

Bach, Stefan; Wittenberg, Erich

**Article**

## "Redistribution reduces inequality in household incomes": Six questions to Stefan Bach

DIW Economic Bulletin

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

German Institute for Economic Research (DIW Berlin)

*Suggested Citation:* Bach, Stefan; Wittenberg, Erich (2015) : "Redistribution reduces inequality in household incomes": Six questions to Stefan Bach, DIW Economic Bulletin, ISSN 2192-7219, Deutsches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (DIW), Berlin, Vol. 5, Iss. 8, pp. 112

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10419/107606>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*



Dr. Stefan Bach, Research Associate  
in the Public Economics Department  
at DIW Berlin

## SIX QUESTIONS TO STEFAN BACH

# »Redistribution Reduces Inequality in Household Incomes«

1. Dr. Bach, you have analyzed the impact of Germany's tax and transfer system on income redistribution. How are incomes distributed in Germany? Market income, in other words earned or capital income, is very unevenly distributed. The distribution of gross income (market income plus transfers such as pensions) also remains relatively imbalanced. Social security contributions and income tax are yet to be deducted from this income. But since income tax, in particular, has a highly progressive impact and is increasingly paid by the wealthier members of society, the distribution of net incomes is much more homogeneous. On balance, this means that the poorest 60 percent of the population receive money from the government and the richest 40 percent pay money to the government.
2. How large is the redistributive effect of the government tax and transfer system on households? If we use the Gini coefficient as a measure of inequality, Germany has a high level of income redistribution. For market income, this measure displays a relatively high inequality value of 0.5; the corresponding value for household disposable income is as low as 0.29. What is also clear, however, is that a substantial share of this redistribution is the result of the statutory pension system. In Germany, statutory pension insurance involves employees paying contributions over the course of their working lives which they then receive back when they retire in the form of pension payments. In this sense, it is an insurance which, when calculated over a lifetime, does not result in any appreciable redistribution. If this dimension is removed from the overall redistributive effect of the government tax and transfer system, total state redistribution is reduced by approximately half.
3. What are the most important benefits in the government transfer system? From a macroeconomic perspective, statutory pension benefits account for the largest share of government social security benefits. In the long term, though, this form of insurance does not have a significant redistributive effect insofar as the population has paid contributions for these benefits in the past. However, part of pension insurance falls under what are known as non-contribution-backed benefits which do not require contributions and are consequently part of the state redistribution system. Further, basic social security, which includes basic unemployment benefit II and social assistance for elderly also have a major redistributive effect as they are funded by tax revenues.
4. What percentage of GDP is spent on government transfers each year? Government transfer payments are the biggest item in Germany's entire national budget. Every year they account for 18 percent of GDP. This includes non-monetary government benefits within the social security system, such as healthcare. This clearly shows how important social welfare is to the national economy.
5. How have social security benefits developed in recent years? Social security benefits have remained relatively constant in relation to GDP. This is linked to the dominance of pension insurance. Of course there are certain natural fluctuations over the economic cycle. However, since Germany recovered quickly from the last major economic crisis following the global financial crisis, the impact on social security benefits was minimal.
6. How well targeted are state transfers? Do they really benefit those who actually need them? Unemployment benefit II and social assistance for elderly are of course carefully tailored to ensure that they reach the poor. Needs testing is used to help achieve this. In addition, there are also transfers such as child benefit or care allowance. Whether or not these benefits always actually achieve family policy aims is disputed, however.

Interview by Erich Wittenberg



DIW Berlin – Deutsches Institut  
für Wirtschaftsforschung e.V.  
Mohrenstraße 58, 10117 Berlin  
T +49 30 897 89 -0  
F +49 30 897 89 -200

#### Publishers

Prof. Dr. Pio Baake  
Prof. Dr. Tomaso Duso  
Dr. Ferdinand Fichtner  
Prof. Marcel Fratzscher, Ph.D.  
Prof. Dr. Peter Haan  
Prof. Dr. Claudia Kemfert  
Dr. Kati Krähnert  
Prof. Karsten Neuhoff, Ph.D.  
Dr. Kati Schindler  
Prof. Dr. Jürgen Schupp  
Prof. Dr. C. Katharina Spieß  
Prof. Dr. Gert G. Wagner

#### Editors in chief

Sabine Fiedler  
Dr. Kurt Geppert

#### Editorial staff

Renate Bogdanovic  
Andreas Harasser  
Sebastian Kollmann  
Dr. Claudia Lambert  
Dr. Anika Rasner  
Dr. WolfPeter Schill

#### Translation

HLTW Übersetzungen GbR  
team@hltw.de

#### Layout and Composition

eScriptum GmbH & Co KG, Berlin

#### Press office

Renate Bogdanovic  
Tel. +49-30-89789-249  
presse@diw.de

#### Sale and distribution

DIW Berlin

Reprint and further distribution – including extracts – with complete reference and consignment of a specimen copy to DIW Berlin's Communication Department (kundenservice@diw.berlin) only.  
Printed on 100 % recycled paper.

Income inequality for retired households has increased slightly in recent years, with the Gini coefficient for disposable income rising to 26.8, up from 24.3 in 2009/10. The median income of retired households was largely unaffected by the economic downturn and rose by 7.7% (£1,500) between 2007/08 and 2014/15. There has been a very gradual decline in inequality of disposable income on this measure since 2006/07. The Gini coefficient for disposable income in 2014/15 was 32.6%, effectively unchanged from its 2013/14 value of 32.4%. There has been some variation over time in the extent to which cash benefits and direct taxes together work to decrease income inequality. International Comparison of Household Income Inequalities and Redistribution Effect of Taxes. August 1992. Economic Development Quarterly. Sourushe Zandvakili. The Luxembourg Income Study data sets for 10 countries are used for an international comparison of inequality among households. Inequality in household income is measured using a number of measures to gauge the robust nature of our observations. In the process, pretax and posttax inequality in income are measured in order to learn about the nature of income tax progressivity in each country. The effects of household size on the measured inequality are discussed as well. Moreover, unlike redistribution growth does not require pitting the interests of the rich (and usually powerful) against those of the poor, and so has a far better chance of being sustained long enough to achieve real progress. 26. 2. It is a question of distribution of the benefits of growth - who gets the additional stuff - not a question of the simple amount of growth. Assuming nobody wants to get less of the output than they are getting now, then to increase output that goes to poor people requires increasing total output. One factor might be that it has to address issues, such as income inequality and poverty. Too, it gets involved in the mechanics of things like this. Aside: These are solvable, in the longer run, but it will require a change in the thinking pattern.