## The effects of taxes and benefits on household income

Date: 19 May 2011
Coverage: UK Theme: The Economy

## For the 2009/10 financial year:

- Before taxes and benefits, the richest fifth of households received income that was 16 times greater than the poorest fifth, compared with 17 times greater in 2008/09
- After all taxes and benefits are taken into account, the ratio between the top and the bottom fifth households was four-to-one, unchanged on the previous year
- Indirect taxes, such as VAT, take a higher proportion of income from lower income households, and therefore increase income inequality
- After taxes and benefits, income inequality was lower for retired than for non-retired households
- There was a fall in inequality between $2008 / 09$ and $2009 / 10$, as measured by the Gini coefficient for disposable income
- The fall in inequality was driven mainly by retired households.

The effects of taxes and benefits on household income by quintile groups ${ }^{1}$, 2009/10


Note:
Source: Office for National Statistics
1 Households are ranked throughout by their equivalised disposable incomes, using the modified-OECD scale.

## Summary of results for all households

The overall impact of taxes and benefits are that they lead to income being shared more equally between households. In 2009/10, before taxes and benefits, the richest fifth (those in the top income quintile group) had an average original income of $£ 77,900$ per year, compared with $£ 4,800$ for the poorest fifth - a ratio of 16 to 1 . In 2008/09 the corresponding ratio was 17 to 1 , indicating that inequality of original income fell slightly between the two years. Original income includes earnings, occupational pensions and investments.

In contrast to original income, the amount received from cash benefits tends to be higher for poorer households than for richer households. The largest cash benefits were received by households in the second quintile group, $£ 8,300$ per year, compared with $£ 6,900$ for households in the bottom group. This is largely because more retired households are located in the second quintile group, compared with the bottom group, and in this analysis the state pension is classified as a cash benefit. After cash benefits were taken into account, the richest fifth had income that was seven times that of the poorest fifth (gross incomes of $£ 79,900$ per year compared with $£ 11,700$, respectively), a proportion that was unchanged on the previous year. Cash benefits therefore reduced the inequality of income.

Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits by quintile groups, ALL households ${ }^{1}$, 2009/10

## Average per household (£ per year)



Source: Office for National Statistics

## Note:

[^0]On average households paid $£ 7,200$ per year in direct taxes, 20 per cent of their gross income. Richer households pay both higher amounts of direct tax and higher proportions of their income in direct tax (income tax, National Insurance, and council tax and Northern Ireland rates). As a result, direct taxes also reduce inequality of income. The richest fifth of households paid on average $£ 19,500$ per year in direct taxes, corresponding to 24 per cent of their gross income. In contrast, the direct tax bill for the poorest fifth was around $£ 1,200$ per year, or 10 per cent of their gross household income. These proportions are broadly unchanged on those for 2008/09. The richest fifth of households had disposable incomes that were six times that of the poorest fifth ( $£ 60,400$ per year and $£ 10,500$, respectively), a ratio that was the same in 2008/09.

The amount of indirect tax (such as VAT, and duties on alcohol and fuel) each household pays is determined by their expenditure rather than their income. The richest fifth of households paid two and a half times as much indirect tax as the poorest fifth ( $£ 7,400$ and $£ 3,000$ per year, respectively). This simply reflects higher expenditure by higher income households. In 2009/10, the bottom fifth of households paid 25 per cent of their gross income in indirect taxes, compared with 9 per cent for the richest fifth. The proportions were almost unchanged on a year previous, when they were 25 per cent and 10 per cent, respectively. Therefore, indirect taxes take a higher proportion of income from those with lower incomes, and act to increase the inequality of income. Further ONS analysis of the effect of indirect taxes on household income was published on 14 April 2011 and is available at http://www.statistics.gov.uk/articles/nojournal/indirect-taxes-1404.pdf .

When expressed as a percentage of expenditure, the proportion paid in indirect tax declines less sharply as income rises. The bottom fifth of households paid 20 per cent of their expenditure in indirect taxes compared with 15 per cent for the top fifth, almost unchanged on those for 2008/09, when they were 19 per cent and 15 per cent, respectively. After indirect taxes the richest fifth had post-tax household incomes that were seven times those of the poorest fifth ( $£ 52,900$ compared with $£ 7,600$ per year, respectively) - in 2008/09 the ratio was also seven.

Taxes as a percentage of income and expenditure, ALL households, 2009/10

|  | Quintile groups of ALL households ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \text { All } \\ \text { households } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | Top |  |
| (a) Percentages of gross income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Direct taxes | 10.2 | 11.5 | 16.6 | 20.1 | 24.4 | 19.9 |
| Indirect taxes | 25.3 | 18.1 | 15.3 | 12.9 | 9.3 | 13.0 |
| All taxes | 35.5 | 29.6 | 31.9 | 32.9 | 33.7 | 32.9 |
| (b) Percentages of disposable income |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indirect taxes | 28.1 | 20.5 | 18.3 | 16.1 | 12.3 | 16.3 |
| (c) Percentages of expenditure ${ }^{2}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indirect taxes | 19.6 | 19.6 | 18.6 | 17.4 | 15.2 | 17.4 |

These statistics also consider the effect on household income of benefits received in kind. Benefits in kind are goods and services provided by the Government to households that are either free at the time of use or at subsidised prices. These goods and services can be assigned a monetary value based on the cost to the Government which are allocated as a benefit to individual households. The poorest fifth of households received the equivalent of around $£ 7,600$ per year from all benefits in kind, compared with $£ 5,100$ received by the top fifth. The ratio of the richest fifth's final income to the poorest fifths is four-to-one ( $£ 58,100$ per year and $£ 15,100$, respectively). Therefore benefits in kind also reduce the inequality of income. Due to methodological changes to the calculation of the benefit from the National Health Service, estimates of the total benefit in kind are not comparable with those in previous ONS analyses. Further work to derive a consistent series over time, based on the current methodology, is planned for autumn 2011.

Income, taxes and benefits, by quintile groups, ALL households, 2009/10


## Summary of results for retired households

Retired households are those where the income of retired household members accounts for the majority of the total household gross income (see the background note for the definition of a retired person). Retired households have different income and expenditure patterns to their non-retired counterparts.

Retired households were much more likely to be at the bottom of the income distribution than at the top of the distribution. Whereas retired households made up 35 and 46 per cent of the bottom and second quintile groups, respectively, they only made up 7 per cent of the top group.

Among retired households, there is a higher degree of income inequality before taxes and benefits than for non-retired households. The richest fifth of retired households received 54 per cent of total original income, compared with 51 per cent for all households. Also, the Gini coefficient for original income was 61 per cent for retired households, compared with 52 per cent for all households.

The effect of taxes and benefits is that disposable income inequality is much lower for retired households than for non-retired households. Cash benefits play by far the largest part in bringing about this reduction, due especially to the state retirement pension. Retired households' Gini coefficient for disposable income was 24 per cent compared with 34 per cent for non-retired households. The corresponding coefficients for 2008/09 were 26 per cent, and 34 per cent, respectively.

On average, the poorest fifth of retired households received $£ 7,400$ per year from cash benefits, while those in the other quintile groups received between $£ 9,500$ and $£ 11,100$ per year. Cash benefits represent just over a half ( 52 per cent) of retired households' total gross income on average, a proportion which is higher for poorer households and lower for richer households (78 per cent for the poorest fifth of retired households and 30 per cent for the richest fifth). Of the total retired households' cash benefits, almost three-quarters ( 74 per cent) were due to the retirement pension, on average.

Retired households derive significant benefits from the National Health Service (NHS). The benefit in kind from the NHS is spread fairly evenly between retired households and in 2009/10 it was worth an average of $£ 5,400$ per year, per household. The benefit derived from the NHS makes up on average 95 per cent of the total benefit in kind received by retired households.

Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits, RETIRED households, 2009/10

|  | Quintile groups of RETIRED households ${ }^{1}$ |  |  |  |  | All retired households | Ratio <br> Top/Bottom quintile |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | Top |  |  |
| Income, taxes and benefits per household (£ per year) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Original income | 2036 | 3740 | 4990 | 9795 | 24582 | 9029 | 12 |
| plus total cash benefits | 7409 | 9530 | 10532 | 11092 | 10464 | 9806 | 1 |
| Gross income | 9445 | 13270 | 15522 | 20887 | 35046 | 18834 | 4 |
| less Direct taxes | 950 | 1103 | 1277 | 2284 | 5180 | 2159 | 5 |
| Disposable income | 8495 | 12167 | 14246 | 18603 | 29866 | 16675 | 4 |
| less Indirect taxes | 2225 | 2541 | 2635 | 3146 | 4279 | 2966 | 2 |
| Post-tax income | 6270 | 9626 | 11610 | 15456 | 25586 | 13710 | 4 |
| plus National health service | 5407 | 5489 | 5254 | 5584 | 5497 | 5446 |  |
| Housing subsidy | 8 | 32 | 32 | 30 | 11 | 23 |  |
| Other benefits in kind | 188 | 234 | 171 | 507 | 257 | 271 |  |
| Final income | 11874 | 15381 | 17067 | 21576 | 31351 | 19450 | 3 |
| Cash benefits as a percentage of gross income | 78 | 72 | 68 | 53 | 30 | 52 |  |
| Retirement pension as a percentage of cash benefits | 82 | 73 | 70 | 71 | 79 | 74 |  |
| Note: |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Households are ranked by equivalised disposable income, using the modified-OECD scale. |  |  |  |  | Source: Office for National Statistics |  |  |

Overall, retired households are major beneficiaries from redistribution through the tax and benefit system. Before taxes and benefits, the richest fifth of retired households had an average original income of $£ 24,600$ per year, 12 times that of the poorest fifth ( $£ 2,000$ per year). The richest fifth of retired households had an average disposable income of $£ 29,900$ per year, four times that of the poorest fifth ( $£ 8,500$ per year). This ratio was unchanged on that for 2008/09; however, this masks
much greater growth in disposable incomes for the poorest fifth, relative to the richest fifth of retired households, over the period. The majority of the increase in disposable incomes for the poorest fifth over the period came from growth in cash benefits. After taxes and benefits the ratio between the top and bottom fifths was reduced to three-to-one (final incomes of $£ 31,400$ and $£ 11,900$ per year, respectively), unchanged on the ratio for the year previous.

## Non-retired households

Taxes and benefits lead to income being shared more equally between non-retired households, but the effect is smaller than for retired households. Before taxes and benefits, there is less inequality of non-retired households' income than for retired households. However, after the process of redistribution, inequality of post-tax income (as measured, for example, by the Gini coefficient) is greater than that for retired households.

In 2009/10, the average original income for non-retired households was $£ 38,900$ per year. The original income of non-retired households showed a relatively strong relationship to the number of economically active people they contained. On average, households in each of the top three quintile groups contained almost twice as many economically active people as those in the lowest group.

Summary of the effects of taxes and benefits by quintile groups, NON-RETIRED households, 2009/10

| Quintile groups of ALL households ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | All <br> Ratio |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| Bottom | 2nd | 3rd | 4th | Top households | quintile |

Income, taxes and benefits per household
( $£$ per year)

| Original income | 6772 | 20167 | 33072 | 47346 | 87273 | 38926 | 13 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| plus cash benefits | 6518 | 5560 | 3505 | 2204 | 1494 | 3856 | 0.2 |
| Gross income | 13290 | 25728 | 36576 | 49550 | 88767 | 42782 | 7 |
| less direct taxes | 1370 | 3955 | 7121 | 10848 | 22121 | 9083 | 16 |
| Disposable income | 11920 | 21773 | 29455 | 38702 | 66647 | 33699 | 6 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| less indirect taxes | 3318 | 4469 | 5307 | 5998 | 7874 | 5393 | 2 |
| Post-tax income | 8602 | 17303 | 24149 | 32705 | 58773 | 28306 | 7 |
| plus benefits in kind | 8611 | 8221 | 7020 | 5831 | 5133 | 6963 | 0.6 |
| Final income | 17213 | 25524 | 31169 | 38536 | 63906 | 35270 | 4 |

## Number of individuals per household

| Children ${ }^{2}$ | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Adults | 1.7 | 1.9 | 2.1 | 2.1 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| $\quad$ Men | 0.8 | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 1.1 | 1.0 |
| $\quad$ Women | 0.9 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.9 | 1.0 |
| People | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.4 | 2.6 |
|  |  |  |  |  | 0.5 |  |
| People in full-time education | 1.0 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| Economically active people | 1.0 | 1.5 | 1.8 | 1.9 | 1.9 | 1.6 |
| Retired people | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

## Notes:

Source: Office for National Statistics
1 Households are ranked by equivalised disposable income, using the modified-OECD scale.
2 Children are defined as people aged under 16 or aged between 16 and 18 , unmarried and receiving non-advanced further education.

Cash benefits provided 49 per cent of gross income for households in the bottom quintile group, falling to just 2 per cent for households in the top quintile. Their payment results in a significant reduction in income inequality. The patterns for direct and indirect taxes are similar to those described for all households.

The largest two categories of benefits in kind for which a value is assigned are health and education services and, in total, six categories are assigned values. The poorest fifth of non-retired households received the highest benefit from benefits in kind, on average $£ 8,600$ per year. This is mainly due to the concentration of children in this part of the distribution.

## Trends in income inequality

Inequality of income increased in the late 1980s and late 1990s, and on average has remained at broadly the same level since. Smaller changes in the level of inequality are observed in the period from 1990s to date. The Gini coefficient for disposable income in 2009/10 was 33 per cent, a fall of one percentage point on its 2008/09 value, therefore indicating a fall in inequality of income. The fall in inequality was driven mainly by retired households, for whom inequality fell by two percentage points in the latest period, and by three percentage points between 2007/08 and 2009/10. Further ONS analysis of the effects that taxes and benefits have had on inequality since the 1980s is planned for publication in June 2011.

Gini coefficients ${ }^{1}$, 1977 to 2009/10


Note:
1 Households are ranked throughout by their equivalised disposable incomes, using the modified-OECD scale.

## Sampling variability

As the LCF is a sample survey, data from it will differ in varying degrees from those of all households in the UK. The degree of difference will depend on how widely particular categories of income and expenditure vary between households. This 'sampling error' is smallest in relation to large groups of households and measures that do not vary greatly between households. A broad numerical measure of the amount of variability is provided by the quantity known as the standard error. Estimates of the standard error are provided in the attached table.

95 per cent confidence intervals for gross and disposable income of households ${ }^{1}$, and as a percentage of the published estimate, 2009/10

| Average per household (£ per year) |  | Gross income |  |  |  | Disposable income |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Lower bound | Published estimate | Upper bound | $\begin{gathered} \hline \% \\ \pm \end{gathered}$ | Lower bound | Published estimate | Upper bound | $\begin{array}{r}\text { \% } \\ \pm \\ \hline\end{array}$ |
| All households | Bottom decile group | 8,838 | 9,275 | 9,712 | 4.7 | 7,737 | 8,162 | 8,587 | 5.2 |
|  | Mean | 35,493 | 36,373 | 37,252 | 2.4 | 28,473 | 29,143 | 29,813 | 2.3 |
|  | Top decile group | 97,208 | 101,808 | 106,408 | 4.5 | 72,356 | 76,089 | 79,822 | 4.9 |
| Retired households | Bottom decile group | 7,552 | 7,901 | 8,250 | 4.4 | 6,697 | 7,022 | 7,347 | 4.6 |
|  | Mean | 18,185 | 18,834 | 19,483 | 3.4 | 16,157 | 16,675 | 17,193 | 3.1 |
|  | Top decile group | 40,053 | 44,135 | 48,217 | 9.2 | 33,963 | 36,963 | 39,963 | 8.1 |
| Non-retired households | Bottom decile group | 9,554 | 10,187 | 10,820 | 6.2 | 8,366 | 8,973 | 9,580 | 6.8 |
|  | Mean | 41,604 | 42,782 | 43,960 | 2.8 | 32,808 | 33,699 | 34,590 | 2.6 |
|  | Top decile group | 105,341 | 111,355 | 117,369 | 5.4 | 77,675 | 82,654 | 87,633 | 6.0 |

1 Ranked by equivalised disposable income, using the modified-OECD scale.

## Stages of redistribution

This analysis looks at how taxes and benefits affect the distribution of income and breaks this process into five stages:

1) Household members begin with income from employment, occupational pensions, investments and from other non-government sources. This is referred to as 'original income'
2) Households then receive income from cash benefits. Cash benefits, when added to original income, is referred to a 'gross income'
3) Households then pay direct taxes. Gross income minus direct taxes is referred to as 'disposable income'
4) Indirect taxes are then paid via expenditure, which when subtracted from disposable income is referred to as 'post-tax income'
5) Households finally receive a benefit from services (benefits in kind). Benefits in kind plus post-tax income is referred to as 'final income'.

Diagram A: Average household income, cash benefits and taxes, 2009/10


## Background Notes

1. Today's analysis, along with The effects of taxes and benefits on household income, 2009/10: Further analysis and methodology can be found on the Office for National Statistics website at: http://www.statistics.gov.uk/StatBase/Product.asp?vInk=10336
2. This analysis has been undertaken each year since the 1960s. Where it is practical, the methodology used is similar to that used in previous years. However, there have been some changes in the underlying surveys and improvements made to the methodology. For this reason, one should be cautious about making direct comparisons with earlier years. Comparisons with previous years are also affected by sampling error (for more details see the technical paper). Time series are presented for inequality measures.
3. The most widely used summary measure of inequality in the distribution of household income is the Gini coefficient. The lower the value of the Gini coefficient, the more equally household income is distributed. More details on how the Gini coefficient is calculated are available at: http://www.statistics.gov.uk/about/methodology by theme/gini/default.asp
4. This analysis uses several different measures of household income. Original income (before taxes and benefits) includes income from wages and salaries, self-employment, occupational pensions and investments. Gross income includes all original income plus cash benefits provided by the state. Disposable income is that which is available for consumption, and is equal to gross income less direct taxes. Post-tax income is calculated by estimating the payment of indirect taxes, and deducting these from disposable income. Final income is calculated as post-tax income plus benefits in kind received from the state.
5. 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 National Insurance pension age describing themselves as 'unoccupied' or 'sick or injured but not intending to seek work'.
6. Income quintile groups are based on a ranking of households by equivalised disposable income. Equivalised incomes are standardized to account for the fact that households of differing size or composition will require different incomes to achieve the same standard of living. In this analysis the modified-OECD equivalisation scale was used. This is the first year for which all analysis has used the modified scale - previously the McClements Scale was utilised. Please note that comparisons with previous year's data also used the modified-OECD equalisation scale. For more information please see:
http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/article.asp?ID=2349
7. A Summary Quality Report for these statistics is available at: http://www.statistics.gov.uk/StatBase/Product.asp?vInk=10336
8. Further analysis of these statistics is planned for 2011. This includes an investigation of taxes and benefits between 1980 and 2009/10, scheduled for publication on 16 June 2011. Work to derive a consistent series in benefits in kind over time will be undertaken during autumn 2011. Additionally, it is expected that a number of short articles using these data will be undertaken.
9. The Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) publishes analysis each year of the income distribution in their publication Households Below Average Income (HBAI), based on data from the Family Resources Survey (FRS). The latest publication, including data for 2009/10, was released on 12 May 2011 and is available at: http://research.dwp.gov.uk/asd/index.php?page=hbai There are commonalities between HBAI and the estimates presented in this analysis. Where this is the case, the two publications are broadly consistent in the main messages and trends.
10. Details of the policy governing the release of new data are available from the Media Relations Office.
11. National Statistics are produced to high professional standards set out in the Code of Practice for Official Statistics. They undergo regular quality assurance reviews to ensure that they meet customer needs. They are produced free from any political interference.
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[^0]:    1 Households are ranked by their equivalised disposable incomes, using the modified-OECD scale.

