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# THE EFFECTS OF TAXES AND BENEFITS ON HOUSEHOLD INCOME, 1987 

## The main points are:

(1) The effect of government expenditure and taxation is to reduce the differences in income amongst households. In 1987 taxes and benefits (including NI pensions) increased the share of total income of the bottom fifth of households from 2.1 per cent of original income to 7.6 per cent of post-tax income. Cash benefits play the largest part in reducing income differences.
(2) The joint impact of taxes and benefits is greatest for retired households and for those non-retired households containing no economically active people.
(3) Equivalisation of income (ie adjusting income for household size and composition) is used extensively in ranking the households for the first time this year. The main effect is that small households are no longer concentrated at the bottom of the income distribution, nor are larger households concentrated at the top.

## Introduction

The aim of this analysis is to examine how the distribution of income amongst households in the UK is modified as a result of Government expenditure and taxation. During 1987 the Government raised and spent $£ 168$ billion; most of this revenue was raised, directly or indirectly, from UK households who also benefited, directly or indirectly, from the associated Governmentexpenditure. Although greater equality of incomes is not necessarily a primary aim of this process, it is nevertheless one of its consequences. The article is the latest in an annual series published in Economic Trends since the early 1960s. Each year the article covers the same main ground but also has a special topic.

This year we have made some fundamental changes to the article after reviewing the methodology behind the analysis - the first such review for over 10 years. As part of this review, we have decided to produce the article on an equivalised basis ie adjusting income to take account of household size and composition. Equivalisation is used in the ranking process, for percentage shares and when calculating Gini coefficients: but the tables show incomes and taxes in ordinary $£$ a year not equivalised $£$ a year. The effects of equivalisation form this year's special topic.

## Equivalisation

Equivalisation means adjusting household income to allow for houschold size and composition (ю recognise different needs). A household of five adults needs a higher income than a single person living alone to achieve the same 'standard of living'. A distribution of equivalised income, where all househoids are put on an equal footing regardless of size or composition, thus provides a more meaningful way of comparing the income of households. For example: consider two married couples, the Jones with no children and the Smiths with two children (aged 3 and 5), both earning $£ 15,000$ a year. The Jones have an equivalence factor of 1.00 whereas the Smiths have a factor of 1.39 (where the 0.39 accounts for the children). The Smiths have a lower equivalised income at $£ 10,791(=£ 15,000 / 1.39)$ than the Jones at $£ 15,000(=£ 15,000 / 1.00)$.

The contents are as follows:

Part I

Part II The effects of equivalisation.
Appendix 1 Detailed tables with fine breakdown of income components for quintile and decile groups, and results for different types of household.

Appendix 2 Methodology and definitions.
Appendix 3 Changes in the methodology this year.
Appendix 4 Selection of tables on the old basis.
The main data source is the annual Family Expenditure Survey (FES). Since this article is based on a sample survey, its results are subject to sampling errors. These are generally larger for the smaller household groups (further details on sampling errors and reliability are given in Appendix 2). The unit of analysis is the household, rather than the person or tax unit. This analysis gives a snapshot of households at various stages in their lifecycles: nearly everyone has less income when elderly than at their peak earning age. The monetary values in the tables in the main body of the article are rounded to the nearest $£ 10$.

The figures in each year's article are free standing and are not intended to be used as part of a time series with figures from earlier articles. The FES changes slightly each year, and no special effort has been made in the past to ensure a fully-consistent time series. The major changes to the methodology this year mean that the 1987 figures are completely incompatible with those for earlier years. As a special exercise, we intend to produce a consistent time series (as consistent as the changing FES will allow) for a small number of tables in thenextarticle. This series will becalculated retrospectively and on the new basis, not a further continuation of the oid series.

## Summary of methodology and sources

Chart 1 illustrates the stages of redistribution which form the structure of this analysis. Initially, households receive income from various non-governmental sources: from their employment (wages and salaries; self-employment income); from occupational pensions; from their investments and from other households (eg alimony payments). Total income from these sources constitutes original income. The flow chart shows the various ways in which Government then raises revenue from houscholds and distributes benefits to them both in cash and in kind.

The main source of data for this analysis is the Family Expenditure Survey (FES) 1987. This is a continuous household survey which collects information on the income, expenditure and direct tax payments of each household member aged 16 years and over, and on household composition and other characteristics such as tenure. In 1987 some 7,400 households participated in the UK - about 1 in every 3,000 households. The response rate was 72 per cent in Great Britain: the FES in Northern Ireland is a separate exercise to the rest of UK, with a much larger sampline fraction and only a nomertion

the FES suffers from some non-response bias, for example through under-representation of the very top of the income distribution, the elderly and the self-employed. However, in general, comparisons of survey results over successive years justify confidence in their general reliability, and examination of the characteristics and expenditure and income patterns of various groups of households shows a high degree of internal consistency. The data presented in this article have not been reweighted to take account of nonresponse bias.

The data on household income, cash benefits, income tax, National Insurance contributions and domestic rates are used directly from the FES. In contrast, the figures for indirect taxes (eg VAT, duty on beer) and benefits in kind (eg from state education) are calculated using an imputation process - which uses FES data, for example on households' expenditure and characteristics. This imputation process is carried out within the framework of the National Accounts aggregates, and involves many assumptions (for example on incidence and grossing up for non-response). Some of these assumptions are doubtful, and hence the results of this part of the analysis are subject to a wide margin of error. Tables 1 and 2 in Appendix 1 give government expenditure and its financing for 1987, derived from the National Accounts. Appendix 2 gives more detail on the methodology.

## Summary of changes to this year's analysis

The following list gives the changes made to this year's analysis as a result of the special review of methodology:

- equivalisation is used extensively in ranking the households for the first time.
- household income now ranked using only one measure (ie equivalised disposable income).
In previous articles, income was ranked by original, disposable and gross income in various tables.
original income no longer includes free meals and food from employer.
disposable income re-defined to be exclusive of domestic rates (in anticipation of community charge data being available for 1989)
- new definition of a 'child' (to be in line with other Government departments)
- domestic rates now shown in full ie. before any rebates which are now shown as a cash benefit (as part of housing benefit). In previous articles, domestic rates were shown net of rebates and these rebates were excluded from cash benefits.

Further details are given in Appendix 3, and Appendix 4 gives a selection of tables on the old basis - so that readers can gauge the effects of the changes. Equivalisation has by far the greatest impact.

## PART I

## RESULTS FOR ALL HOUSEHOLDS

The level of original income varies widely between households. Table A shows this and other income measures for quintile groups ranked by equivalised disposable income (the lowest quintile group contains the 20 per cent of households with the lowest equivalised disposable incomes). In the lowest quintile group the average number of economically active people is 0.3 and hence the average original income is low ( $£ 1,220$ per annum). In the highest quintile group, there are an average of 1.7 economically active people and average original income is $£ 25,470$. In the lowest quintile group, nearly half of the households are retired (Table B) - defined as households where at least half the total gross income comes from retired people - and the majority of these have virtually no original income since the state retirement pension (including any graduated or additional pension) is a cash benefit.

## Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits, 1987

TABLE A


[^0]
## The composition of each quintile group of households, 1987

TABLE B

|  | Quintile groups of households ranked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  | All households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3 rd | 4th | Top |  |
| Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Household type |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retired | 48 | 46 | 18 | 11 | 8 | 26 |
| Non-retired |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 adult | 7 | 8 | 9 | 12 | 18 | 11 |
| 2 adults | 8 | 9 | 18 | 25 | 40 | 20 |
| 1 adult with children' | 9 | 6 | 2 | 1 | - | 4 |
| 2 adults with children | 19 | 21 | 33 | 29 | 20 | 24 |
| 3 or more adults* | 8 | 10 | 20 | 22 | 14 | 15 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1 This group is smaller than the category of "one parent families" because some of these lamilles will be contained In larger household types.
2 With or without children.

Chart 2 illustrates the declining importance of cash benefils in gross income from the virtual dependence of the lowest quintile group to a minor income source for the top quintile group.

Chart 3 shows how the dispersion of incomes is reduced at each stage of the tax-benefit system, so that the average final income for each quintile groupranges from $£ 4,820$ to $£ 17,660$, a ratio of about $1: 4$ compared with the ratio for original incomes of about $1: 20$.

An alternative way to illustrate the extent of income redistribution is to examine how income shares are modified by the tax-benefit system (Table C). For example, househoids in the highest quintile group (when ranked by equivalised disposable income) receive 50 per cent of all original income. After taking into account cash benefits, this same group's share falls to 43 per cent. At the other end of the scale, the share of the lowest quintile group rises from 2.1 per cent to 7.5 per cent. A further, but comparatively smaller, compression of the income distribution occurs at the stage of disposable income, but this is reversed after indirect taxes are taken into account. This table is now calculated using equivalised incomes, and hence 'final income' has not been included: it would be inappropriate to equivalise this income measure because of its substantial non-spendable elements eg benefits from education.

The Gini coefficient is the most widely used summary measure of the inequality of the distribution of income (see paragraph 37 of Appendix 2). It takes values between 0 and 100 per cent - the higher values indicating greater inequality. In this article, Gini coefficients are now calculated using equivalised incomes (using the same equivalence scale that is applied to equivalise disposable income). The reduction from 51 per cent to 36 per cent shown in Table $C$ shows that cash benefits produce the largest reduction in income inequality.

Attention has already been drawn to the preponderance of retired households in the lower ranges of the distribution of original income; nearly half of the households in the botom two quintile groups are retired (Table B). The income pattern of the retired is very different from that of households whose head is of working age, as is their expenditure pattern (which is reflected in their indireet tax payments). For this reason in the detailed examination of each stage of the tax-benefit system which follows, retired and non-retired households are analysed separately.

## CHART 2



CHART 3
The effects of taxes and benefits on quintile groups ${ }^{1}$ of households, 1987

Percentage shares of total household income and Gini coefficlents', 1987

TABLE C

|  | Percentage shares of total equivalised income for households ranked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Original income | Gross income | Disposable income | Post-tax income |
| Quintile group |  |  |  |  |
| Botiom .. | 2.1 | 7.5 | 8.2 | 7.6 |
| 2nd .. .+ | 7 | 11 | 12 | 12 |
| 3rd .. .. | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| 4th .- .. | 25 | 23 | 23 | 22 |
| Top .. .. | 50 | 43 | 41 | 43 |
| All househoids | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Decile group |  |  |  |  |
| Botion .. | 0.8 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 3.1 |
| Top .. .. | 32 | 27 | 26 | 27 |
| Gini coefficient (percent) | 51 | 36 | 33 | 36 |

1 This is a measure of the dispersion of each definition of income. Unllike the percentage shares analysis where the household incomes ate ranked only once, the Gini cooefliclent calculation needs a separale ranking for each income detinition. For example. the coefficient for originat income is produced by first equivalising the original income of all the households, then this distribution is ranked and this ranked distribution is used to calculate the coetficient.
relationship between the original income of a household and the number of economically active people it contains and Table K (at the end of this section) gives a breakdown by the number of economically active people per household. There is also a strong relationship between the number of children per household and income: the number of children falls steadily as income rises.

## Original income

The distribution of original income amongst non-retired households is more equal than amongst all households, ranging from an average of $£ 2,760$ per annum in the lowest quintile group to $£ 27,700$ in the highest (Table D), a ratio of $1: 10$ compared to the ratio of $1: 20$ for the distribution over all households. There is a fairly strong
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## RESULTS FOR NON-RETIRED HOUSEHOLDS

## Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits on non-retired households, 1987

TABLE 0


Average per household (number)


1 Altar tax relise al source on morigage interest and life assurance premiums and including gross domestic rates.
2 Children are delined as persons aged under 16 or aged between 16 and 18 , unmarrled and receiving non-advanced

## Cash benefits

Cash benefits are of two types: contributory, paid from the National Insurance Fund to which individuals and their employers make contributions while working, and non-contributory (Table E). For non-retired households, non-contributory benefits form the most important source of cash benefit income. An important item, child benefit, is biased towards the bottom of the income distribution, in proportion to the number of children per household (Table D). The other non-contributory benefits are mainly income-related, in particular Supplementary Benefit (now Income Support), and so payments are concentrated in the lowest quintile group, although the presence of some individuals with low incomes in high income households means that some payments are recorded further up the income distribution. Most contributory benefits, for which contribution records rather than income are the criteria for payment, are highest for the second quintile group. On average, eash benefits formed 10 per cent of the gross income of non-retired households: theirpayment resulted in a significant reduction in income inequality.

## Average value of cash benefits for each quintile group of non-retired households, 1987

TABLE E

|  | Quintile groups of households ranked by equivalised dilsposable income |  |  |  |  | All house holds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom |  | 3 rd | 4th | Top |  |
| Average per household (2 a year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension.. | 120 | 270 | 260 | 110 | 110 | 180 |
| Sickness/ injury related | 180 | 230 | 120 | 100 | 60 | 140 |
| Unemployment benelit | 150 | 90 | 70 | 60 | 40 | 80 |
| Other .. .. .. | 60 | 70 | 50 | 50 | 40 | 60 |
| Total contributory | 510 | 660 | 500 | 330 | 250 | 450 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplementary benefit | 1170 | 320 | 110 | 40 | 30 | 330 |
| Child benefit .. .. | 490 | 410 | 320 | 230 | 140 | 320 |
| Housing benelit .. | 610 | 180 | 70 | 10 | 20 | 180 |
| Sickness/ disablement related | 100 | 160 | 100 | 50 | 20 | 90 |
| Other .. .. | 160 | 120 | 90 | 60 | 20 | 90 |
| Total non-contributory | 2540 | 1190 | 680 | 390 | 2301 | 1000 |
| Total cash benefits | 3050 | 1840 | 1180 | 720 | 4801 | 450 |
| Cash benefits as a percentage of gross income | 53 | 18 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 10 |

## Income tax, NI contributions and domestic rates

Both income tax payments and employees' National Insurance contributions are closely related to the size of original income. The payments by houscholds of employees' National Insurance contributions in particular vary with the number of persons in employment and with their eamings. However, since National Insurance contributions are only calculated on the first $£ 295$ of weekly earnings (the ceiling in operation during most of 1987), households in the top quintile group pay rather less in contributions as a percentage of gross income than the middle 60 per cent of households (Table F).

Income tax, employees' NIC and domestic rates as percentages of gross income for each quintile group of non-retired households, 1987
table F

|  | Quintile groups of non-retired househoids ranked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  | All households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom |  | 3 rd | 4th | Top |  |
| Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income tax | 4.3 |  | 11.6 | 14.0 | 17.7 | 13.7 |
| Employees' NIC | 2.5 | 5.2 | 5.7 | 5.8 | 4.5 | 5.0 |
| Domestic rates | 7.6 | 4.4 | 3.5 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 3.3 |
| Total | 14.4 | 19.2 | 21.1 | 22.7 | 24.5 | 22.0 |

[^1]In 1987 over one-third of working age individuals had insufficient income to pay income tax, and marginal tax rates for taxpayers ranged from 27 per cent to 60 per cent. The analysis of households when ranked by equivalised disposable income shows a much less progressive tax system. Average rates are 4.3 per cent in the lowest quintile, rising steadily to 17.7 percent in the highest quintile. This results from grouping individuals in the same households, from ranking households by equivalised disposable income, and from calculating average income tax rates on gross income (instead of taxable income).

For domestic rates, before the deduction of rate rebates (which are treated as a cash benefit), the level of payments is quite regressive - the average percentage falling steadily as income rises.

## Indirect taxes

In total, indirect taxes expressed as a proportion of disposable income fall as disposable income rises (Table G), ranging from 28 per cent in the bottom quintile group to 16 per cent in the highest, though the highest quintile pay most in indirect taxes in absolute terms. However, individual taxes have divergent effects.

VAT, tobacco duty, beer duty and intermediate taxes (see box below) all fall as a percentage of disposable income as income rises. The fall in tobacco duty payments as a percentage of income is particularly marked. For expenditure items relating to motoring (ie car tax and duty on hydrocarbon oils), the tax as a proportion of income is similar for the bottom four quintile groups but much lower for the top group.

## INTERMEDIATE TAXES

Some indirect taxes, such as VAT and excise dulies on petrol, alcohol, tobacco, etc have a direct effect on the final price of goods and services. However, the producers of these goods and services also incur costs such as employers' National Insurance contributions, nondomestic rates, and duty on hydrocarbon oils, part of which they may pass on to households in the price of their products. These are called intermediate taxes.

TABLE G


1 The corresponding figures using total expenditure as the denominator are: $20.9,22.9,22.2,21.9,19.8$ (top group) and 21.4 per cent.

Although some indirect taxes are less regressive than others, Table G shows that the impact of virtually all the indirect taxes declines for the top quintile group compared with the fourth quintile group. This is so partly because it is likely that higher income households spend a smaller proportion of their income than households with smaller incomes. If the incidence of indirect taxes, were to be expressed in terms of expenditure rather than income, they can be shown to be rather less regressive.

## Benefits in kind

Government current expenditure in providing certain goods and services to households either free at the time of use or at subsidised prices is converted by imputation into the equivalent of an income flow to individual households in order to arrive at final income. The largest two items for which such imputations are made are the health and education services, which together accounted for 21.6 per cent of total general government expenditure in 1987. Other items for

## Average value of benefits in kind for each quintile group of non-retired households, 1987

TABLE H

|  | Quintile groups of non-retired househoids ranked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  | All house. holds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3 rd | 4th | Top |  |
| Average per househoid (2 a year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | 1510 | 1040 | 910 | 620 | 330 | 880 |
| National health service | 880 | 860 | 820 | 720 | 590 | 770 |
| Housing subsidy | 130 | 70 | 40 | 30 | 10 | 60 |
| Travel subsidies | 30 | 40 | 50 | 60 | 90 | 50 |
| School meals and welfare milk | 130 | 30 | 20 | 10 | 10 | 40 |
| Total | 2680 | 2040 | 1850 | 1450 | 1040 | 1810 |

Bonefits in kind as a
percentage of post-tax income
which imputations are made are school meals and welfare milk, the housing subsidy and travel subsidies, together accounting for a further 1.9 per cent of general government expenditure.

Education benefit to individual households is imputed by reference to the number of pupils and students in the households (students living away from home are not included as part of their parents' household), and to the type of education they are receiving, though no allowance is made for differing costs between local authorities. The bottom quintile group contains the highest number of children and consequently the highest number of those in full-time education (Table D). This is the main reason for this quintile group being allocated the highest average imputed benefit (Table H). Another important factor is the presence of the majority of student-only households, for whom the costs of education are greatest. Similarly the impact of expenditure on school meals and welfare milk is greatest in the lower income groups where children are more likely to take school meals and have them provided free of charge.

Data are available on the average cost to the Exchequer of providing the various types of health care - hospital inpatient/outpatient care, GP consultations, dental services etc - and it is possible to estimate the use made of each service on average by individuals of different age and sex. Using this information, an imputed benefit from the health service can be allocated to eachindividual in the FES sample. These benefits are then aggregated for members of the household to yield figures on a household basis, so that not only the sex and age composition but also the size of the household determines the attribution of health service benefits.

Age and sex are by no means the only possible determinants on which to base the allocation, but age is certainly a very important factor. Data availability also limits the choice of determinants - the FES collects little information on health or use of health services. Table H indicates that these benefits decline steadily with income.

Housing subsidy is the sum of Exchequer subsidy and local authority determined rate fund contributions to the housing revenue account. Thus housing subsidy as defined here has been spread between public sector tenants, and since such households tend to be concentrated in the lower half of the income distribution this is where the subsidy is highest. In these articles, tax relief on mortgage interest is treated as an adjustment to income tax, not as part of the housing subsidy analysed in Table H.

Travel subsidies cover the passenger element of the grants made to various public transportoperations covering both buses and railways. The use of public transport by non-retired houscholds is partly related to the need to travel to work and thus to the number of economically active people in a household and so the combined effect of these travel subsidies increases over the income distribution. The heavy use of railways by households in the top quintile group, particularly commuters, means that their imputed benefit is nearly twice the average of all households.

Table H shows that taken together the absolute values of these benefits in kind clearly decline as household income increases. As a proportion of post-tax income, benefits decrease from 75 per cent in the lowest quintile group to 6 per cent in the highest quintile group, indicating that this expenditure contributes to the reduction in income inequality.

## Summary

The overall effect of the various stages of the tax-benefit system on non-retired households is summarised in Table J. Households in the highest quintile group (when ranked by equivalised disposable income) receive 44 per cent of all (equivalised) original income, compared with 4 per cent received by the lowest quintile group. However after direct taxes and benefits are taken into account the share of the lowest quintile group rises to 8 per cent and that of the highest falls to 39 per cent. Cash benefits are the major factor underlying these changes, causing the Gini coefficient to fall from 42 per cent based on original income to 34 per cent based on gross income. Income tax, employees' National Insurance contributions and rates produced a further reduction in inequality, but payment of indirect taxes increases inequality.

## Economic activity

As already mentioned, the size of original income is largely determined by the number of economically active people in the

Percentage shares of total househoid income and Gini coefficients ${ }^{1}$ for non-retired households, 1987

TABLE J

|  | Percentage shares of total equivalised income for non-retired households ranked by equivalised disposable Income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Original income | Gross income | Disposable income | Post-tax income |
| Quintile group |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom .. | 3.5 | 7.3 | 8.0 | 7.2 |
| 2nd .. | 11 | 12 | 13 | 12 |
| 3rd .. | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| 4th .. .. | 24 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Top .. .. | 44 | 41 | 39 | 42 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Decile group |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom .. | 1.0 | 3.0 | 3.3 | 2.8 |
| Top .. .* | 28 | 25 | 25 | 26 |
| Ginl coefficient (percent) | 42 | 34 | 31 | 35 |

1 This is a measure of the dispersion of each delinition of Income. Unlike the percentage shares analysis whora the household incomes are ranked only once, the Gini coefficient calculation noeds a separate ranking for each income definition. For example. the coefficient lor original income is produced by lirst equivalising the original incorre of all the households, then this distribution is ranked and this ranked distribution is used to calculate the coelficient.
household - even though someone may be defined as economically active if they have been out of work for up to a year as long as they are seeking work. This relationship between income and economic activity amongst non-retired households is explored further in

## Average incomes, taxes and benefits by the number of economically active people per non-retired household, 1987

TABLE K


[^2]Table K , in which households are classified according to the number of economically active people they contain.

Original income ranges from an average of $£ 890$ per annum in households where there are no economically active people to an average of $£ 23,060$ in households where there are three or more. Cash benefits are concentrated in households where no-one is economically active and here they form 82 per cent of gross income; but they remain important, at 12 per cent of gross income, for those where one household member is economically active. This latter group will contain a number of households whereno-one is currently in work.

Not only does average original income differ widely between these four household groups but they also differ considerably in the degree of variation of income within the groups. As measured by the Giri coefficient, variability in original income is very high amongst households where no-one is economically active but where two or more persons are economically active the variability is considerably less. Equally, the tax-benefit system has the effect of substantially reducing inequality between the different types of houscholds within the economically inactive group. This results largely from the diverse nature of the economically inactive group, which ranges from single parents with young children, single fulltime students, the disabled, and households where no member has been able to find work during the 12 months prior to interview, to a small number of households where income from other sources such as investments means that they have no need to work.

## RESULTS FOR RETIRED HOUSEHOLDS

Retired households have quite distinct income and expenditure patterns and so the tax-benefit systern affects them in a different way to non-retired households (Table L). Few retired households have substantial original income; those who do are concentrated in the top two quintile groups and are receiving occupational pensions. The majority of retired households are dependent on cash benefits, in the form of state retirement pensions and income-related benefits such as Housing Benefits and Supplementary Pension.

Thus cash benefits form a very high proportion of gross income for all but the better-off retired households. However, unlike nonretired households, the bulk of these cash benefits are paid from the National Insurance Fund into which the recipients will have made contributions throughout their working lives.

People over pensionable age do not pay National Insurance contributions so the small payments recorded are made by nonretired people living in households defined as retired (see Appendix 2 paragraph 7 for details of definition). All households except those in the highest quintile group of retired households pay very little income tax, because their income is unlikely to exceed their tax allowances unless they have significant income from investments oroccupational pensions in addition to their stateretirement pension. The largest indirect tax payment made by retired households is VAT, and the top quintile group pays more than twice as much as the average for all households.

Effects of taxes and benefits on retired households, 1987
TABLE L


Retired households derive significant benefits from health services and, to a lesser extent, the housing subsidy and travel subsidies, though of course virtually none from the education service. Health benefit is spread fairly evenly within the group of retired households, as a result primarily of the attribution method used, but housing subsidy is substantially higher for the middle three quintile groups since they have the highest concentration of public sector tenants. The benefits received by retired households from travel subsidies are mainly for bus travel, particularly in the form of concessionary fares, passes, etc, for senior citizens, and since these are not usually means-tested but depend instead on what sort of scheme is being operated by their local authority, there is no particular relationship with income.

Table M shows the extent to which income inequality amongst retired households is reduced by the tax-benefit system. Cash benefits play by far the largest part in bringing about this reduction and income tax payments make a further, though much smaller, contribution. Payments of indirect taxes result in an increase in dispersion.

A comparison of Table M with Table J shows that although the distribution of original income amongst retired households is much more unequal than that within the non-retired houschold group, the distribution of post-tax income is more equal amongst the retired than amongst the non-retired. Chart 4 illustrates the different impact which the tax-benefit system has on retired and non-relired households.

## Percentage shares of total househoid income and Gini coefficients ${ }^{1}$ for retired households, 1987

TABLE M

|  | Percentage shares of total equivalised income for retired households ranked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Original income | Gross income | Disposable income | Posttax income |
| Quintile group |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom .. | 2.6 | 10.7 | 11.0 | 10.2 |
| 2nd .. | 4 | 13 | 14 | 14 |
| 3 rd .. | 7 | 15 | 16 | 17 |
| 4th .. | 16 | 19 | 20 | 20 |
| Top .. | 71 | 42 | 39 | 39 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Decile group |  |  |  |  |
| Eltom .. | 1.2 | 5.0 | 4.9 | 4.4 |
| Top .. .. | 52 | 28 | 26 | 26 |
| Glin coefficient (percent) | 71 | 30 | 27 | 32 |

1 This is a measure of the dispersion of each defintion of income.
Unlike the percentage shares analysis whore the household Incormes are ranked only once, the Gini coefficient calculation needs a separate ranking for each Income definition. For example, the coolficient for original income is produced by first equivalising the original income of all the households, then this distribution is ranked and this ranked distribution is used to calculate the coeflicient.

## PART II

## THE EFFECTS OF EQUIVALISING INCOME

Equivalising household incomes is a method of adjusting for house hold size and composition to allow for their different needs. A household of five adults needs a higher income than a single person living alone to achieve the same 'standard of living'. On the other hand they do not require five times as much income-partly because some costs, such as heating and lighting do not rise in line with the

CHART 4

number of people sharing a house. Equivalisation allows for such factors and thus produces a more meaningful ranking of households by income. The scale used in this analysis is the McClements scale (before housing cosis): this uses a married couple as the standard for comparisons and assigns them a value of one. See paragraph 35 of Appendix 2 for further details.

The question of equivalisation was addressed in the 1985 article (in July 1987 Economic Trends) where the effects of three different scales were assessed. The conclusion of the article was that the application of equivalence scales has a substantial impact on the composition of each quintile group and on the distribution of income between households, but there is little difference in effect between the three scales examined. Small households are no longer concentrated at the bottom of the income distribution, nor are large houscholds concentrated at the top. The impact of the tax benefit system is greater, resulting in a more equal distribution of income after taxes and benefits. The 1985 article suggested that equivalence scale adjustments might be used extensively in future articles. It was difficult to introduce equivalisation in the 1986 article because the 1986 FES data were very late, without further delaying the article by a major change in methodology.

Table N gives a cross-tabulation of households, ranked by quintile groups, of unadjusted disposable income and equivalised disposable income. The effect of equivalisation is that the majority of households either stay in the same quintile group, or move only to the next group. For example, of the 1,479 households in the second quintile group of unadjusted disposable income, 519 moved to the bottom quintile of equivalised disposable income, 496 stayed in the second quintile and 290 moved to the third quintile (only 174 moved to the fourth quintile group).

The percentage shares of disposable income of each quintile group are also modified by equivalence scale adjustments, particularly at

Cross tabulation of quintile groups of households ranked by disposable income, unadjusted and equivallsed, 1987

TABLE N

the top and bottom of the income distribution (Table O). The share of disposable income of the bottom quintile group is increased by some 2 percentage points, whilst the share of the top quintile group is reduced by a similar amount-so the distribution of equivalised income is less unequal. The reason for this is that, on an unadjusted basis, there are a disproportionately high number of single person households in the bottom quintile group-and these have the lowest incomes in absolute terms, but not after equivalisation. In other words, the effect results from the positive correlation between income and household size in the unadjusted distribution.

Table $P$ shows the effect of equivalisation on the Gini coefficient. All the coefficients for equivalisation income are lower than the unadjusted versions, indicating that the distribution of all measures of equivalised income is more equal than without this adjustment -this is the same point as in the previous paragraph. A separate point is that the effects that taxes and benefits (particularly benefits) have in reducing income inequality is greater for equivalised income than for unadjusted income.

Table Q shows the average household size by quintile groups of households ranked by disposable income, on an unadjusted and equivalised basis. On the unadjusted basis the average household size rises steadily from 1.3 in the bottom quintile group to 3.2 in the top quintile group. After equivalisation, the average household size is much more evenly spread:but the number of economically active people is still much higher in the higher income households. This table illustrates another important point, namely that throughout this article monetary amounts in equivalised £ a year are shown in italics. All other monetary values are ordinary (ie unequivalised) $£$ a year eg the disposable income of $£ 3,810$ a year for the bottom quintile group in the lower half of this table is the average of the unadjusted disposable income values for the 1,479 households in the bottom quintile of the distribution of equivalised disposable incomes (ranked in ascending order). In this article, equivalisation is only used for ranking purposes, and virtually all monetary amounts in the tables are unequivalised $£$ a year. We have chosen to use equivalisation only in the ranking process because we feel that to present all the tables in terms of equivalised income would be confusing and difficult to understand. Equivalised income is a theoretical concept, rather removed from the real money that households actually receive and spend.

The point and purpose of equivalisation is evident from Table Q , which indicates the two criteria for assigning households to the quintile groups of the income distribution. For example, without equivalisation, households with the smallest monetary incomes are in the bottom group-but it is clear that in most of these cases the

## Percentage shares of total household disposable income, unadjusted and equivalised, 1987

TABLE O


Gini coefficients for the distribution of income at each stage of the tax-benefit system, unadjusted and equivalised, 1987

TABLE P

|  |  |  | Unadjusted | Equivalised |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gini coefficients (parcent) |  |  |  |  |
| Original income | -• | * | 52 | 51 |
| Gross income .. | -• | . | 40 | 36 |
| Disposable income | .. | - | 37 | 33 |
| Post-tax Income | " | " | 40 | 36 |
| Final income .. | . | .* | 36 | $30^{\prime}$ |

1 This is given for illustrative purposes only. Strictly speaking, it is not appropriale to equivalise final lncome because it contains notional money Income for benelits in kind (eg from state educatlon) that are not available for spending In cash.
small incomes have only to provide for a single household member. After equivalisation, however, the lowest quintile group contains those households whose income is smallest relative to their size and composition. This group therefore has a higher absolute average income ( $£ 3,810$ compared to $£ 2,930$ ), but this amount has to contribute to the living standards of many more people-as shown by the average household size.

TABLE Q

|  |  |  |  |  | Quintile groups of households ranked by disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | All households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Bottom |  | 2nd |  | 3 rd |  | 4th |  | Top |  |
| Unadjusted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average per household (\% per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quintile points | .. | 兂 | .. | - |  | 4053 |  | 6780 |  | 10105 |  | 14483 |  |  |
| Disposable income | .. | .. | * | -• | 2930 |  | 5300 |  | 8420 |  | 12150 |  | 21570 | 10070 |
| Average per household (number) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons .. |  |  | . | " | 1.3 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.8 |  | 3.1 |  | 3.2 | 2.5 |
| Economically acti | ve p |  | .. | .. | 0.1 |  | 0.5 |  | 1.2 |  | 1.8 |  | 2.1 | 1.2 |
| Children |  |  | .. | $\square$ | 0.1 |  | 0.5 |  | 0.8 |  | 0.8 |  | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| Retired people | * |  | .. | .. | 0.8 |  | 0.7 |  | 0.4 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| Equivalised |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average per household ( $£$ per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quintile points (equivalised \& per year) |  |  |  |  |  | 4603 |  | 6344 |  | 8606 |  | 12274 |  |  |
| Disposable income |  | . | $\cdots$ | * | 3810 |  | 5570 |  | 9100 |  | 12150 |  | 19740 | 10070 |
| Average per household (number) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Persons .. | . |  | * | * | 2.4 |  | 2.3 |  | 2.9 |  | 2.7 |  | 2.4 | 2.5 |
| Economically acti | ve p |  | . | . | 0.3 |  | 0.7 |  | 1.4 |  | 1.7 |  | 1.7 | 1.2 |
| Children .. | . | * | . | , | 0.7 |  | 0.6 |  | 0.8 |  | 0.6 |  | 0.4 | 0.6 |
| Retired people | .. | . | " | . | 0.7 |  | 0.7 |  | 0.4 |  | 0.2 |  | 0.2 | 0.4 |

Summary statistics for the distribution of disposable income, unadjusted and equivalised, 1987
TABLE R


## Summary statistics for the distribution of equivalence factors, 1987

## TABLE S

|  | Statistics for the distribution of equivalence factors: |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All households | Non-retired | Retired |
| Number of households | 7396 | 5459 | 1937 |
| Mean equivalence value | 1.11 | 1.22 | 0.81 |
| Minimum equivalence value | 0.61 | 0.61 | 0.61 |
| Maximum equivalence value | - 3.85 | 3.85 | 1.99 |

The comparison between ordinary $£$ a year and equivalised $£$ a year is given in Table R. The average (unadjusted) disposable income for all households is $£ 10,070$ compared with $£ 9,060$ after equivalisation. The variation of disposable income (as measured by its
standard deviation) is reduced by equivalisation from $£ 92$ to $£ 78$ a year Table S gives some summary statistics for the distribution of the equivalence factors themselves. The average equivalence value for all households is 1.11 (compared with the standard value of 1.00 for a married couple).

Table T shows the results of equivalising on the composition of the top and bottom quintile groups of disposable income. The proportion of retired households in the bottom quintile group is reduced from over two-thirds to under a half and is there is also a large drop in single person (non-retired) households. In contrast, the proportion of 2 adults with children households rises from 2 to 19 per cent. At the top of the income distribution, the proportion of large households ( 3 or more adults) falls markedly as does the 2 adults with children group, whereas 1 adult and 2 adult households increase substantially. A more detailed version of the distribution of households is given in Table U. This gives the number of households in each quintile group of disposable income, for uadjusted and equivalised measures.

Composition of the top and bottom quintile groups of households, ranked by disposable income, unadjusted and equivalised, 1987

TABLE T


1 This group is smalier than the category of "one parent lamilies" because some of these families
will be contained in larger household types.
2 Whth or without chlldren

Number of households in the survey by quintile groups, ranked by disposable income, unadjusted and equivalised, 1987

TABLE U

|  |  |  |  | Household type |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Retired | Non-retired |  |  |  |  | All <br> house- <br> hold <br> types |
|  |  |  |  |  | 1 adult | 2 adults | 1 adult with children' | 2 adults with children | 3 or more adults |  |
| Quintile groups of unadjusted disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | * | $\cdots$ | " | 1006 | 246 | 74 | 108 | 36 | 9 | 1479 |
| 2nd .. | . | . | .. | 578 | 230 | 217 | 131 | 264 | 59 | 1479 |
| 3rd .. | . | - | . | 206 | 189 | 371 | 33 | 521 | 160 | 1480 |
| 4th .. | .. | ., | . | 87 | 87 | 417 | 8 | 543 | 337 | 1479 |
| Top .. | ** | * | .. | 60 | 47 | 411 | 4 | 442 | 515 | 1479 |
| Ali households |  | - | " | 1937 | 799 | 1490 | 284 | 1806 | 1080 | 7396 |
| Quintile groups of equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | .. | .. | * | 712 | 109 | 119 | 137 | 280 | 115 | 1479 |
| 2nd .. | * | * | * | 690 | 112 | 136 | 86 | 300 | 147 | 1478 |
| 3 rd .. | . | .. | * | 259 | 132 | 260 | 36 | 489 | 291 | 1481 |
| 4th .. | . | * | * | 164 | 172 | 372 | 18 | 442 | 321 | ¢ 479 |
| Top .. | . | . | $\cdots$ | 112 | 274 | 603 | 7 | 295 | 206 | 1479 |
| All house |  | * | * | 1937 | 799 | 1490 | 284 | 1806 | 1080 | 7396 |

[^3]
## APPENDIX 1

## Detailed tables with fine breakdown of income components for quintile and decile groups, and results for different types of household
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TABLE 1


Financing of general government expenditure in 1987
TABLE 2


TABLE 3


By declle groups of households
TABLE 4


[^4]By quintile groups within housshold type
TABLE 5


1 After tax reliel at source on mortgage interest and life assurance premiums.


## (iv) 2 adutte non-retired

| Quinille points (equivalised ¢) | .. | * | 6665 |  | 12238 |  | 16400 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of households in the sample |  |  | 298 | 298 | 298 | 298 | 298 | 1490 |
| Original income .. | - | * | 3722 | 9015 | 13562 | 18381 | 30803 | 15097 |
| Direct benelits in cash Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension .. | . | * | 487 | 553 | 209 | 115 | 203 | 309 |
| Sickness/ injury related | . | . | 460 | 245 | 117 | 98 | 64 | 187 |
| Unermployment benefit | . | . | 143 | 72 | 48 | 20 | 28 | 62 |
| Othet .. | .. | . | 60 | 44 | 25 | 44 | 27 | 40 |
| Total contributory ., | . | , | 1131 | 914 | 399 | 278 | 321 | 609 |
| Non-contributory " " |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplementary benefit | . | - | 529 | 94 | 15 | 25 | 12 | 135 |
| Child benefit | .. | .. | * | 1 | - | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| Housing benefit | . | - | 351 | 64 | 18 | 9 | 2 | 93 |
| Sickness/ disabiement related | . | . | 174 | 196 | 19 | 17 | 8 | B3 |
| Other .. .. | - | * | 87 | 56 | 40 | 14 | 8 | 41 |
| Total non-contributory.. | * | . | 1141 | 410 | 92 | 67 | 34 | 349 |
| Gross incorme | .. | * | 5994 | 10339 | 14052 | 18726 | 31158 | 16054 |
| Incorne tax' and Employess' NIC Domestic rates(gross) .. |  | * | 572 | 1738 | 2709 | 4041 | 7278 | 3268 |
|  |  | + | 448 | 449 | 452 | 516 | 673 | 508 |
| Disposable income Equivalised disposable income |  |  | 4974 | 8152 | 10892 | 14169 | 23207 | 12279 |
|  |  | . | 4875 | 8011 | 10723 | 14011 | 22965 | 12117 |
| Taxes on final goods and services |  | . | 1148 | 1489 | 1739 | 2113 | 2665 | 1831 |
| Intermediate taxes .. | , | , | 360 | 458 | 560 | 659 | 934 | 594 |
| Post-tax incorne .. | - | . | 3466 | 6204 | 8592 | 11396 | 19608 | 9854 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | * | * | 138 | 74 | 76 | 8 | - | 59 |
| National heath service | . | . | 651 | 633 | 521 | 487 | 501 | 559 |
| Housing subsidy ." | .. | " | 84 | 69 | 33 | 20 | 8 | 43 |
| Travel subsidies .. | . | .. | 38 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 112 | 58 |
| School meals and wellare milk | -. | . | 1 | 1 | . | - | . | . |
| Final income | . | " | 4378 | 7026 | 9268 | 11962 | 20230 | 10573 |

1 Alter tax rellef at source on morigage interest and ife assurance premiums.

By quintile groups within household type
TABLE 5 (comtinued)

(vi) 1 adult with children'

| Quintile points (equivalised ¢) | . | . | 3858 |  | 4377 | 5050 | 6494 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of households in the sample |  |  | 57 | 57 | 56 | 57 | 57 | 284 |
| Orlginal income .. | * | " | 497 | 375 | 955 | 2438 | 8624 | 2584 |
| Direct benefits in cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension.. | $\cdots$ | . | * | 46 | - | - | 7 | 9 |
| Sickness/ injury related | .. | . | 21 | 58 | - | 10 | 57 | 29 |
| Unemployment beneft | .. | .. | 8 | - | - | 18 | 6 | 6 |
| Other .. .. | .. | . | 7 | $\cdots$ | - | 121 | 194 | 65 |
| Total contributory .* | .. | . | 36 | 104 | . | 149 | 256 | 109 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplementary benelit | * | . | 1349 | 2101 | 1968 | 1285 | 457 | 1430 |
| Child benefit .. | * | - | 736 | 777 | 641 | 683 | 653 | 698 |
| Housing benellt .. | .. | .. | 951 | 1164 | 1176 | 897 | 325 | 902 |
| Sickness/ disablement related | . | .. | $\bigcirc$ | 39 | - | 56 | * | 19 |
| Other .. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | . | .. | 30 | 18 | 69 | 224 | 192 | 107 |
| Total non-contributory | " | .. | 3067 | 4100 | 3854 | 3145 | 1627 | 3156 |
| Gross income | " | - | 3599 | 4580 | 4809 | 5732 | 10507 | 5849 |
| Income tax ${ }^{2}$ and Employees' NIC Domestic rales(gross).. |  | - | -19 | -43 | 54 | 85 | 1088 | 236 |
|  |  | .. | 463 | 439 | 446 | 455 | 531 | 467 |
| Disposable income Equivalised disposable income | $\cdots$ | " | 3155 | 4183 | 4310 | 5192 | 8878 | 5146 |
|  | . | .. | 3073 | 4126 | 4677 | 5620 | 9396 | 5381 |
| Taxes on final goods and services ..Intermediate taxes .. |  | * | 598 | 584 | 571 | 748 | 1263 | 753 |
|  |  | .. | 243 | 240 | 226 | 305 | 435 | 290 |
| Post-tax income | . | - | 2314 | 3359 | 3512 | 4139 | 7179 | 4103 |
| Benelits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education.. | * | . | 1633 | 1667 | 1431 | 1456 | 1781 | 1590 |
| National health service | . | .. | 756 | 620 | 706 | 688 | 499 | 654 |
| Housing subsidy .. | . | . | 142 | 254 | 198 | 122 | 88 | 181 |
| Travel subsidies .i. | * | . | 12 | 11 | 28 | 33 | 19 | 21 |
| School meals and wellare milk | * | * | 264 | 259 | 176 | 134 | 101 | 187 |
| Final income .. | * | " | 5121 | 6171 | 6051 | 6572 | 9647 | 6715 |

[^5]By quintile groups within household type
TABLE 6 (continued)


## (viii) 2 adults 2 chiidren

| Quintile points (equivalised £) | . | * | 5452 |  | 7083 | 8734 | 11123 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of househodds in the sample |  |  | 175 | 175 | 174 | 175 | 175 | 874 |
| Original Incorne .. | * | . | 4129 | 9968 | 13137 | 16840 | 30283 | 14873 |
| Direct benefits in cash Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension .. | - | * | 14 | $\bullet$ | 12 | - | 7 | 7 |
| Sickness/ injury related | . | - | 125 | 104 | 70 | 40 | 34 | 74 |
| Unemployment benefit | .. | * | 205 | 74 | 12 | 34 | 59 | 77 |
| Other .. .. | .. | .. | 33 | 27 | 40 | 45 | 28 | 35 |
| Total contributory .- | . | .. | 377 | 205 | 133 | 118 | 128 | 192 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplementary benefit | . | . | 1019 | 137 | 40 | 61 | 22 | 256 |
| Child benefit .. | . | " | 743 | 757 | 736 | 736 | 734 | 741 |
| Housing benefit .. |  | - | 527 | 52 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 125 |
| Sickness/ disablement related | * | ., | 28 | 28 | 38 | 7 | 38 | 28 |
| Other .. .. | . | .. | 102 | 59 | 15 | 19 | 23 | 44 |
| Total non-contributory.. | . | .. | 2418 | 1033 | 844 | 838 | 830 | 1193 |
| Gross incorne | * | . | 6924 | 11206 | 14114 | 17796 | 31241 | 16259 |
| Income lax ${ }^{1}$ and Employees' NIC . Domestic rates (gross).. |  | " | 648 | 1743 | 2450 | 3137 | 6255 | 2847 |
|  |  | . | 457 | 475 | 521 | 587 | 750 | 558 |
| Disposable income Equivalised disposable income |  | * | 5819 4121 | 8988 | 11143 7881 | 14072 | 24236 | 12854 |
| Taxes on final goods and services.. |  | $\stackrel{ }{\square}$ | 1157 | 1528 | 1758 | 1913 | 2385 | 1748 |
| Intermediate taxes ... | . | .. | 408 | 564 | 629 | 734 | 396 | 666 |
| Post-tax Incorne .. | $\cdots$ | * | 4255 | 6896 | B 756 | 11426 | 20856 | 10440 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | * | $\cdots$ | 1760 | 1516 | 1704 | 1819 | 1710 | 1702 |
| National health service | . | .. | 1082 | 1044 | 1.047 | 974 | 923 | 1014 |
| Housing subsidy -- | " |  | 135 | 41 | 26 | 29 | 11 | 48 |
| Travel subsidies ... | - |  | 18 | 21 | 25 | 39 | 76 | 36 |
| School meals and wellare milk | .. | " | 174 | 43 | 46 | 50 | 50 | 73 |
| Final income | - | " | 7426 | 9561 | 11603 | 14337 | 23626 | 13313 |

1 Alter tax rellef at source on morigage interest and life assurance premiums.

TABLE 5 (coninued)

## Average per household ( E a year) <br> (Ix) 2 adults with 3 or more children

Quinille points (equivalised E)..
Number of households in the sample


| Direct benefits in cash |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Retirement pension | * |
| Sickness/ Injury related | . |
| Unemployment benefit | . |
| Other .. .. | * |
| Total contributory | " |
| Non-contributory |  |
| Supplementary benefit | * |
| Child benefit .. | * |
| Housing benelit.. | . |
| Sickness/ disablement | lated |
| Other .. | .. |
| Total non-contributory | -* |

Gross Income
Income tax' and Employees' NIC
Domestic rates (grose)
Disposable income ..
Equivalised disposable income

| 253 | 60 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 295 | 52 |
| 6 | 42 |
| 554 | 154 |
|  |  |
| 1864 | 633 |
| 1356 | 1242 |
| 722 | 324 |
|  | 278 |
| 184 | 103 |
| 4126 | 2580 |
| 6526 | 9787 |
| 201 | 1300 |
| 422 | 450 |
| 5902 | 8036 |
| 3284 | 4663 |
| 1178 | 1669 |
| 389 | 581 |
|  |  |
| 4325 | 5787 |
|  |  |
| 3467 | 3268 |
| 1597 | 1410 |
| 130 | 128 |
| 12 | 299 |
| 373 | 257 |
| 9903 | 10877 |

## (x) 3 or more adulta with children

| Quintile points (equivalised 8).. |  | " | . | 4858 |  | 6720 | 8294 | 10248 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of households in the sample |  |  |  | 80 | 79 | 80 | 79 | 80 | 398 |
| Original Income - | * | .. | * | 4376 | 11475 | 16275 | 19903 | 31063 | 16623 |
| Direct beneflis in cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension | * | * | * | 225 | 352 | 307 | 119 | 54 | 211 |
| Sickness/ injury related | - | * | . | 224 | 210 | 99 | 67 | 105 | 141 |
| Unemployment benefit | ** | " | * | 134 | 225 | 57 | 78 | 47 | 108 |
| Other .. .. | - | .. | ." | 60 | 42 | 54 | 38 | 28 | 44 |
| Total contributory | $\bullet$ | .. | .. | 644 | B29 | 517 | 302 | 234 | 505 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplementary benelit | : | - | * | 1902 | 669 | 199 | 114 | 119 | 602 |
| Child benelit ." | - | .. | - | 786 | 546 | 583 | 495 | 581 | 589 |
| Housing benefit.. |  | . | . | 529 | 168 | 34 | 33 | 2 | 154 |
| Sickness/ disablement related |  | .. | ., | 119 | 140 | 130 | 97 | 145 | 126 |
| Other .. ... | - | - | .. | 422 | 236 | 313 | 296 | 129 | 279 |
| Total non-contributory | * | .. | -* | 3758 | 1760 | 1259 | 1036 | 977 | 1760 |
| Gross Income .. | ** | * | * | 8777 | 14 O6A | 18051 | 21241 | 32275 | 18888 |
| Income tax ${ }^{1}$ and Employees' NIC |  | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | * | 649 | 2040 | 3055 | 3819 | 6528 | 3220 |
| Domestic rates(gross) | .. | * | .. | 510 | 501 | 494 | 527 | 744 | 555 |
| Disposable Income .. Equivalised disposablo income |  | ** | * | $7619$ | $11523$ | $14502$ | $16895$ | 25003 | 15113 |
|  |  | . | " | $3756$ | $5827$ | $7530$ | $9119$ | 13487 | 7946 |
| Taxes on final goods and services |  | * | " | 1566 | 2249 | 2722 | 2876 | 3524 | 2587 |
| Intermediate taxes.. | * | . | .. | 584 | 703 | 859 | 917 | 1179 | 848 |
| Post-tax income .. | $\cdots$ | " | - | 5470 | 8570 | 10921 | 13103 | 20300 | 11677 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | * | - | * | 2707 | 2428 | 2033 | 2175 | 1955 | 2259 |
| National health service | $\because$ | .. | .. | 1401 | 1314 | 1092 | 1110 | 1076 | 1198 |
| Housing subsidy | $46$ | - | " | 134 | 63 | 50 | 55 | 38 | 68 |
| Travel subsidies |  | - | - | 74 | 64 | 98 | 117 | 147 | 100 |
| School meals and welfare milk |  | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{*}$ | 253 | 67 | 48 | 30 | 29 | 86 |
| Final income .. .. | ** | * | '* | 10039 | 12507 | 14242 | 16590 | 23545 | 15389 |

[^6]Distribution of households ${ }^{1}$ co-operating in the Family Expenditure Survey, 1987
By decile groups of households
TABLE


1 See Appendlx 2 for definitions oi retired househoids, adulls and children.

## METHODOLOGY AND DEFINITIONS

## The allocation of government expenditure and its financing

1. There are considerable difficulties in moving from the aggregates of government expenditure and financing published in the United Kingdom National Accounts - the CSO Blue Book - to apportioning taxes and benefits to individual households. We can obtain information about the types of household that receive cash benefits and pay direct taxes through surveys such as the Family Expenditure Survey (FES). From the replies respondents give to questions on their expenditure we can impute their payments of indirect taxes, and from information they supply about such factors as their ages and the number of children in the household we can estimate the average costs of providing them with social services, such as health and education. But there are other kinds of financing, such as corporation tax and government receipts from public corporations: no attempt is made in this analysis to apportion them to households because it would be too difficult. Similarly, there are other items of government expenditure, such as capital expenditure and expenditure on defence and on the maintenance of law and order, for which there is no clear conceptual basis for allocation, or for which we do not in any event have sufficient informationto make an allocation. In all, 66 per cent of government financing (including the Borrowing Requirement) and 51 per cent of expenditure are allocated to households in this analysis.

## Family Expenditure Survey (FES)

2. The estimates in this article are based mainly on data derived from the FES. The FES is an annual survey of the expenditure and income of private households. People living in hotels, lodging houses, and in institutions such as old peoples' homes are excluded. Each person aged 16 and over keeps a full record of payments made during 14 consecutive days and answers questions about hire purchase and other payments. The respondents also give detailed information, where appropriate, about income (including cash benefits received from the state) and payments of income tax. Information on age, occupation, education received, family composition and housing tenure is also obtained. The survey covers the whole 12 month period.
3. One of the main purposes of the FES is toproduce information on household expenditure pattems which is used to derive the weights for the index of retail prices. The survey is conducted by the Office of Population Censuses and Surveys on behalf of the Central Statistical Office who analyse and report on it (prior to July 1989, the FES was the responsibility of the Department of Employment). The Family ExpenditureSurvey Report for 1987, containing detailed data on household characteristics, income, and expenditure, was published in June 1989. Details of the survey method are set out in 'The Family Expenditure Survey Handbook' by W F F Kemsley, R U Redpath and M Holmes. Both are published by Her Majesty's Stationery Office.
4. The number of houscholds in the United Kingdom responding to the FES in 1987 was 7,396 . The response rate in Great Britain was 72 per cent: the FES in Northern Ireland is done as a separate exercise to the rest of UK, with a larger sampling fraction, and only a proportion of these cases go into the UK analysis. To count as a co-operating household, all members aged 16 and over must fill in the diaries for both weeks and give full details of income
elc. The availableevidence suggest thatolder houscholds, households where the head is self-employed, those without children and higher income houscholds, are less likely to co-operate than others (see 'Family Expenditure Survey: a second study of differential response, comparing Census characteristics of FES respondents and nonrespondents' by Bob Redpath, Statistical News No 72, February 1986. (HMSO)). In addition response in Greater London is noticeably lower than in other areas. However, at present, the results in this article are based on the responses of those households which actually co-operated in the survey and they are not reweighted. This means that some of the figures differ from those produced by other surveys such as the Survey of Personal Incomes from the Inland Revenue.

## Unit of analysis

5. The basic unit of analysis in the article is the household, and not the family, individual or tax unit. A houschold is defined in the FES as comprising people who live at the same address and who share common catering for at least one meal a day. Spending on many items, particularly on food, housing, fuel and light, is largely joint spending by the members of the houschold. Without further information or assumptions it is difficult to apportion indirect taxes between individuals or other sub-divisions of households.
6. In classifying the households into various types, a child (ie a dependant) is defined as:
either aged under 16
or aged 16,17 or 18 nol married, and receiving full-time non-advanced further education. [The definition used in previous articles was a person aged under 16].

Most of the 'extra' adults in househoids with at least three adults are sons or daughters of the head of household rather than retired people.
7. A retired household is defined as one where the combined income of retired members amounts to at least half the total gross income of the housebold, where a retired person is defined as anyone who describes themselves as 'retired' or anyone over minimum NI pension age describing themselves as 'unoccupied' or 'sick or injured but not intending to seek work'.
8. By no means all retired people are in retired households: about one in five households comprising three or more adults contain retired people, for example, and households comprising one retired and one non-retired adult are often classified as non-retired.
9. The sample houscholds have been classified according to their compositions at the time of the interview. This classification is sensible for the vast majority of households, but it can be misleading for the very small number of cases ( 26 in 1987) where a spouse is absent from the household at the time of interview. The absent spouse may well be working away from home (eg on an oil rig), or living separately - but contributing financially to the houschold's upkeep. These contributions would be picked up as part of the household's original income. Also, it is likely that some households will have changed their composition during the year.
10. Economically active people comprise employees, the seffemployed and others not in employment but who are seeking or intending, when able, to seek work. In 1982 there were changes in the FES in the definition relating to economic activity. The effect of these changes is to exclude all those out of employment for more than a year rather than five years. This exclusion applies regardless of the fact that they may still describe themselves as seeking work. Also excluded are those who have not been in paid employment since leaving foll-time education unless they have worked within the previous year; certain of the part-time self-employed with very small incomes: and those whose only economic activity is working as mail-order agents or baby-sitters.

## Income: redistributive stages

## 11. Stage one:

Original income plus cash benefits $=$ Gross income .
Stage two:
Gross income minus income tax, employees' National Insurance contributions and domestic rates $=$ Disposable income.

## Slage thrce: <br> Disposable income minus indirect taxes $=$ Post-tax income

## Stage four:

Post-tax income plus 'benefits in kind' = Final income.
12. The starting point of the analysis is original income. This is the annual income in cash of all members of the household before the deduction of taxes or the addition of any state benefits. It includes income from employment, self-employment, investment income, occupational pensions and annuities. Employment income is based on the last payment received before the interview or, where different, the amount usually received. Allowance is made for any periods of absence from work through sickness and unemployment in the preceding 12 months, and for bonuses. Income from selfemployment is recorded in the FES for a past period. This is brought up to current levels using the average earnings index. Income from interest, dividends and rent is taken as the amount received in the 12 months before the interview. Income from occupational pensions is based on the last payment received.
13. About 99 per cent of original income comes from earnings, occupational pensions (including annuities) and investment income. The tiny bit remaining comes from a variety of sources: trade union benefits, income of children under 16 , private scholarships, earnings as a mail order agent or babysitter, regular allowance from a nonspouse, allowance from an absent spouse and the imputed value of rent-free accommodation. Households living in rent-free dwellings are each assigned an imputed income based upon the rateable value of the dwelling. This is counted as employment income if the tenancy depends on the job.
14. The next stage of the analysis is to add cash benefits to original income to obtaingross income. This is slightly different to the 'gross normal weekly income' used in the FES Report, mainly because it excludes the imputed rent of owner-occupiers. Cash benefits are:

## Contributory:

Retirement pension and Christmas bonus, unempioyment benefil, sickness and industrial injury benefit, statutory sick pay, invalidity pension and allowance, industrial injury disablement benefits, widows' benefits, matemity allowance and statutory maternity pay.

## Nor-contributory:

Supplementary bencfit, child benefit, housing benefit, attendance allowance, mobility allowance, war pensions, severe disablement allowance, family income suppiement, old person spension, government training scheme allowances (YTS etc), student maintenance awards, maternity grant.
15. Statutory Sick Pay is classified as a cash bencfit even though it is paid through the employer.
16. Income from short-term benefits is taken as the product of the last weekly payment and the number of weeks the benefit was received in the 12 months prior to interview. Income from longterm benefits, and from housing benefit, is based on current tates.
17. Income tax, domestic rates and employees' and selfemployed contributions to National Insurance and National Health services are then deducted to give disposable income. Taxes on capital, such as capital gains tax and inheritance tax, are not included in these deductions because there is no clear conceptual basis for doing so, and the relevant data is not available from the FES.
18. The figures for domestic rates include, as well as local authority rates, charges made by water authorities for water, environmental and sewerage services. Rates are shown in full with any rebates given in housing benefit. [In previous articles, domestic rates have been included in the 'indirect' tax category. They are now deducted in the derivation of disposable income in anticipation of their replacement by the community charge in 1989. The National Accounts system, which strongly influences this article, will be showing the community charge as a deduction before disposable income is produced].
19. The tax estimates are based on the amount deducted from the last payments of employment income and pensions, and on the amount paid in the last 12 months in respect of income from selfemployment, interest, dividends and rent. The income tax payments recorded will therefore take account of a household's tax allowances, with the exception of tax relief obtained 'at source'. In 1987 there were two types of tax relief oblained in this way: mortgage interest relief and life assurance premium relief. Where households are eligible for these relicfs imputations are made and deducted from recorded income tax payments. In the case of mortgage interest relief obtained through the MIRAS scheme, which was introduced in April 1983, these imputations are based on the interest component of the latest mortgage repayment.
20. The next step is to deduct indirect taxes to give post-tax income. Indirect tax on final consumer goods and services include:

> Duties on beet, wines, spirits, tobacco, oil, betting, etc
> Value Added Tax (VAT)
> Customs (import) duties
> Car tax
> Motor vehicle duties
> Driving licences
> Stamp duties
> Gas levy
21. Taxes levjed on final goods and services are assumed to be fully incidenton the consumer, and can be imputed from a household's FES expenditure record. For example, the amount of VAT which is paid by the household is calculated from the househoid's total expenditure on goods and services subject to VAT.
22. VAT and car tax affect the prices of secondhand cars and are therefore assumed to be incident on the mumbanan-.....
well as on the purchasers of new cars. In allocating taxes, expenditures recorded in the FES on alcoholic drink, tobacco, ice cream, soft drinks and confectionery are grossed up to allow for the known under-recording of these items in the sample. The true expenditure in each case is assumed to be proportional to the recorded expenditure. This approach has its drawbacks because there is some evidence to suggest that heavy drinkers, for example, are not picked up by the FES.
23. The incidence of stamp duty on house purchase on an owner-occupying household has been taken as the product of the hypothetical duty payable on buying their currentdwelling (estimated from rateable values) and the probability of a household of that type moving in a given year (estimated from the General Household Survey).
24. Indirect taxes on intermediate goods and services are:

Local authority rates on commercial and industrial property Motor vehicle duties
Duties on hydrocarbon oils
Employers' contributions to National Insurance, the National Health Service, the industrial injuries fund and the redundancy payments scheme
Customs (import) duties
Stamp duties
VAT
25. These are taxes that fall on goods and services purchased by industry. Only the elements attributable to the production of subsequent goods and services for final consumption by the UK personal sector are allocated in the article, being assumed to be fully shifted to the consumer. Their allocations between different categories of consumers' expenditure are based on the relation between intermediate production and final consumption using estimated input-output techniques. This process is not an exact science, and many assumptions have to be made.
26. Finally, we add those notional benefits in kind provided to households by government for which there is a reasonable basis for allocation to houscholds, to obtain final income. Benefits in kind are:

State education<br>School meals and welfare milk<br>National Health service<br>Housing subsidy<br>Railway travel subsidy<br>Bus travel subsidy

27. Education benefit is estimated by the Department of Education and Science as the cost per pupil or student in special schools, primary and secondary schools, universities, and other further education establishments. The value of the benefit attributed to a household depends on the number of people in the household recorded in the FES as receiving each kind of education (students away from home are excluded).
28. The value of school meals and other welfare foods is based on their cost to the public authoritics. Any payment by the individual household is subtracted to arrive at a net contribution.
29. Each individual in the FES is allocated a benefit from the National Healh Service according to the estimated average use made of the various types of health service by people of the same age and sex, and according to the total cost of providing those services. The benefit from maternity services is assigned separately to those households containing children under the age of 12 months.
30. In this article public sector tenants are defined to include the tenants of local authorities, New Town Corporations, the Scottish Special Housing Association (SSHA), Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) and housing associations. The total housing subsidy includes the contribution from rate funds and from central government to the housing revenue accounts of local authorities: and grants paid to the New Town Corporations, the SSHA, the NIHE and housing associations. Within Greater London, the rest of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland each public sector tenant has been allocated a share of the region's total relevant subsidy based on the gross rateable value of his dwelling. Housing subsidy does not include mortgage interest tax relief, rent rebates and allowances or rate rebates included in housing benefit (see paragraphs 14 and 18 respectively).
31. The rail travel subsidies allocated are those to British Rail passenger operations and the London Underground. The subsidy to London and South East services is allocated to households living in the area and subsidies to provincial services to households living outside the South East, in proportion to households' expenditure on rail fares as recorded in the FES. A single allocation of the subsidy to inter-city services was made by dividing that subsidy between all households in proportion to their recorded expenditure on rail fares. In making both these allocations allowances are made for the use of rail travel by the business sector, tourists and the institutional part of the personal sector.
32. In this article, bus travel subsidy covers both the cost of concessionary travel schemes for senior citizens and others, and subsidies to operators. Separate allocations are made for Greater London, the other metropolitan areas and the rest of the United Kingdom. The subsidy is divided between households according to recorded expenditure on bus travel and the types of concessionary passes held.
33. We must emphasise that the analysis in this article provides only a very rough guide to the kinds of household which benefit from government expenditure, and by how much, and to those which finance il. Apart from the fact that large parts of expenditure and receipts are not allocated, the criteria used both to allocate taxes and to value and apportion benefits to individual households could be regarded as too simplistic. For example, the lack of data forces us to assume that the incidence of direct taxes falls on the individual from whose income the tax is deducted. This implies that the benefit of tax relief for mortgage interest, for example, accrues directly to the taxpayer rather than to some other party, for instance, the vendor of the land. It also implies that the working population is not able to pass the cost of the direct tax back to employers through lower profits, or to consumers through higher prices. And, in allocating indirect taxes we assume that the part of the tax falling on consumers' expenditure is borne by the households which buy the item or the service taxed, whereas in reality the incidence of the tax is spread by pricing policies and probably falls in varying proportions on the producers of a good or service, on their employees, on the buyer, and on the producers and consumers of other goods and services. Another example is that we know only an estimate of the total financial cost of providing benefits such as education, and so we have to treat that cost as if it measured the benefit which accrues to recipients of the service. In fact, the value the recipients themselves place on the service may be very different to the cost of providing it: moreover, there may be households in the community, other than the immediate beneficiaries, who receive a benefit indirecly from the general provision of the service.

## Equivalence scale

34. The equivalence scalcused in this analysis is the McClements. scale (before housing costs are deducted). The scales (separate
ones for before and after housing costs) were developed by Dr LD McClements at the Department of Health and Social Security (DHSS) in the mid-seventies, based on expenditure data from the 1971 and 1972 FES. They are based on the assumption that it is possible to estimate equivalence scales from people's spending behaviour as recorded in the FES without making any specific assumption about the criteria for equivalence. These scales are in regular use, though it is recognised that they are based on what is now rather old expenditure data and that it might be desirable to update them. The scales are regarded as plausible and they are well within the range of equivalence scales developed at different times in a number of countries. Hence their use is fully justified for broad statistical standardisation pending any re-calculation.
35. The equivalence values are given below:

## Type of household member

Equivalence value

| a. married head of household |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| (ie a married couple of 2 adulis) | 1.00 |
| 1 st additional adult | 0.42 |
| 2nd (or more) additional adult | 0.36 |
| b. single head of household |  |
| (ie 1 adult) | 0.61 |
| 1st additional adult | 0.46 |
| 2nd additional adult | 0.42 |
| 3rd (or more) additional adult | 0.36 |
| c. Child aged: |  |
| 16-18 | 0.36 |
| 13-15 | 0.27 |
| 11-12 | 0.25 |
| 8-10 | 0.23 |
| 5-7 | 0.21 |
| $2-4$ | 0.18 |
| under 2 | 0.09 |

The values for each houschold member are added together to give the total equivalence number for that household. This number is then divided into the disposable income for that household to give equivalised disposable income. For example, a houschold has a
married couple with 2 children (aged 6 and 9 ) plus one adult lodger. The houschold's equivalence number is $1.0+0.21+0.23+0.42=1.86$. The household's disposable income is $£ 20,000$, and so its equivalised disposable income is $£ 10,753(=£ 20,000 / 1.86)$.
36. This quantity is used to produce the single ranking used in all the tables in this article (apart from the Gini coefficients which have to be ranked afresh for each different definition of income). [In previous articles, three types of ranking were used: the mainone was using original income but gross income and disposable income were also used. In addition, the tables showing income shares were reranked for each separate income measure]. It is important to note that most monetary values shown in the article are ordinary (ie unequivalised) $£$ a year, notequivalised $f$ a year. Where equivalised £ a year do appear (eg the quintile points in Table 3 of Appendix 1), they are shown in italics.

## Gini coefficient

37. The Gini coefficient is the most widely used summary measure of the degree of inequality in an income distribution. Itcan most easily be understood by considering a Lorenz curve of the income distribution, (see Diagram B) ie a graph of the cumulative income share against the cumulative share of households. The curve representing complete equality of income is thus a diagonal line while complete inequality (with only one recipient of income) is represented by a curve comprising the horizontal axis and the righthand vertical axis (see Diagram A). The area between the Lorenz curve and the diagonal line of complete equality, as a proportion of the triangular area between the curves of complete equality and inequality, gives the value of the Gini coefficient. Thus a distribution of perfectly equal incomes has a Gini coefficient of zero; as inequality increases (and the Lorenz curve bellies out), so does the Gini cocfficient until, with complete inequality, it reaches its maximum value of 1 (or 100 per cent).
38. To calculate the Gini coefficient for an income distribution, the first step is to rank that distribution in ascending order. All the Gini coefficients shown in this articie(apart from the few on the 'old' basis in Appendix 4) are based on distributions of equivalised income eg the coefficient for original income is calculated after dividing the original income for all the households by their appropriate equivalence values.
[In previous articies, no such equivalisation was used].

Diagram A


Diagram B

## Lorenz curve for a typical income distribution


39. Strictly speaking, one could argue that the equivalence scales used here are only applicable to disposable income because this is the only income measure relating directly to spending power. Since the scales are often applied, in practice, to other income measures, we are content to use them to equivalise original, gross and post-tax income for the purpose of producing Gini coefficients (and in the tables giving percentage shares of total income). However, we do not think it is appropriate to equivalise the final income measure because this contains notional income from benefits in kind (eg state education): the equivalence scales used here are based on actual household spending and do not, therefore, apply to such items.

## Sampling errors and reliability

40. As the FES is a sample survey, data from it will differ in varying degrees from those of all households in the UK. The degree of difference will depend on how widely particular categories of income and expenditure vary between households. This 'sampling error' is smallest in relation to, say, the average expenditure of large groups of houscholds on items purchased frequently (when spending does not vary greatly between households). Conversely, it is largest for small groups of households, and for items or services purchased
infrequently (for which expenditure varies considerably between households). A broad numericalmeasure of the amount of variability is provided by the quantity known as the standard error.
41. The formula used below is a simple approximation, obtained by regarding the co-operating households as if they were a representative sample, from a single-stage random selection, of all private households in the United Kingdom. This simple random sample formula therefore takes no account of the multi-stage design of the actual sample: it is very likely to yield smaller estimates than the more complicated formula for the multi-stage process. The standard error of the mean for N households is $\mathrm{S} / \sqrt{\mathrm{N}}$ where $\mathrm{S}^{2}$ is the estimate of the population variance. Table (i) gives the standard errors of the mean for the five income measures, for all households and the ten household types. These figures are very likely to be under-estimates of the actual values.
42. The standard errors can be used to give an idea of the reliability of a mean by quoting a confidence interval of the form:

$$
\text { estimate of mean }+ \text { or }-(1.96 * \text { standard error })
$$

where the factor 1.96 corresponds to the $95 \%$ confidence interval.

Standard errors of the mean, 1987

| Houtshold type |  | Number in sample | Standard error of the mean for the 5 income measures (£ a year): |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Original income | Gross income | Disposable income | Post-tax income | Final inceme |
| All households | * | 7396 | 134 | 125 | 92 | 83 | 86 |
| Non-tetirad | . | 5459 | 157 | 148 | 110 | 100 | 104 |
| Relired .. | .. | 1937 | 148 | 147 | 103 | 96 | 99 |
| 1 adult retired | . | 1059 | 140 | 136 | 108 | 105 | 106 |
| 2 or more adults retired .. | .. | 878 | 273 | 264 | 168 | 159 | 162 |
| 1 adult non-retired .. ." | . | 799 | 307 | 288 | 207 | 194 | 192 |
| 2 adults non-retired.. | . | 1490 | 280 | 264 | 186 | 172 | 171 |
| 3 or more aduts non-retired | . | 682 | 507 | 476 | 383 | 361 | 371 |
| 1 aduth with children.. | * | 284 | 244 | 195 | 169 | 162 | 203 |
| 2 aduts and 1 child ... ." | . | 592 | 405 | 378 | 260 | 234 | 234 |
| 2 aduts and 2 children .. | .. | 874 | 402 | 387 | 296 | 281 | 283 |
| 2 aduls and 3 or more children | .. | 340 | 723 | 677 | 447 | 398 | 398 |
| 3 or more adults with children .. | , | 398 | 539 | 486 | 366 | 332 | 341 |

Standard errors for disposable income for quintile groups within households type, 1987

Households ranked by equivalised disposable income
TABLE (ii)


# Standard errors for disposable income expressed as a percentage of the mean, 1981 to 1987 

| Household type |  | Number In sample | Slandard errora ior disposabio income expressed as a percentage ol the mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | (1986) | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 |
| All houssholds | .. | 7178 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Non-retired | " | 5366 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Retred .. | .. | 1812 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 | 1.9 |
| 1 adult retired | " | 986 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 2.8 |
| 2 or more adulls retired | " | 826 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.4 |
| 1 adult non-fetired .. | . | 758 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 2.9 |
| 2 adults non-retirsd.. | . | 1530 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 1.5 |
| 3 or more adults nen-retised | .. | 746 | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 2.1 |
| 1 adult with children.. | * | 266 | 9.6 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.2 | 3.5 |
| 2 adutts and 1 child .. | . | 550 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.9 | 2.2 | 2.3 | 3.4 | 2.3 |
| 2 aduls and 2 children .. | .. | 742 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 2.4 |
| 2 aduts and 3 or more children | * | 325 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 3.3 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 2.9 |
| 3 or more adults with children.. | . | 449 | 1.8 | 6.2 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 3.0 | 2.7 |

For example: the mean disposable income for all households is $£ 10,074$ (see Table 3 in Appendix 1), and its standard error is $£ 92$ (from Table (i)). So the confidence interval for the population value is $£ 10,074$ + or - $£ 180$ ie about ( $£ 9,900$ to $£ 10,250$ ). It is very likely that the mean disposable income for the whole population (ie all UK private households) will lie in this range, though the interval is likely to be larger if the more accurate standard error formula is used.
43. The standard errors for the household types are larger than for the whole sample, mainly because the sample sizes concemed are smaller. For quintile groups of given household types, the sample sizes are of course smaller still, which would tend to increase sampling variability. On the other hand, the income values are by definition in a narrower range which would tend to reduce the sampling error. Precise estimates of standard errors for averages for quintile groups are complicated to produce. As well as the variability of the observations between the quintile points, we should also take account of the randomness which exists because the sample quintile points are themselves subject to random variation. However, to get a feel for the order of magnitude involved, we have ignored the latter element of variability and have estimated the standard error of the mean for the quintile groups of disposable income using the simple random sample formula ( $\mathrm{S} / \sqrt{\mathrm{N}}$ ). This formula almost certainly under-estimates the actual values, and for sample sizes of 50-500 the simple formula may seriously underestimate the error (the true value may be as much as twice the simple estimate). Table (ii) gives these estimated standard errors for disposable income. The standard errors of the top quintile group are always much larger than for the other quintile groups. This is not surprising as, in general, any distribution of incomes has a long positive tail. The standard errors for the top quintile group are so large that it is doubtful whether the averages for this group are reliable enough to be worth quoting in the tables in this article.
44. Another aspect of sampling errors and reliability is the variation from year to year. Table (iii) gives the standard error of the mean (expressed as a percentage of the mean) for disposable income
for the seven years from 1981 to 1987. Note that this table is in terms of the old methodology and definitions. The two groups with consistently high proportionate standard errors are one adult with children, and two adults with 3 or more children. Relatively small groups like these are more likely to be strongly influenced by unusually large income and expenditure values.
If the change between years were to be considered, then it is the standard error of the difference between years that is relevant. This is about twice the size of the standard error for a particular year because the standard errors for the individual years are effectively added together.

## Previous articles

45. This article is the latest in an annual series. Earlier articles covering the years 1957 to 1986 were published in the following issues of Economic Trends: November 1962, February1964, August 1966. February 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, 1972, November 1972 and 1973, December 1974, February 1976. December 1976, February 1978, January 1979, 1980, 1981 and 1982, December 1982, November 1983, December 1984, December 1985, July 1986, November 1986, July 1987 and December 1988. This year's article has such a marked change in methodology that the results are completely incompatible with those for earlier years. We intend to produce a consistent time series (as far as the ever-changing FES will allow) for a selection of tables in the next article.
46. The results in previous articles were designed to be freestanding: they were not designed for direct comparison with other years except where some limited comparisons were made in the articles. Such comparisons are fraught with difficulty because of changes in definitions eg housing benefit in 1983. However, some broader measures like the Gini coefficients quoted in those earlier articles are relatively robust and will stand comparison with other years. Enquiries should be addressed to Dave Westcott, Branch E2, Central Statistical Office, Room 1936, Millbank Tower, Millbank, London SWIP 4QU.

## CHANGES IN THE METHODOLOGY THIS YEAR

## Background

1. This year we have used equivalisation in the article extensively for the first time. This is the major change. At the same time, we have taken the opportunity to review the methodology in general - the first such review for over 10 years. As a result of this review, we have made various changes in definition and coverage to improve the analysis and make it more amenable to time series work. This review has taken some time and hence this year's article has taken longer to publish than previous articles. The changes are described below.

## Equivalisation

2. Equivalisation of income means adjusting income for houschold size and composition. The main effect is that small households are no longer concentrated at the bottom of the income distribution, nor are larger households concentrated at the top. The effects of equivalisation are covered in detail in Part $\Pi$ of this article, and a description of the McClements equivalence scale (before deducting housing costs) is given in paragraphs 34-36 of Appendix 2. By equivalising the income distributions for a period of years, any changes (eg growing proportion of single retired households in the country) in household size or composition (ie demographic changes) will be automatically taken into account. Hence, these 'standardised' income distributions for a period of years allow a much more meaningful and consistent time series analysis than is possible without equivalisation. In the next article, we intend to produce a time series for selected tables on a consistent basis (or as consistent as the ever-changing FES will allow).
3. It is very important to note that we have confined the use of equivalisation to the ranking of income that produces the distribution of quintiles and deciles. So the vast majority of monetary values quoted in the tables are ordinary $£$ a year, and not equivalised $£$ a year. Some of the tables in Appendix 1 show the decile and quintile points which are given in equivalised money (and printed in italics), but all other monetary values are average $£$ a year for the particular quintile group or decile group concemed.
4. For example, Table 3 of Appendix 1 shows the stages of the tax-benefit system for quintile groups of households, ranked by equivalised disposable income. 'This table was produced as follows:

- take each household's disposable income and divide it by the household's equivalence factor to produce the households equivalised disposable income eg disposable income of $£ 18,000$, equivalence factor 1.18 , equivalised disposable income of $£ 15,254$
- rank the equivalised disposable incomes in ascending order
- divide this income distribution into quintile groups
- calculate, for each quintile group separately, the average (unequivalised) values of original income, cash benefits, gross income, tax payments, disposable income etc.


## Ranking the income distribution

5. We have decided to use only one system for ranking the incomedistribution for percentile analysis, vizequivalised disposable income. In previous articles, there were three ways of ranking income: the most common was by original income, but gross income and disposable income were also used. This could have led to some confusion because the bottom quintile group (say) of original income would not contain the same households as the bottom quintile group of gross income. So now, the bottom quintile group of households refers to the same set of households throughout the entire article.
6. We chose the disposable income measure because this corresponds most closely to the cash amounts that households have to spend on goods and services - and the equivalisation process is most appropriate to this income measure. Strictly speaking, the equivalisation process is not appropriate to apply to the original income, gross income or post-tax income measures. In practice, the process is widely used elsewhere on many income measures and so we apply it to these other income measures in this article for the calculation of percentage shares of total household income, and Gini coefficients. However we do not think it is appropriate to equivalise final income because it contains notional income from benefits in kind (eg from state education) that is not available in cash for the household to spend.
7. The tables showing percentage shares of total household income (Tables C, J and M in Part I) are now based on the one ranking (ie equivalised disposable income). So, for example, in Table C the bottom quintile group of households (when ranked by equivalised disposable income) had 2.1 per cent of the total equivalised household original income. The same set of households had 7.5 per centof the total householdequivalised gross income etc. By staying with the same groups of households, the effects of the tax-benefit system are more clearly seen. In previous articles, the income distribution was re-ranked for each of the income measures. Hence the bottom quintile of households for original income was different to the bottom quintile group for gross income etc.
8. The Gini coefficients are the only part of the new method of analysis where the single ranking rule is broken. The Gini coefficient needs a distribution of income in ascending order. So, for example, the coefficient for original income has to have the (equivalised) original incomes ranked in order. As mentioned in paragraph 6 above, we do not think it is appropriate to equivalise final income so there is now no percentage share or Gini coefficient for this income measure.

## Original income

9. A comprehensive coverage (with accurate valuations) of the many minor perks which attach to various types of employment is not possible. Original income, therefore, no longer includes free meals and food from employer, luncheon vouchers and concessionary coal and coke. These had become small in money terms $£ 218$ a year on average for the 533 sample households receiving free meals and food, $£ 222$ ayear for the 77 households withluncheon vouchers, and £319 a year for the 85 households getting coke and coal (the corresponding amounts for the whole sample are $£ 16, £ 2$ and $£ 4$ ). Their valuations were rather arbitrary. However, there are much more significant items, most notably the company car, which are seen not as a 'fringe benefit' or 'perk' but as an integral part of the remuneration package. We intend to extend the analysis to cover this item in future years (a question on the engine size of company cars was introduced into the 1990 FES), and follow Inland Revenue valuations.

## Disposable income

10. We have re-defined this income measure to be exclusive of domestic rates (which were previously in the indirect tax section along with VAT, duty on beer etc). This change is made in anticipation of community charge data being available in the 1989 FES and onwards. The National Accounts system, which we use extensively in our analysis, will show the community charge as a
deduction before arriving at disposable income - we will follow suit. For the sake of only 2 year's data (ie 1987 and 1988) it seems silly to introduce a discontinuity in the series, when it can so easily be avoided.

## Domestic rates

11. Domestic rates are now shown in full ie before any rebates which are now shown as a cash benefit (as part of housing benefit). This will be very useful in the next article (which will look at disposable income in earlier years) because it avoids a discontinuity - arising from the introduction of Housing Benefit in 1983 - which was present under the old definition. In previous articles, domestic rates were shown net of rebates and these rebates were excluded from cash benefits.

## Definition of a 'child'

12. The new definition, given in paragraph 6 of Appendix 2, is now the same as that used in the derivation of a tax unit (and hence is in line with usage in other Government Departments). The old definition was that anyone under 16 was a child - mainly because anyone over 16 in the FES had to fill in a diary record of their expenditure over a fortnight. The number of children in the 1987 FES is 4,283 on the old basis and 4,555 on the new basis. This change of definition will, of course, have an effect on the ten household types shown in Table 5 of Appendix 1.

## APPENDIX 4

## Selection of tables on the old basis

## CONTENTS

Average incomes, taxes and benefits, 1987
By decile groups of households ranked by original and disposable income .. .. .. .. .. .. 1

Percentage distribution of original, gross, disposable, post-tax and final income,
households re-ranked at each stage, 1975-87

Gini coefficients for the distribution of income at each stage of the tax-benefit system, 1975-87

By decile groups of households ranked by original and disposable income

| Eper year |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Average over all decile groups |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Decile |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | and | 3 rd | 4ih | 51h | 6th | 7th | Bth | 917 | Top |  |

## (1) Fanked by original income All households

| Decile Points (¢) | " | * | 31 |  | 820 | 6030 |  | 11502 |  | 17333 |  | 23382 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Nurrber of househo | in the sa |  | 740 | 739 | 740 | 739 | 740 | 740 | 739 | 740 | 739 | 740 | 7396 |
| Original income.. | * | * | 3 | 319 | 1686 | 4393 | 7504 | 10246 | 12832 | 15896 | 20166 | 34542 | 10759 |
| Direct benellis in cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gontributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pens |  | * | 1206 | 1865 | 1797 | 1159 | 605 | 337 | 247 | 232 | 164 | 160 | 777 |
| Sickness/ injury | related | ., | 150 | 146 | 198 | 234 | 130 | 115 | 77 | 78 | 72 | 53 | 125 |
| Unemploymant | enefit | * | 69 | 41 | 83 | 114 | 76 | 70 | 67 | 31 | 43 | 45 | 64 |
| Other contributo | benefits |  | 29 | 53 | 66 | 80 | 77 | 46 | 40 | 30 | 27 | 16 | 40 |
| Total contributory | enetits | , | 1454 | 2105 | 2144 | 1587 | 889 | 568 | 430 | 371 | 306 | 274 | 1013 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | * | 1152 | 495 | 323 | 299 | 148 | 60 | 82 | 32 | 39 | 35 | 267 |
| Child benefit |  | . | 246 | 94 | 110 | 190 | 238 | 322 | 305 | 312 | 279 | 254 | 235 |
| Rent rebates! a | wances | - | 748 | 392 | 192 | 142 | 41 | 20 | 21 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 156 |
| Sickness/ disab | ment relat | ed | 186 | 135 | 180 | 104 | 129 | 52 | 51 | 31 | 41 | 20 | 83 |
| Other non-contr | utory bene | fits | 78 | 97 | 130 | 125 | 78 | 54 | 62 | 73 | 62 | 26 | 79 |
| Tetal non-contribu | ry benefit |  | 2409 | 12.13 | 935 | 860 | 636 | 509 | 521 | 450 | 424 | 339 | 829 |
| Gross income .* |  | ** | 3866 | 3637 | 4766 | 6830 | 9029 | 11324 | 13784 | 16717 | 20896 | 35155 | 12601 |
| Income tax ${ }^{1}$ and Er | oyees' N |  | -213 | 8 | 119 | 575 | 1274 | 1898 | 2421 | 3192 | 4272 | 8195 | 2193 |
| Disposable income | - |  | 3887 | 3629 | 4646 | 6255 | 7755 | 9425 | 11362 | 13535 | 16623 | 26960 | 10408 |
| Domestic rates' |  | - | 153 | 208 | 338 | 392 | 435 | 455 | 480 | 526 | 581 | 731 | 430 |
| Taxes on linal goods | and servic |  | 543 | 532 | 790 | 1100 | 1397 | 1559 | 1827 | 2105 | 2368 | 3006 | $\dagger 523$ |
| Intermediate taxes |  | . | 196 | 219 | 289 | 384 | 454 | 525 | 609 | 696 | 776 | 1103 | 525 |
| Post-tax Incorre | * | ** | 2998 | 2671 | 3229 | 4379 | 5469 | 6887 | B 446 | 10208 | 12898 | 22120 | 7931 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education |  | .. | 570 | 301 | 434 | 544 | 634 | 766 | 788 | 851 | 836 | 732 | 656 |
| National health se |  | - | 971 | 1029 | 997 | 895 | 862 | 810 | 815 | 788 | 748 | 787 | 870 |
| Housing subsidy |  | " | 156 | 89 | 85 | 74 | 62 | 45 | 37 | 27 | 24 | 16 | 61 |
| Travel subsidies |  |  | 37 | 46 | 55 | 48 | 41 | 44 | 48 | 47 | 72 | 121 | 56 |
| School meals and wellare milk.. |  |  | 76 | 34 | 33 | 43 | 28 | 20 | 23 | 21 | 21 | 15 | 31 |
| Final Income .. | * | -• | 4804 | 4170 | 4933 | 5983 | 7097 | 8751 | 10157 | 12041 | 14588 | 23791 | 9605 |

(ii) Runked by disposable income

All households

| Decile points (g) | - | .. | 3166 |  | 4293 | 5554 | 7103 | 8720 | $3 \quad 12479$ |  | 319172 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of housetiolds in the sample |  |  | 740 | 739 | 740 | 739 | 740 | 740 | 739 | 740 | 739 | 740 | 7396 |
| Original Income.. | *. | * | 413 | 1047 | 2098 | 4444 | 7263 | 8932 | 12649 | 15682 | 19960 | 34090 | 10759 |
| Ditect benetits in cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contrlbutory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pan |  | ** | 1472 | 1440 | 1464 | 991 | 757 | 473 | 370 | 314 | 268 | 222 | 777 |
| Sickness/ injur | elated | - | 29 | 98 | 132 | 263 | 153 | 147 | 155 | 114 | 83 | 78 | 125 |
| Unemploymen | eneft | - | 26 | 48 | 96 | 96 | 77 | 71 | 67 | 47 | 63 | 50 | 64 |
| Other contribut | $y$ benelits |  | 39 | 50 | 65 | 55 | 59 | 49 | 54 | 40 | 35 | 19 | 46 |
| Total contributory | onefits |  | 1566 | 1636 | 1756 | 1406 | 1046 | 740 | 646 | 515 | 449 | 369 | 1013 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Supplementary | enefit |  | 250 | 484 | 590 | 476 | 333 | 190 | 120 | 102 | 59 | 62 | 267 |
| Child benefit |  |  | 33 | 97 | 176 | 248 | 269 | 329 | 307 | 309 | 303 | 280 | 235 |
| Fient rebates/ | wances |  | 338 | 445 | 368 | 185 | 111 | 41 | 32 | 23 | 9 | 16 | 156 |
| Sickness/ disab | ment relat |  | 31 | 65 | 115 | 163 | 135 | 131 | 89 | 78 | 75 | 47 | 93 |
| Other non-cont | utory bene | fits | 43 | 57 | 92 | 96 | 106 | 92 | 52 | 108 | B6 | 53 | 79 |
| Total non-contrib | ry benelis |  | 695 | 1148 | 1325 | 1168 | 954 | 784 | 601 | 620 | 531 | 459 | 829 |
| Gross income .. | - | * | 2674 | 3831 | 5189 | 7018 | $92 ¢$ | 11456 | 13895 | 16817 | 20941 | 34919 | 12601 |
| Income tax' and Employees' NIC.. |  |  | 59 | 132 | 303 | 727 | 1355 | 1857 | 2497 | 3180 | 4139 | 7675 | 2193 |
| Disposable income | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 2615 | 3699 | 4886 | 6292 | 7907 | 9600 | 11398 | 13637 | 16802 | 27244 | 10.408 |
| Taxes on final goods and services |  |  | 213 | 238 559 | 296 806 | 368 1.129 | 408 1379 | 451 $\times 576$ | 484 1824 | 523 | 592 2422 | 726 2995 | $\begin{array}{r}430 \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
|  |  |  | 406 180 | 559 218 | 806 291 | 1129 366 | 1379 458 | 1576 522 | 1824 607 | 2131 708 | 2422 813 | 2995 1088 | 1523 525 |
| Post-tax income | * | - | 1816 | 2685 | 3493 | 4428 | 5661 | 7051 | 8483 | 10276 | 12976 | 22435 | 7931 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education... | * | $\cdots$ | 168 | 198 | 433 | 611 | 657 | 895 | 856 | 970 | 976 | 791 | 656 |
| National hoalth s | vice | $\cdots$ | 825 | 857 | 987 | 930 | 898 | 890 | 856 | 825 | 802 | 834 | 870 |
| Housing subsidy | * | $\cdots$ | 85 | 121 | 100 | 85 | 66 | 52 | 34 | 22 | 30 | 18 | 61 |
| Travel subsidies |  |  | 37 | 40 | 49 | 42 | 50 | 49 | 39 | 56 | 82 | 115 | 55 |
| School meals and wellare milk.. |  |  | 9 | 23 | 53 | 65 | 41 | 36 | 24 | 22 | 22 | 18 | 31 |
| Final income .. | * | - | 2938 | 3923 | 5115 | 6161 | 7374 | 8972 | 10292 | 12172 | 14888 | 24210 | 9605 |

2 Net of the rate element of housing benelit, but including water, etc. charges.

Percentage distribution of original, gross, disposable, post-tax, and final income, households re-ranked at each stage, 1975-87

TABLE 2
OLD BASIS

|  |  |  |  |  |  | 1975 | 1977 | 1979 | 1981 | 1983 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original Income Quintile group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bothom | .. | - | * | * | * | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 |
| 2nd.. | .. | .. | .. | . | .. | 10 | 10 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 3 rd . | . | . | . | . | ** | 19 | 19 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 18 | 16 |
| 4th .. | .. | . | .. | " | . | 26 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 |
| Top .. | - | * | . | * | * | 44 | 44 | 45 | 46 | 48 | 49 | 51 | 51 |
| All hous |  | * | . | . | * | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Gross income Quintile group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | . | . | .. | . | $\cdots$ | 5.5 | 5.7 | 5.5 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 5.4 | 5.3 | 5.1 |
| 2nd .. | " | $\ldots$ | " | . | " | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
| 3rd .. | * | * | - | . | * | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 |
| $4{ }^{\text {th }}$.. | * | * | * | * | . | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 |
| Top .. | .- | * | * | - | * | 40 | 40 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 44 | 45 |
| All hous |  | * | . | * | .. | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Disposable income Quintile group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | .. | " | " | * | * | 6.6 | 6.9 | 6.5 | 6.7 | 6.8 | 6.5 | 6.2 | 6.1 |
| 2nd .. | - | $\cdots$ | . | . | . | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| 3rd .. | . | * | . | " | .. | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| 4th .. | . | . | " | " | $\ldots$ | 24 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Top .. | . | . | . | * | . | 38 | 38 | 39 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 42 |
| All hous |  |  |  |  |  | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Post-tax income Quintile group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | . | * | * | . | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | 6.2 | 6.4 | 6.1 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.6 | 5.1 | 5.1 |
| 2nd .. | . | . | . | " | - | 12 | 12. | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 10 |
| 3rd .. | . | * | * | . | * | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 |
| 4th .. | . | .. | . | * | * | 24 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Top .. | . | . | " | * | " | 39 | 38 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 43 | 45 | 45 |
| All hous |  | * | - | * | * | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Final income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quintile group |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Botiom | .. | " | " | " | $\cdots$ | 7.1 | 7.3 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 6.3 | 6.2 |
| 2nd .. | . | * | .. | . | . | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| 3rd .. | . | .. | " | " | .. | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| 4th .. | . | . | " | . | . | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| Top .. | . | * | * | . | . | 38 | 3B | 38 | 39 | 39 | 40 | 42 | 42 |
| All hous |  | .. | * | * | * | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Gini coefficients for the distribution of income at each stage of the tax-benefit system, 1975-87

TABLE 3
OLD BASIS

|  |  |  |  |  | 1975 | 1977 | 1979 | 1981 | 1983 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gini coetficients (per cent) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Original income | . | * | * | . | 43 | 44 | 45 | 47 | 49 | 51 | 52 | 52 |
| Gross income .. | . | .. | . | . | 35 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 36 | 38 | 40 | 40 |
| Disposable income | * | ". | .. | .. | 32 | 31 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 35 | 36 | 37 |
| Post-tax income | .. | .. | .. | .. | 33 | 33 | 35 | 36 | 36 | 38 | 40 | 40 |
| Final income .. | $\cdots$ | * | * | .. | 31 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 33 | 34 | 36 | 36 |


[^0]:    1 All the tables in Part I of this article show unequivalised income: oquivalised income has only boen used
    in the ranking process to produce the quintlle groups (and to produce the percentage shares and Ginl coelficients)
    After tax rellef at source on mortgage interest and life assurance premiums and including gross domestic rates.
    3 Children are delined as persons aged under 16 or agod betweon 16 and 18, unmarried and receiving
    non-advanced lurther education.

[^1]:    1 After tax relief at source on morlgage interest and lite assurance premiums.

[^2]:    1 Economically active people comprise employees, the sett employed and others not in ermploymem but who are seeking or
    intending, when able, to seek work.
    2 Atter tax rellei at source on mortgage interest and life assurance premlums and including gross domestic rates.

[^3]:    1 This group is smatier than the category of "one parent lamilies" because some of these lamilies
    will be contalned in larger household types.

[^4]:    1 On mortgage interest and Ife assutance premlume.

[^5]:    1 This group is smaller than the category of "one parent familes" because some of these families
    will be contained in larger household lypes.
    2 After tax reliel at source on mortgage interest and life assurance premiums.

[^6]:    1 Atter tax rellel al source on mortgage interest and lile assurance premiums.

