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## In Brief

## Correction

## The effect of annual chain-linking on Blue Book 2002 annual growth estimates - article published in April 2003 issue:

We regret to inform you that there were two errors in the conclusions section:
In the first paragraph of the conclusion, the penultimate sentence 'There are smail upward effects from 1999 to 2001' should read 'There are small downward effects from 1999 to 2001'.

In the final sentence of the article, 'the upward effect on GDP growth rates is greater' should read 'the effect on GDP growth rates is greater'.

These changes have already been made to the electronic version of the article on the National Statistics website:
http://nswebcopy/cci/article.asp?id=328

## Articles

This month we feature four articles
Caroline Lakin of the ONS discusses the effects of taxes and benefits on household income in 2000-2001. The article examines how the distribution of income among households in the UK is modified by government benefits and taxation, which reduce the differences in incomes between households. Before taxes and benefits, the top fifth of households have an average income of around eighteen times as great as the bottom fifth; after taxes and benefits the ratio is greatly reduced to four to one. Inequality of disposable income has changed over time; it was stable in the first half of the 1980s, then increased during the second half of the 1980s. Inequality was relatively flat in the 1990s, but with some indications of a slight fall in the first half of the 1990s and a slight rise since then.

Mari Frogner of the DWP and Nigel Stuttard of the ONS summarise the development of an UK Social Accounting Matrix (SAM). The methodology improves on previous work carried out by ONS in 1996 by developing a SAM, which is both more detailed and consistent with the European System of Accounts (ESA95). A SAM is an analytical framework in which social and economic data are integrated and harmonised. The matrix representation of these data has the advantage that both sides of a transaction are identifies, both who pays and who receives.

Leonidas Akritidis of the ONS examines the latest revisions to quarterly GDP growth. This Revisions Analysis investigates the change from the first estimate to the latest official estimate of the quarterly growth in GDP at constant prices. The article examines the bias and dispersion of the quarterly revisions at the different stages of the National Accounts process for the period of 1993 Q1 to 1999 Q4. The average revisions show a positive bias of 0.189 percentage points between the first and last estimates of GDP growth.

Simon Humphries of the ONS describes the IMF Co-ordinated Portfolio Investment Survey, which was launched by the international Monetary Fund (IMF) in response to the recommendations contained in the "Report on the Measurement of International Capital Flows" published in 1992. The report highlighted the increasing importance of portfolio investment across International borders, reflecting the liberalisation of financial markets, financial innovation, and the changing behaviour of investors. The increased liberalisation has brought measurement difficulties which have been reflected in the imbalances between global financial assets and liabilities. If perfectly measured, assets and liabilities have consistently exceeded recorded assets.

Continued...

## Changes

## Table 4.5A

The table now shows seasonally adjusted data. As population data for 1991-2000 have been published, the data have been revised, replacing the interim population estimates published in October 2002. For further details, please see: www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/ nugget.asp?id=207

## Recent economic publications

Quarterly
Consumer Trends: 2002 quarter 4. Available for downloading from the National Statistics website www.statistics.gov.uk/products/ p242.asp
United Kingdom Economic Accounts: 2002 quarter 4. TSO, ISBN 011621638 7. Price £26. Also available for downloading from the National Statistics website www.statistics.gov.uk/products/p1904.asp
UK Trade in Goods analysed in terms of industries (MQ10): 2002 quarter 4. Available for downloading from the National Statistics website www.statistics.gov.uk/products/p731.asp

## Monthly

Financial Statistics: April 2003. TSO, ISBN 011621595 X. Price £23.50.
Focus on Consumer Price indices: March 2003. Available for downioading from the National Statistics website www.statistics.gov.ukd products/p867.asp
Monthly Review of External Trade Statistics (MM24): March 2003. Available for downloading from the National Statistics website www.statistics.gov.uk/products/p613.asp from 15 May.

TSO publications are available by telephoning 08706005522 , fax 08706005533 or online at www.tso.co.uk/bookshop

## Economic Update - May 2003

## Michael Wycherley, Macroeconomic Assessment - Office for National Statistics

Address: D4/20, 1 Drummond Gate, London, SW1V 2QQ, tel: 0207533 5923, E-mail: michael.wycherley@ONS.gov.uk

## Overview

Preliminary GDP data shows growth slowed down in the last quarter of 2002 and the first quarter of 2003 . Similarly extemal indices of output show a weaker position than earlier in 2002, although the latest monthly manufacturing figures show output rising slightly. Retail sales weakened into 2003, but evidence of any fall in household demand is still faily limited. Private investment demand stabilised during 2002 after the recent falls. This stabilisation is set against a background of high indebtedness and an increase in bankruptcies. Govemment demand has been stronger. However weaker revenues have retumed public sector finances to deficit. Trade demand may have stabilised after the falls from the strong second quarter demand. Overail labour market aggregates remain fairly stable, and private sector wage pressures are minimal. Producer prices have picked up, driven by oil price rises, while consumer prices remain above target.

## GDP activity - overview

The preliminary estimate showed gross domestic product (GDP) quarterly growth in the first quarter of 2003 at 0.2 per cent, down from 0.4 per cent in the fourth quarter of 2002 and 1.0 per cent in the third quarter (figure 1). Comparing the first quarter of 2003 with the same quarter a year ago growth was 2.3 per cent, slightly up from the 2.2 per cent in the year to the fourth quarter of 2002.

Figure 1
GDP
growth


The lower GDP growth in the latest quarter reflects a slowdown in growth in the service industries. Manufacturing production grew slightly in the first quarter, set against strong construction growth and weak industrial production.

Overall, movements in the UK economy are similar to those around the world. The recovery in the main industrial economies seen in the middle of 2002 has become a little more subdued. Much of this recovery was export led, and exports have subsequently fallen back. Accompanying renewed weakness has been rising unemployment in several of the
major economies (figure 2). What has set the UK economy apart from the continental European economies has been the strength of the consumer and government demand, and the stability of the labour market.

Figure 2
International unemployment
percentage of the workforce


## Financial Market activity

Recent events continue to be accompanied by a substantial degree of volatility in world stock market valuations of equity. Following falls starting in 2000, the UK FTSE all share index rebounded slightly at the end of 2001, before declining again from the middle of 2002. March saw a stabilisation of the index, and April saw a rise in the medium term, according to the FTSE all-share index, equity values peaked at 3147 in December 1999. In March 2003 the index was 1748, a total decline of 44 per cent. This is the largest and most prolonged deterioration in equity values since the decline in the early 1970 s, where the all-share index fell by 71 per cent between August 1972 and December 1974.

Outside the stock market concems are echoed in the corporate bond
market, which, alongside long-termloans frombanks, has been the primary source of corporate borrowing since 2001. Some measures of spreads between corporate and government bonds continue to show historically high spreads - particularly for lower rated paper.

## Output

Although, as noted, manufacturing output has grown so far in the first quarter following a fail in the last quarter of 2002, looking at the monthly figures gives a more mixed picture. While there were small rises in January and February, the three month average, which smoothes out some of the monthly volatility, continues to show small falls (figure 3). Taken together these figures suggest the declines may have halted, but do not provide much evidence for strong growth.

Figure 3
Manufacturing output growth


The source of the weakness in manufacturing has been the fall in ICT industries since the start of 2001. This decline slowed during 2002, and ouput rose between November 2002 and January 2003, with February seeing a small fall. Much of the recent volatility has been associated with the production of motor vehicles over the Jubilee period. Output fell sharply in the middle of 2002, rose sharply afterwards, and then fell back to about the same level as at the start of 2002. The latest figures suggesting that output may have stabilised, although the three month figure continues to show a fall due to a weak December. Output in the investment goods industries rose by 1.6 per cent in the latest three months compared with the previous three months.

Much of the slowdown in GDP growth since the third quarter of 2002 is due to a slowdown in the oulput growth of the service industries. Comparing output with that of the previous quarter shows growth of 0.3 percent in the first quarter of 2003, down on the growth of 0.5 per cent in the last quarter of 2002, but well down on the growth of 1.2 per cent in the third quarter. Comparing with the same quarter a year ago annual growth was 2.6 per cent in the first quarter of 2003, the same as in the last quarter of 2002.

Apart from the growth of 3.1 per cent in the third quarter of 2002, growth has been 2.5 or 2.6 per cent since the start of 2002 (figure 4).

Figure 4
Services output
growth


A broad industrial breakdown shows that in 2001 there was a shift in the driver of growth from 'business services and finance' and 'transport, storage and communications' to 'distribution, hotels and catering, and repairs' and 'government and other services' (figure 5). In the last quarter of 2002 and the first quarter of 2003 the general slowdown in the service sector has been due to lower growth in all service industries.

Figure 5
Service industries
growth, quarter on a year ago


Strong construction output growth has continued to support overall GDP growth. Growthin 2003 as a whole was 7.5 per cent, and strong growth has continued into 2003.

## External measures of output

Extemal measures for both the manufacturing and service sectors suggest a weakening of the economy in the first quarter of 2003.

Figure 6 shows the British Chambers of Commerce (BCC) domestic sales for the manufacturing and service sectors. Both indices rose fast at the start of the 2002, rising again in the third quarter of 2002, but falling sharply in the first quarter of 2003. Chartered Institute of Purchasing and Supply (CIPS) and Confederation of British Industry (CBI) figures both show a similar picture, with output and orders deteriorating sharply at the start of 2003, with much of the fall in the CIPS indices occurring in March.

Figure 6 BCC services/manufacturing growth


## Household demand

National Accounts figures for the fourth quarter of 2002 continued to show strong growth, with quarterly growth of 1.1 per cent up from 0.7 per cent in quarter three. Annual growth slowed slightly to 3.6 per cent. However, other data suggests this growth is likely to weaken in 2003.

Retail sales data show strong growth into the fourth quarter, with quarterly growth of 1.6 per cent, substantially up from growth of 0.7 per cent in quarter three. However the latest monthly figures show growth slowing, with a monthly rise of 0.6 per cent in March and 0.4 per cent in February ofisetting a fall of 1.0 per cent in January, with the thee monthly growth rate positive at 0.1 per cent (figure 7). Overall these latest figures suggest that the recent strong retail sales growth is weakening.

Support for a slowdown in retail sales growth is found in sharply lower consumer confidence figures since the end of 2002. Similarly, both the CBI and British Retail Consortium (BRC) report retail sales weakening in February and March.

Similarly there is evidence that gross consumer credit growth may be easing, with annual growth of 4.9 per cent in the February, weil down from the peak growth in 2002 of 16.0 per cent in the March. This slowdown began in the second half of 2002 and, with the exception of December, annual growth has been around 5 per cent since October 2002.

Nevertheless, the prolonged period of high growth in consumer credit shows that the present level of consumer demand is supported by continued addition to the stock of household debt. Debt to income ratios remain at historic highs. As a result household demand is at least partly dependent on bank and building societies' willingness to lend and on households continuing to be willing to take on more debt and to be able to meet the interest payments on previous and new borrowing. Many emphasise though that with interest rates low these debt servicing costs continue to remain relatively low.

Figure 7 Retail sales growth


Part of this continued willingness to take on additional debt appears to be related to the very strong growth of house prices through 2002; here the Nationwide and Halifax figures show annual inflation in the year to March at 26.4 and 24.5 per cent respectively. Tentative signs of a cooling are based on the three month on previous three month growth rates from the Nationwide and Halifax. These have fallen from their peaks of eight to nine per cent in mid 2002 to 2.0 per cent in March 2003 according to the Halifax and 4.2 per cent according to the Nationwide (figure 8).

## Figure 8

House prices
growth, 3 months on previous 3 months


There are quite substantial regional differences in house price inflation, and London in particular appears to have seen a particularly large fall in house price inflation recently.

## Business demand

In contrast to household demand, but echoing the position around the world, UK business investment demand fell sharply in 2001, then stabilised in 2002 before a small rise at the end of the year.

Figure 9 shows business investment rose by 0.4 per cent between the third and fourth quarters of 2002. On an annual basis there was a fall of 5.4 per cent in the fourth quarter, however this was largely due to a quarterly fall of 5.6 per cent in the first quarter of 2002. The fourth quarter saw a 0.7 per cent fall in manufacturing investment in the fourth quarter being offset by a 3 per cent rise in construction and other production investment, while investment in services was unchanged.

Figure 9
Business investment
growth


An analysis by asset shows that investment decline in manufacturing was broadly based, although some small components are volatile. Much of the recent fall has been in other machinery and equipment, and the flat investment in this asset in the fourth quarter follows seven quarters of decline. Previously the same asset had recorded very high growth, peaking at annual growth of 26.4 per cent in the first quarter of 1998. These assets include high profile investment in information and communications technologies.

External indices have shown a quite sharp weakening in investment intentions recently, with the BCC indicating a fall in investment intentions in the first quarter of 2003 , particularly in services.

As noted, the decline in investment is a global phenomenon that began between the end of 2000 and the start of 2001. In the year to the fourth
quarter of 2002, overall investment (i.e. business investment and govemment investment) rose by 0.8 per cent in the US and 1.2 per cent in Japan, but fell by 4.7 per cent in Germany and 1.1 per cent in France. Comparing the fourth quarter with the third, growth was 0.9 per cent in the US, 1.2 per cent in Japan, and 0.9 per cent in Germany, only France saw a fall in the fourth quarter, with investment 0.6 per cent lower. Comparable figures for the UK show an annual decline of 1.1 per cent, but a quarterly rise of 0.5 per cent in the fourth quarter.

The cutbacks in investment have seen a recovery in the financial situation of the private non-inancial corporation (PNFC) sector. Between Q2 2001 and Q4 2002 a net borrowing position of $£ 2.9$ billion has given way to net lending of $£ 3.6$ billion, as investment has fallen by $£ 1.7$ billion and there has been a degree of recovery in profits. Over recent quarters the overall indebtedness of the sector, while still at a high level, had moderated as net lending was recorded. The latest quarter however saw a rise; although this is related to financial flows associated with direct investment and may be a one-off. Lastly DTI data show faily sharp increases inboth company and individual insolvencies in fouth quarter.

## Government demand

Government demand is growing at a relatively robust pace, although in the second and third quarters of 2002 growth weakened from the very strong growth between Q3 2001 and Q1 2002, before recovering somewhat in the fourth quarter. In the fourth quarter of 2002 constant price government expenditure rose by 1.0 per cent compared with the previous quarter, following growth of 0.4 per cent in quarter three. Compared with the fourth quarter of 2001, govemment dermand was up 2.2 per cent. In cash terms government expenditure has grown by 7.4 per cent in the year to the fourth quarter.

The ongoing growth in government expenditure has come as revenue growth is slowing, reflecting the slowdown in the economy. The effect is that the central Govemment sector has retumed to net borrowing for five consecutive quarters, following thirteen quarters of net lending.

Monthly public sector net borrowing data now extends to March 2002, covering the whole financial year, and shows net borrowing for the financial year 2002-03 stands at $£ 25.2$ billion, this compares with lending of $£ 0.4$ billion the previous financial year. The data also illustrates the weakness in corporation tax receipts, with corporation tax revenues falling in 200203 compared with 2001-02.

## Imports

Following a pick-up in the first half of 2002, total imports fell back in the last quarter of 2002.

Monthly goods figures are available up to February, and the three months to February show a fall of 0.5 per cent due to a weak December, although compared with the same period a year ago imports were 1.7 per cent higher (figure 10). In the latest three months goods imports from the EU have fallen 0.5 per cent, the decline in goods imports from non-EU countries was 0.6 per cent. On an annual basis most of the change is due to the EU, with imports in the three months to February 3.1 per cent higher this year than last year, while non-EU imports were unchanged.

Figure 10
Goods import (volume) growth


## Overseas Demand

UK exports strengthened in the second quarter of 2002 before falling back in the third and fourth quarters.

Using volume indices shows weakness continuing into 2003, with goods exports falling by 0.7 per cent in the three months to February (figure 11). Recent export weakness appears to be due to trade with EU countries. Goods exports by volume to non-EU countries rose by 4.0 per cent in the

Figure 11
Goods export (volume)
growth

three months to February 2003 compared with the previous three months, whilst goods exports to EU countries fell by 3.5 per cent in the same period. On an annual basis goods exports rose by 2.8 per cent to nonEU countries and fell by 3.7 per cent to EU countries

The overall effect of these changes is that the improvement in the balance of trade in goods in the latest three months is due to a fall in imports from and rise in exports to non-EU countries. Trade in services continues to support the current account, although less than in the previous three months.

## Labour Market

Headline labour market statistics continue to remain failly stable.

From the perspective of employment, the labour force survey (LFS) employment rate was 74.5 per cent in Dec.-Feb. little changed over the quarter (figure 12), the LFS count of employment increased by 33,000 over the quarter. Similarly employer survey 'workforce jobs' data has shown a modest rise of 47,000 in December 2002 compared with September. From the perspective of unemployment, the ILO rate was 5.1 per cent in Dec-Feb, the same as a year ago (figure 12), and the claimant count rate, at 3.1 per cent in March, has been unchanged for a year.

Figure 12
Labour Force Survey


Both full-time and part-time employment are growing at 0.1 per cent compared with the previous quarter. This comes after a period when part-ime employment grew faster than full-time, leading to annual growth rates of 2.3 and 0.4 per cent respectively.

The industry dis-aggregation from 'workforce jobs' figures shows that the manufacturing sector continues to lose jobs, whilstechoing the ouput data the main sources of job creation have been 'public administration, health and education', construction and 'distribution, hotels and restaurants'. In the year to December manufacturing lost 154,000 jobs, whilst services
gained 255,000 of which 153,000 were in been 'public administration, health and education' and 96,000 in 'distribution, hotels and restaurants'.

The recent trend for most job creation to be in self-employed jobs may have ended. Again according to workforce jobs data, over the year to quarter four, self-employed jobs have increased by 124,000 , whereas 'employee jobs' have fallen by 83,000 , however comparing quarters three and four self-employed jobs rose by 21,000 and 'employee' jobs by 25,000 .

The average earnings index suggests a more subdued labour market. In February 2002 the headline rate was 3.0 per cent, down on the figure of around 3.8 per cent that was the case for much of 2002 and well below the 4.5 per cent figure that the Bank of England consider broadly consistent with their inflation target.

## Prices

Over the past few months producer price inflation has shown slight increases on the output side and a shift to rises on the input side. Annual output inflation rose to 1.9 per cent in March, from 1.8 per cent in February continuing the upward trend that began in the middle of 2002, when a brief period of defiation ended. Annual input price inflation fell back from 6.2 per cent in February to 4.5 per cent in March, however this is still well above any figure for 2002, where prices fell for much of the year. Some of these recent rises have been associated with increases in oil prices, however underlying (i.e. excluding food, beverages, tobacco and petroleum) annual output price inflation was 1.4 per cent in March up from 1.3 per cent in February (figure 13). Underlying annual input prices inflation showed a rise of 2.5 per cent in the year to March, following a rise of 0.8 per cent in February, these are the first annual input price rises since the middle of 2001 (figure 13). More generally, the recent low outturns for output price inflation compared with input price inflation may reflect the deteriorating global conditions that began in 2001, with oversupply remaining a significant phenomenon.

On the other hand consumer price inflation has picked up a little in recent months. The Govemment's target measure RPIX was 3.0 per cent in March, unchanged from February, the RPI rose slightly from 3.0 per cent to 3.1 per cent. The RPIX figure was the highest rate since 1998 (figure 13 again), but this was partly due to ongoing increases to the depreciation of housing component that are due to house price increases and to effects from oil price rises. Other sources of price rises include leisure and household services, possibly indicating the recent strength of the service sector.

Figure 13
Consumer prices
growth, month on a year ago
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## Forecasts for the UK Economy

A comparison of independent forecasts, April 2003
The tables below are extracted from HM Treasury's "FORECASTS FOR THE UK ECONOMY" and summarise the average and range of independent forecasts for 2003 and 2004, updated monthly.

|  | Independent Forecasts for 2003 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Lowest |  |
| GDP growth (per cent) | 1.9 | -0.4 |  |


|  | Independent Forecasts for 2004 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Average | Lowest |
| GDP growth (per cent) | 2.4 | -0.3 |

NOTE: "FORECASTS FOR THE UK ECONOMY" gives more detailed forecasts, covering 27 variables and is published monthly by HM Treasury, available on annual subscription, price $£ 75$. Subscription enquiries should be addressed to Claire Coast-Smith, Public Enquiry Unit 2/S2, HM Treasury, 1 Horse Guards Road, London SW1A 2HQ (Tel: 020-7270 4558). It is also available at the Treasury's internet site: http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk.
*PSNB: Public Sector Net Borrowing.

## International Economic Indicators - May 2003

## Gladys Asogbon, Marcoeconomic Assessment - National Statistics

Address: D4/20, 1 Drummond Gate, London, SW1V 2QQ, tel: 0207533 5925, E-mail: gladys.asogbon@ONS.gov.uk


#### Abstract

Overview The fourth quarter shows growth in the major economies, although at a declining rate, with the exception of Germany, which did not grow in quarter four and Italy, where growth accelerated throughout 2002. With the exception of Italy, consumer demand is weak in most major economies with the USA in particular showing a marked slowdown. Trade also slowed in the latest period and investment demand is still at best weak or in decline in most major economies again except in Italy. Industrial output declined in all major economies in quarter four, reversing growth in the earlier quarters of 2002. Unemployment is at best broadly flat or inching up in most economies, employment growth is weakening. Headline prices figures remain subdued, although producer prices rose mainly due to increases in the price of oil.


## EU15

The latest data for 2002 quarter three shows that the EU economy grew by 0.4 per cent, the same rate of growth as the two preceding quarters.

EU GDP has been subdued since the start of 2001 (figure 1). The main driver of this has been falls in investment and falls in exports. In 2001 quarter four GDP declined for the first time since 1993 quarter one. A demand breakdown shows a strengthening in consumer expenditure and exports over the last two quarters. Investment demand also made a modest contribution to quarterly GDP after six consecutive quarters of contraction.

Figure 1
GDP: EU15
growth


As with GDP, industrial production in the EU has been subdued since 2001, when the index grew by just 0.1 per cent. The index contracted in quarter four by 0.5 per cent, following three consecutive quarters of expansion. Annual growth for the year shows the index falling by 1.0 per cent.

Consumer prices in the EU inched up in the second half of 2002, with growth reaching 2.5 per cent in December up from 1.8 per cent in June. February 2003 figures show consumer price inflation picking up to 2.6 per cent, the highest rate since August 2001 and above the ceiling targeted by the European Central Bank. However, the recent increase in the CPI is likely to reflect mainly an increase in oil prices. The same pattem canbe seen on prices at the factory gate, which had been falling for the first half of 2002 , but started rising in the second half of 2002. Producer prices rose by 2.0 per cent in the year to February, the highest rate since May 2001.

EU employment figures continue to show growth, athough at a declining rate. Annual growth in the year to the third quarter was 0.5 per cent. The unemployment rate however is inching up with 7.9 per cent of the workforce unemployed as at February, up from a trough of 7.3 per cent in the second and third quarters of 2001.

Annual eamings showed grow th in the year to the third quarter, of 3.3 per cent, following growth in the second quarter of 2.5 per cent and 3.4 per cent in the first quarter; the figures are volatile.

## Germany

The German economy did not grow in the fourth quarter of 2002, having posted growth of 0.3 per cent in the previous quarter. Overall GDP grew by just 0.2 per cent for 2002 as a whole compared with 0.8 per cent in 2001.

Recently, there has been a lack of any appreciable domestic momentum in the German economy. Household consumption made a negative contribution of 0.3 per cent in 2002 and did not add to quarterly GDP growth in quarter four. Investment expenditure has been in decline, showing contractions in annual growth in both 2001 and 2002 and
government demand has made only small contributions in recent years. The impetus that came mainly from exports in quarters two and three slowed considerably in quarter four. Germany's growth rate remains below the EU average with quarterly GDP being below the quarterly GDP growth rate of the EU as a whole in every quarter of 2002

Having grown for three consecutive quarters, the IOP contracted by 1.1 per cent in quarter four. This was dominated by a very large contraction in December of 3.5 per cent although this has since rebounded in January 2003. Overall in 2002 , the index fell by 1.4 per cent. Growth in the index has been subdued since 2001, when it grew by only 0.5 per cent, compared to growth of 6.2 per cent in 2000.

The CP| shows consumer prices growing by 1.2 per cent in the year to February, down from growth of 2.1 per cent growth seen at the start of 2002. Figures for the PPI for the same period show prices at the factory gate increasing by 1.9 per cent in the year to February. This is a significant increase when compared to growth in the index of 0.9 per cent in December 2002. The increase in producer prices reflects the recent increases in oil prices. Despite this, Germany has the lowest consumer price inflation of the large Euro economies.

Unemployment in Germany continues to increase steadily, with the rate in February at 8.7 per cent, up from 8.0 per cent at the start of 2002 (figure 2). There has been a gradual increase in the unemployment rate from the recent trough of 7.6 per cent in quarter one 2001. Similarly employment growth contracted for the fifth consecutive quarter in the fourth quarter of 2002, with annual growth figures for the quarter showing a decline of 0.9 per cent, accelerating from a decline of 0.7 per cent in the previous quarter.

## Figure 2

GDP : Unemployment percentage of the workforce


Having hovered between 1.0 per cent and 1.1 per cent between 2001
quarter three and 2002 quarter two and despite the increase in unemployment, eamings growth has picked up in the year to the fourth quarter, growing by 2.4 per cent, the largest growth in earnings since 2000 quarter four.

## France

The latest data show that growth in the French economy slowed in the fourth quarter to 0.2 per cent, having grown by 0.3 per cent in the previous quarter. Overall in 2002, the economy grew by 1.1 per cent, the lowest growth rate since 1996.

The French economy has slowed significantly over the last two years, in line with global trends, although it outperformed the EU in the first quarter of this year. Consumer spending (helped by recent income tax cuts of five per cent in September) and government consumption drove growth in both 2002 as a whole and 2002 quarter four. This was offset by falls in investment and stocks (which has made a negative contribution to quarterly GDP in six of the last eight quarters).

Industrial production contracted in France in the latest quarter, by 0.1 per cent, the second consecutive quarter of negative growth in the index. Quarter four's contraction was driven by a sharp fall in December, which wiped out the November rebound, although the index has rebounded again in January. Overall in 2002, the IOP contracted by 0.9 per cent having made an equivalent positive contribution to annual GDP growth in the previous year (figure 3).

Figure 3
France : IOP
growth


Consumer price inflation has continued to rise steadily since the second half of 2002. Growth in the index in the year to February was 2.6 per cent, the highest growth since June 1992. The increase was due to a strong rebound in the prices of clothing and footwear and the increase in oil prices. Similarly, producer prices have been rising since the second half of 2002, having fallen in the previous five months. The PPI increased
from 0.5 per cent in January to 0.7 per cent in February.

The French unemployment rate, like most major economies has also been rising steadily over the past year and now stands at 9.1 per cent of the workforce in February; this rate was last seen in August 2000. Employment growth also continuedits slowdown in the fourth quarter of 2002, with an annual rate of 0.4 per cent, well down on growth of 2.3 per cent at the start of 2001.

Following on from the labour market conditions, annual eamings growth continued to ease, slowing from 4.1 per cent in the fourth quarter of 2001 to 3.4 in the fourth quarter of 2002.

## Italy

Data for 2002 quarter four show the Italian economy growing by 0.4 per cent, following growth of 0.3 per cent in quarter three. The Italian economy is alone in the major economies in seeing an acceleration of growth through 2002. Overall in 2002, the economy grew by 0.4 per cent compared to growth of 1.8 per cent in the previous year and down from 3.1 per cent in 2000.

Unilike France and Germany where consumer demand has been fairly weak, in Italy it was strong particularly in the last two quarters of 2002 and was the main driver of growth in quarters three and four, contributing 0.5 percentage points and 0.6 percentage points to quarterly GDP growth respectively (figure 4). Also while investment was contracting in most majoreconomies, in Italy investment demand has also supported GDP growth strongly in the last two quarters of 2002 and made a positive contribution to GDP in 2002 of 0.1 per cent.

Figure 4
Consumer demand contributions to quarterly GDP: Italy, Germany and France
quarters


However, these contributions were offset by weak or negative growth in
government demand and trade.

Having grown in quarter three by 0.5 per cent and in the two preceding quarters before then, the IOP contracted in the fourth quarter by an equivalent rate. Industrial production has contracted for all four quarters of 2001. Annual figures show that for 2002 as a whole, the index contracted by 1.4 per cent, following a contraction of 1.0 per cent in the previous year. More generally, the IOP has contracted in Italy in four years out of the last seven.

Inflation in Italy had stabilised somewhat for the past three months since November at 2.8 per cent, but fell by 0.2 percentage points in February to 2.6 per cent, although this is still above the ECB's ceiling of 2.0 per cent. However the increase in the CPI in the last few months can be atributed in part to the recent increases in oil prices. The PPI also grew in the second half of 2002 and has continued to grow in 2003 with the index growing from 2.4 per cent in January to 2.8 per cent in February.

Figures on the Italian labour market show unemployment in 2002 flat at 9.0 per cent, but improved on 9.5 per cent in 2001. Employment growth Was 0.9 per cent in the year to the fourth quarter of 2002 down from growth of 1.3 per cent in the year to quarter three.

Eamings growth picked up in the year to the fourth quarter to 2.8 per cent, but the figures are volatile from quarter to quarter.

## USA

The latest figures for the US economy for 2002 quarter four show the economy growing by 0.3 per cent, following strong growth in the previous quarter of 1.0 per cent.

Quarterly GDP growth in 2002 has been below growth rates seen in the 1990s although performance has been better than in every quarter in 2001 except quarter four. Overall, growth in 2002 was 2.4 per cent, diven mainly by strong consumer spending (stimulated in part by interest free credit on car deals) and strong government demand. The slightly weaker performance in quarter four is largely due to much weaker consumer spending as the impact of the ono-off factors faded and also to a fall in exports. Import growth also weakened substantially in the last two quarters of 2002.

The index of production contracted in quarter four for the first time in 2002 , by 0.9 per cent. Overall in 2002 , the index contracted by 0.8 per cent which although negative is an improvement over the previous year's 3.5 per cent contraction. The index has rebounded strongly in January showing a month on month increase of 0.8 per cent followed by an 0.1 per cent increase in February.

Inflationary pressures had remained subdued since January 2002, and only started increasing in October. This increase has been more marked in the first two month of 2003 when inflation grew by 0.4 percentage points and stands at 3.0 per cent in February. This is the highest rate since June 2001. The Producer prices index also shows prices increasing substantially at the factory gate in February by 4.3 per cent (the highest rate since July 2000) compared to an increase in January of 3.2 per cent (figure 5 ). These latest increases may be due

## Figure 5
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in part to the recent increase in oil prices.

The US saw a sharp increase in unemployment in 2001 from 4.1 per cent in January to 5.8 per cent in December. The deterioration slowed somewhat in the first threemonths of 2002 , but the volatility in the figures since then offers no clear signs of recovery. The latest data shows the unemployment rate rising to 6.0 per cent in December and falling back slightly in 2003, with the rate in February at 5.8 per cent. Annual figures show that for 2002, unemployment was 5,8 per cent up from 4.8 per cent in the previous year.

Average earnings growth feil in the year to February to 2.4 per cent from 3.3 per cent in the previous month, possibly reflecting the slight deterioration in the labour market between January and February.

Japan

The Japanese economy grew by 0.5 per cent in the fourth quarter of 2002, following growth of 0.8 per cent in the previous quarter (figure 6).

Japan has had low or negative GDP growth since 1997 (except in 2000 when growth was 2.7 per cent, although this was still below the growth rates for most major economies for that year). Annual figures for 2002 shows the economy growing by just 0.3 per cent, similar to the
previous year. The stronger growth in the later quarters of 2002 has been driven by a combination of stronger consumer demand (atthough this fell back again in 2002 quarter four), substantial stockbuilding (particularly in quarters two and three), and a fairly strong rebound in exports. Consumer demand has been weak especially in the three years prior to 2001 possibly due to falling prices. Export growth has also been low due in part to the global economic slowdown. Investment spending contracted in 1998, 1999, 2001 and 2002.

Having shown strong growth in quarters two and three; the index of production has again contracted in quarter four by 0.9 per cent. Overall in 2002, the index contracted by 1.5 per cent, which, although negative, is a

Figure 6
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substantial improvement over the previous year's contraction of 7.0 per cent.

Consumer and producer price falls continue the deflation that began in mid-1998. Figures for the year to February show the consumer prices index falling by 0.2 per cent. Producer prices also show a similar story.

However, there has been some improvement to the unemployment rate in February with the rate at 5.2 per cent, down from 5.5 per cent in the previous month. Recent rates of unemployment are very high by historical standards for Japan (unprecedented since 1960 when OECD records began). Employment growth is also negative, declining by 1.1 percent in the year to 2002 quarter four.

Despite the present unemployment situation, eamings growth declines have been reversed in quarter four to show a moderate increase in eamings of 0.1 per cent in the year to the fourth quarter. This is a significant improvement over the previous quarter when earnings were 2.2 per cent lower than in the same quarter of the previous year.

## World Trade

Some data for world trade now extends to quarter three and generally shows a fall back in trade from the levels seen in the first half of 2002.

Growth in total manufactures exports slowed considerably from 3.8 per cent in quarter two to 1.9 per cent in quarter three. The slowdown was primarily due to slowing export growth in OECD countries (figure 7). On the export of goods side, OECD exports slowed from 3.8 per cent in quarter two to just 1.5 per cent in quarter three.

Import data for quarter three is only available for OECD countries and shows that import of manufactures also slowed considerably from 3.3 per cent to 1.6 per cent. Similarly, imports of goods data shows OECD imports slowing from 3.7 per cent in quarter two to 1.7 per cent in quarter Figure 7
OECD exports of manufactures
growth
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three.

## Notes

The series presented here are taken from the OECD's Main Economic Indicators and are shown for each of the G7 (except the UK) economies and for the European Union (EU15) countries in aggregate. The definitions and methodologies used conform to SNA 93.

Comparisons of indicators over the same period should be treated with caution, as the length and timing of the economic cycles varies across countries. For world trade, goods includes manufactures, along with food, beverages and tobacco, basic materials and fuels.

Data for EU15, France, Germany, Italy, the USA and Japan are all available on an SNA93 basis. Cross country comparisons are now more valid
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|  | GDP | Contribution to change in GDP |  |  |  |  |  | 10 P | Salele | CPI | PPI | Earninga | Empl ${ }^{1}$ | Unempl |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PFC | GFE | GFCF | ChgSik | Exporta | $\begin{array}{r} \text { less } \\ \text { Imports } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage change on a year earlier |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ILFY | HUBW | HUBX | HUBY | HUBZ | HUCA | HUCB | ILGS | ILHM | HVLL | ILAF | 1 LAO | ILIG | GABD |
| 1996 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 0.4 | -0.2 | -0.4 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.7 | -1.1 | 1.5 | -1.2 | 3.5 | -0.4 | 8.7 |
| 1997 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.2 | - | 2.9 | 2.0 | 3.7 | -1.5 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 1.5 | -0.3 | 9.6 |
| 1998 | 17 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 4.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | -0.4 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 9.1 |
| 1999 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 0.8 | -0.4 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.6 | -1.0 | 2.6 | 0.9 | 8.4 |
| 2000 | 3.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 8.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 7.8 |
| 2001 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.2 | -1.1 | -0.6 | 1.8 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 1.9 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 0.4 | 7.8 |
| 2002 | 0.2 | $-0.3$ | 0.3 | -1.4 | - | 0.8 | -0.7 | -1.4 | -1.8 | 1.5 | -0.4 | 1.7 | -0.6 | 8.2 |
| 1999 Q3 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 0.2 | 1.0 | -0.6 | 2.0 | 2.5 | 1.9 | -0.2 | 0.7 | -0.7 | 2.7 | 1.4 | 8.4 |
| Q4 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 1.2 | -0.2 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 3.0 | 0.8 | 8.2 |
| 2000 Q1 | 2.9 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.8 | -0.1 | 4.4 | 2.8 | 5.1 | -0.2 | 1.5 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 0.5 | 7.9 |
| Q2 | 4.5 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 6.7 | 4.4 | 1.1 | 2.6 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 7.8 |
| Q3 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 4.0 | 3.0 | 7.1 | 1.6 | 1.3 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 7.7 |
| Q4 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 4.9 | 4.4 | 5.9 | -0.1 | 1.8 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 7.6 |
| 2001 Q1 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 0.2 | -0.4 | -0.3 | 3.5 | 2.3 | 6.0 | 1.0 | 1.7 | 4.8 | 2.0 | 0.7 | 7.6 |
| Q2 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 | -1.0 | -0,3 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 1.4 | - | 2.5 | 4.7 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 7.7 |
| Q3 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.2 | -1.5 | -1.0 | 1.8 | -0.1 | -1.2 | 0.6 | 2.2 | 2.6 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 7.8 |
| Q4 | 0.1 | 0.9 | - | -1.6 | -0.9 | -0.2 | -1.8 | -3.7 | -0.7 | 1.6 | 0.3 | 1.0 | -0.1 | 7.9 |
| 2002 Q1 | -0.2 | -0.3 | 0.2 | -1.4 | $-0.8$ | $\stackrel{\square}{\square}$ | -2.0 | -4.0 | -2.9 | 1.9 | -0.2 | 1.1 | -0.2 | 8.0 |
| Q2 | -0.1 | -0.7 | 0.4 | -1.8 | 0.1 | 0.6 | -1.3 | -1.8 | -1.9 | 1.3 | -0.9 | 1.0 | -0.5 | 8.2 |
| Q3 | 0.5 | -0.4 | 0.4 | -1.4 | 0.5 | 1.3 | - | -0.5 | -1.0 | 1.1 | -1.0 | 2.1 | -0.7 | 8.3 |
| Q4 | 0.7 | -0.1 | 0.2 | -1.0 | 0.4 | 1.8 | 0.6 | 0.8 | -1.5 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 2.4 | -0.9 | 8.4 |
| 2002 Mar | - | " | . | " | * | " | * | -3.1 | -2.5 | 2.0 | -0.2 | - | * | 8.0 |
| Apr | . | ., | .. | . | .. | .. | . | -1.4 | -1.1 | 1.5 | -0.8 | .. | . | 8.0 |
| May | . | .. | . | . | .. | " | .. | -3.0 | -2.2 | 1.2 | -0.9 | " | . | 8.2 |
| Jun | .. | " | - | $\cdots$ | . | * | " | -0.8 | -2.6 | 1.0 | -1.1 | . | " | 8.3 |
| Jul | . | * | " | $\because$ | . | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | -0.5 | -1.0 | 1.2 | -1.0 | * | " | 8.2 |
| Aug | .. | . | . | , | . | . | . | -0.7 | -1.5 | 1.2 | -1.0 | " | * | 8.3 |
| Sep | , | . | . | .. | * | , | . | -0.3 | -0.5 | 1.1 | -0.8 |  | * | 8.3 |
| Oct | . | . | .. | .. | - | . | .. | - | 1.5 | 1.3 | 0.3 | * | . | 8.4 |
| Nov | .. | * | .. | . | . | .. | * | 3.1 | -3.5 | 1.2 | 0.4 |  | - | 8.4 |
| Dec | .. | " | " | " | " | * | . | -0.6 | -2.4 | 1.2 | 0.9 | " | * | 8.5 |
| 2003 Jan | . | * | * | .. | " | * | . | 2.1 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 1.6 | " | " | 8.6 |
| Feb | " | * | .. | . | .. | . | . | . | . | 1.2 | 1.9 | . | .. | 8.7 |
| Percentage changa on prevlous quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | HUCE | HUCF | HUCG | HUCH | ILHC | ILHW |  |  |  | 1 LIG |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} 1999 \text { Q3 } \\ \text { Q4 } \end{array}$ | 1.5 | 0.8 0.5 | 0.1 0.1 | 0.5 -0.1 | $0 . \overline{2}$ | 1.0 0.7 | 0.7 0.3 | 1.6 1.3 | 1.4 1.8 |  |  |  | 1.0 0.6 |  |
| 2000 Q1 | 0.7 | - | 0.1 | 0.3 | - | 1.4 | 1.1 | 0.9 | -0.1 |  |  |  | -1.8 |  |
| Q2 | 1.1 | 0.8 | -0.1 | 0.2 | - | 0.9 | 0.8 | 2.6 | 1.1 |  |  |  | 1.1 |  |
| Q3 | - | -0.1 | -0.1 | 0.2 | - | 0.9 | 0.8 | 2.1 | -1.3 |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |
| Q4 | 0.1 | -0.3 | 0.4 | -0.2 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  | 0.9 |  |
| 2001 Q1 | 0.6 | 0.8 | -0.1 | -0.6 | -0.5 | - | -1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |  |  | -1.9 |  |
| Q2 | - | 0.5 | - | -0.3 | -0.1 | -0.2 | -0.1 | -1.8 | 0.2 |  |  |  | 1.0 |  |
| Q3 | -0.2 | -0.1 | - | -0.4 | -0.7 | 0.3 | -0.7 | -0.5 | -0.7 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| Q4 | -0.3 | -0.3 | 0.2 | -0.3 | 0.4 | $-0.4$ | - | -2.4 | -1.1 |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| 2002 Q1 | 0.3 | -0.4 | 0.1 | -0.4 | -0.4 | 0.2 | -1.1 | 0.7 | -1.3 |  |  |  | -2.0 |  |
| Q2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | -0.7 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 1.2 |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |
| Q3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | $\overline{1}$ | - | -0.3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Q4 | - | - | -0.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.6 | -1.1 | -1.6 |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |
| Percentage change on previous month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ILKC | ILKM |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 Mar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.5 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| May Jun |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.2 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  | , |
| Jun |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.0 | -1.2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.9 | 0.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aug |  |  |  | \% |  |  |  | 1.4 | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sep |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.6 | 0.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.4 | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 | -2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dec |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -3.5 | -0.6 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.8 | 2.3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | . |  |  |  |  |  |

GDP $=$ Gross Domestic Product at constant market pricos PFC $=$ Private Final Consumption at constant market prices GFC $=$ Government Final Consumption at constant market prices GFCF = Gross Fixed Capital Formation at constant market prices GFCF $=$ Gross Fixed Capital Formation at constant m
ChgStk $=$ Change in Stocks at constant market prices
ChyStk $=$ Change in Stocks at constant m
Exports $=$ Exports of goods and services
Exports $=$ Exports of goods and services
imports $=$ Imports of goods and services
Imports = Imports of goods
loP $=$ Industrial Production

Sales $=$ Retail Sales volume
CPI = Consumer Prices measurement not uniform among countries
PPI $=$ Producer Prices (manufacturing)
Earnings = Average Earnings (manufacturing), definitions of coverage and treatment vary among countries
Empl = Total Employment not seasonally adjusted
Unempl = Standardised Unemployment rates: percentage of total workforce Source: OECD - SNA93

|  | Contrlbution to change in GDP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GDP | PFC | GFC. | GFCF | ChgStk | Exports | $\begin{array}{r} \text { loss } \\ \text { Imports } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | IoP | Sales | CPI | PPi ${ }^{1}$ | Earnings | Empl ${ }^{2}$ | Unempl |
| Percentage change on a year earlier |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ILFZ | HUBK | HUBL | HUBM | HUBN | HUBO | HUBP | ILGT | ILHN | HXAA | ILAG | LLAP | ILIH | GABC |
| 1998 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.5 | - | -0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.9 | -0.3 | 2.0 | -2.7 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 11.9 |
| 1997 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 0.5 | - | 0.1 | 2.7 | 1.5 | 3.9 | 1.1 | 1.2 | -0.6 | 2.6 | 0.7 | 11.8 |
| 1998 | 3.5 | 1.9 | - | 1.3 | 0.7 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 5.2 | 2.6 | 0.8 | -0.9 | 2.2 | 2.0 | 11.4 |
| 1999 | 3.2 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 1.6 | -0.3 | 1.1 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 0.5 | -1.6 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 10.7 |
| 2000 | 4.2 | 1.5 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 3.7 | 3.7 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 2.1 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 9.3 |
| 2001 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 0.5 | 0.5 | -0.9 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.8 | -0.2 | 1.7 | 1.5 | 4.2 | 1.7 | 8.5 |
| 2002 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.8 | -0.1 | -0.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | -0.9 | - | 1.9 | 0.1 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 8.7 |
| 1999 Q3 | 3.3 | 2.0 | 0.3 | 1.6 | $-0.7$ | 1.5 | 1.4 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 0.5 | -1.6 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 10.6 |
| Q4 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 1.6 | $-0.1$ | 2.4 | 2.4 | 4.3 | 2.1 | 1.0 | - | 3.4 | 2.5 | 10.2 |
| 2000 Q1 | 4.6 | 2.1 | 0.5 | 1.8 | 0.1 | 3.2 | 3.1 | 3.8 | 1.9 | 1.5 | 1.2 | 5.2 | 2.6 | 9.8 |
| Q2 | 4.5 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 1.7 | 0.1 | 3.9 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 2.1 | 5.4 | 2.9 | 9.4 |
| Q3 | 3.9 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 3.5 | 4.1 | 3.7 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 2.7 | 5.2 | 2.8 | 9.1 |
| Q4 | 3.7 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 4.0 | 4.1 | 2.7 | -1.3 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 5.0 | 2.7 | 8.8 |
| 2001 Q1 | 3.0 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 1.1 | -0.4 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 4.3 | 2.3 | 8.6 |
| Q2 | 2.0 | 1.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 | -0.3 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.7 | -0.4 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 4.2 | 1.8 | 8.5 |
| Q3 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | -1.1 | -0.2 | -0.3 | 1.5 | -0.7 | 1,9 | 1.1 | 4.2 | 1.4 | 8.5 |
| Q4 | 0.4 | 1.5 | 0.5 | - | -2.0 | $-1.7$ | -2.1 | -2.1 | -0.8 | 1.4 | 0.6 | 4.1 | 1.1 | 8.6 |
| 2002 Q1 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.7 | -0.1 | -0.7 | -1.0 | -0.7 | -1.7 | -1.6 | 2.2 | -0.2 | 3.9 | 0.7 | 8.6 |
| Q2 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.8 | - | -0.9 | 0.3 | 0.3 | -0.7 | -0.6 | 1.6 | -0.1 | 3.9 | 0.5 | 8.7 |
| Q3 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.7 | -0.2 | -0.7 | 1.0 | 0.6 | -1.9 | 1.0 | 1.8 | 0.3 | 3.5 | 0.5 | 8.8 |
| Q4 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.9 | -0.2 | -0.1 | 1.4 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 0.3 | 3.4 | 0.4 | 8.9 |
| 2002 Mar | . | * | .. | * | * | .. | * | -1.0 | -0.6 | 2.1 | -0.3 | . | - | 8.6 |
| Apr | , | . | .. | .. | . | . | .. | -0.3 | -0.6 | 1.9 | -0.1 | - | - | 8.7 |
| May | . | " | " | . | .. | ., | .. | -0.9 | 2.0 | 4.5 | -0.1 | - | .. | 8.7 |
| Jun | " | * | " | * | * | $\cdots$ | * | -1.0 | -3.1 | 1.5 | -0.1 | .. | .. | 8.7 |
| Jul | * | * | . | * | * | " | " | -2.4 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 0.3 | . | .. | 8.7 |
| Aug | .. | .. | . | .. | . | -. | . | -2.0 | 2.7 | 1.8 | 0.4 | .. | ./ | 8.8 |
| Sep | " | .. | . | .. | , | - | , | -1.4 | -1.3 | 1.8 | 0.4 | " | - | 8.8 |
| Oct | .. | . | . | - | , | ., | - | - | 3.0 | 1.9 | 0.4 | . | " | 8.8 |
| Nov | .. | . | .. | . | " | . | . | 1.5 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 0.3 | - | " | 8.9 |
| Dec | .. | * | .. | .. | .. | .. | . | -0.1 | -1.8 | 2.3 | 0.4 | - | * | 8.9 |
| 2003 Jan | - | - | * | " | * | * | " | 1.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 0.5 | . | - | 9.0 |
| Feb | . | п | * | .. | " | . | . | . | -0.7 | 2.6 | 0.7 | " | " | 9.1 |
| Percentage change on previous quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | IL.GJ | HUBQ | HUBR | HUBS | HUBT | HUBU | HUBV | ILHD | ILHX |  |  |  | ILIR |  |
| 1999 Q3 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -0.6 | 1.2 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 1.3 |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |
| Q4 | 1.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 1.0 |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |
| 200001 | 1.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.6 | - | 0.9 | 0.9 | -0.3 | -0.2 |  |  |  | 0.8 |  |
| Q2 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.4 | -0.1 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.5 | -0.7 |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |
| Q3 | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 1.4 | - |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| Q4 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | -0.4 |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| 2001 Q1 | 0.4 | 0.6 | - | 0.1 | -0.8 | -0.1 | -0.6 | -0.3 | 2.3 |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |
| Q2 | -0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | -0.1 | - | -0.8 | -0.6 | -0.4 | -2.2 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| Q3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.1 | -0.5 | -0.2 | -0.2 | 1.1 | -0.3 |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Q4 | -0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | $-0.1$ | -0.7 | -0.5 | -0,8 | -2.4 | -0.5 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| 2002 Q1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 1.4 |  |  |  | - |  |
| Q2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | - | -0.1 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.6 | -1.2 |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Q3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | -0.1 | -0.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | -0.2 | 1.3 |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Q4 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | $-0.1$ | -0.1 | -0.1 | -0.1 | -0.1 | -0.5 |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Porcentage change on previous month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ILKD ILKN |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 Mar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 0.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apr |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0.4 | -2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| May |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $-0.4$ | 1.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jun |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | -2.4 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.2 | 3.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aug |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.3 | 1.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sep |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.3 | $-3.8$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.9 | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dec |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.7 | -2.7 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.5 | 4.1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fab |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | -2.0 |  |  |  |  |  |

 GFC $=$ Government Final Consumption at constant market prices GFCF = Gross Fixed Capital Formation at constant market prices ChgStk = Change in Stocks at constant market prices
ChgStk $=$ Change in Stocks at constant m
Exports $=$ Exports of goods and services
Imports $=$ Imports of goods and services
1 Producer prices in manufactured goods
2 Excludes members of armed foces

Sales $=$ Retail Sales volume
CPI $=$ Consumer Prices, measurement not uniform among countries
$\mathrm{PPI}=$ Producer Prices (manufacturing)
Earnings $=$ Average Wage Earnings (manufacturing), definitlons of coverage and treatment vary among countries
Empl = Total Employment not seasonally adjusted
Unempl = Standardised Unemployment rates: percentage of total workforce loP=Index of Production

|  | Contribution to change in GDP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GDP | PFC | GFC | GFCF | ChgStk | Exports | $\begin{array}{r} \text { less } \\ \text { Imports } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 10 P | Sales | CPI | PPI | Earnings | Empl | Unempl |
| Percentage change on a year earlier |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ILGA | HUCl | HUCJ | HUCK | HUCL | HUCM | HUCN | ILGU | ILHO | HYAA | ILAH | ILAQ | 1 LII | GABE |
| 1996 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.7 | -0.7 | 0.2 | -0.1 | -1.6 | 1.2 | 4.0 | 1.9 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 11.5 |
| 1997 | 2.0 | 1.9 | - | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 2.3 | 3.8 | 0.9 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 3.9 | 0.4 | 11.6 |
| 1998 | 1.8 | 1.9 | - | 0.7 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 0.1 | 3.0 | 1.1 | 11.7 |
| 1999 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 1.0 | 0.3 | - | 1.4 | -0.2 | 1.0 | 1.7 | -0.2 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 11.3 |
| 2000 | 3.1 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 1.4 | -1.1 | 3,3 | 2.4 | 4.1 | -0.5 | 2.5 | 6.0 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 10.4 |
| 2001 | 1.8 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.6 | - | 0.3 | 0.3 | -1.0 | -0.6 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 9.5 |
| 2002 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -0.3 | 0.4 | -1.4 | $-0.4$ | 2.5 | 0.2 | 2.6 | 1.4 | 9.0 |
| 1999 Q3 | 1.5 | 1.6 | 0.2 | 1.0 | - | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.7 | - | 1.9 | 1.2 | 11.2 |
| Q4 | 3.1 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 1.5 | -0.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 3.0 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 11.0 |
| 2000 Q1 | 3.4 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 1.6 | -1.3 | 4.0 | 2.6 | 3.6 | - | 2.4 | 4.7 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 10.9 |
| Q2 | 3.3 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 1.6 | -0.9 | 3.0 | 2.6 | 5.7 | - | 2.6 | 6.2 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 10.5 |
| Q3 | 3.0 | 1.7 | 0.3 | 1.6 | -1.4 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 3.6 | 1.3 | 2.6 | 6.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 10.3 |
| Q4 | 2.9 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 0.9 | -0.8 | 2.6 | 1.8 | 3.8 | -3.2 | 2.6 | 6.5 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 9.9 |
| 2001 Q1 | 2.6 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.8 | -0.5 | 1.8 | 1.2 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 2.9 | 4.7 | 2.2 | 3.2 | 9.7 |
| Q2 | 2.3 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | -0.2 | 1.5 | 1.1 | -0.4 | -0.3 | 3.0 | 3.2 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 9.5 |
| Q3 | 1.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.8 | -0.8 | -0.4 | -1.9 | -1.6 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 9.4 |
| Q4 | 0.7 | - | 0.6 | 0.4 | -0.2 | -1.0 | -0.8 | -4.9 | -1.0 | 2.5 | -1.1 | 2.1 | 1.2 | 9.2 |
| 2002 Q1 | - | -0.2 | 0.5 | -0.3 | 1.5 | $-3.0$ | -1.5 | -3.8 | - | 2.4 | -1.0 | 2.2 | 1.7 | 9.0 |
| Q2 | 0.1 | -0.2 | 0.4 | -0.3 | 0.6 | -0.7 | -0.4 | -2.2 | -1,3 | 2.2 | -0.6 | 3.1 | 1.9 | 9.0 |
| Q3 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.3 | -0.4 | 1.2 | 1.4 | -0.4 | -0.6 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 2.3 | 1.3 | 9.0 |
| Q4 | 1.0 | 1.0 | - | 0.8 | - | 1.3 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 2.8 | 0.9 | 8.9 |
| 2002 Mar | * | " | . | . | * | * | * | -3.3 | 1.0 | 2.5 | -0.8 | 2.8 | . | 9.0 |
| Apr | . | . | .. | . | . | .. | . | $-3.0$ | -1.9 | 2.3 | -0.8 | 3.1 | .. | 9.0 |
| May | .. | . | .. | . | .. | .. | . | -1.6 | -1.0 | 2.3 | -0.4 | 3.1 | . | 9.0 |
| Jun | . | - | .. | ., | .. | .. | . | -1.8 | -0.9 | 2.2 | -0.4 | 3.2 | .. | 9.0 |
| Jul | - | " | * | " | * | * | " | -0.3 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 0.4 | 2.2 | * | 9.0 |
| Aug | , | . | . | . | .. | , | . | -0.9 | -0.9 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 2.2 | .. | 9.0 |
| Sep | . | . | .. | .. | * | . | * | 0.2 | -2.0 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 2.4 | . | 9.0 |
| Oct | , | .. | . | " | . | - | " | - | 1.0 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 2.8 | " | 8.9 |
| Nov | .. | .. | " | ${ }^{\prime}$ | " | " | " | 1.9 | - | 2.8 | 1.5 | 2.8 | " | 8.9 |
| Dec | .. | . | . | . | * | ., | .. | 0.4 | - | 2.8 | 2.0 | 2.7 | * | 8.9 |
| 2003 Jan | * | . | ** | " | * | . | * | 0.5 | - | 2.8 | 2.4 | $\cdots$ |  | 9,0 |
| Feb | . | .. | . | . | - | .. | . | .. | . | 2.6 | 2.8 | " | " |  |
| Percentage change on previous quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1999 Q3 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 仡 | 0.3 | -0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 2.2 | LLH |  |  |  | 1.4 |  |
| Q4 | 1.1 | 0.4 | - | 0.6 | 0.1 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.4 | 1.3 |  |  |  | -0.1 |  |
| 2000 Q1 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.4 | -0.6 | 1.6 | 1.1 | 0.3 | -1.6 |  |  |  | -1.2 |  |
| Q2 | 0.4 | 0.4 | - | 0.4 | 0.2 | -0.5 | - | 1.7 | 0.3 |  |  |  | 1.6 |  |
| Q3 | 0.6 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | -1.0 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 1.3 |  |  |  | 1.9 |  |
| Q4 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.2 | -0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 1.5 | -3.2 |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| 200101 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | -0.4 | 0.9 | 0.5 | -0.5 | 2.3 |  |  |  | -0.8 |  |
| Q2 | . | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.5 | -0.6 | - | -1.6 | $-0.6$ |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |
| Q3 | - | -0.2 | 0.1 | - | $\cdots$ | -1.0 | -1.2 | -1.3 | - |  |  |  | 1.7 |  |
| Q4 | -0.1 | - | 0.2 | -0.1 | -0,3 | -0.1 | -0.2 | -1.6 | -2.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 Q1 | - | -0.2 | 0.1 | -0.3 | 1.4 | -1.1 | -0.2 | 0.7 | 3.3 |  |  |  | -0.4 |  |
| Q2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | -0.5 | 1.5 | 1.0 | 0.1 | -1.9 |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| Q3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | - | 0.6 | -1.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.6 |  |  |  | 1.1 |  |
| Q4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | -0.1 | 0.4 | 0.1 | - | 0.6 | -0.5 | -1.6 |  |  |  | -0.4 |  |
| Percentage change on previous month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 Mar ( ILKE ILKO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Apr |  |  |  | $1=$ |  |  |  | -1.2 | -2.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jun $\quad-0.6$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Jul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.0 | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| AugSep |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.2 | - |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 | -4.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Oct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.7 | 3.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.6 | -1.9 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dec |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.6 | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - | 4.0 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | .. |  |  |  |  |  |

[^0]Sales $=$ Retail Sales volume
CPI $=$ Consumer Prices, measurement not uniform among countries
PPI $=$ Producer Prices (manufacturing)
Earnings $=$ Average Wage Earnings (manufacturing), definitions of coverage and treatment vary among countries
Empl = Total Employment not seasonally adjusted
Unempl = Standardised Unemployment not seasonally adjusted
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|  | GDP | Contribution to change in GDP |  |  |  |  |  | 10 P | Sales | CPI | PPI | Earnings | Empl ${ }^{1}$ | Unempl |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PFC | GFC | GFCF | ChgStk | Exports | $\begin{array}{r} \text { less } \\ \text { Imports } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage change on a year earlier |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ILGC | HUDG | HUDH | HUDI | HUDJ | HUDK | HUDL | H.GW | ILHO | ILAA | ILA.J | ILAS | ILIK | GADO |
| 1996 | 3.6 | 2.1 | 0.1 | 1.5 | - | 0.9 | 1.0 | 4.3 | 5.6 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 3.3 | 1.4 | 5.4 |
| 1997 | 4.4 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 0.4 | 1.4 | 1.7 | 7.4 | 4.9 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 3.2 | 2.3 | 4.9 |
| 1998 | 4.3 | 3.2 | 0.2 | 2.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.6 | 5.6 | 7.1 | 1.6 | -1.1 | 2.5 | 1.5 | 4.5 |
| 1999 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 0.4 | 1.6 | -0.2 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 4.2 | 8.8 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 2.9 | 1.5 | 4.2 |
| 2000 | 3.8 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 1.2 | - | 1.1 | 2.0 | 4.7 | 5.5 | 3.4 | 4.1 | 3.5 | 2.5 | 4.0 |
| 2001 | 0.3 | 1.7 | 0.5 | -0.6 | -1.4 | -0.7 | -0.5 | -3.5 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 0.7 | 3.2 | - | 4.8 |
| 2002 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 0.6 | -0.4 | 0.7 | -0.2 | 0.6 | -0.8 | 5.3 | 1.5 | $-0.6$ | 3.2 | -0.3 | 5.8 |
| 1999 Q3 | 4.2 | 3.4 | 0.5 | 1.7 | -0.3 | 0.7 | 1.8 | 4.3 | 9.6 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 3.7 | 1.4 | 4.2 |
| Q4 | 4.3 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0.1 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 5.0 | 8.2 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 1.5 | 4.1 |
| 2000 Q1 | 4.2 | 3.4 | 0.4 | 1.6 | -0.4 | 1.0 | 2.0 | 5.2 | 7.8 | 3.2 | 4.6 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 4.0 |
| Q2 | 4.9 | 3.0 | 0.6 | 1.4 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 2.2 | 6.0 | 5,8 | 3.3 | 4.4 | 3.3 | 2.8 | 4.0 |
| Q3 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 1.4 | 2.2 | 4.8 | 5.2 | 3.5 | 3.9 | 2.9 | 2.3 | 4.1 |
| Q4 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 0.7 | -0.4 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 2.3 | 3.9 |
| 2001 Q1 | 1.5 | 1.9 | 0.5 | 0.1 | -0.8 | 0.4 | 0.8 | -0.2 | 2.9 | 3.4 | 2.1 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 4.2 |
| Q2 | -0,1 | 1.6 | 0.4 | -0.5 | -1.6 | -0.4 | -0.2 | -3.4 | 4.5 | 3.4 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 0.1 | 4.5 |
| Q3 | -0.4 | 1.2 | 0.5 | -0.8 | -1.4 | -1.3 | -1.2 | -4.6 | 3.8 | 2.7 | 0.6 | 3.4 | - | 4.8 |
| Q4 | 0.1 | 1.9 | 0.7 | -1,0 | -1.7 | -1.4 | -1.4 | -5.7 | 7.9 | 1.8 | -1.5 | 3.4 | -0.8 | 5.6 |
| 2002 Q1 | 1.4 | 2.0 | 0.7 | -0.9 | -7 | -1.1 | -0.7 | $-3.8$ | 5.9 | 1.2 | -1.8 | 4.0 | -1.2 | 5.8 |
| 02 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 0.7 | -0.6 | 0.7 | -0.4 | 0.4 | -1.3 | 5.5 | 1.3 | -1.7 | 3.4 | -0.5 | 5.8 |
| Q3 | 3.3 | 2.6 | 0.6 | -0.2 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 7.0 | 1.5 | -0.6 | 2.8 | 0.1 | 5.8 |
| Q4 | 2.9 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 0.2 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 2.7 | 0.3 | 5.9 |
| 2002 Mar | .. | .. | - | .. | .. | . | .. | -3.0 | 6.0 | 1.5 | -1.3 | 4.2 | -1.2 | 5.7 |
| Apr | - | .. | " | $\because$ | .. | . | . | -2.1 | 5.8 | 1.6 | -1.4 | 3.4 | -0.8 | 5.9 |
| May | .. | .. | .. | .. | , | .. | .. | -1.3 | 4.4 | 1.2 | -2.2 | 3.4 | -0.5 | 5.8 |
| Jun | . | .. | * | $\cdots$ | . | * | * | -0.3 | 6.2 | 1.1 | -1.6 | 3.3 | -0.5 | 5.8 |
| Jul | * | * | " | * | " | * | " | 0.6 | 6.9 | 1.5 | -0.6 | 2.5 | -0.5 | 5.8 |
| Aug | . | .. | . | . | .. | . | .. | 0.6 | 6.5 | 1.8 | -0.7 | 3.3 | 0.4 | 5.8 |
| Sep | " | " | " | $\cdots$ | - | " | " | 1.2 | 7.6 | 1.5 | -0.5 | 2.5 | 0.4 | 5.7 |
| Oct | " | . | . | " | .. | * | $\because$ | 1.0 | 0.3 | 2.1 | 1.5 | 3.3 | 0.5 | 5.8 |
| Nov | . | - | $\cdots$ | ., | .. | $\stackrel{ }{*}$ | * | 1.8 | 3.5 | 2.2 | 1.5 | 2.5 | 0.2 | 5.9 |
| Dec | . | " | " | " | * | " | " | 1.6 | 5.3 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 2.4 | 0.3 | 6.0 |
| 2003 Jan | . | * | " | $\cdots$ | * | . | . | 1.9 | 5.3 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 5.7 |
| Fob | . | .. | .. | * | . | . | - | 1.7 | 2.2 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 2.4 | 0.7 | 5.8 |
| Percentage change on previous quarter H HUDO |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Parcora | ILGM | HUDM | HUDN | HUDO | HUDP | HUDQ | HUDR | ILHG | ILIA |  |  |  | ILIU |  |
| 1999 Q3 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 1.9 |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| Q4 | 1.7 | 0.8 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.6 | 2.0 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| 2000 Q1 | 0.6 | 0.9 | -0.1 | 0.6 | -0.5 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 2.2 |  |  |  | 0.7 |  |
| Q2 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 1.7 | -0.4 |  |  |  | 1.2 |  |
| 03 | 0.1 | 0.6 | - | - | -0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 1.3 |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Q4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | -0.1 | - | -0.1 | -0.1 | -0.4 | 0.4 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| 2001 Q1 | -0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | - | -0.9 | -0.2 | -0.3 | -1.6 | 1.6 |  |  |  | -0.7 |  |
| Q2 | -0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | -0.4 | -0.3 | -0.4 | -0.3 | -1.5 | 1.2 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |
| Q3 | -0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | -0.4 | - | -0.6 | -0.5 | -1.2 | 0.5 |  |  |  | - |  |
| Q4 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 0.3 | -0.2 | -0.4 | -0.3 | -0.2 | -1.5 | 4.3 |  |  |  | -0.5 |  |
| 2002 Q1 | 1.2 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 | -0.2 |  |  |  | -1.1 |  |
| Q2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | -0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 1.1 | 0.8 |  |  |  | 1.1 |  |
| Q3 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.1 | - | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.9 | 2.0 |  |  |  | 0.6 |  |
| Q4 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | -0.2 | 0.3 | -0.9 | 0.4 |  |  |  | -0.4 |  |
| Percentage change on provious month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ILKG | ILKQ |  |  |  | ILLA |  |
| 2002 Mar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | -0.4 |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Apr |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | 0.8 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| May |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.3 | -0.7 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |
| Jun |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.3 | 1.6 |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |
| Jul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.7 | 1.4 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| Aug |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.2 | 0.4 |  |  |  | -0.2 |  |
| Sep |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.1 | -1.5 |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Oct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.6 | 0.2 |  |  |  | 0.1 |  |
| Nov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.2 | 0.8 |  |  |  | -0.6 |  |
| Dec |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.6 | 1.8 |  |  |  | - |  |
| 2003 Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.8 | 0.2 |  |  |  | -0.5 |  |
| Fob |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.1 | -2,3 |  |  |  | 0.4 |  |

[^1]|  | GDP | Contribution to change in GDP |  |  |  |  |  | $10 \mathrm{P}^{1}$ | Sales | CPI | PP1 | Earnings ${ }^{2}$ | Empl | Unempl |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | PFC | GFC | GFCF | ChgStk | Exports | $\begin{array}{r} \text { lese } \\ \text { Imports } \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| centage change on a year earlier |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ILGD | HUCU | HUCV | HUCW | HUCX | HUCY | HUCZ | ILGX | ILHR | ILAB | ILAK | ILAT | LiL | GADP |
| 1996 | 3.5 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 1.9 | 0.3 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 2.2 | 0.6 | 0.1 | -1.7 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 3.4 |
| 1997 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.2 | - | 1.1 | 0.1 | 4.0 | -2.1 | 1.7 | 0.6 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 3.4 |
| 1998 | -1.2 | - | 0.3 | -1.1 | -0.6 | -0.2 | -0.6 | -6.7 | -6.0 | 0.7 | -1.3 | -0.9 | -0.6 | 4.1 |
| 1999 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.7 | -0.2 | -0.3 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.0 | -2.6 | -0.3 | -1.4 | -0.7 | -0.8 | 4.7 |
| 2000 | 2.7 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 1.3 | 0.7 | 5.2 | -1.1 | -0.7 | 0.1 | 1.7 | -0.3 | 4.7 |
| 2001 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.4 | -0.3 | - | -0.7 | - | -7.0 | -1.2 | -0.7 | -2.4 | - | -0.5 | 5.0 |
| 2002 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.4 | -1.1 | -0.4 | 0.8 | 0.2 | -1.5 | -2.9 | -1.0 | -1.9 | -1.0 | -1.3 | 5.4 |
| 1999 Q3 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 2 | -0,3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 2.7 | -2.2 | $=$ | -1.3 | -0.3 | -0.7 | 4.7 |
| Q4 | -0.5 | -0.9 | 0.7 | 0.2 | -0.2 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 5.1 | -1.1 | -1.0 | -0.5 | -0.3 | -0.2 | 4.6 |
| 2000 Q1 | 1.3 | 0.3 | 0.6 | - | -0.1 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 4.3 | -2.2 | -0.6 | 0.8 | 1.9 | -0.5 | 4.8 |
| Q2 | 1.9 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 6.6 | -1.5 | -0.7 | 0.5 | 2.1 | -0.4 | 4.7 |
| Q3 | 2.8 | - | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0.8 | 5.3 | -0.4 | -0.6 | - | 1.7 | -0.4 | 4.7 |
| Q4 | 6.1 | 1.4 | 0.8 | 1.9 | 0.6 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 4.4 | -0.4 | -0.8 | -0.6 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 4.7 |
| 2001 Q1 | 3.5 | 1.1 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 2.3 | -0.5 | -1.9 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 4.7 |
| Q2 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | -0.6 | 0.2 | -5.2 | -1.1 | -0.7 | -2.1 | 0.5 | -0.4 | 4.9 |
| Q3 | -0.6 | 0.8 | 0.2 | -0.4 | -0.4 | -1.0 | -0.2 | -10.4 | -2.6 | -0.8 | -2.5 | -0.2 | -0.8 | 5.1 |
| Q4 | -2.4 | 0.7 | 0.4 | -2.3 | -0.6 | -1.2 | -0.6 | -12.8 | -3.4 | -1.0 | -3.0 | -0.6 | -1.3 | 5.4 |
| 2002 Q1 | -2.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | -2.2 | -1.6 | $-0.3$ | $-0.5$ | -10.1 | -4.4 | -1.4 | -2.8 | -1.5 | -1.5 | 5.3 |
| Q2 | -0.2 | 0.5 | 0.4 | -1.4 | -0.5 | 0.8 | - | -3.0 | -3.0 | -0.9 | -2.2 | -0.8 | -1.6 | 5.4 |
| Q3 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 0.5 | -1.0 | 0.2 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 3.4 | -2.3 | -0,8 | -1.9 | -2.2 | -1.0 | 5.4 |
| Q4 | 2.8 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 1.8 | 0.8 | 4.9 | -1.9 | -0.5 | -1.1 | 0.1 | -1.1 | 5.4 |
| 2002 Mar | " | . | . | . | * | " | * | -8.5 | -4.4 | -1.2 | -2.7 | -1.0 | -1.3 | 5.3 |
| Apr | . | " | " | , | . | . | . | -6.4 | -3.4 | -1.1 | -2.3 | 0.1 | -1.4 | 5.3 |
| May | * | " | .. | .. | .. | .. | . | -1.6 | -2.3 | -0.9 | -2.2 | -0.4 | -1.9 | 5.4 |
| Jun | . | - | . | .. | .. | . | .. | -1.1 | -3.4 | -0.7 | -2.1 | -1.8 | -1.4 | 5.4 |
| Jul | " | " | .. | - | $\cdots$ | * | $\stackrel{ }{\square}$ | 1.7 | -4.5 | -0.8 | -1.9 | -4.9 | -1.2 | 5.4 |
| Aug | .. | . | * | .. | . | . | . | 2.6 | -1.1 | -0.9 | -1.9 | -2.8 | -1.1 | 5.5 |
| Sop | " | * | " | ., | - | * | . | 5.8 | -1.1 | -0.7 | -1.8 | 1.3 | -0.7 | 5.4 |
| Oct | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | .. | . | 5.5 | -2.3 | -0.8 | -1,3 | 1.0 | -0.8 | 5.5 |
| Nov | .. | .. | . | .. | . | .. | . | 5.9 | -1.1 | -0.4 | -1.1 | 0.5 | -1.3 | 5.3 |
| Dec | .. | . | . | , | " | " | . | 3.4 | -2.4 | -0.3 | -1.0 | -1.3 | -1.4 | 5.3 |
| 2003 Jan | " | .. | . | " | . | " | . | 7.4 | -2.3 | -0.4 | -0.9 | 0.2 | -1.0 | 5.5 |
| Feb | * | . | . | . | " | * | . | . | - | -0.2 | -0.9 |  | -0.9 | 5.2 |
| Percentage change on previous quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | ILGN | HUDA | HUDB | HUDC | HUDD | HUDE | HUDF | ILHH | ILIB |  |  |  | ILIV |  |
| 1999 Q3 | -0.2 | 0.1 | 0.3 | -0.4 | -0.2 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 2.7 | -0.4 |  |  |  | - |  |
| Q4 | -1.0 | $-0.9$ | 0.1 | - | - | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.2 | -0.7 |  |  |  | -0.6 |  |
| 2000 Q1 | 2.1 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.4 | - | 0.6 | - | 0.6 | -0.7 |  |  |  | -2.1 |  |
| Q2 | 1.0 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 1.9 | 0.4 |  |  |  | 2.3 |  |
| Q3 | 0.7 | -0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 1.5 | 0.8 |  |  |  | - |  |
| Q4 | 1.3 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.9 | - | - | 0.3 | 0.3 | -0.7 |  |  |  | - |  |
| 2001 Q1 | 0.5 | 0.6 | - | -0.2 | 0.5 | -0.4 | -0.1 | -3.1 | 1.9 |  |  |  | -1.8 |  |
| Q2 | -1.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | -0.7 | -0.8 | -0.4 | -0.2 | -4.0 | -2.9 |  |  |  | 1.4 |  |
| Q3 | -1.1 | -0.3 | - | -0.4 | -0.3 | -0.3 | -0.2 | $-4.0$ | -0.8 |  |  |  | -0.4 |  |
| 04 | -0.6 | 0.3 | 0.2 | -1.0 | -0.2 | -0.2 | -0.2 | -2.4 | -1.5 |  |  |  | -0.5 |  |
| 2002 Q1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | -0.2 | -0.5 | 0.5 | 0.1 | -0.1 | 0.8 |  |  |  | -2.0 |  |
| Q2 | 1.4 | 0.2 | - | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 3.7 | -1.5 |  |  |  | 1.3 |  |
| 03 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | - | 0.2 | 2.3 | - |  |  |  | 0.2 |  |
| Q4 | 0.5 | - | - | 0.3 | -0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 | -0.9 | -1.2 |  |  |  | -0.6 |  |
| Percentage change on previous month |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ILKH | ILKR |  |  |  | ILLB |  |
| 2002 Mar |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 0.3 | -1.1 -1.2 |  |  |  | 0.7 0.6 |  |
| May |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 4.0 | 1.2 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| Jun |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.2 | -1.2 |  |  |  | 0.3 |  |
| Jul |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.4 | -1.2 |  |  |  | - |  |
| Aug |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.2 | 2.4 |  |  |  | - |  |
| Sep |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.3 | - |  |  |  | -0.3 |  |
| Oct |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.2 | -2.3 |  |  |  | - |  |
| Nov |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -1.1 | 2.4 |  |  |  | -0.1 |  |
| Dec |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -0.6 | -3.5 |  |  |  | -0.9 |  |
| 2003 Jan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.3 | 2.4 |  |  |  | -1.3 |  |
| Feb |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | . | 2.4 |  |  |  | -0.2 |  |

[^2]Sales = Retail Sales volume
$C P I=$ Consumer Prices, measurement not uniform among countries
PPI = Producer Prices (manufacturing)
Earnings $=$ Average Earnings (manufacturing), definftons of coverage and treatment vary among countries
Empl = Total Employment not seasonally adjusted
Unempl = Standardised Unemployment rates: percentage of total workforce 10 $P=$ Index of Production

| Export of manufactures |  |  | Import of manufactures |  |  | Export of goods |  |  | Import of goods |  |  | Total trade |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | OECD | Other | Total | OECD | Other | Total | OECD | Other | Tolal | OECD | Qthar | manufactUres | goods |


| Perce | ILIZ | earl ILJA | ILJB | ILdC | ILJD | ILJE | ILJF | ILJG | IL.JH | ILJ! | IL.JJ | ILJK | ILJL | ILJM |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1992 | 4.3 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 5.5 | 4.2 | 9.3 | 4.5 | 3.6 | 6.2 | 5.2 | 4.2 | 8.3 | 5.0 | 4.7 |
| 1993 | 3.6 | 2.1 | 11.8 | 3.6 | 0.7 | 11.7 | 4.1 | 2.2 | 7.6 | 3.1 | 0.7 | 10.0 | 3.8 | 3.4 |
| 1994 | 10.4 | 9.9 | 17.8 | 12.0 | 11.0 | 11.3 | 11.6 | 9.3 | 13.2 | 10.9 | 12.2 | 10.7 | 11.8 | 10.6 |
| 1995 | 9.1 | 9.9 | 10.6 | 10.5 | 9.0 | 11.5 | 10.2 | 9.3 | 8.6 | 9.8 | 10.1 | 11.8 | 10.3 | 9.5 |
| 1996 | 6.4 | 6.5 | 4.5 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 4.7 | 6.0 | 6.5 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 8.0 | 3.6 | 6.6 | 6.3 |
| 1997 | 10.8 | 11.9 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 9.7 | 12.4 | 11.7 | 11.0 | 10.2 | 10.2 | 11.3 | 11.5 | 11.7 | 10.5 |
| 1998 | 4.8 | 6.3 | 1.4 | 6.1 | 8.1 | -2.7 | 5.3 | 5.6 | 2.4 | 5.5 | 9.5 | -1.3 | 5.7 | 5.1 |
| 1999 | 5.6 | 6.1 | 6.9 | 7.8 | 9.1 | -0.8 | 6.3 | 5.7 | 5.3 | 6.6 | 10.8 | -0.7 | 7.1 | 6.1 |
| 2000 | 12.2 | 12.4 | 18.8 | 14.8 | 12.1 | 17.5 | 13.9 | 11.9 | 13.1 | 12.6 | 14.0 | 13.9 | 14.3 | 12.4 |
| 2001 | -0.7 | -1.6 | -1.2 | -0.9 | $-1.2$ | 1.8 | -1.4 | -0.8 | -0.5 | -0.1 | -1.8 | 3.1 | -1.2 | -0.4 |

2002

| 1996 ¢3 | 6.6 | 6.8 | 4.5 | 6.9 | 7.7 | 2.2 | 6.3 | 6.6 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 8.8 | 1.0 | 6.6 | 6.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Q4 | 8.4 | 8.2 | 5.8 | 8.4 | 8.5 | 7.1 | 7.6 | 8.8 | 7.2 | 7.7 | 8.9 | 5.5 | 8.0 | 8.0 |
| 1997 Q1 | 8.1 | 8.0 | 8.9 | 8.6 | 7.3 | 9.7 | 8.2 | 7.6 | 9.5 | 7.7 | 8.2 | 8.7 | 8.4 | 7.9 |
| Q2 | 11.7 | 13.0 | 10.1 | 12.1 | 10.4 | 12.2 | 12.4 | 12.4 | 9.8 | 10.7 | 12.1 | 11.5 | 12.2 | 11.2 |
| Q3 | 12.3 | 14.0 | 12.2 | 13.2 | 10.5 | 15.2 | 13.6 | 12.9 | 10.6 | 11.5 | 12.4 | 14.2 | 13.4 | 11.9 |
| Q4 | 11.0 | 12.3 | 13.4 | 12.4 | 10.4 | 12.7 | 12,6 | 11.1 | 10.8 | 10.7 | 12.3 | 11.5 | 12.5 | 10.9 |
| 1998 Q1 | 9.6 | 11.3 | 6.4 | 10.0 | 11.0 | 3.6 | 10.2 | 10.9 | 6.1 | 9.1 | 12.6 | 4.3 | 10.1 | 9.3 |
| Q2 | 5.4 | 6.9 | 2.9 | 6.7 | 8.3 | -1.2 | 6.0 | 6.2 | 3.1 | 5.9 | 8.8 | -0.4 | 6.4 | 5.6 |
| Q3 | 2.8 | 4.2 | 0.1 | 4.3 | 6.7 | -5.1 | 3.3 | 3.3 | 1.3 | 3.9 | 7.9 | -3.6 | 3.8 | 3.3 |
| Q4 | 1.7 | 3.3 | -3.4 | 3.6 | 6.6 | -7.8 | 1.8 | 2.6 | -0.8 | 3.3 | 8.0 | -5.5 | 2.7 | 2.5 |
| 1999 Q1 | 1.4 | 2.8 | -2.5 | 3.9 | 6.2 | $-6.3$ | 1.6 | 1.7 | 0.5 | 3.4 | 7.7 | $-4.0$ | 2.8 | 2.4 |
| Q2 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 6.2 | 7.9 | -3.4 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 5.1 | 9.5 | -2.9 | 5.1 | 4.4 |
| Q3 | 7.0 | 7.3 | 9.5 | 8.8 | 9.8 | 0.8 | 7.8 | 7.2 | 6.2 | 7.3 | 11.6 | -0.1 | 8.3 | 7.1 |
| Q4 | 10.2 | 10.4 | 17.0 | 12.3 | 12.2 | 6.4 | 11.8 | 10.1 | 10.8 | 10.3 | 14.2 | 4.8 | 12.1 | 10.3 |
| 2000 Q1 | 13,3 | 13.6 | 23.1 | 14.5 | 13.4 | 12.7 | 15.6 | 13.4 | 13.1 | 12.0 | 15.1 | 8.0 | 15.0 | 12.7 |
| Q2 | 13.3 | 13.9 | 20.9 | 15.8 | 13.2 | 17.7 | 15.4 | 13.0 | 14.4 | 13.6 | 15.3 | 14.7 | 15.6 | 13.5 |
| Q3 | 12.8 | 12.4 | 19.6 | 16.4 | 12.8 | 21.7 | 13.9 | 11.8 | 15.0 | 14.1 | 14.7 | 18.3 | 15.2 | 13.4 |
| Q4 | 9.9 | 10.1 | 12.5 | 12.5 | 9.3 | 17.6 | 10.6 | 9.8 | 10.1 | 10.5 | 10.9 | 14.6 | 11.5 | 10.2 |
| 2001 Q1 | 6.1 | 6.0 | 6.4 | 7.0 | 5.2 | 11.6 | 6.1 | 5.9 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 5.5 | 12.0 | 6.5 | 6.5 |
| Q2 | 0.2 | -0.3 | -1.3 | - | -0.4 | 2.9 | -0.6 | 0.4 | -0.4 | 0.5 | -0.9 | 3.6 | -0.3 | 0.3 |
| Q3 | -3.7 | -4.6 | -5.9 | -4.3 | -4.1 | -2.3 | -4.9 | -3.4 | -4.7 | -3.3 | -5.0 | -0.8 | -4.6 | -3.5 |
| Q4 | -5.1 | -6.8 | -3.4 | -5.7 | -4.9 | -3.8 | -6.1 | $-5.8$ | -3.2 | -4.1 | -6.3 | -1.7 | -5.9 | -4.6 |
| 2002 Q1 | -3.2 | -4.8 | 1.4 | $-3.3$ | $-3.1$ | -2.5 | $-3.4$ | -4.0 | -0.9 | -2.8 | $-3.6$ | -1.8 | -3.4 | -3.0 |
| Q2 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 11.0 | 2.8 | 2.2 | 3.8 | 4.5 | 2.5 | 7.0 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 4.3 | 3.6 | 3.2 |
| Q3 | -11.8 | 6.2 | 16.8 | .. | 5.2 | , | 8.5 | 5.6 | .. | " | 5.7 | - | $\stackrel{ }{ }$ |  |


| Percentage change on provious quarter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ILJN | ILJO | ILJP | ILJQ | ILJR | ILJS | ILJT | ILJU | ILJV | ILJW | IL.JX | ILJY | KJJZ | ILKA |
| 1996 O3 | 1.8 | 2.3 | -0.2 | 1.7 | 2.4 | -0.9 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 0.3 | 1.4 | 2.8 | -1.2 | 1.8 | 1.6 |
| Q4 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 4.1 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 1.8 | 2.5 | 2.2 | 3.6 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| 1997 Q1 | 2.4 | 2.0 | 6.1 | 3.2 | 1.1 | 6.5 | 2.9 | 1.1 | 5.8 | 2.7 | 2.0 | 6.9 | 3.1 | 2.5 |
| Q2 | 4.4 | 5.3 | 2.2 | 3.9 | 4.5 | 2.1 | 4.6 | 5.5 | 1.6 | 3.7 | 4.6 | 1.9 | 4.3 | 4.1 |
| Q3 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 1.8 | 2.8 | 2.8 | 1.1 | 2.1 | 3.1 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 2.2 |
| Q4 | 1.5 | 1.3 | 2.8 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 1.3 | 1.8 | 1.6 |
| 1998 Q1 | 1.0 | 1.0 | $-0.4$ | 1.1 | 1.7 | -2.1 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 2.3 | - | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| Q2 | 0.4 | 1.3 | -1.2 | 0.8 | 1.9 | -2.7 | 0.7 | 1.1 | -1.3 | 0.7 | 2.0 | -2.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Q3 | -0.2 | 0.5 | -1.0 | 0.4 | 1.1 | -2.2 | 0.1 | - | -0.7 | 0.2 | 1.3 | -2.2 | 0.3 | - |
| Q4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | -0.8 | 1.3 | 1.7 | -0.9 | 0.2 | 0.6 | -0.1 | 1.1 | 2.1 | -0.7 | 0.8 | 0.8 |
| 1999 Q1 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 1.3 | -0.6 | 0.5 | 0.1 | 2.6 | 1.3 | 2.0 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| Q2 | 2.7 | 2.4 | 5.3 | 3.0 | 3.6 | 0.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 2.3 | 3.8 | -1.6 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Q3 | 2.9 | 3.7 | 4.3 | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.0 | 3.8 | 3.4 | 1.6 | 2.3 | 3.2 | 0.7 | 3.4 | 2.6 |
| Q4 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 6.0 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 4.2 | 4.3 | 3.7 |
| 2000 Q1 | 3.6 | 3.4 | 5.7 | 3.4 | 2.4 | 5.2 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 4.7 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 4.6 | 3.6 | 3.2 |
| Q2 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 3.5 | 4.8 | 2.8 | 2.6 | 3.2 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.5 | 3.5 | 3.2 |
| Q3 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 3.4 | 2.5 | 5.5 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 3.8 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Q4 | 1.0 | 1.3 | -0.2 | 1.0 | 0.6 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.4 | -0.2 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| 200101 | - | -0.4 | - | -1.7 | -1.4 | -0.2 | $-0.4$ | -0.5 | 1.6 | -0.5 | -2.1 | 2.3 | -1.0 | -0.2 |
| Q2 | -3.0 | -3.5 | -4.1 | -2.6 | -2.1 | -3.3 | -3.6 | -2.7 | -3.8 | -2.4 | -2.4 | -3.3 | -3.1 | -2.7 |
| Q3 | $-1.7$ | -2.0 | -1.6 | -1.1 | -1.3 | 0.1 | $-1.9$ | -1.5 | -2.3 | -1.1 | -1.5 | -0.6 | -1.5 | -1.4 |
| Q4 | -0.4 | -1.1 | 2.4 | -0.5 | -0.2 | -0.5 | $-0.3$ | -1.1 | 1.5 | -0.1 | -0.5 | - | -0.4 | -0.3 |
| 2002 Q1 | 2,0 | 1.7 | 4.9 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 2.5 | 1.3 | 3.9 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 2.2 | 1.6 | 1.5 |
| Q2 | 3.8 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 3.5 | 3.3 | 3.0 | 4.3 | 3.8 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 2.7 | 3.9 | 3.5 |
| Q3 | -16.4 | 1.4 | 3.6 | .. | 1.6 | . | 1.9 | 1.5 | .. | .. | 1.7 | .. | , | . |
| Q4 | ' | $\because$ | . | * | " | . | .. | .. | * | . | .. | * | .. | . |

[^3]Source: OECD - SNA93
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#### Abstract

Overview Labour market data shows employment rose across most regions in the fourth quarter of 2002, although employee job growth showed a more mixed picture and somewhat lower growth rates with falls in many regions. Long term unemployment across all regions has been fainy flat so far this year but fell between March 2002 and March 2003, although there are large variances in the rates across regions. Industrial production contracted in 2002 in all countries, while the index of construction generally rose. However, external data shows that businesses in nearly all regions are less optimistic in January 2003 than they were in October 2002. Annual house prices show very strong increases in all regions, but there is some evidence of falls in the latest period in some regions,


## GDP at basic prices

Tables 1 to 4 concern National Accounts statistics for the regions.

In Table 1, London and the South East together accounted for 31.7 per cent of the UK's total GDP in 1999, with contributions of 15.9 per cent and 15.8 per cent respectively. For the South East this was a significant increase from 14.8 per cent in 1989 . The other region to grow significantly faster than the average was Northem Ireland, which posted an 82.3 per cent increase in value terms from 1989 to 1999, although this only accounted for 2.2 per cent of the UK's total GDP in 1999. In 1999 overall GDP at basic prices rose by 3.8 per cent, compared to 6.1 per cent in 1998 (figure 1). The highest annual rate of increase was in the South East at 5.1 per cent.

## Figure 1

GDP: UK, England, Wales, Scotland \& Northern Ireland
growth, year on previous year
percentage change, 1997 to 1999


Table 2 compares GDP per head per region and on that basis it shows that London remains the richest region and the North East the poorest.

The growth rate was the highest in the South East, at 4.1 per cent. The other regions that grew above the UK average of 3.4 per cent were Yorkshire and the Humber, the West Midands, the East and Wales. London, with one of the highest growth rates in GDP between 1997 and 1998 had the lowest growth rate in GDP per head of all the regions in 1999.

Table 3 shows how household disposable income per head increased in the UK in 1999 by 4.6 per cent compared to an increase of 1.9 per cent in 1998. Londonrecorded the highest value in 1999 of $£ 12,207$ followed by the South East with $£ 11,055$, which continues medium term trends. Looking at annual percentage changes, Scotiand recorded the largest rise of 7.8 per cent in 1999, while Yorkshire and the Humber was the slowest growing region, with growth of 2.4 per cent in 1999. Other slower growing regions were the South East, with 3.3 per cent, London, with 3.4 per cent, and the South West with growth of 3.6 per cent in 1999 . Significant acceleration in the rates of increase in 1999 compared to 1998, of more than 4.5 per cent, was seen in the North East and Scotland, whilst growth fell in the Yorkshire and Humber region.

Table 4, shows individual consumption expenditure per head, with L.ondon again recording the highest monetary value of $£ 12,250$ in 1999 , followed by the South East with $£ 11,392$ and the North East having the lowest expenditure. Looking at annual percentage changes, London also recorded the largest rise in consumption with growth of 8.8 per cent in 1999, while the North East recorded a decline of 1.0 per cent in the same period, compared to an increase of 4.4 per cent in 1998.

## The Labour Market

Tables 5 to 11 concem the labour market. Tables 6,8 and 9 are seasonally adjusted; tables 5, 7, 10 and 11 are not.

The total in employment (from the Labour Force Survey), table 9, in
the UK grew by 0.5 per cent in 2002 quarter four compared to a fall of 0.1 per cent in the previous quarter. This however masks the varied performance at the regional level with the North East and the East Midands showing falls in employment growth of 1.6 per cent and 0.4 per cent respectively. The North West had the highest growth in employment of 2.0 per cent. On an annual basis, all regions showed growth in the year to the fourth quarter, with the exception of the East and the North East. Wales recorded the highest growth for the period of 4.8 per cent. The other region that saw high annual growth were Northem Ireland (4,4 per cent),

Employee jobs (from Employers Surveys), in table 11 shows employment in the UK with slower growth than the figures complied from the Labour Force Survey. In quarter four, growth in employee jobs in the UK fell by 0.4 per cent compared to a year ago. Growth in the year to the fourth quarter was mixed across the regions, with many regions seeing declines. The largest decline was in the South East, 1.3 per cent and the strongest growth was in the North East, 1.2 per cent.

The UK claimant count rate, table 8, was 3.1 per cent of the workforce in the UK in 2002 and has remained at that rate for the first three months of 2003. Again, the national rate masked large variations between regions with the North East having the highest claimant count in March 2003 of 4.9 per cent, followed closely by Northem Ireiand with 4.3 per cent. Over the year, the national level of unemployment has remained the same and this is echoed in most regions.

Table 6 shows the rate of ILO unemployment. The rate stabilised at 5.1 per cent for most of 2002, except in quarter three when there was a slight increase to 5.3 per cent. However, there was a high degree of volatility between the latest quarters at the regional level and the differences in their rates are also fairly marked. Increases in unemployment in 2002 quarter four were seen in the North East, the East, the South West and Wales. The largest declines in the unemployment rate were seen in Northem Ireland, the North West, and London. The unemployment rate in the north East rose by 1.3 percentage points between quarters three and four.

Long-term claimant count rates as a percentage of the unemployed, table 7, shows an increase in the UK of 0.2 percentage points in March having fallen by 0.4 percentage points between January and February. During the same period across most regions there were also either slight decreases or no change in most regions since the start of the year. Comparing count rates, the highest rate of 22.0 per cent was in Northem Ireland while the South West has the lowest count of 10.8 per cent. Comparing March of this year with last year shows that there has been a significant decrease in the count in all the regions over the year. Although Northem Ireland has the highest count in March 2003, this was
reduced from 27.6 per cent in the same month of last year. Other regions to have significantly reduced their count over the year are the North East, the West Midlands and Yorkshire and the Humber.

Table 10 shows redundancy rates in the government office regions. Examing the aggregate picture is not possible at the moment due to areweighting of the Labour Force Survey data. However, figures for most regions are avaliable. Between Winter 2001 and Winter 2002, there were considerable reductions in the redundancy rates in the North West, the South East and the South West. The other regions that saw small changes in redundancies over the same period were Yorkshire and the Humber, the West Midlands and Wales.

Total average gross weekly pay (from the annual New Earnings Survey), in table 5 , shows London having the highest pay of $£ 624$ a week in April 2002, up from $£ 596$ a year ago, an increase of 4.8 per cent. Regions where the rate of growth increased by 5 per cent or more were the South East ( 5.0 per cent) and Scotland ( 5.6 per cent). However, the rates of increase in 2002 are generally lower than those seen in 2001, when the UK average was 6.3 per cent and many more regions had growth rates of 5.0 per cent and above. In April 2002, the West Midland's weekly pay increased by 2.0 per cent, the lowest of all the regions, although this followed the highest rate of growth in the year to April 2001, with a rate of 8.2 per cent.

Figure 2
Total average gross weekly pay 2002 April
seasonally adjusted


## Industrial Production and Construction

For UK industrial production output, table 12, figures for the UK and Wales extend to 2002 quarter four, while data for Scotiand and Northem Ireland extends to quarter three. Overall production was declining at the end of 2002, following a degree of recovery earlier in the year. The
index of production in quarter four for the UK shows a contraction of 0.8 per cent following expansions of 0.4 per cent and 0.3 per cent in the previous two quarters. Overall in 2002 the index contracted by 3.5 per cent in the UK accelerating from a 2.2 per cent decline in 2001. In Wales, the index also contracted by 2.4 per cent in quarter four compared with a contraction of 0.5 per cent in the previous quarter. In 2002, the index fell 1.7 per cent. Between quarters two and three in Scotland and Northem Ireland, growth in the index fell by 0.9 per cent and 0.2 per cent respectively.

On the other hand, UK construction output, table 13 , rose by 1.9 per cent in 2002 quarter four and 1.8 per cent in quarter three; this continues the recent strong positive growth. Overall in 2002, the index for the UK the index grew by 7.5 per cent. Again, data for Scotland and Northern Ireland only extends to quarter three and shows construction in Scotland rising for two consecutive quarters after falling in quarter one. InNorthern Ireland, having had a strong quarter two, the index contracted in quarter three by 2.5 per cent. Wales sustained its recent growth in construction in quarter two, but this slowed considerably in quarter three but has again picked up fairly strongly in quarter four, growing by 3.5 per cent (figure 3). Comparing 2002 quarter four to the same quarter a year ago shows the index for the UK growing by 8.0 per cent. In Wales over the same period, growth was 12.7 per cent

Figure 3
Index of construction
growth, quarter on previous quarter


## Manufacturing

Almost all CBI data is presented on the basis of govemment office regions. However, London and the South East are combined.

Tables 14 to 18 show that CBI/BSL balances reveal a failly mixed picture across regions regarding in business optimism and in the volumes of new orders in its latest survey.

Table 14 shows that businesses in most regions were substantially less optimistic about the business situation in the January 2003 survey than the October 2002 survey, with most regions also being less optimistic than in the July survey. The only regions where optimism increased significantly were the North East and the South West and Northem Ireland and even then, the balances are relatively low.

Figure 4
Manufacturing industry business optimism (balances) January 2003


UK manufacturing output, as measured by CBI/BSL. balances for volume of output in table 15 , shows a generally more mixed picture some regions reporting improvements but the majority reporting deterioration in the volume of output over the past four months, but looking ahead an improvement is anticipated. Output is anticipated to deteriorate significantly only in Scotland and Wales.

The overall CBI/BSL. January 2003 balance for volume of new orders, table 16, shows a slight improvement for the UK in the volume of new orders between the October and January surveys but a mixed picture by region. The figures are volatile and those regions showing small recent increases generally have had large falls in earlier surveys. Looking ahead to the next four months, again, mostregions anticipate improvements.

Volume of new export orders, table 17, for the next four months is showing a mixed picture from the January 2003 survey across the regions. Broadly the figures show continuing decline, although there has been reductions to the extent of the deterioration in most cases. Only the North East was the balance of opinion positive about the volume of orders in the past four months. Looking ahead, the picture on new export orders across the regions is mixed but with majority of the regions expecting the decline to continue. The exceptions are the North East, Yorkshire and the Humber, the West Midlands and London and the South East.

In line with the overall general fall in output and expected workflows in the
future, the percentages of firms working below capacity, table 18, shows an increase in the number of firms working below capacity in January 2003 of 74 per cent compared with 67 per cent in October 2002. This pattem is generally seen across the regions with the highest increase in the East Midlands where the number of firms working below capacity increased from 53 per cent to 72 per cent in the same period. The most significant decrease was in Northem Ireland where there was a decrease from 70 per cent to 51 per cent between October 2002 and January 2003, but again these figures are volatile.

## The Housing Market

in Table 20, UK house prices (not seasonally adjusted) continued to grow in the fourth quarter with falls in some regions. This was however at a slower pace than in the previous quarters of the year, increasing by just 2.1 per cent compared with 8.3 per cent in quarter three and 8.0 per cent in quarter two.

The iatest quarterly data shows increases occuring in most regions, but at a wide range of rates. The exceptions being London, the South West, Wales and Northem Ireland, where prices fell by 2.6 per cent, 1.1 per cent, 9.3 per cent and 1.7 per cent respectively. The highest rates of growth in houses prices were in the North East and the North West.

The annual data shows a fairly similar story of house prices increasing but generally at lower rates. UK year-on-year growth in 2002 saw house prices increase by 17 per cent from 8.6 per cent in the previous year and this was reflected in all regions. Regions with increases in house prices of over 20 per cent were Yorkshire and the Humber, East Midlands, West Midands, the South West and Wales.

In Table 19 the number of permanent dwellings started fluctuates quite widely from quarter to quarter with a significant seasonal factor involved. Year-on-year growth to quarter four shows a mixed picture across the regions with some showing an increase in the number of permanent dwelling started and others showing a decrease.

## Business Start-Ups

VAT registrations and de-registrations, table 21, shows registrations outnumbering de-registrations by 12,700 for the calendar year 2001 which, is well up on the levels of 1999 and 2000, although well down on that recordedin 1998. in 2001 registrations outnumbered de-registrations in every region, except the North East, where there was a small net decline of 100 enterprises. The largest net gains were in London ( 2,800 businesses), the South East ( 3,900 businesses), the East ( 1,000 businesses) and the North West ( 1,400 businesses).

|  | United Kingdom ${ }^{2}$ (£m) | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East Midiands | West <br> Midlands | East | London | South <br> East | South West | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMPV } \\ 452437 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMPW } \\ & 17156 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMPX } \\ 49365 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMPY } \\ & 34848 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMPZ } \\ & 30439 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMQA } \\ & 37956 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMOB } \\ & 45885 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMQC } \\ & 68907 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMQD } \\ & 66979 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMQE } \\ & 34118 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMQF } \\ 385653 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMQG } \\ & 19007 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMQH } \\ & 38448 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TMOI } \\ & 9329 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1993 | 562857 | 21480 | 60664 | 42952 | 37124 | 46859 | 55928 | 86574 | 83817 | 42529 | 477927 | 23191 | 49302 | 12437 |
| 1994 | 593931 | 22074 | 63938 | 44752 | 39023 | 49577 | 59824 | 91118 | 88936 | 44607 | 503851 | 24463 | 52273 | 13344 |
| 1995 | 622389 | 22975 | 66007 | 47108 | 40976 | 52407 | 62416 | 93843 | 93319 | 47385 | 526437 | 25989 | 55667 | 14297 |
| 1996 | 657775 | 23755 | 68937 | 50043 | 44184 | 54851 | 66484 | 99490 | 100614 | 50128 | 558483 | 27017 | 57338 | 14936 |
| 1997 | 700567 | 24202 | 72414 | 53182 | 47261 | 57783 | 72698 | 108559 | 108276 | 53580 | 597956 | 28010 | 58650 | 15952 |
| 1998 | 743314 | 25294 | 75275 | 55457 | 49413 | 61130 | 77962 | 118499 | 116024 | 56064 | 635117 | 29541 | 62153 | 16501 |
| 1999 | 771849 | 25875 | 77562 | 57554 | 50906 | 63495 | 81793 | 122816 | 121956 | 58151 | 660108 | 30689 | 64050 | 17003 |

1 Based on the European System of Accounts 1995 (ESA95).
Source: National Statistics
2 UK less Extra-Regio and statistical discrepancy.

- Gross domestic product ${ }^{1}$ at basic prices: $£$ per head
Government Office Regions

|  | United Kingdom ${ }^{2}$ | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East Midlands | West Midlands | East | London | South East | South West | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1989 | TMQJ | TMAK 6614 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMQL } \\ & 7199 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMQM } \\ 7042 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMQN } \\ & 7621 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMQO } \\ 7242 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMQP } \\ 9012 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TMQQ } \\ & 10135 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMQR } \\ 8805 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMQS } \\ 7297 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMQT } \\ 8069 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMQU } \\ 6624 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { TMQV } \\ 7544 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { TMQW } \\ 5893 \end{gathered}$ |
| 1993 | 9671 | 8216 | 8783 | 8563 | 9102 | 8855 | 10772 | 12494 | 10834 | 8927 | 9852 | 7978 | 9614 | 7610 |
| 1994 | 10170 | 8441 | 9248 | 8901 | 9519 | 9352 | 11467 | 13088 | 11441 | 9311 | 10349 | 8393 | 10168 | 8114 |
| 1995 | 10619 | 8796 | 9547 | 9354 | 9944 | 9869 | 11889 | 13406 | 11918 | 9828 | 10771 | 8900 | 10818 | 8654 |
| 1996 | 11185 | 9111 | 9980 | 9927 | 10673 | 10309 | 12582 | 14107 | 12761 | 10351 | 11384 | 9240 | 11162 | 8964 |
| 1997 | 11871 | 9301 | 10494 | 10541 | 11371 | 10845 | 13657 | 15266 | 13634 | 11008 | 12141 | 9562 | 11429 | 9507 |
| 1998 | 12548 | 9741 | 10909 | 10983 | 11848 | 11455 | 14530 | 16532 | 14510 | 11447 | 12845 | 10063 | 12117 | 9754 |
| 1999 | 12972 | 10024 | 11273 | 11404 | 12146 | 11900 | 15094 | 16859 | 15098 | 11782 | 13278 | 10449 | 12512 | 10050 |

1 Based on the European System of Accounts 1995 (ESA95).
Source: National Statistics
2 UK less Extra-Reglo and statistical discrepancy.

## ? Household disposable income ${ }^{1}$ : $£$ per head <br> Government Office Regions

|  | United Kingdom ${ }^{2}$ | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | $\begin{array}{r} \text { East } \\ \text { Midlands } \end{array}$ | West <br> Midlands | East | London | South East | South West | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DEPZ | LRCG | LRCH | DEQB | DEQC | DEOH | LRCI | DEQE | LRCJ | DEQG | LREV | DEQJ | DEQK | DEQL |
| 1989 | 5560 | 4908 | 5239 | 5208 | 5280 | 4934 | 6097 | 6549 | 6110 | 5638 | 5643 | 4994 | 5355 | 4729 |
| 1993 | 7771 | 7053 | 7313 | 7232 | 7214 | 7112 | 8248 | 9311 | 8519 | 7608 | 7867 | 6986 | 7704 | 6540 |
| 1994 | 8019 | 7095 | 7536 | 7417 | 7569 | 7391 | 8540 | 9612 | 8873 | 7767 | 8127 | 7235 | 7773 | 6959 |
| 1995 | 8497 | 7522 | 7874 | 7780 | 7869 | 7939 | 9011 | 10102 | 9282 | 8606 | 8592 | 7742 | 8287 | 7678 |
| 1996 | 8938 | 7972 | 8334 | 8323 | 8401 | 8313 | 9484 | 10650 | 9814 | 8915 | 9070 | 8056 | 8541 | 7834 |
| 1997 | 9513 | 8554 | 8900 | 8776 | 8835 | 8748 | 10025 | 11485 | 10579 | 9511 | 9674 | 8389 | 8977 | 8365 |
| 1998 | 9696 | 8585 | 9008 | 9106 | 8935 | 8981 | 10147 | 11811 | 10698 | 9725 | 9862 | 8529 | 9154 | 8500 |
| 1999 | 10142 | 9018 | 9501 | 9325 | 9409 | 9541 | 10638 | 12207 | 11055 | 10073 | 10284 | 8870 | 9870 | 8998 |

1 Based on the European System of Accounts 1995 (ESA95).
Source: Nathonal Statistics
2 UK less Extra-Regio
Individual consumption expenditure ${ }^{1}$ : $£$ per head
Government Office Regions

|  | United Klingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East <br> Midlands | West <br> Midlands | East | London | South East | South West | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TLZI | TLZJ | TLZK | TLZL | TLIM | TLZN | TLZO | TLZP | TZQQ | TLZR | TLZS | TLZT | TLZU | THZZ |
| 1994 | 7441 | 6676 | 7082 | 7081 | 7180 | 6920 | 7380 | 8799 | 8424 | 7045 | 7539 | 6563 | 7334 | 6427 |
| 1995 | 7762 | 6973 | 7336 | 7306 | 7583 | 7364 | 7915 | 9011 | 8697 | 7408 | 7865 | 6997 | 7537 | 6775 |
| 1996 | 8268 | 7391 | 7798 | 7758 | 7939 | 7705 | 8514 | 9485 | 9333 | 8049 | 8365 | 7722 | 8007 | 7188 |
| 1997 | 8776 | 7744 | 8331 | 8177 | 8370 | 8128 | 8963 | 10248 | 9938 | 8584 | 8895 | 8041 | 8488 | 7463 |
| 1998 | 9316 | 8086 | 8662 | 8763 | 8695 | 8640 | 9740 | 11264 | 10656 | 8961 | 9488 | 8079 | 8874 | 7749 |
| 1999 | 9864 | 8003 | 9321 | 8907 | 9057 | 9262 | 10077 | 12250 | 11392 | 9600 | 10057 | 8206 | 9459 | 8281 |

1 Based on the European System of Accounts 1995 (ESA95).
Source: National Statistics

Total average gross weekly pay ${ }^{1}$
Government Office Regions

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East <br> Midiands | West Midlands | East | London | $\begin{aligned} & \text { South } \\ & \text { East } \end{aligned}$ | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 Apr | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DEOG } \\ & 316.0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LRCO } \\ 286.2 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LSHZ } \\ & 299.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DCQ1 } \\ & 287.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { DCQH } \\ 285.5 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { DCQG } \\ 292.6 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LRCQ } \\ & 312.2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DCPI } \\ & 408.8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LRCR } \\ & 328.9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { DCQF } \\ 298.8 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { DCQL } \\ & 281.5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { DCQM } \\ 297.6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { DCQN } \\ 282.4 \end{array}$ |
| 1994 Apr | 324.7 | 294.6 | 307.7 | 297.0 | 292.5 | 300.1 | 322.8 | 420.6 | 339.4 | 306.9 | 290.5 | 301.9 | 286.5 |
| 1995 Apr | 336.7 | 299.2 | 317.7 | 306.0 | 306.4 | 311.3 | 331.5 | 441.5 | 348.1 | 313.9 | 302.1 | 313.4 | 300.2 |
| 1996 Apr | 350.2 | 315.2 | 329.5 | 316.8 | 318.5 | 323.9 | 347.7 | 455.0 | 367.1 | 325.3 | 313.3 | 325.2 | 306.2 |
| 1997 Apr | 366.3 | 327.4 | 345.6 | 330.6 | 333.1 | 337.3 | 362.2 | 480.1 | 382.6 | 342.6 | 330.2 | 336.9 | 319.7 |
| 1998 Apr | 383.1 | 338.7 | 363.3 | 345.2 | 350.3 | 359.8 | 380.3 | 504.5 | 406.3 | 354.6 | 342,8 | 350.0 | 332,6 |
| 1999 Apr | 398.7 | 348.3 | 371.8 | 353.2 | 362.8 | 375.9 | 396.2 | 537.7 | 429.0 | 363.3 | 352.3 | 368.9 | 344.9 |
| 2000 Apr | 418.1 | 368.0 | 389.0 | 375.1 | 374.4 | 387.2 | 416.2 | 561.7 | 443.3 | 380.6 | 368.4 | 383.0 | 360.4 |
| 2001 Apr | 442.3 | 379.7 | 408.2 | 391.7 | 393.4 | 417.4 | 438.0 | 595.6 | 472.5 | 408.3 | 381.6 | 404.8 | 375.0 |
| 2002 Apr | 462.6 | 399.3 | 426.8 | 409.9 | 413.0 | 427.3 | 459.6 | 624.1 | 496.7 | 421.7 | 399.7 | 427.0 | 390.1 |

I Average gross weekly earnings of full-time amployees on adult rates whose
Sources: New Earnings Survey, National Statistics: pay for the survey pay-perlod was not affected by absence.

Department of Economic Development, Northern Ireland
6 Unemployed as a percentage of the economically active population ${ }^{1}$,
Government Office Regions
Percentages

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East <br> Midlands | West <br> Midlands | East | London | South East | South West | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MGSX | YCNC | YCND | YCNE | YCNF | YCNG | YCNH | YCNI | YCNJ | YCNK | YCNL | YCNM | YCNN | MGXW |
| 1999 Q4 | 5.8 | 8.5 | 6.0 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 6.7 | 4.2 | 6.9 | 4.0 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 7.2 | 7.1 | 6.8 |
| 2000 Q1 | 5.8 | 8.9 | 6.1 | 6.4 | 5.1 | 6.1 | 3.9 | 7.5 | 3.5 | 4.2 | 5.5 | 6.7 | 7.6 | 6.5 |
| Q2 | 5.5 | 8.8 | 5.4 | 6.1 | 4.8 | 6.1 | 3.6 | 7.3 | 3.3 | 4.3 | 5.3 | 6.1 | 7.0 | 6.6 |
| Q3 | 5.3 | 8.8 | 5.4 | 5.9 | 4.8 | 5.8 | 3.7 | 6.9 | 3.1 | 4.1 | 5.1 | 6.6 | 6.7 | 5.6 |
| Q4 | 5.2 | 7.9 | 5.3 | 6.1 | 4.7 | 5.9 | 3.6 | 6.7 | 3.4 | 3.9 | 5.1 | 5.8 | 8.3 | 6.2 |
| 2001 Q1 | 5.1 | 7.7 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 4.7 | 5.6 | 3.6 | 6.5 | 3.3 | 3.9 | 4.9 | 6.1 | 6.0 | 6.1 |
| Q2 | 5.0 | 7.3 | 5.4 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 3.5 | 6.1 | 3.2 | 3.6 | 4.8 | 6.1 | 6.2 | 5.9 |
| Q3 | 5.1 | 6.9 | 5.2 | 5.4 | 4.6 | 5.6 | 4.0 | 6.5 | 3.4 | 3.6 | 4.9 | 5.5 | 6.7 | 6.1 |
| Q4 | 5.2 | 7.3 | 5.3 | 5.1 | 4.7 | 5.5 | 3.9 | 7.2 | 3.3 | 3.6 | 5.0 | 5.9 | 6.7 | 6.0 |
| 200201 | 5.1 | 7.3 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 3.7 | 6.8 | 3.5 | 3.4 | 4.9 | 5.7 | 6.6 | 6.0 |
| Q2 | 5.1 | 6.3 | 5.6 | 5.2 | 4.5 | 5.5 | 3.7 | 6.7 | 3.9 | 3.7 | 4.9 | 5.7 | 6.4 | 5.4 |
| Q3 | 5.3 | 6.2 | 5.5 | 5.5 | 4.7 | 6.0 | 3.8 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 3.9 | 5.1 | 5.2 | 6.4 | 6.3 |
| Q4 | 5.1 | 7.5 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 4.8 | 5.6 | 3.9 | 6.5 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.3 | 6.2 | 5.7 |

1 Periods are calendar quarters.
Source: Labour Force Survey, National Statistics

## 7 Long-term claimant count as a percentage of the unemployed <br> (those out of work for 12 months or more)

Government Office Regions
Percentages

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East <br> Midlands | West <br> Midlands | East | London | South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LRFN | LRFO | LSIA | LRFR | LRFS | LRFT | LRFU | LRFV | LRFW | LRFX | LRFY | LRFZ | LRGA |
| 2002 Feb | 16.4 | 17.3 | 16.2 | 15.6 | 15.3 | 19.0 | 12.5 | 20.0 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 15.3 | 14.1 | 28.4 |
| Mar | 16.3 | 17.4 | 16.1 | 15.4 | 15.1 | 18.9 | 12.4 | 19.8 | 11.3 | 11.8 | 15.3 | 14.0 | 27.6 |
| Apr | 16.6 | 17.8 | 16.5 | 15.8 | 15.8 | 19.2 | 12.7 | 19.8 | 11.6 | 12.6 | 15.8 | 14.2 | 27.7 |
| May | 16.7 | 18.1 | 16.6 | 15.8 | 15.9 | 19.2 | 12.7 | 19.7 | 11.6 | 12.9 | 16.1 | 14.2 | 27.4 |
| Jun | 16.7 | 18.1 | 16.6 | 15.7 | 16.1 | 19.0 | 12.8 | 19.6 | 11.8 | 13.1 | 16.3 | 14.1 | 26.2 |
| Jul | 16.2 | 17.7 | 16.2 | 15.2 | 15.7 | 18.2 | 12.4 | 19.3 | 11.6 | 12.8 | 15.6 | 13.5 | 23.8 |
| Aug | 15.9 | 17.7 | 15.9 | 14.9 | 15.2 | 17.6 | 12.1 | 19.2 | 11.4 | 12.3 | 15.1 | 13.4 | 23.3 |
|  | 16.1 | 18.1 | 16.3 | 14.9 | 15.4 | 17.7 | 12.3 | 19.2 | 11.7 | 12.6 | 15.2 | 14.2 | 23.3 |
| Oct | 16.3 | 18.2 | 16.6 | 15.2 | 15.6 | 17.9 | 12.5 | 19.3 | 12.0 | 12.6 | 15.6 | 14.4 | 23.9 |
| Nov | 16.0 | 17.6 | 16.3 | 14.8 | 15.1 | 17.6 | 12.3 | 19.3 | 11.8 | 12.3 | 15.3 | 14.2 | 23.2 |
| Dec | 15.7 | 17.0 | 15.8 | 14.3 | 14.5 | 17.1 | 12.2 | 19.3 | 11.9 | 11.7 | 14.8 | 14.1 | 22.8 |
| 2003 Jan | 14.8 | 15.6 | 14.6 | 13.4 | 13.4 | 16.1 | 11.5 | 19.3 | 11.3 | 10.9 | 13.8 | 12.9 | 22.1 |
| Feb | 14.4 | 15.2 | 14.4 | 13.0 | 12.9 | 15.6 | 10.9 | 18.9 | 10.9 | 10.5 | 13.3 | 12.6 | 21.9 |
| Mar | 14.6 | 15.1 | 14.6 | 13.0 | 13.1 | 15.6 | 11.1 | 18.9 | 11.0 | 10.8 | 13.5 | 13.0 | 22.0 |

1 Computerised claims only.
Source: National Statistics

# 8 <br> Claimant count rates as a percentage of total workforce <br> Government Office Regions 

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East Midlands | West <br> Midlands | East | London | South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern treland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | BCJE | DPDM | IBWC | DPBI | DPE, | DPEN | DPDP | DPDQ | DPDR | DPBM | DPBP | DPBQ | DPBR |
| 1999 | 4.2 | 7.1 | 4.6 | 5.0 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 2.9 | 4.5 | 2.3 | 3.1 | 5.0 | 5.1 | 6,4 |
| 2000 | 3.6 | 6.3 | 4.1 | 4.4 | 3.4 | 4.0 | 2.4 | 3.7 | 1.9 | 2.5 | 4.4 | 4.6 | 5.3 |
| 2001 | 3.2 | 5.7 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.1 | 3.7 | 2.1 | 3.3 | 1.6 | 2.1 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.9 |
| 2002 | 3.1 | 5.2 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 4.5 |
| 2002 Mar | 3.1 | 5.4 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.5 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 4.7 |
| Apr | 3.1 | 5.3 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 3.7 | 4.0 | 4.7 |
| May | 3.1 | 5.3 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 4.6 |
| Jun | 3.1 | 5.3 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 3.7 | 3.9 | 4.6 |
| Jul | 3.1 | 5.3 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 3.9 | 4.5 |
| Aug | 3.1 3.1 | 5.2 5.2 | 3.5 3.5 | 3.6 | 2.9 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 3.7 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| Oct | 3.1 | 5.1 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| Nov | 3.1 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 2.9 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| Dec | 3.1 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| 2003 Jan | 3.1 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 3.5 | 2.1 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 3.6 | 3.8 | 4.4 |
| Feb | 3.1 | 4.9 | 3.5 | 3.6 | 2.8 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 3.6 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 4.3 |
| Mar | 3.1 | 4.9 | 3.4 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 3.6 | 2.2 | 3.7 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 3.5 | 3.8 | 4.3 |

Source: National Statistics

## 9 <br> Total in employment ${ }^{1,2}$, seasonally adjusted <br> Government Office Regions

Thousands

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | $\begin{array}{r} \text { East } \\ \text { Midlands } \end{array}$ | West <br> Midlands | East | London | South East | South West | England | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MGRZ | YCJP | YCJQ | YCJR | YCJS | YCJT | YCJU | YCJV | YCJW | YCJX | YCJY | YCJZ | YCKA | YCPT |
| 1999 Q4 | 27141 | 1058 | 2994 | 2245 | 1982 | 2400 | 2605 | 3324 | 3986 | 2350 | 22946 | 1217 | 2295 | 690 |
| 2000 Q1 | 27187 | 1057 | 2998 | 2237 | 1987 | 2404 | 2613 | 3311 | 4024 | 2356 | 22987 | 1214 | 2301 | 692 |
| Q2 | 27294 | 1069 | 3019 | 2270 | 1997 | 2397 | 2637 | 3311 | 4030 | 2345 | 23075 | 1228 | 2321 | 680 |
| O3 | 27350 | 1066 | 2998 | 2272 | 1979 | 2398 | 2658 | 3323 | 4017 | 2384 | 23096 | 1234 | 2338 | 691 |
| Q4 | 27336 | 1059 | 3002 | 2269 | 1970 | 2390 | 2680 | 3320 | 4011 | 2356 | 23057 | 1233 | 2353 | 697 |
| 2001 Q1 | 27428 | 1062 | 3016 | 2263 | 1965 | 2409 | 2695 | 3365 | 4019 | 2361 | 23155 | 1229 | 2348 | 699 |
| Q2 | 27512 | 1065 | 3032 | 2256 | 1971 | 2409 | 2680 | 3404 | 4030 | 2380 | 23228 | 1221 | 2357 | 708 |
| 03 | 27487 | 1067 | 2982 | 2263 | 1990 | 2412 | 2668 | 3409 | 4038 | 2386 | 23217 | 1219 | 2343 | 714 |
| Q4 | 27559 | 1066 | 3016 | 2261 | 1993 | 2439 | 2684 | 3405 | 4050 | 2393 | 23308 | 1219 | 2338 | 700 |
| 2002 Q1 | 27576 | 1070 | 3011 | 2274 | 1991 | 2435 | 2688 | 3393 | 4065 | 2393 | 23320 | 1221 | 2335 | 707 |
| Q2 | 27698 | 1069 | 3006 | 2275 | 2013 | 2448 | 2690 | 3425 | 4059 | 2410 | 23396 | 1238 | 2352 | 720 |
| Q3 | 27662 | 1070 | 3003 | 2273 | 2027 | 2430 | 2687 | 3404 | 4042 | 2410 | 23347 | 1252 | 2355 | 718 |
| Q4 | 27812 | 1053 | 3064 | 2276 | 2018 | 2444 | 2678 | 3432 | 4061 | 2412 | 23436 | 1277 | 2377 | 731 |

1 Includas employees, the self-employed, partlcipants on Government-sup-
Source: Labour Force Survey, National Statistics ported employment and training schemes and unpaid family-workers.
2 Perlods are calendar quarters.

## 10 <br> Redundancies, not seasonally adjusted ${ }^{1}$ <br> Government Office Regions

Rates ${ }^{2}$

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East <br> Midlands | West Midiands | East | London | South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Winter 1998 | DITA | LRDH 16 | LRDI 9 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { DCXF } \\ 6 \end{array}$ | DCXG | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \mathrm{DCXL}_{9} \end{array}$ | LRDJ 6 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { DCXI } \\ 10 \end{array}$ | LRDK | $\underset{9}{\mathrm{DCXK}}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { DCXN } \\ \hline 12 \end{array}$ | DCXO | $\mathrm{DITB}_{3}$ |
| Spring 1999 | 8 | $\sim^{3}$ | 9 | 9 | ${ }^{3}$ | 11 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 10 | $\sim^{3}$ |
| Summer 1999 | 7 | 3 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 6 | 7 | $-3^{3}$ | 8 | $\sim^{3}$ |
| Autumn 1999 | 7 | $\rightarrow^{3}$ | 10 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 8 | $\sim^{3}$ | 6 | ${ }^{3}$ |
| WInter 1999 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 11 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 15 | 9 | $\sim^{3}$ |
| Spring 2000 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 4 | 7 | 6 | 8 | $\sim^{3}$ | 10 | $-3$ |
| Summer 2000 | 6 | $\sim^{3}$ | 7 | 5 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 4 | , | 8 | -3 | 6 | $\sim^{3}$ |
| Autumn 2000 | 7 | $-^{3}$ | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | ${ }^{3}$ | 7 | $-3$ |
| Winter 2000 | 7 | $\sim^{3}$ | 9 | 6 | 7 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 8 | 9 | 6 | $\sim^{3}$ |
| Spring 2001 | 7 | $-3$ | 8 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 7 | -3 | 10 | -3 |
| Summer 2001 | 7 | $\sim^{3}$ | 8 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 5 | ${ }^{3}$ | 6 | ${ }^{3}$ |
| Autumn 2001 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 8 |  | 6 | $\sim^{3}$ | 7 | -3 |
| Winter 2001 | $-4$ | 12 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 10 | 8 | 10 | 10 | - 3 |
| Spring 2002 | ${ }^{4}$ | $-3$ | 8 | 5 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 7 | $-3$ | 8 | $-3$ |
| Summer 2002 | ${ }^{4}$ | ${ }^{3}$ | 7 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 7 | B | 8 | ${ }^{3}$ | 8 | - |
| Autumn 2002 | - 4 | $\sim^{3}$ | 6 | 6 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 9 | 7 | $4^{3}$ | 7 | ${ }^{3}$ |
| Winter 2002 | -4 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 5 | 12 | 8 | ${ }^{3}$ |

1 The method of calculating redundancy estimates back to spring 1995 has
Source: Labour Force Survey, National Statistics
changed from that used to calculate data previously published in this table
Thus the data in this table are not comparable to those previously published.
See pp225-229 of the May 2000 Labour Market Trends for more informa-
tion.
2 Redundancles per 1,000 employees.
Sample size too small to provide a rellable estimate.
4 Data to be shown on completion of full re-welghting of all LFS series

Employee jobs (all industries)
Government Office Regions
June $1996=100$

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East Midlands | West <br> Midlands | East | London | South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | YEKA | YEKB | YEKJ | YEKKC | YEKD | YEKI | YEKE | YEKF | YEKG | YEKH | YEKK | YEKL | YEKM |
| 1999 | 105.3 | 100.1 | 106.5 | 104.0 | 103.7 | 101.9 | 106.2 | 111.9 | 107.7 | 104.7 | 104.8 | 102.0 | 106.3 |
| 2000 | 107.2 | 116.5 | 101.8 | 109.1 | 110.7 | 107.2 | 106.5 | 102.0 | 104.0 | 105.3 | 106.0 | 103.5 | 108.7 |
| 2001 | 108.2 | 117.3 | 100.6 | 110.0 | 112.1 | 108.1 | 109.6 | 102.1 | 104.1 | 105.1 | 106.2 | 106.5 | 110.2 |
| 2002 | 108.1 | 115.7 | 102.3 | 110.4 | 110.5 | 108.5 | 111.0 | 102.7 | 103.7 | 105.1 | 105.8 | 106.6 | 111.3 |
| 2001 Jun | 108.1 | 99.8 | 107.5 | 104.8 | 103.9 | 101.6 | 112.8 | 117.4 | 109.8 | 109.8 | 106.3 | 106.8 | 109.8 |
| 200 Sep | 108.4 | 100.2 | 108.9 | 105.2 | 104.6 | 102.1 | 111.7 | 117.4 | 110.2 | 110.3 | 106.2 | 106.9 | 110.1 |
| Dec | 108.9 | 102.4 | 108.9 | 105.8 | 104.9 | 103.0 | 111.2 | 117.1 | 111.5 | 110.9 | 106.2 | 107.6 | 111.3 |
| 2002 Mar | 107.9 | 101.4 | 107.8 | 104.4 | 103.9 | 102.5 | 110.5 | 115.7 | 110.6 | 110.3 | 105.2 | 106.9 | 110.6 |
| 2002 Jun | 107.9 | 101.8 | 108.0 | 104.3 | 103.6 | 102.2 | 110.5 | 115.4 | 110.7 | 111.1 | 105.9 | 106.5 | 111.0 |
| Sop | 108.1 | 102.6 | 108.7 | 105.4 | 103.5 | 102.8 | 110.4 | 115.4 | 110.1 | 111.3 | 106.0 | 106.4 | 111.1 |
| Dec | 108.5 | 103.6 | 109.4 | 106.3 | 103.7 | 103.3 | 110.6 | 116.3 | 110.1 | 111.2 | 106.0 | 106.5 | 112.5 |

Source: Natlonal Statistics

## 12 Index of industrial production ${ }^{1}$

|  | United Kingdom | Scotland | Northern Ireland | Wales |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | CKYW | LRFK | LRFL | TMQX |
| 1999 | 104.2 | 115.3 | 118.3 | 100.9 |
| 2000 | 105.9 | 115.7 | 128.0 | 103.1 |
| 2001 | 103.6 | 106.4 | 126.9 | 95.4 |
| 2002 | 100.0 | . | .. | 93.8 |
| 1999 Q4 | 105.3 | 116.7 | 122.0 | 101.8 |
| 2000 Q1 | 104.8 | 116.8 | 124.3 | 104.5 |
| Q2 | 106.2 | 117.2 | 125.6 | 103.8 |
| Q3 | 106.4 | 115.8 | 130.3 | 101.9 |
| Q4 | 106.3 | 113.0 | 131.7 | 102.0 |
| 2001 Q1 |  | 110.4 | 134.2 | 97.9 |
| $02$ | 104.3 | 109.5 | 127.2 | 94.5 |
| Q3 | 103.4 | 105.1 | 125.1 | 94.7 |
| Q4 | 101.0 | 100.5 | 121.0 | 94.5 |
| 200201 | 99.8 | 97.3 | 118.3 | 93.9 |
| $\mathrm{Q} 2$ | 100.1 | 96.9 | 120.8 | 94.9 |
| Q3 | 100.5 | 96.0 | 120.6 | 94.4 |
| Q4 | 99.7 | .. | " | 92.1 |

1 The index of Industrial production has been rebased from 1990=100 to
Sources: National Statistics; Scottish Executive
Department of Enterprise, Trade \& Investment Northern Irelano

## 13 <br> Index of construction ${ }^{1}$

Seasonally adjusted $1995=100$

|  | Unlted Kingdom | Scotland | Northern Ireland | Wales |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GDQB | LRZR | LRFM | TMAY |
| 1999 | 107.8 | 101.6 |  | 93.0 |
| 2000 | 109.7 | 109.3 |  | 86.3 |
| 2001 | 113.7 | 106.4 | . | 80.5 |
| 2002 | 122.2 |  | .. | 90.3 |
| 1999 Q4 | 109.3 | 107.7 | 103.1 | 88.9 |
| 2000 Q1 | 112.1 | 114.8 |  | 85.9 |
|  | 109.7 | 105.3 | 121.2 | 91.4 |
| Q3 | 107.9 | 107.5 | 114.9 | 86.8 |
| Q4 | 109.2 | 109.5 | 113.2 | 81.3 |
| 2001 Q1 | 111.5 | 110.4 | 119.2 | 82.2 |
|  | 113.1 | 108.4 | 118.7 | 74.4 |
|  | 114.1 | 104.7 | 118.1 | 82.2 |
|  | 116.1 | 102.0 | 116.5 | 83.4 |
| $2002 Q_{1}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  | 120.9 | 103.5 | 117.92 | 86.7 89.8 |
|  | 123.1 | 106.1 | $115.0{ }^{3}$ | 90.8 |
| Q4 | 125.4 | .. | .. | 94.0 |

1 The Index of construction has been rebased from $1990=100$ to $1995=100$.

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East <br> Midiands | West Midlands | East | London and the South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern treland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DCMO | LRYS | LRYT | DCMU | DCMT | DCMS | LRYU | DCMP | DCMR | DCMX | DCMY | DCMZ |
| 2002 Apr | 21 4 | -11 | 14 | 14 12 | -4 | -3 | 18 | -8 | r ${ }^{4}$ | -1 | -7 | -6 |
| Oct | -19 | -11 | -18 | -9 | 3 | -20 | -20 | -18 | -37 | -15 | -18 | -7 |
| 2003 Jan | -19 | -4 | -26 | -13 | -28 | -27 | -29 | -19 | -10 | -20 | -26 | -4 |

1 Balance in percentage of firms reporting rises less those reperting falls.
Source: CBI/BSL Regional Trends Survey ISSN:0960 7781

## 15 <br> Manufacturing industry: volume of output <br> Government Office Regions (London and the South East is still on an SSR basis)

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | $\begin{array}{r} \text { East } \\ \text { Midiands } \end{array}$ | West Midlands | East | London and the South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Past 4 months | DCLQ | LPYV | LRYW | DCLW | DCLV | DCLU | LRYX | DCL.R | DCLT | DCLZ | DCMA | DCME |
| 2002 Apr | -15 | -3 | -5 | -24 | -5 | -17 | -11 | -9 | -26 | - | -33 | -21 |
| 200 Jul | -10 | 1 | 7 | -17 | -12 | -8 | -9 | 1 | -8 | 6 | 4 | -4 |
| Oct | -12 | -17 | -2 | -20 | 6 | -8 | -26 | -19 | -17 | 12 | 1 | 24 |
| 2003 Jan | -7 | 13 | -25 | -23 | -10 | -26 | -7 | -11 | 22 | 9 | -7 | - |
| Next 4 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2003 Jan | 2 | - 31 | -4 | 15 | -4 | 2 | 9 | 8 | 7 | -11 | -12 | 11 |

1 Balance in percentage of firms reporting rises less those reporting falls.
Source: CBI/BSL. Regional Trends Survey ISSN:0960 7781

## 16 <br> Manufacturing industry: volume of new orders <br> Government Office Regions (London and the South East is still on an SSR basis)

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East Midlands | West Midlands | East | London and the South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Past 4 months |  |  | LRZC | DCNG | DCNF |  | IRZO | DCNB | DCND | DCNJ | DCNK | DCNL |
| 2002 Apr | -14 |  |  | -19 | -1 | -15 | -10 | -17 | -22 | -7 | -30 | -22 |
| Jul | -11 | $-5$ | 8 | -17 | -17 | -17 | -1 | 3 | -22 | 6 | -3 | 6 |
| Oct | -16 | 7 | 1 | -20 | 3 | -6 | -28 | -20 | -35 | -8 | -2 | 8 |
| 2003 Jan | $-9$ | 22 | $-18$ | $-2$ | -13 | -12 | -12 | -6 | -5 | -24 | -19 | 38 |
| Next 4 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DCNM | LRZE | LRZF | DCNS | DCNR | DCNQ | LRZG | DCNN | DCNP | DCNV | DCNW | DCNX |
| 2003 Jan | 2 | 27 | -4 | 6 |  | 8 | -7 | 4 | -26 | -10 | -7 |  |

1 Balance in percentage of firms reporting rises less those reporting falls.
Source: CBI/BSL Regional Trends Survey ISSN:0960 7781

17
Manufacturing industry: volume of new export orders
Government Office Regions (London and the South East is still on an SSR basis)

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East <br> Midlands | West Midlands | East | London and the South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Past 4 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2002 Apr | DCNY | LRZH | LRZI | DCOE | DCOD -29 | OCOC -23 | LRZJ | DCNZ | DCOB -56 | $\mathrm{DCOH}_{2}$ | DCOI | DCOJ |
| Jul | -14 | -1 | 11 | -11 | -33 | -21 | -13 | -1 | $-43$ | -1 | 9 | 11 |
| Oct | -19 | 6 |  | 2 | 13 | -4 | -29 | -25 | -26 | -9 | -23 | 13 |
| 2003 Jan | -21 | 15 | -14 | -16 | -18 | $-8$ | -20 | -17 | -22 | -34 | -24 | -5 |
| Next 4 months |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | DCOK | LRZK | ${ }_{-17}^{\text {LRZL }}$ | $\mathrm{DCOQ}_{3}$ | DCOP | DCOO | LRZM | DCOL. | DCON | OCOT | DCOU | DCOV |
| 2003 Jan | -9 | 12 | -17 | 3 | -27 | 14 | -9 | 1 | -19 | -5 | -18 | -15 |

1 Balance In percentage of firms reporting rises less those reporting falls.
Source: CBI/BSL Reglonal Trends Survey ISSN:0960 7781

18
Manufacturing industry: firms working below capacity
Government Office Regions (London and the South East is still on an SSR basis)

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | $\begin{array}{r} \text { East } \\ \text { Midlands } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | West <br> Midlands | East | London and the South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DCOW | LRZN | LRZO | DCPC | DCPB | DCPA | LRZP | DCOX | DCOZ | DCPF | DCPG | DCPH |
| 2002 Apr | 72 | 80 | 65 | 80 | 66 | 60 | 69 | 72 | 71 | 69 | 54 | 68 |
|  | 67 | 92 | 53 | 70 | 62 | 55 | 66 | 73 | 56 | 64 | 44 | 54 |
| Oct | 67 | 74 | 63 | 81 | 53 | 63 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 52 | 47 | 70 |
| 2003 Jan | 74 | 76 | 64 | 79 | 72 | 73 | 65 | 72 | 70 | 54 | 59 | 51 |


|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | $\begin{array}{r} \text { East } \\ \text { Midlands } \end{array}$ | West <br> Midiands | East | London | South East | South West | Wales | Scotiand ${ }^{1}$ | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2001 2002 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { DEOI } \\ 193053 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LRDP } \\ & 6373 \\ & 6541 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { LRZO } \\ 19228 \\ 18924 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DCRX } \\ & 14774 \\ & 14635 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DCRW } \\ & 14982 \\ & 16705 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DCRV } \\ & 14616 \\ & 14599 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LRDR } \\ & 19071 \\ & 19896 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DCRA } \\ & 16601 \\ & 17642 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { LRDS } \\ & 25727 \\ & 25464 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { DCRU } \\ & 16393 \\ & 16904 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BLIA } \\ & 9141 \\ & 9373 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { BLFA } \\ 23091 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { BLGA } \\ & 13245 \\ & 11976 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1999 Q4 | 42842 | 1473 | 4424 | 3418 | 4034 | 3402 | 4101 | 2951 | 5361 | 3709 | 1958 | 5386 | 2625 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2000 \mathrm{Q1} \\ \mathrm{Q2} \\ \text { Q3 } \\ \mathrm{Q4} \end{array}$ | 52100 50641 48140 37971 | $\begin{aligned} & 2071 \\ & 1793 \\ & 1712 \\ & 1518 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5546 \\ & 4804 \\ & 4554 \\ & 3779 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3571 \\ & 3661 \\ & 3594 \\ & 2987 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4161 \\ & 3992 \\ & 3890 \\ & 3087 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4566 \\ & 4464 \\ & 3663 \\ & 3087 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5350 \\ & 5074 \\ & 4871 \\ & 3391 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3240 \\ & 4466 \\ & 4119 \\ & 3475 \end{aligned}$ | 6316 6776 6078 4270 | $\begin{aligned} & 4688 \\ & 4595 \\ & 4258 \\ & 3200 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2205 \\ & 2749 \\ & 2781 \\ & 1617 \end{aligned}$ | 6794 5464 6130 5291 | 3592 2803 2490 2269 |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2001 \mathrm{Q} 1 \\ \mathrm{Q2} \\ \mathrm{Q3} \\ \mathrm{Q4} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48861 \\ & 51617 \\ & 49735 \\ & 42840 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1926 \\ & 1735 \\ & 1593 \\ & 1119 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4788 \\ & 4938 \\ & 4813 \\ & 4689 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3879 \\ & 3797 \\ & 3644 \\ & 3454 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3757 \\ & 3766 \\ & 3967 \\ & 3492 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4026 \\ & 4116 \\ & 3309 \\ & 3165 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4521 \\ & 5641 \\ & 4825 \\ & 4084 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3446 \\ & 4338 \\ & 5705 \\ & 3112 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6043 \\ & 7071 \\ & 6509 \\ & 6104 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4082 \\ & 4431 \\ & 4125 \\ & 3755 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2206 \\ & 2705 \\ & 2452 \\ & 1778 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6392 \\ & 5464 \\ & 5802 \\ & 5433 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3764 \\ & 3847 \\ & 2889 \\ & 2745 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} 2002 \text { Q1 } \\ \text { Q2 } \\ \text { Q3 } \\ \text { Q4 } \end{array}$ | $50629$ $50559$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1768 \\ & 1764 \\ & 1644 \\ & 1365 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5258 \\ & 5093 \\ & 4672 \\ & 3901 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3328 \\ & 3765 \\ & 4196 \\ & 3345 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3580 \\ & 4439 \\ & 4976 \\ & 3710 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4079 \\ & 3621 \\ & 3864 \\ & 3035 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5391 \\ & 4403 \\ & 5982 \\ & 4120 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4765 \\ & 4152 \\ & 4321 \\ & 4404 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6431 \\ & 7145 \\ & 6300 \\ & 5588 \end{aligned}$ | 4672 4372 4508 3352 | $\begin{aligned} & 2159 \\ & 2794 \\ & 2617 \\ & 1803 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6326 \\ & 5165 \\ & 5250 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3381 \\ & 3381^{3} \\ & 3107 \\ & 2107 \end{aligned}$ |

1 Includes estimates for outstanding retums for private sector. 2 Estimate for 2002 Q4 for the English regions is provisional. 3 Estimate for 2002 Q2 for Northern Ireland has been revised.

Sources: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister,
National Assembly for Wales; Scottish Executive; Depantment for Social Development, Northern Ireland

House prices ${ }^{1}$
Government Office Regions
$1993=100$

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West ${ }^{2}$ | Mersey- side | Yorkshire and the Humber | East <br> Midiands | West <br> Midiands | East | London | South East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | LRBH | LRDX | LRDY | LREN | LRBJ | LRBK | LRBP | LRDZ | LRBM | LREA | LRBO | LRBR | LRBS | LRBT |
| 2001 | 179.2 | 132.1 | 143.5 | 141.9 | 132.5 | 157.1 | 160.5 | 192.9 | 231.8 | 207.5 | 191.3 | 146.4 | 129.3 | 207.8 |
| 2002 | 209.6 | 156.3 | 168.7 | 152.0 | 160.2 | 196.3 | 195.2 | 235.4 | 254.8 | 241.7 | 236.2 | 176.3 | 146.0 | 229.3 |
| 1999 Q4 | 152.1 | 119.4 | 129.5 | 112.7 | 120.0 | 129.7 | 136.3 | 159.7 | 192.6 | 167.3 | 150.6 | 125.5 | 124.8 | 170.7 |
| 2000 Q1 | 156.0 | 116.5 | 126.5 | 109.8 | 119.9 | 137.3 | 137.5 | 163.7 | 200.7 | 171.6 | 157.7 | 128.6 | 124.2 | 181.5 |
| Q2 | 164.5 | 131.9 | 135.8 | 120.0 | 119.9 | 140.8 | 146.9 | 170.6 | 215.7 | 184.5 | 163.8 | 129.2 | 123.6 | 184.3 |
| Q3 | 167.6 | 122.4 | 134.8 | 121.2 | 127.4 | 144.6 | 151.0 | 178.0 | 204.1 | 192.4 | 176.9 | 131.8 | 124.4 | 186.0 |
| Q4 | 172.6 | 126.2 | 129.3 | 134.8 | 125.7 | 144.7 | 153.1 | 181.4 | 219.2 | 202.1 | 177.7 | 133.2 | 124.2 | 201.9 |
| 2001 Q1 | 171.7 | 122.7 | 135.4 | 150.5 | 129.0 | 146.3 | 152.2 | 188.1 | 225.5 | 192.0 | 182.0 | 137.7 | 130.2 | 221.9 |
|  | 177.9 | 132.9 | 138.0 | 132.0 | 128.8 | 154.5 | 157.9 | 187.9 | 234.4 | 211.3 | 183.8 | 154.6 | 126.9 | 204.4 |
| Q3 | 184.3 | 132.7 | 153.5 | 141.5 | 135.9 | 162.6 | 166.6 | 196.3 | 236.4 | 214.3 | 200.2 | 148.1 | 130.5 | 215.0 |
| Q4 | 180.6 | 141.3 | 142.0 | 140.7 | 135.7 | 163.6 | 162.1 | 196.2 | 228.2 | 207.9 | 197.9 | 145.1 | 131.5 | 196.2 |
| 2002 Q1 | 187.3 | 139.6 | 144.5 | 121.6 | 141.7 | 173.8 | 168.9 | 222.2 | 226.6 | 211.0 | 201.2 | 168.3 | 146.2 | 210.7 |
| Q2 | 202.3 | 144.0 | 169.9 | 158.1 | 156.0 | 190.5 | 184.3 | 227.7 | 253.1 | 228.1 | 226.8 | 170.2 | 141.0 | 222.1 |
| Q3 | 219.1 | 153.6 | 172.3 | 153.8 | 164.2 | 202.4 | 209.6 | 239.4 | 268.5 | 254.1 | 255.9 | 192.5 | 145.3 | 237.9 |
| Q4 | 223.8 | 181.7 | 185.2 | 163.4 | 176.4 | 216.2 | 210.5 | 247.9 | 261.5 | 263.6 | 253.1 | 174.6 | 154.7 | 233.8 |

1 These indices adjust for the mix of dwellings (by size and type, whether new
Source: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister or second-hand) and exclude those bought at non-market prices and are based on a sample of mortgage completions by all lenders.
2 Excludes Merseyside.

21
VAT registrations and deregistrations ${ }^{1}$ : net change ${ }^{2}$
Government Office Regions

|  | United Kingdom | North East | North West | Yorkshire and the Humber | East Midiands | West Midands | East | London | South <br> - East | South West | Wales | Scotland | Northern Ireland |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | DCYO | LREB | LAZS | DCYT | DCYU | DCYY | LRED | DEON | LREE | DCYX | DCZA | DCZB | DCZC |
| 1998 | 30.3 | 0.2 | 2.5 | 0.5 | 1.2 | 1.7 | 2.7 | 11.3 | 6.9 | 1.7 | -0.1 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| 1999 | 6.5 | -0.1 | 0.9 | -0.7 | -0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 4.6 | 2.4 | 0.1 | -0.7 | -0.5 | -0.1 |
| 2000 | 6.2 | 0.1 | 0.8 | -0.8 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 1.0 | 2.7 | 1.9 | - | -0.2 | - | 0.3 |
| 2001 | 12.7 | -0.1 | 1.4 | 0.2 | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 2.8 | 3.9 | 0.8 | 0.1 | 0.8 | 0.2 |

1 Registrations and deregistrations of VAT-based enterprises. Not wholly
Source: Department of Trade and Industry Comparable with figures for earlier years which counted VAT reporting units.
2 Reglistrations less deregistrations.

# The effects of taxes and benefits on household income, 2001-02 
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## SUMMARY

This analysis examines how taxes and benefits redistribute income between various groups of households in the United Kingdom. It shows where different types of households and individuals are in the income distribution and looks at the changing levels of income inequality over time. The tables and figures were renumbered starting from the previous annual publication and new tables and figures were added. Table 1, showing links between the current tables and figures and those for 1999-2000 and previous years, is included at the end of the summary section.

## Redistribution through taxes and benefits

Government intervention, by means of taxes and benefits, alters the incomes of households. In general, households in the top half of the distribution pay more in taxes than they receive in benefits while the reverse is true for those in the lower half. Taxes and benefits therefore tend to reduce the differences between househoids' incomes. As shown in Table 4 for 2001-02, before government intervention, the top fifth of househoids have an average of around $£ 62,900$ per year in original income (that is from sources such as earnings, occupational pensions and investments). This is around 18 times as great as the figure of around $£ 3,500$ for the bottom fifth. After taking account of taxes and benefits, the ratio for final income is greatly reduced to four to one. Both of these ratios are basically the same as in 2000-01. The effect on the transition between original income and final income for 2001-02, broken down by quintiles, is also shown graphically in Figure 1.

## Figure 1

Original income and Final income by quintile groups for ALL households, 2001-02


Figure 2
Gross income by quintile groups for ALL households, 2001-02


Cash benefits play the largest part in reducing inequality. The majority of these go to households in the lower part of the distribution, with the poorest two fiths receiving 60 per cent of the total. As shown in Table 4, these househoids typically receive around $£ 5,600$ from cash benefits, representing around three fifths of gross income for the bottom quintile group and two fifths for the next group. These proportions are even higher for retired households in this part of the distribution (see Table 12). The majority of cash benefits for non-retired households come from non-contributory benefits and, for retired households, from contributory benefits, particularly the state pension. Figure 2 shows gross income broken down into original income and cash benefits by the quintile distribution for equivalised disposable income.

Direct taxes, except for local taxes, are progressive - they take a larger proportion of income from those higher up the income distribution because tax is not paid on the first tranche of income and higher rates of tax are paid on higher incomes. Therefore, they also contribute to a reduction in inequality although not to the same extent as cash benefits. The proportion of gross income paid in direct tax (Table 3) by the top fifth of households is double that paid by the bottom fifth: 24 per cent compared with 12 per cent. For local taxes, the top quintile group pays the largest absolute amount (Table 14A). On the other hand, when expressed as a proportion of gross income (Table 3), the impact of local taxes is higher in the lower half of the distribution.
indirect taxes have the opposite effect to direct taxes taking a higher proportion of income from those with lower incomes, i.e. they are regressive. This is partiy due to the recorded expenditure of some lower income households being higher than their recorded current incomes. This results in relatively large payments of indirect tax. In addition, on average higher income households channel a relatively high proportion of their income into savings and mortgage payments. These do not attract indirect taxes. Despite this, the top fifth of households still pay more indirect tax in absolute terms than other households, see Table 14A.

Households also receive benefits in kind from services provided free or at subsidised prices by government, such as health and education. The amount received falls gradually as income increases indicating that these benefits also lead to a reduction in inequality.

## Characteristics across the income distribution

Adults and children are not spread evenly throughout the income distribution (Tables 4,15 and 15 A ). For example, there are more children in households in the lower half of the distribution. However, among adults, women appear fairly evenly spread across income groups. There are more men in households in the higher groups than in the lower groups. There are also distinct patterns by household type. For example, households containing one adult and at least one child are concentrated in the bottom fifth. Retired households are over-represented in the bottom two quintile groups.

The higher income groups are characterised by households with more economically active people than those lower down the income distribution. Two adult households with no children are also over-represented towards the top of the distribution.

## Trends in income inequality

As shown in Figure 5 and Table 27, inequality of disposable income was fairly stable in the first half of the 1980s then increased during the second half of the 1980s. Inequality was relatively flat in the 1990 s but with some indications of a slight fall in the first half of the 1990 s and a slight rise since then.

Changes in the income distribution over time have been the focus of much study. This analysis includes discussion of work which has attempted to identify some of the factors which have influenced these changes.

## CONCEPTS AND SOURCES

## Redistribution through taxes and benefits

This study examines how taxes and benefits redistribute income. It adds the value of government benefits to the private income of households and subtracts the value of taxes to look at different measures of household income.

Diagram 1 shows the stages in the redistribution of income used in this analysis. Household members receive income from employment, occupational pensions, investments and other nongovernment sources. This is referred to as original income. The diagram shows the various ways that government raises revenue from households through taxation and distributes benefits to them in cash and in kind.

The analysis only allocates those taxes and benefits that can reasonably be attributed to households. Therefore, some government revenue and expenditure is not allocated such as revenue from corporation tax and expenditure on defence and public order. There are three main reasons for non-allocation. Some taxes and benefits fall on people who do not live in private households. In other cases, there is no clear conceptual basis for allocation to particular households. Finally, there may be a lack of data to enable allocation. In this study, some $£ 270$ billion of taxes and compulsory social contributions have been allocated to households. This is equivalent to 69 per cent of general government expenditure, which totalled around $£ 384$ billion in 2001 (Table 13). Similarly, $£ 219$ billion of cash benefits and benefits in kind have been allocated to households, making up 57 per cent of general government expenditure (Table 13).

The estimated values of taxes and benefits reflect the methodology used in this study. They are based on assumptions about which taxes and benefits should be covered and to whom they should apply. Where it is practical, the methodology used is similar to that used in previous years. However, there have been some changes in the underlying survey (the Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS) from 2001-02, formerly the Family Expenditure Survey (FES)) and improvements in the methodology. For example, changes from 1996-97 onwards include new questions for the self-employed and the use of data which are grossed up to the UK household population. Time series are presented for some measures that are relatively robust to these changes. These include Gini coefficients and other measures of inequality in Tables 26 and 27 . Beyond these measures, one should be cautious about making direct comparisons with earlier studies.

## Diagram 1



> A National Statistics strategic quality review of income statistics and a quality review of the redistribution of income analyses are being carried out currently. For further information, please contact the author.

## Unit of analysis

The unit of analysis used in this study is the household. The households are ranked by their equivalised disposable income, which the analysis uses as a proxy for their level of welfare. Equivalisation is a standard methodology that takes into account the size and composition of households and adjusts their incomes to recognise differing demands on resources. For example, a couple would need a higher income than a single person to achieve the same standard of living. So a single person's income of $£ 6,100$ is treated as equivalent to an income of $£ 10,000$ for a couple (see Appendix 2, paragraph 46). Househoids with the same equivalised
income do not necessarily have the same standard of living where other characteristics are different. For example, households which own their homes outright would be in a better position than identical households with the same income which had to pay rent or mortgage payments. Also, households which include disabled people may require additional resources to maintain the same standard of living as those without disabled people. Equivalisation does not adjust for these differences.

Equivalised income is used only to rank the households. Most monetary values shown in the analysis are not equivalised. Where equivalised amounts are given, they are shown in italics. Once the households have been ranked, the distribution is split into five (or ten) equally sized groups - that is quintile groups (or decile groups). The bottom and second quintile groups are those with the lowest equivalised disposable incomes while the fourth and top groups have the highest.

## Data source

The main data source for this analysis is the EFS which covers about 7,000 households in the United Kingdom each year. It oniy covers private households - people living in hotels, lodging houses and in institutions, such as old peoples' homes, are excluded. The EFS brought together and replaced the FES and the National Food Survey from 2001-02. However, the income questions were essentially unchanged.

The survey results are re-weighted and grossed so that the totals reflect the whole household population in terms of age, sex and region. Different initial weights are applied to different types of household in order to correct for over or under-representation of these groups in the responding sample of the EFS. Studies have indicated that the EFS suffers from under-representation at the very top of the income distribution. This under-representation is not directly corrected by the re-weighting and grossing methodology and may lead to some under-estimation of income. Those who are interested in the level of income for the top decile group of the income distribution should refer to the Department for Work and Pensions publication Households Below Average Income 2001-02.1 This analysis uses data from the Family Resources Survey and contains an income adjustment for households at the top of the income distribution, which is made using the Inland Revenue's Survey of Personal Incomes.

Further details of the concepts and methodology used are given in Appendix 2.

The results of the analysis are reported in three sections. The first looks at the effects for all households. Non-retired and retired households have distinct income and expenditure patterns and so the tax and benefit systems affect the two groups in very different ways. Therefore, the second and third sections look separately at results for non-retired and retired househoids.

TABLE 1: Comparison between old and new table and figure numbers, and additional tables and figures

| Old table or chart | New Name | Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chart 1 | Diagram 1 | Stages of redistribution |
| New Chart | Figure 1 | Original income and final income by quintile groups of all households, 2001-02 |
| New Chart | Figure 2 | Gross income (original income \& cash benefits) by quintile groups of all households, 2001-02 |
| Chart 2 | Figure 3 | Sources of gross income by quintile groups of equivalised disposable income, 2001-02 |
| Chart 3 | Figure 4 | Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits on all households, 2001-02 |
| Chart 4 | Figure 5 | Gini coefficients 1979 to 2001-02 |
| Chart 5 | Figure 6 | Income stages by non-retired household types, 2001-02 |
| Look up table | Table 1 | Comparison between old and new table and figure numbers and additional tables and figures |
| A | Table? | Percentage shares of household income and Gini coefficients, 2001-02 |
| B | Table 3 | Taxes as a percentage of gross income, disposable income and expenditure for all househoids by quintle groups, 2001-02 |
| C | Table 4 | Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits by quintile groups on all households, 2001-02 |
| D | Table 5 | Percentage shares of househoid income and Gini coefficients for non-retired households, 2001-02 |
| E | Table 6 | Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits on non-retired households by quintie groups, 2001-02 |
| F | Table 7 | Cash benefits for non-retired households by quintile groups, 2001-02 |
| G | Table 8 | Taxes as a percentage of gross income for non-retired households by quintile groups, 2001-02 |
| H | Table 9 | Indirect taxes as a percentage of (a) disposable income and (b) household expenditure for non-retired households by quintile groups, 2001-02 |
| 1 | Table 10 | Benefits in kind for non-retired househoids by quintile groups, 2001-02 |
| $J$ | Table 11 | Percentage shares of household income and Gini coefficients for retired households, 2001-02 |
| K | Table 12 | Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits on retired households by quintile groups, 2001-02 |
| Appendix 1 | Appendix 1 |  |
| 1 | Table 13 | Taxes and benefits allocated to households as a percentage of general govermment expenditure, 2001 |
| 2 A | Table 14 | Average incomes, taxes and benefits by decile groups of all households, 2001-02 |
| New quintiles | Table 14A | Average incomes, taxes and benefits by quintile groups of all households, 2001-02 |
| 2 B | Table 15 | Household characteristics of decile groups of all households, 2001-02 |
| New quintiles | Table 15A | Household characteristics of quintile groups of ali households, 2001-02 |
| 3A | Table 16 | Average incomes, taxes and benefits by decile groups of non-retired households, 2001-02 |
| New quintiles | Table 16A | Average incomes, taxes and benefits by quintile groups of non-retired households, 2001-02 |
| 3B | Table 17 | Household characteristics of decile groups of non-retired households, 2001-02 |
| New quintiles | Table 17A | Household characteristics of quintile groups of non-retired households, 2001-02 |
| 4A | Table 18 | Average incomes, taxes and benefits by decile groups of retired households, 2001-02 |
| New quintiles | Table 18A | Average incomes, taxes and benefits by quintile groups of retired households, 2001-02 |
| 48 | Table 19 | Household characteristics of decile groups of retired households, 2001-02 |
| New quintiles | Table 19A | Household characteristics of quintile groups of retired households, 2001-02 |
| 5 | Table 20 | Average incomes, taxes and benefits by decile groups of non-retired households without children, 2001-02 |
| 6 | Table 21 | Average incomes, taxes and benefits by decile groups of non-retired households with children, 2001-02 |
| 7 | Table 22 | Distribution of households by househoid type, 2001-02 |
| 8 | Table 23 | Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits, by household type, 2001-02 |
| 9 | Table 24 | Average incomes, taxes and benefits by decile groups of households (ranked by unadjusted disposable income), 2001-02 |
| 10 | Table 25 | Cross-tabulation of households ranked by disposable income, unadjusted and equivalised, 2001-02 |
| Appendix 2 | Appendix 1 | Long run time series |
| i | Table 26 | Percentage shares of equivalised total original, gross, disposable and post-lax incomes by quintile groups for all households, 1979 to 2001-02 |
| 2 | Table 27 | Gini coefficients for the distribution of income at each slage of the tax-benefit system |
| 3 | Table 27 | and P90/P10 and P75/P25 ratios for disposable income for all households, 1979 to 2001-02 |
| Appendix 3 | Appendix 2 | Methodology and definitions |
| Diagram A | Diagram 3 | Complete income equality |
| Diagram B | Diagram 2 | Lorenz curve for a lypical income distribution |

Note:
Symbois The ollowing symbols have been usad throughour the matysts
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## RESULTS FOR ALL HOUSEHOLDS

## Overall effect

Government intervention affects household income in various ways. Money is taken through taxes, both direct and indirect, and given back in the form of cash benefits and the provision of free or subsidised services. In general, households in the bottom half of the income distribution tend to be net gainers from the tax and benefit systems while those in the top hall pay more in tax than they receive in benefits. Therefore, taken as a whole, government intervention leads to income being shared more equally between households. Table 2 summarises the overall effects.
in this analysis, income before taxes and benefits is termed original income and includes income from earnings, occupational pensions and investments. The extent of inequality in this measure of income can be seen by looking at the proportion of total original income received by groups of househoids in different parts of the income distribution. At this stage, the richest fith of households (those in the top quintile group) receive 52 per cent of all original income (Table 2). This compares with only 3 per cent for households in the bottom fiith.

Adding cash benefits to original income produces gross income. In contrast to original income, the amount received from cash benefits is higher for households lower down the income distribution than for those at the top. This has an equalising effect on the distribution. It

TABLE 2: Percentage shares of household income and Gini coefficients ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$, 2001-02

|  | Percentage shares of equivalised income for ALL households ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Original income | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gross } \\ & \text { income } \end{aligned}$ | Disposable income | Posttax income |
| Quintilie group ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | 3 | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| 2nd | 7 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| 3 rd | 14 | 15 | 16 | 15 |
| 4th | 24 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Top | 52 | 45 | 43 | 46 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Decile group ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Botiom | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| Top | 34 | 30 | 28 | 31 |
| Ginic coefficient |  |  |  |  |
| (percenti) | 53 | 39 | 36 | 40 |

[^4]
## Figure 3


raises the share of income received by the bottom quintile group to 6 per cent of gross income while the share of the top fifth is reduced to 45 per cent. Figure 3 shows a breakdown of gross income by quintiles.

The tax system has a much smaller effect on income inequality. The shares of income for disposable income (that is after direct taxes) and post-tax income (after indirect taxes) for each quintile group are similar to those for gross income. The direct tax system has a small equalising effect while the indirect system reverses this.

Tables 3,14 and 14 A show the effect of direct and indirect tax on each quintile and decile group in more detail. Households at the lower end of the income distribution pay smaller amounts of direct tax compared with households with higher incomes. Of the total income tax paid by all households, the bottom two quintile groups together pay about 6 per cent. This compares with 82 per cent of the total paid by the top two fifths combined.

In addition, low income households also pay a smaller proportion of their income in income tax. This is due to the progressive nature of the income tax system. As a proportion of their gross incomes, households in the bottom quintile group pay 3 per cent in income tax on average compared with 18 per cent for those in the top quintile group.

For national insurance contributions, the amount paid as a proportion of gross income rises as income rises until the fourth quintile group. The proportion then falls for the top fifth. This is because national insurance contributions are only levied on the first $£ 575$ of weekly earnings in 2001-02, so part of the earnings of many of those in the top quintile group will not be subject to this deduction.

TABLE 3: Taxes as a percentage of gross income, disposable income and expenditure for ALL households by quintile groups', 2001-02
(a) Direct and indirect taxes as a percentage of gross income
(b) Indirect taxes as a percentage of disposable income
(c) Indirect taxes as a percentage of expenditure ${ }^{2}$

| Quintile groups of ALL households' |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { All } \\ \text { households } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Botom | 2nd | 3 rd | 4th | Top |  |

(a) Percentages of gross income

| Direct taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income tax | 3.2 | 6.3 | 10.3 | 13.5 | 18.3 | 13.7 |
| Employess' NIC | 1.2 | 2.4 | 4.0 | 4.8 | 3.8 | 3.8 |
| Local taxes | 7.1 | 4.8 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 3.0 |
| Ald direct taxes | 11.6 | 13.5 | 18.0 | 21.2 | 23.9 | 20.5 |
| Indirect taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VAT | 11.3 | 7.5 | 7.0 | 6.2 | 4.6 | 6.1 |
| Duty on alcohol | 1.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| Duty on tobacco | 3.1 | 1.8 | 1.5 | 0.9 | 0.3 | 1.0 |
| Duty on hydrocatbon oils \& Vehicle excise duty | 3.3 | 2.4 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 1.3 | 1.9 |
| Other indirect taxes | 10.8 | 7.1 | 5.8 | 5.0 | 3.5 | 5.1 |
| All indirect taxes | 30.1 | 19.9 | 17.7 | 15.2 | 10.4 | 14.9 |
| All laxes | 41.7 | 33.3 | 35.7 | 36.4 | 34.2 | 35.3 |

(b) Percentages of disposable income

| VAT | 12.8 | 8.7 | 8.5 | 7.9 | 6.0 | 7.6 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Duty on alcohol | 1.8 | 1.2 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 0.8 | 1.1 |
| Duty on tobacco | 3.5 | 2.1 | 1.8 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 1.2 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils and Vehicle excise duty | 3.8 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 1.7 | 2.4 |
| Other indirect taxes | 12.2 | 8.2 | 7.1 | 6.3 | 4.6 | 6.4 |
| All indirect taxes | 34.1 | 23.0 | 21.6 | 19.2 | 13.6 | 18.7 |

(c) Percentages of expenditure ${ }^{2}$

| VAT | 8.0 | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.7 | 7.0 | 7.6 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Duty on alcohol | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| Duty on tobacco | 2.2 | 1.9 | 1.7 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 1.2 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils and Vehicle excise duty | 2.4 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.0 | 2.4 |
| Other indirect taxes | 7.7 | 7.6 | 6.6 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 6.3 |
| All indirect taxes | 21.4 | 21.3 | 20.1 | 18.7 | 15.8 | 18.5 |

[^5]Local taxes mainly consist of council tax in Great Britain and domestic rates in Northern Ireland and are shown net of council tax benefits and rates rebates in Tables 3, 14 and 14A. Households in the lower part of the income distribution pay smaller absolute amounts in local taxes. Net payments by the bottom quintile group are typically just over hall of those in the top fifth. On the other hand, when expressed as a proportion of gross income, the burden decreases as income rises. Local taxes represent 7 per cent of gross income for those in the bottom fifth but 2 per cent for those in the top quintile group.

## Indirect taxes

The amount of indirect tax that each household pays is estimated from its expenditure recorded in the EFS. However, the income and expenditure data recorded in the EFS are not fully compatible because they are recorded in different ways (see Appendix 2, paragraph 6). Indeed, measured expenditure exceeds measured income for households in the lower half of the distribution. There are a number of possible explanations for this. Some households with low incomes may draw on their savings or borrow in order to finance their expenditure. In these cases, expenditure taxes are not being met from current income. Some types of receipts are not included as income in the EFS, e.g. inheritance and severance payments. In some cases, the information given on direct tax is not consistent with that on income received, possibly because of timing differences. For a minority of households, the EFS may be measuring incomes inaccurately. Therefore, to give a more complete picture of the impact of indirect taxes, they are shown in Table 3 as a proportion of gross and disposable income and, separately, as a proportion of expenditure. In addition, direct taxes are also shown as a proportion of gross income so that the impact of direct and indirect taxes can be compared.

In cash terms, the top fifth of households pay nearly two and a half times as much indirect tax as the bottom fifth. However, when expressed as a percentage of expenditure, the proportion paid in indirect tax tends to be lower for households at the top of the distribution compared to those lower down.

When expressed as a proportion of gross or disposable income, as shown in Table 3, the impact of indirect taxes declines sharply as income rises (as shown in Table 14A). This is because those in higher income groups tend to channel a larger proportion of their income into savings and mortgage payments, which do not attract indirect taxes. Indirect taxes therefore appear more regressive than when expressed as a proportion of expenditure. However, the top fifth still pay a smaller proportion of their expenditure or income in indirect taxation whichever measure is used.

Another way of looking at how taxes and benefits change inequality is to calculate Gini coefficients - a widely used summary measure of inequality (see Appendix 2, paragraph 51). It can take values from 0 to 100 per cent where a value of zero would indicate that each household had an equal share of income, while higher values indicate greater inequality.

The Gini coefficients (as shown in Tables 2 and 27) produce a similar picture to the shares of income discussed earlier. For 2001-02, the figure of 53 per cent for original income is reduced to 39 per cent for gross income by the inclusion of cash benefits - a large reduction in inequality. The coefficient for disposable income shows the equalising effect of direct taxes with the figure falling further to 36 per cent. The picture of indirect taxes reversing this effect is confirmed by the Gini coefficient rising to 40 per cent for post-tax income. The Gini coefficients for original, gross, disposable and post-tax income show marginal rises in 2001-02 compared to those in 2000-01, taking them back to similar levels to those in 1999-2000. As discussed earlier, all comparisons are subject to the potential effect of the discrepancy between income and expenditure in the lower half of the income distribution.

## Characteristics of households

Different types of household are not spread evenly throughout the income distribution. Information about the characteristics of households in the different income groups is shown in Table 4, with more detail in Tables 15 and 15A. Household size does not vary much across the income distribution, with an average of between 2.1 and 2.5 people per household in each decile group in 2001-02. There are differences in the split between adults and children. A child (i.e. a dependent) is defined as either aged under 16, or aged 16, 17 or 18 not married, and receiving full-time non-advanced further education. There are more children in the lower half of the income distribution. The bottom quintile group has about one and a half times the number of children as the top group. The pattern for the numbers of men and women also varies across income groups. The number of women is fairly constant while households in the higher income groups tend to have more men than the lower groups. Higher income groups also contain more economically active people. The top fifth of households has about three times as many economically active people as the bottom fitth. Non-retired households with one adult and one or more children are concentrated in the lower groups, as shown in Tables 4, 15A and 22.

Around 70 per cent of these households are in the bottom two quintile groups. This group makes up the majority of lone parent families. However, some lone parents will be part of larger households and will be included in other household types. For two adult households

TABLE 4: Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits by quintile groups on ALL households', 2001-02

|  | Quintile groups of ALL households ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  |  | Ratio <br> Top/Bottom quintile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | Top |  |  |
| Income, taxes and benefits per household $\left(£\right.$ per year) ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Original income | 3460 | 9060 | 19490 | 32220 | 62860 | 25420 | 18 |
| plus cash benefits | 5530 | 5650 | 3950 | 2230 | 1150 | 3700 | 0 |
| Gross income | 8980 | 14710 | 23430 | 34440 | 64010 | 29120 | 7 |
| less direct taxes ${ }^{3}$ and employees' NIC | 1040 | 1980 | 4220 | 7300 | 15270 | 5960 | 15 |
| Disposable income | 7950 | 12730 | 19210 | 27140 | 48740 | 23150 | 6 |
| less indirect taxes | 2710 | 2920 | 4150 | 5220 | 6630 | 4330 | 2 |
| Post-tax income | 5240 | 9800 | 15060 | 21920 | 42110 | 18830 | 8 |
| plus benefits in kind | 5290 | 4480 | 4070 | 3640 | 2670 | 4030 | 1 |
| Final income | 10530 | 14280 | 19140 | 25550 | 44780 | 22860 | 4 |

## Number of individuals per household

| Children ${ }^{4}$ | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Adulls | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| $\quad$ Men | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| $\quad$ Women | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| People | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| People in full-time education | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 |
| Economically active people | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.2 |
| Retired people | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 |

## Household type (percentages)

| Retired | 40 | 44 | 25 | 13 | 7 | 26 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Non-retired | 14 | 11 | 13 | 15 | 20 | 15 |
| 1 adult | 10 | 12 | 18 | 29 | 38 | 22 |
| 2 adults | 11 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 1 aduit with children $^{5}$ | 15 | 18 | 24 | 23 | 20 | 20 |
| 2 adults with children | 9 | 9 | 15 | 18 | 13 | 13 |
| or more adults ${ }^{6}$ | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| All household types |  |  |  |  |  |  |

1 Households are ranked by equivalised disposable income.
2 All the tables in Part 1 of this article show unequivalised income. Equivalised income has only been used in the ranking process to produce the quinfili groups (and to produce the percentage shares and Gini coefficients).
3 These are income tax (which is atter tax relief al source on life assurance premiums) and councii tax, domestic rates and water charges but atter deducting discounts, coundil lax benefits and rates rebates.
4 Chidren are delined as people aged under 16 or aged between 16 and 18 , unmarried and receiving non-advanced further education.
5 This group is smalier than the category of one parent fansilies'because some of these families will be contained in the larger household types.
6 With or without children.
with children, the position in the income distribution tends to vary according to the number of children. Those with three or more children tend to be in lower groups than those with only one or two. Households with three or more children are less likely to have two economically active adults compared to those with fewer children, partiy reflecting the fact that the youngest child or children may not yet be of school age. In addition, households with higher numbers of children will tend to have higher needs than smaller households. As the ranking of households is based on income adjusted for the needs of the household (i.e. equivalised income, adjusted for househoid size and composition), this increases the chance that households with three or more children will be found in the lower part of the income distribution. Where there are no children in the household, non-retired two adult households tend to be found in the higher income groups.

Retired households are over-represented at the lower end of the distribution. Two-thirds are in the bottom two fifths (as shown in Table 22). Those consisting of one retired woman are more concentrated towards the bottom compared to those with one retired man.

## Stages of redistribution

Details of the amounts which households in each quintile group receive from the various measures of income are shown in Table 4, with more detailed information for decile groups in Table 14 and quintile groups in Table 14A.

On average, households receive about $£ 25,400$ a year in original income but this varies widely between households. Those in the top quintile group have around $£ 62,900$ compared with $£ 3,500$ for the bottom fifth. This pattern is driven by differences in the numbers of economically active people and the employment status of the chief economic supporter between the groups. For example, as shown in Tables 15 and 15A, almost nine in ten adults in the top quintile group are economically active compared with only one in three of those in the lowest. The chief economic supporters in the top fifth are predominantly full-time employees or self-employed. Those in the bottom fith are more likely to work part time or be unemployed or economically inactive. Those in the higher deciles tend to have better paid jobs as well as being more likely to be economically active.

Wages and salaries and income from self-employment are typically the most important source of income, together making up three quarters of gross income on average (as shown in Table 14A). Cash benefits are also a significant source, particularly for households in the lower half of the distribution. Of the total amount of cash benefits received, the bottom two quintile groups together receive about 60 per cent. These households typically receive around $£ 5,600$ from cash benefits, representing approximately three-fifths of gross income for the bottom quintile group and two-fiths for the next group (Figure 3).

Higher income groups pay both higher amounts of direct tax and higher proportions of their income in direct tax (Tables 3, 4, 14 and $14 \mathrm{~A})$. The top quintile group pays about $£ 15,300$ per household in income tax, national insurance contributions and local tax - 24 per cent of gross income. In contrast, the direct tax bill for households in the bottom fifth is around $£ 1,000$, representing 12 per cent of their gross income. Looking at income tax on its own, the top two quintile groups pay around 80 per cent of the total.

In contrast to benefits and direct taxes, the indirect tax system has a different effect. Households with higher incomes still pay more in absolute terms but not as a proportion of their incomes. This means that indirect taxes tend to increase income inequality.

The final stage in the redistribution process is the addition of benefits in kind, such as those from state education and the health service. Households in the bottom quintile group receive the equivalent of around $£ 5,300$ from all benefits in kind, which is twice the amount received by the top fifth (see Figure 4). These are described in more detail later in the analysis.

Taken as a whole, the tax and benefit systems redistribute income from high income households to those on low incomes. The average final income for the quintile groups ranges from $£ 10,500$ to $£ 44,800$, a ratio of one to four compared to a ratio of one to 18 for original income, i.e. before government intervention, as shown in Table 4.

## Changes in inequality over time

There are many ways of measuring income inequality. Different measures may show different trends depending on whether they are particularly sensitive to changes in one part of the distribution. Calculation of several measures of inequality allows us to see whether

## Figure 4

Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits on ALL househoids, 2001-02

a particular trend is peculiar to one particular measure or backed up by others. Tables 26 and 27 (at the end of Appendix 1) show trends for three measures of inequality. Table 26 shows trends for the shares of income figures that have already been seen for 2001-02 earlier in this analysis. Table 27 contains time series for Gini coefficients and another concept: using the ratio of the incomes at two points in the distribution. Two such measures are calculated: the ratio of the disposabie income at the 90th percentile compared to the 10th ( $\mathrm{P9O} /$ P 10 ); and the ratio of the 75th percentile to the 25th (P75/P25). (The $90 t h$ percentile is the income below which nine out of ten households lie and the 75 th percentile is the income below which three quarters of households lie.) An advantage of the measure of the ratio of the 75 th percentile to the 25 th is that it is not affected by extreme values at either end of the distribution, which may be inaccurately measured. However, it does not reflect changes within households in the middle of the distribution.

Figure 5 shows how inequality has been changing over time since 1979 for the various measures of income as measured by the Gini coefficient. It indicates several phases over the last two decades and shows that the different measures of income do not always show the same trend in inequality.

The 1980 s were characterised by a large increase in inequality. The Gini coefficient for original income rose fairly steadily throughout this period. However, the pattern for the coefficient for disposable
income is slightly different: for the first half of the decade inequality of disposable income was stable; this was then followed by a rise in the second half of the 1980s.

The data for the 1990 s and since then show a different story. Inequality of original income has been relatively stable for the whole period. Inequality of disposable and post-tax income has been relatively flat over the whole period but with some indications of a slight fall in the first half of the 1990s, and a slight rise since then. The gap between the Gini coefficients for original income and post-tax income has tended to narrow towards the end of the period.

As with all measures derived from sample surveys, the Gini coefficients are subject to sampling errors. To give an indication as to whether the estimated changes in inequality are real changes or simply the result of sampling variation, we have calculated confidence intervals for the coefficients in Figure 5 using software developed at the London School of Economics. ${ }^{2}$ These show that, in most cases, the year-on-year changes are within the bounds of sampling variation. However, when we look at changes over periods of more than one year there are changes which cannot be explained by variation introduced by the sampling process.

Figures in Table 26 for trends in the shares of income figures tell the same story as the Gini coefficient: one of increasing inequality of disposable income in the 1980s then a flatter picture in the 1990s.

Figure 5
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Changes in income distribution over time have been the focus of much study. The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) ${ }^{3}$ has commissioned a number of studies into this, and has identified a number of reasons for possible shifts, in particular the widening of the income distribution during the 1980 s. The most prominent reasons given are globalisation of trade pushing down some wages, recent technological changes having a bias against unskilled workers, and other developments concerning the deregulation of labour and product markets. Other explanations for trends in recent years offered by, for example, the Institute for Fiscal Studies ${ }^{4}$ (IFS) include: the effect of wage growth in some areas; the change in the importance of self-employment income; the change in the level of unemployment and the type of people affected; the importance of additional income sources; demographics; and the tax and benefit system.

## RESULTS FOR NON-RETIRED HOUSEHOLDS

## Overall effect

As for all households, the tax and benefit systems lead to income being shared more equally between non-retired households. Before government intervention, original income is shared more equally between non-retired households, as shown in Table 5, than for all househoids, as shown in Table 2. However, after the process of redistribution, the shares of income and Gini coefficients for posttax income are almost the same as those for all households. The

TABLE 5: Percentage shares of household income and Gini coefficients ${ }^{1}$ for NON-RETIRED households, 2001-02

|  | Percentage shares of equivalised income for NON-RETIRED households |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Original income | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gross } \\ & \text { income } \end{aligned}$ | Disposable income | Post-lax income |
| Quintle group ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Botlom | 3 | 6 | 7 | 5 |
| 2nd | 10 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| 3 rd | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| 4th | 24 | 23 | 22 | 22 |
| Top | 47 | 44 | 43 | 45 |
| All non-retired households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Decile group ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Top | 31 | 29 | 28 | 30 |
| Gini coefficient (per cent) | 45 | 38 | 36 | 40 |

[^6]redistribution effect is therefore smaller for non-retired households than for ail households. A summary of the effects of taxes and benefits on non-retired households is shown in Table 6, with more detail in Tables 16 and 16A.

## Characteristics of households

Unlike for all households, the average househoid size tends to decrease as income increases, as shown in Tables 17 and 17A. This fall is more than accounted for by the decrease in the average number of children in each household from 1.1 in the bottom quintile group to 0.4 in the top.

Other patterns are similar to those for all households. One adult households with children are concentrated at the bottom of the distribution with 44 per cent of these households in the bottom filth and a further 25 per cent in the second quintile group (Table 22). Two adult households with three or more children are also concentrated towards the bottom although not to the same extent. Two adult households without children are over-represented at the top.

For single person households, there are different patterns for men and women. Households containing only one man are overrepresented in the top quintile of the distribution. One woman households are more evenly spread throughout the income groups.

## Original income

The average original income for non-retired households is $£ 31,600$ (Table 6). As mentioned above, inequality of original income is lower for non-retired households than for all households. The ratio of the average for the bottom quintile group to the top is one to 12 (compared to one to 18 for all households).

The original income of households shows a relatively strong relationship to the number of economically active people it contains. Househoids in the top three quintile groups typically contain around twice as many economically active people as those in the lowest group, as shown in Table 6.

## Cash benefits

Table 7 gives a summary of the benefits that each quintile group receives. There are two types of cash benefits: contributory benefits which are paid from the National Insurance Fund (to which individuals and their employers make contributions while working) and noncontributory benefits. For non-retired households, non-contributory benefits (including Working Families Tax Credit (WFTC)) make up nearly three quarters of all cash benefits on average. Children's tax credits could not be separately identified but will have led to a reduction in income tax paid by households with children.

The average non-retired househoid receives $£ 2,600$ in cash benefits. The bottom fifth receive double this amount while those in the top quintile group typically get $£ 800$. However, the patterns for contributory and non-contributory benefits are different.

Most non-contributory benefits, particularly income support and housing benefit, are income related and so payments are concentrated in the two lowest quintile groups. The presence of some individuals with low incomes in high income households means that some payments are recorded further up the income distribution. Nearly two-thirds of income support and housing benefit paid to nonretired households goes to househoids in the bottom fifth of the distribution. Child benefit and WFTC are based on the number of children in the household. Levels of child benefit received are therefore higher at the lower end of the distribution, as these households tend to have more children. Receipts of WFTC are high partly for that reason but, to a greater extent, because the amount received is higher the lower the income of the household.

In contrast, one criterion for receipt of contributory benefits is the amount of national insurance contributions that has been paid by, or on behalf of, the individual. The amounts received from these benefits are the same in the first and second quintile groups and only slightly lower in the middle quintile group.

For all non-retired households, as shown in Tabie 7, cash benefits provide 8 per cent of gross income on average. For those in the bottom quintile group they form a much larger proportion - 48 per cent. Their payment results in a significant reduction in income inequality.

## Direct taxes

Households at the lower end of the income distribution pay smaller amounts of direct tax compared with households with higher incomes (Tables 16 and 16A). Of the total income tax paid by non-retired households, the bottom two quintile groups together pay about 10 per cent. This compares with 76 per cent of the total paid by the top two fifths.

TABLE 6: Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits on NON-RETIRED households by quintile groups ${ }^{1}, 2001-02$

|  | Quintile groups of NON-RETIRED households' |  |  |  |  | non-retired households | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Ratio } \\ \text { Top/Bottom } \\ \text { quintile } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Botiom | 2nd | 3 rd | 4h | Top |  |  |
| Income, taxes and benefits per househoid (£ per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Original income | 5560 | 17340 | 27030 | 38890 | 69430 | 31650 | 12 |
| plus cash benefits | 5220 | 3680 | 2280 | 1220 | 790 | 2640 | 0 |
| Gross income | 10780 | 21020 | 29310 | 40110 | 70220 | 34290 | 7 |
| less direct taxes ${ }^{2}$ and employees' 'NIC | 1310 | 3610 | 5850 | 9040 | 17070 | 7380 | 13 |
| Disposable income | 9470 | 17410 | 23460 | 31060 | 53150 | 26910 | 6 |
| less indirect taxes | 3280 | 4100 | 5010 | 5650 | 6970 | 5000 | 2 |
| Posttax income | 6180 | 13310 | 18450 | 25410 | 46190 | 21910 | 7 |
| plus benefits in kind | 5900 | 4830 | 3950 | 3360 | 2560 | 4120 | 0 |
| Final income | 12080 | 18140 | 22400 | 28770 | 48750 | 26030 | 4 |
| Number of individuals per househoid |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Children ${ }^{3}$ | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.7 |  |
| Adults | 1.8 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 1.9 | 2.0 |  |
| Men | 0.8 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 |  |
| Women | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 |  |
| People | 2.9 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.7 |  |
| People in full-time education | 1.1 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.7 |  |
| Economically active people | 0.9 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.8 | 1.6 |  |
| Ketired people | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 |  |

[^7]In addition, low income households also pay a smaller proportion of their income in income tax (Table 8). This is due to the progressive nature of the income tax system. As a proportion of their gross incomes, households in the bottom quintile group typically pay 5 per cent in income tax compared with 19 per cent for those in the top quintile group.

For national insurance contributions, the amount paid as a proportion of gross income rises as income rises until the fourth quintile group; the proportion then falls for the top fitth. This is because national insurance contributions are only levied on the first $£ 575$ of weekly earnings in 2001-02, so part of the earnings of many of those in the top quintile group will not be subject to this deduction.

TABLE 7: Cash benefits for NON-RETIRED households by quintile groups ${ }^{1}$,2001-02

|  | Quintile groups of NON-RETTRED <br> households' | All non. <br> retired |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| house- |  |  |


| Average per household (£ per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension | 210 | 440 | 500 | 380 | 230 | 350 |
| Incapacity benefit | 620 | 410 | 280 | 120 | 40 | 300 |
| Job seeker's allowance ${ }^{2}$ | 80 | 20 | 20 | 10 | 0 | 30 |
| Other | 50 | 90 | 80 | 50 | 110 | 70 |
| Total contributory | 960 | 960 | 880 | 560 | 390 | 750 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income support | 1470 | 600 | 160 | 30 | 10 | 450 |
| Working Families |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| TaxCredit | 300 | 280 | 130 | 40 | 0 | 150 |
| Child benefit | 700 | 610 | 490 | 340 | 270 | 480 |
| Housing benefit | 1070 | 450 | 110 | 20 | 0 | 330 |
| Job seeker's allowance ${ }^{3}$ | 240 | 60 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Sickness/disablement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other | 150 | 150 | 120 | 60 | 30 | 100 |
| Total non-contributory | 4270 | 2720 | 1400 | 660 | 400 | 1890 |
| Total cash benefits | 5220 | 3680 | 2280 | 1220 | 790 | 2640 |
| Cash beneitits as a percentage |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| of gross income | 48 | 18 | 8 | 3 | 1 | 8 |

1 Houseenorks are ranked by Oquivalised disposabite income.
2 Contribution based.
3 theome based.

Local taxes mainly consist of council tax in Great Britain and domestic rates in Northern Ireland and are shown net of council tax benefits and rates rebates in Tables 8,16 and 16A. Households in the lower part of the income distribution pay smaller absolute amounts in local taxes. Net payments by the bottom quintile group are only about half of those in the top fith (Table 16A). When expressed as a proportion of gross income in Table 8, the impact decreases as income rises. Local taxes represent 5 per cent of gross income for the bottom fifth but less than 2 per cent for those in the top quintile group.

## Indirect taxes

The amount of indirect tax that each household pays is estimated from its expenditure recorded in the EFS. However, as described eariier in this analysis, the income and expenditure data recorded in the EFS are not fully compatible because they are recorded in different ways (see Appendix 2, paragraph 6). Therefore, to give a more complete picture of the impact of indirect taxes, they are shown in Table 9 as a proportion of disposable income and, separately, as a proportion of expenditure. In addition, indirect taxes are also shown as a proportion of gross income in Table 8 so that the impact of direct and indirect taxes can be compared.

In cash terms, the top fifth of non-retired households pay over twice as much indirect tax as the bottom fith (Table 16A). On the other hand, when expressed as a percentage of disposable income or expenditure (Table 9), the proportion paid in indirect tax tends to be lower for households at the top of the distribution compared to those lower down.

TABLE 8: Taxes as a percentage of gross income for NON-RETIRED households by quintile groups', 2001-02

|  | Quintile groups of NON.RETIRED households' |  |  |  |  | All nonretired households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | Top |  |
| Percentages |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income tax ${ }^{2}$ | 4.6 | 9.2 | 11.9 | 14.6 | 18.9 | 14.6 |
| Employees' NIC | 2.1 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 5.4 | 3.8 | 4.3 |
| Local taxes ${ }^{3}$ | 5.4 | 3.9 | 3.1 | 2.6 | 1.6 | 2.6 |
| All direct taxes | 12.2 | 17.2 | 20.0 | 22.5 | 24.3 | 21.5 |
| All indirect taxes | 30.5 | 19.5 | 17.1 | 14.1 | 9.9 | 14.6 |
| All taxes | 42.7 | 36.7 | 37.1 | 36.6 | 34.2 | 36.1 |
| 1 Househohts are ranked by equivalised disposaste incame. <br> 2 Atar lax celiaf al source on lifiassurance premiums. <br>  <br> rebates. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

When expressed as a proportion of disposable income, the impact of indirect taxes declines sharply as income rises. This is because those in higher income groups tend to channel a larger proportion of their income into savings and mortgage payments. These do not attract indirect taxes. Indirect taxes appear less regressive when expressed as a proportion of expenditure, with payments rising broadly in line with expenditure. However, the top fifth still pay a smaller proportion of their expenditure in indirect taxation. In particular, the burden of tobacco duty is much heavier on households in the lower half of the distribution.

## Benefits in kind

The Government provides certain goods and services to househoids either free at the time of use or, at subsidised prices. This study allocates these benefits in kind to individual households in order to arrive at final income. The imputed value of these benefits is based on the estimated cost of providing them. The largest two categories for which such imputations are made are health and education services. The 2001 expenditure for both these allocated in this analysis to all households is equivalent to around 27 per cent of total general government expenditure, as shown in Table 13. Other items for which imputations are made are free school meals, welfare milk, housing subsidy and travel subsidies. These items are equivalent to a further 1 per cent of general government expenditure. Table 10
gives a summary of the value of these benefits for each quintile group for non-retired households.

The benefit in kind from education is ailocated to a household according to its members' use of state education (Appendix 2, paragraph 36). Households in the lower quintiles receive the highest benefit from education, as shown in Table 10. This is due to the concentration of children in this part of the distribution. The impact of expenditure on free school meals and weffare milk is greatest in the lower income groups, where children are more likely to have schooi meals provided free of charge.

The benefit from the health service is estimated according to the age and sex of the household members rather than their actual use of the service, as the EFS does not contain this information (Appendix 2, paragraph 38). The imputed benefit is relatively high for young children, low in later childhood and through the adult years until it begins to rise from late middle age onwards. This benefit increases marginally from the bottom quintile to the second quintile then falis gradually as income rises, as shown in Table 10. This pattern is a reflection of the demographic composition of households. Studies by Sefton ${ }^{5}$ have attempted to aliow for variations in use of the health service according to socio-economic characteristics.

TABLE 9: Indirect taxes as a percentage of (a) disposable income and (b) household expenditure ${ }^{1}$ for NON-RETIRED households by quintile groups ${ }^{2}$, 2001-02

|  | Quintile groups of NON-RETIRED households ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  | All |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4.h | Top | households |
| (a) Percentages of disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VAT | 12.9 | 9.0 | 8.5 | 7.5 | 5.9 | 7.6 |
| Duty on alcohol | 1.8 | 1.3 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.8 | 1.1 |
| Duty on tobacco | 4.0 | 2.3 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 0.4 | 1.3 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils and Vehicle excise duty | 3.8 | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 2.4 |
| Other indirect taxes | 12.1 | 7.9 | 6.9 | 5.9 | 4.5 | 6.2 |
| All indirect taxes | 34.7 | 23.5 | 21.4 | 18.2 | 13.1 | 18.6 |
| (b) Percentages of expenditure' |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VAT | 8.1 | 7.9 | 7.8 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 7.5 |
| Duty on alcohol | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 1.1 |
| Duty on tobacco | 2.5 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 1.0 | 0.5 | 1.2 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils and Vehicle excise duty | 2.4 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 1.9 | 2.4 |
| Other indirect taxes | 7.6 | 6.9 | 6.4 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 6.1 |
| All indirect taxes | 21.7 | 20.6 | 19.8 | 18.0 | 15.4 | 18.3 |

[^8]The housing subsidy, which excludes housing benefit (see Appendix 2, paragraph 39), is spread between public sector, housing association and Registered Social Landlord tenants. Since such households tend to be concentrated in the lower half of the income distribution, this is where the imputed benefit is highest, as shown in Table 10.

Travel subsidies cover the support payments made to bus and train operating companies. The use of public transport by non-retired households is partly related to the need to travel to work and therefore to the number of economically active people in a household. This results in estimates of these subsidies being higher for households in higher income quintiles. This pattern is also due to London and the South East having higher levels of commuting by public transport together with higher than average household incomes.

Taken together, the absolute value of these benefits in kind declines as household income increases. The ratio of benefits in kind to posttax income decreases from 95 per cent for the lowest quintile group to 6 per cent for the highest, as shown in Table 10. This indicates that these benefits contribute to the reduction in inequality.

## The effects of taxes and benefits by household type

The tax and benefit systems affect different types of household in different ways reflecting, in part, the number and ages of people within each household type. Of the types of non-retired households

TABLE 10: Benefits in kind for NON-RETIRED households by quintile groups ${ }^{1}$, 2001-02

| Quintile groups of NON-RETIRED <br> househoids' | All non- <br> retired |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | Top | houlds |

## Average per household

(£ per year)

| Education | 3590 | 2610 | 1890 | 1450 | 770 | 2060 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| National health service | 2040 | 2090 | 1980 | 1820 | 1700 | 1930 |
| Housing subsidy | 110 | 60 | 30 | 20 | 10 | 40 |
| Travel subsidies | 50 | 40 | 50 | 70 | 80 | 60 |
| School meals and welfare milk | 110 | 30 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| All benefits in kind | 5900 | 4830 | 3950 | 3360 | 2560 | 4120 |
| Benefits in kind as a percentage of post-tax income | 95 | 36 | 21 | 13 | 6 | 19 |

[^9]shown in Figure 6, only those containing one adult and children are net gainers, with average final incomes of $£ 16,800$ compared to original incomes of $£ 8,700$ (Table 23). This table also has a more detailed breakdown that shows that households with two adults and three or more children are also net beneficiaries, but to a smaller extent.

Original income is strongly related to the number of adults in the household. For two adult households, those with children have broadly similar levels of original income to those without, but receive more cash benefits than those without. This reflects the effect of receiving child benefit and WFTC. The effect of taxes is broadly similar for both groups. Final incomes are higher for those with children due to the imputed benefit in kind from education.

For one adult households, original income is much lower for those with children as the adult is less likely to be economically active. Benefits, both in cash and in kind, are significantly higher for those with children.

## RESULTS FOR RETIRED HOUSEHOLDS

In this analysis retired households are those where the income of retired household members accounts for more than half of the household gross income (see Appendix 2, paragraph 9 for the definition of a retired person). These households have quite distinct income and expenditure patterns. The tax and benefit systems affect them in different ways from non-retired households.

## Figure 6

Income stages by NON-RETIRED household types, 2001-02


There is a high degree of inequality in original income between households. Tabies 11,18 and 18 A show that, before government intervention, the richest fith of retired households receive over threefifths of total original income, while the Gini coefficient for this measure of income is 66 per cent. Both these measures are higher (showing more inequality) than equivalent figures for non-retired households. After the impact of taxes and benefits there is a large reduction in inequality. Cash benefits play by far the largest part in bringing about this reduction. Income tax payments make a further, though much smaller, contribution. Payments of indirect taxes result in an increase in inequality.

Overall, retired households receive an average of $£ 7,400$ in original income with most of this coming from occupational pensions and investments (Tables 12, 18 and 18A). Original income ranges from $£ 1,300$ for the bottom quintile group to $£ 22,700$ for the top. On the other hand, amounts received from cash benefits vary less across the distribution. On average, households in the bottom fith receive around $£ 5,500$ from this source, while those in the second to fourth quintile groups receive between $£ 7,000$ and $£ 7,500$. These cash benefits make up large proportions of the gross incomes for the bottom four quintiles ranging from 82 per cent for the bottom quintile group to 51 per cent for the fourth quintile group. The top fifth are much less dependent on cash benefits - these account for only 22 per cent of their gross incomes.

TABLE 11: Percentage shares of household income and Gini coefficients' for RETIRED households, 2001-02

|  | Percentage shares of equivalised <br> income for RETIRED households |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Original <br> income | Gross <br> income | Disposable <br> income | Post-tax <br> income |
| Quintile group ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | 3 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| 2nd | 6 | 13 | 14 | 13 |
| 3rd | 9 | 16 | 17 | 17 |
| 4th | 19 | 21 | 21 | 21 |
| Top | 63 | 41 | 39 | 41 |
| All retired | -100 |  |  |  |
| households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Most retired people will have made contributions to the National Insurance Fund throughout their working lives. The bulk of the benefits which retired households receive will be paid out of this fund in the form of contributory benefits. The most significant of these is the state retirement pension, which on average accounts for three quarters of their cash benefits (Tables 12,18 and 18A).

Non-contributory benefits are lowest in the bottom quintile group, where about three quarters of househoids own their homes outright (Table 19A) and so receive little in the way of housing benefit. In addition, as shown in Table 18A, disability benefits sometimes make up a significant proportion of the income of a retired household and their receipt may push a household up the income distribution. This does not necessarily mean that households receiving disability benefits have a higher standard of living than those lower down the income distribution. The income from these benefits may be offset by the additional costs that may be incurred by the individual due to the illness or disability in question.

Retired households derive significant benefits from health services and, to a lesser extent, housing and travel subsidies. Health benefit is spread fairly evenly between retired households whereas benefit from the housing subsidy is significantly higher for those in the middle quintiles, since public sector tenants are concentrated in these groups. The benefits received by retired households from travel subsidies are mainly for bus travel, particularly in the form of concessionary fares and passes for senior citizens and, since these are not usually means-tested, there is no particular relationship with income.

Table 23 gives some details of the effiect of taxes and benefits on different types of retired household. On average, both one adult retired households and those with two or more adults are net gainers from the tax and benefit systems. For one adullt retired households there are distinct dififerences in original income by gender. Men received one and a half times the level of original income than that of women on average: $£ 6,400$ for men compared with $£ 4,300$ for women. After the addition of benefits and the deduction of taxes, the differences are greatly reduced, so that final income levels for these men is only slightly higher than for women.

The author gratefully acknowledges the considerable work done for this study by Peter Acol, Daniel Annan, Peter Mayne, Paul Janvier, and Keith Brook.

TABLE 12: Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits on RETIRED households by quintile groups', 2001-02

|  | Quintile groups of RETIRED households ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | All retired households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3 rd | 4th | Top |  |
| Income, taxes and benefits per household (£ per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Original income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Earnings | 30 | 180 | 190 | 400 | 1020 | 370 |
| Occupational pensions | 840 | 1710 | 2370 | 5730 | 14030 | 4940 |
| Investment income | 340 | 420 | 690 | 990 | 7360 | 1960 |
| Other income | 40 | 80 | 60 | 70 | 340 | 120 |
| Total original income | 1250 | 2400 | 3310 | 7200 | 22740 | 7380 |
| plus Contributory benefits | 4860 | 5490 | 5210 | 5480 | 5130 | 5230 |
| Non-contributory benefits | 670 | 1480 | 2170 | 2050 | 1320 | 1540 |
| Total cash benefits | 5530 | 6980 | 7380 | 7530 | 6440 | 6770 |
| Gross income | 6780 | 9370 | 10690 | 14720 | 29180 | 14150 |
| less income tax ${ }^{2}$ | 100 | 190 | 290 | 910 | 3850 | 1070 |
| Employees' NIC | 10 | 10 | 10 | 70 | 50 | 30 |
| Local taxes ${ }^{3}$ | 720 | 680 | 650 | 790 | 1040 | 780 |
| Disposable income | 5960 | 8490 | 9740 | 12950 | 24240 | 12280 |
| less/ndirect taxes | 1780 | 1790 | 1930 | 2540 | 3790 | 2370 |
| Post-tax income | 4180 | 6700 | 7810 | 10410 | 20450 | 9910 |
| plus National health service | 3940 | 3680 | 3460 | 3460 | 3430 | 3600 |
| Housing subsidy | 20 | 60 | 90 | 60 | 10 | 50 |
| Other benefits in kind | 150 | 160 | 140 | 130 | 100 | 130 |
| Final income | 8290 | 10600 | 11500 | 14050 | 23990 | 13690 |
| Cash benefits as a |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| percentage of gross income | 82 | 74 | 69 | 51 | 22 | 48 |
| Retirement pension as a percentage of cash benefits | 85 | 77 | 70 | 71 | 77 | 76 |

1 Househotds are ranked by equrivalised disposabie income.
2 After lax relief at soume on lite assurance premiums.
3 Council tax, local rates and water charges aftar deducting discounts, councif tax benatit and rates rebates.
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## APPENDIX 1

TABLE 13 (Appendix 1): Taxes and benefits allocated to househoids as a percentage of general government expenditure, 2001

Taxes and compulsory social contributions' allocated to households

|  | £ million | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { of } \\ \mathrm{GGE}^{2} \end{gathered}$ |  | £ million | $\begin{gathered} \% \text { ol } \\ G G E^{2} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Income tax (gross) | 109010 | 28.4 | Cash benefits |  |  |
| Tax rotiels | -90 | 0.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Contributory (National Insurance, etc) |  |  |
| Income tax (net) | 108920 | 28.4 | Retirement | 42600 | 11.1 |
|  |  |  | Incapacity benefit | 6800 | 1.8 |
| Employees' \& sell-employed Ni conitibutions | 27720 | 7.2 | Widows' and guardians' allowances | 1080 | 0.3 |
| Council lax | 14980 | 3.9 | Maternity/Statutory maternity pay | 710 | 0.2 |
|  |  |  | Job seekers allowance | 450 | 0.1 |
|  |  |  | Social fund | 1870 | 0.5 |
|  |  |  | Other | 220 | 0.1 |
| Texes on final goods and services |  |  |  |  |  |
| VAT | 45260 | 11.8 | Non-contributory |  |  |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 11120 | 2.9 | Income support | 14220 | 3.7 |
| Duty on tobacco | 7410 | 1.9 | Working Families Tax Credit | 5440 | 1.4 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 2860 | 0.7 | Other family benefits | 8740 | 2.3 |
| Duty on wines, cider, perry and spirits | 3760 | 1.0 | War pensions | 1200 | 0.3 |
| Duty on beer | 2690 | 0.7 | Other | 16990 | 4.4 |
| Betting duties | 1330 | 0.3 |  |  |  |
| Cameiot: payments to NLDF | 1350 | 0.4 | Student support | 520 | 0.1 |
| Stamp duty on house purchase | 2030 | 0.5 |  |  |  |
| Other | 2800 | 0.7 | Rent rebates and allowances | 11540 | 3.0 |
| Texes \& NI contributions on |  |  |  |  |  |
| Internediate goods \& services ${ }^{3}$ |  |  | Benafits in kind |  |  |
| Employers' Ni contributions | 12420 | 3.2 |  |  |  |
| Commercial \& industrial rates | 8900 | 2.3 | Heaith services | 59490 | 15.5 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 5590 | 1.5 | Education | 43430 | 11.3 |
| VAT | 3270 | 0.9 | Travel subsidies ${ }^{4}$ | 1520 | 0.4 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 640 | 0.2 | Housing subsidy | 1020 | 0.3 |
| Other | 3320 | 0.9 | School meais and wellare milk | 850 | 0.2 |
| Total | 266370 | 69.4 | Total | 218680 | 57.0 |

[^10]Source: United Kingdom National Accounts, 2002 Edition.

|  | Declle groups of ail households ranked by equkalised disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | All <br> house holds |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3 3rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8ih | 9th | Top |  |
| Average per household (\% per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decile points (equivalised £) | 8271 |  |  | 12456 |  |  |  |  | 640 |  |  |
| Number of households in the population ( ${ }^{(000 s \text { ) }}$ | 2489 | 2488 | 2491 | 2489 | 2488 | 2491 | 2490 | 2489 | 2492 | 2490 | 24898 |
| Original income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wages and salaries | 1504 | 2710 | 4610 | 8331 | 12960 | 17682 | 22992 | 29564 | 37176 | 56034 | 19356 |
| Imputad income trom benefits in kind | 28 | 28 | 43 | 52 | 152 | 242 | 280 | 572 | 836 | 1477 | 371 |
| Seli-employment income | 273 | 424 | 529 | 732 | 1122 | 1003 | 2110 | 1731 | 3489 | 14276 | 2569 |
| Occupational pensions, annuities | 265 | 833 | 1061 | 1620 | 2173 | 2292 | 2230 | 2702 | 2093 | 3513 | 1878 |
| Investment Income | 228 | 246 | 362 | 441 | 408 | 544 | 824 | 978 | 1345 | 4879 | 1025 |
| Other income | 205 | 171 | 139 | 191 | 168 | 225 | 160 | 292 | 200 | 411 | 216 |
| Total | 2503 | 4412 | 6745 | 11367 | 16983 | 21989 | 28596 | 35839 | 45138 | 80590 | 25416 |
| Direct benefits in cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension | 1683 | 2564 | 2686 | 2303 | 1865 | 1440 | 1158 | 928 | 586 | 531 | 1574 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Contribution based) | 82 | 27 | 15 | 18 | 9 | 19 | 6 | 15 | 10 | 2 | 20 |
| Incapacity benefit | 325 | 486 | 279 | 293 | 294 | 315 | 173 | 129 | 80 | 41 | 241 |
| Widows' benefits | 27 | 48 | 55 | 65 | 46 | 38 | 51 | 26 | 25 | 23 | 40 |
| Statutory Maternity Pay/Allowance | 5 | . | 1 | 11 | 11 | 6 | 33 | 19 | 40 | 114 | 24 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income support | 746 | 1207 | 826 | 505 | 471 | 237 | 87 | 53 | 4 | 18 | 415 |
| Child benefit | 399 | 456 | 354 | 386 | 402 | 410 | 380 | 316 | 244 | 259 | 361 |
| Housing benefit | 529 | 892 | 956 | 563 | 392 | 180 | 69 | 35 | 3 | . | 362 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Income based) | 240 | 106 | 39 | 53 | 15 | 14 | 2 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 48 |
| Invalid care allowance | 15 | 52 | 62 | 50 | 59 | 30 | 6 | 10 | 5 |  | 29 |
| Attendance allowance |  | 26 | 45 | 94 | 34 | 41 | 26 | 35 | 5 | 5 | 31 |
| Disability living allowance | 88 | 184 | 262 | 364 | 398 | 243 | 199 | 146 | 79 | 61 | 202 |
| Disabled Persons Tax Credit |  | - | - | 10 | 8 | 0 | 6 | - | 7 | - | 3 |
| War pensions/War widows' pensions | 12 | 19 | 45 | 24 | 33 | 138 | 116 | 42 | 21 | 2 | 45 |
| Severe disablement allowance | 16 | 48 | 33 | 29 | 60 | 57 | 37 | 30 | 2 |  | 31 |
| Industrial injury disablement benelit | 9 | 15 | 33 | 27 | 36 | 33 | 9 | 13 |  |  | 19 |
| Student support | 59 | 38 | 9 | 97 | 52 | 48 | 29 | 21 | 17 | 8 | 38 |
| Government training schemes | 37 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 21 | 21 | 15 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| Working Families Tax Credit | 125 | 204 | 200 | 228 | 109 | 129 | 66 | 43 | 9 | $\cdots$ | 112 |
| Other non-contributory benefits | 139 | 133 | 135 | 134 | 97 | 82 | 62 | 57 | 29 | 43 | 91 |
| Total cash benefits | 4538 | 6515 | 6040 | 5263 | 4412 | 3482 | 2531 | 1922 | 1178 | 1118 | 3700 |
| Gross income | 7041 | 10928 | 12785 | 16630 | 21395 | 25470 | 31127 | 37760 | 46316 | 81708 | 29116 |
| Direct taxes and Employees' NIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income tax | 228 | 359 | 654 | 1196 | 2025 | 2794 | 3981 | 5321 | 7281 | 16184 | 4002 |
| less: Tax relief at source' | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 |  | 4 | 3 |  |  | 11 | 5 |
| Employees' NI contributions | 83 | 138 | 253 | 467 | 802 | 1079 | 1447 | 1872 | 2325 | 2529 | 1099 |
| Local taxes ${ }^{2}$ | 843 | 855 | 836 | 873 | 930 | 940 | 991 | 1047 | 1078 | 1205 | 960 |
| less, Council tax benefivRates rebates | 214 | 211 | 198 | 111 | 77 | 41 | 24 | 16 | 14 | 27 | 93 |
| Total | 938 | 1137 | 1542 | 2421 | 3674 | 4769 | 6392 | 8218 | 10664 | 19881 | 5964 |
| Disposable income | 6103 | 9790 | 11.243 | 14209 | 17721 | 20702 | 24735 | 29542 | 35652 | 61827 | 23152 |
| Equivalised disposabie income | 5888 | 9353 | 11447 | 13588 | 16031 | 18607 | 21809 | 26043 | 32465 | 61158 | 21639 |
| Indirect taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes on final goods and services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VAT | 1055 | 980 | 985 | 1231 | 1523 | 1735 | 2053 | 2251 | 2534 | 3349 | 1770 |
| Duty on tobacco | 285 | 276 | 249 | 275 | 345 | 365 | 324 | 299 | 235 | 169 | 282 |
| Duty on beer and cider | 62 | 65 | 63 | 90 | 106 | 126 | 157 | 141 | 162 | 145 | 112 |
| Duty on wines \& spirits | 82 | 61 | 59 | 91 | 109 | 141 | 161 | 167 | 201 | 267 | 135 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 221 | 233 | 232 | 316 | 392 | 458 | 527 | 606 | 657 | 644 | 429 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 74 | 71 | 72 | 92 | 122 | 138 | 156 | 173 | 184 | 181 | 126 |
| Television licances | 78 | 78 | 75 | 81 | 90 | 94 | 95 | 99 | 101 | 103 | 90 |
| Stamp duty on house purchase | 37 | 35 | 30 | 36 | 56 | 64 | 86 | 102 | 125 | 260 | 83 |
| Customs duties | 22 | 22 | 21 | 25 | 29 | 31 | 37 | 41 | 45 | 58 | 33 |
| Betting taxes | 37 | 43 | 61 | 58 | 57 | 70 | 64 | 46 | 63 | 44 | 55 |
| Insurance premium tax | 22 | 19 | 19 | 27 | 37 | 39 | 47 | 54 | 61 | 79 | 40 |
| Air passenger duty | 11 | 6 | 11 | 15 | 17 | 20 | 26 | 24 | 40 | 51 | 22 |
| Camelot National Lottery Fund | 41 | 53 | 50 | 64 | 67 | 72 | 72 | 65 | 62 | 44 | 59 |
| Other | 8 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 10 | 15 | 28 | 15 | 23 | 28 | 14 |
| Intermediate taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial and industrial rates | 185 | 181 | 179 | 209 | 244 | 264 | 311 | 339 | 374 | 487 | 277 |
| Employers' Nl contributions | 257 | 252 | 248 | 290 | 339 | 366 | 432 | 472 | 520 | 678 | 385 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 115 | 112 | 111 | 129 | 151 | 163 | 192 | 210 | 232 | 302 | 172 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 16 | 16 | 15 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 27 | 29 | 32 | 42 | 24 |
| Other | 145 | 142 | 140 | 164 | 191 | 207 | 244 | 266 | 293 | 382 | 217 |
| Total Indirect taxes | 2764 | 2648 | 2625 | 3219 | 3906 | 4391 | 5041 | 5402 | 5947 | 7313 | 4326 |
| Post-tax income | 3339 | 7142 | 8617 | 10990 | 13816 | 16311 | 19694 | 24141 | 29706 | 54514 | 18827 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | 2566 | 2016 | 1524 | 1632 | 1704 | 1651 | 1383 | 1432 | 849 | 708 | 1547 |
| National health service | 2688 | 2887 | 2825 | 2652 | 2329 | 2263 | 2267 | 2025 | 1810 | 1807 | 2355 |
| Housing subsidy | 69 | 95 | 80 | 74 | 46 | 32 | 18 | 19 | 15 | 5 | 45 |
| Rail travel subsidy | 16 | 10 | 12 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 21 | 40 | 49 | 61 | 25 |
| Bus travel subsidy | 43 | 54 | 51 | 47 | 38 | 36 | 35 | 29 | 22 | 22 | 38 |
| School meals and welfare milk | 70 | 70 | 30 | 19 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Total | 5452 | 5133 | 4523 | 4434 | 4143 | 4004 | 3727 | 3547 | 2746 | 2604 | 4031 |
| Final income | 8791 | 12274 | 13140 | 15423 | 17959 | 20315 | 23421 | 27687 | 32451 | 57118 | 22858 |

1 On ifie assurance premtums.
2 Cowncil tax, domostic rates and waler charges alter deducting discounts.

TABLE 14A (Appendix 1): Average incomes, taxes and benefits by quintile groups of ALL households, 2001-02

|  | Quintile groups of all households ranked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Botlom |  | 2nd |  | 3rd | 4th | Top |  |
| Average per household (\% per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Quintilie points (equivalised £) |  | 10412 |  | 14751 |  | 20085 | 28640 |  |
| Number of households in the population (000s) | 4978 |  | 4981 |  | 4980 | 4978 | 4982 | 24898 |
| Original income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wages and salaries | 2107 |  | 6471 |  | 15321 | 26278 | 46605 | 19356 |
| Imputed income from benefits in kind | 28 |  | 48 |  | 197 | 426 | 1156 | 371 |
| Self-employment income | 348 |  | 630 |  | 1063 | 1920 | 8883 | 2569 |
| Occupational pensions, annuities | 549 |  | 1341 |  | 2232 | 2466 | 2803 | 1878 |
| Investinent income | 237 |  | 401 |  | 476 | 901 | 3112 | 1025 |
| Other income | 188 |  | 165 |  | 197 | 226 | 305 | 216 |
| Total | 3458 |  | 9056 |  | 19486 | 32217 | 62864 | 25416 |
| Diract benefits in cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension | 2124 |  | 2494 |  | 1653 | 1043 | 558 | 1574 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Contribution based) | 55 |  | 17 |  | 14 | 10 | 6 | 20 |
| Incapacity benefit | 405 |  | 286 |  | 304 | 151 | 60 | 241 |
| Widows' benefits | 38 |  | 60 |  | 42 | 38 | 24 | 40 |
| Statutory Maternity Pay/Alilowance | 2 |  | 6 |  | 8 | 26 | 77 | 24 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income suppori | 976 |  | 666 |  | 354 | 70 | 11 | 415 |
| Child benefit | 428 |  | 370 |  | 406 | 348 | 252 | 361 |
| Housing benefit | 710 |  | 760 |  | 286 | 52 | 4 | 362 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Incoma based) | 173 |  | 46 |  | 14 | 3 | 1 | 48 |
| Invalid care allowance | 33 |  | 56 |  | 45 | 8 | 2 | 29 |
| Attendance allowance | 13 |  | 70 |  | 38 | 31 | 5 | 31 |
| Disability living allowance | 137 |  | 313 |  | 321 | 172 | 70 | 202 |
| Disabled Persons Tax Credit | - |  | 5 |  | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 |
| War pensions/War widows' pensions | 15 |  | 34 |  | 85 | 79 | 11 | 45 |
| Severe disablement allowance | 32 |  | 31 |  | 59 | 33 | 1 | 31 |
| Industrial injury disablement benetif | 12 |  | 30 |  | 35 | 11 | 5 | 19 |
| Student support | 49 |  | 53 |  | 50 | 25 | 13 | 38 |
| Govemment training schemes | 23 |  | 6 |  | 21 | 8 | 0 | 12 |
| Working Families Tax Credit | 165 |  | 214 |  | 119 | 54 | 7 | 112 |
| Other nor-contributory benefits | 136 |  | 135 |  | 89 | 60 | 36 | 91 |
| Tolal cash benefits | 5527 |  | 5652 |  | 3947 | 2226 | 1148 | 3700 |
| Gross income | 8984 |  | 14708 |  | 23433 | 34444 | 64012 | 29116 |
| Direct taxes and Employees' NIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income tax | 293 |  | 925 |  | 2409 | 4651 | 11733 | 4002 |
| less: Tax relief at source' | 3 |  | 3 |  | 5 | 5 | 9 | 5 |
| Employees' NI contributions | 110 |  | 360 |  | 940 | 1660 | 2427 | 1099 |
| Local taxes ${ }^{2}$ | 849 |  | 855 |  | 935 | 1019 | 1142 | 960 |
| less. Council tax benefithates rebates | 212 |  | 155 |  | 59 | 20 | 21 | 93 |
| Total | 1038 |  | 1982 |  | 4221 | 7305 | 15272 | 5964 |
| Disposable income | 7947 |  | 12726 |  | 19212 | 27139 | 48739 | 23152 |
| Equivalised disposable income | 7620 |  | 12517 |  | 17319 | 23926 | 46812 | 21639 |
| Indirect taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes on final goods and services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VAT | 1017 |  | 1108 |  | 1629 | 2152 | 2942 | 170 |
| Duty on tobacco | 281 |  | 262 |  | 355 | 312 | 202 | 282 |
| Duty on beer and cider | 64 |  | 77 |  | 116 | 149 | 154 | 112 |
| Duty on wines \& spirits | 76 |  | 75 |  | 125 | 164 | 234 | 135 |
| Duty on hydrocarion oils | 227 |  | 274 |  | 425 | 566 | 651 | 429 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 72 |  | 82 |  | 130 | 164 | 182 | 128 |
| Television licences | 78 |  | 78 |  | 92 | 97 | 102 | 90 |
| Stamp duty on house purchase | 36 |  | 33 |  | 60 | 94 | 192 | 83 |
| Customs duties | 22 |  | 23 |  | 30 | 39 | 51 | 33 |
| Betting taxes | 40 |  | 60 |  | 64 | 56 | 54 | 55 |
| Insurance premium tax | 20 |  | 23 |  | 38 | 51 | 70 | 40 |
| Air passenger duty | 8 |  | 13 |  | 18 | 25 | 46 | 22 |
| Camelot National Lottery Fund | 47 |  | 57 |  | 70 | 69 | 53 | 59 |
| Other | 7 |  | 6 |  | 12 | 22 | 26 | 14 |
| Intermediate taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial and industrial rates | 183 |  | 194 |  | 254 | 325 | 431 | 277 |
| Employers' Nl contributions | 254 |  | 269 |  | 352 | 452 | 599 | 385 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 113 |  | 120 |  | 157 | 201 | 267 | 172 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 16 |  | 17 |  | 22 | 28 | 37 | 24 |
| Other | 143 |  | 152 |  | 199 | 255 | 338 | 217 |
| Total indirect taxes | 2706 |  | 2922 |  | 4148 | 5221 | 6630 | 4326 |
| Post-tax income | 5240 |  | 9804 |  | 15063 | 21917 | 42110 | 18827 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | 2291 |  | 1578 |  | 1677 | 1408 | 779 | 1547 |
| National health service | 2787 |  | 2738 |  | 2296 | 2146 | 1808 | 2355 |
| Mousing subsidy | 82 |  | 77 |  | 39 | 19 | 10 | 45 |
| Aail travel subsidy | 13 |  | 11 |  | 15 | 30 | 55 | 25 |
| Bus travel subsidy | 49 |  | 48 |  | 37 | 32 | 22 | 38 |
| School meals and welfare milk | 70 |  | 24 |  | 10 | 2 | 0 | 21 |
| Total | 5292 |  | 4478 |  | 4074 | 3637 | 2675 | 4031 |
| Final income | 10533 |  | 14282 |  | 19137 | 25554 | 44785 | 22858 |

[^11]TABLE 15 (Appendix 1): Household characteristics of decile groups of ALL households, 2001-02

|  | Decile groups of all households ranked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { house- } \\ & \text { holds } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3 dd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7th | 8th | 9th | Top |  |
| Average per household (number) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| People | 2.3 | 2.4 | 2.1 | 2.3 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Aduts | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.6 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| Men | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Women | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Children | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Economically active prople | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.6 | 1.2 |
| Retired people | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| People in full-time education | 0.73 | 0.64 | 0.48 | 0.52 | 0.53 | 0.53 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 0.30 | 0.33 | 0.49 |
| In state primary schools |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.21 |  |  |  |  |
| in state secondary schools | 0.19 | 0.21 | 0.15 | 0.18 | 0.20 | 0.19 | 0.15 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.06 | 0.15 |
| In further and higher education | 0.24 | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.07 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.09 |
| In other educational establishments | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.05 | 0.12 | 0.03 |
| Compositlon (percentages) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Household type

Retired

| 1 adult | 21 | 19 | 30 | 21 | 13 | 11 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 adult men | 4 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| 1 adult women | 16 | 14 | 24 | 16 | 8 | 9 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 10 |
| 2 or more adulls | 16 | 25 | 19 | 16 | 15 | 10 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| Non-retired |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 adult | 17 | 10 | 10 | 13 | 12 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 19 | 22 | 15 |
| 1 adult men | 9 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 15 | 9 |
| 1 adult women | 7 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 6 |
| 2 adults | 11 | 10 | 10 | 14 | 18 | 19 | 26 | 32 | 37 | 40 | 22 |
| 3 or more adults | 7 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 9 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 7 | 9 |
| 1 adult with children | 8 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 2 adults with 1 child | 5 | 4 | 5 | $\theta$ | 10 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 8 |
| 2 adults with 2 children | 7 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 9 | 10 | 9 |
| 2 adults with 3 or more children | 6 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 3 or more adults with children | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 4 |
| Household tenure |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rented | 42 | 54 | 54 | 40 | 31 | 26 | 17 | 17 | 12 | 11 | 30 |
| Local authority rented | 24 | 31 | 30 | 21 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 14 |
| Housing association or RSL | 6 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 6 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| Other rented unfurnished | 4 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| Rented furnished | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Rent free | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Owner occupied | 58 | 46 | 46 | 60 | 69 | 74 | 83 | 83 | 88 | 89 | 70 |
| With mortgage | 18 | 14 | 17 | 27 | 42 | 47 | 57 | 61 | 69 | 66 | 42 |
| Rental purchase | 0 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |  | 0 |
| Owned outright | 40 | 33 | 30 | 33 | 27 | 27 | 25 | 21 | 19 | 22 | 28 |
| Age of chief economic supporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 25 | 9 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Over 24 and under 35 | 13 | 14 | 10 | 12 | 13 | 18 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 17 |
| Over 34 and under 45 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 19 | 21 | 22 | 25 | 25 | 31 | 21 |
| Over 44 and under 55 | 12 | 12 | 9 | 16 | 20 | 19 | 22 | 22 | 29 | 24 | 19 |
| Over 54 and under 65 | 15 | 12 | 13 | 16 | 19 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 11 | 16 | 15 |
| Over 64 and under 75 | 12 | 20 | 23 | 18 | 16 | 13 | 8 | 7 | 5 | 5 | 13 |
| Over 74 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 17 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 12 |
| Employment status of chief economic supporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Self-employed | 5 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 16 | 7 |
| Full-time employee | 8 | 11 | 19 | 32 | 46 | 58 | 64 | 73 | 78 | 72 | 46 |
| Parr-time employee | 11 | 9 | 8 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 7 |
| Unemployed | 10 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Unoccupied and under minimum Nl age | 32 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 11 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 12 |
| Relired/unoccupied over minimum NI age | 34 | 42 | 49 | 37 | 28 | 22 | 16 | 11 | 7 | 5 | 25 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | - | . | . | . | . | . | 0 |

TABLE 15A (Appendix 1): Household characteristics of quintile groups of ALL households, 2001-02


| Average per household (number) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| People | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.5 | 2.3 | 2.4 |
| Adults | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.9 | 1.8 |
| Men | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 0.9 |
| Women | 0.9 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.9 |
| Children | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.5 |
| Economically active people | 0.6 | 0.8 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 | 1.2 |
| Relired people | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.4 |
| People in full-time education | 0.68 | 0.50 | 0.53 | 0.45 | 0.31 | 0.49 |
| In stata primary schoo's | 0.30 | 0.24 | 0.24 | 0.19 | 0.11 | 0.22 |
| In state secondary schools | 0.20 | 0.16 | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.07 | 0.15 |
| In further and higher oducation | 0.16 | 0.08 | 0.07 | 0.09 | 0.05 | 0.09 |
| In other educational establishments | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.03 |

## Composition (percentages)

## Household type

Retired
1 adult
1 adult men
1 adult women
2 or more adults

| 26 | 12 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 6 | 3 |
| 20 | 9 |
| 18 | 12 |


| 6 | 4 | 14 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 10 |
| 7 | 4 | 12 |

Non-retired
1 adult
1 adult men
1 adult women
2 adults

| 11 | 13 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 6 | 8 |
| 5 | 6 |
| 12 | 18 |
| 5 | 9 |
| 6 | 5 |
| 6 | 10 |
| 8 | 11 |
| 5 | 3 |
| 4 | 5 |


| 15 | 20 | 15 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 10 | 14 | 9 |
| 5 | 6 | 6 |
| 29 | 38 | 22 |
| 13 | 11 | 9 |
| 3 | 1 | 5 |
| 9 | 9 | 8 |
| 12 | 9 | 9 |
| 3 | 2 | 3 |
| 4 | 2 | 4 |

Household tenure

| Rented | 48 | 47 | 28 | 17 | 12 | 30 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Local authority rented | 27 | 25 | 13 | 5 | 1 | 14 |
| Housing association or PSL | 8 | 10 | 5 | 2 | ; | 5 |
| Other rented unfurnished | 5 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 |
| Rented furnished | 6 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Rent free | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Owner occupied | 52 | 53 | 72 | 83 | 88 | 70 |
| With mortgage | 16 | 22 | 44 | 59 | 68 | 42 |
| Rental purchase | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Owned outright | 36 | 31 | 27 | 23 | 20 | 28 |
| Age of chief economic supporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 25 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 4 |
| Over 24 and under 35 | 13 | 11 | 15 | 22 | 23 | 17 |
| Over 34 and under 45 | 17 | 17 | 20 | 23 | 28 | 21 |
| Over 44 and under 55 | 12 | 13 | 18 | 22 | 26 | 19 |
| Over 54 and under 65 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 16 | 14 | 15 |
| Over 64 and under 75 | 16 | 21 | 15 | 8 | 5 | 13 |
| Over 74 | 21 | 21 | 10 | 6 | 3 | 12 |
| Employment status of chief economic supporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Self-employed | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 13 | 7 |
| Full-time employee | 10 | 26 | 52 | 69 | 75 | 48 |
| Part-time employee | 10 | 10 | 8 | 7 | 4 | 7 |
| Unemployed | 8 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Unoccupied and under minimum Nl age | 30 | 14 | 9 | 4 | 2 | 12 |
| Retired/unoccupied over minimum Nl age | 38 | 43 | 25 | 13 | 6 | 25 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | - |  | . | 0 |


|  | Decile groups of non-reired households renked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | All such households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3 rd | 4th | 5th | 6th | 7h | 817 | 9th | Top |  |
| Average per household (£ per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decile points (equivalised £) | 8719 |  | 11604 | 14369 | 17038 | 19597 | 22711 | 26370 | 31321 | 40892 |  |
| Number of households in the population ('000ss) | 1850 | 1850 | 1850 | 1852 | 1850 | 1849 | 1849 | 1853 | 1849 | 1852 | 18504 |
| Original income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wages and salaries | 2473 | 6199 | 12031 | 17496 | 21719 | 25390 | 31356 | 37038 | 41065 | 64560 | 25933 |
| Imputed income from benefits in kind | 34 | 56 | 84 | 193 | 269 | 385 | 538 | 729 | 924 | 1757 | 497 |
| Sell-employment income | 366 | 844 | 1245 | 1523 | 1198 | 2379 | 1729 | 2542 | 5291 | 17333 | 3445 |
| Occupational pensions, annuities | 87 | 254 | 446 | 690 | 729 | 833 | 1065 | 1158 | 904 | 2047 | 821 |
| Investment income | 165 | 127 | 237 | 244 | 224 | 466 | 547 | 606 | 1001 | 3415 | 703 |
| Other income | 260 | 246 | 266 | 222 | 239 | 224 | 287 | 183 | 208 | 364 | 250 |
| Total | 3385 | 7726 | 14309 | 20369 | 24378 | 29677 | 35522 | 42256 | 49392 | 89476 | 31649 |
| Direct benefits in cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension | 81 | 338 | 399 | 491 | 557 | 448 | 451 | 303 | 200 | 254 | 352 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Contribution based) | 111 | 39 | 28 | 16 | 20 | - 14 | 20 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 26 |
| Incapacity benefit | 481 | 766 | 440 | 373 | 306 | - 262 | 116 | 130 | 34 | 47 | 295 |
| Widows' benefits | 49 | 39 | 102 | 46 | 55 | - 54 | 13 | 24 | 34 | 11 | 43 |
| Statutory Maternity Pay/Allowance | 6 | 2 | 11 | 17 | 8 | 39 | 21 | 32 | 58 | 125 | 32 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income support | 1296 | 1650 | 678 | 515 | 225 | 105 | 31. | 22 | 7 | 18 | 455 |
| Child benefit Housing benafit | 654 | 753 | 642 | 575 | 509 | 464 | 371 | 311 | 254 | 292 | 482 |
| Housing benefit Job seeker's allowance (Income based) | 943 | 1200 | 592 | 317 | 170 | \$9 | 22 | 8 | 2 | - | 332 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Income based) | 353 | 128 | 76 | 38 | 17 | - 5 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 63 |
| Invalid care allowance | 16 | 85 | 80 | 70 | 30 | 7 | 8 | 12 |  | - | 31 |
| Attendance allowance | 3 | 4 | 8 |  | 5 | 13 | 18 | 11 |  | ${ }^{6}$ | 7 |
| Disability living allowance | 132 | 298 | 397 | 381 | 256 | - 192 | 122 | 80 | 63 | 62 | 198 |
| Disabled Persons Tax Credit |  | - | 13 | 9 | 0 | ) 4 | 4 | 10 | - | - | 4 |
| Warpensions/War widows' pensions | 9 | 1 | - | 22 | 28 | -68 | 23 |  | 7 | 3 | 16 |
| Severe disablement allowance | 29 | 61 | 42 | 52 | 67 | . 35 | 26 | 11 | 3 | - | 33 |
| Industrial injury disablement benetit | 14 | 13 | 27 | 37 | 25 | -12 | 12 | 12 | - | - | 16 |
| Student support | 83 | 49 | 52 | 123 | 91 | 20 | 49 | 23 | 3 | 8 | 50 |
| Government training schemes | 49 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 42 | 22 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 15 |
| Working Families Tax Credit | 201 | 397 | 391 | 175 | 171 | 85 | 43 | 33 | 2 |  | 150 |
| Other non-contributory benefits | 52 | 50 | 48 | 55 | 44 | 30 | 28 | 18 | 34 | 17 | 38 |
| Total cash benefits | 4563 | 5883 | 4040 | 3324 | 2627 | 1938 | 1384 | 1049 | 717 | 859 | 2638 |
| Gross income | 7948 | 13609 | 18349 | 23693 | 27005 | - 31615 | 36906 | 43305 | 50109 | 90335 | 34288 |
| Direct taxes and Employees' NIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income tax less: Tax relief at source ${ }^{\text {! }}$ | 315 2 | 682 2 | 1489 | 2390 5 | 2993 4 | 3987 3 | 5156 5 | 6537 8 | 8293 | 18298 | 5014 |
| Employees' Nl contributions | 129 | 330 | 664 | 1054 | 1309 | - 1584 | 1992 | 2344 | 2541 | 2749 | 1470 |
| Local taxes ${ }^{2}$ | 814 | 829 | 882 | 932 | 927 | 7970 | 1024 | 1069 | 1084 | 1230 | 976 |
| less; Council tax benelit/Rates rebates | 249 | 220 | 116 | 61 | 34 | 25 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 31 | 78 |
| Total | 1007 | 1619 | 2917 | 4309 | 5191 | 6512 | 8153 | 9928 | 11901 | 22235 | 7377 |
| Disposable income | 6942 | 11990 | 15433 | 19384 | 21815 | - 25103 | 28753 | 33376 | 38209 | 68100 | 26910 |
| Equivalised disposabio income | 5824 | 10118 | 12992 | 15782 | 18259 | - 21080 | ) 24458 | 28743 | 35388 | 66180 | 23882 |
| Indirect taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes on final goods and services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VAT | 1231 | 1209 | 1419 | 1729 | 1868 | - 2108 | 2232 | 2410 | 2640 | 3622 | 2047 |
| Duty on tobacco | 383 | 378 | 399 | 395 | 436 | - 381 | 313 | 292 | 233 | 184 | 339 |
| Duty on beer and cider | 83 | 93 | 106 | 130 | 148 | - 171 | 156 | 173 | 166 | 153 | 138 |
| Duty on wines \& spirits | 102 | 68 | 91 | 112 | 149 | - 162 | 161 | 203 | 191 | 284 | 153 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 259 | 308 | 364 | 473 | 501 | 550 | 616 | 695 | 649 | 669 | 508 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 74 | 80 | 101 | 137 | 144 | 4155 | 175 | 182 | 180 | 181 | 141 |
| Television licences | 99 | 99 | 98 | 101 | 104 | 103 | 102 | 106 | 104 | 106 | 102 |
| Stamp duty on house purchase | 39 | 44 | 45 | 66 | 68 | 85 | -99 | 117 | 134 | 299 | 99 |
| Customs duties | 26 | 26 | 28 | 33 | 34 | 38 | 41 | 43 | 47 | 61 | 38 |
| Belting taxes | 42 | 50 | 73 | 57 | 83 | -72 | 29 | 57 | 62 | 47 | 59 |
| Insurance premium tax | 20 | 21 | 28 | 38 | 39 | 47 | - 50 | 58 | 64 | 78 | 44 |
| Air passenger duty | 9 | 6 | 15 | 20 | 20 | - 28 | 23 | 37 | 44 | 44 | 25 |
| Camelot National Lottery Fund | 45 | 57 | 67 | 73 | 80 | - 80 | -69 | 64 | 64 | 40 | 64 |
| Other | $\theta$ | 7 | 8 | 9 | 18 | 26 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 34 | 16 |
| Intermediate taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial and industrial rates | 218 | 220 | 238 | 273 | 281 | - 319 | 344 | 363 | 394 | 514 | 317 |
| Employers' NI contributions | 304 | 306 | 331 | 379 | 390 | 444 | 479 | 504 | 549 | 715 | 440 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 135 | 136 | 147 | 169 | 174 | 198 | 213 | 225 | 244 | 319 | 196 |
| Vehicle excise duly | 19 | 19 | 20 | 23 | 24 | - 27 | 30 | 31 | 34 | 44 | 27 |
| Other | 171 | 173 | 186 | 214 | 220 | 250 | 270 | 284 | 309 | 403 | 248 |
| Total indirect taxes | 3267 | 3297 | 3767 | 4431 | 4781 | - 5245 | 5440 | 5862 | 6125 | 7808 | 5002 |
| Post-tax income | 3674 | 8693 | 11666 | 14953 | 17034 | - 19858 | 23313 | 27514 | 32084 | 60293 | 21908 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | 3983 | 3202 | 2736 | 2485 | 2027 | 7 1753 | 1683 | 1218 | 829 | 716 | 2063 |
| National heath service | 1943 | 2144 | 2088 | 2090 | 1940 | 2020 | 1891 | 1753 | 1653 | 1745 | 1927 |
| Housing subsidy | 101 | 122 | 66 | 49 | 32 | - 23 | 21 | 11 | 15 | 7 | 45 |
| Rail travel subsidy | 21 | 15 | 17 | 14 | 18 | - 22 | - 36 | 48 | 46 | 71 | 31 |
| Bus travel subsidy | 29 | 27 | 29 | 25 | 30 | 27 | 28 | 21 | 21 | 19 | 26 |
| School meals and wellare milk | 118 | 94 | 34 | 18 | 9 | 5 | 51 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 28 |
| Total | 6194 | 5603 | 4970 | 4681 | 4056 | 3849 | - 3660 | 3053 | 2564 | 2558 | 4119 |
| Final income | 9869 | 14296 | 16636 | 19634 | 21090 | - 23707 | 726973 | 30567 | 34648 | 62851 | 26027 |

1 On itite assurance premiums.
2 Councll tax, domestic rates and water charges after deducting discounts.

TABLE 16A (Appendix 1): Average incomes, taxes and benefits by quintile groups of NON-AETIRED households, 2001-02

| Quintile groups of non-ratired househoods ranked by equivalisad dlsposable income |  | All such <br> house- <br> holds |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Average par household (\& per year)



IOn fite assurance premidms.
2 Counch tax, domestle retes and water charges after deduciling discounts.

TABLE 17 (Appendix 1): Household characteristics of decile groups of NON-RETIRED households, 2001-02


## Average per household (number)

| People | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.6 | 2.3 | 2.3 | 2.7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adults | 1.8 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| Men | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Women | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 1.0 |
| Children | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.5 | 0.7 |
| Economically active people | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.4 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 2.0 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.6 |
| Retirad people | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| People in ful-time education | 1.15 | 1.02 | 0.86 | 0.77 | 0.65 | 0.57 | 0.51 | 0.40 | 0.31 | 0.36 | 0.66 |
| In state primary schools | 0.48 | 0.53 | 0.41 | 0.35 | 0.29 | 0.27 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.11 | 0.11 | 0.29 |
| In state secondary schools | 0.31 | 0.32 | 0.31 | 0.27 | 0.24 | 0.19 | 0.14 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.07 | 0.21 |
| In further and higher education | 0.34 | 0.14 | 0.10 | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.13 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.12 |
| In other oducational establishments | 0.02 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.06 | 0.14 | 0.04 |

Composition (percentages)
Household type
Non-retired
1 adult
1 adult men
1 adutt women
2 adults
3 or more adults
1 adult with children
2 adults with 1 child
2 adultt with 2 children
2 adults with 3 or more children
3 or more adults with children

| 25 | 20 | 20 | 15 | 19 | 17 | 18 | 17 | 22 | 24 | 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15 | 12 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 15 | 16 | 12 |
| 11 | 8 | 10 | 7 | 8 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 8 |
| 17 | 18 | 22 | 24 | 24 | 30 | 33 | 39 | 42 | 42 | 29 |
| 10 | 7 | 10 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 18 | 17 | 12 | 7 | 12 |
| 17 | 21 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 |
| 7 | 8 | 10 | 13 | 14 | 11 | 10 | 8 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| 10 | 11 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 15 | 12 | 12 | 8 | 12 | 12 |
| 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 5 |
| 6 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| 61 | 65 | 42 | 32 | 28 | 20 | 18 | 14 | 14 | 11 | 30 |
| 35 | 35 | 20 | 13 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | $\dagger$ | 13 |
| 9 | 15 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 |
| 7 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 6 |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 39 | 35 | 58 | 68 | 72 | 80 | 82 | 86 | 86 | 89 | 70 |
| 23 | 22 | 39 | 52 | 56 | 65 | 67 | 71 | 73 | 71 | 54 |
| 0 | $\cdot$ | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | * | 0 |
| 16 | 13 | 18 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 18 | 15 |

## Age of chlef economic supporter

Under 25
Over 24 and under 35
Over 34 and under 45
Over 44 and under 55
Over 54 and under 65
Over 64 and under 75
Over 74

## Employment status of chief economic supporter

| Self-employed | 7 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 7 | 12 | 18 | 9 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Full-time employee | 13 | 26 | 48 | 63 | 73 | 75 | 81 | 84 | 82 | 77 | 62 |
| Part-time employee | 16 | 16 | 18 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 7 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 10 |
| Unemployed | 16 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 |
| Unocupied and under minimum Nl age | 47 | 39 | 18 | 12 | 7 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 13 |
| Retired/unoccupied over minimum Nl age | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | - |  |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 2 | 2 | - |  |  |  |

TABLE 17A (Appendix 1): Household characteristics of quintile groups of NON-RETIRED househoids, 2001-02


Composition (percentages)
Household type
Non-retired
1 adult
1 aduft men
1 aduff women
2 adults
3 or more adults
1 adult with children
2 adults with 1 child
2 adults with 2 children
2 adults with 3 or more children
3 or more adults with children
23
13
9
18
8
19
7
10
8
6

| 18 | 17 | 23 | 20 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 11 | 12 | 16 | 12 |
| 7 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 27 | 36 | 42 | 29 |
| 13 | 17 | 10 | 12 |
| 5 | 2 | 1 | 7 |
| 12 | 9 | 11 | 10 |
| 14 | 12 | 10 | 12 |
| 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 |
| 6 | 4 | 2 | 5 |

Household tenure
Rented
Local authority rented
Housing association or RSL
Other rented unfurnished
Rented furnished
Rent free
Owner occupied
With mortgage
Rental purchase
Owned outright

Age of chief economic supporter

| Under 25 | 11 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Over 24 and under 35 | 23 | 18 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 23 |
| Over 34 and under 45 | 29 | 29 | 27 | 26 | 31 | 28 |
| Over 44 and under 55 | 18 | 26 | 25 | 27 | 27 | 25 |
| Over 54 and under 65 | 16 | 19 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 16 |
| Over 64 and under 75 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 3 |
| Over 74 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Employment status of chlef economic supporter |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sell-employed | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 15 | 9 |
| Full-time employee | 20 | 55 | 74 | 83 | 80 | 62 |
| Par-time employee | 16 | 15 | 10 | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Unemployed | 11 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Unoccupied and under minimum N age | 43 | 15 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 13 |
| Retired/unoccupied over minimum Nl age | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | - | . |  | 0 |

TABLE 18 (Appendix 1): Average incomes, taxes and benefits by decile groups of RETIRED households, 2001-02


1On Ifta assurance premlums.
2 Councif tax, domestic rates and water charges after deducting discounts

TABLE 18A（Appendix 1）：Average incomes，taxes and benefits by quintile groups of RETIRED households，2001－02


## Average per household（¿ per year）

Quintile points（equivalised £）
Number of housetholds in the population（＇000s）
9026
11354
13878
18465

Original income
Wages and salaries
Imputed income from benefits in kind
Solf－employment income
Occupational pensions，annuities
Investment income
Other income
Total
Direct benefits in cash Contributory

Relirement pension
Job seeker＇s aliowance（Contribution based） Incapacity benefi
Widows＇benefits
Widows＇benefits
Slatutory Maternity Pay／Allowance
Non－contributory
Income suppon
Child benefit
Housing benefit
Job seeker＇s allowance（Income based）
Invalid care allowance
Attendance allowance
Disability living allowance
Disabled Persons Tax Credit War pensions／War widows＇pensions Severe disablement allowance Industrial injury disablement benefit Student support
Government training schemes
Working Families Tax Credit
Other non－contributory benefits
Total cash benefits
Gross income
$\begin{array}{r}4715 \\ 11 \\ 121 \\ 15 \\ \hline\end{array}$

176
9
77
14
11
14
11
9
16
5
13
840
337
41
1251
1251
．
148
3
31
1712
421
80
2395
2395

の灾 $\omega$ 蓄

345
13
574
8
33
79
102
67
28
43
5
4
234
234
6976
9371
Direct taxes and Employees＇NIC
Income tax
less：Tax relief at source＇
Employees＇NI contributions
Local laxes
Iess：Councii tax benelit／Rates rebates
Total

Disposable income
Equiverised disposable income

| 194 | 296 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 4 | 4 |
| 8 | 5 |
| 870 | 832 |
| 186 | 183 |
| 882 | 947 |
| 8489 | 9743 |
| 10242 | 12497 |

## 661 118 24 43 167 62 53 23 16 43 17 7 45 2

Taxes on final goods and services VAT
Duty on tobacco
Duty on beer and cider Duly on wines \＆spirits Duty on hydrocarbon oils Vehicle excise duty
Television licences
Stamp duty on house purchase
Customs dutie
Betting taxes
Insurance premium tax
Air passenger duty
Camelot National Lottery Fund Other

Internediate taxes
Commercial and industrial rates
Employers＇Ni contributions
Duty on hydrocarbon oils
Vehicle excise duty
Other
Total indirect taxes
Post－lax income
Benefits in kino


National health service
Housing subsidy
Rail travel subsidy
Bus travel subsidy
School meals and welfare milk Tota！

Final income

1On ilf assurance premiums．
2 Council tex，domestic rates and water charges aftor doducting discounts．

| 1278 | 1277 | 1281 | 6394 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 167 | 344 | 952 | 326 |
| 5 | 9 | 10 | 6 |
| 22 | 49 | 53 | 34 |
| 2368 | 5734 | 14029 | 4937 |
| 691 | 987 | 7356 | 1958 |
| 60 | 74 | 340 | 119 |
| 3313 | 7196 | 22741 | 7379 |
| 5144 | 5317 | 4977 | 5111 |
| － | － | 0 | 3 |
| 54 | 130 | 100 | 85 |
| 9 | 29 | 50 | 34 |
| － | － | － | ． |
| 421 | 437 | 131 | 302 |
| 10 | 7 | ， | 8 |
| 939 | 534 | 132 | 451 |
| － | － | － | 4 |
| 40 | 16 | 17 | 23 |
| 132 | 192 | 97 | 102 |
| 232 | 394 | 289 | 214 |
| － | 3 | － | 1 |
| 104 | 149 | 345 | 130 |
| 17 | 30 | 52 | 27 |
| 31 | 51 | 1 | 26 |
| 3 | 1 | － | 2 |
| － | － | － | 2 |
| － | － | － | ＊ |
| 239 | 237 | 251 | 246 |
| 7377 | 7527 | 6443 | 6771 |
| 10690 | 14723 | 29184 | 14150 |
| 296 | 916 | 3862 | 1075 |
| 4 | 6 | 9 | 5 |
| 5 | 70 | 53 | 28 |
| 832 | 912 | 1069 | 913 |
| 183 | 122 | 33 | 138 |
| 947 | 1770 | 4942 | 1873 |
| 9743 | 12952 | 24242 | 12277 |
| 12497 | 15888 | 29772 | 15146 |

合

| 1278 | 1277 | 1281 | 6394 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 167 | 344 | 952 | 326 |
| 5 | 9 | 10 | 6 |
| 22 | 49 | 53 | 34 |
| 2368 | 5734 | 14029 | 4937 |
| 691 | 987 | 7356 | 1958 |
| 60 | 74 | 340 | 119 |
| 3313 | 7196 | 22741 | 7379 |
| 5144 | 5317 | 4977 | 5111 |
| － | － | － | 3 |
| 54 | 130 | 100 | 85 |
| 9 | 29 | 50 | 34 |
| － | － | － | － |
| 421 | 437 | 131 | 302 |
| 10 | 7 | － | 8 |
| 939 | 534 | 132 | 451 |
| － | － | － | 4 |
| 40 | 16 | 17 | 23 |
| 132 | 192 | 97 | 102 |
| 232 | 394 | 289 | 214 |
| － | 3 | － | 1 |
| 104 | 149 | 345 | 130 |
| 17 | 30 | 52 | 27 |
| 31. | 51 | 1 | 26 |
| 3 | 1 | － | 2 |
| － | － | － | 2 |
| － | － | － | ． |
| 239 | 237 | 251 | 248 |
| 7377 | 7527 | 6443 | 6771 |
| 10690 | 14723 | 29184 | 14150 |
| 296 | 916 | 3862 | 1075 |
| 4 | 6 | 9 | 5 |
| 5 | 70 | 53 | 28 |
| 832 | 912 | 1069 | 913 |
| 183 | 122 | 33 | 138 |
| 947 | 1770 | 4942 | 1873 |
| 9743 | 12952 | 24242 | 12277 |
| 12497 | 15888 | 29772 | 15146 |


| $\begin{aligned} & \vec{A} \\ & \stackrel{y}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \vec{o} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & N \\ & \text { O } \\ & \text { A } \end{aligned}$ | 感い言会示 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ng } \\ & \text { 含 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \omega \\ & \text { 信 } \end{aligned}$ | ¢心岛南呂 |  |
| $\omega$ | $\omega \quad \omega$ | $\infty$ | N |  |  |
| 品 | ジ心むがあった。 | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$ | 岢 |  |  |


| 130 | 140 | 174 | 250 | 163 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 181 | 194 | 242 | 348 | 227 |
| 81 | 87 | 108 | 155 | 101 |
| 11 | 12 | 15 | 21 | 14 |
| 102 | 110 | 136 | 196 | 128 |
| 1786 | 1933 | 2544 | 3794 | 2367 |
| 6703 | 7810 | 10408 | 20447 | 9910 |
| 83 | 58 | 49 | 22 | 52 |
| 3681 | 3460 | 3460 | 3435 | 3595 |
| 58 | 88 | 57 | 12 | 48 |
| 7 | 3 | 10 | 16 | 8 |
| 83 | 80 | 69 | 58 | 73 |
| 4 | $\dagger$ | 1 | ． | 2 |
| 3897 | 3690 | 3645 | 3542 | 3777 |
| 10600 | 11501 | 14053 | 23989 | 13687 |

TABLE 19 (Appendix 1): Household characteristics of decile groups of RETIRED households, 2001-02


## Age of chief economic supporter

Under 25
Over 24 and under 35
Over 34 and under 45
Over 44 and under 55
Over 54 and under 65
Over 64 and under 75
Over 74

## Employment status of chief economic supporter

Self-employed
Full-time employee
Part-time employee
Part-ime emp
Unemployed
Unemployed
Unoccupied and under minimum Nl age
Retired/unoccupied over minimum Nl age

TABLE 19A (Appendix 1): Household characteristics of quintile groups of RETIRED households, 2001-02

|  | Quintle groups of relired househoids ranked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  | All such households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3 rd | 4th | Top |  |
| Avarage per household (number) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| People | 1.5 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Aduit's | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| Men | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Women | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 | 0.8 | 0.9 |
| Children | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | . | 0.0 |
| Economically active peopla | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Retired people | 1.4 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.4 |
| People in full-fime education | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.01 |

Composition (percentages)
Household type
Retirgd

> 1 adult
> 1 adult men
> 1 adult women
> 2 or more adults

| 53 | 51 | 60 | 51 | 49 | 53 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11 | 10 | 16 | 14 | 16 | 14 |
| 42 | 40 | 44 | 37 | 33 | 39 |
| 47 | 49 | 40 | 49 | 51 | 47 |
| 17 | 42 | 51 | 29 | 10 | 30 |
| 11 | 28 | 29 | 17 | 4 | 18 |
| 2 | 8 | 14 | 7 | 2 | 7 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 |
| 1 | 1 | 2 | , | 0 | 1 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 83 | 58 | 49 | 71 | 90 | 70 |
| 6 | 4 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 6 |
| - | - | - | - | - |  |
| 77 | 53 | 44 | 63 | 83 | 64 |

## Age of chief economic supporter

Under 25
Over 24 and under 35
Over 34 and under 45
Over 44 and under 55
Over 54 and under 65
Over 64 and under 75
Over 74
-
0
1
9
45
45

64

Employment status of chief economic supporter

| Sell-employed | - | - | - |  | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fulltlime employee | - | - | - |  | . |  |
| Part-lime employee | - | 0 | - | 0 |  | 0 |
| Unemployed | - | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | 0 |
| Unoccupied and under minimum Nl age | 9 | 5 | 6 | 9 | 14 | 8 |
| Relired/unoccupied over minimum Nl age | 91 | 94 | 94 | 91 | 86 | 91 |


|  | Decie groups of non-retired households without children ranked by equivalised disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | All such households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 51h | 6th | 74h | 8th | 91/ | Top |  |
| Average per household (\% per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decile points (equivalised ¢) | 9361 |  | 12981 | 16138 | 18886 | 21922 | 25121 | 28993 | 33779 | 43740 |  |
| Number of househoids in the population ('000s) | 1122 | 1126 | 1125 | 1122 | 1128 | 1122 | 1126 | 1121 | 1128 | 1127 | 11248 |
| Original income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wages and salaries | 2488 | 5918 | 11276 | 17195 | 20624 | 27006 | 31106 | 36465 | 40102 | 60065 | 25224 |
| Imputed income from benefits in kind | 10 | 46 |  | 103 | 188 | 251 | 597 | 715 | 904 | 1653 | 456 |
| Sell-employment income | 415 | 1176 | 944 | 1093 | 1284 | 1913 | 1231 | 2855 | 5105 | 15131 | 3115 |
| Occupational pensions, annuities | 160 | 535 | 1027 | 971 | 1115 | 1467 | 1589 | 946 | 1422 | 2975 | 1221 |
| Investment income | 222 | 229 | 357 | 246 | 377 | 504 | 661 | 700 | 1328 | 4155 | 878 |
| Other income | 304 | 151 | 161 | 102 | 156 | 246 | 95 | 131 |  | 282 | 172 |
| Total | 3600 | 8055 | 13855 | 19711 | 23744 | 31386 | 35280 | 41813 | 48954 | 84261 | 31066 |
| Direct benefits in cash Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Aetirement pension | 125 | 682 | 861 | 747 | 714 | 721 | 478 | 310 | 346 | 272 | 526 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Contribution based) | 119 | 68 | 19 | 26 | 26 | 29 | 3 | 14 | 2 | 3 | 31 |
| Incapacily benefit | 646 | 982 | 636 | 419 | 451 | 168 | 167 | 95 | 37 | 71 | 367 |
| Widows' benefits | 46 | 112 | 66 | 76 | 28 | 41 | 13 | 20 | 27 | 19 | 45 |
| Statulory Maternity Pay/Allowance | . | . | - | . | 1 | , |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income support | 485 | 748 | 468 | 336 | 181 | 55 | 17 | ; | 11 | 22 | 232 |
| Child benefit | 8 | 11 | 8 | 6 | 8 | 30 | 20 | 7 | 6 |  | 10 |
| Housing benefit | 690 | 767 | 349 | 188 | 141 | 20 | 23 |  | 3 |  | 219 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Income based) | 349 | 100 | 60 | 8 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 53 |
| Invalld care allowance | 10 | 89 | 44 | 51 | 11 | 7 | . | 10 |  |  | 22 |
| Attendance allowance |  | 6 | , | . | 22 | 22 | 9 | 9 | 11 | $\cdots$ | 8 |
| Disability living allowance | 150 | 377 | 449 | 346 | 305 | 192 | 92 | 907 | 28 | 65 | 211 |
| Disabled Persons Tax Credit | ; |  |  | 5 |  | 7 |  |  | - | , | 1 |
| War pensions/War widows' pensions | 1 | - | 25 | 28 | 16 | 117 | 16 |  | - | 4 | 21 |
| Severe disablement allowance | 49 | 109 | 20 | 88 | 39 | 62 | 18 |  | - | - | 39 |
| Industrial injury disablement benefit | 9 | 13 | 50 | 28 | 46 | 5 | 11 | 11 | - | - | 18 |
| Student supporl | 56 | 31 | 149 | 76 | 64 | 33 | 31 | 33 | 2 | 10 | 49 |
| Government training schemes | 31 | 5 | 12 | 43 | 10 | 3 | 1 | 2 | - | 0 | 11 |
| Working Families Tax Credit | 4 | 11 | 29 | i |  |  |  |  | - 5 | - | 4 |
| Other non-contributory benefits | 32 | 95 | 90 | 54 | 59 | 42 | 28 | 21 | 54 | 21 | 50 |
| Total cash benefits | 2812 | 4205 | 3337 | 2523 | 2124 | 1560 | 928 | 641 | 539 | 485 | 1916 |
| Gross income | 6411 | 12260 | 17192 | 22234 | 25868 | 32.946 | 36208 | 42454 | 49493 | 84756 | 32982 |
| Direct taxes and Employees' NIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income tax less: Tax refiel at source | 308 3 | 769 3 | 1505 4 | 2401 6 | 3038 5 | 4295 4 | 5202 | 6453 9 | 8306 6 | 16550 14 |  |
| Employees' Nil contributions | 124 | 334 | 627 | 1033 | 1267 | 1738 | 2055 | 2383 | 2576 | 2773 | 1481 |
| Localtaxes ${ }^{2}$ asi | 762 | 818 | 873 | 896 | 875 | 963 | 989 | 997 | 1072 | 1176 | 942 |
| less: Council tax benefitRates rebates | 211 | 192 | 83 | 57 | 29 |  | 14 |  | 16 | 22 | 66 |
| Total | 979 | 1726 | 2918 | 4267 | 5146 | 6967 | 8226 | 9815 | 11933 | 20463 | 7244 |
| Disposable income | 5432 | 10534 | 14274 | 17966 | 20722 | 25979 | 27982 | 32639 | 37560 | 64293 | 25738 |
| Equivalised disposable income | 5805 | 11163 | 14598 | 17453 | 20428 | 23539 | 27005 | 31073 | 38180 | 70883 | 26013 |
| Indirect taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes on final goods and services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VAT | 1140 | 1050 | 1340 | 1625 | 1812 | 2002 | 2049 | 2362 | 2501 | 3259 | 1914 |
| Duty on tobacco | 419 | 351 | 383 | 488 | 456 | 389 | 302 | 278 | 234 | 183 | 348 |
| Duty on beer and cider | 106 | 117 | 122 | 168 | 174 | 196 | 172 | 194 | 175 | 155 | 158 |
| Duty on wines \& spirits | 128 | 78 | 96 | 137 | 184 | 172 | 175 | 224 | 210 | 310 | 171 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 227 | 278 | 332 | 451 | 463 | 609 | 587 | 664 | 623 | 610 | 484 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 75 | 79 | 107 | 132 | 147 | 168 | 167 | 173 | 173 | 165 | 139 |
| Television licences | 95 | 92 | 97 | 102 | 101 | 100 | 105 | - 104 | 102 | 105 | 100 |
| Stamp duty on house purchase | 38 | 45 | 41 | 52 | 55 | 73 | 93 | - 101 | 144 | 271 | 91 |
| Customs duties | 23 | 23 | 25 | 30 | 32 | 37 | 37 | - 42 | 45 | 56 | 35 |
| Setting taxes | 48 | 64 | 64 | 74 | 93 | 68 | 42 | - 78 | 71 | 30 | 63 |
| Insurance premium tax | 18 | 20 | 28 | 36 | 39 | 46 | 48 | - 58 | 61 | 73 | 43 |
| Air passonger duty | 9 | 13 | 14 | 23 | 22 | 19 | 23 | 41 | 51 | 43 | 26 |
| Camelot National Lottery Fund | 49 | 65 | 70 | 80 | 86 | 82 | 61 | ${ }^{66}$ | 67 | 37 | 86 |
| Other | 7 | 5 | 5 | 22 | 11 | 14 | 19 | 20 | 11 | 25 | 14 |
| Intermediate taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial and industrial rates | 197 | 190 | 213 | 250 | 272 | 308 | 310 | - 356 | 376 | 468 | 294 |
| Employers' NII contributions | 273 | 264 | 296 | 347 | 378 | 429 | 432 | 494 | 522 | 651 | 409 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 122 | 117 | 132 | 155 | 168 | 191 | 192 | 220 | 233 | 290 | 182 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 17 | 16 | 18 | 21 | 23 | 26 | 27 | 31 | 32 | 40 | 25 |
| Other | 154 | 149 | 167 | 196 | 213 | 242 | 243 | - 279 | 295 | 367 | 230 |
| Total indirect taxes | 3144 | 3015 | 3549 | 4389 | 4729 | 5171 | 5085 | - 5786 | 5925 | 7139 | 4793 |
| Post-tax inconie | 2287 | 7519 | 10724 | 13578 | 15993 | 20809 | 22897 | 7 26853 | 31635 | 57154 | 20945 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | 2128 | 513 | 355 | 345 | 322 | 542 | 431 | - 325 | 108 | 146 | 521 |
| National health service | 1218 | 1578 | 1620 | 1570 | 1527 | 1644 | 1400 | 1387 | 1319 | 1205 | 1447 |
| Housing subsidy | 78 | 75 | 57 | 33 | 33 | 19 | 24 | 423 | - 8 | 7 | 36 |
| Rail travel subsidy | 26 | 17 | 15 | 17 | 19 | 23 | 50 | - 33 | 44 | 78 | 32 |
| Bus travel subsidy | 24 | 28 | 27 | 29 | 31 | 30 | 24 | 420 | 24 | 21 | 26 |
| School meals and wellare milk | 3475 |  |  |  |  | - |  | - 178 |  |  |  |
| Total | 3475 | 2211 | 2074 | 1994 | 1932 | 2258 | 1929 | - 1788 | 1503 | 1457 | 2062 |
| Final income | 5762 | 9730 | 12798 | 15572 | 17925 | 23067 | 24826 | - 28641 | 33138 | 58611 | 23007 |

1 On life assurance premiums.
2 Councir tax, domestic rates and water charges after deducting discounts.

TABLE 21 (Appendix 1): Average incomes, taxes and benefits by decile groups of NON-RETIRED households WITH CHILDREN, 2001-02

y On tife assurance premums.
2 Coumeil fax, domestic rates and water charges aftor deducting discounts.

TABLE 22 (Appendix 1): Distribution of households' by household type, 2001-02


I Seg Appendix 2 for definifions of retired households, adults and childran.

TABLE 23 (Appendix 1): Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits, by household type ${ }^{1}$, 2001-02

|  | Retired households |  |  |  | Non-Metired households |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1 adult Men | 1 adult Women | $\stackrel{\text { All }}{\text { Adull }}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2 \text { or } \\ \text { more } \\ \text { adulls } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { adult } \\ \text { Men } \end{gathered}$ | 1 adult Women | $\begin{array}{r} \text { All } \\ 1 \text { adult } \end{array}$ |
| Average per household (£ per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Original income plus: Cash benelitis | $\begin{aligned} & 6404 \\ & 5645 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4318 \\ & 5899 \end{aligned}$ | 4854 5833 | $\begin{array}{r} 10207 \\ 7821 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 19272 \\ 1801 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15565 \\ 1803 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 17848 \\ 1802 \end{array}$ |
| Gross income | 12049 | 10217 | 10688 | 18028 | 21073 | 17368 | 19650 |
| less: Direct laxes and employees' NIC | 1820 | 1240 | 1389 | 2415 | 4646 | 3800 | 4321 |
| Disposable income | 10229 | 8977 | 9299 | 15613 | 16427 | 13568 | 15329 |
| Equivalised disposable income | 16768 | 14687 | 15222 | 15061 | 26930 | 22242 | 25129 |
| less: Indirect taxes | 1805 | 1439 | 1533 | 3301 | 2859 | 2688 | 2793 |
| Post-lax income | 8424 | 7538 | 7766 | 12312 | 13568 | 10880 | 12535 |
| plus: Benafits in kind | 2744 | 3247 | 3118 | 4516 | 850 | 937 | 883 |
| Final Income | 11168 | 10785 | 10883 | 16828 | 14418 | 11816 | 13419 |

Non-Retired households

| 2 adulls | $\begin{gathered} 3 \text { or } \\ \text { more } \\ \text { adults } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { adult } \\ & \text { with } \\ & \text { children } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { adults } \\ & \text { with } \\ & 1 \text { childd } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { adults } \\ & \text { with } \end{aligned}$ children | 2 adults <br> with 3 or more children | 3 or more adults with children | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All } \\ & \text { house- } \\ & \text { holds } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35419 | 42209 | 8654 | 36586 | 40465 | 33026 | 37816 | 25416 |
| 1751 | 2503 | 6438 | 2057 | 2635 | 5155 | 4960 | 3700 |
| 37170 | 44712 | 15091 | 38643 | 43100 | 38181 | 42776 | 29116 |
| 8480 | 9048 | 1776 | 8694 | 9501 | 8205 | 8156 | 5964 |
| 28690 | 35664 | 13316 | 29949 | 33599 | 29976 | 34620 | 23152 |
| 27954 | 22775 | 13585 | 24749 | 23448 | 16991 | 18097 | 21639 |
| 5174 | 7149 | 2932 | 5353 | 5772 | 5948 | 6936 | 4326 |
| 23516 | 28515 | 10383 | 24595 | 27827 | 24028 | 27684 | 18827 |
| 1812 | 4597 | 6461 | 4334 | 7421 | 12550 | 9511 | 4031 |
| 25328 | 33112 | 16845 | 28.930 | 35248 | 36578 | 37195 | 22858 |

1 See Appendix 2 for definitions of retired households, adults and chiddren.

TABLE 24 (Appendix 1): Average incomes, taxes and benefits by decile groups of households (ranked by UNADJUSTED disposable income), 2001-02

|  | Decile groups of all households ranked by UNADJUSTED disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | households |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4 th | 5th | 61 h | 7 7h | 8th | 9th | Top |  |
| Average per household (£ per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Decile points ( $£$ per year) | 6687 |  | 8920 | 11492 | 14491 | 17956 | 21953 | 26786 | 33063 | 43639 |  |
| Number of households in the population ('000s) | 2486 | 2493 | 2490 | 2488 | 2488 | 2494 | 4 2487 | 2480 | 2492 | 2490 | 24898 |
| Original income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wages and salaries | 647 | 1214 | 3189 | 5738 | 10587 | 16730 | - 22581 | 29211 | 39616 | $64050$ | 19356 |
| Imputed Income from benefils in kind | 14 | 26 | 32 |  | 105 |  |  | 584 | 803 | $1563$ | 371 |
| Sell-employment income | 205 | 162 | 371 | 558 | 863 | 1232 | 1803 | 2237 | 3471 | 14787 | 2569 |
| Occupational pensions, annuities | 414 | 968 | 1517 | 2122 | 2628 | 2235 | 2162 | 2196 | 1809 | 2730 | 1878 |
| Investment income | 254 | 278 | 349 | 704 | 648 | 766 | 698 | 1016 | 1379 | 4163 | 1025 |
| Other income | 102 | 115 | 143 | 237 | 229 | 223 | 142 | 215 | 324 | 433 | 216 |
| Total |  | 2764 | 5602 | 9403 | 15060 | 21382 | 27730 | 35459 | 47402 | 87726 | 25416 |
| Direct benefits in cash |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Retirement pension | 2065 | 2810 | 2747 | 2514 | 1906 | 1130 | 915 | 792 | 497 | 367 | 1574 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Contribution based) | 43 | 44 | 19 | 37 | 7 | 17 | 9 | 7 | 15 | 6 | 20 |
| Incapacity benefil | 303 | 286 | 387 | 302 | 301 | 239 | 230 | 209 | 106 | 51 | 241 |
| Widows' benefits | 57 | 43 | 58 | 35 | 56 | 58 | 33 | 16 | 40 | 8 | 40 |
| Statutory Maternity Pay/Allowance | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 11 | 24 | 33 | 54 | 102 | 24 |
| Non-contributory |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income support | 409 | 849 | 860 | 721 | 495 | 364 | 191 | 168 | 61 | 36 | 415 |
| Child benefit | 101 | 152 | 220 | 337 | 342 | 467 | 501 | 489 | 516 | 480 | 361 |
| Housing benefit | 501 | 1057 | 813 | 592 | 335 | 146 | 112 | 49 | 19 | - | 362 |
| Job seeker's allowance (Income based) | 129 | 52 | 85 | 111 | 23 | 23 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 2 | 48 |
| Invalid care allowance |  | 13 | 29 | 59 | 54 | 49 | 44 | 17 | 15 | - | 29 |
| Attendance allowance | 7 | 44 | 78 | 83 | 32 | 14 | 14 | 8 | 17 | 15 | 31 |
| Disability living allowance | 34 | 164 | 277 | 322 | 365 | 264 | 236 | 195 | 105 | 64 | 202 |
| Disablod Persons Tax Credit |  | . |  | 10 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 5 | - | 7 | 3 |
| War pensions/War widows' pensions | 8 | 26 | 90 | 83 | 43 | 81 | 27 | 41 | 47 | 5 | 45 |
| Severe disablement allowance | 12 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 58 | 60 | 46 | 43 | 9 | . | 31 |
| Industrial injury disablement benefit | 9 | 9 | 36 | 33 | 16 | 32 | 18 | 21 | - | 1 | 19 |
| Student support | 14 | 31 | 19 | 36 | 42 | 89 | 46 | 46 | 42 | 14 | 38 |
| Government training schernes | 10 | 13 | 10 | 13 | 2 | 3 | 26 | 23 | 18 | 1 | 12 |
| Working Families Tax Credit | 11 | 38 | 101 | 216 | 280 | 204 | 152 | 60 | 48 |  | 112 |
| Other non-contributory benefits | 131 | 170 | 140 | 132 | 110 | 73 | 63 | 38 | 34 | 22 | 91 |
| Total cash benefits | 3845 | 5829 | 5993 | 5661 | 4458 | 3326 | 2707 | 2278 | $\dagger 663$ | 1238 | 3700 |
| Gross income | 5480 | 8593 | 11595 | 15063 | 19518 | 24708 | 30437 | 37737 | 49064 | 88964 | 29116 |
| Direct taxes and Employees' NIC |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Income lax | 155 | 240 | 600 | 1066 | 1863 | 2776 | 3751 | 5118 | 7590 | 16864 | 4002 |
| less: Tax relief at source' | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 4 |  | 5 |  | 5 | 12 | 5 |
| Employees' Nicontributions | 40 | 59 | 184 | 320 | 639 | 1062 | 1428 | 1864 | 2434 | 2964 | 1099 |
| Local laxes ${ }^{2}$ | 769 | 775 | 832 | 886 | 820 | 947 | 1011 | 1032 | 1151 | 1296 | 960 |
| less: Council tax benefit/Rates rebates | 185 | 242 | 178 | 116 | 70 | 37 | 32 | 28 | 19 | 27 | 93 |
| Total | 777 | 830 | 1435 | 2132 | 3348 | 4743 | 6152 | 7982 | 11151 | 21085 | 5964 |
| Disposable income | 4703 | 7763 | 10160 | 12931 | 16170 | 19965 | 24284 | 29755 | 37913 | 67879 | 23152 |
| Indirect taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxes on final goods and services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VAT | 722 | 677 | 896 | 1196 | 1425 | 1738 | 2054 | 2408 | 2686 | 3893 | 1770 |
| Duty on tobacco | 194 | 192 | 229 | 232 | 337 | 337 | 362 | 362 | 333 | 246 | 282 |
| Duty on beer and cider | 41 | 44 | 58 | 77 | 87 | 120 | 141 | 179 | 190 | 182 | 112 |
| Duty on wines \& spirits | 56 | 61 | 77 | 83 | 93 | 124 | 155 | 204 | 195 | 301 | 135 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 144 | 127 | 213 | 282 | 374 | 462 | 539 | 618 | 721 | 808 | 429 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 56 | 44 | 68 | 96 | 117 | 138 | 156 | 174 | 194 | 219 | 126 |
| Television licences | 68 | 68 | 78 | 83 | 91 | 97 | 100 | 103 | 103 | 105 | 90 |
| Stamp duty on house purchase | 35 | 20 | 31 | 46 | \$1 | 74 | 91 | 103 | 128 | 252 | 83 |
| Customs duties | 16 | 16 | 20 | 24 | 28 | 31 | 38 | 42 | 49 | 67 | 33 |
| Betting taxes | 29 | 35 | 39 | 44 | 59 | 77 | 78 | 56 | 71 | 59 | 55 |
| Insurance premium tax | 16 | 14 | 22 | 28 | 32 | 39 | 45 | 57 | 65 | 87 | 40 |
| Air passenger duty | 7 | 9 | 6 | 16 | 17 | 20 | 26 | 27 | 47 | 47 | 22 |
| Camelot National Lottery Fund | 32 | 37 | 46 | 55 | 64 | 71 | 72 | 73 | 85 | 57 | 59 |
| Other | 4 | 5 | 4 | 13 | 7 | 15 | 18 | 26 | 16 | 35 | 14 |
| Intermediate taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial and industrial rates | 136 | 135 | 169 | 202 | 231 | 260 | 315 | 354 | 412 | 559 | 277 |
| Employers' Nl contributions | 189 | 186 | 234 | 281 | 322 | 361 | 438 | 493 | 573 | 777 | 385 |
| Duty on hydrocarbon oils | 84 | 84 | 104 | 125 | 143 | 161 | 195 | 219 | 255 | 346 | 172 |
| Vehicle excise duty | 12 | 12 | 14 | 17 | 20 | 22 | 27 | 30 | 35 | 48 | 24 |
| Other | 106 | 106 | 132 | 156 | 181 | 204 | 247 | 278 | 323 | 438 | 217 |
| Total indirecttaxes | 1946 | 1875 | 2442 | 3057 | 3679 | 4352 | 5096 | 5807 | 6478 | 8525 | 4326 |
| Post-lax income | 2757 | 5889 | 7718 | 9874 | 12491 | 15613 | 19189 | 23948 | 31436 | 59354 | 18827 |
| Benefits in kind |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Education | 750 | 658 | 1110 | 1507 | 1419 | 1854 | 2018 | 2020 |  | 2043 | 1547 |
| National health service | 2252 | 2576 | 2556 | 2634 | 2347 | 2223 | 2248 | 2167 | 2276 | 2272 | 2355 |
| Housing subsidy | 63 | 94 | 80 | 65 | 53 | 33 | 24 | 20 | 10 | 13 | 45 |
| Rail travel subsidy | 9 | 9 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 21 | 36 | - 45 | 78 | 25 |
| Bus travel subsidy | 38 | 48 | 54 | 51 | 38 | 28 | 32 | 27 | 30 | 31 | 38 |
| School meals and welfare milk | 13 | 27 | 41 | 46 | 26 | 29 | 13 | 10 |  | 3 | 21 |
| Total | 3125 | 3412 | 3851 | 4315 | 3898 | 4181 | 4355 | 4280 | 4453 | 4439 | 4031 |
| Final income | 5883 | 9301 | 11570 | 14190 | 16390 | 19793 | 23544 | 28228 | - 35889 | 63793 | 22858 |

1On He assurence promiums.
2 Counail tax, domestic fates and water charges after deduating alscounts.

TABLE 25 (Appendix 1): Cross-tabulation of households ranked by disposable income, unadjusted and equivalised, 2001-02

| (i) Quintile groups | Quintile groups of equivellsed disposable income |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | Top |

Number of households in the population ('0008)
Quintile groups of unadjusted
disposable income

| Botlom | 3127 | 1852 | - | - | - | 4979 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2nd | 1497 | 1603 | 1352 | 527 | - | 4979 |
| 3 rd | 331 | 1188 | 2046 | 924 | 492 | 4981 |
| 4th | 23 | 325 | 1351 | 2261 | 1017 | 4977 |
| Top | - | 12 | 231 | 1268 | 3472 | 4982 |
| All households | 4978 | 4981 | 4980 | 4978 | 4982 | 24898 |

(ii) Dacile groups

| Decile groups of equlvaliead dispossble income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Botlom | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | 5 th | 6th | 7 h | 8th | 9 th | Top | All <br> house- <br> holds |

## Number of househoids in the population ('000s)

| Deciie groups of unadjusted disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bottom | 1476 | 740 | 270 | - | - | - | * | - | - | - | 2486 |
| 2nd | 595 | 316 | 775 | 806 | - | * | - | * | - | - | 2493 |
| 3 rd | 221 | 795 | 378 | 74 | 616 | 406 | $\stackrel{-}{-}$ | - | * | - | 2490 |
| 4th | 161 | 320 | 540 | 611 | 65 | 265 | 527 | - | - | - | 2488 |
| 5th | 22 | 208 | 299 | 346 | 804 | 199 | 38 | 505 | 66 | - | 2488 |
| 6th | 10 | 90 | 142 | 402 | 348 | 694 | 362 | 19 | 426 | - | 2494 |
| 7th | 2 | 16 | 70 | 192 | 416 | 368 | 676 | 494 | 66 | 188 | 2487 |
| 8th | 2 | 3 | 13 | 51 | 194 | 373 | 467 | 624 | 556 | 208 | 2490 |
| 9th | . | - | 4 | 8 | 44 | 166 | 381 | 618 | 800 | 471 | 2492 |
| Top | - | * | . | - | - | 21 | 40 | 228 | 579 | 1623 | 2490 |
| All househoids | 2489 | 2488 | 2491 | 2489 | 2488 | 2491 | 2480 | 2489 | 2492 | 2490 | 24898 |

TABLE 26 (Appendix 1): Percentage shares of equivalised total original, gross, disposable and post-tax incomes by quintile groups for ALL households', 1979 to 2001-02 ${ }^{2}$

|  | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 | 1987 | 1988 | 1989 | 1990 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 2nd | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 3 rd | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| 4th | 27 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 27 | 26 | 25 | 26 | 26 | 25 |
| Top | 43 | 44 | 46 | 46 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 49 | 50 | 50 | 49 | 51 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Gross income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Botiom | 9 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 2nd | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| 3 rd | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| 4th | 24 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Top | 37 | 38 | 39 | 38 | 39 | 39 | 40 | 41 | 43 | 43 | 42 | 44 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Disposable income 9 9 9 - 9 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Botiom | 9 | 9 | , | 9 | 9 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
| 2nd | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| 3 d | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 16 |
| 4th | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Top | 36 | 37 | 38 | 37 | 38 | 37 | 38 | 40 | 41 | 42 | 41 | 43 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Post-tax income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Botiom | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| 2nd | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 10 |
| 3 rd | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| 4th | 23 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 |
| Top | 37 | 38 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 38 | 39 | 41 | 43 | 44 | 43 | 45 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |


|  | 1991 | 1992 | 1993 | 1993-4 | 1994-5 | 1995-6 | 1996-7 | 1997-8 | 1998-9 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 | 2001-02 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Original income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 2nd | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 3 td | 16 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 14 |
| 4th | 26 | 26 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 24 |
| Top | 50 | 50 | 52 | 52 | 51 | 50 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 52 | 50 | 52 |
| All househoids | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Gross income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| 2nd | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| 3 rd | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| 4th | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 22 |
| Top | 44 | 43 | 44 | 44 | 43 | 43 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 45 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | 7 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| 2nd | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 |
| 3rd | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 |
| 4th | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 22 |
| Top | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 41 | 40 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 42 | 43 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Post-tax income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottom | 7 | 11 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 |
| 2nd | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| 3rd | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 |
| 4th | 23 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Top | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 43 | 43 | 44 | 44 | 45 | 45 | 44 | 46 |
| All households | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |

1 Ranked by equvatiset olsposable income.
2 From 1890 ihs includes company car benell and bensliciat house purchase loans from amployers. From 1996-97 valuss are based on ostimates for ithe sample grossed up to population totals.

TABLE 27 (Appendix 1): Gini coefficients for the distribution of income at each stage of the tax-benefit system and P90/P10 and P75/P25' ratios for disposable income for ALL households, 1979 to 2001-02 ${ }^{2}$

|  | Gini coefliclents (per cent) Ratios for disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Equlvalised income |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Original | Gross | Disposable | Posi-1ax | P90/P10 | P75/P25 |
| 1979 | 44 | 30 | 27 | 28 | 3.3 | 2.0 |
| 1980 | 44 | 31 | 28 | 30 | 3.5 | 2.0 |
| 1981 | 46 | 31 | 28 | 31 | 3.4 | 2.0 |
| 1982 | 47 | 31 | 28 | 31 | 3.3 | 2.0 |
| 1983 | 48 | 32 | 28 | 31 | 3.3 | 1.9 |
| 1984 | 48 | 31 | 28 | 30 | 3.3 | 2.0 |
| 1985 | 49 | 32 | 29 | 32 | 3.5 | 2.1 |
| 1986 | 50 | 34 | 31 | 35 | 3.7 | 2.1 |
| 1987 | 51 | 36 | 33 | 36 | 4.1 | 2.2 |
| 1988 | 51 | 37 | 35 | 38 | 4.4 | 2.4 |
| 1989 | 50 | 36 | 34 | 37 | 4.5 | 2.4 |
| 1990 | 52 | 38 | 36 | 40 | 4.9 | 2.5 |
| 1991 | 51 | 37 | 35 | 39 | 4.8 | 2.5 |
| 1992 | 52 | 37 | 34 | 38 | 4.6 | 2.4 |
| 1993 | 53 | 38 | 35 | 38 | 4.5 | 2.3 |
| 1993/94 | 54 | 37 | 34 | 38 | 4.5 | 2.3 |
| 1994/95 | 53 | 37 | 33 | 37 | 4.5 | 2.3 |
| 1995/96 | 52 | 36 | 33 | 37 | 4.2 | 2.2 |
| 1996/97 | 53 | 37 | 34 | 38 | 4.4 | 2.3 |
| 1997/98 | 53 | 37 | 34 | 38 | 4.5 | 2.3 |
| 1998/99 | 53 | 38 | 35 | 39 | 4.5 | 2.3 |
| 1998/00 | 53 | 38 | 35 | 40 | 4.6 | 2.4 |
| 2000/01 | 51 | 38 | 35 | 39 | 4.5 | 2.3 |
| 2001/02 | 53 | 39 | 36 | 40 | 4.5 | 2.3 |

I PSOPP10 is the ratio of the income at the SOth percentile to the foth; P75/P25 is the ratlo of the income at the 75h percentila to the 25 ith
2 From 1990 inis includes company car benelit and benaficid house purchase loans from employers. From $1996-97$ values are based on astimates for the sample grossed to papulation tolais.

## APPENDIX 2

## 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 ONS 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 Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS). 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 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 have sufficient information to make an allocation.

## Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS)

2. The estimates in this analysis are based mainly on data derived from the EFS, which replaced the Family Expenditure Survey (FES) from 2001-02. The EFS 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; children aged 7 to 15 keep a simplified diary. 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 EFS is to produce information on household expenditure patterns which is used to derive the weights for the retail prices index. The fieldwork is undertaken by
the Social Survey Division of ONS and by the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency. Family Spending 2001-02, published by TSO in January 2003, shows detailed results on expenditure and income from the 2001-02 survey, and how they vary with household characteristics. The report also includes an outline of the survey design.
4. The number of households in the United Kingdom responding to the EFS in 2001-02 was 7,500 (about 1 in every 3,300 households). The response rate was 61 per cent. To count as a cooperating household, all members aged 16 and over must fill in the diaries for both weeks and give full details of income, etc. The available evidence suggests that households containing a couple with non-dependent children, those where the head is selfempioyed, and those where the head was born outside the United Kingdom, are less likely to co-operate than others (see A comparison of the Census characteristics of respondents and nonrespondents to the 1991 Family Expenditure Survey by Kate Foster, Survey Methodology Bulletin, ONS, No. 38, January 1996). In addition, response in Greater London is noticeably lower than in other areas.
5. The results in the analysis are based on the survey grossed up so that totals reflect the total population in private households in the United Kingdom (that is excluding those in institutions such as residential homes for the elderly). Households were assigned different initial weights based on the non-response in the 1991 FES. These weights were derived from Census-linked data (see Weighting the FES in Great Britain to compensate for nonresponse: an investigation using Census-linked data by Kate Foster). The final household weights were produced using specialised software developed by INSEE, the French national statistics institute. The control variables used in the grossing system were the number of individuals by age (in five-year bands) and sex; and the number of individuals by region. The grossing has not yet been revised to take account of results from the 2001 Census.
6. The EFS is designed primarily as a survey of expenditure on goods and services by households. It has been developed to gather information about the income of household members, and is an important and detailed source of income data. However, no
information is collected that would enable a balance sheet of income and expenditure to be drawn up for a household over any particular period. Much expenditure relates to the two-week period after the interview, whereas many income components refer to a much longer period (e.g. investment income over the previous 12 months). EFS income does not include proceeds from the sale of assets (e.g. a car) or windialls such as legacies. But recorded expenditure might reflect these items, as well as the effects of living off savings, using capital or borrowing money. Hence, there is no reason why income and expenditure should balance either for an individual household or even averaged over a group of households. Indeed, measured expenditure substantially exceeds measured income for the bottom half of the income distribution. Moreover, the difference between income and expenditure is not necessarily a measure of savings or dis-savings.

## Unit of analysis

7. The basic unit of analysis used is the household, and not the family, individual or benefit unit. A household is defined in the EFS from 2001-02, and in the FES from 2000-01, in terms of the harmonised definition as used in the Census and nearly all other government household surveys since 1981. This is one person or a group of persons who have the accommodation as their only or main residence and (for a group) share the living accommodation, that is a living or sitting room, or share meals together or have common housekeeping. Up until 1999-2000, the definition was based on the pre-1981 Census definition and required members to share eating and budgeting arrangements as well as shared living accommodation. The definition of a household was comprising people who live at the same address and who share common catering for at least one meal a day. The effect of the change was fairly small but not negligible. Spending on many items, particularly on food, housing, fuel and light, is largely joint spending by the members of the household. Without further information or assumptions it is difficult to apportion indirect taxes between Individuals or other sub-divisions of households.
8. In classifying the households into various types, a child (i.e. a dependent) is defined as:
either aged under 16;
or aged 16, 17 or 18 not married, and receiving full-time non-advanced further education.

Most of the 'extra' adults in households with at least three adults are sons or daughters of the head of household rather than retired people.
9. 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 household, 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'.
10. By no means all retired people are in retired households: about one in five households comprising three or more adults contains retired people, for example, and households comprising one retired and one non-retired adult are often classified as non-retired.
11. The sample households 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 (none in 2001-02) where a spouse is absent from the household at the time of interview. The absent spouse may well be working away from home (e.g. on an oil rig), or living separately - but contributing financially to the household'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.
12. Economically active people comprise persons aged 16 or over who, at the time of interview, were:
employees at work,
employees temporarily away from work through iliness, temporary lay-off, industrial action, etc,
on government training schemes,
self-empioyed,
not in employment but who had sought work within the last four weeks, or were waiting to start a job already obtained.

## Income: redistributive stages

13. Stage one:

Original income plus cash benefits $=$ Gross income.

## Stage two:

Gross income minus income tax, employees' National Insurance contributions and local taxes (see paragraph 24 below) = Disposable income.

## Stage three:

Disposable income minus indirect taxes $=$ Post-tax income.

## Stage four:

Post-tax income plus 'benefits in kind' = Final income.
14. The starting point of the analysis is original income. This is the annualised 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. The term 'annualised' rather than 'annual' is used advisedly. For instance, annualised income from a respondent's 'main job' is not current wage or salary multiplied up to an annual value; nor is it the sum of income from this source in the twelve month period prior to interview. Rather it is an estimate of such income expressed at an annual rate based on the respondent's assessment of his 'normal' wage or salary subject to his current employment status.
15. Furthermore, to avoid double counting and to make it consistent with the estimate of income from cash benefits (see paragraph 20), this annualised estimate has to be 'abated' for the number of weeks likely to be lost due to unemployment, sickness, etc. This figure is taken as the number of weeks so lost in the 12 months prior to interview. It should be noted that regardless of whether the respondent is currently working or unemployed the treatment is essentially the same, i.e. normal gross wage or salary expressed at an annual rate abated as required.
16. In all of this, the crucial determining role of current employment status should also be noted. Thus, no employment income would be assigned to a respondent whose employment status had recently become retired or unoccupied even though he or she may have worked for most of the twelve months prior to interview.
17. About 98 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 baby-sitter, regular allowance from a non-spouse, 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. This is counted as employment income if the tenancy depends on the job.
18. In addition to salary, many employees receive as part of their income fringe benefits such as company cars, private medical insurance and beneficial loans. The company car benefit, together with the benefit from fuel for personal use, has been included in the analysis since 1990. This is by far the most important fringe benefit accounting for over two thirds of all taxable fringe benefits according to Iniand Revenue statistics. The benefit is taken to be the taxable income in accordance with Inland Revenue scale charges. The Inland Revenue website contains more detailed information on taxable fringe benefits and their impact on
individuals. Although, for those earning below $£ 8,500$ per year the benefit is not taxable, benefit has been allocated to all those with a company car regardless of the level of earnings. The calculation of this benefit is based primarily on the car price as reported in the EFS. In any given year, the total amount of benefit will depend on the level of scale charges for tax purposes as well as the numbers and prices of vehicles in the EFS.
19. The benefit of subsidised loans from employers for house purchase has been allocated, since the 1992 analysis. The benefit is taken to be the difference between the interest payments on such loans as reported in the EFS and the interest payments that would have been payable at the ruling market rate of interest.
20. The next stage of the analysis is to add cash benefits and tax credits to original income to obtain gross income. This is slightly different from the 'gross normal weekly income' used in the EFS report. Cash benefits and tax credits include:

Contributory:

Retirement pension, part of job seeker's allowance, incapacity benefit, widows' benefits, and statutory maternity pay.

Non-contributory:

Income support, part of job seeker's allowance, child benefit, housing benefit (council tax benefit and rates rebates are treated as deductions from local taxes), invalid care allowance, attendance allowance, disability living allowance, disabled persons tax credit, war pensions, severe disablement allowance, industrial injury disablement benefits, working families tax credit, old persons pension, Christmas bonus for pensioners, government training scheme allowances, educational support and winter fuel payments.
21. Statutory maternity pay is classified as a cash benefit even though it is paid through the employer.
22. 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 benefits, is based on current rates.
23. Income tax, local taxes and employees' and self-employed 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 are not available from the EFS.
24. The figures for local taxes include:

Council tax (for househoids in Great Britain), domestic rates (for households in Northern Ireland), and charges made by water authorities for water, environmental and sewerage services.
25. Council tax is shown after discounts to reduce or remove the personal element of the tax (e.g. the discount of 25 per cent for single person households). All local taxes are shown after the deduction of council tax benefit and rates rebates. This brings the treatment in line with that of National Accounts which treats such rebates as revenue foregone. Up to and inciuding 1995-96 these rebates were included as part of housing benefits.
26. 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 seli-employment, 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 2001-02, there was only one type of tax relief obtained in this way: life assurance premium relief. Where househoids are eligible for these reliefs, imputations are made and deducted from recorded income tax payments.
27. The next step is to deduct indirect taxes to give post-tax income. Indirect tax on final consumer goods and services include: Duties on aicoholic drinks, tobacco, petrol, oil, betting, etc; Value Added Tax (VAT);
Customs (import) duties;
Motor vehicle duties;
Air passenger duty;
Insurance premium tax;
Driving licenses;
Television licenses;
Stamp duties;
Fossil fuel levy;
Camelot: payments to National Lottery Distribution Fund.
28. Taxes levied on final goods and services are assumed to be fully incident on the consumer, and can be imputed from a househoid's EFS expenditure record. For example, the amount of VAT that is paid by the househoid is calculated from the household's total expenditure on goods and services subject to VAT.
29. VAT affects the prices of second-hand cars and is therefore assumed to be incident on the purchasers of such cars as well as on the purchasers of new cars. In allocating taxes, expenditures recorded in the EFS 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 under-represented in the EFS.
30. The incidence of stamp duty on house purchase on an owneroccupying household has been taken as the product of the hypothetical duty payable on buying their current dwelling (estimated from valuations given in the EFS) and the probability of a household of that type moving in a given year (estimated from the General Household Survey).
31. Indirect taxes on intermediate goods and sevices include:

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;
Independent Commission franchise payments;
Landfill tax;
Consumer Credit Act fees.
32. 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 analysis, being assumed to be fully shifted to the consumer. Their allocations between different categories of househoid 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. Some analyses, e.g. that by Dilnot, Kay and Keen Allocating Taxes to Households: A Methodology, suggest that the taxes could be progressive rather than regressive if one were to use different incidence assumptions.
33. For Tables 3 and 9 of the main analysis, we have constructed a measure of expenditure on goods and services from data from the EFS. Indirect taxes are shown as a proportion both of disposable income and of expenditure. One drawback of comparing the incidence of indirect taxes on households at different levels of income is that, by whatever measure used, on average, recorded expenditure exceeds income apparently available for it by substantial amounts in the bottom half of the distribution. Thus, it
has been argued that for many households, where, for instance, income fluctuates widely or where it is difficult to measure accurately, a measure based on regular household outgoings would be a far better indicator of resources available to the household and therefore give a better picture of the incidence of indirect taxes.
34. This measure of expenditure has been customised to be analogous to the definition of disposable income used in the analysis in order to facilitate these comparisons. For instance, because the imputed benefit of company cars and beneficial loans will have boosted the figure for disposable income these items have had to be added to this expenditure measure. Expenditure on alcohol, tobacco and confectionery have been grossed up for under-recording in line with the treatment of the indirect taxes on these items. Payments deemed to be made out of income such as superannuation, regular savings, mortgage repayments, etc. have been included and adjusted where necessary but not items such as lump sum capital payments in line with the exclusion of capital gains and windalls from income.
35. Finally, we add those notional benefits in kind provided to househoids by government for which there is a reasonable basis for allocation to households, to obtain final income. The benefits in kind allocated are:

State education;
School meals and welfare milk;
National Health Service;
Housing subsidy;
Railway travel subsidy;
Bus travel subsidy (including concessionary
fares schemes).
36. Education benefit is estimated from information provided by the Department for Education and Skills of the cost per pupil or student in special schools, primary and secondary schools, universities, and other further education establishments. The value of the benefits attributed to a household depends on the number of people in the household recorded in the EFS as receiving each kind of state education (students away from the household are excluded). No benefit is allocated for pupils attending private schools.
37. The value of school meals and other welfare foods is based on their costs to the public authorities.
38. 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. Each individual in the EFS is allocated a benefit from the National Health

Service according to the estimated average use made of these 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 trom maternity services is assigned separately to those households containing children under the age of 12 months. No allowance is made for the use of private health care services.
39. In this analysis, public sector tenants are defined to include the tenants of local authorities, Scottish Homes, Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE), housing associations and Registered Social Landiords. The total housing subsidy includes the contribution from central government to the housing revenue accounts of local authorities, and grants paid to Scottish Homes, the NIHE, housing associations and Registered Social Landiords. Within Greater London, the rest of England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland each pubic sector tenant has been allocated a share of the region's total relevant subsidy based on the council tax band of the dwelling. Housing subsidy does not include, rent rebates and allowances or local tax rebates.
40. The rail travel subsidies allocated are the support payments made to the train operating companies. 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 EFS. In making these allocations, allowances are made for the use of rail travel by the business sector, tourists and the institutional part of the personal sector.
41. In this analysis, 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.
42. We must emphasise that the analysis provides only a rough guide to the kinds of household which benefit from government expenditure, and by how much, and to those which finance it. 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.
43. 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 a life assurance premium, for example, accrues directly to the
taxpayer rather than to some other party, for instance, the seller of the policy. 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.
44. 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.
45. 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 indirectly from the general provision of the service.

## Equivalence scale

46. The equivalence scale used 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 DrLD 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 EFS without making any specific assumption about the criteria for equivalence. These scales are in regular use and an analysis by Banks and Johnson (Children and Household Living Standards, IFS, 1993) suggests that the scales are as valid now as when they were developed. 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 justfied for broad statistical standardisation.
47. The equivalence values are given below:

## Type of household member Equivalence value

## Married head of household

| (i.e. a married or cohabiting couple) | 1.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1st additional adult | 0.42 |
| 2nd (or more) additional adult | 0.36 (per adult) |

## Single head of household

(adult) 0.61

1 st additional adult $\quad 0.46$
2nd additional adult 0.42
3 rd (or more) additional adult $\quad 0.36$ (per adult)

## 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 |

48. The values for each household 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 household has a married couple with two children (aged six and nine) plus one adult lodger. The household'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 $£ 10,753$ ( $=£ 20,000 / 1.86$ ).
49. This quantity is used to produce the single ranking used in all the tables in this analysis (apart from the Gini coefficients which have to be ranked afresh for each different definition of income).


Population share (per cent)
50. It is important to note that most monetary values shown in the analysis are ordinary (i.e. un-equivalised) £ per year, not equivalised $£$ per year. Where equivalised values do appear (e.g. the quintile points in Table 16A of Appendix 1), they are shown in italics.

## Gini coefficient

51. The Gini coefficient is the most widely used summary measure of the degree of inequality in an income distribution. It can more easily be understood by considering a Lorenz curve of the income distribution, (see Diagram 2), i.e. 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 right-hand vertical axis (see Diagram 3). 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 coefficient until, with complete inequality, it reaches its maximum value of 1 (or 100 per cent).
52. 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 analysis are based on distributions of equivalised income, e.g. the coefficient for original income is

## Diagram 3

Complete income equality

calculated after dividing the original income for all the households by their appropriate equivalence values.
53. 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 (e.g. state education): the equivalence scales used in this analysis are based on actual household spending and do not, therefore, apply to such items as notional income.

## Impact of population weighting

54. The survey results have been re-weighted and grossed so that the population totals reflect the whole household population, a process described as population weighting. Different weights are applied to different types of households in order to correct for over and under-representation of these groups in the responding sample of the EFS. Population weighting raises the quality of the estimates by making the population more representative and by improving the allocation of national accounts aggregates to individual households. Estimates based on the population-weighted data set are different from estimates based on the sample. Indeed,
if they were not, there would be little point in the weighting. The effect of weighting on some of the major variables used in the analysis was given in the 1997-98 analysis. More detail about the effect of weighting can be obtained from the ONS on request.

## Sampling errors and reliability

55. As the EFS 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 househoids. This 'sampling error' is smallest in relation to large groups of households and measures that do not vary greaty between households. Conversely, it is largest for small groups of households, and for measures that vary considerably between households. A broad numerical measure of the amount of variability is provided by the quantity known as the standard error.
56. It is dificicult to calculate these standard errors exacily because of the multi-stage design of the EFS sample and the population weighting, but we have made a good approximation by combining the simple random formula with the appropriate design factor from the EFS analysis. The design factor is the ratio of the standard error using the detailed formula that takes account of the full complexity of the sample design and the population weighting to the standard error using the simple random sample formula.) The most appropriate design factor from the EFS work is for 'gross normal weekly household income'. The standard error of the mean for N households is given by:
(design factor) * $\mathrm{S} / \sqrt{\mathrm{N}}$
where the design factor is 1.1 for 2001-02, and $\mathrm{S}^{2}$ is the estimate of the population variance.
57. The standard error for normal weekly disposable income of all households is slightly more than one per cent of the mean but, for the less frequent household types, e.g. 1 adult with children and 3 or more adults with children, it is likely to be higher.
58. 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 per cent confidence interval.
59. The standard errors for the household types are larger than for the whole sample, mainly because the sample sizes concerned 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.
60. The 'complex' standard errors for quintile and decile groups are quite a bit larger than the simple random sample estimates.

## Previous analyses

61. This analysis is the latest in an annual series covering the years from 1957 onwards. From 1987 onwards, the analyses have used a very different methodology, in particular households are ranked by their equivalised disposable income. Hence, the results are completely incompatible with earlier years. Last year the analysis was published on the Internet in April, and in the May 2002 edition of Economic Trends. A list of the previous articles was included in the article published in March 1997.
62. The results in all analyses are intended to be free standing: they were not designed for direct comparison with otheryears except where some limited comparisons were made in them. Such comparisons are difficult because of changes in definitions, however, some broader measures like the Gini coefficients are relatively robust and will stand comparison with other years: this year's analysis gives such a comparison for the years 1979 to 2001-02.
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## Summary

This article summarises the development of a UK Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) by the Office for National Statistics (ONS). The methodology improves on previous work carried out by ONS in 1996 (Hughes 1996) by developing a SAM which is both more detailed and consistent with the European System of Accounts (ESA95).

A SAM is an analytical framework in which social and economic data are integrated and harmonised. As with all accounts the SAM balances. By expanding the detail of the breakdown, for example four household types are defined to disaggregate the household sector, we introduce an element of social analysis. The matrix representation of economic and social statistics has the advantage that both sides of a transaction are identified, both who pays and who receives.

The current work uses a top-down approach. It was constructed in two stages. The first step was to create a National Accounting Matrix (NAM) by representing the traditional UK National Accounts in matrix form. The second stage disaggregated certain cells of the matrix using household surveys expanding the NAM into a fuil SAM.

## Introduction

A Social Accounting Matrix (SAM) links together the (mainly) macrostatistics of National Accounts with the (mainly) micro-statistics of the labour market and of households to show the inter-relationships between economic and social statistics. To achieve this, statistics from household surveys have to be integrated into the National Accounts framework, which requires the adoption of common units, definitions and classifications.

The UK has a long history of producing Social Accounting Matrices (SAM). Several SAMs have been produced by academics, amongst them Richard Stone who worked on National Accounting from 1940 onwards, earning him his Nobel Prize in 1984 (Deaton 1987). An
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official SAM was produced by ONS in 1996 for the year 1993. The SAM presented in this article improves on this work as it is the first UK Social Accounting Matrix to be produced according to regulations in the 1995 revision of the European System of Accounts (Eurostat, 1995) (hereafter ESA95), and provides a more detailed social breakdown. This pilot SAM for the UK is constructed for the year 1996 based on the 2002 Blue Book. It uses a top-down approach, that is to say control totals are taken from the National Accounts and broken down to the required level of detail using shares based on other (micro-)data sources.

The UK has been a member of a Eurostat Leadership Group on Social Accounting Matrices. As part of the work of the group, each country involved has produced a pilot SAM for 1996 or 1997. The group has produced a Handbook on Social Accounting Matrices (Eurostat, forthcoming) that provides more technical detail about the construction of SAMs than can be covered in this article.'

The rest of this article is set out as follows. The next section gives the background to the SAM with particular reference to the existing National Accounts. The following section goes through the methods of creating the SAM. The penultimate section presents the results and the final section contains the concluding remarks.

## Background

Social Accounting Matrices and National Accounts are built upon the same framework. Although their presentation is different(National Accounts are presented in T-accounts and the SAM in a matrix form), the concepts, classifications and accounts are the same. ${ }^{2}$ The current work therefore builds on the standard tables of the National Accounts: Supply and Use tables and Sector Accounts and the methodologies underpinning these.

ONS produces Supply and Use tables annually as part of National Accounts. These tables present the goods and services account and the production account in matrix form. The matrix representation
records how supplies of different kinds of goods and services originate from domestic industries and imports and how these supplies are allocated between various intermediate or final uses, including exports. Supply and Use tables can be used as a framework for reconciling and balancing the various expenditure, income and production estimates assembled for the accounts, including the determination of the level of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (ONS 1998). They also provide the basis for Input-Output tables. These tables can be used to evaluate the impact on individual industry groups of fiscal and economic policy decisions, using multiplier modeling (Pyatt and Round 1979).

The sequence of sector accounts describe the economic process from the generation of income, through its distribution and redistribution and finally to its accumulation in the form of assets. Traditionally the sequence starts with the production account, but the sequence can be started anywhere. The process is known as the circular flow of income, and its concept underlies National Accounts. One of the advantages of a SAM is that its presentation clearly illustrates how this economic process is embedded in the National Accounts.

There are benefits for National Accounting in developing a SAM. The SAM offers a matrix representation of the accounts beyond the goods and services and production accounts. This presents extra information on the flow of funds and who pays what to whom. This extra information can be used to extend and improve the multiplier modelling to incorporate the behaviour of the non-production part of the economy.

A second advantage of a Social Accounting Matrix is its social breakdown. A large number of economic interactions happen within the household sector. National Accounts cannot show these as it treats the househoid sector as one group. The SAM breaks the cells involving 'returns for labour' and the household sector into smaller groups to show the effect of the differential behaviour of these groups. For example, compensation of employees can be broken down to show how they relate to the characteristics of those people who are supplying the labour and the household sector can be expanded to show how disposable income or final consumption varies by household type.

Our Social Accounting Matrix is a labour oriented one, that is labour input is broken down by education and gender, and the household sector is broken down according to main source of income. It is possible to construct Labour Accounts using micro data from the labour market which show the supply and demand for labour in one balanced framework. National Accounts already contain some labour market information. A labour-oriented SAM provides the framework
to confront the National Accounts labour market information with the Labour Accounts, thus fostering greater integration between the two.

Although SAMs have some advantages over the traditional presentation of National Accounts for cross-sectional data, they do not lend themselves to presenting time series as easily.

SAMs are unfamiliar to many. Users need to familiarise themselves with the concepts and conventions of SAMs before they can appreciate the added value that they offer. Box 1 provides an introduction to how to read a SAM.

## Box 1. How to read a SAM

In the traditional T-account presentation, the National Accounts are shown as an ordered set of accounts. In the SAM the accounts are shown as successive rows and columns in a matrix. The rows display the resources and the columns display the uses. Each transaction is shown only once. We will refer to each transaction as a cell and reference it by its row and column number. The production account provides a simple example (see Table 1). The row shows the resources - the output of the resident industries at basic prices (Ceil 2,1). The column shows the usesintermediate consumption (Cell 1,2), consumption of fixed capital (Cell 8,2 ) and the balancing item, net value added (Cell 3,2 ).

The SAM can also be viewed as a family of matrices at three different levels, each of which is embedded in the level above. Table 1 shows the highest level of aggregation, an aggregate National Accounts matrix showing the total for each cell. For example, current transfers within the UK (Cell 5,5 ) amounted to £512,537 million in 1996. Adding on the transfers from the rest of the world (Cell 5,10 ) $£ 16,069$ million, we get total resources of the UK from current transfers, $£ 528,600$ million. This total corresponds to the total resources from D.5, D. 6 and $D .7$ in the Secondary Distribution of Income Account (Table 1.6.4 on page 56 in the Blue Book (ONS 2002a)).

Each of the cells in this level, can be expanded into a (sub-) matrix to show the transactions taking place within the account. The most suitable unit to use to show the transactions varies from account to account. The different units chosen for each account (industry, product, primary input category, institutional sector and financial asset) are shown as classifications in Table 1. In essence, this National Accounts Matrix (NAM) ${ }^{3}$ gives a representation of National Accounts in matrix form, but it contains additional detail in that it shows who pays what to whom. Table 2
continues the current transfers, Cell (5,5), example. It shows the amounts transferred between the different institutional sectors. For example, the household sector paid out $£ 146,564$ million in transters to general government, mainly in the form of taxes and social contributions and general government paid out £112,095 million to the household sector, mainly in the form of benefits.

Certain cells in the NAM can be further expanded to show the part played by groups of actors within different sectors. This expansion, which provides the link between the macro-data of National Accounts and the micro-data about labour and households, gives the SAM in its most disaggregated form. Table 3 shows this expansion for current transters, Cell $(5,5)$. With the household sector broken down, we can see that 82 per cent of the money transferred from households to general government ( $£ 119,409$ million out of $£ 145,564$ million) came from households with wages and salaries as main source of income. In contrast, 39 per cent of the money transferred from general government to households ( $£ 44,059$ million out of $£ 112,095$ million) went to those households with retirement income as the main income source and a further 30 per cent ( $£ 33,579$ million) went to households with transfer income as the main source.

In the matrix presentation, the row and column totals have to balance to ensure that total resources (row sums) equal total uses (column sums). This gives rise to the balancing items, shaded in Table 1, which link successive accounts.

## Method

The current work uses a top-down approach. It was constructed in two stages. The first step was to create a National Accounting Matrix (NAM) by representing the traditional UK National Accounts in matrix form. The second stage disaggregated certain cells of the matrix, using household surveys, expanding the NAM into a full SAM.

The main published National Accounts sources (ONS 2002a, 2002b, 2002c) provided the bulk of the information for the NAM. However, other sources were needed. Data on capital consumption came from West and Clifton-Fearnside (1999). A range of unpublished data series underlying the National Accounts also had to be used. Examples of these are the Dividends and Interest Matrix used to get interest flows and the Perpetual Inventories Method used to get net capital formation.

In the UK National Accounts, Non-profit institutions serving households (NPISH) transactions are not published separately, but are combined with those of the Household sector. This decision, which is in accordance with the National Statistics Code of Practice
and its associated quality requirements, reflects the lack of data currently available to accurately distinguish between the two sectors. However, some provisional information is available for certain parts of the NPISH and Household accounts. It is this provisional data that has informed the process of separation of the NPISH flows from the published account for this particular exercise, thereby resulting in a separate Household sector upon which framework the first version of a UK SAM is dependent.

Users need to be aware that the basis of these estimates is weak. and that they should be regarded as experimental and used with caution. ONS is working to produce improved estimates for NPISH for the National Accounts but it will be a few years before these are ready for inclusion in National Statistics.

To extend the NAM to a SAM requires further breakdown of individuals into their worker types and households into groups classified by their main source of income. The main data sources used to provide the further breakdown are the Labour Force Survey (LFS) and the Family Expenditure Survey (FES), now the Expenditure and Food Survey (EFS). The LFS provides information about the age, educational qualifications, industry and hours worked of all in employment (including the self-employed) and the earnings of employees. The FES, which is the UK household budget survey, provides information about other forms of income (such as selfemployment income and investment income), transfers and expenditure.

## From National Accounts to NAM

When the National Accounts are presented in the form of T-accounts in the Blue Book (BB), they show both resources and uses by the type of transaction and the actors involved at a fairly high level of aggregation. The NAM shows rather more - it shows the amount paid by one sector to another, In other words we need to know not just how much interest is received by and paid out by the sector but also which sector it is received from and paid out to. This requires us to drill down ${ }^{4}$ beneath the published accounts until we can find a level of disaggregation at which a single sector either pays out or receives all of the funds. Once we know how much is paid from whom to whom for each component within an account we can sum together the component parts to show the flows between the sectors for the whole account.

There are three redistribution accounts (property income, current transfers and capital transfers), with three cells in each. There is a cell on the diagonal: for example Cell $(4,4)$ gives the property income payments to and from UK residents only. This diagonal cell is complemented by two other cells: Cells $(4,10)$ and $(10,4)$ that display

| ACCOUNT | Classifications | 1. Goods and services | 2. Production | 3. Generation of income | 4. Aflocation of primary income | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 5. Secondary } \\ \text { distribution } \end{array}$ | 6. Use of disposable income | 7. Capital | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 8. Gross fixed } \\ & \text { capital } \\ & \text { infornation } \end{aligned}$ | 9. Financial | 10. Rest of the word current | 11. Rest ofthe worddcapital | Slatistical adjustment | 12. Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | products | industries | primary input categories | institutional sectors | institutional sectors | institutional sectors | institutional sectors | industries | financial assets |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Goods and senvices | products | Trade and transporl margins 0 | Intermediate consumption 775,797 |  |  |  | Final consumption expenditure 638,964 | Changes in inventories* 1,613 | Gross fixed capital formation 125,762 |  | Exports of goods and services 223,091 |  |  | 1,765,227 |
| 2. Production | industries | Output (basic prices) $1,455,417$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1,455,417 |
| 3. Generation of income | primary input categonies |  | NET VALUE ADDED (basic prices) 589,981 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Compensation of employees from the ROW 911 |  |  | 590,892 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 4. Allocation } \\ & \text { of primary } \\ & \text { income } \end{aligned}$ | institutional sectors | Taxes less subsidies on products $78,123$ |  | GENERATED INCOME, NET (basic prices) $590,074$ | Properly income $209,643$ |  |  |  |  |  | Property income and taxes less subsidies on production from the ROW 91,621 |  |  | 1,029,461 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 5. Secondary } \\ & \text { distribution } \\ & \text { of income } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { institutional } \\ & \text { sectors } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | NATIONAL INCOME, NET 669,891 | Current transfers 512,537 |  |  |  |  | Current transiers from the rest of the world 16,069 |  |  | 1,198,497 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6. Use of } \\ & \text { disposable } \\ & \text { income } \end{aligned}$ | institutional sectors |  |  |  |  | DISPOSABLE INCOME, NET <br> 667,989 | Adjustment for the change in net equity of households on pension funds reserves 14,824 |  |  |  | Adjustment for the change in net equity of households on pension funds reserves from ROW 0 |  |  | 682,813 |
| 7. Capital | institutiona sectors |  |  |  |  |  | SAVING, NET $29,027$ | Capital transfers" $14,693$ |  | Net incurtence of liabilities $550,187$ |  | Capital transfers from the ROW 1,357 | 2,458 | 597,732 |
| 8. Gross fixed capital formation | industries |  | Consumption of fixed capital 89,639 |  |  |  |  | Net fixed capital formation 36,123 |  |  |  |  |  | 125,762 |
| 9. Financial | financial assels |  |  |  |  |  |  | Net acquisitions of financial assets 544,672 |  |  |  | Net lending of the ROW 5,515 |  | 550,187 |
| 10. Rest of the world, current |  | Imports of goods and services (ci.i.) 231,687 |  | Compensation of employees to the ROW $818$ | Property income and taxes less subsidies on production to the ROW 89,927 | Current transiers to the ROW $17,971$ | Adjustment for the change in net equity equity of households on pension funds reserves to the ROW $-2$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | 340,401 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 11. Rest of the } \\ & \text { world, } \\ & \text { capital } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Capital transters to the ROW 631 |  |  | Current extermal balance <br> 8.709 |  | -2,458 | 6,882 |
| 12. Total |  | 1,765,227 | 1,455,417 | 590,892 | 1,029,461 | 1,198,497 | 682,813 | 597,732 | 125,762 | 550,187 | 340,401 | 6,882 |  |  |

- Including acquisitions less disposals of valuables.
- Inciuding acquisitions less disposals of non-produced non-iniancial assets.

|  | Secondary distribution of income (institutional sectors) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |

Table 3 Cell ( 5,5 ) current transfers among residents

| Secondary distribution of income (Institutional sectors) | Secondary distribution of income (Institutional sectors) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Non-financial corporations | Financial corporations | General government | Wages and salaries | Househ <br> Mixed income <br> fincluding <br> property <br> income) | olds <br> Income in connection with old age (retirement) |  | Non-profit institutions sevving households | Total |
| Non-financial corporations | 0 | 5,503 | 537 | 3,046 | 118 | 22 | 23 | 0 | 9,249 |
| Financial corporations | 5,508 | 1,726 | 371 | 53,419 | 13,504 | 5,759 | 1,656 | 247 | 82,189 |
| General government | 22,249 | 2,352 | 59,458 | 119,409 | 16,527 | 8,688 | 1,940 | -2,559 | 228,064 |
| Households classified by main source of income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wages and salaries | 1,122 | 16,357 | 22,714 | 116 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,294 | 41,603 |
| Mixed income (including property income) | 523 | 11,238 | 11,743 | 0 | 73 | 0 | 0 | 399 | 23,976 |
| income in connection with |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| old age (retirement) | 2,476 | 30,761 | 44,059 | 236 | -8 | 231 | 0 | 745 | 78,500 |
| Other transfers income (including other households) | 209 | 1,166 | 33,579 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 613 | 35,578 |
| Non-profit institutions serving households | 335 | 312 | 9,558 | 1,618 | 460 | 674 | 420 | 0 | 13,378 |
| Total | 32,421 | 69,415 | 182,019 | 177,848 | 30,674 | 15,374 | 4,047 | 739 | 512,537 |

the property income payments to and receipts from the rest of the world, respectively. It can be seen in Table 1 that a similar pattern is followed in current transfers and capital transfers.

Table 4 summarises the compilation of the NAM cell by cell. Where the compilation was straightforward - usually because it required only published data - the table contains only a reference to where the data are taken from. The compilation of Cell ( 3,2 ), which required more assumptions than the rest, is described below.

## Cell 3.2 - Net Value Added by Industry and Primary Input Category

In this cell, the net value added in each industry is allocated to the inputs: labour and capital. The compilation requires the correct allocation of returns to labour and capital and adjustments for the consumption of capital. In calculating these splits, data on gross operating surplus, compensation of employees and other taxes on production come from BB 2.1 Use table. The capital consumption total comes from BB Table $1.6 .2-\mathrm{K}$.1. For the industry breakdown of capital consumption see the note for Cell $(8,2)$. The gross mixed income total and net mixed income totals come from BB Table 1.6.2. Gross mixed income by industry is an unpublished series which we used to calculate net mixed income and net operating surplus by industry.

To move to net mixed income and net operating surplus by industry, the capital consumption data by industry is broken down into two components, the part related to gross mixed income and the part related to gross operating surplus. First the ratio of gross mixed income to gross operating surplus is calculated to get a proxy for the size of mixed income in the industry. Then this ratio is applied to the capital consumption data. This gives a proportion for the relative weight of capital consumption from mixed income activity by industry. However, the total is about twice the size of the economy total. (This arises because this method does not take into account the fact that part of net mixed income is compensation of labour, and so overestimating capital consumption.)

## From NAM to SAM

Going from a NAM to a SAM involves disaggregating certain cells. These cells are $(3,2),(4,3),(4,4),(4,10),(10,4),(5,5),(5,10),(10,5)$, $(1,6),(6,6)$ and $(7,6)$. This SAM is a labour oriented one. This means that individuals are categorised according to their sex and their
educational attainment, in Cell (3,2). Households are categorised according to their main income source in the rest of the cells listed.

The labour input is classified by the sex and educational attainment of the individuals who supply their labour. Educational attainment is shown at three levels: lower (corresponding to ISCED ${ }^{5}$ levels 1 and 2), middle (ISCED 3 and 4) and higher (ISCED 5 and 6 ). The LFS collects all the information about employment status, industry, education level and earnings for employees necessary to provide this disaggregation.

In the pilot SAM, households are classified into four groups according to their main source of income: wages and salaries; mixed income (including property income); income in connection with old age; and other transfer income. This disaggregation can be provided by the FES which collects details about income and the source of income for each adult household member.

Wages and salaries income consists of wages and salaries and income in kind (company cars, for example). Mixed income (including property income) consists of imputed rentals, self-employment income and investment income. Income related to old age is defined as occupational pensions and those benefits related to old age. Other transier income is made up of the remaining benefits and other income such as inter-household transfers through alimony and child maintenance payments. Estimates for each of these income components are available from the FES except for imputed rentals, which had to be estimated separately (see Box 2).

Table 5 shows what information (usually an FES variable) has been used to distribute the National Accounts aggregate across the household sector. It also indicates how good a fit there is between the National Accounts category and the FES variable.

Household expenditure data by household type and industry group have been produced using National Accounts household final consumption expenditure (HHFCE) data alongside household survey data and supply-use product group mappings. Estimates of expenditure by household type have been created by applying estimates of expenditure on goods and services by household type, from the Family Expenditure Survey, to UK HHFCE estimates. The allocation of expenditure across industry group has been generated using supply-use product mappings for National Accounts HHFCE estimates.?

Cell Description
1.1 All data come from Blue Book Table 2,1 (BB 2.1).
1.2 All data come from BB 2.1 Use Table,
1.6 All data come from BB 2.1 Use Table.
1.7 Changes in inventories and acquistion less disposals of valuables (including transfer costs). Only sector and industry totals are available. Industry totals come from BB 2.1 whereas sector totals come from BB 1.7, P. 52 and P. 53 . Due to a complete lack of data to fill in the individual cells, this cell has been left emply apart from the totals.
1.8 All data come from 10 Table 6. Dwellings, transfer costs, adjustment for sales by final demand and valuables are given its own column, as these are not allocated to industries. The columns do not contain sales by final demand, and are therefore total consumption at purchaser prices rather than total inputs. All data come from BB 2.1 Use Table.
2.1 Column totals come from BB2.1 Supply Table, Row totals come from 2.1 Use Table. Diagonals are filled in using information from IO Table 1. This gives total output for all 123 industries and principal product as a percentage of total industry total output. These are multiplied together. Off-diagonals have been left blank due to their potential disclosive nature. There are two cases where the diagonal enlry would have been larger than the product total. In both cases the differences are smail enough to be altributable to the percentages being rounded to the nearest whole number. Also in both cases the numbers are restricted to the product total. This is consistent with numbers from the IO Table 1 , which state that for these groups 100 per cent of total gross outpul of producls are principal products.

### 3.2 See previous page.

3.10 Data are from BB Table 1.7 D.1 (CDID KTMN).
4.1 The industry breakdown of taxes paid is from BB 2.1 Supply Table and Table 1.70.21-31 confirms that this amount goes to government. There is a sum of money that goes through General Government to external sources. These are consequently paid by general government to the rest of the world in (10,4) except for VAT to the EU. ESA95 stipulates that, although VAT is organised by the general government, it is a direct transfer to the rest of the world. As there is a product breakdown of VAT, there is not a breakdown of the part thal goes to the EU. To solve this, a dummy account is introduced which subtracts the amount of the VAT. It is subsequently reintroduced in 10-1 through a dummy account where this tax is added in.

Data are from BB Table 6.13 plus additional information from the equivalent tables for the other sectors ( $3.1 .3 ; 4.1,3 ; 5.1 .3$ ).
4.4 Column and row totals are from BB 6.1 .4 plus additional information from the equivalent tables for the other sectors, D .4 split into subcategories of (D.41, D. $42, ~ D .43, ~ D .44$ and D. 45 ). The subcategories D. 43 (Reinvested earnings on foreign direct investment), D. 44 (Property income altributed to insurance policy holders) and D. 45 (Rent on land and sub-soil assets) can be filled in by looking at disaggregated series. D. 41 (Interest). The Dividends and interest Matrix provides detailed information on interest received and paid according to the instrument earning the interest. D. 42 (Distributed Income of Corporations). This can be further broken down into D.421 (Dividends) and D.422(Distribution of income from Quasi-corporations) We could divide out the income from quasi corporation, but there were no systems in place to allow us to break down D.421. D. 421 has therefore been left in a dummy account showing only total resources and total uses for each sector.
4.10 Mainly results from 4.4 except that, in addition, this cell includes total taxes less subsidies on production and imports paid to the rest of the world. This is paid by general government. The sum paid is the difference between government resources in the allocation of primary income account from these laxes less subsidies (NVCC-NMYF) and the taxes and subsidies received by general government in 1.7 D.21-D. 31.
5.4 Data are from BB 1.7 B.5g net of K.1. The numbers are entered into the matrix on the diagonal.
5.5 Data are from BB 6.1.4 plus additional information from the equivalent tables for the other sectors, D. 5 D. 6 D. 7 D. 6 and $D .7$ are split into subgroups D. 61 D. 62 D. 71 D. 72 D. 73 D. 74 and D. 75 . Drilling down, each of these series can be disaggregated and the from-whom-to-whom relationships become apparent through this exercise.

### 5.10 Results from 5.5.

6.5 Dala are from BB 6.1.4 plus additional information from the equivalent tables for the other sectors, (The numbers can also be taken from 1.7 B .6 g and net it with K.1.) Data are entered on the diagonal.
6.6 Data are from BB 1.7 D.8. This cell only involves households and the financial sector.
6.10 Data are from BB 1.7 D.8 Uses.
7.6 Data are from BB 1.7 B .8 g , net of K .1 . Data are entered on the diagonal.
7.7 Data are from BB 6.1.4 plus additional information from the equivalent tables for the other sectors, D. 91 D. 92 D. 99 and K.2. Drilling down, each of these series can be disaggregated and the from-whom-to-whom relationships become apparent through this exercise. Acquisitions less disposals of nonproduced, non-financial assets are such that the negative number from government is equal to the sum of the other numbers and is entered as government payments.
7.9 Data are from BB 1.7F.2 to F. 7 Resources.
7.11 Results from 7.7
8.2 The data are derived by taking proportions from Economic Trend's March 1999 (this Table gives capital consumption by industry, but is not consistent with the 1999 Blue Book) and applying these proportions to Blue Booktotal (BB 1.7 K.1). This only gives industry totals, and not by product and industry, so the entries have been made on the diagonal. Dwellings and iranster costs are given a separate column and row as they are not allocated to industries consistent with $(1,8)$.
8.7 Data on the structure of the cell are supplied from the Perpetual Inventories Model, and then fitted to the national accounts totals using the RAS technique.
9.7 Data are from BB 1.7 F. 2 to F. 7 uses (cell 7 a by 9 g is the sum of other accounts receivable and statistical discrepancy).
9.11 Data are from BB 1.7 F. 2 to F. 7 Uses minus Resources.
10.1 Data are from BB 2.1 Supply Table.
10.3 All data are from BB Table 1.7 D.1 (CDID KTMO).
10.4 Results from 4.4.
10.5 Results from 5.5.
10.6 Data are from BB 1.7 D.8 Resources.
11.7 Results from 7.7.
11.10 This is a balancing item in the spreadsheet worked out from other cells. The amount 600 equals the amount in BB 1.7B. 12 .

Table 5 Variables used to break down the household sector

| Type of income | National Accounts Category Description | $\begin{gathered} \text { Amount } \\ \text { (i billion) } \end{gathered}$ | Variable used for breakdown | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Net generated income - Cell $(4,3)$ |  |  |  |  |
| Resources |  |  |  |  |
| D. 11 | Wages and salaries | 352 | FES Wages and salaries |  |
| D. 12 | Employers' social contributions | 53 | FES Wages and salaries | Assumes employers' contributions ( 12 per cent of total) are proportional to wages + salaries |
| B. 2 | Net operating suplus | 26 | imputed rent |  |
| B. 3 | Net mixed income - self-employment income for sole traders | 42 | FES income from self-employment | FES estimate includes income from partnerships (see D.422) |
| Property income - Cells ( 4,4$),(4,10)$ and ( 10,4 ) |  |  |  |  |
| Resources |  |  |  |  |
| D. 41 | Interest | 23 | FES investment income | FES understates investment income by about 40 per cent |
| D. 421 | Dividends | 14 | FES investment income |  |
| D. 422 | Income withdrawals from |  |  |  |
|  | quasi-corporations | 19 | FES income from self-employment | FES estimate includes income for sole traders (see B.3) |
| D. 44 | Income attributable to insurance policy hoiders | 48 | FES expenditure of life and non-life insurance | NA assumes insurance reserves belong to policy hoiders |
| D. 45 | Rent - land + sub-soil assets | 0.1 | FES income from self-employment | Insignificant amount with counterpart in Uses |
| Uses |  |  |  |  |
| D. 41 | Interest | 37 | FES mortgage interest payments | Assumes other debts are proportional to housing debts. |
| 0.45 | Rent - land + sub-soil assets | 0.2 | FES income from self-employment | Insignificant amount with counterpart in Resources |
| Transfer income - Cells (5,5), (5,10) and (10,5) |  |  |  |  |
| Resources |  |  |  |  |
| D. 61 | Social contributions | 0.3 | Pro-rated by number of households | Refund of over-payment from households. Insignificant amount |
| D. 621 | Social security benefits | 42 | FES contributory benefits | Good match |
| D. $622+$ D. 623 | Private funded and unfunded employee social benefils | 57 | FES income from occupational pensions | FES understates by around 20 per cent |
| D. 624 | Social assistance benefits from centrai government | 43 | FES non-contributory benefits | Good match. Housing benefit excluded from total as paid through local authority |
| D. 624 | Social assistance benefits from local government + NPISH | 14 | FES housing benefit and council. tax rebates |  |
| 0.72 | Non-life insurance claims | 19 | FES expenditure on non-life insurance | Counterpart in Uses |
| D. 75 | Miscellaneous transiers | 6 | Pro-rated by number of househoids | No information. Offset by counterpart in Uses. |
| Uses |  |  |  |  |
| D. 51 | Income tax | 78 | FES net income tax |  |
| D. 59 | Other taxes including car lax, council lax | 13 | FES net local taxes |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { D.6111 and } \\ & \text { D. } 612 \end{aligned}$ | Employers social contributions and imputed social contributions | 53 | FES wages and salaries | Counterpart in 0.12 |
| D. 6112 and |  |  |  |  |
| $0.6113$ | Social contributions from employees, self-employed and non-employed to government | 23 | FES employees National Insurance contributions |  |
| D. 6112 | Social contributions from employees to financial corporations | 38 | FES contributions to pension funds and expenditure on life assurance |  |
| D. 62 | Social benefits | 0.3 | Pro-rated by number of households | Refund of over-payment to households. Insigniticant amount |
| D. 71 | Non-life insurance claims | 19 | FES expenditure on non-life insurance |  |
| 0.75 | Miscellaneous transfers | 5 | Pro-rated by number of households | No information. Offset by counterpart in Resources |

## Box 2 Imputing Rentals for a Social Accounting Matrix

Owner-occupiers are treated in National Accounts as landlords renting to themselves, paying a shadow rent called imputed rental. As landlords, they are taking part in production and imputed rentais are part of households' gross operating surplus. Having received the imputed rental, owner-occupier households pay out imputed rentals as part of their final consumption expenditure.

We need to allocate the gross operating surplus and final consumption expenditure across household types and to do this we need to estimate imputed rentals per household. As gross operating surplus is part of household income we also need to include it as income when we classify households. Mixed income(including property income) includes imputed rentals, and we add on imputed rentals to income in this category. This moves some households from the wages and salaries, retired or other income categories into the mixed income (including property income) category.

As with the rest of household income, we used the FES to allocate National Accounts totals of owner-occupier rent across household types. To do this we estimate a rental equation. The FES data from financial years $1996-97$ to $2000-01$ were used. This comprises over 33,000 household observations, of which about two-thirds are owner-occupiers. After excluding those in non-private rental accommodation, those in rent-free accommodation, those purchasing their house through a rental purchase and those having been in their rented property from before 1989 , rents below $£ 25$ per week and rents over $£ 400$ per week, we had a remaining sample of 2,640 observations. We used a regression equation based on dwelling characteristics only, and these values were then fitted using the characteristics of each owner-occupied dwelling. To adjust for the fact the we had restricted rents to those within a certain band, we ran a truncated regression (Greene 1993).

Our variables were region, number of rooms, council tax band, whether a property was rented furnished or unfurnished, whether it was in an urban or rural location, whether it was a house or a flat and a time dummy to account for changing rental prices over time. Our regions were North East, Yorkshire and Humberside, North West, East Midlands, West Midiands, East Anglia, Greater London, South East, South West, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland.

Because Northern Ireland does not have council tax bands, the regression was first run excluding Northern Ireland. We then ran the regression again including Northern ireland but dropping the council tax variable, and used this second set of results to fit imputed rentals to owner occupiers in Northern Ireland.

The result of this exercise was the following split of the gross operating surplus by household type

| Household category | Per cent of national total of gross operating surplus |
| :--- | :--- |
| Wages and salaries | 57 |
| Mixed Income (including property income) | 21 |
| Retirement Income | 18 |
| Other Income | 3 |

## Results

The SAM resulting from the work contains a large amount of information. We have elected to focus on four parts of the matrix. These are primary allocation of income, distribution of income, consumption and savings. The results in Table 8 are presented on a per household basis. The estimates are not adjusted for household size and composition by using an equivalence scale.

## Primary allocation of Income

Table 6 shows the results of calculating Cell $(3,2)$ The cell allocates to the different factors of production the net value added by industry, Compensation of employees is broken down by gender and education. This table shows, for instance, that just over 10 per cent of all compensation of employees ( $£ 43,604$ million out of $£ 405,469$ million) goes to men with primary/lower education and that the group receiving the largest part of compensation of employees is men with upper or post secondary levels of education. These numbers make no allowance for the number of employees in each category or the number of hours worked. However, by combining SAM results with volume measures, Table 7 presents wages per hour by gender, education level and industry.

These estimates show that men earn 24 per cent more per hour than women ( $£ 11.24$ compared with $£ 9.15$ ). In terms of education,
those with higher education earn over 50 per cent more than those in the middle education group who, in turn, earn about 15 per cent more than those in the lower education group. These returns from education show up for each of the industry groups.

Comparison between the industry groups show that hourly earnings are highest in group $C-E$ (mining, quarrying; manufacturing; electricity, gas and water supply) where hourly earnings are 21 per cent higher than for all industries ( $£ 12.26$ compared with $£ 10.43$ ). This is followed by group L-P, at 9 per cent above the overall average and group J-K at 7 per cent below the average. Group A-B has the lowest hourly earnings at 54 per cent of the average. These results vary from those obtained using purely the LFS and an article in Labour Market Trends (Stuttard and Frogner 2003) goes into this in detail.

## Distribution of Income

Table 8 shows how income is distributed and redistributed across households at both aggregate level and on a per household basis. Since the households are classified according to their major source of income, it is not surprising that the different household types derive their income in different ways. The 50 per cent of households that are mainly dependent on wages and salaries receive 95 per cent of all compensation of employees. The 15 per cent of households mainly dependent on mixed income (including property income) receive 89

Table 6 Cell $(3,2)$ a detailed value added matrix
£ million

| Generation of income (value added categories) | Production (NACE-rev. 1 industries) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Agriculture, foresty, fishing <br> (NACEAB) | Mining, quarrying, manufacturing, electricity, gas and water supply (NACE C/D/E) | Construction (NACEF) | Trade, repair, holels and restaurants, transport, storage and communication ( NACE G/H/I) | Financial intermediation, real estate, renting and business activities (NACE J/K) | Public <br> administration and defence, education, health and social work, services n.e.c. <br> (NACE- <br> LIMN/OPP) | Total |
| Compensation Male Primaryllower secondary of employees (ISCED 1-2) | 873 | 16,560 | 2,316 | 15,094 | 3,856 | 4,904 | 43,604 |
| Upper or post secondary (ISCED 3-4) | 1,176 | 44,113 | 8,575 | 38,096 | 16,340 | 19,927 | 128,226 |
| Tertiany (ISCED 5-6) | 449 | 26,069 | 4,019 | 13,184 | 23,173 | 29,376 | 96,271 |
| Female Primaryllower secondary (ISCED 1-2) | 172 | 5,308 | 238 | 7,457 | 2,837 | 7,503 | 23,515 |
| Upper or post secondary (ISCED 3-4) | 344 | 9,039 | 928 | 17,349 | 13,217 | 20,415 | 61,292 |
| Tertiary (ISCED 5-6) | 76 | 4,133 | 249 | 4,538 | 7,402 | 36,163 | 52,561 |
| Net mixed income | 2,073 | 2,537 | 13,112 | 8,560 | 9,644 | 6,188 | 42,113 |
| Net operaling surplus | 4,537 | 42,396 | 3,570 | 26,704 | 79,627 | 12,337 | 169,172 |
| Other taxes less subsidies on production | -112 | 3,519 | 344 | 6,620 | 2,131 | 2,446 | 14,948 |
| Total | 9,587 | 153,675 | 33,351 | 137,602 | 158,227 | 139,260 | 631,702 |


| Type of labour |  | Economic activity (NACE-rev. 1 Industries) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Agriculture, foresty, fishing (NACE A/B) | Mining, quarrying, manufacturing, electricity, gas and water supply (NACE C/D/E) | Construction (NACEF) | Trade, repair, hotels and restaurants, transport, storage and communication (NACE GHAI) | Financial intermediation, real estate, renting and business activities (NACE JHK) | Public <br> administration and defence, education, health and social work. services n.e.c. <br> (NACE- <br> LIMNO:P) | Total |
| Employees | Male Primary/lower secondary (ISCED 1-2) | 4.99 | 10.33 | 7.35 | 8.30 | 7.86 | 8.13 | 8.71 |
|  | Upper or post secondary (ISCED 3-4) | 5.26 | 11.94 | 8.83 | 9.32 | 8.95 | 10.51 | 10.09 |
|  | Tertiary (ISCED 5-6) | 10.74 | 19.05 | 12.85 | 15.73 | 14.13 | 15.64 | 15.83 |
|  | Female Primaryllower secondary (ISCED 1-2) | 5.22 | 8.01 | 7.56 | 6.63 | 6.93 | 6.83 | 7.00 |
|  | Upper or post secondary (ISCED 3-4) | 5.56 | 9.70 | 7.89 | 7.58 | 7.57 | 8.18 | 8.02 |
|  | Tertiary (ISCED 5-6) | 9.55 | 16.20 | 8.29 | 11.67 | 11.01 | 13.77 | 13.21 |
| Total |  | 5.69 | 12.35 | 9.18 | 9.08 | 9.85 | 11.16 | 10.46 |

per cent of all mixed income and income withdrawals from quasicorporations. This group inciudes retired households, whose property income exceeds their income from state and private pensions. It is then to be expected that this group will receive a disproportionate amount of income from interest and dividends. The other two groups get most of their income through transfers. The 22 per cent of households that are classified as retired receive 61 per cent of all social security (or contributory) benefits mainly in the form of the state retirement pension and 69 per cent of all private social benefits through occupational pensions. The 14 per cent of households in the "other" group are mainly dependent on transfer income not associated with old age. This group is the largest recipient of social assistance (i.e. non-contributory benefits) paid out by central government or local government ( 51 per cent).

In terms of uses of income, the households in the first two groups (those mainly dependent on wages and salaries and those mainly dependent on self-employment income) pay out 95 per cent of the interest for the household sector as they are much more likely to be owner-occupiers with a mortgage. These two groups also pay out 93 per cent of all income tax and nearly ail of the contributions made to government or non-government social insurance schemes.

## Consumption

Table 8 presents consumption of the different groups, both in total and on a per household basis. There are no unexpected results here. Other income households are consuming the least; only £11,455
per household, 56 per cent of the average for all households. The retired also consume less than average on a household basis they have lower expenditure on housing; not surprisingly as they are more likely to own their house outright, and transport, where costs are often associated with working. They account for 14 per cent of all consumption. Waged and salaried households consume the most both in total and on a per household basis. In total, waged and salaried households account for 63 per cent of all consumption.

## Savings

Having calculated disposable income and consumption, it is not immediately possible to derive savings as the difference between the two, as an adjustment needs to be made to reallocate some amounts between sectors.

Contributions to and pensions from private funded schemes are treated as current transters and affect disposable income. Logically they should be seen as acquistion and disposal of financial assets as the pension reserves are considered to be owned by the households with claims on them. To reconcile these two approaches it is necessary to add back pension contributions to, and subtract pension receipts from, household disposable income, so that measured saving reflects any change in househoids' net equity in pension funds.

This adjustment is shown in Cell $(6,6)$ of the SAM. Once this adjustment is made we reach the final balance in our accounts, an

Table 8 Household Accounts

|  |  |  | Aggregate (£ million) |  |  |  |  |  | Per household (£ per year) |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Wages \& Salaries | Mixed income | etirement Income | Other transter Income | Total | NPISH | Wages \& Salaries | Mixed income | Retirement Income | Other transter income | Total |
| Households mainly dependent on: <br> Number of households <br> Type of income <br> Net generated income - Cell $(4,3)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11,539 | 3,458 | 5,100 | 3,172 | 23,269 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resources | D. 11 | Wages and salaries | 334,341 | 12,999 | 2,371 | 2,573 | 352,285 |  | 28,975 | 3,760 | 465 | 811 | 15,140 |
|  | D. 12 | Employers' sociai contributions | 50,414 | 2,003 | 429 | 432 | 53,277 |  | 4,369 | 579 | 84 | 136 | 2,290 |
|  | B. 2 | Net operaling surplus | 14,715 | 5,609 | 4,621 | 780 | 25,725 | 1,078 | 1,275 | 1,622 | 906 | 246 | 1,106 |
|  | B. 3 | Net mixed income | 3,983 | 37,688 | 346 | 96 | 42,113 | - | 345 | 10,900 | 68 | 30 | 1,810 |
|  | Total |  | 403,454 | 58,299 | 7,767 | 3,880 | 473,400 | 1,078 | 34,964 | 16,862 | 1,523 | 1,223 | 20,345 |
| Property income - cells (4,4), (4,10) and (10,4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resources | D. 41 | Interest | 7,019 | 10,945 | 4,774 | 165 | 22,903 | 923 | 608 | 3,166 | 936 | 52 | 984 |
|  | D.421 | Dividends | 4,205 | 6,557 | 2,860 | 99 | 13,720 | 572 | 364 | 1,896 | 561 | 31 | 590 |
|  |  | Income withdrawals from quasicorporations | 1,843 | 17,438 | 160 | 44 | 19,485 | - | 160 | 5,043 | 31 | 14 | 837 |
|  |  | Income attributable to insurance policy hoiders | 31,677 | 10,836 | 4,023 | 1,252 | 47,788 | 19 | 2,745 | 3,134 | 789 | 395 | 2,054 |
|  | 0.45 | Rent - land + sub-soil assets | 9 | 86 | 1 | 0 | 96 | 7 | 1 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
|  | Total |  | 44,753 | 45,861 | 11,818 | 1,561 | 103,992 | 1,584 | 3,878 | 13,264 | 2,317 | 492 | 4,469 |
|  | D. 41 | Interest | 30,232 | 5,534 | 592 | 1,118 | 37,476 | 966 | 2,620 | 1,601 | 116 | 353 | 1,611 |
|  | D. 45 | Rent - land + sub-soil assets | 20 | 188 | 2 | 0 | 210 | - | 2 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
|  | Total |  | 30,252 | 5,722 | 593 | 1,119 | 37,686 | 983 | 2,622 | 1,655 | 116 | 353 | 1,620 |
| Net national income - cell ( 5,4 ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(4,3)+(4,4)+(4,10)-(4,4)-(10,4)$ |  |  | 417,955 | 98,439 | 18,991 | 4,322 | 539,707 | 1,679 | 36,221 | 28,471 | 3,724 | 1,362 | 23,194 |
| Transter income - cells ( 5,5$),(5,10)$ and ( 10,5 ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resources | D. 61 | Social contributions | 164 | 49 | 72 | 45 | 330 | 99 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
|  | D. 621 | Social security benefits | 5,638 | 6,208 | 26,101 | 4,501 | 42,448 | - | 489 | 1,796 | 5.118 | 1,419 | 1,824 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 0.622+ \\ 0.623 \end{gathered}$ | Private funded and unfunded |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | employee social benelits | 10,080 | 6,346 | 39,695 | 996 | 57,117 | - | 874 | 1,835 | 7,783 | 314 | 2,455 |
|  | $0.624$ | Social assistance benefits from central government | 13,477 | 3,555 | 5,150 | 21,145 | 43,328 | 0 | 1,168 | 1,028 | 1,010 | 6,666 | 1,862 |
|  |  | Social assistance benelitis from local government + NPISH | 1,338 | 546 | 3,856 | 7,978 | 13,719 |  | 116 | 158 | 756 | 2,515 | 590 |
|  | D.72 | Non-lie insurance claims | 11,216 | 4,081 | 3,256 | 560 | 19,113 | 247 | 972 | 1,180 | 638 | 177 | 821 |
|  | D. 75 | Miscellaneous transters | 2,928 | 877 | 1,294 | 805 | 5,905 | 14,122 | 254 | 254 | 254 | 254 | 254 |
|  | Total |  | 44,841 | 21,662 | 79,426 | 36,031 | 181,960 | 14,468 | 3,886 | 6,265 | 15,573 | 11,358 | 7,820 |
| Uses |  | Income lax | 60,712 | 11,225 | 5,622 | 138 | 77,696 | -2,559 | 5,261 | 3,246 | 1,102 | 43 | 3,339 |
|  |  | Other taxes | 6,626 | 2,091 | 2,674 | 1,404 | 12,795 | - | 574 | 605 | 524 | 442 | 550 |
|  | D. 6111 | and D. 612 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.6112 | Employers social contributions and imputed social contributions and D. 6113 | 50,4i4 | 2,003 | 429 | 432 | 53,277 | - | 4,369 | 579 | 84 | 136 | 2,290 |
|  |  | Social contributions to govermment | 21,221 | 2,006 | 112 | 104 | 23,443 | - | 1,839 | 580 | 22 | 33 | 1,007 |
|  | D. 6112 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Social contributions to financial corporations | 26,073 | 8,795 | 2,388 | 972 | 38,228 | - | 2,260 | 2,544 | 468 | 306 | 1,643 |
|  | D. 62 | Social benefils | 164 | 49 | 72 | 45 | 330 | 569 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
|  | D. 71 | Non-lite insurance claims | 11,216 | 4,081 | 3,256 | 560 | 19,113 | 247 | 972 | 1,180 | 638 | 177 | 821 |
|  | D. 75 | Miscellaneous transfers | 2,558 | 766 | 1,131 | 703 | 5,158 | 3,032 | 222 | 222 | 222 | 222 | 222 |
|  | Total |  | 178,982 | 31,017 | 15,684 | 4,357 | 230,040 | 1,289 | 15,511 | 8,971 | 3,075 | 1,374 | 9,886 |
| Net disposable income - cell ( 6,5 ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $(5,4)+(5,5)+(5,10)-(5,5)-(10,5)$ |  |  | 283,814 | 89,084 | 82,733 | 35,995 | 491,627 | 14,858 | 24,596 | 25,765 | 16,222 | 11,347 | 21,128 |
| Adusiment for increase in net equity inPension funds $(6,6)$ |  |  | 34765 | 4968 | -25304 | 396 | 14824 | - | 3,013 | 1,437 | -4,961 | 125 | 637 |
| Final consumption (1,6) |  |  | 296,648 | 75,521 | 65,292 | 36,339 | 473,800 | 18,385 | 25,708 | 21,843 | 12,802 | 11,455 | 20,362 |
| Sayings - cell ( 7,6$)(6,5)-(1,6)+(6,6)$ |  |  | 21,931 | 18,531 | -7,863 | 52 | 32,651 | -3,527 | 1,901 | 5,360 | -1,542 | 16 | 1,403 |

estimate of savings. Waged and salaried households on a per household basis save $£ 1,901$ whilst mixed income households save $£ 5,360$. It is plausible that mixed income households save more than waged and salaried households as their income is both higher on a per household basis and more variable. The Bank of England (2001) found that savings ratios go up as income rises. Guariglia (1998) found that savings ratios are positively correlated with earnings variability. Her analysis had to use earnings rather than income, but still shows a link between variability and savings which corresponds to the predictions from the permanent income hypothesis which states that individuals try to smooth their consumption over time. The retired spend a fair amount of their savings; $£ 1,542$ per household per year. This is not surprising as the retired would be expected to save earlier in life, and are now living off the income from their savings. A large part of this negative saving is related to the money taken out of pension funds. With annuities, this spending of savings does not lead to future reductions in income, it simply means that the claim on the total funds of the retired is reduced, and so it is, in a sense, only theoretical.

Other income households make a smaller contribution to the household sector. They receive little income, their expenditure is low, and they have on average a neutral savings balance (the per household estimate is $£ 16$ ). This category of household may be more volatile in membership with spells of unemployment making households enter and then leave the category. Also, dependence on transfers may mean that households have little collateral, so the potential for negative savings is limited. We believe that a neutral savings balance is plausible.

## Conclusion

The UK pilot SAM is a first attempt at merging the results of social surveys with National Accounts. These results are indicative of the value of such analyses but there is a need to recognise some of the shortcomings of the present analysis. In particular, it has been necessary to make a number of assumptions in disaggregation because of the top-down approach used here. However, the process of construction has been a valuable exercise as it has exposed areas where the data used in National Accounts are not consistent with the micro data from other surveys (Stuttard and Frogner 2003). The SAM does yield some interesting findings and provides, as a diagnostic, plausible savings estimates for the different household types. Cell $(7,6)$ shows that the average household saved $£ 1,403$ in 1996, with waged and salaried households and mixed income (including property income) households having savings of $£ 1,901$ and $£ 5,360$ per year, and households mainly dependent on income
related to old age spend $£ 1,542$ of their savings per year, whereas those mainly dependent on transfer income balance their income and expenditure and save $£ 16$ per year.

## Notes

1. It should be noted that developing countries have previously taken the lead in developing SAMs. This is because the SAMs framework allows for National Accounts to be produced using relatively little information. The SAM has the advantage of providing a framework to confront different data sets, even when the data sets are quite sparse.
2. A T-account presentation displays all the resources on one side (usually left) and all the uses on the other (usually right), and the two sides add up to the same amount.
3. The difference between a NAM and a SAM can, in a simplified form, be described as the level of disaggregation. The social part of the analysis comes from breaking down the household sector. This means that what we call a NAM can be seen as a SAM at a more aggregate level, the highest level of aggregation being the UK total shown in Table 1. In fact different authors use Social Accounting and National Accounting interchangeable for what is now mainly known as National Accounts.
4. Each published series in the National Accounts is made up of sub-series, the process of breaking down the aggregate series into its components is referred to as drilling down.
5. ISCED stands for International Standard Classification of Education.
6. Property income is included with mixed income purely for the purpose of classifiying households. The two concepts are treated separately in National Accounts.
7. The household final consumption expenditure COICOP to InputOutput product allocations have been reviewed and changed in Blue Book2002, and will be changed again in Blue Book2003. This change will include substantial changes, and hence impact on the allocations in Cell $(1,6)$ in Table 1.
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# Revisions to quarterly GDP growth 
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## Summary

This article examines the latest results of GDP Revisions Analysis, updating the previous article published in July 2002.

This Revisions Analysis investigates the change from the first estimate to the latest official estimate of the quarterly growth in GDP at constant prices. The present article examines the bias and dispersion of the quarterly revisions at the different stages of the National Accounts process for the period of 1993 Q1 to 1999 Q4.

The average revisions show a positive bias of 0.189 percentage points between the first and the latest estimates of GDP growth.

The results of the Revisions Analysis by stages provide evidence that two stages were significantly different from zero: Blue Book One and Post Blue Book Two.

The mean revision for the Blue Book Two stage is relatively low and statistically non-significant. However, the largest revisions occurred at this stage, with a high dispersion, and with a tendency for revisions to offset one another in different quarters.

## Introduction

National Accounts (NA) provides a measurement of the economy. it is a complex system that draws together many different types of data sources and balances them against each other to produce an estimate of Gross Domestic Product (GDP), using three different approaches: Production, Expenditure, and Income.

GDP, the main economic indicator, encapsulates what we would like to know about the size and growth of the economy, and what it can
deliver. The NA system tries to ensure that GDP, as a statistical estimate, tells as accurate a story as possible.

In order to achieve timeliness, NA estimates are published first as preliminary quarterly estimates, and are then subjected to revisions when more comprehensive data become available. In addition, methodological changes in the NA processes might also lead to further revisions of the estimates.

This article focuses on the results of the latest Revisions Analysis of the growth rates of GDP at constant 1995 prices. This article is one of a series of articles published in Economic Trends that aim to regularly monitor the reliability of the estimates. Reliability of the statistical estimates is one of the dimensions of internationally agreed definitions of quality in statistics (see Akritidis, 2002).

For the purpose of this article, the reliability of the preliminary estimates of quarterly GDP growth refers to how consistent they are with the latest estimates of GDP growth. Information on reliability is obtained by measuring biases that occur in the revisions to preliminary estimates until the latest estimates.

## Methodology of the Revisions Analysis

The Revisions Analysis is based on the methodology introduced by Richardson (2002). It looks at revisions by stages of the GDP compilation process, where different methods or different data are used at each stage. The stages are as follows:

1. Preliminary Estimate (M1)-Month One, when the estimate is prepared on the basis of a limited proportion of survey data from short-term indicator surveys on the production side;
2. Quarterly National Accounts (M3) - Month Three, when fuller survey data for the components of each of the Expenditure, Output, and Income measures are available from short-term Indicator and other surveys, but production remains the main source;
3. Blue Book One (BB1) - the first time the estimate appears in the Blue Book, typically after new and more comprehensive annual data sources have become available, around three to twelve months after publication of the corresponding M1 estimate;
4. Blue Book Two (BB2) - the stage at which Input-Output Supply and Use balancing' is applied to the estimate for the first time, around 12-18 months after it is first published based on definitive annual benchmark sources: the ONS Annual Business Inquiry and Inland Revenue income estimates (see Mahajan, 1997; Mahajan and Penneck, 1999);
5. Post Blue Book Two (Post-BB2)-the Input-Output Supply and Use balancing is run for the second time or more, and longer run methodological changes may be introduced to the current data and back series, including revised benchmark data (e.g., Inland Revenue data).

The impact of Total Revisions on the GDP growth rates at constant 1995 prices can be shown as in Figure 1. This shows the revisions between the Preliminary (Month One) estimate and the latest (Post Blue Book Two) estimate from the first quarter of 1993 to the fourth quarter of 1999.1993 was the first time that the preliminary estimate
was published. Taking the analysis as far as the fourth quarter of 1999 ensures that all data have had at least three years to mature.

Figure 1 shows that the largest Total Revisions (approximately 0.5 percentage points) occurred between 1993 Q1 and 1994 Q3. In 1999 Q4 the GDP growth rate was revised upwards by 0.4 percentage points. This is the largest upward revision since that of 0.5 percentage points for 1998 Q1.

Figure 2 shows the contribution of revisions by stages. The largest single total revision since it was first published occurred in 1994 Q3, when GDP was revised up by 0.7 percentage points. This was mainly due to revisions applied at the Post Biue Book Two stage (Post-BB2). Post-BB2 stage also made the greatest contribution to the total revisions in 1999 Q4 - an upward change of 0.4 percentage points.

It is interesting to note that the revisions applied at each of the four stages tend to partly offset each other. For exampie, in 1999 Q3 the GDP growth was revised:

- Down by 0.1 percentage point in the Quarterly National Accounts (M3);
- Upwards by 0.2 percentage points in the Blue Book One (BB1);
- Upwards again by 0.2 percentage points in the Blue Book Two (BB2);
- Downwards by 0.1 in Post Blue Book Two (Post-BB2).



## Figure

2
Contributions of revisions by stages


Figures 1 and 2 indicate that it is necessary to check the revisions applied to GDP growth between 1993 Q1 and 1999 Q4 for possible biases.

In line with previous ONS articles, a given revisions stage is considered to be biased when, in the long run, its mean revision is different from zero.

However, it must be noted that the average revisions over the finite period may be non-zero simply due to random effects. Hence it is vital to check whether the mean signiificantly differs from zero - i.e., by more than it could be expected from mere random effects.

## The characteristics of the revisions

Table 1 shows that the mean of the Total Revisions between the first (Preliminary) estimate and the latest (Post Blue Book Two) estimate was 0.189 . The contribution of the revisions at each stage indicates moderate positive biases in two stages ( 0.007 percentage points in M 3 , and 0.021 percentage points in BB 2 ), and extreme biases in two stages ( 0.071 percentage points in BB1, and 0.089 percentage points in post-BB2).

Table 1: Revisions at each stage of the quarterly constant-price GDP growth estimate

| 1993 Q1-1999 Q4 | Mean | m(ABS) | MSE | Variance |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Month Three (M3) <br> less Month One (M1) | 0.007 | 0.079 | 0.010 | 0.010 |
| Blue Book One (BB1) <br> less M3 | 0.071 | 0.157 | 0.033 | 0.028 |
| Blue Book Two (BB2) <br> less BB1 | 0.021 | 0.179 | 0.044 | 0.044 |
| Post Blue Book Two <br> (Post-BB2) | 0.089 | 0.146 | 0.037 | 0.029 |
| Total revisions | 0.189 | 0.561 | 0.107 | 0.071 |

Further light is thrown on these means by three further analyses, namely m(ABS) (absolute mean revision), MSE (mean square error), and Variance.

The low bias of M3 revisions is apparently borne out in these analyses, where its figures are much lower than those of any other stage. However, the source data available at the M3 stage are limited to short-term indicators, quarterly surveys, and some data extrapolated from the latest available benchmarks. Given these limitations, it seems reasonable to assume that the M3 stage must be biased, even though the analyses do not show this.

As would be expected, the stages with big biases (BB1 and PostBB2) also have high mean absolute biases and high mean squared errors.

The BB2 stage shows how important it is to look beyond a mean when assessing bias. The mean revision of the BB2 stage (0.021 percentage points) is relatively low, which would seem to indicate no extreme bias. However, the fact that it had the highest value ( 0.179 percentage points) of $m$ (ABS) reveals that there are relatively large revisions applied at this stage even though they mainly offset one another (see also Figure 2).

The mean square error (MSE) is a measure that confines the notion of the bias and the dispersion of the revised quarters at the specific stage of revisions. The BB2 stage had the highest MSE value ( 0.044 percentage points) of any stage, suggesting that the largest revisions occurred at this stage. The BB2 also had the highest variance ( 0.044 percentage points), indicating that it had a greater spread of revisions.

## Frequency distributions of the revisions

The frequency distributions of the revisions for the period of 1993 Q1-1999 Q4 are presented in Figures 3-7. The horizontal axis records the values (appropriately rounded) of the revisions. The vertical axis records the frequency of revisions.

Figure 3 shows the histogram of revisions at the Month 3 stage, where the interval is a constant of 0.1 percentage points. The dispersion at this stage was smail and clearly clustered around the mean.

A slightly higher dispersion of the revisions occurred at the Blue Book One stage. At this stage the data are compiled from additional

## Figure

Revisions at Month 3 stage


Figure 4
Blue Book One stage

annual source data. Figure 4 shows that the revisions applied at this stage have a positive bias, with the mode of revisions occurring at the 0.2 percentage points' interval ( 9 observations).

As was shown in Table 1, the largest dispersion of revisions occurred about 2 years after the first estimate was published. During the Blue Book Two stage a complete set of annual source data becomes available, and the supply-use input-output tables are produced. Figure 5 shows the revisions at the Blue Book Two stage, where the intervals of 0.1 and 0.2 percentage points each recorded 6 observations.

## Figure

## Revisions at Blue Book Two stage



The post-Blue Book Two stage was dominated by positive revisions, and the dispersion intervals were between -0.2 and 0.4 percentage points. Figure 6 shows bimodality ${ }^{2}$ of revisions occurred in 0 and 0.2 intervals, each containing 7 observations.

## Figure 6

Revisions at Post Blue Book Two stage


Figure 7 shows that the frequency distribution of the Total Revisions was a mainly positive bias, with dispersion between -0.2 and 0.7 percentage points.


## Tests of statistical significance

A widely used method to test whether the observed mean is statistically significant from zero is the statistic $t(t$-stat). The null hypothesis says that, for a given stage, there is no material difference between the mean of its revisions and a hypothesised mean of zero -i.e., that there is no material bias in that stage's revision.

An alternative hypothesis can be formulated. In the present case, the null hypothesis is two-tailed, which states that the mean is not equal to zero.

If the observed $t$-stat is more extreme than the critical value determined by the appropriate $t$ distribution, the null hypothesis is rejected. The critical value depends on the significance level of the test (the probability of erroneously rejecting the null hypothesis).

The test $t$-stat is given by the following equation:

$$
t=\frac{\bar{x}-\mu}{\sqrt{\frac{\sigma_{x}^{2}}{n}}}
$$

Where:
$\bar{x}$ - the mean revision at a particular stage;
$\mu_{x}$ - the hypothesised value of the mean, zero in this case;
$\sigma_{x}^{2}$ - the variance of the revisions at a particular stage;
n - the number of observations (quarters).

It is standard practice to use a test statistic tadjusted for the existence of a seriai correlation between quarters (see Appendix A for more details).

The virtue of the adjusted $t$-statistic (adj. $t$-stat) is that it takes into account the concept that the revision applied to GDP growth in a given quarter is dependent upon its previous value (see Priestley, 1981).

Table 2 shows the $t$-stat, adj. $t$-stat, and the critical values at the 0.95 confidence level. The degree of freedom of the $t$-stat is $n-1$, and the degree of freedom of the adj. t -statis $\mathrm{n}^{*}$, as described in Appendix A .

Table 2: T-statistics

| 1993 Q1-1999 Q4 | $t$-stat <br> (sample) | Critical <br> Value | adj. t-stat | Critical <br> Value |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Month Three (M3) less |  |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Month One (M1) | 0.372 | 2.052 | 0.372 | 2.048 |
| Blue Book One (BB1) less M3 | $2.257^{*}$ | 2.052 | $2.127^{*}$ | 2.048 |
| Blue Book Two (BB2) less BB1 | 0.541 | 2.052 | 0.719 | 2.064 |
| Post Blue Book Two (Post-BB2) | $2.768^{*}$ | 2.052 | $3.346^{*}$ | 2.056 |
| Total Revisions | $3.749^{*}$ | 2.052 | $2.778^{*}$ | 2.064 |

[^12]The two tests of the $t$-stat in Table 2 indicate that the BB1 and PostBB2, as well as, the Total Revisions are all statisticaily significant at the 0.95 confidence level. This clearly indicates the presence of bias in these revisions.

It is worthwhile mentioning that the evidence of positive bias in the Blue Book One stage has emerged only since the previous article (Richardson, 2002). This is because there were more quarters with high upwards revisions in the present analysis than in the earlier analysis (see Figure 2).

## Evidence for the relationships between the revisions and the quarterly GDP growth

Other useful statistics, important for analysing the relationships between the revisions and the quarterly GDP growth are:

- Ratio of the number of Upwards versus Downwards revisions (U/D), compared to the estimated GDP growth rates at the different revisions stages;
- Correlation coefficient ( R ) of revisions in a given stage with the latest GDP growth;
- Relative mean ratio -r(Mean) - the ratio of a stage is the mean of its revisions divided by its mean GDP growth rates. Accordingly, the relative absolute mean is defined $\mathrm{rm}(\mathrm{ABS})$ (Oeller and Hansson 2002);
- Relative Standard Deviation ratio r(SD) - the ratio of a stage is given by the standard deviation of its revisions divided by standard deviation of GDP growth rates.

Table 3: Correlation coefficient and relative revisions

| 1993 Q1-1999 Q4 | U/D | R | r (Mean) | $\mathrm{mm}(\mathrm{ABS})$ | $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{SD})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Month Three (M3) <br> less Month One (M1) | $10 / 9$ | 0.150 | 0.012 | 0.127 | 0.436 |
| Blue Book One (BB1) <br> less M3 | $17 / 8$ | 0.309 | 0.103 | 0.228 | 0.541 |
| Blue Book Two (BB2) <br> less BB1 | $15 / 10$ | 0.320 | 0.030 | 0.251 | 0.660 |
| Post Blue Book Two <br> (Post-BB2) <br> Total revisions | $15 / 6$ | 0.248 | 0.112 | 0.189 | 0.545 |

Table 3 shows that the two stages with the largest upward biases in their revisions also have high U/D ratio-BB1 with 17/8, and Post-BB2 with 15/6. In contrast, the two stages with lower upward biases in their revisions have lower U/D ratios - M3 with 10/9, and BB2 with 15/10.

All this seems to have an effect on the correlation of the revisions with the latest GDP growth. The correlation coefficient $(\mathrm{R})$ indicates

M3 as having the lowest correlation with GDP growth. Much higher correlations with the GDP growth are shown by the next revisions stage. These are highest in $\mathrm{BB} 1(0.309)$ and $\mathrm{BB} 2(0.320)$, and lower, but still high, in Post-BB2.

The above shows the importance of the revisions occurring at the BB2 stage. During this stage a complete set of annual source data becomes available from surveys and censuses, and from administrative records. These are then processed through the Input and Output framework to ensure a balance between the Supply and Demand sides of the economy.

The revisions applied after the BB2 stage are limited mainly to methodological changes.

Other important statistics for the revisions analysis are relative ratios, such as: relative mean ratio-r(Mean), relative ratio of absolute mean revisions - $\mathrm{m}(\mathrm{ABS})$ and relative standard deviation - $\mathrm{r}(\mathrm{SD})$.

The r(mean) ratio for the Total Revisions was 0.257 , which means that the GDP growth indicated by the preliminary estimate was on average 26 per cent too low. For example, a preliminary estimate showing quarterly GDP growth of 0.6 per cent will on average change by 0.2 percentage point after the latest revisions. (Oeller and Hansson, 2002)

However, the analysis of the relative ratios by stage of revisions seems to confirm a tendency in BB2 mentioned earlier. This tendency is that although the $B B 2$ 's relative mean of absolute revisions - $\mathrm{rm}(\mathrm{ABS})$ is high, the corresponding value of the relative mean revisions $r$ (Mean) is low. This indicates that the revisions applied at this stage are thoroughly investigated and balanced. However, the relative standard deviation $-r(S D)$ reveals that this sophisticated revisions process causes the revisions to offset one another in different quarters.

## Conclusions

The article has indicated the presence of a positive bias of 0.189 percentage points in the revisions to the GDP growth rates at constant 1995 prices for the period of 1993 Q1-1999 Q4. This is consistent with the finding in the earlier ONS work by Richardson (2002).

The results of the Revisions Analysis provided evidence that two stages, Blue Book One and Post Blue Book Two, are significantly different from zero at the 0.95 confidence level. This is a slightly different picture than that presented by Richardson for the period of 1993 Q1-1998 Q4.


[^0]:    GDP $=$ Gross Domestic Product at constant market prices
    PFC $=$ Private Final Consumption at constant market prices
    GFC $=$ Government Final Consumption at constant market prices GFCF = Gross Fixed Capital Formation at constant market prices
    Exports $=$ Exports of goods and services
    Exports $=$ Exports of goods and services
    Imports $=1$ mports of goods and services
    IoP = Industrial Production

[^1]:    GDP $=$ Gross Domestic Product at constant market prices
    PFC $=$ Private Final Consumption at constant market prices GFC $=$ Government Final Consumption at constant market prices GFCF = Gross Fixed Capital Formation at constant market prices
    ChgStk = Change in Stocks at constant market prices
    Exports $=$ Exports of goods and services
    Exports $=$ Exports of goods and services
    Imports = Imports of goods
    loP $=$ Industrial Production
    § Excludes members of armed forces

    Sales $=$ Retail Sales volume
    CPI = Consumer Prices, measurement not uniform among countries $\mathrm{PPI}=$ Producer Prices (manufacturing)
    Earnings $=$ Average Earnings (manufacluring), definitions of coverage and treatment vary among countrios
    Empl = Total Employment not seasonally adjusted
    Unempl = Standardised Unemployment rates: percentage of total workforce Source: OECD - SNA93

[^2]:    GDP = Gross Domestic Product at constant market prices
    PFC $=$ Private Final Consumption at constant market prices
    GFC $=$ Government Final Consumption at constant market prices
    GFCF = Gross Fixed Capital Formation at constant market prices
    ChgStk = Change in Stocks at constant market prices
    Exports $=$ Exports of goods and services
    Imports $=$ imports of goods and services

[^3]:    1 Data used in the World and OECD aggregates refer to Germany ather unin-
    cation

[^4]:    This is a measure of the dispersion of each defintion of income (see Appendix 2, paragraph 51)
    2 Households are ranked by equivalised disposabio income.

[^5]:    1 Households are ranked by equivalisad disposable income.
    2 Caleviated to be consisient with oisposatile income. Ses paragraph 34 of Appendix 2 for the definition of expandifure.

[^6]:    1 Thls is a measure of the dispersion of each definition of income (see Appenctix 2 , pariggraph 51).
    2 Housendids ars ranked by equivalised disposabile income

[^7]:    I Housshatds are ranked by equinalised disposable inceme.
    
    3 Chllaren Bre definedid as people aged under 16 or aged befween 16 and 18 , unmaaried and fecelving non-advanced further education.

[^8]:    1. Calculaled to be consisitent with disposathe income. Soe paragraph 34 of Appendix 2 for the definition of experadilure.

    2 Houschaids are ranked by equivalised dispossble income.

[^9]:    I Houssholds are ranked by equivalised disposable incorite

[^10]:    1 Paid to UK central and local government and Europearn Community institutions.
    2 Expressed as a percentage of general government expendifure.
    3 These are taxes paid by industry and commerce assumed to be passed on to households th the prices of goods and services they buy. For instance, cuty on derv used
    in the transportation of goods is an intermediate' tax whereas the duty on petrol bought by the private motorist is a tax on final goods and services.
    4 incuuding concessionary lares expenditure.

[^11]:    1 On 坆 assurance promiums.
    2 Council tax, domestic fates and water charges affer deducting discounts.

[^12]:    *Statistically significant at the 0.95 confidence level.

