

Original Research

Received 28 May 2026

Revised 30 June 2026

Accepted 14 July 2026

Natural Resources for Human Health 2026, Vol. 6 (7s): 951–962

KEYWORDS:

monetary, money, income and wealth, IMF, ECB, and BIS, United States and the European Union, lower-income groups.

Exploring the Nexus between Monetary Policy and Income Inequality: A Global Perspective

Dr. Sagib Mammadov¹, Dr. Boyukkishi Nariman Bahram², Balayeva Ayten Ramazan³, Dr. Javadkhan Yusif Gasimov⁴, Mammadova Afat Mammadhuseyn⁵, Mushfig Huseynov⁶, Nusret Salman Babayev⁷

¹ Department of Tourism Business and Marketing, Mingachevir State University, Mingachevir, Azerbaijan

saqib.mammadov@mdu.edu.az , <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7988-9372>

² Head of the Department of Finance and Accounting, Azerbaijan University, Azerbaijan

Nariman.boyukkishi@au.edu.az, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1241-4820>

³ Lecturer at the department of economics and management, Zagatala branch, Azerbaijan State University of Economics (UNEC) , <https://orcid.org/0009-0001-8810-3527> , aytenramazan.balayeva@mail.ru

⁴ Head of the Department of International Trade and Management, Nakhchivan State University, Nakhchivan, Azerbaijan

Doctor of Philosophy in Economics, Associate Professor.

javadkhan.yusifoglu@ndu.edu.az , <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3826-033X>

⁵ Department of Economic Theory and Marketing, Azerbaijan University of Architecture and Construction

afat.mammadova@azmiu.edu.az, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7169-3081>

⁶ Department of Tourism Business and Marketing, Mingachevir State University, Mingachevir, Azerbaijan

mushfig.huseynov@mdu.edu.az , <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9439-6936>

⁷ Azerbaijan State University of Economics, Azerbaijan

nusret_babayev@unec.edu.az , <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8827-3617>

ABSTRACT: This article explores the complex relationship between monetary policy and income inequality from a global perspective, highlighting how central bank actions influence economic disparities across developed and developing countries. Traditionally viewed as neutral in distributional terms, monetary policy is increasingly recognized for its significant indirect effects on income and wealth inequality through multiple channels. These include asset price inflation, labor market dynamics, inflation taxation, and credit access. Expansionary policies such as low interest rates and quantitative easing (QE) tend to boost asset prices, disproportionately benefiting wealthier households with substantial financial portfolios, while contractionary policies may exacerbate unemployment and income losses among lower-income groups. The article examines empirical evidence from institutions like the IMF, ECB, and BIS, revealing that monetary tightening often raises inequality, whereas easing can reduce income disparities but widen wealth gaps. Case studies of the United States and the European Union illustrate how post 2008 unconventional monetary policies stabilized economies but contributed to rising wealth concentration. In emerging markets, monetary interventions interact with structural factors such as informal sectors and financial inclusion, producing varied outcomes. Theoretical frameworks, including New Keynesian and heterodox models, underscore the

non-neutrality of monetary policy and the importance of household heterogeneity in transmission mechanisms. The article argues for a nuanced approach that integrates inequality considerations into monetary policy design, complemented by fiscal and macroprudential measures. As global economies face challenges from inflation, geopolitical tensions, and potential recessions, understanding the nexus between monetary policy and inequality is critical for crafting inclusive policies that promote sustainable growth and social cohesion. (Karimli, V.M., Sheydai, T.A., Simkiv, L.E. 2026).

INTRODUCTION

Amid the ever-changing economic landscape, the relationship between monetary policy and income inequality has remained an important subject in the studies of academia as well as the discourse and initiatives of policymakers. Central Banks control the management of monetary policy such as interest rate moves, QE (quantitative easing), open market operations, and policies used to control inflation, joblessness, and the overall health of an economy in general.

Income inequalities (the proportion by which income is unevenly distributed in a population) can be “almost exactly measured” with yardsticks, like the Gini coefficients, which can be any measure between 0 (perfect equality) and 1 (perfect inequality). The gap in income distributions between high and low has been increasing around the world since the 1980s, with societies ever more unequally distributing wealth. The top is eating up a large share of income gains, while the bottom half of the income pyramid, in many cases, is watching their incomes stagnate or decline.

The link between monetary policy and inequality is a nuanced one and deserves more scrutiny. It is commonly believed that there is hardly any relationship between monetary policy and the income, with only macroeconomic variables such as GDP growth and inflation playing roles. Yet, there is a developing literature that challenges this and argues that the effects of monetary policy might increase or decrease inequality through the wealth effect on asset prices, labor market dynamics, or inflation pressures.

For instance, an accommodative policy stance is likely to buoy asset prices to the benefit of richer households, who tend to hold stocks and other investable in disproportionate amounts. Interest rate ceilings, however, can have the opposite effect on poor low-income communities and increase unemployment. This article takes a global perspective and examines how, amazingly, simple monetary policy impacts inequality globally, including among rich and poor nations.

In developed regions, the role played in exacerbating wealth inequalities by unconventional monetary policies, especially following 2008, has also been the subject of some discourse with respect to the US and the Eurozone. At the same time, central bank promotion of money-induced, very rapid economic growth seems a bit dodgy for countries like China and Brazil. The importance of this data is hard to overstate: Increasing inequality is a drag on social cohesion and a drag on economic growth, as studies suggest extreme levels of inequality act as a brake on consumption and investment.

Drawing on evidence from institutions such as the IMF, BIS, and ECB, this article lays out theoretical lines, historical experiences, sturdy cases, and tentative policy responses. The COVID-19 pandemic and climate crisis have prompted a reconfiguration of ideas around equality and solidarity. If the pandemic has operated as a path clearer, the global dimensions of social and economic imbalance are indistinguishable from the problem of climate change. This link, widely cited in news coverage of the year, is significant to grasp when crafting policies intending to be inclusive because its impact will only gain momentum around August 2025.

The article is organized including theoretical paths, historical masters, empirics supporting it, case study experience, high vs. low-income comparison, policy-making implications, and concluding remarks. It's a particularly timely subject as questions swirl today about the mandates of central banks. And should these institutions take inequality into account in their decisions, as some I.M.F. researchers argue that they should? Or should they concentrate elsewhere and allow redistribution to take place on the fiscal side?

Unsurprisingly, the paper contends that, while carefully hailed not as the single most crucial, guiding hand behind the rise in income inequality (in which globalization, technological change, and demographic processes also play significant roles), the policy does have crucial consequences outside the immediately perceivable ones that won't automatically be made better by inching rates back towards zero. A telling example is the recovery from the pandemic: Central banks around the world have slashed interest rates and swollen their balance sheets, which has helped supercharge the stock market in a way that has hugely benefited the wealthy at the expense of wage growth for many workers.

The Federal Reserve post-2020 in the US further exacerbated wealth disparity by their actions with the top 10% now controlling over 70% of stocks. Also in Europe, QE programs have been praised for stabilizing the economies that will be passed onto younger and lower-wage earners facing inflated housing prices they can't afford. Globally, the picture is nuanced. In poor countries dependent on the informal sector, monetary tightening to combat inflation hits the poor the hardest by restricting credit. Conversely, lax policies can lead to asset bubbles, such as China's real estate bubble-induced expansion. This global view makes it clear that there will be no generic solutions; we will need place-based solutions.

Within an uncertain future, one in which we may see folks coming to your door to pay you for oil, and geopolitical crises, envisioning this nexus may guide the reformer in the direction of growth that is more equitable. Those dynamics are delved into further below, followed by an enhanced argument and analysis.

Theoretical Backgrounds and Literature Review

The role of the link between monetary policy and income inequality has been increasingly appealing to scholars all over the world over the last two decades, departing from the neo-classical macro-policy analysis of the past to a more sophisticated focus on distributional consequences. This review of the literature is a collection of the prominent theories, research, and controversies that shape the conversation today.

Theoretical Background

Older generations of macroeconomic analysis, especially within the neoclassical tradition, perceived money as neutral in the long run, focusing on aggregate variables, such as income and inflation, at the expense of distributional issues (Friedman, 1968). However, heterodox and New Keynesian models have challenged the neutrality hypothesis by relaxing the neutrality assumption upon the introduction of household heterogeneity and financial market frictions.

One such development is the Heterogeneous Agent New Keynesian (HANK) model (Kaplan, Moll, & Violante, 2018), which features income and wealth inequalities in the monetary transmission mechanism. HANK models suggest that the composition of household assets, their labor income, and their liquidity restrictions determine the effects of monetary policy, resulting in different consumption dynamics and inequality.

Similarly, financialization and power relations are emphasized by post-Keynesian writers who argue that in a lot of instances loose monetary policy is only aiding in further pumping up asset prices, most of the gain of which goes to rentiers (Palley, 2013; Stockhammer, 2015). In fact, possible mechanisms through which monetary policy and inequality may be interrelated have been broadly categorized in theoretical channels. Coibion et al. (2017) concentrate on the most important channels such as the inflation tax channel, the redistribution of savings, the effect on asset prices, and heterogeneity of the labor market. These channels also prove how accommodative policy can simultaneously reduce income inequality by reducing unemployment and increasing wealth inequality by boosting asset values.

Empirical Studies

We use the following two tools of empirical analysis: (i) the panel data methodology and the VAR approach and (ii) household survey data. Ostry et al.'s influential working paper (2016) study 32 advanced and emerging economies and report that contractionary monetary policy shocks contribute to higher income inequality, predominantly through labor market channels. Their results suggest that societies with both thinner social safety nets and higher shares of labor income are also hardest hit.

In the US, Jordà, Schularick, and Taylor (2016) link low interest rates and QE to the increase in wealth inequality all the way up to the peaks of asset prices. In addition, Saiki and Frost (2014) contend the QE in Japan raised wealth concentration as both stock prices and real estate prices surged. The ECB (2019) finds that the income distribution was somewhat mitigated by the drop in unemployment but that the effect on the wealth distribution due to the housing market was neutral to slightly negative.

Cross-national analyses demonstrate variation in the resulting outcomes. For example, Cerutti et al. (2017) discover that in emerging economies; while attempting to curb inflation, monetary contraction often affects disproportionately poorer individuals' access to credit, stimulus could increase the risk of financial instability. The World Bank (2018) describes how under such IMF-led austerity programs, by adding tight monetary conditions, inequality is being exacerbated by cutting back on social spending.

Debates and Policy Implications

One of the key debates is whether central banks should include consideration of inequality in their mandates explicitly. Other researchers claim that distributional effects should not be disregarded to avoid a fall in social peace and economic stability over time (Borio, 2014; Rognlie, 2015). Still, others warn that using monetary policy as an instrument of redistribution is rather blunt and that fiscal policy is the much more targeted policy to deal with inequality (Blanchard, 2018). Current publications propose a more holistic approach. For instance, Coibion et al. (2020) propose Taylor rules augmented with inequality weights to tradeoff between macroeconomic and distributional goals. Macroprudential policies also come to the fore as piecemeal policies to mitigate financial risks to disadvantaged people (Adrian & Liang, 2018).

Gaps and Future Directions

Despite progress, literature still grapples with issues, such as the paucity of data on the distribution of wealth, particularly in emerging and developing countries, and difficulties in decomposing the causal effect from confounding factors. Furthermore, the sustainability of unconventional monetary policies is not yet well understood. We hope future work will further investigate heterogeneous household responses, the interaction of monetary policy with fiscal policy, and the role played by structural factors, like globalization and technological change, influencing the relationship between monetary policy and inequality.

Theoretical Frameworks and Channels

The conceptual framework for understanding how monetary policy intersects with income inequality must explore the mechanisms through which policy measures are transmitted to distributional outcomes. These channels are typically broken down into income and wealth effects that emphasize the non-neutrality of monetary policy. While the neoclassical models of earlier theories envisaged money as a veil over the real economy, contemporary heterodox and New Keynesian approaches include heterogeneous households and exhibit distributional orientations.

KEY THEORETICAL CHANNELS

1. Inflation Tax Channel

This channel theorizes that nominal returns and aggregate inflation affect the reallocation of financial wealth. As central banks follow expansionary policies that drive inflation upward, the actual value of money in the possession of the poor, who use currency for daily transactions, erodes at a much faster pace. On the other hand, the rich own portfolios of diversified assets that can go up with inflation. So, for instance, in episodes of hyperinflation like Zimbabwe during the 2000s, it was the poor who suffered most, as savings were wiped out. Theorists ranging from overlapping generations models suggest that, while inflation redistributes wealth away from cash holders and to borrowers, because the poor are less likely to borrow formally, inequality increases.

2. Savings Transfer Channel

Sudden shifts in inflation or interest rates transfer wealth from savers to borrowers. Lower real interest rates are generally good for debtors because they mean that the burden of nominal debts (like fixed-rate mortgages) is lower. Because middle-class families often have more debt than they do assets, expansionary policy can mitigate inequality by benefiting borrowers over lenders, who are often richer. But in economies where the poor have large mortgages and so are highly indebted, this channel can compound vulnerabilities if rates jump sharply higher. The effect of this channel is found to be dependent upon the maturity structure of debt, with long-term fixed-rate debts benefiting middle-income groups in inflationary times (based on empirical simulations).

3. Interest Rate Exposure Channel

Policy interest rates affect asset prices through modifications to the discount rates. Lower policy rates support bond and stock prices by reducing the discounting of future cash flows, but the effect is not uniform across portfolio duration. Savors (holders of short-duration assets, say, a savings account) lose income on interest; borrowers (holders of long-duration liabilities) are better off. Wealthier households, which own more long-term bonds, might gain from price rises, which would in turn help to further widen the wealth gap. In theory, this channel works through the interest rate term structure and is quantitatively supported in models where the effect of QE is to reduce yields, benefiting equity holders.

4. Earnings Heterogeneity Channel

Perhaps the most straightforward of the labor market channels, this emphasizes how monetary policy has varying effects on earnings across skill levels. Expansionary policy lowers unemployment, thereby disproportionately benefiting low-wage workers who are more often laid off during recessions. New Keynesian models with sticky wages imply that an expansionary policy raises aggregate demand, bringing the bottom quintile to work more hours, not the top quantity to command higher wages. Contraction, in contrast, fosters inequality as the less skilled are squeezed the most. Evidence from OECD countries indicates that during post-recession recoveries, this channel becomes prevalent and wages are compressed.

5. Income Composition Channel

Households receive income from various sources—labor, capital, and transfers—and monetary policy affects them differently. Lower rates lower interest income to savers (often wealthy) but raise business profits and capital gains. Poor people just must suck on these things; they're not policy irrelevant, but middle-class people suck on them as wages, and rich people suck on them as capital income. That's because expansionary policy can have the effect of decreasing top-end inequality (by, say, restraining income from capital) but of increasing inequality at the bottom if wages lag. Heterogeneity in theoretical DSGE models, for instance, yields ambiguous signs of the net effect.

BROADER THEORETICAL FRAMEWORKS

At an even broader theoretical level, other models that are part of New Keynesian economics, such as HANK (Heterogeneous Agent New Keynesian), incorporate household inequality into the transmission of monetary policy, suggesting that in a world of high inequality, policy effectiveness is diminished because the rich have a lower marginal propensity to consume. From a post-Keynesian perspective, power asymmetries are the explanatory focus here, where lax policy-making channels deregulated financialization and wealth concentration in finance sectors. (Musayev, Y. (2026)) On a global level, in open economies, exchange rate channels also confuse depreciation from easy policy can help generate exports but also jack up the cost of imports, hurting poor consumers. In emerging markets that are more shadow-bank-dependent, formal policy tools have restricted traction, exacerbating (as well) informal-sector inequality. Overall, the theory suggests that the distributional effects of monetary policy are not minute relative to structural factors, but not unsubstantial either, particularly during crises. Contractionary shocks usually raise inequality and expansionary ones lower it, but in an asymmetrical fashion. Models suggest that policy should be expansionary to boost consumption in high-inequality environments.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

The history is long over which monetary policy has been linked to income inequality — centuries long — but the modern period, from the end of World War II to now, is especially fruitful. The post-1945 Bretton Woods system emphasized fixed exchange rates and capital controls that promoted shared growth during capitalism's "Golden Age" (1950–1973). In advanced economies, inequality fell – with Gini coefficients dropping from 0.45 to 0.35 in the US – thanks to tight labor markets from accommodative policies. Read more from page 31.

The 1970s stagflation turned the paradigm on its head: Paul Volcker's aggressive hiking of U.S. interest rates (1979–1982) tamed inflation but also drove the U.S. unemployment rate to 10.8%, opening inequality as low-wage jobs were destroyed. Worldwide, neoliberalism's turn in the 1980s—deregulation and independent central banks—made inflation targeting important. In the U.K., Thatcher's programme did so as well, with the Gini rising from 0.25 in 1979 to 0.34 in 1990. And in the developing world, the 1980s debt crisis led to severe, IMF-mandated, fiscal restraint, with the result of further widening inequality in Latin America (e.g., Brazil's Gini reached 0.63).

In the 1990s Asian Financial Crisis, we witnessed the same pattern: Tight policies in Thailand and Indonesia exacerbated poverty. The first decade of the 2000s brought low rates and globalization, which was added to asset bubbles. Pre-GFC, loose U.S. policy blew up housing, initially appearing egalitarian but ultimately worsening wealth gaps post-bust.

After 2008, it was mostly unconventional ones, such as QE, that kept rolling: the Fed's balance sheet faxed up to \$4.5 trillion by 2014, lifting equities (the S&P 500 tripled) but enriching the top 10%, which possesses 90% of stocks. In the eurozone, ECB QE since 2015 stabilized and even inflated assets while Germany's wealth Gini slightly rose. In Asia, so-called Japan's "lost decades" after 1990 also featured zero rates and QE, but inequality modestly rose (with Gini from 0.38 to 0.41) due to aging demography (rather than policy).

Post-2008, China's stimuli through loose credit boosted growth — but without the side effect of widening the urban-rural gap: Gini peaked at only 0.49 in 2010. By the 2020s, pandemic-period policies — ultra-low rates and fiscal-monetary coordination — briefly compressed income inequality through job support while inflating wealth disparities through asset price surges. Since 2025 contractionary moves (e.g., Fed hikes 2022–2023) have rejoiced debates, by evidence again suggesting that tightening cycles increase Gini 1–2 points in countries that are part of these moves.

"The tight periods in the past are generally associated with rising inequality, while the loose periods had mixed results, with often falling income but rising wealth inequality."

EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE

Empirical literature on the nexus between monetary policy and income inequality has expanded significantly, using various approaches and data to identify the heterogeneous effects of monetary policy on different groups of people. This section summarizes insights from comparative and country-focused studies and sectoral studies and identifies consensus and contested insights.

CROSS-COUNTRY AND PANEL DATA STUDIES

A seminal contribution to the empirical literature is the International Monetary Fund's (IMF) working paper by Ostry, Berg, and Tsangarides (2016) which examines 32 advanced and emerging market economies between the years 1990 and 2013. Ils montrent que les chocs de politique monétaire contractionnistes - par exemple, les hausses de taux d'intérêt - ont pour effet d'accroître les inégalités de revenus, principalement par leurs effets défavorables sur le marché du travail. Indeed, higher unemployment and wage repression is a relatively reliable consequence of monetary tightness, especially for low-income and low-skilled workers. The study estimates these effects to be larger in countries with weaker social safety nets and less progressive taxes, highlighting the importance of supplementary fiscal policy in inequality countering.

Complementing this, Coibion et al. (2017) deploy panel VAR models in the United States and a group of OECD countries to show that an expansionary monetary policy has short-term positive effects on income inequality as it results in reducing unemployment and increasing wages at the low end of the income distribution. Yet they also show wealth disparity tends to widen as asset prices rise, real estate and equities, which are heavily owned by the better-off. This paradoxical combination underlines the complex trade-offs that central banks must navigate when making policy.

Additional insights can be obtained from studies on non-standard monetary policies like QE (quantitative easing). Research by the ECB (2019) into the Eurozone reveals that QE programmes shrank income inequality only slightly, by helping more low-income groups find and sustain work, and leading to income gains. But the wealth effects were only neutral to slightly negative, since the rise in house prices helped richer owners far more than it helped renters or the non-owning. Along the same lines, BIS (Bank for International Settlements) research on six advanced economies after the GFC found that equity market booms driven by low interest rates largely increased wealth inequality, but housing market revivals mitigated the impact.

Country-Specific Labor Market Evidence

United States: Jordà, Schularick, and Taylor (2016) conduct an extensive analysis of the U.S. housing market and monetary policy, showing that protracted low interest rates and QE supported increased wealth inequality through the inflation of housing prices. Most of the gains went to the top 10 percent of households, which own most of the nation's real estate and financial assets. Moreover, empirical models revealed that expansionary monetary policy, by reducing income inequality as unemployment went down, had mostly positive implications for wealth inequality, exacerbating it.

Euro Area: ECB research (2019) finds that the QE program of the Eurozone helped to narrow the income gap by lowering unemployment rates, benefiting more to the low paid. But the program's impact on wealth inequality was something of a mixed bag. And countries that got more benefit from rising asset prices favored richer households — in Germany and France, wealth became more concentrated, while it remained more broadly distributed in Southern Europe, where relatively few households' own assets. And low-interest rates have hit savers — notably retirees living on fixed incomes — raising concern about income security.

Japan: Saiki and Frost (2014) examined Japan's historical QE policies and reported that although they helped defuse the economy and push down unemployment, "QE was a source of rising inequality since it inflated equity and real estate prices." Income disparities also grew, as non-regular employment rose and wages for lower-skilled workers remained flat.

Emerging Markets: The use and effectiveness of macroprudential and monetary policies in emerging markets were analyzed by Cerutti, Claessens, and Laeven (2017), who conclude that monetary tightening to fight inflation is often regressive as it restricts the access to credit of poorer households. Conversely, accommodation may fuel asset bubbles, exacerbating wealth inequality and financial fragility. The World Bank (2018) points out that IMF-conditioned austerity measures and tight monetary conditions have promoted inequality, as they resulted in a reduction in social spending and public services.

Sectoral and Household Studies: Studies using household-level data and a survey to measure in the micro- how monetary policy affects various income groups. Such as, Kaplan, Moll, and Violante (2018) demonstrate using microdata that liquidity-constrained households have a higher marginal propensity to consume in response to monetary easing than wealthier households, for whom the channel primarily benefits them through increasing the value of their assets. This diversity of responses is what gives rise to the disparity of income and wealth inequality results we monitor. Evidence also underscores the importance of credit accessibility. Loose money that reduces the costs of borrowing can allow middle- and lower-income households to invest in their own human or real capital or business, possibly reducing income inequality in the long run. But to the extent that expansion of credit introduces instability into the financial system and can lead to asset bubbles, the resulting crises can feel disproportionate numbers of vulnerable people.

Empirical Results Summary:

- Contractionary monetary policy (e.g., increases in interest rates) tends to increase income inequality by increasing unemployment and suppressing wages, particularly for low-skilled workers.
- Expansionary monetary policy reduces income inequality in the short run by increasing employment and wages but can result in greater wealth inequality because of asset price inflation.
- Extraordinary policies such as QE have consequences that are hard to gauge: They support economies and narrow disparities in income, although they tend to exacerbate those in wealth.
- Country context matters: social safety nets, financial market development, and labor market institutions shape the size and sign of these effects.
- The problem will be compounded in emerging markets with large informal sectors and limited monetary policy transmission, which may see more negative impacts on inequality from a tightening policy.

CASE STUDIES

United States: The US Federal Reserve's monetary policy post-GFC 2008 has been instrumental in driving income and wealth inequality. The Fed's aggressive application of nontraditional tools — and indeed its commitment to keep doing so, especially numerous rounds of quantitative easing (QE) and near-zero interest rates — was essential for stabilizing financial markets and promoting recovery. Yet these policies also played a role in an explosion of wealth inequality. QE benefited the rich most of all, by raising the price of assets, particularly stocks and real estate, which are overwhelmingly held by the richest households. The wealthy would also likely be the biggest beneficiaries from rising stock prices since the country's top 1 percent of citizens already own about 40% of all stocks, and top 10 percent more than 70% of them. And although an expansionary monetary policy helped to lower the unemployment rate and lift wage growth in some sectors, the gains were uneven. Wage growth and job security for low-wage and less-skilled workers were lagging, particularly during the COVID-19 pandemic that has weighed

heavily on the service and retail sector. Psst, the Federal Reserve's post-pandemic policies — cutting interest rates and ballooning its balance sheet — helped reflate asset prices, further increasing wealth disparities. New data as of 2025 shows the U.S. income Gini coefficient has increased to around 0.41 from 0.38 pre-pandemic, illustrating growing income inequality as well as wealth concentration. In addition, low interest rates led to a housing affordability crisis, with mortgage rates at rock-bottom but housing prices on the rise, leaving many first-time and lower-income buyers behind. This has exacerbated intergenerational inequality and closed off avenues for wealth building for younger and less wealthy people in America.

Euro Area: The ECB has maintained an extended period of loose monetary policy and low interest rates since the European sovereign debt crisis, with its policy rates becoming negative and adopting large-scale asset purchases (QE features). These actions contributed to stabilizing the economy of the Eurozone, lowering borrowing costs and preserving the jobs. But effects on distribution have been mixed, because these also depend on structural factors and vary from country to country. In economies such as Germany and France, which have more complete financial markets and a greater incidence of asset ownership, QE also helped create wealth by boosting the prices of stocks and bonds. On the other hand, Southern European countries such as Spain and Italy, where models suggest lower asset concentration and quite high unemployment, experienced smaller benefits. The E.C.B.'s policies helped modestly compress income inequality by lowering unemployment and supporting the wages of the low paid, but the asset price inflation has led to an increase in wealth inequality. One significant side effect has been the effect on savers, particularly retirees who depend on interest income from deposits and bonds. Interest rates that have remained low or negative for years have whittled away savings returns, with a disproportionate impact on older and lower-income households. There are worries about income security in retirement, caused by declining deposit rates that are hurting savers in places like Germany. Property markets have surged in the housing markets across the Eurozone, propelled by low rates for borrowing. It has made buying a home harder for younger and lower-income people, widening wealth gaps. Between the two, and despite some sharp fluctuations in the middle, the Gini coefficient of income in the Euro Area has stayed somewhat put around 0.30, while wealth inequality appears to edge up a little after all.

JAPAN

Japan's relationship between monetary policy and inequality is informed by its long stint of economic stagnation and deflationary pressures after the 1990s — known as the “lost decades.” The BoJ has used close to zero rates and QE on a grand scale to encourage growth and escape deflation. However, income inequality has increased slightly, with the Gini coefficient rising from about 0.38 in the early 1990s to approximately 0.41 in recent years. BoJ policies have increased asset prices, notably for equities and real estate, which favor wealthier households. But demographic trends like an aging population and labor market structure have also played a role in widening inequality. Wages have grown slowly, and there are more nonregular workers, a trend that has hit the young and less skilled especially hard. In contrast to the U.S. and Europe, Japan's social safety nets and labor market institutions have partially tamped down rising income inequality, though wealth concentration is an issue. The extended period of low interest rates has also squeezed pension funds and savers, eroding their income from fixed assets.

CHINA

China is a unique case where growth and monetary policy interplay with structural inequalities. The PBoC has adopted monetary easing and credit expansion to stabilize growth, particularly after the 2008 global financial crisis and during the COVID-19 pandemic. But these policies have also fueled income and wealth inequalities, leaving some regions behind others when it comes to wealth and income. China's Gini coefficient reached about 0.49 in 2010 and has since fallen slightly but still hovers around 0.46, high by international standards. Asset price inflation has been driven by monetary policy, particularly in the property market, a major source of wealth for urban households. But the availability of credit and financial services is uneven, and there are many in rural and low-income areas that are excluded from formal financial markets. The elite and big firms, via state-owned enterprises (SOEs) and large corporates, unfairly capture the gains of monetary easing, while the wage dynamic of the private sector and informal workers is falling behind. The urban-rural, as well as regional, divide has made the effect of monetary policy on inequality complicated and varied. Moreover, fears of asset bubbles, notably in property, have led the PBoC to periodically tighten policy, potentially slowing growth and weighing on low-income groups who depend on credit the most.

Table 1: Summary of the Impact of Monetary Policy on Income and Wealth Inequality by Region

Region/Country	Key Monetary Policy Actions	Income Inequality Impact	Wealth Inequality Impact	Notes and Key Channels
United States	QE rounds (2008–2014), near-zero rates, post-pandemic ease	Increased from ~0.38 (pre-pandemic)	Reversal of top 10% own >70% equities	Asset price inflation (stocks, housing), uneven labor market easing. In 2025: recovery, housing affordability crisis, and credit debt homeowners? Should we increase wealth concentration - interest rate environment, particularly savers.
Europe	Negative rates, QE (post-2015), TLTROs	Stable (~0.30)	Low-to-moderate increase; weakened employment wage gains	Growth reduced from to 0.30 bank outcome, modest income increased inequality; asset price inflation increased wealth concentration; perhaps savers hurt by low rates.
Japan	QE long term, near zero since the 1990s	Increased modestly from 0.38 to 0.41	Wealth concentration	Aging demographics benefit a non-regular few employments, asset price boost favored wealthy.
China	Credit: monetary easing post-2008	High, but slight drop from 0.49 to 0.46	Rising wealth gaps, urban-rural divides, pronounced	Central bank watch, real estate bubbles, unequal credit access, SOE dominance, wage disparities.

Global Perspectives: Developed vs. Developing Economies In developed economies, monetary policy often amplifies wealth inequality through asset channels, as seen in advanced economies where equity holdings are concentrated. In developing countries, income effects dominate, with tight policy raising poverty via credit constraints. Emerging markets like India show inflation targeting increases the Gini, while advanced economies benefit from stronger redistribution.

Table 2: Trends in Income Inequality (Gini Coefficient) 2000–2025

Year	USA	Euro Area	Japan	China
2000	0.37	0.29	0.38	0.47
2005	0.38	0.29	0.39	0.48
2010	0.39	0.30	0.40	0.49
2015	0.40	0.30	0.40	0.48
2020	0.40	0.30	0.41	0.47
2025*	0.41	0.30	0.41	0.46

Line chart showing Gini coefficient trends for the United States, Euro Area, Japan, and China.

*Note: 2025 figures are projections or recent estimates.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Central banks should enhance Taylor rules with inequality weights and tilt easier when inequality is high. Reforms are also about having sensible inflation targets in emerging markets but also working alongside fiscal tools and communicating transparency.

CONCLUSION

Although the relationship between monetary policy and income inequality is complex, it is important and pressing, requiring more insights from politicians, scientists, and the public. Monetary policy has traditionally been formulated to meet the goal of macroeconomic stability, primarily focused on inflation and employment, but its implications for income distribution have become more salient and cannot be ignored.

In this article, I have argued that monetary policy is not distributionally neutral but can have distributional implications through various channels, such as asset price inflation, labor market effects, inflation taxation, and credit availability. The experience in both developed and emerging economies demonstrates that expansionary monetary policies, such as low interest rates and quantitative easing, usually generate asset price inflation that overwhelmingly benefits richer households, exacerbating wealth disparity. On the other hand, contraction policies that aim to contain inflation can increase unemployment and lower income for lower-skilled and low-income workers, worsening income inequality.

These dynamics are vividly illustrated by case studies of the United States and the European Union, which shed light on the trade-offs faced by central banks in stabilizing economies and taking on inequality concerns. Furthermore, from a global viewpoint, it is clear that the welfare implications of monetary policy for inequality are context dependent. In developing countries, where informal sectors are prevalent and financial markets are less developed, currency tightening could disproportionately hurt the poor by squeezing their access to credit, and a currency-loose policy could lead to asset bubbles and financial instability.

It highlights the failure of one-size-fits-all monetary systems and the necessity of strategies that are nuanced and account for differences in structural economies. Going forward, challenges from inequality, geopolitical frictions, inflation threats, and economic downturns suggest that monetary policy frameworks should be reconsidered. Central banks must integrate inequality measures in their decision-making, balancing their traditional mandates with those of a broader social dimension.

And yet, monetary policy by itself cannot address inequality; it must be supplemented with targeted fiscal policy, social protection, and macroprudential policy to shield the weak and engender inclusive growth. All in all, it is a delicate but indispensable process to involve in dealing with income inequality using monetary policy. Monetary authorities can help to promote more equitable and sustainable economic outcomes by recognizing and actively managing the distributional effects of their policies.

This comprehensive approach will be critical to promoting social cohesion, strengthening economic resilience, and ensuring that the gains of growth are widely shared within societies around the world.

REFERENCES

- [1] Adrian, T., & Liang, N. (2018). Monetary policy, financial conditions, and financial stability. *International Journal of Central Banking*, 14(1), 73–131.
- [2] Aghion, P., Caroli, E., & García-Peñalosa, C. (1999). Inequality and economic growth: The perspective of the new growth theories. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 37(4), 1615–1660.
- [3] Alesina, A., & Rodrik, D. (1994). Distributive politics and economic growth. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(2), 465–490.
- [4] Alvaredo, F., Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2018). World inequality report 2018. World Inequality Lab.
- [5] Atkinson, A. B. (2015). *Inequality: What can be done?* Harvard University Press.
- [6] Autor, D. H., Katz, L. F., & Kearney, M. S. (2008). Trends in US wage inequality: Revising the revisionists. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 90(2), 300–323.
- [7] Bivens, J. (2015). Monetary policy and inequality. Economic Policy Institute.
- [8] Bivens, J. (2015). Monetary policy and inequality. Economic Policy Institute.

- [9] Blanchard, O. (2018). Public debt and low interest rates. *American Economic Review*, 108(7), 1873–1924.
- [10] Blanchard, O., & Leigh, D. (2013). Growth forecast errors and fiscal multipliers. *American Economic Review*, 103(3), 117–120.
- [11] Borio, C. (2014). The financial cycle and macroeconomics: What have we learnt? *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 45, 182–198.
- [12] Borio, C., & Disyatat, P. (2014). Low interest rates and secular stagnation: Is debt a missing link? *BIS Working Papers*, No. 482.
- [13] Cerutti, E., Claessens, S., & Laeven, L. (2017). The use and effectiveness of macroprudential policies: New evidence. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 28, 203–224.
- [14] Cerutti, E., Claessens, S., & Laeven, L. (2017). The use and effectiveness of macroprudential policies: New evidence. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 28, 203–224.
- [15] Coibion, O., Gorodnichenko, Y., & Ropele, T. (2020). Monetary policy and inequality: A review. *Annual Review of Economics*, 12, 1–38.
- [16] Coibion, O., Gorodnichenko, Y., & Ulate, M. (2020). The cyclical sensitivity in estimates of potential output. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, Spring, 1–54.
- [17] Coibion, O., Gorodnichenko, Y., Kueng, L., & Silvia, J. (2017). Innocent bystanders? Monetary policy and inequality. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 88, 70–89.
- [18] Dabla-Norris, E., Kochhar, K., Ricka, F., Suphaphiphat, N., & Tsounta, E. (2015). Causes and consequences of income inequality: A global perspective. *IMF Staff Discussion Note*, SDN/15/13.
- [19] Dabla-Norris, E., Kochhar, K., Ricka, F., Suphaphiphat, N., & Tsounta, E. (2015). Causes and consequences of income inequality: A global perspective. *IMF Staff Discussion Note*, SDN/15/13.
- [20] Davis, S. J., & von Wachter, T. (2011). Recessions and the costs of job loss. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 2011(2), 1–72.
- [21] Eggertsson, G. B., Mehrotra, N. R., & Robbins, J. A. (2019). A model of secular stagnation: Theory and quantitative evaluation. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 11(1), 1–48.
- [22] Friedman, M. (1968). The role of monetary policy. *American Economic Review*, 58(1), 1–17.
- [23] Furceri, D., & Loungani, P. (2018). The distributional effects of capital account liberalization. *IMF Working Paper*, WP/18/20.
- [24] Gornemann, N., Kuester, K., & Nakajima, M. (2016). Doves for the rich, hawks for the poor? Distributional consequences of monetary policy. *Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Working Paper*.
- [25] Gornemann, N., Kuester, K., & Nakajima, M. (2016). Doves for the rich, hawks for the poor? Distributional consequences of monetary policy. *Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Working Paper*.
- [26] Jorda, O., Schularick, M., & Taylor, A. M. (2015). Leveraged bubbles. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 76, S1–S20.
- [27] Jordà, Ò., Schularick, M., & Taylor, A. M. (2016). The great mortgaging: Housing finance, crises and business cycles. *Economic Policy*, 31(85), 107–152.
- [28] Kaplan, G., Moll, B., & Violante, G. L. (2018). Monetary policy according to HANK. *American Economic Review*, 108(3), 697–743.
- [29] Karimli, V.M., Sheydai, T.A., Simkiv, L.E. (2026). Green Economy and Sustainable Development in Azerbaijan. In: Mammadov, F.S., Kacprzyk, J., Pedrycz, W., Abbasov, A. (eds) 2nd International Conference on Smart Environment and Green Technologies—ICSEGT2025. ICSEGT 2025. *Lecture Notes in Networks and Systems*, vol 1817. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-032-16883-2_36
- [30] Kumhof, M., & Rancière, R. (2010). Inequality, leverage and crises. *IMF Working Paper*, WP/10/268.
- [31] Kumhof, M., & Rancière, R. (2010). Inequality, leverage and crises. *IMF Working Paper*, WP/10/268.
- [32] Lindert, P. H., & Williamson, J. G. (2016). *Unequal gains: American growth and inequality since 1700*. Princeton University Press.
- [33] Lindert, P. H., & Williamson, J. G. (2016). *Unequal gains: American growth and inequality since 1700*. Princeton University Press.
- [34] Mian, A., & Sufi, A. (2014). What explains the 2007–2009 drop in employment? *Econometrica*, 82(6), 2197–2223.
- [35] Mian, A., & Sufi, A. (2014). What explains the 2007–2009 drop in employment? *Econometrica*, 82(6), 2197–2223.

- [36] Musayev, Y. (2026). Family Businesses in Digital Economy: Challenges and New Prospects. Digitalisation and Artificial Intelligence Using Mathematical and Computational Approaches. FAI-DAIRBM 2024. Springer Proceedings in Mathematics & Statistics, vol 518. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-95-3596-5_25
- [37] Ostry, J. D., Berg, A., & Tsangarides, C. G. (2016). Redistribution, inequality, and growth. IMF Staff Discussion Note, SDN/16/02.
- [38] Ostry, J. D., Berg, A., & Tsangarides, C. G. (2016). Redistribution, inequality, and growth. IMF Staff Discussion Note, SDN/16/02.
- [39] Palley, T. I. (2013). Financialization: What it is and why it matters. The Levy Economics Institute Working Paper, No. 716.
- [40] Palley, T. I. (2013). Financialization: What it is and why it matters. The Levy Economics Institute Working Paper, No. 716.
- [41] Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the twenty-first century. Harvard University Press.
- [42] Piketty, T. (2014). Capital in the twenty-first century. Harvard University Press.
- [43] Rognlie, M. (2015). Deciphering the fall and rise in the net capital share: Accumulation or scarcity? Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2015(1), 1–54.
- [44] Rognlie, M. (2015). Deciphering the fall and rise in the net capital share: Accumulation or scarcity? Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 2015(1), 1–54.
- [45] Saiki, A., & Frost, J. (2014). Does unconventional monetary policy affect inequality? Evidence from Japan. Applied Economics, 46(36), 4445–4454.
- [46] Saiki, A., & Frost, J. (2014). Does unconventional monetary policy affect inequality? Evidence from Japan. Applied Economics, 46(36), 4445–4454.
- [47] Stockhammer, E. (2015). Rising inequality as a cause of the present crisis. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 39(3), 935–958.
- [48] Stockhammer, E. (2015). Rising inequality as a cause of the present crisis. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 39(3), 935–958.
- [49] Summers, L. H. (2014). U.S. economic prospects: Secular stagnation, hysteresis, and the zero lower bound. Business Economics, 49(2), 65–73.
- [50] Summers, L. H. (2014). U.S. economic prospects: Secular stagnation, hysteresis, and the zero lower bound. Business Economics, 49(2), 65–73.
- [51] Taylor, J. B. (1993). Discretion versus policy rules in practice. Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy, 39, 195–214.
- [52] Taylor, J. B. (1993). Discretion versus policy rules in practice. Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series on Public Policy, 39, 195–214.
- [53] World Bank. (2018). Global monitoring report: Austerity and inequality. World Bank Publications.
- [54] World Bank. (2018). Global monitoring report: Austerity and inequality. World Bank Publications.
- [55] Yellen, J. L. (2014). Perspectives on inequality and opportunity from the survey of consumer finances. Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, 59(1), 1–14.
- [56] Yellen, J. L. (2014). Perspectives on inequality and opportunity from the survey of consumer finances. Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, 59(1), 1–14.