low to high in a scale from 1 to 7 (Jensen and Kletzer, 2010), while the categorical levels of the frequency element of the work context range from never to every day in a scale from 1 to 5.

We assign a Cobb-Douglas weight of two thirds to "importance" (I) and one third to "level" (L) in using a weighted sum for work activities. While for work contexts, we multiply the frequency (F) by the value of the categorical level (V). Thereby, for each occupation j we compute two composite task content indexes (*TC*), so that:

(1) Information Content_j =
$$IC_j = \sum_{k=1}^{5} I_{jk}^{2/3} * L_{jk}^{1/3}$$

(2) Automation Content_j = $AC_j = \sum_{l=1}^{5} F_{jl} * V_{jl}$

Where k is the number of work activity elements, and l the number of work context elements considered in the construction of the task content index. We normalize the task measures by dividing them by their maximum value observed over all occupations, so that they range between zero and one. That gives us a ranking of occupations for each of the two dimensions. We use these indexes to assess the impact of technological change on changes in wages.¹²

In Table 1 we report the average value and standard deviations of the measures of task content for five major occupational groups. As it is observed in Figure 1, alike the results reported by Firpo et al. (2011) using US data, Professional, managerial and technical occupations have the highest score in terms of their use of information, and a relative low score for automation. On the other hand, Production workers and operators have a low score in terms of their use of

^{12.} In our case the occupation with the higher information content index is Financial Analyst and the one with the lowest one is models, followed by farmworkers and laborers. On the other hand, the occupation with the higher automation index is tire builders, plastic and rubber operators and the ones with the lowest one are models and tour guides.

information and the highest score for automation. Therefore, technological change is expected to have an adverse impact on wages in this last group of occupations while benefiting those with a more intense use of information technology.

The distribution of both indexes among occupational categories is similar for both decades. The small changes in the overall mean of information and automation content from the 90s to the 2000s could be interpreted as changes in the share of occupations with a bigger information index and a smaller automation index, as the indexes used are the same for both decades. However, some change may also be attributed to the use of a different classification code for occupations.

We expect ICTs to enhance tasks involving the processing of information performed by high skilled workers while substituting those tasks that can be automated and generally performed by middle skilled workers. In this sense, we expect a direct relationship between the "information content" of task and wages and an inverted U-shaped relation between the "automation content" of task and wages. In Appendix Figure A.1 we show the relationship between our task measures and wages for both periods of analysis. We confirm that while information task content tend to be monotonically related to wages, automation task content follows an inverted U-shaped curve consistent with ALM's routinization hypothesis.

IV. Wage dispersion in Uruguay - Descriptive evidence

Appendix Table A.2 reports the mean and standard deviation values of several variables for the 90s and the 2000s. The most notable changes along the period of analysis are a raise in the participation of middle (between 10 and 16 years of schooling) and high educated (more than 16 years of schooling) in detriment of those less educated (less than 10 years of schooling). Regarding potential experience, the behavior is different between the two decades: while in the 90s there is an increase of those with little or middle experience in detriment of more experimented workers (more than 30 years), in the 2000s less experimented workers also increase its share but those with middle experience (between 10 to 30 years of experience) decrease.

With regard to hourly wages there is a relatively small increment during the whole period of analysis (0.024 in log terms). However, while in the 90s mean men hourly wages increased 0.103, between 2001/02 and 2009/10 the increase was barely 0.029. This difference is due to the great economic crisis that Uruguay suffered between 2001 and 2003 with the obviously negative impact on labor markets and especially on wages.¹³ Actually, it took until 2010 for mean real wages to recover its pre-crisis levels.¹⁴

Regarding inequality, during the 90s global inequality raised mostly due to an increase at the top end of the distribution together with a smaller increase in the bottom half. However, during the first decade of the 2000s, global wage inequality decreased explained by a reduction both at the bottom and the upper half the distribution (See Appendix Table A.3). Nonetheless, inequality increased during the first half of the 2000s and started to decrease after 2007 (Perazzo, 2012).

Figure 2 confirms the previous analysis. It shows changes in log real wages (\$ Dec. 2010) at each percentile of the wage distribution, for the different periods of analysis. During the

^{13.} In 2001 Uruguay's GDP dropped 3.8% while in 2002 GDP shrank 7.7%. Meanwhile, unemployment increased up to 20.4% in September 2002 and real wages declined 10.7% in 2002 and 12.4% in 2003.

^{14.} Measured by the Mean Real Wages Index (IMSR for its initials in Spanish).

nineties men wages at the top raised much more than wages in the middle, resulting in increased top-end inequality, while changes in the lower half of the distribution have been more modest. By contrast, from 2001/02 to 2009/10 changes in men real wages at each percentile of the wage distribution show a decrease in wages at the top end of the distribution and an increase in wages at the lower end, which results in a decrease in global inequality. Wage changes in Uruguay during the nineties are better explained by the canonical model but also in line with the ALM hypothesis that ICTs complements tasks performed by high educated workers. During the 2000s, however, changes in the lower half of the distribution seems to follow a pattern in line with ALM's routinization hypothesis. Nevertheless, the evolution of inequality at the top end of the distribution seems to contradict the complementation hypothesis.

However, changes in wage distribution in the second half of the 2000s should be analyzed with caution as, together with a rapid economic growth, they were affected by important institutional changes: increase of minimum wage, restoration of wage councils, income tax inception and a Health Reform. After July 2007, Uruguay implemented a tax reform that introduced income taxes, which had a direct impact on wages actually received by those belonging to the upper tail of the distribution, while at the same time it increased or had no impact on lower wages.¹⁵Besides in 2008 a Health Reform was implemented according to which each worker has to destine a mandatory percentage¹⁶ of its wage to the National Health System.

As wages in the ECH are declared net of social security and income taxes, the tax and health reforms translated into a reduction of declared wages belonging to the upper tail of the wage distribution-and an increase in lower wages. Amarante, Colafrancheschi and Vigorito (2011) estimate returns to education for both pre- and post-tax labor income. They find that income tax for the entire labor force exerted a significant contribution to the reduction of inequality by

^{15.} Before the tax reform was implemented, wages had to pay a tax called IRP (Tax to personal remunerations) which was a fixed percentage over salaries with a rate between 0% and 6%. Several studies prove that the tax reform had had a positive impact to reduce inequality, increasing the income actually perceived by those at the bottom half of the distribution and. reducing the income of those at the top end (See Amarante, Arim and Salas (2010), Perazzo and Rodríguez (2007)). 16. 4,5% or 3% depending on having children or not.

downsizing the skill premium in 2008 relative to 2006. However, the 2008 to 2010 evolution of pre-tax skill premium shows the same pattern as the post-tax one. Therefore, although the level of pre-tax inequality was considerably mitigated by the income tax and contributes to explain the reversal of the 2006 to 2008 inequality trend it cannot explain by itself the 2008 to 2010 reduction in returns to education.

At the same time, other institutional changes that affected the lower end of the distribution occurred since 2005. The national minimum wage introduced in 1969 in order to establish a wage floor for private workers over 18 years old, had had a declining tendency until almost having a marginal role to determine wages due to its constant loss of purchasing power.¹⁷ Therefore, it became more a policy instrument to control government expenditure – since it was the reference measure to index social security variables - than an effective regulatory mechanism of labor markets. However, since 2005 the real minimum wage increased sharply. Indeed, between 2004 and 2010 the real minimum wage raised 157%. Borraz and González Pampillón (2011) using OLS estimations find that the increase in the minimum wage contributes to reduce inequality. However, when they use instrumental variables and a semiparametric estimator they find that the increase in the minimum wage overall has no significant impact on wage inequality, although its impact is significant on the 10th, 20th, 40th and 60th percentile gap (relative to the 70th percentile). Besides, PNUD (2008) shows for 2005 and 2006 that the increase of minimum wage has contributed to a reduction in wage inequality due to its impact at the lower end of the distribution. In 2004-06 the total incidence of the increase in minimum wages on the Gini index of salaried workers was estimated to be -0.4 and -0.54 in the case of low skilled worker.

Besides, in 2005 collective negotiation of wages was reinstituted¹⁸ and since the 2008 round minimum wages by category had had a bigger increase than medium wages (Cabrera and Cárpena, 2012) which, may have also impacted on the lower end of the wage distribution.

^{17.} In 2004, the minimum national wage had a 24% power purchase of that of 1969. Besides Buchelli (1998) and Furtado (2006) state that minimum wage lost its effectiveness as a regulatory mechanism. Indeed, according to Buchelli (1998), while in 1986 between 18% to 40% of private wage-earner worker earned a minimum wage or less, in 1997 this group only represented between 2% and 6% of private wage-earners workers and in 2006 this percentage increase to 10,2% (PNUD, 2008).

^{18.} It must be said, however, that agreements became effective only since 2006.

Moreover, international literature regarding collective negotiations states that a more centralized wage setting mechanism is associated with a reduction on wage dispersion (Perazzo, 2012).

As a consequence of the mentioned changes, it is not immediately to associate the reduction in inequality at the bottom end of the distribution between 2001 and 2010 with ALM's routinization hypothesis. To have a clearer idea of what happened to wage distribution before the tax reform and other institutional changes were implemented, we repeat the exercise for the change in wages between 2001/02 and 2005/06. For this last period data present a slight inverted U-shape,¹⁹ suggesting that contrary to what could be expected, workers at the middle of the distribution were the less affected by the 2002 economic crisis. Besides, Alves et al. (2012) suggest that the decrease in inequality in the lasts years is related to institutional changes such as the ones mentioned above.

19. Although, what is actually observed are decreases in wages due to the fact that during 1998-2003 the Uruguayan economy experiment the worst crisis in the Uruguayan economic history, and wages did not fully recovered until 2010.

V. Decomposition methodology

In this section we discuss alternative decomposition methods and present the one introduce by Firpo, Fortin and Lemieux (2007, 2009, 2011 FFL from hereon) which we actually used in this research. The aggregate decomposition (Δ_0^v) consists of dividing the overall change in a given distributional parameter into the effect of changes in coefficients (structure effect, (Δ_S^v)) and in characteristics (composition effect, (Δ_X^v)). The structure effect reflects how the conditional distribution of the variable of interest, F(Y/X), changes over time and the composition effect reflects the effect of changing the distribution of the covariates X.²⁰ The detailed decomposition permits a partition of the overall components into the contribution of each individual covariate (or group of covariates) to the differences in the distributional statistic.

The overall change over time of the distributional statistic v would be:

(1)
$$\Delta_o^v = v(F_{Y1/T=1}) - v(F_{Y0/T=0}) = v_1 - v_0,$$

which can be decompose into:

(2)
$$\Delta_o^v = (v_1 - v_c) + (v_c - v_0)$$

where the first term is the wage structure effect and the last one represents the composition effect. $v_c = v(F_{Y0/T=1})$ is the counterfactual distributional statistic, that represents the distributional statistic that would have prevailed if individuals observed in T=0 had been paid under the wage structure of T=1. Then we have,

(3) $\Delta_o^v = \Delta_S^v + \Delta_X^v$

^{20.} In the literature the composition effects are usually referred to as the *explained effects* while the structure effects are named the *unexplained effects*.

The goal of this paper is to explain changes on wage inequality and especially to measure the effect of technological change, as measured by the task content of occupations, on the distribution of wages. As has been mentioned, explanations regarding changes on wage inequality affect specific points of the distribution. For instance, the computerization of routine jobs proposed by ALM (2003) tends to affect the middle and lower-middle of the distribution. Therefore, it is important to go beyond the mean and summary measures such as the variance to better understand changes in wages inequality.

Three decomposition methods have been suggested in the decomposition literature to decompose in detail both the composition and the wage structure subcomponents of the change over time of a distributional statistic (apart from the mean) into various explanatory factors: Inverse Propensity Reweighting (DiNardo, Fortin and Lemieux, 1996), Estimation of Conditional Distribution (Chernozhukov, Fernandez-Val and Melly, 2009) and Recentered Influence Function Regressions (RIF-regressions) (FFL, 2009).

According to FFL (2010), the problem with methods based on conditional distributions is that they require computing a large number of counterfactuals conditional distribution functions and quantiles, which may result in non-monotonicities in the estimated counterfactual distribution. Therefore, some smoothing method may be needed to make sure that the counterfactual distribution is monotonic and thus, invertible into quantiles. Besides, the procedure is path dependent since the different counterfactual elements of the detail decomposition have to be compute sequentially.

On the other hand, Dinardo, Fortin and Lemieux (1996) reweighing method is simple to implement and counterfactual values of any distributional statistical can be readily computed from the reweighted sample but this method is also path dependent. Besides, this type of procedure does not provide a general way to dividing up the contribution of each covariate to the wage structure and composition effect, except for the case of dummy covariates (FFL, 2010).

Unlike the other two methods the RIF-regression decomposition method is path independent, is not computational intensive and is easy to interpret (FFL, 2010).²¹ A RIF-regression is a regression where the dependent variable, Y, has been replaced by the recentered influence function (RIF) of the statistic of interest v(F). In general terms, a RIF-regression coefficient can be interpreted as the contribution of one observation to the individual statistic of interest.

In the particular case of quantiles the RIF-regression is known as unconditional quantile regression (UQR). It estimates the impact of changes in the independent variables over the unconditional quantile of the explained variable. It seeks to answer questions such as: which is the impact of increasing one year of education over the median of wages, keeping everything else constant. FFL (2009), estimate UQR using different regression methods (Ordinary Least Squares (OLS), Logit and non parametric methods) showing that they all get similar results and thus for simplicity reasons recommend to use RIF-OLS.

Unlike the traditional (conditional) quantile regressions which focus on the determinants of the conditional distribution, the UQR allows to directly obtain the effects of small changes in the covariates over the unconditional quantile of the variable of interest. Besides they could be extended to other statistics of interest such as the variance or the Gini index. Another advantage of UQR, in particular, and RIF-regressions in general, is that they allow identifying non-monotonic effects. That is to say, they capture both, between and within (conditional distribution) effects of covariables. Specifically, they can capture the effect of a covariable not only because of changes in the conditional mean but also because of its changes along the whole distribution.

The method used here to decompose wage changes follows FFL (2007, 2010) and involves performing Oaxaca-Blinder type decomposition on the unconditional quantile partial effect obtained through the RIF-OLS estimates. Similarly, this method allows decomposing other statistics of interest such as the variance or the Gini index. The idea is to use the recentered

^{21.} Firpo, Fortin and Lemieux (2007, 2009 and 2010) explain in more detail how to perform this decomposition and illustrate how the different elements of the decomposition can be computed in the case of specific distributional statistics. Here, we simply present a short summary of the methodology based on those papers. For more detail also see Appendix 1.

influence function for the statistic of interest instead of the outcome variable as the left hand side variable in a regression. Once the RIF-regression has been estimated, the estimated coefficients can be used to perform the detailed decomposition in the same way as a standard Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition (FFL, 2010).

As in the case of the standard Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition, performing a decomposition based only on the RIF-regression may have a bias problem because the linear specification used in the regression is only a local approximation that does not generally hold for larger changes in the covariates (FFL, 2007). To solve this problem, FFL (2007, 2010) recommend a two-step procedure to estimate the different elements of the decomposition. In the first stage, distributional changes are divided into a wage structure effect and a composition effect. This stage is based on a reweighing procedure to cope with potential non-linearities in the true conditional expectation. The second stage further divides the wage structure and the composition effects into the contribution of each covariate, and is based on the estimation of RIF-regressions.

By analogy to a standard Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition, we could write the wage structure and the composition effect as:

(4)
$$\Delta_S^{\nu} = E[X \mid T = 1]^T \cdot (\gamma_1^{\nu} - \gamma_0^{\nu})$$

(5) $\Delta_X^v = [E(X | T = 1) - E(X | T = 0)^T] \cdot \gamma_0^v$

where γ_1 , γ_0 are the estimated coefficients of the RIF regression.

Following Dinardo et al. (1996), the first step of the estimation procedure consist of estimating the weighing function $\omega_C(T, X)$ and then to compute the distributional statistics directly from the appropriately reweighted samples. Without this reweighing procedure the decomposition would only yield consistent results if the true conditional expectation is in fact linear, which imposes a strong assumption on the data (FFL, 2007). The reweighing procedure generates a

counterfactual observation that results if individuals of group 0 had the same distribution of observable characteristics as individuals in group 1. So that the weighing function $\omega_C(T, X)$ can be estimated as

(6) $\widehat{\omega_c}(X) = \frac{\Pr(T=1|X)}{\Pr(T=1)} \cdot \frac{\Pr(T=0)}{\Pr(T=0|X)}$

The reweighing procedure is based on estimating a logit (or probit) model on the probability of being observed in group 1.²²

In the second step, the decomposition analysis is performed on the reweighted data by estimating OLS regressions of the RIF on X for the T=0, 1 samples and the T=0 sample reweighted to have the same distribution of X as in T=1.

Following FFL (2011) the estimated composition effect $\widehat{\Delta}_{X,R}^{\nu}$ can be divided into a pure composition effect $\widehat{\Delta}_{X,p}^{\nu}$ using the wage structure of period 0 and a component measuring the specification error, $\widehat{\Delta}_{X,e}^{\nu}$

(7)
$$\hat{\Delta}_{X,R}^{\nu} = (\bar{X}_0^{\mathcal{C}} - \bar{X}_0) \cdot \hat{\gamma}_0^{\nu} + \bar{X}_0^{\mathcal{C}} (\hat{\gamma}_c^{\nu} - \hat{\gamma}_0^{\nu})$$
$$= \widehat{\Delta}_{X,n}^{\nu} + \widehat{\Delta}_{X,e}^{\nu}$$

Where γ_1 , γ_0 and γ_c are the RIF estimated coefficients for the T=0, 1 samples and the T=0 sample reweighted to have the same distribution of X as in T=1, $\bar{X}_0 = E[RIF(y_0, v_0)|X, T = 0]$ and $\bar{X}_0^c = E[RIF(y_0, v_0)|X, T = 1]$.

The second term in equation (7) is the approximation (specification) error, linked to the fact that a potentially incorrect specification may be used for the RIF-regression. The approximation error is large when the linearity of the RIF-regression is inappropriate and

^{22.} In this research, the reweighting function is computed as the ratio of the predicted probabilities obtained from a logit specification model that considers the explanatory variables of the decomposition analysis and their interaction.

should be small when it provides an accurate approximation of the composition effect. Therefore, looking at the magnitude of the error provides a specification test of FFL's regression model-based procedure (FFL, 2007). In practice the total approximation error corresponds to the difference between the "Total wage structure" across the standard Oaxaca Blinder and the reweighted-regression decomposition.

The wage structure effect can be written as

(8)
$$\hat{\Delta}_{S,R}^{\nu} = \bar{X}_1(\hat{\gamma}_1^{\nu} - \hat{\gamma}_c^{\nu}) + (\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_0^{\mathcal{C}}), \hat{\gamma}_c^{\nu},$$
$$= \hat{\Delta}_{S,\nu}^{\nu} + \hat{\Delta}_{S,e}^{\nu}$$

where $\widehat{\Delta}_{S,e}^{v}$ is the reweighting error, which tends to disappear in large samples if the reweighting matrix is consistently estimated and $plim(\overline{X_0^c}) = plim(\overline{X_1})$. The difference between the wage structure effect in a standard Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition and that in equation (8) is that, instead of using the unadjusted regression coefficient for group 0 (γ_0^v), the FFL(2007) decomposition method use the regression coefficient when the group 0 data is reweighted to have the same distribution of X as group 1 (γ_c^v). Unlike the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition, using the counterfactual coefficient avoids to contaminate the difference in the wage structure with differences in the distribution of the covariates between the two groups and therefore allows to reflect solely the differences between the structures in T=1 and T=0. That is, using γ_c^v instead of γ_0^v allows dealing with one of the two limitations of Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition.²³ However, the method does not allow solving the omitted group problem of standard decompositions: that is the sensitivity of the contribution of each covariate to the wage structure effect to the choice of a base group (FFL, 2007).²⁴

^{23.} The standard Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition has two limitations, apart from not being suitable to examine changes in the entire distribution of the variable of interest for functional statistics other than the mean. One limitation is that the contribution of each covariate to the wage structure effect is sensitive to the choice of the base group. The other one is that the Oaxaca – Blinder decomposition provides consistent estimates of the wage structure and composition effect only under the assumption that the conditional expectation is linear, since when linearity does not hold, the decomposition based on linear regression will be biased (FFL, 2007).

^{24.} See methodological Appendix.

Then the size of the reweighting error provides another specification test of the FFL's approach. In practice the reweighting error can be estimated as the difference between the "Total Composition" across the classic Oaxaca-Blinder and the reweighted regression decomposition.

To sum up, the RIF-regression decomposition method is performed in practice as two standard Oaxaca-Blinder decompositions over the recentered influence functions. The composition effect is obtained by comparing time period 0 and the reweighted time period 0 that mimics time period 1, while the wage structure effect is obtained by comparing time period 1 and the reweighted time period 0.

ĒΛ

25

VI. Decomposition results: Occupational Characteristics vs. Other Factors

IV.1 RIF – regressions

Before showing the decomposition results, we first present some estimates from the RIF-regressions for the different wage quantiles, the variance of wages and its Gini coefficient. The RIF-regression coefficients for the 10th, 50th, and 90th quantiles in 1991/92, 1998/99, 2001/02 and 2009/10, along with their bootstrapped standard errors²⁵ are reported in Tables 2 and 4. The RIF-regression coefficients for the variance and the Gini index are reported in Tables 3 and 5. Detailed estimates for the 5th to the 95th quantiles are also reported in Figures 3 and 4.

We compute the influence function, $IF(y_i, Q_\tau)$, for each observation using the sample estimate of quantile, Q_τ , and the kernel density estimate of $f(Q_{\tau_i})$ using a bandwidth of 0.06. In addition to the reweighting factors, we also use the ECH sample weights ("pesoan") throughout the empirical analysis, which in practice means that we multiply the relevant reweighting factor by the ECH sample weight. Apart from our two measures of occupational tasks, in the regressions we include covariates suggested by the literature as the major sources of changes in the distribution of wages: education (five groups) and potential experience²⁶ (nine groups) (Autor et al., 2006). We also include controls for geographic localization (capital city vs. rest of the country) public vs. private sector and marital status.²⁷

The base group used in the RIF-regression models consists of married men living at Montevideo working at the private sector with six or less years of education, 10 to 15 years of potential experience, and following Firpo (2011) we normalize the occupational task measures variable at half a standard deviation below their sample averages.²⁸²⁹ So the wage structure

^{25.} The analytical standard errors have to take account of the fact that the logit model used to construct the reweighting factor is estimated. That is why using bootstrapped standard errors is recommended. In practice, FFL (2011) recommend to bootstrap the whole estimation procedure (both the estimation of the logit/probit to construct the weights and the computation of the various elements of the decomposition), and that is how we proceeded.

^{26.} Measured as age minus years of education minus six.

^{27.} Concubinary unions are considered as married.

^{28.} The base education and experience categories were chosen based on the modal of each category.

^{29.} In the Annex we also present the RIF-regressions and decomposition results considering sector of activity. As expected, this variable turns out to be significant. Regarding results, the main change is that compositions effects become more relevant, especially during the nineties, regarding our task content results the only significant change is that during the 2000s task

effect for the task measure can be interpreted as the change over time in the wage impact of a half a standard deviation increase in the measure.³⁰ However, regarding composition effects of task measures, as we use the same task measure for every year – i.e they remain invariant over time –, if they exist they only reflect changes in shares of occupations over time.

To compute the reweighing factor we estimate a logit model with additional interaction terms.³¹ As can be seen in Appendix Figure A.2, the reweighting approach performs well in the sense that the reweighting error tends to be zero and is not significant.³² That is, the reweighted means of the covariates for the base period are very close to those for the end period.

An important feature of RIF-regressions is that they allow identifying non-monotonic effects. In the case of quantiles, this means that they capture the effect of covariates on both between and within group components of wage dispersion (FFL, 2011). Regarding our task measures, like FFL (2011) we find for both periods an inverse impact between the information and automation content of task on the distribution of wages (Figure 3).

In the case of *"information task content"*, unlike Firpo (2011) we find that it increases inequality along the whole range of the wage distribution. Indeed, the UQR coefficient of the information task content increases across the different percentiles of wage distribution instead

content measures became not significant at the lower end of the distribution, while the covariable related to industries is significant. However, due to the fact that the coding occupation criterion, especially in the nineties, is closely related to the sector of activity and because we are using a task-content approach, where the "job task" – which are transversal to activity sectors - is the central unit of production which is then combined with capital and labor to produce output, we consider that it is better to concentrate the analysis on task content measures. In fact, other reference studies that consider the task content of occupations as an explanatory variable, does not include sector of activity in the regression.

^{30.} The choice of half of a standard deviation is based on the same criteria used by Firpo (2011) following that the difference between the mean value of task measures for all occupations and the mean for the major group with lowest mean ranges from 38 to 70 per cent of a standard deviation. For example, for 1991/92 to 1998/99 the mean for automation is 0.75 which is 0.0372 (or 0.60 standard deviation) above the mean for professional, managerial and technical occupations. This suggest that occupations at half a standard deviation below the mean are reasonably representative of a large group of occupations with relatively low values of the task measures. Thus, we use this criterion as a uniform way of choosing the base group for each task measure.

^{31.} The logit specification also includes a full set of interaction between experience and education, and education and occupation task measures. We also tried with some interaction between localization and education and localization and experience, but they turned out to be not significant.

^{32.} The reweighting error presented in Appendix Figure A.2 is the difference between the total composition effect obtained by using the RIF-regression with reweighing and the RIF-regression without reweighing. It is found to be small and not significant. Nonetheless, when including controls for public sector the reweighing and specifications errors for the variance and the Gini index become significant in the 2000s, although for the quantiles remain not significant.

of reflecting an inverted U- shape, as the one found by FFL (2011) for the US during the nineties. Besides, changes over time show an increasing effect especially in the upper middle of the distribution.

On the other hand, the "automation task content" measure has a decreasing impact, with very little difference among its impact on the 10th through the 50th decile. Therefore, contrary to expected, automation content of task has almost no impact on inequality at the lower end of the distribution and *decreases* inequality at the higher end of the distribution. However, workers at the lower middle of the distribution have the biggest coefficient.

Consequently, in the case of Uruguay during the period of analysis, workers in the upper side of the distribution instead of workers in the middle of the distribution were more likely to experience negative wage changes as the "routine" tasks they used to perform could be executed by computer technologies, while workers at the lower middle of the distribution were the most positively affected by automation, indicating a non-substitution effect of their task by technology. Therefore, for the Uruguayan case the effect of automation and the consequences predicted by the "routinization hypothesis" seems to be displaced toward the right of the wage distribution. These may occur due to the different share of occupations in Uruguay compared to developed countries' labor markets, as well as to a difference in the degree of automation of task in those markets compare to Uruguay's.³³

Besides, contrary to FFL (2011) the information content of tasks tends to increase inequality along the whole range of the distribution during both decades while, the automation content of task has a positive impact in reducing inequality, mainly due to its negative impact on the upper middle of the distribution rather than at the lower end. Looking at the Gini index, as a summary measure of inequality, we find that technology contributes to reduce inequality due to the impact of the automation content of tasks.

^{33.} Remember that as we are using O*NET data to classify the degree of automation of occupations we are classifying them according to their potential degree of automation in the US, which in practice might be different in Uruguay where this task may remain manual, due to relative prices between labor and technology.

As expected, in the case of education we find that it has a positive effect on inequality in the whole range of wage distribution, but its premium varies along the wage distribution and the years of education. That is, wage differentials among workers are not homogeneous: while the premium for years of education at tertiary level (13 and more years) is increasing over the wage distribution in every year of the analysis, the premium for high school drop outs (7 to 9 years) starts with a U-shape form in 1991, but becomes decreasing in 2010, meaning that the differentiation between workers with primary school (our base group) and those with some years of high school became less significant for occupations that are paid with higher wages. This reflects a within group effect, consistent with the results found by Alves et al. (2009) and Sanguinetti (2007). Besides, these results are in line with the hypothesis of increasing returns to education and the results of other studies for the Uruguayan case (Arim and Zoppolo, 2000; Sanguinetti, 2007; Alves et al., 2009). Nevertheless, premiums to years of education at the top end of the distribution in the 2000s diminished relative to the nineties (See Figure 4).

In the case of localization, like Alves et al. (2009) we find that the wage gap between Montevideo and the rest of the country has reduced between the nineties and 2009/2010 until having almost no impact, at least for the first half of the distribution.

IV.2 Decomposition results

IV.2.1 Overall Decomposition Results:

The results of the decomposition are presented in Figure 5 and reported in Table 6 which summarizes the results of standard measures of top-end (90-50 gap) and low-end (50-10 gap) wage inequality together with the variance and Gini index of wages.

Figure 5 shows the overall change in (real log) wages at percentile τ , (Δ_O^{τ}) , and decomposes the overall change into a composition (Δ_X^{τ}) and a wage structure effect (Δ_S^{τ}) .³⁴ Figure 5a shows

^{34.} The composition effect reported in Figure 5 only captures the component, $\hat{\Delta}_{X,p}^{v}$, from equation (7). The specification error, $\hat{\Delta}_{X,e}^{v}$, corresponds to the difference between the total composition effect obtained by reweighting and the RIF-Regression

that along the nineties the overall change in real wages shows a positively sloped curve for all quantiles as wage dispersion increases at all points of the distribution, but with higher dispersion at the top end and much more stability at the lower end. While during the first decade of the 2000s the overall change in real wages show a negatively sloped curve with a decline of wages at the top end of the distribution (Figure 5b).

Table 6 summarizes the changes shown in Figure 5 by showing the results of the decomposition for the standard measures of top-end (90-50 gap) and low-end (50-10 gap) wage inequality, as well as for the variance of log wages and the Gini coefficient. For the nineties it shows a relatively large increase in inequality measures, such as the variance and the 90-10 gap, which captures wage changes over the entire distribution during the period of analysis. It can also be seen, that this increase in inequality is basically due to an increase in inequality at the top end of the distribution (the 90-50 gap), which more than doubles the inequality at the lower end of the distribution (the 50-10 gap). For the 2000s the case is exactly the opposite as inequality diminish basically due to a reduction in inequality at the top end of the distribution.

It can also be seen that for the nineties composition effect accounts for a significant increase in inequality: 54 percent of the growth in the 90-50 gap and 41 percent of the growth in the 50-10 gap was due to composition effects which, together with the wage structure effect, also helps to explain the positive slope in overall inequality.³⁵

On the other hand, during the first decade of the 2000s composition effect also contributes to an increase in inequality, but these effects were more than offset by changes in the wage structure that contribute to a decrease in inequality, which was mostly explained by a reduction on inequality at the top end of the distribution and to a less extent at the lower end.³⁶

methods without reweighing shown in Appendix Figure A2. As it can be seen the RIF-regressions capture quite accurately the overall trend in composition effects, although there are a number of small discrepancies particularly at the top end of the distribution.

^{35.} The total change in the 90-50 and the 50-10 gap between 1991/92 and 1998/99 is 0.126 and 0.054, respectively. The corresponding composition effect is 0.068 and 0.022, respectively.

^{36.} Between 2001/02 and 2009/10 the total change in the 90-50 and the 50-10 gap is -0.093 and -0.018 respectively, while the corresponding composition effect is 0.045 and 0.019.

Consequently, composition effects account for a sizable part of growth on overall inequality but wage structures effects capture a major part of changes in the distribution of wages. Moreover, in both periods changes in the distribution of wages have been led by changes at the top end of the distribution explaining the increase of inequality during the nineties and its decrease during the 2000s.

IV.2.2 Detailed Decomposition Results

The next step is to analyze the decomposition using RIF-regressions to compute the contribution of each set of covariates to the composition and the wage structure effects. Figure 6 reports the composition effect of the covariates that were grouped into five categories: technological content of tasks: information and automation content, education (5 dummy variables – 6 years or less omitted), experience (9 dummy variables – 5 to 10 years of experience omitted) and the control variable group others that includes, localization, marital status and working at the public sector.³⁷

For 1991/92 to 1998/99 period, regarding composition effects all covariates result significant with the exception of information content of tasks.³⁸ Apart from experience, they all contribute positively to an increase in inequality along the distribution of wages which is larger on the 90-50 than on the 50-10 gap, consistently with the fact that the increase in inequality during that period was led by changes at the top end. What is more, composition effects related to education are the ones that account for most of the rise in inequality during the nineties, as changes in the composition effect of education represents almost 90% of the total composition effect for the 90-50 gap and 59% for the 50-10 gap (Table 7).

Contrary to the nineties in the 2001/02 to 2009/10 period overall inequality decreases. However, the composition effect of education and "others" have a positive contribution to

^{37.} The effect of each set of factors is obtained by summing up the contribution of the relevant covariates.

^{38.} As it was mentioned earlier, composition effects of task content measures only reflects changes in shares of occupations with one or other characteristics between the initial and end period, since we use the same index for every year.

increase inequality, meaning that the changes in the composition of education does not account for the large decrease in inequality observed during that period (Table 8).³⁹

The contribution of each set of covariates to the wage structure effect is reported in Figure 7 and in Panel B of Tables 7 and 8. It also reports the change in the intercept in the RIF– regressions. The change in the intercepts captures the part of the wage structure effect that cannot be explained by the covariates.⁴⁰ It represents the change in the wage distribution for the base group used in the RIF-regression and can be interpreted as the residual change for that base group (Firpo, 2011).

In both periods the total change of wages was led by changes in the aggregate wage structure effect, which is clearly seen in Figure 5. For the nineties, changes in the return to covariates accounts for all or even more of the change in the 50-10 and 90-50 gap wage structure effect. However, -0.076 of the 0.059 change in the 90-50 gap and -0.052 of the 0.033 change in the 50-10 gap remains unexplained (the effect of the "constant" in Table 7). Besides contrary to composition effects, changes in return to potential experience turns out to be more important than changes in return to education, although, by construction, both factors reflect skill premiums.

On the other hand, for the 2000s the change in inequality at the top end is explained mainly by a reduction in the coefficients of experience and other factors, while technology, information task content in particular, contributes to an increase in inequality at the top end. However, at the lower end the reduction in inequality is explained by changes in almost all factors, with the exception of automation, which is not significant. What is more, as seen in Figure 7 and Appendix Figures A.3 and A.4, factors in the wage structure show a clear polarization pattern

^{39.} Note that, as in an Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition, composition effects on the 50-10 and the 90-50 gap can be obtained directly by multiplying the difference in mean of the corresponding factor between the beginning and the end of each period by the respective RIF – regression coefficient for that factor on the base year.

^{40.} More formally, as is shown in the Methodological Appendix the total wage structure effect, $\hat{\Delta}_{5,p}^{\tau}$, is the sum of the component explained by the RIF-regression models, $\sum_{K=2}^{M} \overline{X_1} (\hat{\gamma}_1^{\nu} - \hat{\gamma}_C^{\nu})$, and the residual component $\hat{\gamma}_{1,1}^{\nu} - \hat{\gamma}_{C,1}^{\nu}$ captured by the change in the intercepts.

similar to that seen in the US during the nineties, led by education and experience but also technology.

Regarding the contribution of each covariate, Tables 7 and 8 show that changes in the wage structure linked to education and experience changed over time and have a different role at the bottom than at the higher end of the distribution. While during the nineties education and experience increased inequality over the whole range of the distribution of wages, during the 2000s changes in the wage structure linked to education had a positive role to increase inequality at the higher end of the distribution but reduce inequality at the lower end, while returns to experience reduce inequality at the whole range of the distribution.

The results show that, contrary to FFL's findings, changes in the wage structure linked to the technology task content measures made a very small and negative contribution to the increase in the inequality during the nineties, both at the top and the lower end. However, in the first decade of the 2000s, technology task content measures contribute to an increase in inequality at the upper end while reduce inequality at the lower end of the distribution, which is in line with the ALM's routinization hypothesis.

Changes in the wage structure linked to technology, as capture by the occupation task measures included in the RIF-regressions had contributed to explain the changes in the distribution of men wages observed during the nineties and the 2000s. This indicates that during the period of analysis technology might have had a positive effect in reducing inequality at the lower end of the distribution while having a small inequality enhancing effect at the top end of the distribution during the 2000s. So as predicted by ALM's routinization hypothesis, a complementation effect of technology might prevail at the upper end, while a substitution effect would prevail in the middle of the distribution. However, this last effect is better capture by information content of task rather than automation content as expected.

To test the robustness of these results, we also applied the decomposition method excluding education and including technology and vice versa. We observe that when excluding education, the information and/or the automation content of tasks become significant when
they were not in the model that includes both covariates. While in some cases the constant also becomes significant. On the other hand, when excluding technology the main change is that education becomes significant to explain the wage structure effect at the lower end of the distribution in the nineties and in the 90-10 gap in the 2000s. As expected, these results confirm that there is a correlation between education and technology, which reinforce the need of controlling by both covariates to differentiate their impact in changes in the distribution of wages.

VII. Concluding remarks

In this paper we looked at the contribution of technology, as measured by the task content of occupations, to changes in the distribution of wages. We quantify the contribution of this factor to changes in wage inequality relative to other explanations such as changes in returns to skills (education and experience) and localization. We do so by using a decomposition method proposed by Firpo, Fortin, Lemieux (2009) based on the influence function regression approach. We have applied this methodology to Uruguay data for the periods 1991-1999 and 2001-2010, two periods where wage inequality presented two very different trends. Indeed, during the nineties there was an increase in wage inequality while during the first decade of the 2000s Uruguay presented a declining wage inequality.

During the nineties as well as the 2000s changes in the distribution of wages have been led by changes at the top end of the distribution explaining the increase in inequality during the first period and its decrease in the second one. These movements have been mainly captured by wage structure effects although composition effects had had an important role especially in the nineties. Indeed, our results suggest that during the nineties the total increase in men wage inequality was explained almost equally by both the composition effect and the wage structure effect. Meanwhile wage structure effects, which more than offset the impacts of compositions effects to increase inequality, account for the decrease in wage inequality during the first decade of the 2000s.

Regarding technology, our estimates suggest that its importance to explain the observed changes in the distribution of wages became more relevant in the last decade, which is consistent with the extended adoption of technology by economic sectors. During the nineties the composition effect of automation task content increased the inequality of wages at the top end of the distribution reflecting a change in the share of occupations with automated tasks. Meanwhile, contrary to expected, wage structure effects related to automation task content tended to reduce inequality at the top end. On the other hand, also contrary to expected, information task content impact to reduce inequality at the lower end of the

distribution through its wage structure effect. Therefore, the net effect of technology – that is summing up the effects of information and automation content of task – over the distribution of wages increased wage inequality during the nineties trough its composition effect which was partially offset by a negative impact of the wage structure effect.

In the first decade of the 2000s, technology task content composition effects were not significant, while wage structure effects contributed to an increase in inequality at the top while reducing inequality at the lower end of the distribution, creating a polarization effect which is in line with the ALM's routinization hypothesis. That is, technology helped to decrease inequality at the lower end of the distribution by a substitution effect of routine task (placed at the middle of the distribution) and increases inequality at the upper end where a complementation effect prevailed. However, our estimates suggests that contrary to expected the predicted effect of technology at the lower end of the distribution is better captured by the information content of task rather than the automation content.

This might be explained, on the one hand, because the standard deviation of information doubles the one of automation so changes in returns to task content may be better captured in the first one. On the other hand, differences in the relative cost of labor and technology in the US relative to Uruguay could explain a shift to the right of the negative impact of automation over wages at the middle of the distribution. That is, in the case of Uruguay labor task subject to substitution by technology would be placed at an upper level of the distribution of wages rather than at the middle, since wages at the middle are still very low and therefore there are fewer incentives to substitute labor by technology.

With regards to skills dimensions, in both decades education played an important role to increase inequality mainly due to changes in the observed characteristics of individuals rather than to changes in the return to them.

Summing up, introducing tasks and occupations into the analysis helps to understand changes in wage distribution in Uruguay. In fact, in the 2000s technology has a polarizing effect over wages although it is not the only factor. However, this polarizing effect is better explained

through the information task content of occupations rather than automation tasks content. Therefore, we could not confirm ALM's routinization hypothesis

Despite these findings, a great deal of the distribution of wages remains unexplained. During the 2000s this could be attributed to institutional changes that were not included in the model (tax and health reform, increases in minimum wages, Collective Negotiation of Wages) which, for different reasons, had had an impact both at the top and the bottom of the wage distribution and generated a reduction in inequality. Trying to incorporate this variable into the analysis could be an interesting extension of this work.

Moreover, it is worth noticing that results should be analyzed carefully since, apart from the institutional changes mentioned above we are comparing two very different economic phases, since at the beginning of the second period of analysis Uruguay was plunged into its biggest economic crisis and at the end it was going through an expansion period, as well as during the nineties. There is evidence that the patterns of structural change in employment are asymmetric between expansions and contraction phases of the business cycle. For instance for the case of the UE, Eurofond (2013) states that while during expansions knowledge-intensive jobs experiment bigger expansions, during recessions routine service and industrial jobs are destroyed which results in the polarization of labor market. Besides other institutional transformations, in particular labor market flexibility as the one experimented by Uruguay during the nineties; tend to increase the participation of low-middle paid employment (Eurofond, 2013) affecting the polarization of labor market. So we must bear in mind that these issues could be influencing our results.

Regarding further research, it would also be interesting to-extend this work to the case of women, whose relatively high participation in service occupations associated to low-skilled occupations, makes ALM's routinization hypothesis an attractive one to explain changes in the distribution of their wages. Besides, analyzing its difference with the results of this work could shed light to understand the evolution of gender wage gap in the last decade.

Another appealing extension would be to include into the task content of jobs those task related to offshoring, which in the last decade has also been gaining adepts as an explanation of wage polarization in industrialized economies. Although, in the case of Uruguay we would expect a different effect, as Uruguay would tend to export offshored task to developed countries rather than import those task from abroad.

Last but not least, the lack of national information regarding the task content of occupations remains one of the main limitations of this analysis, so deepening into the task-based approach to the labor markets in Uruguay would require to count with a national occupational survey which considers the characteristics of the country labor market.

References

ACEMOGLU, D. AND AUTOR, D. (2011) "Skills, Tasks and Technologies: Implications for Employment and Earnings". in O.Ashenfelter and D.Cards, eds., *Handbook of Labor Economics*, Amsterdam: North Holland, Vol. IV.B: 1043-1171.

ALVES, G., BRUM, M. AND YAPOR, M. (2009) "Cambios en la estructura salarial en Uruguay, 1986-2007: Un análisis mediante regresiones cuantílicas". Instituto de Economía. Documentos basados en monografías de grado 01/09, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Administración, Universidad de la República. Available at: http://www.iecon.ccee.edu.uy/dtm-01-09-cambios-en-la-estructura-salarial-en-uruguay-1986-2007-un-analisis-mediante-regresiones-cuantilicas/publicacion/262/es/

ALVES, G., ARIM, R., SALAS, G. AND VIGORITO, A. (2009) "Desigualdad salarial en Uruguay, 1981-2007. Una descomposición de su evolución en efecto precio y composición." DT 05/09. Instituto de Economía, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Administración, Universidad de la República. Available at: <u>http://www.iecon.ccee.edu.uv/dt-05-09-desigualdad-salarial-en-uruguay-1981-2007-una-descomposicion-de-su-evolucion-en-efecto-precio-y-composicion/publicacion/161/es/</u>

ALVES, G., AMARANTE, V., SALAS, G. AND VIGORITO, A. (2012) "La desigualdad de ingresos en Uruguay entre 1986 y 2009". DT 03/12. *Instituto de Economía*, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Administración, Universidad de la República. Available at: <u>http://www.iecon.ccee.edu.uv/dt-03-12-la-desigualdad-del-ingreso-en-uruguay-entre-1986-y-2009/publicacion/286/es/</u>

AMARANTE, V., ARIM, R. AND SALAS, G. (2010) "La reforma tributaria y su impacto distributivo" in Narbondo, P.-Mancebo, Ma.E (Eds.). Reforma del Estado y políticas públicas de la Administración Vázquez: acumulaciones, conflictos y desafios, Montevideo, Editorial Fin de Siglo: 80-97.

AMARANTE, V., COLAFRANCHESCHI, M AND VIGORITO, A. (2011) "Uruguay's Income Inequality and Political Regimes during 1981–2010". Working Paper No. 2011/94. UNU-WIDER. Available at: <u>http://www.wider.unu.edu/publications/working-papers/2011/en_GB/wp2011-094/</u>

ANTONCZYK, D., DELEIRE, T. AND FITZENBERGER, B. (2010) "Polarization and rising wage inequality: comparing the US and Germany". Discussion Paper No. 4842. IZA, Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit Institute for the Study of Labor, March. Available at: http://ftp.iza.org/dp4842.pdf

ANTONCZYK, D., FITZENBERGER, B. AND LEUSCHNER, U. (2009) "Can a task-based approach explain the recent changes in the German wage structure?" Jahrbucher fur Nationalokonomie und Statistik (Journal of Economics and Statistics) 229 (2–3), 214–238.

ARIM, R. AND ZOPPOLO, G. (2000) "Remuneraciones relativas y desigualdad del mercado de trabajo. Uruguay: 1986-1999". Trabajo monográfico para obtener el título de Licenciado en Economía, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Administración, Universidad de la República.

AUTOR, D.H. (2013) "The "Task Approach" to labor markets: An Overview". Working Paper 18711. National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, MA 02138. Available at: http://www.nber.org/papers/w18711

AUTOR, D.H. AND DORN, D.D (2012) "The growth of low skill service jobs and the polarization of the U.S. labor market." Discussion Paper No. 7068. IZA, Forschungsinstitut

zur Zukunft der Arbeit Institute for the Study of Labor. Available at: http://ftp.iza.org/dp7068.pdf

AUTOR, D.H., KATZ, L.F. AND KEARNEY M. S. (2006) "The Polarization of the U.S. Labor Market", *American Economic Review* 96(2):189-194.

AUTOR, D.H., LEVY, F. AND MURNANE, R. J. (2003) "The Skill Content of Recent Technological Change: An Empirical Exploration", *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 118(4): 1279-1333.

BORRAZ, F. AND GONZALEZ PAMPILLÓN N. (2011) "Assessing the Distributive Impact of More than Doubling the Minimum Wage: The Case of Uruguay". Documento No 17/11. *Departamento de Economía*, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de la República.

BUCHELI, M. (1998) "Flexibilidad del mercado de trabajo en Uruguay", CEPAL. Montevideo: lc/mvd/r166.Rev.1

CABRERA, V. AND CÁRPENA, M. (2012) "Consejo de Salarios en Uruguay 2007-2011: Construcción de una plataforma para su evaluación". Trabajo monográfico para obtener el título de Licenciado en Economía, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Administración, Universidad de la República.

CHERNOZHUKOV, V., FERNANDEZ-VAL, I. AND MELLY, V., (2009) "Inference on counterfactual distributions," CeMMAP working papers CWP09/09, Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice, Institute for Fiscal Studies.

DINARDO, J., FORTIN, N. AND LEMIEUX, T. (1996) "Labor Market Institutions and the Distribution of Wages, 1973-1992: A Semiparametric Approach," *Econometrica*, Econometric Society, vol. 64(5), pages 1001-44, September.

DORN, D. (2009) "Essays on Inequality, Spatial Interaction, and the Demand for Skills", Dissertation of the University of St. Gallen no 3613, Graduate School of Business Administration, Economics, Law and Social Sciences (HSG) to obtain the title of Doctor Oeconomiae (1999): 907-940.

ESPINO, A. (2011) "Evaluación de los desajustes entre oferta y demanda laboral por calificaciones en el mercado laboral de Uruguay", Revista de Economía del Rosario. Vol. 14. No. 2. Julio - Dic 2011: 99 – 133.

EUROFOUND (2013) "Employment polarisation and job quality in the crisis: European Jobs Monitor 2013, Eurofound, Dublin.

FIRPO, S., FORTIN, N. AND LEMIEUX, T. (2007) "Decomposing Wage Distributions using Recentered Influence Function Regressions", Working Paper, Department of Economics, University of British Columbia.

FIRPO, S., FORTIN, N. AND LEMIEUX, T. (2009) "Unconditional Quantile Regressions", *Econometrica* 77(3): 953-973.

FIRPO, S., FORTIN, N. AND LEMIEUX, T. (2010) "Decomposition Methods in Economics" In: Ashenfelter,O, Card, D (eds.): *Handbook of Economics*, Amsterdam: North-Holland, Vol IV.A: 1-102.

FIRPO, S., FORTIN, N. AND LEMIEUX, T. (2011) "Occupational Tasks and Changes in the Wage Structure", Iza DP No. 5542, Discussion Paper Series. Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit. Institute for the Study of Labor, February.

FURTADO, M. (2006): "Uruguay: Impacto social y económico del salario mínimo", en A. Marinakis y J. Jacobo Velasco (eds.): ¿Para qué sirve el salario mínimo? Elementos para su determinación en los países de Cono Sur, Santiago de Chile: OIT.

GONZALES, X. AND MILES, D. (1999) "Wage Inequality in a Developing Country: Decrease of Minimum Wages or Increase in Education Returns".

GOOS, M. AND MANNING, A. (2007) "Lousy and Lovely Jobs: The Rising Polarization of Work in Britain", *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 89(1), 118-133.

GOOS, M., MANNING, A. AND SALOMONS, A. (2009) "The Polarization of the European Labor Market", *American Economic Review*, 99(2):58-63.

GOOS, M., MANNING, A. AND SALOMONS, A. (2011) "Explaining job polarization: the roles of technology, offshoring and institutions," Center for Economic Studies - Discussion papers ces11.34, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Centrum voor Economische Studiën.

GRADIN, C AND ROSSI, M. (2000), "Polarización y Desigualdad Salarial en Uruguay, 1986-1997", *El Trimestre Económico*, 267, Vol. LXVII (3): 421-443.

GRADIN, C. AND ROSSI, M. (2001) "Income Distribution in Uruguay: The Effects of Economic and Institutional Reforms".

GRADIN, C. AND ROSSI, M. (2006) "Income Distribution and income sources in Uruguay" *Journal of Applied Economics*, May, 2006/vol.IX, número 001, Universidad del CEMA, Buenos Aires, Argentina. Pp.49-69

INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE ESTADÍSTICA (1996), "Manual guía para la codificación de ocupaciones de actividad. Clasificación Internacional Uniforme de Ocupaciones (CIUO-88). Adaptada a Uruguay (CNUO-95)". Available at: <u>www.ine.gub.uy</u>.

INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE ESTADÍSTICA, "Clasificador internacional de ocupaciones (COTA-70, CIUO-88)". Available at: <u>www.ine.gub.uy</u>.

JENSEN, J. B. AND. KLETZER, L.G (2010) "Measuring the Task Content of Offshorable Services Jobs, Tradable Services and Job Loss," In *Labor in the New Economy*, Katharine Abraham, Mike Harper, and James Spletzer, eds., Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 309-335.

JUNG, J. AND MERCENIER, J. (2010) "Routinization-Biased Technical Change, Globalization and Labor Market Polarization: A Simple Model with Heterogeneous Agents". Available at: <u>http://congres.afse.fr/docs/2010/658466mercenier.pdf</u>

MICHAELS, G., NATRAJ, A. AND VAN REENEN, J. (2010) "Has ICT polarized skill demand? Evidence from eleven countries over 25 years", Working Paper No. 16138, National Bureau of Economic Research. Cambridge, MA 02138. Available at: <u>http://www.nber.org/papers/w16138</u>

NATIONAL CENTER FOR O*NET DEVELOPMENT (2010). "Data Dictionary O*NET 15.0 Database". Available at: <u>http://www.onetcenter.org</u>

PERAZZO, I. (2012) "El mercado laboral uruguayo en la última década" DT 01/12. *Instituto de Economía*, Facultad de Ciencias Económicas y Administración, Universidad de la República. Available at: <u>http://www.iecon.ccee.edu.uy/dt-01-12-el-mercado-laboral-uruguayo-en-la-ultima-decada/publicacion/281/es/</u>

PERAZZO, I. AND RODRÍGUEZ, S. (2007) "Impactos de la Reforma Tributaria sobre el ingreso de los hogares" in QUANTUM • Volumen II Nº 1 / Octubre 2007, Montevideo: 62-78.

PROGRAMA NACIONES UNIDAS para el DESARROLLO (2008): "Desarrollo Humano en Uruguay: Política, Políticas y Desarrollo Humano", Montevideo: PNUD.

SANGUINETTI, C. (2007), "Educación y dispersión salarial en Uruguay: Un análisis de regresión por cuantiles" Documents de Recerca del Programa de Doctorado en Economía Aplicada Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona, Noviembre 2007



VIGORITO, A. (1994), "Una descomposición de la desigualdad de ingresos por trabajo en Uruguay. 1986-1996". En IX Jornadas Anuales BCU.

WORLD BANK (2012), "The Labor Market Story Behind Latin America's Transformation". World Bank – LAC Tables.

· 45

Table 1. Average O"Net mueses by Major Occupation Grou	Table 1	I. Average	O*Net Indexes	by Ma	ijor Occu	pation Grou
--	---------	------------	---------------	-------	-----------	-------------

O*NET Indexes	Information	Automation
PANEL A: using 1991/92 -1998/99 data a	and COTA-70 C	Occupation codes
Overall Mean	0,5921	0,7500
Standard Deviation	0,1095	0,0624
Professional, Managerial, Technichal	0,7126	0,7128
Clerical, Sales	0,6622	0,7489
Production, Operators	0,5750	0,7975
Primary, Construction, Transport	0,5503	0,7310
Service	0,5537	0,7364

PANEL B: using 2001/02 -2009/10 data and CIOU-88 Occupation codes

Overall Mean	0,6222	0,7354
Standard Deviation	0,1223	0,0627
Professional, Managerial, Technichal	0,7822	0,6915
Clerical, Sales	0,6897	0,7557
Production, Operators	0,5600	0,7701
Primary, Construction, Transport	0,5452	0,7396 ·
Service	0,5645	0,7148

Note: Task content indexes constructed as follow based on O*NET data.

(1) Information Content; =
$$IC_j = \sum_{k=1}^{5} l_{jk}^{2/3} * L_{jk}^{1/2}$$

(2) Automation Content; = $AC_j = \sum_{k=1}^{5} F_{jl} * V_{jk}$

.

Where k is the number of work activity elements, and l the number of work context elements considered in the construction of the task of work content index T ask measures are normalized to range between zero and one.

Table 2. Unconditional Quantile Partial Effect on Men Log Wages (1991/92 - 1998/99) - RIF Regression

Year		1991/92		1	998/99	
Explanatory Variables/ Quantile	10	50	90	· 10	50	90
Information content	0,048 ***	0,062 ***	0,163 ***	0,031 **	0,074 ***	0,177 ***
	(0,009)	(0,005)	(0,012)	(0,012)	(0,007)	(0,018)
Automation content	0,036 ***	0,036 ***	-0,041 ***	0,004	0,002	-0,022
	(0,008)	(0,005)	(0,013)	(0,010)	(0,008)	(0,014)
Education (6 years or less omitted)						
From 7 to 9 years	0,237 ***	0,213 ***	0,302 ***	0,244 ***	0,258 ***	0,240 ***
	(0,023)	(0,015)	(0,025)	(0,034)	(0,019)	(0,032)
From 10 to 12 years	0,338 ***	0,407 ***	0,781 ***	0,341 ****	0,449 👐*	0,754 ***
	(0,029)	(0,022)	(0,055)	(0,036)	(0,023)	(0,062)
From 13 to 15 years	0,428 ***	0,639 ***	1,543 ***	0,435 ***	0,723 ***	1,549 ***
	(0,028)	(0,029)	(0,120)	(0,044)	(0,032)	(0,107)
16 and more years	0,470 ***	0,801 ***	2,483 ***	0,446 ***	0,929 ***	3,074 ***
	(0,031)	(0,028)	(0,140)	(0,039)	(0,032)	(0,185)
Experience (5 <experience<10 omitted)<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></experience<10>						
Experience<5	-0,021	-0,041	-0,615 **	-0,038	-0,136 **	-0,719 ***
	(0,065)	(0,062)	(0,239)	(0,081)	(0,080)	(0,233)
10 <cxperience<15< td=""><td>-0,058</td><td>0,056 *</td><td>0,488 ***</td><td>-0,136 ***</td><td>-0,002 *</td><td>0,662 ***</td></cxperience<15<>	-0,058	0,056 *	0,488 ***	-0,136 ***	-0,002 *	0,662 ***
	(0,041)	(0,029)	(0,094)	(0,044)	(0,040)	(0,096)
15 <experience<20< td=""><td>0,006</td><td>0,149 ***</td><td>0,720 ***</td><td>-0,109 **</td><td>0,104 ***</td><td>0,941 ***</td></experience<20<>	0,006	0,149 ***	0,720 ***	-0,109 **	0,104 ***	0,941 ***
	(0,040)	(0,032)	(0,099)	(0,046)	(0,039)	(0,106)
20 <experience<25< td=""><td>0,053</td><td>0,168 ***</td><td>0,763 ***</td><td>-0,003</td><td>0,201 ***</td><td>0,988 ***</td></experience<25<>	0,053	0,168 ***	0,763 ***	-0,003	0,201 ***	0,988 ***
	(0,041)	(0,034)	(0,098)	(0,036)	(0,043)	(0,101)
25 <experience<30< td=""><td>0,088 **</td><td>0,225 ***</td><td>0,852 🔌 🎄</td><td>-0,019</td><td>0,244 ***</td><td>1,078 ***</td></experience<30<>	0,088 **	0,225 ***	0,852 🔌 🎄	-0,019	0,244 ***	1,078 ***
	(0,035)	(0,032)	(0,101)	(0,046)	(0,040)	(0,098)
30 <experience<35< td=""><td>0,101 **</td><td>0,295 ***</td><td>1,054 ***</td><td>-0,060</td><td>0,229 ***</td><td>1,052 ***</td></experience<35<>	0,101 **	0,295 ***	1,054 ***	-0,060	0,229 ***	1,052 ***
	(0,040)	(0,030)	(0,109)	(0,049)	(0,043)	(0,119)
35 <experience<40< td=""><td>0.121 **</td><td>0,313 ***</td><td>1,045 ***</td><td>0,029</td><td>0,327 ***</td><td>1,256 ***</td></experience<40<>	0.121 **	0,313 ***	1,045 ***	0,029	0,327 ***	1,256 ***
· · ·	(0,050)	(0,036)	(0,114)	(0,047)	(0,044)	(0,109)
Experience>40	0,168 ***	0,343 ***	1,054	-0,010	0,339 👐	1,285 ***
	(0,042)	(0,035)	(0,102)	(0,052)	(0,041)	(0,117)
Nonmarried	-0,142 ***	-0,152 ***	-0,181 ***	-0,216 ***	-0,174 ***	-0,184 ***
	{0,022}	(0,013)	(0,026)	(0,030)	(0,016)	(0,032) .
Rest of the country	-0,255 ***	-0,248 ***	-0,306 ***	-0,323 ***	-0,283 ***	-0,313 ***
	(0,018)	(0,014)	(0,025)	(0,031)	(0,016)	(0,032)
Public sector	0,050 **	-0,122 ***	-0,367 ***	0,191 ***	0,049 ***	-0,144 ***
	(0,020)	(0,012)	(0,025)	(0,024)	(0,015)	(0,040)
Constant	3,246 ***	3,697 ***	3,630 ***	3,524 ***	3,876 ***	3,714 ***
	(0,046)	(0,035)	(0,109)	(0,052)	(0,042)	(0,123)

Notes: Bootstrapped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

Number of observations 1991/92:13,917 ; 1998/99; 13,294.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 1991,1992 and 1998,1999 data.

Уеат	1991/92	.1998/99	1991/92	1998/99
Explanatory Variables / Inequality Measure	Vari	ance		Gini
Information content	0,045 ***	0,055 *	** 0,003 **	* 0,004 ***
	(0,007)	(0,008)	(0,001)	(0,001)
Automation content	-0,042 ***	-0,024 *	-0,004 **	* -0,002 ***
	(0,008)	(0,008)	(0,001)	(0,001)
Education (6 years or less omitted)				
From 7 to 9 years	0,018	-0,025	-0,003 **	* -0,008 ***
	(0,014)	(0,018)	(0,001)	(0,002)
From 10 to 12 years	0,160 ***	0,133 *	** 0,007 **	0,003
	(0,025)	(0,022)	(0,002)	(0,002)
From 13 to 15 years	0,415 ***	0,436 👘	** 0,029 **	* 0,025 ***
	(0,037)	(0,041)	(0,003)	(0,003)
16 and more years	0,996 ***	1,241 *	** 0,075 **	* 0,083 ***
	(0,050)	(0,059)	(0,004)	(0,004)
Experience (5 <experience<10 omitted)<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></experience<10>				
Experience<5	-0,497 ***	-0,488 **	**	* -0,033 ***
	(0,068)	(0,084)	(0,008)	(0,007)
10 <experience<15< td=""><td>0,281 ***</td><td>0,383 **</td><td>** 0,025 **</td><td>* 0,031 ***</td></experience<15<>	0,281 ***	0,383 **	** 0,025 **	* 0,031 ***
	(0,043)	(0,045)	(0,004)	(0,004)
15 <experience<20< td=""><td>0,348 ***</td><td>0,481 **</td><td>** 0,030 **</td><td>* 0,038 ***</td></experience<20<>	0,348 ***	0,481 **	** 0,030 **	* 0,038 ***
	(0,045)	(0,049)	(0,004)	(0,004)
20 <experience<25< td=""><td>0,379 ***</td><td>0,472 *</td><td>** 0,030 **</td><td>* 0,035 ***</td></experience<25<>	0,379 ***	0,472 *	** 0,030 **	* 0,035 ***
	(0,053)	(0,051)	(0,004)	(0,003)
25 <experience<30< td=""><td>0,385 ***</td><td>0,526 **</td><td>*** 0,030 **</td><td>* 0,039 ***</td></experience<30<>	0,385 ***	0,526 **	*** 0,030 **	* 0,039 ***
	(0,048)	(0,053)	(0,005)	(0,003)
30 <experience<35< td=""><td>0,449 ***</td><td>0,550 **</td><td>*** 0,036 **</td><td>* 0,041 ***</td></experience<35<>	0,449 ***	0,550 **	*** 0,036 **	* 0,041 ***
	(0,051)	(0,054)	(0,004)	(0,004)
35 <experience<40< td=""><td>0,430 ***</td><td>0,596 **</td><td>** 0,033 **</td><td>* 0,043 ***</td></experience<40<>	0,430 ***	0,596 **	** 0,033 **	* 0,043 ***
	(0,053)	(0,056)	(0,005)	(0,004)
experience>40	0,408 ***	0,615 **	** 0,030 **	* 0,045 ***
	(0,047)	(0,055)	(0,004)	(0,004)
Nonmarried	0,016	0,029	0,004 **	0,007 ***
	(0,017)	(0,020)	(0,002)	(0,002)
Rest of the country	-0,014	0,026 *	0,004 **	* 0,008 ***
	(0,011)	(0,015)	(0,001)	(0,002)
Public sector	-0,208 ***	-0,201 *	** -0,018 **	* -0,018 ***
	(0,012)	(0,017)	(0,001)	(0,002)
Constant	-0,160 ***	-0,242 *	** 0,040 **	* 0,036`***
	(0,049)	(0,056)	(0,004)	(0,004)

Table 3. RIF Regression Of Inequality Measures on Men Log Wages (1991/92 - 1998/99)

.**.** •

Notes: Bootstrapped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

Number of observations 1991/92: 13,917 : 1998/99: 13,294.

*** p<0.01. ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 1991,1992 and 1998,1999 data.

Table 4. Unconditional Quantile Partial Effect on Men Log Wages (2001/02 - 2009/10) - RIF Regression

Year		2001/02		2009/10		
Explanatory Variables/ Quantile	10	50	90	10	50	90
•						
Information content	0,080 ***	0,104 ***	0,326 ***	0,053 ***	0,111 ***	0,264 ***
	(0,012)	(0,009)	(0,023)	(0,008)	(0,007)	(0,014)
Automation content	0,052 ***	0,050 ***	0,011	0,051 ***	0,053 ***	0,000
	(0,012)	(0,008)	(0,016)	(0,005)	(0,005)	(0,011)
Education (6 years or less omitted)						
From 7 to 9 years	0.212 ***	0,222 ***	0,140 ***	0,250 ***	0,174 ***	0,079 ***
	(0,037)	(0,022)	(0,025)	(0,020)	(0,014)	(0,012)
From 10 to 12 years	0,327 ***	0,456 ***	0,540 ***	0,374 ***	0,427 ***	0,392 ***
	(0,038)	(0,026)	(0,040)	(0,022)	(0,017)	(0,023)
From 13 to 15 years	0,389 ***	0,763 ***	1,206 ***	0,475 ***	0,762 ***	1,010 ***
	(0,050)	(0,039)	(0,104)	(0,025)	(0,025)	(0,054)
16 and more years	0,377 ***	0,921 ***	2,451 ***	0,487 ***	0,920 ***	2,322 ***
	(0,043)	(0,040)	(0,155)	(0,025)	(0,027)	(0,084)
Experience (5 <experience<10 omitted)<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></experience<10>						
Experience<5	0,026	0,104	-0,894 ***	0,023	-0,104 *	-0,849 ***
	(0,056)	(0,065)	(0,210)	(0,044)	(0,053)	(0,107)
10 <experience<15< td=""><td>-0,121 **</td><td>0,093 ***</td><td>0,747 ***</td><td>-0,085 🎂</td><td>0,017</td><td>0,575 🕬</td></experience<15<>	-0,121 **	0,093 ***	0,747 ***	- 0,08 5 🎂	0,017	0,575 🕬
	(0,048)	(0,036)	(0,082)	(0,030)	(0,022)	(0,050)
15 <experience<20< td=""><td>-0,090 *</td><td>0,195 ***</td><td>0,920 ***</td><td>-0,076 **</td><td>0,117 ***</td><td>0,785 ***</td></experience<20<>	-0,090 *	0,195 ***	0,920 ***	-0,076 **	0,117 ***	0,785 ***
	(0,047)	(0,034)	(0,087)	(0,031)	(0,025)	(0,053)
20 <experience<25< td=""><td>-0,023</td><td>0,315 ***</td><td>1,007 ****</td><td>0,016</td><td>0,207 *****</td><td>0,871 ***</td></experience<25<>	-0,023	0,315 ***	1,007 ****	0,016	0,207 *****	0,871 ***
	(0,045)	(0,035)	(0,089)	(0,02 9)	(0,024)	(0,055)
25 <experience<30< td=""><td>0,040</td><td>0,365 ***</td><td>1,065 ***</td><td>0,021</td><td>0,305 ***</td><td>1,015 ***</td></experience<30<>	0,040	0,365 ***	1,065 ***	0,021	0,305 ***	1,015 ***
	(0,044)	(0,036)	(0,094)	(0,030)	(0,023)	(0,066)
30 <experience<35< td=""><td>-0,001</td><td>0,373 ***</td><td>1,123</td><td>0,060 **</td><td>0,370 ***</td><td>1,105 ***</td></experience<35<>	-0,001	0,373 ***	1,123	0,060 **	0,370 ***	1,105 ***
	(0,054)	(0,037)	(0,102)	(0,029)	(0,027)	(0,063)
35 <experience<40< td=""><td>0,022</td><td>0,450 ***</td><td>1,248 ***</td><td>0,081 ***</td><td>0,401 ****</td><td>1,109 ***</td></experience<40<>	0,022	0,450 ***	1,248 ***	0,081 ***	0,401 ****	1,109 ***
·	(0,049)	(0,041)	(0,099)	(0,029)	(0,028)	(0,063)
Experience>40	0,040	0,535 ***	1,249 ***	0,029	0,38 5 ***	1,071 ***
-	(0,058)	(0,041)	(0,097)	(0,030)	(0,026)	(0,061)
Nonmarried	-0,154 ***	-0,116 🐃	-0,176 ***	-0,161 ***	-0,132 👫	-0,078 ***
	(0,029)	(0,016)	(0,031)	(0,015)	(0,011)	(0,020)
Rest of the country	-0,237 ***	-0,260 ***	-0,197 ***	-0,033 ***	-0,036 ***	-0,092 ***
	(0,025)	(0,016)	(0,028)	(0,011)	(0,010)	(0,017)
Public sector	0,264 ***	0,148 ***	-0,270 ***	0,189 ***	0,201 ***	-0,067 ***
	(0,022)	(0,015)	(0,037)	(0,013)	(0,012)	(0,023)
Constant	3,381 ***	3,658 ***	3,579 🏎	3,234 ***	3,725 ****	3,761 ***
	(0,060)	(0,040)	(0,102)	(0,032)	(0,028)	(0,066)

Notes: Bootstrapped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

Number of observations 2001/02:13,033 ; 2009/10: 30.631.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 2001, 2002 and 2009, 2010 data.

Table 5. RIF Re	gression Of Inequality	Measures on Men Lo	og Wages (2001/02 - 2009/10)
-----------------	------------------------	--------------------	------------------------------

Year	2001/02	2009/10	2001/02	2009/10
Explanatory Variables / Inequality Measure	Varia	ince	(Hni
Information content	0,098 ***	0,102 ***	* 0,006 ***	0,007 ***
	(0,010)	(0,007)	(0,001)	(0,001)
Automation content	-0,045 ***	-0,045 ***	* -0,005 ***	-0,005 ***
	(0,009)	(0,006)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Education (6 years or less omitted)				
From 7 to 9 years	-0,058 ***	-0,093 ***	* -0,010 ***	-0,013 ***
	(0,020)	(0,011)	(0,002)	(0,001)
From 10 to 12 years	0,058 ***	-0,044 ***	• -0,002	-0,011 ***
	(0,021)	(0,012)	(0,002)	(0,001)
From 13 to 15 years	0,362 ***	0,176 ***	* 0,019 ***	0,004 *
	(0,040)	(0,018)	(0,003)	(0,002)
16 and more years	1,027 ***	0,832 ***	* 0,068 ***	0,055 ***
	(0,058)	(0,031)	(0,004)	(0,003)
Experience (5 <experience<10 omitted)<="" td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></experience<10>				
Experience<5	-0,511 ***	-0,477 ***	* -0,039 ***	-0,038 ***
	(0,071)	(0,041)	(0,005)	(0,004)
10 <experience<15< td=""><td>0,426 ****</td><td>0,317 ***</td><td>* 0,034 ***</td><td>0,028 ***</td></experience<15<>	0,426 ****	0,317 ***	* 0,034 ***	0,028 ***
	(0,034)	(0,022)	(0,003)	(0,002)
15 <experience<20< td=""><td>0,515 ***</td><td>0,411 ***</td><td>* 0,040 ***</td><td>0,035 ***</td></experience<20<>	0,515 ***	0,411 ***	* 0,040 ***	0,035 ***
	(0,040)	(0,025)	(0,003)	(0,002)
20 <experience<25< td=""><td>0,521 ***</td><td>0,424 ***</td><td>* 0,039 ***</td><td>0,034 ***</td></experience<25<>	0,521 ***	0,424 ***	* 0,039 ***	0,034 ***
	(0,034)	(0,026)	(0,003)	(0,002)
25 <experience<30< td=""><td>0,528 ***</td><td>0,468 ***</td><td>• 0,038 ••••</td><td>0,037 ***</td></experience<30<>	0,528 ***	0,468 ***	• 0,038 ••••	0,037 ***
	(0,036)	(0,028)	(0,003)	(0,002)
30 <experience<35< td=""><td>0,559 ***</td><td>0,500 ***</td><td>* 0,040 ****</td><td>0,038 ***</td></experience<35<>	0,559 ***	0,500 ***	* 0,040 ****	0,038 ***
	(0,040)	(0,027)	(0,003)	(0,002)
35 <experience<40< td=""><td>0,624 ***</td><td>0,487 ***</td><td>* 0,044 ***</td><td>0,037 ***</td></experience<40<>	0,624 ***	0,487 ***	* 0,044 ***	0,037 ***
	(0,047)	(0,031)	(0,004)	(0,002)
experience>40	0,596 ***	0,476 ***	* 0,042 ***	0,037 ***
	(0,041)	(0,028)	(0,003)	(0,002)
Nonmarried	0,027	0,039 ***	* 0,006 ***	0,007 ****
	(0,023)	(0,012)	(0,002)	(0,001)
Rest of the country	0,026 *	-0,030 **	* 0,007 **	-0,002 **
	(0,014)	(0,011)	(0,001)	(0,001)
Public sector	-0,295 ***	-0,208 ***	* -0,028 ***	-0,020 ***
	(0,019)	(0,013)	(0,001)	(0,001)
Constant	-0,262 ***	-0,108 ***	* 0,038 ***	0,049 ***
	(0,043)	(0,028)	(0,004)	(0,002)

Notes: Bootstrapped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

Number of observations 2001/02:13,033 ; 2009/10: 30,631.

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 2001, 2002 and 2009, 2010 data.

Table 6. Aggregate Decomposition Results

Inequality Measure:	90-10	90-50	50-10	Variance	Gini
1991/92 - 1998/99	<u> </u>				
Total Change	0,1 79 7 ***	0,1260 ***	0.0538 ***	0,1037 ***	0,0079 ***
	(0,023)	(0,016)	(0.015)	(0,010)	(0,001)
Wage Structure	0,0918 ***	0,0589 ***	0,0329 ***	0,0609 ***	0,0045 ***
	(0,023)	(0,020)	(0,014)	(0,010)	(0,001)
Composition	0.0897 ***	0,0676 ***	0,0221 ***	0,0421 ***	0, 0 034 ***
	(0.014)	(0,012)	(0,004)	(0,006)	(0,001)
Specification Error	0,0074	0,0068	0,0006	0,0050	0,0004
	(0,025)	(0,022)	(0,015)	(0,011)	(0,001)
Reweighing Error	-0,0092	-0,0073	-0,0019	-0,0043	-0,0003
	(0.008)	(0,007)	(0,002)	(0,004)	(0,000)
2001/02 - 2009/10		, <u></u>			. <u></u>
Total Change	-0,1113 ***	-0,0932 ***	-0,0181 *	-0,0719 ***	-0, 0 072 ***
	(0,017)	(0,014)	(0,013)	(0,010)	(0,001)
Wage Structure	-0,1779 ***	-0,1384 ***	-0,0395 ***	-0,1046 ***	-0,0098 ***
	(0,022)	(0,019)	(0,014)	(0,011)	(0,001)
Composition	0 <u>.</u> 0634 ***	0,0448 ***	0,0186 ***	0,0301 ***	0,0025 ***
	(0,017)	(0,013)	(0,005)	(0,008)	(0,001)
Specification Error	0,0086	0,0050	0,0036	0,0172 *	0,0016 *
	(0,027)	(0,021)	(0,021)	(0,012)	(0,001)
Reweighing Error	-0,0054	-0,0045	-0,0009	-0,0146 ***	-0,0014 ***
	(0,011)	(0,009)	(0,003)	(0,006)	(0,000)

Notes: FFL (2010) decomposition method with F(X) 1991/92 reweighted to 1998/99 and F(X) 2001/02 reweighted to 2009/2010. Bootstraped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

The formulas for the different components are as following. The reweighting error is the difference between the total change and the sum of the wage structure and composition effects and the specificacion error.

Total change:
$$\delta_Q^v = \widehat{RIF}(Y_1, v) - \widehat{RIF}(Y_0, v)$$

Wage structure: $\overline{\Delta}_{5,p}^{p} = \overline{\lambda_{1}} \left(\hat{y}_{1}^{c} - \hat{y}_{C}^{c} \right)$

Composition: $\widehat{\Delta}_{X,F}^{F} \simeq (X_{0}^{C} - \overline{X_{0}})\widehat{Y}_{0}^{F}$

Specification error: $\hat{\Delta}_{X,e}^{c} = \overline{X_{0}^{c}} (\hat{Y}_{c}^{e} - \hat{Y}_{0}^{e})$

Number of observations 1991/92: 13.917 ; 1998/99: 13,294: 2001/2002: 13,033; 2009/10: 30,631. Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 1991,1992.1998,1999,2001.2002 and 2009,2010 data.

Inequality Measure:	90-10	90-50	50-10	Variance	Gini
A: Detailed Composition Effects:					
Information	-0,0008	-0,0007	-0,0001	-0,0003	0,0000
	(0,002)	(0,002)	(0,000)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Automation	0,0048 ***	0,0046 ***	0,0001	0,0025 ***	0,0003 ***
	(0,002)	(0,002)	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Education	0,0735 ***	0,0604 ***	0,0130 ***	0,0311 ***	0,0021 ***
	(0,015)	(0,013)	(0,003)	(0,007)	(0,001)
Experience	-0,0158 ***	-0,0123 ***	-0,0035 **	-0,0062 **	-0,0004 **
	(0,006)	(0,005)	(0,002)	(0,003)	(0,000)
Others	0,0282 ***	0,0156 ***	0,0126 ***	0,0150 ***	0,0015 ***
	(0,005)	(0,003)	(0,003)	(0,002)	(0,000)
Total Composition Effect	0,0897 ***	0,0676 ***	0,0221 ***	0,0421 ***	0,0034 ***
	(0,014)	(0,012)	(0,004)	(0,006)	(0,001)
B: Detailed Wage Structure Effect	s:			,	<u> </u>
Information	-0,0006	0,0010	-0,0015 **	-0,0005	-0,0001
	(0,002)	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Automation	-0,0019 **	-0,0019 **	0,0000	-0,0006 *	-0,0001 **
	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Education	0,0473	0,0160	0,0313	0,0270 **	0,0009
	(0,057)	(0,048)	(0,029)	(0,016)	(0,002)
Experience	0,2501 *	0,1828	0,06 73	0,1246 **	0,0085 **
	(0,159)	(0.147)	(0,064)	(0,061)	(0,005)
Others	-0,0752 *	-0,0629 *	-0,0123	-0.0068	0,0013
	(0,057)	(0,048)	(0,035)	(0,023)	(0,002)
Constant	-0,1279	-0,0760	-0,0519	-0,0826	-0,0060
	(0,203)	(0,192)	(0,088)	(0,073)	(0,006)
Total Wage Structure Effect	0,0918 *** (0,023)	0,0589 *** (0,020)	0,0329 **** (0,014)	0,0609 *** (0,010)	0,0045 *** (0,001)

Table 7. Detailed Decomposition Results 1991/92 - 1998/99

.

..

Notes: FFL (2010) Decomposition method with F(X) 1991/92 reweighted to 1998/99.

Bootstrapped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

Explanatory grouped variables include, automation and information content of tasks, 5 education classes (6 years or less ommited).

9 potential experience classes (5 to 10 years omnited), others (rest of the country, public sector and nonmarried).

<u>.</u> -

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05. * p<0.1

Number of observations 1991/92: 13,917 ; 1998/99: 13,294.

Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 1991,1992 and 1998,1999 data.

Table 8.	Detailed	Decomposition	Results	2001/02 -	- 2009/10

Inequality Measure:	90-10	90-50	50-10	Variance	Gini
A: Detailed Composition Effects:					
Information	-0,0042	-0,0037	-0,0005	-0,0019	-0,0001
	(0,005)	(0,005)	(0,001)	(0,002)	(0,000)
Automation .	-0,0012	-0,0011	-0,0001	-0,0019 *	-0,0002 *
	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,000)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Education	0,0452 ***	0,0290 ***	0,0162 ***	0,0166 ***	0,0007 *
	(0,015)	(0,011)	(0,005)	(0,006)	(0,000)
Experience	-0,0126 *	-0,0076 *	-0,0050 *	-0,0056 *	-0,0004 *
	(0,008)	(0,006)	(0,003)	(0,004)	(0,000)
Others	0,0363 ***	0,0283 ***	0,0080 ****	0,0229 ***	0,0024 ***
	(0,006)	(0,004)	(0,003)	(0,003)	(0,000)
Total Composition Effect	0,0634 ***	0,0448 ***	0,0186 ***	0,0301 ***	0,0025 ***
	(0,017)	(0,013)	(0,005)	(0,008)	(0,001)
B: Detailed Wage Structure Effects:					
Information	0,0092 ***	0,0115 ***	-0 <u>.</u> 0024 *	0,0013	-0,0001
	(0,004)	(0,004)	(0,002)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Automation	0,0021 *	0,0012	0,0009	0,0008	0,0000
	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Education	-0,0091	0,0145	-0,0236	-0,0238 *	-0,0013
	(0,041)	(0,038)	(0,034)	(0,019)	(0,002)
Experience	-0,1252	-0.0285	-0,0967 **	-0,0980 **	-0,0035
	(0,120)	(0,113)	(0,054)	(0.046)	(0,004)
Others .	-0,2729 ***	-0.1859 ***	-0,0869 ***	-0,1103 ***	-0,0122 ***
	(0,054)	(0,048)	(0,033)	(0,025)	(0,002)
Constant	0,2180 *	0,0487	0,1693 **	0,1254 **	0,0073 *
	(0,158)	(0,148)	(0,074)	(0,061)	(0,005)
Total Wage Structure Effect	-0,1779 ***	-0,1384 ***	-0,0395 ***	-0,1046 ****	-0,0098 ***
	(0,022)	(0,019)	(0,014)	(0,011)	(0,001)

Notes: FFL (2010) Decomposition method with F(X) 2001/02 reweighted to 2009/10.

Bootstrapped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

Explanatory grouped variables include, automation and information content of tasks. 5 education classes (6 years or less ommited).

9 potential experience classes (5 to 10 years ournited), others (rest of the country, public sector and nonmarried).

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Number of observations 2001/2002: 13,033; 2009/10: 30.631.

Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 2001,2002 and 2009,2010 data.

53

.

.

Figures

•



Figure 1. Task Content Measures by Occupational Category

Automation Content measure by Occupational Category





Figure 2. Changes in Real Wages (\$ Dic. 2010) by Percentile, Men



Changes in Men Real Wages (\$ Dic.2010) by Percentile 2001-2010

Figure 3. Unconditional Quantile Regression Coefficients: Occupational Task 1991/92 – 1998/99 – 2001/02 – 2009/10







Source: Author's own estimations

•

Ì

•



•

Ó

6

•

•

٠

Ő

•

0











•

•

•

•

•

۲

•

۲

۲

•

•







.

Source: Author's own estimations



,

•

•

ŏ





Source: Author's own estimations

•



Source: Author's own estimations



Figure 6. Detailed Decomposition of Composition Effects

Source: Author's own estimations



Figure 7. Detailed Decomposition of Wage Structure Effects

Source: Auhtor's own estimation



Source: Author's own estimations

Methodological appendix

A RIF-regression is a regression where the dependent variable, Y, has been replaced by the recentered influence function (RIF) of the statistic of interest v(F). Consider IF(y; v, F), the influence function corresponding to an observed variable y for the distributional statistic of interest.⁴¹⁴² The RIF adds this influence function back to the observed statistic of interest,

(1) RIF(y; v) = v(F) + IF(y; v)

Using the law of iterated expectation yields the original statistic v:

(2)
$$E[RIF(y; v)] = \int RIF(y; v) dF(y) = \int (v(F) + IF(y; v)) dF(y) = v(F).$$

Meaning that any functional of interest can be expressed as an expected value. In its simplest form, the approach assumes that the conditional expectation of the RIF(y; v) can be modeled as a linear function of the explanatory variables,

(3)
$$E[RIF(y; v)|X] = X\gamma + \epsilon$$
,

where the parameters γ can be estimated by standard least square methods (FFL, 2007).⁴³ Letting $v_t = v(F_t)$ and $v_c = v(F_c)$, the distributional statistics v_1 , v_0 and v_c can be written as the expectations: $v_t = E[RIF(y_t; v)|T = t]$, t=0,1 and $v_c = E[RIF(y_0; v)|T = 1]$. Using the law of iterated expectations, the distributional statistics can also be expressed in terms of expectations of the conditional recentered influence functions.

In this case we focus on differences in the wage distribution for two time periods, 1 and 0. Let Y_{1i} be the wage that would be paid in period 1 and Y_{0i} the wage that would be paid in period

^{41.} Where $IF(y; v, F) = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} (v(F_{\epsilon}) - v(F))/\epsilon$, where $F_{\epsilon}(y) = (1 - \epsilon)F + \epsilon \delta_y$, $0 \le \epsilon \le 1$ and where δ_v is a distribution that only puts mass at the value y.

^{42.} To simplify notation we write IF (y; v, F) = IF(y; v).

^{43.} FFL (2009) demonstrates that in the case of quantiles, using linear specification for RIF-regressions generally yields very similar estimates to more flexible methods allowing for non-linearities.

0. For each *i* the observed wage Y_i can be defined as $Y_i = Y_{1i} \cdot T_i + Y_{0i} \cdot (1 - T_i)$, where $T_i = 1$ if individual *i* is observed in period 1, and $T_i = 0$ if individual *i* is observed in period 0.

If we write the RIF-regression as $m_t^v(x) \equiv E[RIF(y_t;v_t)|X, T = t]$, for t = 0, 1 and $m_c^v(x) \equiv E[RIF(y_0;v_t)|X, T = 1]$, we have

(4) $v_t = E[m_t^v(X) | T = t], t = 0,1$ (5) $v_c = E[m_c^v(X) | T = 1]$

It follows that Δ_S^{ν} and Δ_X^{ν} can be rewritten as:

(6)
$$\Delta_S^v = E[m_1^v(X) \mid T = 1] - E[m_c^v(X) \mid T = 1]$$

(7) $\Delta_Y^v = E[m_c^v(X) \mid T = 1] - E[m_c^v(X) \mid T = 0]$

In the case of linear specification:

 $m_{t,L}^{\nu} = x^T \gamma_t^{\nu}$ and $m_{c,L}^{\nu} = x^T \gamma_c^{\nu}$

Where γ_t^{ν} and γ_c^{ν} are the estimation coefficients of the regression of RIF(y; v) on X

(8)
$$\gamma_t^v = E([X, X^T | T = t])^{-1} \cdot E[RIF(Y_t; v_t) \cdot X | T = t], \quad t = 0, 1$$

(9) $\gamma_c^v = E([X, X^T | T = 1])^{-1} \cdot E[RIF(Y_t; v_c) \cdot X | T = 1]$

Although linear projections are an approximation for the true conditional expectation, the expected approximation error is zero, so we can rewrite Δ_S^{ν} and Δ_{X-}^{ν} as:

(10)
$$\Delta_{S}^{v} = E[X \mid T = 1]^{T} \cdot (\gamma_{1}^{v} - \gamma_{c}^{v})$$

(11) $\Delta_{X}^{v} = E[X \mid T = 1]^{T} \cdot \gamma_{c}^{v} - E[X \mid T = 0]^{T} \cdot \gamma_{0}^{v}$

If the conditional expectation is indeed linear in x, then $\gamma_0^{\nu} = \gamma_c^{\nu}$ and, in the case of the mean, the equations above reproduce the Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition.

Until now we have gotten a general decomposition very similar to the standard Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition. Now we focus on getting the contribution of each single covariate to the composition and wage structure effect.

Detailed Composition effect

We can rewrite equation (11) as:

(12)
$$\Delta_X^v = (E[X|T=1] - E[X|T=0])^T \cdot \gamma_0^v + R^v$$

where $R^{\nu} = E[X|T = 1]^T (\gamma_c^{\nu} - \gamma_0^{\nu})$. The first term can be rewritten in terms of the contribution of each covariate (k) as

(13)
$$\sum_{k=1}^{K} (E[X^{k}|T=1] - E[X^{k}|T=0])^{T} \cdot \gamma_{0,k}^{v}$$

where each component of this equation can be interpreted as the effect of changing the distribution of one covariate from its T=0 to its T=1 level, holding the distribution of the other covariates unchanged. The second term in equation (15), R^{ν} , is the approximation (specification) error.

Detailed Wage Structure Effect

The difference between the wage structure effect in a standard Oaxaca-Blinder decomposition and that in equation (10) is that instead of using the unadjusted regression coefficient for group 0 (γ_0^v), the FFL(2009) decomposition method use the regression coefficient when the group 0 data is reweighted to have the same distribution of X as group 1 (γ_c^v). Although, using the counterfactual coefficient avoids contaminating the difference in the wage structure with differences in the distribution of the covariates between the two groups, the method does not permit to solve the problem of the sensitivity of the contribution of each covariate to the choice of a base group (DFL, 2007).

Indeed, in the linear specification the detail wage structure effect is given by

(14)
$$\Delta_s^{\nu} = \sum_{k=2}^{K} E[X^k | T = 1] \cdot [\gamma_{1,k}^{\nu} - \gamma_{C,k}^{\nu}] + [\gamma_{1,1}^{\nu} - \gamma_{C,1}^{\nu}],$$

•

6

¢

where $[\gamma_{1,1}^{\nu} - \gamma_{C,1}^{\nu}]$ is the difference in the intercepts of the model. In a more general way where the base group is defined by $X^k = x_B^k$, we have:

(15)
$$\Delta_{s}^{v} = \sum_{k=2}^{K} E[X^{k} - x_{B}^{k}]T = 1] \left[\gamma_{1,k}^{v} - \gamma_{C,k}^{v}\right] + \left[\gamma_{1,1}^{v} - \gamma_{C,1}^{v} + \sum_{k=2}^{K} x_{B}^{k}[\gamma_{1,k}^{v} - \gamma_{C,k}^{v}]\right]$$

Therefore, we have that both, the wage structure effect associated to a given covariate (the first term) and the residual difference (the last term) depend on the choice of the base group. If the RIF-regression approach provides a good approximation, then

(16)
$$v_1 - v_C \approx \gamma_{1,k}^v - \gamma_{C,k}^v + \sum_{k=1}^M x_B^k \cdot [\gamma_{1,k}^v - \gamma_{C,k}^v]$$

That is, the predicted change in the base group (right hand side of the equation) should be close to the actual change in the distributional statistic observed in the base group (left hand side of the equation, which can be estimated separately) (FFL, 2007). If the RIF-regression approach provides an accurate approximation of the underlying effects, then we should have that the reweighting error tends to disappear if the reweighting matrix is consistently estimated and $plim(\overline{X_0^c}) = plim(\overline{X_1})$.

In the case of quantiles, the influence function IF $(Y;Q_{\tau})$ is given by $(\tau - I\{Y \le Q_{\tau}\})/f_{Y}(Q_{\tau})$, where I {.} is an indicator function, $f_{Y}(.)$ is the density of the marginal distribution of Y, and Q_{τ} is the population τ -quantile of the unconditional distribution of Y. As a result, RIF $(Y; Q_{\tau})$ is equal to $Q_{\tau} + IF(Y;Q_{\tau})$, and can be rewritten as

(17)
$$RIF(Y, Q_{\tau}) = Q_{\tau} + \frac{\tau - l\{Y \le Q_{\tau}\}}{f_{Y}(Q_{\tau})} = c_{1,\tau} \cdot l\{Y > Q_{\tau}\} + c_{2,\tau},$$

where $c_{1,\tau} = 1/f_Y(Q_\tau)$ and $c_{2,\tau} = Q_\tau - c_{1,\tau}(1-\tau)$. Except for the constants $c_{1,\tau}$ and $c_{2,\tau}$, the RIF for a quantile is simply an indicator variable I{Y $\leq Q_\tau$ } for whether the outcome variable is smaller or equal to the quantile Q_τ . Running a linear regression of I{Y $\leq Q_\tau$ } on X is a distributional regression estimated at $y = Q_\tau$, using the link function of the linear probability model ($\Lambda(z) = z$) (FFL, 2010).

FFL (2009) explain how to first compute the RIF, and then run regressions of the RIF on the vector of covariates. In the case of quantiles, the RIF is first estimated by computing the sample quantile $\widehat{Q_{\tau}}$ and estimating the density at that point using kernel methods. An estimate of the RIF of each observation, $\overline{RIF}(Y_i; Q_{\tau})$, is then obtained by plugging in the estimates $\widehat{Q_{\tau}}$ and $\widehat{f_Y}(\widehat{Q_{\tau}})$ into equation (17).

Letting the coefficients of the unconditional quantile regressions for each group be

(18)
$$\widehat{\gamma_{g,\tau}} = (\sum_{i \in G} X_i X_i^T)^{-1} \sum_{i \in G} \widehat{RIF}(Y_{g,i}; Q_{g,\tau}) X_i, \qquad g = 0, 1$$

we can write the equivalent of the OB decomposition for any unconditional quantile as

(19)
$$\widehat{\Delta_0^{\tau}} = \overline{X_1} (\widehat{\gamma_{1,\tau}} - \widehat{\gamma_{0,\tau}}) + (\overline{X_1} - \overline{X_0}) \widehat{\gamma_{0,\tau}} \\ = \widehat{\Delta_S^{\tau}} + \widehat{\Delta_X^{\tau}}$$

The second term in equation (19) can be rewritten in terms of the sum of the contribution of each covariate as

(20)
$$\widehat{\Delta_X^{\tau}} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} (\overline{X_{1k}} - \overline{X_{0k}}) \widehat{\gamma_{0k,\tau}}$$

That is, the detailed elements of the composition effect can be computed in the same way as for the mean. Similarly, the detailed elements of the wage structure effects can be computed, but as in the case of the mean, these will also be subject to the problem of the omitted group. For the reweighted-regression decomposition, the composition effect and the wage structure effect are

(21)
$$\Delta_{\overline{X},p}^{\widehat{\tau}} = (\overline{X_0^C} - \overline{X_0})\widehat{\gamma}_{0,\tau}$$
 and $\widehat{\Delta}_{S,p}^{\tau} = \overline{X_1}(\widehat{\gamma_{1,\tau}} - \widehat{\gamma_{1,\tau}^C}),$
(22)

••

and where the group 0 sample is reweighted to mimic the group 1 sample, which means we should have $plim(\overline{X_0^C}) = plim(\overline{X_1})$.

Appendix tables

Appendix Table A.1

CIUO-88	COTA -70	DENOMINACION	SOC CODE	
1		MIEMBROS DEL PODER EJECUTIVO Y DE LOS CUERPOS LEGISLATIVOS Y PERSONAL	11-1011.00	
11		MIEMBROS DEL PODER EJECUTIVO Y DE LOS CUERPOS LEGISLATIVOS Y PERSONAL	11-1011.00	
111	100	MIEMBROS DEL PODER EJECUTIVO Y DE LOS CUERPOS LEGISLATIVOS	11-1011.00	
112		PERSONAL DIRECTIVO DE LA ADMINISTRACIÓN PÚBLICA	11-1011.00	
114	127	DIRIGENTES Y ADMINISTRADORES DE ORGANIZACIONES ESPECIALIZADAS	11-9151.00 -	
12		DIRECTORES DE EMPRESAS	11-1011.00	
121	110/121/122/123/124/125	DIIRECTORES Y GERENTES GENERALES DE EMPRESA	11-1021.00	
122	125	GERENTES DE DEPARTAMENTOS DE PRODUCCION Y OPERACIONES	11-3051.00	
123	110/111/123/124/125/126	OTROS GERENTES DE DEPARTAMENTO	11-9199.00	
13		DUEÑOS O GERENTES DE PEQUEÑA EMPRESA	11-9199.00	
131	110/111/121	DUEÑOS O GERENTES DE PEQUEÑA EMPRESA	11-9199.00	
2		PROFESIONALES, CIENTÍFICOS E INTELECTUALES		
21		PROFESIONALÉS DE LAS CIENCIAS FÍSICAS, QUÍMICAS Y MATEMÁTICAS Y DE LA INGENIERIA		
211	010/011/075	FÍSICOS, QUÍMICOS Y AFINES	19-2012.00; 19-2011.00; 19-2031.00; 19-2042.00; 19-2099.00	
212	070/072/075	MATEMÁTICOS, ESTADÍSTICOS Y AFINES	15-2011.00; 15-2021.00; 15-2031.00; 15-2041.00; 15-2041.01; 15-2041.02; 15-2091.00; 15-2099.00	
213	φ7 0	PROFESIONALES DE LA INFORMÁTICA	15-1051.00; 15-1099.02; 15-1021.00; 15-1099.00; 15-1051.01; 15-1061.00; 15-1071.00; 15-1071.01; 15-1061.00; 15-1030.00	
214	000/001/002/003/004/005/ 005/007/008	IARQUITECTOS, INGENIEROS Y AFINES	17-1011.00; 17-1012.00; 17-2051.00; 17-2071.00; 17-2072.00; 17-2141.00; 17-2121.01; 17-2151.00; 17-1022.00; 17-1021.00; 17-2112.00; 17-2199.00; 17-2021.00; 17-2041.00	
22		PROFESIONALES DE LAS CIENCIAS BIOLÓGICAS, LA MEDICINA Y LA SALUD		
221	014/020/022/025/026	PROFESIONALES EN CIENCIAS BIOLOGICAS Y OTRAS DISCIPLINAS RELATIVAS A LOS SERES ORGANICOS	19-1020.01; 19-1029.00; 19-1023.00; 19-1021.00	
. 222	013/021/030/031	MÉDICOS Y PROFESIONALES AFINES (EXCEPTO EL PERSONAL DE ENFERMERÍA Y PARTERIA)	29-1062.00; 29-1041.00; 29-1061.00; 29-1063.00; 29-1064.00; 29-1065.00; 29-1067.00; 29-1067.00; 29-1069.00; 29-1069.01; 29-1069.00; 29-1069.04; 29-1069.05; 29-1069.06; 29-1069.07; 29-1069.08; 29-1069.09; 29-1069.10; 29-1069.11; 29-1069.12; 29-1069.03; 29-1021.00; 29-1023.00; 29-1024.00; 29-1029.00; 29-1131.00	
223	050/052	PERSONAL DE ENFERMERIA Y PARTERIA DE NIVEL SUPERIOR	29-1111.00; 29-1111.01	
23		PROFESIONALES DE LA ENSEÑANZA		
			25-1054.00; 25-1032.00; 25-1042.00; 25-1022.00;	
231	060	PROFESORES DE UNIVERSIDADES Y OTROS ESTABLECIMIENTOS DE LA ENSEÑANZA SUPERIOR	25-1011.00; 25-1111.00; 25-1041.00; 25-1065.00; 25-1199.00; 25-1052.00; 25-1031.00; 25-1071.00; 25-1063.00; 25-1112.00; 25-1043.00; 25-1067.00; 25-1072.00	
232	061	PROFESORES DE LA ENSEÑANZA SECUNDARIA	25-2031.00	
233	062	MAESTROS TITULADOS DE LA ENSEÑANZA PRIMARIA Y PREESCOLAR	25-2021.00; 25-2011.00, 25-2012.00	
234	064	MAESTROS ESPECIALIZADOS DE LA ENSEÑANZA ESPECIAL	25-2041.00	
235	060/061/062/064/065	OTROS PROFESIONALES DE LA ENSEÑANZA	25-9099.00	
24		OTROS PROFESIONALES CIENTÍFICOS E INTELECTUALES	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
241	072/073/074/075/099/140/ 210/331/338	ESPECIALISTAS EN ORGANIZACIÓN Y ADMINISTRACIÓN DE EMPRESAS Y AFINES	13-2011.01; 13-2011.02; 13-1072.00; 13-1079.00; 13-1199.00; 13-1111.00; 13-2051.00; 19-3021.00; 27-3031.00; 11-2011.00	
242	080/081/082	PROFESIONALES DEL DERECHO	23-1011.00; 23-1023.00; 23-2093.00; 23-2011.00; 23-2091.00; 23-2099.00	
243	092/142	ARCHIVEROS, BIBLIOTECARIOS, DOCUMENTALISTAS Y AFINES	25-4011.00; 25-4013.00; 25-4021.00; 25-9099.00	
244	009/011/073/075/141/143	ESPECIALISTAS EN CIENCIAS SOCIALES Y HUMANAS	19-3011.00; 19-3091.01; 19-3041.00; 19-3092.00; 19-3091.02; 19-3099.00; 19-3093.00, 19-3094.00, 27-3091.00; 19-3031.00; 19-3039.00; 21-1029.00	
245	007/090/091/092/093/094/ 095/096	ESCRITORES, ARTISTAS CREATIVOS Y EJECUTANTES	27-3022.00; 27-3043.00; 27-3011.00; 27-3041.00; 27-1013.00; 27-1019.00; 27-2041.04; 27-2042.01; 27-2042.02; 27-2032.00; 27-2031.00; 27-2012.02; 27-2011.00	
246	130/975	SACERDOTES DE DISTINTAS RELIGIONES	21-2011.00	
	3	TECNICOS Y PROFESIONALES DE NIVEL MEDIO		
31	L	TECNICOS Y PROFESIONALES DE NIVEL MEDIO DE LAS CIENCIAS FÍSICAS Y QUÍMICAS, LA INGENIERIA Y AFINES		
31.1	2.007/009/010/011/013/280	TÉCNICOS EN CIENCIAS FÍSICAS Y QUÍMICAS Y EN INGENIERÍA	19-4031.00; 19-4041.00; 17-3031.01; 17-3022.00; 17-3023.03; 17-3023.01; 17-3029.00; 17-3027.01; 17-3027.00; 17-3021.00; 19-4031.00; 19-4041.00; 17-3011.01; 17-3011.02; 17-3012.01; 17-3013.00; 17-3019.00; 17-3026.00; 17-3012.00; 17-3012.02	
312	008/070/230	TÉCNICOS EN PROGRAMACIÓN Y CONTROL INFORMÁTICOS	15-1051.00; 15-1041.00	
313	043/044/144/145/262/870	OPERADORES DE EQUIPOS ÓPTICOS Y ELECTRÓNICOS	27-4021.00; 27-4012.00; 27-4014.00; 27-4031.00; 27-4099.00; 27-4013.00; 39-3021.00; 29-2099.01; 29-2034.01; 29-2099.00	
314	150/151/152/153/240/521/ 530/682	TÉCNICOS EN NAVEGACIÓN MARÍTIMA Y AERONÁUTICA	53-5021.01; 53-5021.02; 53-5021.03; 53-2011.00; 53-2022.00; 53-2021.00; 53-6041.00	
315	009/099/105/240	INSPECTORES DE OBRAS, SEGURIDAD Y SALUD Y CONTROL DE CALIDAD	47-4011.00: 33-2021.00; 33-2022.00; 13-1041.01;	
GUL0.00	10070 m		r	
--	--	--	--	---
000-88	LOIA 70	DENOMINACION	SOC CODE	
32		TECNICOS Y PROFESIONALES DE NIVEL MEDIO DE LAS CIENCIAS BIOLÓGICAS, LA MEDICINA Y LA SALUD		
	009/012/013/014/022/025/		19-4021 00: 19-4011 01: 19-4093 00: 19-4011 02:	
321	076/027/608/621/841	TECNICOS DE NIVEL MEDIO EN CIENCIÁS BIOLÓGICAS, AGRONOMÍA, ZOOTECNIA Y AFINES	10 4000 01	
	020/02//000/021/041		19-4099.01	
	027/032/040/043/045/046/	077/072/040/043/045/046		29-1071.00; 29-9099.00; 29-1031.00; 29-2081.00;
207			DEALERIONALES DE NIVEL MEDIO DE LA MEDICINA MODERNA VIA CALUE ENCORTO EL GERCONAL DE	31-9091.00; 29-2021.00; 29-1123.00; 29-1011.00;
322	027/032/040/043/043/048/	PROFESIONALES DE MINIELMEDIO DE DA MEDICINA MODERNA Y DA SALOD (EXCEPTO EL PERSONAL DE	29-1081.00: 31-9011.00: 29-2091.00: 29-1199.00:	
4	047/048/051	ENFERMERIA Y PARTERIA)	31-9096 00: 28-2056 00: 26-1051 00: 29-1129 00:	
1			31-30-30.00, 25-2030.00, 25-2031.00, 25-2125.00,	
			29-2052.00; 29-2012.00	
323	050/053	PERSONAL DE ENFERMERIA Y PARTERIA DE NIVEL MEDIO	29-2061.00; 29-9099.01	
324	047/048/975	PRACTICANTES DE LA MEDICINA TRADICIONAL Y CURANDEROS	29-1199.04; 29-1199.01	
33		MAESTROS E INSTRUCTORES NO TITULADOS		
331	065	MAESTROS NO TITULADOS DE LA ENSEÑANZA PRIMARIA	25-3099-00	
332	066	MAESTROS NO TITULADOS DE LA ENSEÑANZA PREESCOLAR	25-3099.00	
353	064/065		35 3000 00	
323	150/500 504		25-5099.00	
304	132/300/321	O ROS MAESTRUS E INSTRUCTORES NO THOLADUS	25-3099.00	
		OTROS TECNICOS Y PROFESIONES DE NIVEL MEDIO		
			41-3031.02; 41-3031.00; 13-2052.00; 13-2053.00;	
2/1	300/320/330/331/332/333/	I INDRESSIONES DE MILVEL ANCOLO EN OREDACIONES EINIANSIER A VICONTERCIALES	41-9021.00; 41-9022.00; 41-3041.00; 41-4012.00;	
	337	FROFESIONES DE NIVEL MEDIO EN OFERACIONES FINANCIERAS 7 COMERCIALES	13-1023.00: 13-1022.00: 13-2021.02: 13-1031.02:	
			13, 2009 00	
			12 1022 00 12 1100 02 12 0021 00 12 7071 03	
342	334/335/336/338/339	AGENTES COMERCIALES Y CORREDORES	15-1025.00; 15-1199.05; 45-5071.00; 15-1071.02;	
	ana (ana (a ao):		15-10/1.01; 13-1011.00; 41-3011.00; 41-3099.00	
343	070/072/082/146/211/220/	PROFESIONALES DE NIVEL MEDIO DE SERVICIOS DE ADMINISTRACIÓN	43-6011.00; 43-6012.00; 43-4031.01; 43-9041.00,	
	282/286		<u>43-91</u> 11.00	
· 344	105/128/200/213/901/902	AGENTES DE LAS ADMINISTRACIONES PÚBLICAS DE ADUANAS, IMPUESTOS Y AFINES	33-3021.05; 13-2081.00; 13-1041.02	
345	901/903	INSPECTORES DE POLICÍA Y DETECTIVES	33-1012.00: 33-3021.01: 33-9021.00	
345	143	TRABALADORES Y ASISTENTES SOCIALES DE NIVEL MEDIO	21,1029.00	
			17 1016 00: 27 1025 00: 27 4027 00: 27 4022 07	
1	007/091/093/094/095/096/		27-1028.00; 27-1025.00; 27-1027.00; 27-1022.00;	
347	160/161/162/286/424/617/	PROFESIÓNALES DE NIVEL MEDIO DE ACTIVIDADES ARTÍSTICAS. ESPECTÁCULOS Y DEPORTES	27-1029.00; 27-1021.00; 27-3011.00; 27-3012.00;	
1	950		27-3021.00; 27-2041.01; 27-2042.02; 27-2031.00;	
	200		27-2099.00: 39-9031.00: 27-2021.00: 27-2023.00	
348	130	AUXILLARES LAICOS DE LOS CUITOS	21-2099.00	
41		OFICINISTAS		
411	210/211/220/221/222/230/	SECRETARIOS Y OPERADORES DE MAQUINAS DE OEICINA	43-9022.00; 43-1011.00; 43-9021.00; 43-3021.03;	
·	261		43-6014.00	
	122/200/211/212/214/280/		43-3031.00; 43-3021.02; 43-3071.00; 43-3051.00;	
412	283/286/332	AUXIUARES CONTABLES Y FINANCIEROS	43-3011.00: 43-9061.00: 43-4141.00: 43-4011.00	
			42 5091 03: 42 5071 00: 42 5091 00: 43 5111 00:	
417	240/245/262/2000/202	INTELED A DAS ENCADAS DE RECEITRA DE MATERIALES Y DE TRANSPORTES	13 F001 01, 43 F0C1 00, F3 5021 00, F3 4000 00.	
+13	240/241/242/200/202	TIMIFICATOS ENCARGADOS DE REGISTRO DE MATERIALES E DE TRANSFORTES	43-3081.01, 43-3081.00, 33-1031.00, 33-4033.00,	
<u>ا</u>			43-5032.00; 53-1031.00; 53-6099.00	
	072/179/142/223/250/251/		25-4031.00; 43-4071.00; 43-4121.00; 43-9071.00;	
414	052/112/142/213/230/151/	EMPLEADOS DE BIBLIOTECAS Y SERVICIOS DE CORREOS Y AFINES	43-5051.00; 43-5052.00; 43-5053.00; 43-9081.00;	
	232/235/284/280/709		25-4010 00; 25-4021.00	
419	212/286	OTROS OFICINISTAS	43-4151.00: 43-9199.00	
47		EMPLEADOS EN TRATO DIRECTO CON EL PURILCO		
	117/117/251/281/282/285/		41,2011 00:20 2012 00:20 2011 00:20 2010 00:	
421	212/213/252/282/285/285/	CAJEROS, TAQUILLEROS Y AFINES	41-2011.00; 35-3012.00; 35-3011.00; 35-3015.00;	
	286/332/975		39-3031.00	
422	260/281/282/972	EMPLEADOS DE SERVICIOS DE INFORMACIÓN À LA CLIENTELA	41-3041.00; 43-4181.00; 43-4171.00; 43-4081.00;	
			13 3004 05 43 3064 05	
5			43+2021.00; 43-2011.00	
51		TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS	45-2021.00; 43-2011.00	
		TRABAJAQORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD	43-201107 43-201100	
511	271/910/933/972/973	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES V DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AS ERVICIO DEREOS PERSANEROS	43-2021.00; 43-2011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6072.00	
511	271/910/933/972/973	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS	43-2021.00; 45-2011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 32-001.00; 35-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00	
511	271/910/933/972/973	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS	39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 37-2011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00;	
511	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES	33-6031.00; 33-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3031.00;	
511	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES	43-2021.00; 43-2011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7022.01; 35-2013.00; 15-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-3021.00; 35-2013.00; 15-2014.00; 35-2015.00;	
511	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES	33-6031.00; 33-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3011.00; 35-2021.0; 35-2013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2019.00	
511	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES	43-7021.06; 43-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3011.00; 35-7022.01; 35-7013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2019.00 35-5011.0131-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031-	
511	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES	39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2022.01; 35-2013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2029.00 39-9011.0131-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00	
511	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES	33-6031.00; 33-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3011.00; 35-2021.00; 35-2013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2019.00; 35-20	
511 512 513	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/951/970/971/075	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICUIJARES	43-7021.00; 43-7011.00 33-6031.00; 35-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2019.00 35-5011.0133-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 35-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 35-2021.95-5091.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4091.00;	
511 512 513 514	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES	33-6031.00; 43-201100 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3011.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2019.00 39-9011.0131-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-3020.00; 35-5091.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00;	
511 512 513 514	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES DETRÓLOCOS A DIVINA DORES Y ACINES	43-7021.06; 43-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3011.00; 35-2029.00 35-5011.01; 31-2013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-5011.01; 31-1012.00; 33-011.00; 31-90; 5.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-90; 00; 39-3020.00; 35-5091.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 39-4021.00	
511 512 513 514 515	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES	43-7021.00; 43-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.90; 35-7021.00; 35-7014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-9011.0133-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5092.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5092.00; 39-5012.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 39-6021.00;	
511 512 513 514 514	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES V DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES	39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2013.00; 35-3031.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2019.00 39-5011.01; 31-1012.0053-3011.0031-5095.0031- 5096.0031-9099.00 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-3092.00; 39-5091.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 39-4021.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-3051.01;	
511 512 513 514 514 515 516	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 068 160/890/900/901/903	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD	43-7021.07 43-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2029.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2019.00; 35-5019.00; 31-1011.00; 35-0099.00; 39-5021.00; 35-5091.00; 31-1011.00; 35-0099.00; 39-4021.00; 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-3052.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9099.00; 33-3052.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9099.00;	
511 512 513 514 515 516	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES V DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD	43-7021.07; 43-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3031.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-9011.0131-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-4021.00; 39-4021.00; 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.03; 33-3051.01; 33-9032.00; 33-9012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9032.00; 33-9012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9032.00; 33-9012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9032.00; 30-9012.00; 33-9012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9032.00; 30-9012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9032.00; 30-9012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9032.00;	
511 512 513 514 514 515 516 516	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES	43-7021.06; 43-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3011.00; 35-2022.01; 35-2013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2019.00 35-5011.01; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-4021.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-3052.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9032.00;	
511 512 513 514 515 515 515 515 515 515	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 310	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIOS DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES	43-7021.07; 43-7011.00 33-6031.00; 35-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2029.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2019.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5021.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5021.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-4021.00; 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-3052.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9032.00	
511 512 513 514 514 515 515 515 515 515 515 517 517	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 310 11/310/338/893	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES V DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD	39-6031.00; 49-201100 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 53-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-9011.0131-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-4021.00 39-4021.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.03; 33-3051.01; 33-9052.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-5032.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-5032.00	
511 512 513 514 514 515 516 516 522 521 522 522	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 068 160/890/900/901/903 310 111/310/338/833 313	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIÓS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD YENDOROSE Y DE MOSTRADORES DE TEMPOS Y ALMACENES	43-7021.06; 43-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3011.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7011.00; 35-2013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 39-4021.00; 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-3052.00; 33-5032.00; 33-50	
511 512 513 514 514 515 516 516 516 512 512 512 512 512 512	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 111/310/338/833 313	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES V DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS, DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD YENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES DE TIRIPAS Y ALMACENES YENDEDORES DE COLOSCOS Y DE PUESTOS DE MERCADO	43-7021.07, 43-7011.00 39-6031.00, 39-6032.00, 39-6021.00, 39-6022.00 37-1011.00, 35-1011.00, 35-2011.00, 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00, 35-1012.00, 35-3031.00, 35-3011.00; 35-7021.00, 35-1012.00, 35-2014.00, 35-2015.00; 35-9011.0133-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 39-9011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9095.00; 39-4021.00; 39-4021.00; 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 33-4022.00; 33-9032.00; 33-9032.00; 33-9032.00; 41-9012.00; 41-9012.00; 41-1011.00; 41-2031.00; 53-6031.00; 41-9011.00; 41-9012.00; 41-9	
511 512 513 514 515 516 516 516 517 517 517 517 517 517 512 512 512 512 512 512	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 066 160/890/900/901/903 111/310/38/833 313	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIÓN Y SEGURIDAD VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES VENDEDORES DE COS Y DE PROSTOS DE TENDAS Y ALMACENES VENDEDORES DE CONSTADORES ON SERVICIOS AGROPECUARIOS Y PESQUEROS	43-7021.06; 43-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-3011.00; 35-2022.01; 35-2013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2019.00 35-5011.01; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-4021.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-4022.00; 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-4022.00; 33-9032.00; 41-9012.00 41-9012.00	
511 512 513 514 515 516 516 516 522 523 523 6 6	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 110/338/833 313	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD YENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES DE TIENDAS Y ALMACENES VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES DE MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS AGROPECUARIOS Y PESQUEROS AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y	43-7021.06; 43-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-3031.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2029.00 35-2019.00 35-2029.00 35-2	
511 512 513 514 514 516 516 525 521 523 61	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 310 111/310/338/833 313	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES V DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES VENDEDORES DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD VENDEDORES DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES CALIFICADOS A GROPECUARIOS Y PESQUEROS AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO	43-7021.07, 43-7011.00 39-6031.00, 39-6032.00, 39-6021.00, 39-6022.00 37-1011.00, 35-1011.00, 35-2011.00, 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00, 35-1012.00, 35-2014.00, 35-3031.00, 35-7021.00, 35-1012.00, 35-2014.00, 35-2015.00; 39-9011.0131-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 39-9011.00, 39-5012.00, 39-5092.00, 39-9099.00; 39-4021.00 39-4021.00 33-1021.00, 33-2011.00, 33-3051.03; 33-3051.01; 33-9032.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00	
511 512 512 513 514 514 515 516 522 523 523 61 611	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 056 160/890/900/901/903 111/310/338/833 313 400/410/414/415/415/426/420/	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS Y DE MOSTRADORES DE TIENDAS Y ALMACENES VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES DE TIENDAS Y ALMACENES VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES CAUFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES A PROYECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CAUFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO	43-7021.07; 45-2011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2029.00 35-5011.01; 35-2013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 39-4021.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-9052.00; 33-9	
511 512 513 514 514 515 516 516 512 512 512 512 512 512 512 512 512 512	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 310 111/310/338/833 313 400/410/414/415/416/420/	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES DE MERCADO AGIRCULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES A GROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO	43-7021.07; 45-2011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1021.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.9.00 35-9011.0133-1011.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 39-5021.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5021.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5021.00; 39-5011.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 39-4021.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-3051.01; 33-9052.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9052.00; 33-9059.00; 33-9032.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 41-1011.02; 41-2081.00; 53-60.31.00; 41-9011.00 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00	
511 512 512 513 514 514 515 516 522 523 61 611 611	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 068 068/090/900/901/903 310 111/310/338/833 313 400/410/414/415/416/420/ 400/411/412/413/426/423/ 92/409(93)/920/920	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES YAFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES YAFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES YAFINES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAS Y ALMACENES VENDEDORES DE COUSTADORES OLIFICADOS DE MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES A PROSENALS Y PESQUEROS AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE CULTIVOS PARA EL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE CULTIVOS PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LOCADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO Y AFINES	43-7021.07; 45-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-7013.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7011.00; 35-7013.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5021.00; 39-5091.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 39-4021.00; 33-1021.00; 33-7011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-3052.00; 33-1021.00; 33-7011.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9032.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 41-1011.00; 41-2031.00; 53-60 31.00; 41-9011.00 41-9012.00 41-1011.00; 41-2031.00; 53-60 31.00; 41-9011.00 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00	
511 512 513 514 514 515 516 516 512 511 512 512 512 512 512 512 512 512	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 310 111/310/338/833 313 400/410/414/415/416/420/ 400/410/414/415/416/420/ 400/410/414/415/416/420/ 424/425/903/975	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES DE TEMPAS Y ALMACENES VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES DE TEMPAS Y ALMACENES VENDEDORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS AGROPECUARIOS Y PESQUEROS AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE CULTIVOS PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO Y AFINES	43-7021.07; 45-2011.00 33-6031.00; 35-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2029.00 35-5011.0133-1012.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 33-5021.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 33-5022.00; 33-5031.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 33-4022.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-8052.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9032.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 41-9011.00; 41-2031.00; 53-60.31.00; 41-9011.00 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00	
511 512 513 514 514 515 516 516 522 523 61 611 612 612	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 310 111/310/338/833 313 400/410/41/415/415/415/420/ 400/410/41/415/415/420	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES A PARCADO VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES ALIFICADOS A AGROPECUARIOS Y PESQUEROS AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LOCUTIVOS PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE CULTIVOS PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS CALIFICADOS DE LOCRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS CALIFICADOS DE LOCADOS CUYA PRODUCCIÓN SE DESTINA AL MERCADO	43-7021.07, 45-2011.00 39-6031.00, 39-6032.00, 39-6021.00, 39-6022.00 37-1011.00, 35-1011.00, 35-2011.00, 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00, 35-102.00, 35-3031.00, 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00, 35-102.00, 35-2014.00, 35-2015.00; 35-9011.0131-1011.0053-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 39-6021.00, 39-5012.00, 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-6021.00, 39-5012.00, 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-6021.00, 33-2011.00, 33-3051.03; 33-3051.01; 33-6022.00, 33-2011.00; 33-3051.03; 33-3051.01; 33-6022.00, 33-2011.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9032.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00 11-9012.00; 45-2093.00; 39-2021.00; 39-2011.00	
511 512 512 513 514 515 516 522 523 61 611 611 612 613	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 310 111/310/338/833 313 400/410/41/41/5/415/420/ 400/410/41/41/5/415/420	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO Y AFINES PRODUCTORES Y TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO Y AFINES PRODUCTORES Y TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS CUA PRODUCCIÓN SE DESTINA AL MERCADO	43-7021.07; 45-2011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-2029.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00 35-2019.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 39-4021.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-4021.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-9052.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9052.00 33-9052.00 41-9012.00 41-1011.00; 41-2031.00; 53-60 31.00; 41-9011.00 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00 41-9012.00; 45-2092.00	
511 512 512 514 514 515 516 516 512 512 512 512 512 512 512 512 512 512	271/910/933/972/973 271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 310 111/310/338/833 313 400/410/414/415/416/420/ 400/411/412/413/420/423/ 400/410/414/420 422/450/451/452	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD YENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES DE MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES A GROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE CULTIVOS PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS CALIFICADOS CUYA PRODUCCIÓN SE DESTINA AL MERCADO TRABAJADORES FORESTALES CALIFICADOS Y AFINES	43-7021.07; 45-2011.00 33-6031.00; 35-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.90; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2015.00; 35-2019.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-8011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-8021.00; 39-8021.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-8022.00; 39-8022.00; 33-9032.00; 33-3012.00; 33-3051.03; 33-3051.01; 33-9032.00; 33-9032.00; 41-9012.00; 41-9012.00; 41-9012.00; 41-1011.02; 41-2031.00; 53-6031.00; 41-9011.00; 45-1011.02; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00; 45-1011.02; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00; 45-1011.02; 45-2093.00; 39-2021.00; 39-2011.00; 11-9012.00; 45-1011.02; 45-7092.00; 45-1011.05; 37-3013.00; 45-4021.00; 45-4029.00; 45-1011.05; 37-3013.00; 45-4021.00; 45-4029.00; 45-1011.05; 45-2093.00; 45-4021.00; 45-4029.00; 45-1011.05; 45-2093.00; 45-1011.05; 45-2093.00; 45-1011.05; 45-2093.00; 45-1011.05; 4	
511 512 512 513 514 514 515 516 522 523 523 613 611 611 611 612 613	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 068 160/890/900/901/903 310 111/310/338/833 313 400/410/414/415/416/420/ 400/410/414/415/416/420 400/410/414/420 422/450/451/452 430/431/452 400/410/45/452 400/45/45 400/45/45 4	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES A PARTICULARES ASTRÓLOGOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DE MOSTRADORES MODELOS DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD VENDEDORES DE QUIOSCOS Y DE PUESTOS DE MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS AGROPECUARIOS Y PESQUEROS AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE CULTIVOS PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS CALIFICADOS DE CULTIVOS PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS CALIFICADOS DE CULTIVOS PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO TRABAJADORES CAZADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS CALIFICADOS CUYA PRODUCCIÓN SE DESTINA AL MERCADO	43-7021.07; 45-7031.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-7033.00; 35-7034.00; 35-7019.00; 35-7019.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-5011.00; 39-5012.00; 39-5092.00; 39-9099.00; 39-4021.00; 39-7011.00; 39-3051.05; 33-3051.01; 33-4021.00; 33-7011.00; 33-3051.05; 33-3051.01; 33-4021.00; 33-7011.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-4021.00; 33-7011.00; 33-5092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-4021.00; 33-7011.00; 33-5092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-4021.00; 41-2031.00; 53-6031.00; 41-9011.00; 41-9012.00; 41-2031.00; 53-6031.00; 41-9011.00; 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00; 45-1011.08; 45-2093.00; 39-2021.00; 39-2011.00; 11-9012.00; 45-7092.00; 45-1011.05; 37-3013.00; 45-4021.00; 45-4029.00; 45-3011.00; 45-7093.00;	
511 512 512 513 514 514 515 516 516 512 522 522 523 52 611 611 612 613 614 615 615 615 615 615 615 615 615 615 615	271/910/933/972/973 066/753/910/921/930/931/ 932 027/040/046/051/960/961/ 975 048/096/961/970/971/975 096 160/890/900/901/903 111/310/338/833 313 400/410/414/415/416/420/ 420/425/903/975 400/410/414/420 422/450/451/452 430/411/432/440	TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS Y VENDEDORES DE COMERCIOS Y MERCADOS TRABAJADORES DE LOS SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD PERSONAL AL SERVICIO DIRECTO DE LOS PASAJEROS PERSONAL DE INTENDENCIA Y DE RESTAURANTES TRABAJADORES DE LOS CUIDADOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES OTROS TRABAJADORES DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, ADIVINADORES Y AFINES PERSONAL DE LOS SERVICIOS DE PROTECCIÓN Y SEGURIDAD MODELOS, VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES MODELOS DE MODAS, ARTE Y PUBLICIDAD YENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES DE TIENDAS Y ALMACENES VENDEDORES Y DEMOSTRADORES DE TIENDAS Y ALMACENES VENDEDORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO AGRICULTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE EXPLOTACIONES AGROPECUARIAS, FORESTALES Y PESQUERAS CON DESTINO AL MERCADO CRIADORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO Y AFINES PRODUCTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO Y AFINES PRODUCTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO Y AFINES PRODUCTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO Y AFINES PRODUCTORES Y TRABAJADORES CALIFICADOS DE LA CRÍA DE ANIMALES PARA EL MERCADO Y AFINES PRODUCTORES Y TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS CUA PRODUCCIÓN SE DESTINA AL MERCADO TRABAJADORES FORESTALES CALIFICADOS Y AFINES PRODUCTORES Y TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS CALIFICADOS CUA PRODUCCIÓN SE DESTINA AL MERCADO TRABAJADORES FORESTALES CALIFICADOS Y AFINES PESCADORES, CAZADORES AGROPECUARIOS Y PESQUEROS CALIFICADOS CUA PRODUCCIÓN SE DESTINA AL MERCADO TRABAJADORES FORESTALES CALIFICADOS Y AFINES PESCADORES AGROPECUARIOS Y TRAMPEROS TRABAJADORES AGROPECUARIOS Y TRAMPEROS	43-7021.07 45-7011.00 39-6031.00; 39-6032.00; 39-6021.00; 39-6022.00 37-1011.00; 35-1011.00; 35-2011.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 35-2014.00; 35-2019.00; 35-7021.00; 35-1012.00; 33-2012.00; 35-2019.00; 35-9031.0133-1012.00; 33-3011.0031-9095.0031- 9096.0031-9099.00 33-9032.00; 35-5091.00; 31-1011.00; 39-4011.00; 39-4021.00 33-1021.00; 33-2011.00; 33-3051.01; 33-3052.00; 33-3012.00; 33-9092.00; 33-9099.00; 33-9032.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 41-9012.00 45-1011.07; 45-2099.00; 37-3011.00; 45-2092.00 45-1011.05; 45-2093.00; 39-2021.00; 39-2011.00 11-9012.00; 45-7092.00 45-1011.05; 37-3013.00; 45-4021.00; 45-4029.00 45-2011.00; 45-3021.00	

CIU0-88	COTA - 70	DENOMINACION	SOCCODE
. 7		OFICIALES, OPERARIOS Y ARTESANOS DE ARTES MECÁNICAS Y DE OTROS OFICIOS	
71		OFICIALES Y OPERARIOS DE LAS INDUSTRIAS EXTRACTIVAS Y DE LA CONSTRUCCIÓN	
711	715/716/736	MINEROS, CANTEROS, PEGADORES Y LABRANTES DE PIEDRA	47-1011.00; 47-5099.00; 47-5031.00; 47-2022.00, 51-9195.03
712	009/630/631/640/561/671/ 811	OFICIALES Y OPERARIOS DE LA CONSTRUCCIÓN (OBRA GRUESA) Y AFINES	47-2051.00; 47-2021.00; 47-2071.00; 47-2051.00; 47-2031.02; 47-2073.00; 51-2099.00
713	630/640/642/643/644/660/ 670/671/675/677/736	OFICIALES Y OPERARIOS DE LA CONSTRUCCIÓN (TRABAJOS DE ACABADO) Y AFINES	47-2181.00; 47-2044.00; 47-2042.00; 47-2161.00; 47-2081.00; 47-2131.00; 49-9021.01; 47-2132.00; 47-2121.00; 47-2151.00; 47-2152.01; 47-2152.02; 47-4071.00; 47-2111.00
714	093/651/652/81/952	PINTORES, UMPIADORES DE FACHADAS Y AFINES	47-2141.00; 47-2142.00; 51-9123.00; 51-9122.00; 37-2019.00
72		OFICIALES Y OPERARIOS DE LA METALURGIA, LA CONSTRUCCIÓN MECÁNICA Y AFINES	
721	431/661/662/563/720/721	MOLDEADORES, SOLDADORES, CHAPISTAS, CALDEREROS, MONTADORES DE ESTRUCTURAS METALICAS Y AFINES	51-4071.00; 51-4121.00; 47-2211.00; 49-3021.00; 51-2041.00; 47-2221.00; 49-9096.00
722	686/667/721/723/724/726	HERREROS, HERRAMENTISTAS Y AFINES	51-4111.00; 51-4052.00; 51-4052.00; 51-2093.00; 49-9069.00; 49-9094.00; 51-1011.00; 51-4194.00; 51-4199.00
723	680/681/683/684/689	MECÁNICOS Y AJUSTADORES DE MAQUINAS	49-1011.00; 49-3023.00; 49-3043.00; 49-3031.00; 49-3052.00; 49-3092.00; 49-3011.00; 49-3041.00; 49-3042.00; 49-9041.00; 49-9042.00; 49-3051.00; 49-9099.00; 49-2092.00
724	670/671/672/673/674/676/ 685/791	MECÁNICOS Y AJUSTADORES DE EQUIPOS ELECTRICOS Y ELECTRÓNICOS	47-2111.00; 47-4021.00; 47-4099.03; 49-9031.00; 49-2097.00; 51-2022.00; 49-2094.00; 51-2023.00; 49-2022.00; 49-2021.00; 49-9052.00; 49-9051.00
73		MECÁNICOS DE PRECISIÓN, ARTESANOS, OPERARIOS DE LAS ARTES GRÁFICAS Y AFINES	
731	690/692/693/694/840/850/ 852	MECÁNICOS DE PRECISIÓN EN METALES Y MATERIALES SIMILARES	49-9069.00; 49-9064.00; 49-9061.00; 49-9062.00, 51-9081.00; 49-9063.00; 51-9071.01
732	650/691/730/732/733/734/ 735	ALFAREROS, OPERARIOS DE CRISTALERÍAS Y AFINES	51-9195.05; 51-9195.00; 51-9195.04; 51-9031.00; 51-9123.00
733	605/607/622/631/736/841/	ARTESANOS DE LA MADERA, TEJIDOS, CUERO Y MATERIALES SIMILARES	27-1012.00; 51-9194.00
734	608/700/701/702/703/704/	OFICIALES Y OPERARIOS DE LAS ARTES GRÁFICAS Y AFINES	51-5011.00; 51-5012.00; 51-5021.00; 51-5022.00;
74	705/706/707/708/709	ATTOR OF MALE OF THE ASSALL AND THE ASSALL AS A STATE AS A DECIMAL AS A DECORDOR OF THE	51-9131.00; 51-9132.00
741	750/751/753/754/755/757/ 760	OFICIALES Y OPERARIOS DEL PROCESAMIENTO DE ALIMENTOS Y AFINES	51-3011.00; 51-3021.00; 51-3022.00; 51-3023.00; 51-3092.00
742	631/632/633/841	OFICIALES Y OPERARIOS DEL TRATAMIENTO DE LA MADERA, EBANISTAS Y AFINES	51-7031.00; 51-7021.00; 51-7031.00; 51-7032.00; 51-7099.00
743	600/603/604/605/605/607/ 610/611/612/613/614/615/ 616/617/618/619/844/845	OFICIALES Y OPERARIOS DE LOS TEXTILES Y DE LA CONFECCIÓN Y AFINES	51-6011.00; 51-6021.00; 51-6052.00; 51-6092.00, 51-6093.00; 51-6099.00
744	619/620/621/622/623/770/ 771	OFICIALES Y OPERARIOS DE LAS PIELES, CUERO Y CALZADO	51-6041.00; 51-6042.00
8		OPERADORES DE INSTALACIONES Y MAQUINAS Y MONTADORES	
81		OPERADORES DE INSTALACIONES FIJAS Y AFINES	
- 611	/15//16//36/802	OPERADURES DE INSTALACIONES MINERAS Y DE EXTRACCIÓN Y PROCESAMIENTO DE MINERALES	47-5049.00, 47-5042.00; 51-9052.00, 47-5021.00 51-4051.00, 51-4072.00; 51-4011.00; 51-4021.00;
812	720/721/722/724	OPERADORES DE INSTALACIONES DE PROCESAMIENTO DE METALES	51-4192.00
813	730/732/734/737/740	OPERADORES DE INSTALACIONES DE VIDRIERIA, CERAMICA Y AFINES	51-9051.00; 47-2021.00; 51-9195.05; 53-9195.04
814	631/746/748/780	OPERADORES DE INSTALACIONES DE PROCESAMIENTO DE LA MADERA Y LA FABRICACION DE PAPEL	51-7041.00
\$15	734/741/742/743/744/842	OPERADORES DE INSTALACIONES DE TRATAMIENTOS QUÍMICOS	51-9021.00; 51-9012.00; 51-8093.00; 51-8091.00; 51-9011.00
816	671/759/832/860	OPERADORES DE INSTALACIONES DE PRODUCCIÓN DE ENERGÍA Y AFINES	53-7071.00
817	680	OPERADORES DE CADENAS DE MONTAJE AUTOMATIZADAS Y DE ROBOTS INDUSTRIALES	·····
62		OPERADORES DE MÁQUINAS Y MONTADORES	
821	663/687/723/726/734/736/ 850	OPERADORES DE MÁQUINAS PARA TRABAJAR METALES Y PRODUCTOS MINERALES	51-4034.00; 51-4032.00; 51-4035.00; 51-4031.00; 51-4022.00; 51-4033.00; 51-9032.00; 47-5049.00; 51-4023.00
822	707/725/726/740/741/744	OPERADORES DE MÁQUINAS PARA FABRICAR PRODUCTOS QUÍNICOS	51-9121.00; 51-9132.00
823	842	OPERADORES DE MÁQUINAS PARA FABRICAR PRODUCTOS DE CAUCHO Y DE MATERIAL PLASTICO	51-9197.00; 51-4031.00; 51-4021.00; 51-4192.00; 51-4035.00; 51-4072.00; 51-4033.00
824	631/632	OPERADORES DE MAQUINAS PARA FABRICAR PRODUCTOS DE MADERA	51-7042.00; 51-9121.00
825	702/705/706/709/746/780	OPERADORES DE MAQUINAS DE IMPRENTA, ENCUADERNACIÓN Y FABRICACIÓN DE PRODUCTOS DE PAPEL	51-5023.00; 51-9196.00
826	600/602/603/604/605/607/ 608/609/612/614/615/619/ 621/623/770/771	OPERADORES DE MÁQUINAS PARA FABRICAR PRODUCTOS TEXTILES Y ARTÍCULOS DE PIEL Y CUERO	51-6061.00; 51-6062.00; 51-6063.00; 51-6064.00; 51-6091.00; 51-6031.00; 51-9051.00; 51-6042.00
827	750/752/753/754/755/756/ 757/758/760/761/825	OPERADORES DE MÁQUINAS PARA ELABORAR ALIMENTOS Y PRODUCTOS AFINES	51-3091.00; 51-3093.00; 51-9192.00; 51-9193.00
828	609/623/632/680/681/693/ 723/726/746/780/790/791/ 792/842	MONTADORES	51-2031.00; 51-2022.00; 51-2093.00; 51-2099.00
825	671/736/821/823/825/975	OTROS OPERADORES DE MÁQUINAS Y MONTADORES	51-9111.00; 51-9191.00
83		CONDUCTORES DE VEHÍCULOS Y OPERADORES DE EQUIPOS PESADOS MÓVILES	
831	510/532/534	MAQUINISTAS DE LOCOMOTORAS Y AFINES	53-4011.00; 55-4012.00; 53-4099.00; 53-4021.00 53-3041.00; 53-3033.00; 53-3011.00; 53-3021.00;
. 832	500/501/502/505		53-3022.00; 53-3032.00; 53-3031.00 53-3099.00; 53-7011.00; 53-7021.00; 53-7031.00
83	421/812/861/862	OPERADORES DE MAQUINARIA AGRÍCOLA MÓVIL Y DE OTRAS MÁQUINAS MÓVILES	53-7032.00; 53-7033.00; 53-7041.00; 53-7051.00
834	\$20/521/531	MARINEROS DE CUBIERTA Y AFINES	\$3-5011.00; \$3-5022.00; 53-6011.00

ē

	COTA 30		
	COIA-70	DENUMINATION	SOC CODE
9		TRABAJADORES NO CALIFICADOS	
91		TRABAJADORES NO CALIFICADOS DE VENTAS Y SERVICIOS	
911	301/311/312/313/338	VENDEDORES ÁMBULANTES Y AFINES	41-9091.00: 41-9041.00
912	953/975	LIMPIABOTAS Y OTROS TRABAJADORES CALLEJEROS	53-6021.00
912	832/920/921/930/933/940/	DEBLONAL DOMÉCTICO Y ACIMES, MARIADORES, LAVAMORROS Y DI ANCHA DORES	37-2012.00; 35-2013.00; 35-9021.00; 37-2021.00;
	941/943/952	TOOTINE DOINE TOTAL ANTILES, ENGINEEDINES, EAVAILBERGS FEDARCHADORES	47-4071
914	833/950/952	CONSERJES, LAVADORES DE VENTANAS Y AFINES	39-6012.00; 37-2011.00; 53-7061.00
	351/660/671/833/903/910/		43-5021.00; 39-6011.00; 39-2021.00; 39-6012.00;
915	022/050/051/075	MENSAJEROS, PORTEADORES, PORTEROS Y AFINES	39-3031.00; 33-9032.00; 39-3093.00; 37-2011.00;
	100/ 000 001 010		43-5041.00
916	312/834/835	RECOLECTORES DE BASURA Y AFINES	53-7081.00
917		TRABAJADORES NO CALIFICADOS DE SERVICIOS PERSONALES	
92		PEONES AGROPECUARIOS, FORESTALES, PESQUEROS Y AFINES	
921	420/422/424/430/440/450/	PEONES AGROPECUARIOS, FORESTALES, PESQUEROS Y AFINES	45-2092.02; 45-3021.00; 45-2021.00; 45-2041.00
93		PEONES DE LA MINERÍA, LA CONSTRUCCIÓN, LA INDUSTRIA MANUFACTURERA Y EL TRANSPORTE	
971	907/911		47-4051.00; 47-3019.00; 47-3011.00, 47-3012.00;
331	вч <i>2</i> 611		47-3013.00; 47-3014.00; 47-3015.00, 47-3016.00
932	821/822/823/825	PEONES DE LA INDUSTRIA MANUFACTURERA	53-7064.00; 51-9199 00; 51-9198.00
933	504/505/820/ 821/822/ 824/ 826	PEONES DEL TRANSPORTE	53-7121.00; 53-7062.00

.

	1991/	92	199	8/99	Diff. in Means	200	1/02	200	9/10	Diff. in Means	Diff. in Means
Variable	Mean	Std.Dev	Mean	Std.Dev.	(98/99 - 91/92)	Mean	Std.Dev.	Mean	Std.Dev.	(09/10 - 01/02)	(09/10-91/92)
Log wages	4,094	0,666	4,198	0,739	0,104	4,100	0,764	4,118	0,70	0.018	0,023
Non-Married	0,189	0,392	0,216	0,412	0,027	0,241	0,428	0,252	0,43	0,011	0,063
Age	41,562	10,792	, 41,111	10,482	-0,451	41,502	10,684	41,747	10,71	0,245	0,184
Education											
6 years or less (ed1)	0,415	0,493	0,339	0,473	-0,076	0,274	0,446	0,251	0,43	-0,023	-0,164
From 7 to 9 years (ed2)	0,324	0,468	0,320	0,467	-0,004	0,284	0,451	0,280	0,45	-0,004	-0,044
From 10 to 12 years (ed3)	0,147	0,354	0,200	0,400	0,053	0,279	0.449	0,293	0,46	0.014	0,146
From 13 to 16 years (ed4)	0,052	0,222	0,064	0,245	0,012	0,067	0,250	0,076	0,26	0,008	0,024
16 and more years (ed5)	0,062	0,241	0,076	0,265	0,014	0,096	0,295	0,100	0,30	0,004	0,039
Experience											
Experience <5 (exp1)	0.007	0,081	0,008	0,087	0.001	0,008	0,088	0,008	0,09	0.000	0,001
5 <expereince>10 (exp2)</expereince>	0,035	0,185	0,044	0,206	0,009	0,051	0,221	0,054	0,23	0,003	0,019
10 <experience<15 (exp3)<="" td=""><td>0,118</td><td>0,323</td><td>0,136</td><td>0,343</td><td>0,018</td><td>· 0,137</td><td>0,344</td><td>0,126</td><td>0,33</td><td>-0,011</td><td>0,008</td></experience<15>	0,118	0,323	0,136	0,343	0,018	· 0,137	0,344	0,126	0,33	-0,011	0,008
15 <experience<20 (exp4)<="" td=""><td>0,163</td><td>0,369</td><td>0,147</td><td>0.354</td><td>-0,016</td><td>0,148</td><td>0,355</td><td>0,157</td><td>0,36</td><td>0,009</td><td>-0,006</td></experience<20>	0,163	0,369	0,147	0.354	-0,016	0,148	0,355	0,157	0,36	0,009	-0,006
20 <experience<25 (cxp5)<="" td=""><td>0,137</td><td>0,344</td><td>0,147</td><td>0,354</td><td>0,010</td><td>0,143</td><td>0,350</td><td>0,142</td><td>0,35</td><td>-0,001</td><td>0,005</td></experience<25>	0,137	0,344	0,147	0,354	0,010	0,143	0,350	0,142	0,35	-0,001	0,005
25 <experience<30 (exp6)<="" td=""><td>0,124</td><td>0,330</td><td>0,140</td><td>0,347</td><td>0,016</td><td>0,133</td><td>0,340</td><td>0,124</td><td>0,33</td><td>-0,009</td><td>0,000</td></experience<30>	0,124	0,330	0,140	0,347	0,016	0,133	0,340	0,124	0,33	-0,009	0,000
30 <experience<35 (exp7)<="" td=""><td>0,115</td><td>0,319</td><td>0,114</td><td>0,317</td><td>-0,002</td><td>0,125</td><td>0,331</td><td>0,132</td><td>0,34</td><td>0.007</td><td>0,017</td></experience<35>	0,115	0,319	0,114	0,317	-0,002	0,125	0,331	0,132	0,34	0.007	0,017
35 <experience<40 (exp8)<="" td=""><td>0,105</td><td>0,307</td><td>0,106</td><td>0,308</td><td>0,001</td><td>0,103</td><td>0,304</td><td>0,108</td><td>0,31</td><td>0,005</td><td>0,003</td></experience<40>	0,105	0,307	0,106	0,308	0,001	0,103	0,304	0,108	0,31	0,005	0,003
Experience>40 (exp9)	0,195	0,396	0,158	0,364	-0.038	0,152	0,359	0,149	0,36	-0,003	-0,047
Rest of the country	0,474	0,499	0,493	0,500	0,019	0,500	0,500	0,521	0,50	0,021	0,047

Results based on ECH data from 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2009, 2010.

Number of observations 1991/92: 13,918; 1998/99: 13,294; 2001/02: 13,018; 2009/10: 30,609.

Source: Author's own calculations.

73

.

5

Appendix Table A.2. Descriptive Statistics

Year/Inequality Measure	90-10 gap	90-50 gap	50-10 gap	Variance	Gini
1991/92	1,635	0,891	0,745	0,444	0,089
1998/99	1,807	1,009	0,798	0,545	0,097
Change	0,171	0,118	0,053	0,102	0,008
2001/2002	1,850	1,055	0,795	0,582	0,105
2009/2010	1,728	0,959	0,768	0,491	0,095
Change	-0,122	-0,095	-0,027	-0,091	-0,011

Appendix Table A.3. Men hourly wage inequality measures

Results based on ECH data from 1991, 1992, 1998, 1999, 2001, 2002, 2009, 2010.

Number of observations 1991/92: 13,918; 1998/99: 13,294; 2001/02: 13,018; 2009/10: 30.609.

Source: Author's own calculations.

 Table A4. Aggregate Decomposition Results

Inequality Measure:	90-10	90-50	50-10	Variance	Gint
1991/92 - 1998/99					
Total Change	0,1790 ***	0,1257 ***	0,0533 ***	0.1035 ***	0,0079 ***
	(0,023)	(0,016)	(0,015)	(0,010)	(0,001)
Wage Structure	0,0723 ***	0,0487 ***	0,0237 **	0 <u>.</u> 0517 ***	0,0033 ***
	(0,022)	(0,020)	(0,013)	(0,011)	(0,001)
Composition	0,1112 ***	0,0794 ***	0,0318 ***	0,0524 ***	0,0047 ***
	(0,018)	(0,015)	(0,006)	(0,008)	(0,001)
Specification Error	0,0083	0,0072	0,0012	0,0057	0,0004
	(0,025)	(0,022)	(0,015)	(0,011)	(0,001)
Reweighing Error	-0,0129	-0,0095	-0,0033	-0,0063 *	-0,0005
	(0,011)	(0,009)	(0.003)	(0,005)	(0,000)
2001/02 - 2009/10			·		
Total Change	-0,1113 ***	-0,0932 ***	-0,0181 *	-0,0719 ***	-0,0072 ***
	(0,017)	(0,014)	(0,013)	(0,010)	(0,001)
Wage Structure	-0,1543 ***	-0,1196 ***	-0,0347 ***	-0,0954 ***	-0,0089 ***
	(0,022)	(0,019)	(0.014)	(0,011)	(0,001)
Composition	0,0416 **	0.0277 **	0,0138 **	0,0232 ***	0,0018 ***
	(0,018)	(0,013)	(0,007)	(0,008)	(0,001)
Specification Error	0,0057	0,0027	0,0030	0,0147	0,0014 *
	(0,027)	(0,021)	(0,020)	0,012	(0,001)
Reweighing Error	-0,0043	-0,0041	-0,0002	-0,0144 *	-0,0015 ***
	(0,012)	(0,009)	(0,004)	(0,007)	(0,001)

Notes: FFL (2010) decomposition method with F(X) 1991/92 reweighted to 1998/99 and F(X) 2001/02 reweighted to 2009/2010. Bootstraped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

The formulas for the different components are as following. The reweighting error is the difference between the total change and the sum of the wage structure and composition effects and the specificacion error.

Totai change: $\Delta_0^{\vec{v}} = \widehat{RIF}(Y_1, v) - \widehat{RIF}(Y_0, v)$

Wage structure: $\tilde{\Delta}_{S,p}^{p} = \overline{X_{1}} \left(\hat{Y}_{1}^{r} - \hat{Y}_{C}^{r} \right)$

Composition: $\widetilde{\Delta}_{\mathbf{x},p}^{\mathbf{r}} \simeq (X_0^2 - \overline{X_0}) \widetilde{\mathbf{y}}_0^{\mathbf{r}}$

Specification error: $\hat{\Delta}_{X,e}^{v} = \overline{X_{0}^{c}}(\hat{\gamma}_{0}^{v} - \hat{\gamma}_{0}^{v})$

Number of observations 1991/92: 13,917 ; 1998/99: 13,294; 2001/2002: 13,033; 2009/10: 30.631. Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 1991.1992,1998,1999,2001.2002 and 2009.2010 data.

Гable	A5.	Detailed	Decomposition	Results	1991/92 -	1998/99	
-------	-----	----------	---------------	---------	-----------	---------	--

Inequality Measure:	90-10	90-50	50-10	Variance	Gini
A: Detailed Composition Effects:					
Information	-0,0008	-0,0007	-0,0001	-0,0003	0,0000
	(0,002)	(0,002)	(0,000)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Automation	0,0061 ***	0,0060 ***	0,0001	0,0028 ****	0,0003 ***
	(0,003)	(0,002)	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Education	0,0645 ***	0,0524 ***	0,0121 ***	0,0280 ***	0,0018 ***
	(0,014)	(0,012)	(0,003)	(0,006)	(0,000)
Experience	-0,0144 **	-0,0110 **	-0,0034 **	-0,0056 **	-0,0004 *
	(0,006)	(0,005)	(0,002)	(0,003)	(0,000)
Industry .	0,0263 ***	0,0147 ***	0,0116 ***	0,0158 ***	0,0015 ***
	(0,005)	(0,004)	(0,003)	(0,003)	- \cdot (0,000)
Others	0.0294 ***	0,0179 ***	0,0115 ***	0,0117 ***	0,0016 ***
	(0,009)	(0,007)	(0,004)	(0,004)	(0,000)
Total Composition Effect	0,1112 ***	0,0794 ***	0,0318 ⇔⇔	0,0524 ***	0,0047 ****
	(0,018)	(0,015)	(0,006)	(0,008)	(0,001)
B: Detailed Wage Structure Effect	S :	- m · - <u>- · - · · - · · · · · · · · · · </u>			- <u></u> ,
Information	-0,0003 (0,001)	0,0013	-0,0015 ** (0,001)	-0,0003 (0,001)	-0,0001 (0,000)
Automation	-0,0017 *	-0.0019 **	0,0002	-0,0002	0,0000
	(0,001)	(0.001)	(0,000)	(0,000)	(0,000)
Education	0,0718 *	0,0342	0,0376	0,0327 **	0,0017
	(0.055)	(0,046)	(0.030)	(0.017)	(0,002)
Experience	0,2434 *	0,1608	0,0826	0,1192 **	0,0085 *
	(0,169)	(0,150)	(0,071)	(0,063)	(0.005)
Industry	-0,1852 ***	-0,1501 ***	-0,0351	-0,0596 **	-0,0042 *
	(0,067)	(0,057)	(0,037)	(0,031)	(0,003)
Others	0,1058 ***	0,0671 **	0.0386	0,0561 ***	0,0061 ***
	(0,044)	- (0,037)	(0,026)	(0,021)	(0,002)
Constant	-0,1615	-0.0628	-0,0987	-0,0962	-0,0086 *
	(0,217)	(0,198)	(0,095)	(0,076)	(0,006)
Total Wage Structure Effect	0,0723 ***	0,0487 ***	0;0237 **	0,05 17 ***	0,0033 ***
	(0,022)	(0,020)	(0,013)	(0,011)	(0,001)

Notes: FFL (2010) Decomposition method with F(X) 1991/92 reweighted to 1998/99.

Bootstrapped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

Explanatory grouped variables include, technology :automation and information content of tasks. 5 education classes

(6 years or less ommited), 9 potential experience classes (5 to 10 years ommited), others (rest of the country, nonmarried and public sector), 7 activity . sectors (Social and Personal services ommited)

*** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1

Number of observations 1991/92: 13,917 ; 1998/99: 13.294.

Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 1991,1992 and 1998,1999 data.

Table	A6.	Detailed	Decompo	osition	Results	2001/02 -	- 2009/10

Inequality Measure:	90-10	90-50	50-10	Variance	Gini
A: Detailed Composition Effects:					
Information	-0,0043	-0,0035	-0,0007	-0,0021	-0,0001
	(0,005)	(0,004)	(0,001)	(0,003)	(0,000)
Automation	-0,0021 *	-0,0021 *	0,0000	-0,0021 *	-0,0002 *
	(0,001)	(0,002)	(0,000)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Education	0,0424 ***	0,0260 ***	0,0164 ****	0,0159 ***	0,0007 **
	(0,014)	(0,011)	(0,004)	(0,006)	(0,000)
Experience	-0,0132 *	-0,0082 *	-0,0050 *	-0,0058 *	-0,0004 *
	(0,008)	(0,006)	(0,003)	(0,004)	(0,000)
Industry	0,0243 ***	0,0195 ***	0,0047 *	0,0213 ***	0,0021 ***
	(0,006)	(0,005)	(0,003)	(0,004)	(0,000)
Others	-0,0055	-0,0040	-0,0015	-0,0041	-0,0003
	(0,009)	(0,006)	(0,005)	(0,004)	(0,000)
Total Composition Effect	0,0416 **	0,0277 **	0,0138 **	0,0232 ***	0,0018 ***
	(0,018)	(0,013)	(0,007)	(0,008)	(0,001)
B: Detailed Wage Structure Effects:					
Information	0,0109 ***	0,0127 ***	-0,0019	0,0030 **	0,0001
	(0,004)	(0,004)	(0,002)	(0,002)	(0,000)
Automation	0,0033 **	0,0027 **	0,0006	0,0010 *	0,0000
	(0,002)	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,001)	(0,000)
Education	-0,0226	0,0104	-0,0330	-0,0368 **	-0,0029 **
	(0,042)	(0,038)	(0,035)	(0,018)	(0,002)
Experience	-0,0683	0,0144	-0,0827 *	-0,0757 *	-0,0018
	(0,116)	(0,109)	(0,054)	(0,045)	(0,004)
Industry	-0,2920 ***	-0,2252 ***	-0,0668 **	-0,1151 ***	-0,0121 ***
	(0,059)	(0,057)	(0,032)	(0,030)	(0,002)
Others	0,0123	0,0354	-0,0230	0,0150	0,0009
	(0,049)	(0,041)	(0,027)	(0,024)	(0,002)
Conŝtant	0,2021 *	0,0299	0,1721 **	0,1132 **	0,0069 *
	(0,155)	(0,143)	(0,076)	(0,060)	(0,005)
Total Wage Structure Effect	-0,1543 ***	-0,1196 ***	-0,0347 ***	-0,0954 ***	-0,0089 ***
	(0,022)	(0,019)	(0,014)	(0,011)	(0,001)

Notes: FFL (2010) Decomposition method with F(X) 2001/02 reweighted to 2009/10.

Bootstrapped standard errors are in parenthesis (100 replications of the entire procedure).

Explanatory grouped variables include, technology (automation and information content of tasks), 5 education classes

(6 years or less ommited), 9 potential experience classes (5 to 10 years ommited), others (rest of the country, nonmarried and public sector). 7 activity sectors (Social and Personal services ommited)

*** p<0.01. ** p<0.05. * p<0.1

Number of observations 2001/2002: 13,033: 2009/10: 30.631.

Source: Author's own calculations. Results based on ECH 2001.2002 and 2009.2010 data.

.

.

Appendix figures



Appendix Figure A.1

(iii)







Appendix Figure A.2

B. Total Composition Effects 2001/02 to 2009/10 .15 τ. .05 0 -.05 7 -.15 Ò 20 40 100 60 80 Quantile ---- RIF Regression Reweighting



Appendix Figure A.3

