Inequality of income and wealth in Sweden

David Domeij[a,b], Paul Klein[*,a]

[a]*Institute for International Economic Studies, Stockholm University,*

106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

[b]*Department of Economics, Northwestern University, 2003 Sheridan Road,*

Evanston, IL 60208-2600, USA

First draft: 19 May 1998

This version: 14 August 1998

Very preliminary

Abstract

Compared to the United States, Sweden's distribution of earnings and income exhibit a high degree of equality. However, the distribution of wealth is about as unequal in Sweden as in the United States. In this paper, we document these and many other facts about the Swedish income and wealth distribution.

Keywords: Inequality, Sweden.

JEL classification:

1 Introduction

The purpose of this paper is to document som basic facts about the Swedish income and wealth distribution, comparing and contrasting these facts with those reported by Ríos-Rull et al (1996) for the United States. Our data source is the HINK (Hushållens inkomster) database. The HINK database is an annual survey of Swedish households conducted by Statistiska Centralbyrån (Statistics Sweden, SCB). It is in many ways similar to the PSID. The sample size is about 10000 households which overlap so that half of the respondents in period t are included in the survey of year $t + 1$. With the exception of a special study done around 1990, no household participates in the survey more than twice.

In the version of the HINK database that we use, there is no oversampling of the very wealthy. This means that we probably understate the inequality of wealth

---

* Correspondence to: klein@iies.su.se or domeijd@iies.su.se.

somewhat. For some years, SCB has collected data on the very richest households, but this data contains no survey information and conseqently is not as reliable as the basic HINK database, especially for the wealth data. For that reason, we ignore this supplementary sample for most of the analysis, reporting only some basic results so as to provide a rough measure of the how important oversampling of the very rich is for measuring inequality.

1.1   Earnings, income and wealth

Earnings is defined as wages and salaries plus a fraction of business income corresponding to the labor share of national income as measured in the national accounts. *Factor income* is defined as wages and salaries, business income, and capital income. *Total income* is defined as factor income plus transfer payments. *(Net) wealth* is defined as the sum of tangible wealth (including clothes, jewelry, books, cars, boats, real estate as well as immaterial assets such as patents) and financial wealth (e.g. cash, bank deposits, stocks) minus debt. Human capital is not included. Assets are valued at (estimated) market prices whenever possible.[1]

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we report the most fundamental facts about the distribution of earnings, total income, and net wealth in Sweden. In section 3, we go into more detail, sorting the sample by earnings, factor income, total income, disposable income, age, occupation, employments status, and marital status. Section 5 concludes.

1.2   Other definitions

A *head of household* as defined by Statistics Sweden is normally that adult household member with the highest total income. The main exception is if one of the spouses in a married couple has business income as a major source of income. Then he or she is designated head of household. Gender is not a factor determining the head of household.

A household is considered *married (or cohabiting)* if the head of household shares the household with another adult of the opposite sex who is not a relative.

---

[1]The exception is *bostadsrättslägenheter* (which correspond roughly to condominiums), which are valued at their taxable value, a much lower number than the market value. [Numbers that indicate how important this is.]

2   Fundamental facts

Looking at Table 1, three facts stand out. First, (labor) earnings and factor income are much more evenly distributed in Sweden than in the United States. The Gini coefficient for earnings is only 0.48; the corresponding number for the United States is 0.63. (See Ríos-Rull et al.) Second, the equalizing effect of transfer payments is much larger in Sweden than the United States. The Gini coefficient for total income (including transfers) is just 0.33, which is much lower than the Gini coefficient for earnings. The corresponding figure for the U.S. is 0.57, which is not very far away from the Gini coefficient for earnings. Finally, the Gini coefficient for (net) wealth is 0.79, which is actually higher than for the United States, in spite of the fact that the very rich are not oversampled. With a supplementary sample of very rich households, the Gini coefficient is 0.86. This means that the difference in the degree of inequality between the wealth and income distributions is even more dramatic for Sweden than it is for the United States.

Interestingly, transfers seem to be more redistributive than taxes. In Table 1 we see that total income is much more evenly distributed than factor income, but disposable income has about the same Gini coefficient as total income.

A striking fact about the Swedish wealth distribution is the large fraction of households reporting negative (21 percent) and zero (3 percent) net wealth. In fact, the 55 percent of the population with the lowest net wealth have a total wealth very close to zero. These numbers are much larger than for the United States, where only about 7 percent of households have zero or negative wealth and the bottom 40 percent of the wealth distribution account for a positive share of total wealth.

Table 1. Income and wealth inequality. Households. 1992.

	Gini coeff.	Coeff. of variation	Ratio top 1% to bottom 60%
Earnings	0.48	0.90	10.82
Factor income	0.47	0.94	12.50
Total income	0.33	0.69	7.26
Disposable income	0.31	0.65	6.38
Wealth	0.79	2.37	244.52

A measure of the importance of oversampling the very wealthy can be had by considering the Gini coefficient for net wealth reported by Statistics Sweden when

a supplementary sample of very wealthy households has been added. For 1992, the Gini coefficient is approximately 0.86, noticably but not dramatically greater than the 0.79 in the basic sample.

More detailed information on the distributions of earnings, income and wealth can be gleaned from the histograms in Figure 1. One clear tendency is the double-peakedness, especially of the distribution of total income and disposable income. Obviously these two peaks represent single-income and double-income households, respectively. These histograms suggest that some of the inequality between house-holds comes from the fact that some households have more members than others. To get some perspective on thiss issue, it is worthwhile to consider the distribution of income and wealth in relation to a rough measure of consumption capacity. Table 2 reports Gini coefficients for income and wealth where these numbers have been divided by a measure of household size which takes the age of household members into account according to the schedule in Table 9. Perhaps surprisingly, the Gini coefficients are almost unchanged by this adjustment.

Table 2. Gini coefficients. 1992.
Income and wealth per mouth to feed.

	Gini coeff.	
Earnings	0.47	
Factor Income	0.46	
Total Income	0.27	
Disposable Income	0.26	
Wealth	0.80	

N.B. The statistic 'mouths to feed' weights adults and children according to the schedule described in Table 9.

Table 3 shows the correlation coefficients between earnings, income and wealth. These numbers are rather similar to the corresponding ones for the United States which also exhibit a small positive correlation between income and wealth. The main difference is in the correlation between earnings and income, which is lower in Sweden than the United States, presumably because of the equalizing effect of transfer payments which are negatively correlated with earnings.

4

Table 3. Correlations between earnings, income and wealth. 1992.

	Corr. Coeff.
Earnings and total income	0.78
Earnings and wealth	0.17
Total income and wealth	0.37

3   Detailed facts

3.1   The earnings partition

3.1.1   The earnings-poor

As can be seen in Table 5, the bottom percentile of the earnings distribution consist, as in the United States, largely of business owners in trouble. Mean earnings in this percentile is a negative number, and business losses are the source of this. The upper half of the bottom quintile, however, looks rather different. These households have an average business income close to zero, and their total income consists almost completely of transfer payments and capital income. 50 percent of households in the bottom earnings quintile have a head of household who is 65 years or older, and 92 percent have no dependants. Only 41 percent are married, as compared with 65 percent of the total sample.

Low-earnings households receive large transfer payments, much larger than the corresponding households in the United States. There the bottom earnings quintile receives 55 percent of its income in the form of transfers; in Sweden that number is 92 percent.

3.1.2   The earnings-rich

The earnings-rich households are middle-aged double-income households. In the top quintile, 95 percent have a head of household of age 31-65, and 97 percent are married. 52 percent have dependent children as compared with 33 percent of the total sample. 86 percent of their total income comes from wages and salaries, transfer payments accounting for about 5 percent.

3.2   The factor income partition

As exhibited in Tables 10-14, the factor income partition looks very much like the earnings partition.

3.3   The total income partition

3.3.1   The income-poor

The bottom 5 percentiles of the total income distribution is mainly characterized by its youth. The median age of the head of household in the bottom 5 percentiles of the income distribution is 22 years, while the median age of the entire sample is 45 years. However, although there are not many old people at the bottom 5 percent of the income distribution, there are quite a few in the bottom quintile. 20 percent of heads of household in this quintile are over 65; the corresponding figure for the entire sample is 12 percent.

Closely related to the relation of income with age, the income-poor typically have no dependent children. In the bottom quintile, only 5 percent do; in the entire sample, that number is 33 percent. Nor are the income-poor households married; only 15 percent are, as compared with 65 percent of the entire sample.

3.3.2   The income-rich

The income-rich are the mirror image of the income-poor. In the top quintile, only 4 percent have heads of household over 65, and only 3 percent have a head of household under the age of 31. In the entire sample, these numbers are 12 and 20, respectively. Also, 51 percent of households in the top quintile are married with children, as compared with 29 percent of the entire sample.

3.3.3   The disposable income partition

The disposable income partition looks very much like the total income partition.

3.4   The wealth partition

The most striking thing about the wealth distribution is, as we have seen, its concentration. Even in our sample, which does not feature an oversampling of the very wealthy, the top 1 percent have 13 percent of total wealth, and the top quintile owns

72 percent of net wealth. Meanwhile, as can be seen in Table 25, the bottom quintile represents a negative share of total net wealth.

Two facts, apart from the lack of oversampling among the very wealthy, may lead us to question the data we have on the wealth distribution. One is that total net wealth in the sample divided by the sample's share of the total number of households does not come close to independent measures of national wealth. [Evidence. Reasons explaining why this is.] Another is that many of the households which report negative net wealth may be underreporting the value of their condominiums. [Detailed evidence here.]

Nevertheless, we think that the measures of inequality we report come reasonably close to the facts. [Argument here.] There is no reasonable doubt about the fact that the Swedish wealth distribution is much more unequal than the Swedish income distribution, and that this difference is larger than in the United States.

3.4.1   The wealth-rich

The wealthy households have older heads than other households. In the top percentile of the wealth distribution, 77 percent of heads of household are over 45, as against 50 percent in the total sample. They are also married. In the top quintile, 87 percent are married as against 65 percent of the total sample. Obviously, they also have a higher ratio of capital income to total income than other households. For households in the top percentile, on average 23 percent of total income is capital income, as against 1 percent in the bottom quintile. The ratio of transfers to total income seems, however, to be more or less independent of wealth. Presumably this reflects the fact that most transfer payments in Sweden are not means tested with respect to wealth.

3.4.2   The wealth-poor

The bottom percentile of the wealth distribution, like the bottom percentile of the earnings and factor income distribution, consists largely of business owners in trouble. 50 percent have business income different from zero, as against 25 percent of the total sample. Nevertheless, it is not true that the wealth-poor are earnings- or income poor. In fact, the bottom quintile of the wealth distribution has a higher share of earnings and income than the second quintile from the bottom. Presumably this reflects the fact that only those with reasonably high incomes are able to

borrow so much as to achieve negative net wealth. However, it is true that the top quintile in the wealth distribution have a disproportionately large share of income and earnings as well.

The overall result, as seen in Table 3, is a correlation between income and wealth of about 0.37. This number is not too far from the corresponding number for the United States, which is reported by Ríos-Rull et al to be about 0.32.

3.5   The age partition

In this section, we consider Tables 30-33. From Table 30, we see that all measures of average income peak at age 46-50, but that average wealth peaks at age 61-65. Table 31 shows that within-cohort dispersion of earnings and income varies remarkably little over age, especially if the under 25:s are ignored. This is particularly true for disposable income. But even for earnings, the stability is striking. The Gini coefficient for earnings among the households with a head aged between 26 and 30 years old is 0.36. For the 51-55-year-olds, the coefficient is 0.37. The corresponding numbers for the United States are 0.41 and 0.51.

Meanwhile, wealth inequality tends to decrease with the age of a cohort. This is true to some extent in the United States as well, but there the changes are small and clearly nonmonotonic. A particularly stark contrast is provided by the following figures. For households in Sweden with a head aged between 26 and 30, the Gini coefficient for wealth is 2.09, reflecting the large fraction of these households that have negative net wealth. Meanwhile, the Gini coefficient for wealth among 61-65-year-olds is just 0.55. For the United States, the corresponding numbers are 0.73 and 0.74.

In this context, it is worth keeping in mind the relationship between debt and age. Households with negative net wealth have relatively young heads; on average their age is 37 years. Meanwhile, the average head age of households with strictly positive wealth is 48 years.

In Table 32, we find that the importance of transfers exhibits a U-shaped pattern with age, compensating for the upside-down U-shape of factor income across age. On the whole, it is the young and the old that rely most heavily on transfers. For households with heads below the age of 25, the average ratio of transfers to total income is 27 percent, whereas for the over 66:s, this fraction is 78 percent. Meanwhile, households with heads aged between 46 and 50 only receive 11 percent

of their total income in the form of transfers.

Table 30 exhibits the extent to which transfers and taxes equalize income across age groups. Again it seems that transfer payments have a more powerful impact than taxes. Total income has a much flatter time profile than factor income. Regressing total income on age and age squared yields a coefficient on age squared of -250, while regressing factor income on age and age squared yields a coefficient of -300, indicating a greater curvature of the upside-down U curve for factor income than for total income. The corresponding number for disposable income, -174, is even smaller in absolute value.

Although Ríos-Rull et al do not report formal measures of the curvature of the age-income curves, eyeball observations of the relevant tables confirm the fact that Swedish transfers equalize much more than U.S. transfers do.

3.6   The employment status partition

Here we look at the relationship between employment status, income, and wealth. A household's employment status is classified in six categories, based on the status of the head of household: central government employee, local government employee, private sector employee, self-employed, not employed, and other. The facts we report can be found in Tables 34-37.

¿From Table 34 it is clear that the self-employed have considerably more net wealth than others. In fact, the average net wealth among the self-employed is about double that of the total sample average. The level of average wealth of the not-employed group (which is slightly below the total sample average) is perhaps best understood by recalling that this group consists mainly of the unemployed and of retirees, where of course the wealth of retired households is relatively high. The fact that the not-employed category enjoys such a high average level of total income is presumably explained by the presence of retired people as well; their pensions make up the rather big difference between average earnings and average total income. The generous level of unemployment benefits presumably also contributes to this fact.

In Table 35 we may notice a striking fact about the self-employed: their wealth is rather evenly distributed, with a Gini coefficient of just 0.60, as compared to the total sample's 0.79. Table 36 we notice the the self-employed receive a rather high fraction of total income as transfers; at 24 percent, this fraction is only slightly smaller than the total sample average of 25 percent. Table 37 gives us a rough idea

of the employment situation in Sweden as of 1992. 78 percent of households were headed by an employed person.

3.7   The occupation partition

The occupation partition divides the sample according to type of employment (as opposed to type of employer). Table 38 gives the average levels of earnings, factor income, total income, disposable income and wealth for these groups. The most striking fact is the high average wealth of farmers, which is about three times the total sample average. Meanwhile, students have almost no wealth at all (about 5 percent of the total sample average). It is also interesting to note that those groups that have a high disposable income has a disproportionately high wealth. For example, those employed skilled manual services have about half the disposable income of those employed in middle management. However, the average net wealth is only about a fifth.

Table 39 exhibits the degree of inequality within occupational groups. Earnings inequality is highest among the retired, where very few have non-zero earnings so that a small number of households represent a very large fraction of total earnings. Other groups with a high degree of earnings inequality are the self-employed, the farmers, and the students.

Meanwhile, wealth inequality is above one for several occupational groups, indicating that a very large fraction of the group has negative wealth. Interestingly, although farmers have a high degree of within-group earnings inequality, net wealth is distributed rather equally, with a Gini coefficient of just 0.46.

3.8   The marital status partition

Not surprisingly, we find from Table 42 that it is married households with children that have the highest average earnings, factor income, total income, and disposable income. Howver, it is the married households without children that have the highest average net wealth. Presumably this is so because this group contains many retired households. We also notice that single men have higher income and wealth than single women; this is especially true of single men with children.

Table 43 describes the degree of inequality between marital status groups. Clearly, it is among single men and women that inequality of earnings and income is the greatest. Wealth presents a more confused picture, with Gini coefficients often very

close to or even above one. As we have noted above, this is a sign that a very large fraction of the subsample has negative net wealth.

Table 44 gives us an impression of the relative importance of transfers in the various marital status groups. Clearly it is single women with children that rely most heavily on transfers; on average, 47 percent of their total income consists of transfers. As we saw in Table 42, these transfers enable single women without children to achieve a relatively high total and disposable income, in spite of their low earnings. While their earnings are only about half the total sample average, their disposable income is about three quarters of the total sample average.

4   Changes over time

[To be written.]

5   Concluding remarks

Several striking facts stand out from the data we have presented in this paper. Earnings and factor incomes are more evenly distributed in Sweden than in the United States. Transfers have a strongly redistributive effect; taxes less so. Net wealth is about as unevenly distributed in Sweden as in the United States, not because there are as many very wealthy households, but because a large fraction of households have negative net wealth.

We have characterized the main features of inequality of income and wealth in Sweden. What remains is to explain these features, and especially to study the relationship between the extent and characteristics of the welfare state on the one hande, and the extent and characteristics of inequality on the other.

Table 4. The earnings partition. Shares. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Earnings share	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.18	0.28	0.47	0.12	0.12	0.05
Factor income share	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.09	0.18	0.27	0.46	0.11	0.12	0.05
Total income share	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.24	0.36	0.09	0.09	0.04
Disposable income share	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.11	0.13	0.18	0.24	0.35	0.08	0.08	0.03
Wealth share	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.16	0.18	0.15	0.19	0.32	0.08	0.08	0.04

Table 5. The earnings partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)			Total
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1	sample
Labor	1.36	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.34	0.65	0.77	0.86	0.89	0.87	0.84	0.65
Capital	1.68	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.05
Business	-7.94	-0.01	0.00	-0.05	0.09	0.06	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.04
Transfers	5.34	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.49	0.23	0.14	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.25
Other	0.56	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.02

Table 6. The earnings partition. Age of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)			Total
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1	sample
Average age	54.95	49.65	63.40	56.17	42.54	40.90	43.06	45.86	47.38	47.00	46.57	45.70
Fraction $\leq$ 30	0.05	0.28	0.07	0.19	0.33	0.27	0.15	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.04	0.20
Fraction 31-45	0.25	0.16	0.12	0.11	0.22	0.36	0.42	0.41	0.32	0.38	0.40	0.31
Fraction 46-65	0.40	0.20	0.24	0.23	0.36	0.35	0.42	0.54	0.66	0.61	0.56	0.38
Fraction 65+	0.31	0.36	0.58	0.47	0.09	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.12

Table 7. The earnings partition. Marital status of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)			Total
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1	sample
Frac. marr. w children	0.18	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.16	0.27	0.48	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.55	0.29
Frac. marr. w/o children	0.45	0.28	0.35	0.37	0.31	0.25	0.40	0.45	0.46	0.46	0.42	0.36
Frac. single w children	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.06	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04
Frac. single w/o children	0.35	0.62	0.59	0.55	0.46	0.42	0.10	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.31

Table 8. The earnings partition. Ave. no. of household members and mouths to feed. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)			Total
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1	sample
Ave. no. of members	2.03	1.55	1.48	1.57	1.91	2.13	2.80	2.88	2.88	2.83	2.98	2.26
Ave. no. of mouths to feed	1.90	1.55	1.52	1.58	1.81	1.96	2.45	2.53	2.54	2.50	2.61	2.07

N.B. The statistic 'mouths to feed' weights adults and children according to the schedule described in Table 9.

Table 9. Definition of 'mouth to feed'.

Single adult	1.16
Cohabiting couple	1.92
Child 0-3 years	0.56
Child 4-10 years	0.66
Youth 11-17 years	0.76

Table 10. The factor income partition. Shares. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Earnings share	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.08	0.18	0.28	0.46	0.12	0.12	0.04
Factor income share	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.09	0.17	0.27	0.47	0.11	0.12	0.05
Total income share	0.00	0.02	0.02	0.09	0.13	0.17	0.24	0.37	0.09	0.09	0.04
Disposable income share	0.00	0.02	0.03	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.24	0.36	0.09	0.09	0.04
Wealth share	0.01	0.00	0.02	0.11	0.17	0.15	0.21	0.36	0.09	0.09	0.06

2

Table 11. The factor income partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Labor	2.58	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.37	0.66	0.76	0.82	0.86	0.84	0.59
Capital	0.89	0.00	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05	0.06	0.10
Business	-13.85	0.00	0.00	-0.05	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
Transfers	9.88	1.00	0.97	0.96	0.50	0.24	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.07
Other	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.21

Table 12. The factor income partition. Age of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Average age	54.51	48.58	56.31	52.76	44.35	41.63	43.62	46.17	47.15	47.46	47.00
Fraction ≤ 30	0.06	0.23	0.22	0.24	0.31	0.26	0.14	0.04	0.01	0.02	0.03
Fraction 31-45	0.25	0.22	0.08	0.13	0.22	0.35	0.42	0.41	0.38	0.35	0.39
Fraction 46-65	0.38	0.31	0.22	0.23	0.33	0.36	0.43	0.55	0.59	0.62	0.58
Fraction 65+	0.31	0.23	0.48	0.40	0.14	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.00

Table 13. The factor income partition. Marital status of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Fraction married w children	0.19	0.05	0.03	0.05	0.15	0.28	0.49	0.51	0.48	0.52	0.54
Fraction married w/o children	0.41	0.17	0.30	0.31	0.33	0.28	0.41	0.46	0.48	0.46	0.38
Fraction single w children	0.01	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02
Fraction single w/o children	0.39	0.71	0.62	0.59	0.45	0.40	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.06

Table 14. The factor income partition. Ave. no. of household members and mouths to feed. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Ave. no. of members	1.98	1.46	1.49	1.55	1.88	2.16	2.81	2.88	2.80	2.87	2.96
Ave. no. of mouths to feed	1.87	1.49	1.52	1.56	1.79	1.98	2.46	2.53	2.48	2.53	2.59

N.B. The statistic 'mouths to feed' weights adults and children according to the schedule in Table 9.

Table 15. The total income partition. Shares. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Earnings share	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.11	0.16	0.27	0.43	0.11	0.11	0.04
Factor income share	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.10	0.16	0.26	0.45	0.11	0.11	0.05
Total income share	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.13	0.19	0.24	0.38	0.09	0.10	0.05
Disposable income share	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.13	0.19	0.25	0.37	0.09	0.09	0.04
Wealth share	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.10	0.13	0.19	0.20	0.39	0.10	0.10	0.06

Table 16. The total income partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Labor	0.24	0.33	0.20	0.34	0.53	0.55	0.71	0.75	0.76	0.78	0.55
Capital	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.10
Business	-1.53	0.02	0.06	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.03
Transfers	0.20	0.56	0.67	0.59	0.37	0.35	0.21	0.13	0.14	0.10	0.11
Other	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.22

Table 17. The total income partition. Age of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Average age	34.51	32.97	47.15	43.22	46.22	46.82	44.76	47.51	48.63	48.25	48.43
Fraction ≤ 30	0.50	0.64	0.36	0.41	0.24	0.18	0.13	0.03	0.02	0.01	0.02
Fraction 31-45	0.15	0.10	0.14	0.15	0.28	0.30	0.40	0.40	0.35	0.36	0.40
Fraction 46-65	0.34	0.15	0.23	0.24	0.32	0.39	0.42	0.53	0.56	0.59	0.52
Fraction 65+	0.02	0.10	0.27	0.20	0.17	0.13	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.06

Table 18. The total income partition. Marital status of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Fraction married w children	0.10	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.10	0.32	0.50	0.51	0.48	0.52	0.49
Fraction married w/o children	0.08	0.06	0.07	0.12	0.27	0.48	0.46	0.45	0.48	0.46	0.42
Fraction single w children	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.09	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02
Fraction single w/o children	0.82	0.90	0.89	0.82	0.53	0.15	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.02	0.07

Table 19. The total income partition. Ave. no. of household members and mouths to feed. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Ave. no. of members	1.35	1.15	1.17	1.25	1.69	2.49	2.92	2.95	2.88	2.91	2.88
Ave. no. of mouths to feed	1.41	1.27	1.28	1.34	1.66	2.22	2.53	2.57	2.53	2.55	2.53

N.B. The statistic 'mouths to feed' weights adults and children according to the schedule in Table 9.

Table 20. The disposable income partition. Shares. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Earnings share	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.03	0.11	0.16	0.27	0.43	0.11	0.11	0.04
Factor income share	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.04	0.10	0.16	0.26	0.44	0.10	0.11	0.05
Total income share	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.13	0.19	0.24	0.38	0.09	0.09	0.04
Disposable income share	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.06	0.13	0.19	0.25	0.37	0.09	0.09	0.04
Wealth share	0.01	0.02	0.03	0.10	0.14	0.19	0.20	0.37	0.09	0.09	0.06

Table 21. The disposable income partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Labor	0.28	0.38	0.24	0.39	0.52	0.55	0.71	0.75	0.77	0.79	0.53
Capital	0.09	0.10	0.08	0.06	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.06	0.10
Business	-1.65	0.01	0.07	-0.01	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.03
Transfers	0.27	0.48	0.61	0.56	0.37	0.35	0.21	0.13	0.14	0.10	0.10
Other	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.23

Table 22. The disposable income partition. Age of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Average age	35.39	32.34	47.49	42.92	47.26	47.40	44.39	46.54	47.87	47.32	47.07
Fraction ≤ 30	0.46	0.64	0.35	0.42	0.23	0.18	0.13	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.03
Fraction 31-45	0.20	0.11	0.13	0.15	0.26	0.28	0.41	0.43	0.38	0.40	0.43
Fraction 46-65	0.31	0.18	0.24	0.24	0.33	0.41	0.42	0.49	0.54	0.56	0.50
Fraction 65+	0.03	0.08	0.28	0.20	0.19	0.13	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.03	0.04

Table 23. The disposable income partition. Marital status of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Fraction married w children	0.12	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.08	0.29	0.51	0.57	0.56	0.58	0.52
Fraction married w/o children	0.10	0.07	0.07	0.10	0.29	0.52	0.46	0.41	0.40	0.41	0.42
Fraction single w children	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.08	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02
Fraction single w/o children	0.77	0.89	0.89	0.85	0.54	0.13	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.05

Table 24. The disposable income partition. Ave. no. of household members and mouths to feed. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Ave. no. of members	1.46	1.17	1.16	1.21	1.63	2.43	2.94	3.08	3.10	3.09	2.98
Ave. no. of mouths to feed	1.49	1.28	1.28	1.31	1.62	2.19	2.55	2.67	2.68	2.67	2.60

N.B. The statistic 'mouths to feed' weights adults and children according to the schedule in Table 9.

Table 25. The wealth partition. Shares. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Earnings share	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.19	0.12	0.20	0.23	0.26	0.07	0.06	0.01
Factor income share	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.18	0.11	0.19	0.23	0.29	0.07	0.07	0.02
Total income share	0.01	0.04	0.05	0.18	0.13	0.19	0.22	0.28	0.07	0.06	0.02
Disposable income share	0.01	0.05	0.05	0.19	0.13	0.20	0.22	0.26	0.06	0.06	0.02
Wealth share	-0.02	-0.03	-0.01	-0.07	0.01	0.09	0.25	0.72	0.16	0.20	0.13

Table 26. The wealth partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Labor	0.85	0.73	0.72	0.71	0.64	0.68	0.67	0.58	0.61	0.54	0.33
Capital	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.10	0.09	0.12	0.23
Business	-0.14	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.11
Transfers	0.19	0.22	0.24	0.26	0.33	0.25	0.23	0.21	0.21	0.18	0.17
Other	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.07	0.17

Table 27. The wealth partition. Age of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Average age	41.84	38.32	37.08	37.38	37.96	47.50	51.98	53.70	52.64	52.34	53.96
Fraction ≤ 30	0.15	0.26	0.37	0.36	0.44	0.14	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02
Fraction 31-45	0.45	0.50	0.40	0.40	0.26	0.34	0.30	0.22	0.25	0.25	0.21
Fraction 46-65	0.38	0.23	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.37	0.49	0.59	0.58	0.59	0.60
Fraction 65+	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.09	0.14	0.17	0.16	0.16	0.12	0.17

Table 28. The wealth partition. Marital status of head of household. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Fraction married w children	0.45	0.45	0.35	0.32	0.17	0.32	0.34	0.31	0.31	0.40	0.34
Fraction married w/o children	0.41	0.29	0.25	0.24	0.16	0.34	0.47	0.56	0.59	0.50	0.54
Fraction single w children	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Fraction single w/o children	0.12	0.22	0.35	0.37	0.61	0.30	0.17	0.11	0.08	0.09	0.12

Table 29. The wealth partition. Ave. no. of household members and mouths to feed. 1992.

	Lowest (%)			Quintiles					Highest (%)		
	1	1-5	5-10	1	2	3	4	5	5-10	1-5	1
Ave. no. of members	2.74	2.63	2.36	2.26	1.74	2.34	2.34	2.48	2.46	2.48	2.66
Ave. no. of mouths to feed	2.40	2.31	2.11	2.05	1.69	2.12	2.24	2.24	2.24	2.26	2.37

N.B. The statistic 'mouths to feed' weights adults and children according the schedule in Table 9.

Table 30. The age partition. Averages. 1992. Current SEK.

Age	Earnings	Factor income	Total income	Disposable income	Wealth
-25	97210	100283	136629	106293	29633
26-30	170035	179530	242439	184988	84055
31-35	216586	230210	295397	224608	183348
36-40	243732	265120	325141	243551	431001
41-45	266490	291866	340081	249954	509589
46-50	293577	319171	357302	257685	655378
51-55	270758	296884	339617	243077	715960
56-60	210403	237204	303843	218571	738243
61-65	130521	156384	276116	198148	755303
66-	20132	47112	210286	153854	710253
Total	191757	212236	282018	207587	480879

N.B. The age is that of the head of household. For a definition of head of household, see Table 9.

Table 31. The age partition. Gini coefficients. 1992.

Age	Earnings	Factor income	Total income	Disposable income	Wealth
-25	0.51	0.50	0.38	0.36	2.35
26-30	0.36	0.37	0.26	0.25	2.09
31-35	0.35	0.35	0.26	0.25	1.33
36-40	0.36	0.36	0.27	0.26	0.91
41-45	0.35	0.36	0.29	0.28	0.78
46-50	0.35	0.35	0.29	0.27	0.68
51-55	0.37	0.37	0.31	0.29	0.63
56-60	0.41	0.40	0.29	0.27	0.58
61-65	0.58	0.53	0.30	0.28	0.55
66-	0.95	0.72	0.33	0.29	0.56
Total	0.48	0.47	0.33	0.31	0.79

Table 32. The age partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

Age	Labor	Capital	Business	Transfers	Other
-25	0.71	0.01	0.02	0.27	0.06
26-30	0.69	0.01	0.03	0.26	0.02
31-35	0.71	0.02	0.03	0.22	0.01
36-40	0.72	0.04	0.04	0.18	0.02
41-45	0.76	0.03	0.04	0.14	0.01
46-50	0.79	0.04	0.04	0.11	0.01
51-55	0.76	0.05	0.05	0.13	0.01
56-60	0.65	0.05	0.06	0.22	0.02
61-65	0.44	0.04	0.07	0.43	0.02
66-	0.07	0.03	0.10	0.78	0.03
Total	0.65	0.04	0.05	0.25	0.02

Table 33. The age partition. Fraction of sample, members and mouths.

Age	Fraction of sample	Ave. no. of members	Ave. no. of mouths
-25	0.11	1.35	1.41
26-30	0.09	2.23	1.98
31-35	0.09	2.98	2.50
36-40	0.10	3.25	2.74
41-45	0.11	2.98	2.60
46-50	0.13	2.46	2.25
51-55	0.09	2.03	1.93
56-60	0.08	1.83	1.79
61-65	0.08	1.76	1.74
66-	0.12	1.64	1.65
Total	1.00	2.26	2.07

Table 34. The employment status partition. Averages. Current SEK. 1992.

	Earnings	Factor income	Total income	Disposable income	Wealth
Central gov't employee	280561	296698	340634	248094	485489
Local gov't employee	230365	244198	297145	219869	366281
Private sector employee	268928	290766	340586	248238	448173
Self-employed	125855	165571	218942	162324	950419
Not employed	13939	29414	166467	126793	390390
Other	45149	53174	206991	161023	143527
Total	191451	212236	282018	207587	480879

N.B. The employment status refers to the head of household.

Table 35. The employment status partition. Gini coefficients. 1992.

	Earnings	Factor income	Total income	Disposable income	Wealth
Central gov't employee	0.29	0.30	0.24	0.23	0.79
Local gov't employee	0.34	0.35	0.28	0.26	0.86
Private sector employee	0.31	0.33	0.28	0.26	0.84
Self-employed	0.49	0.45	0.35	0.34	0.60
Not employed	0.94	0.74	0.37	0.34	0.73
Other	0.75	0.74	0.29	0.28	1.11
Total	0.48	0.47	0.33	0.31	0.79

N.B. The employment status refers to the head of household.

Table 36. The employment status partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

	Labor	Capital	Business	Transfers	Other
Central gov't employee	0.82	0.04	0.00	0.13	0.01
Local gov't employee	0.77	0.03	0.00	0.18	0.02
Private sector employee	0.79	0.04	0.00	0.15	0.02
Self-employed	0.27	0.08	0.38	0.24	0.01
Not employed	0.08	0.08	0.00	0.82	0.03
Other	0.21	0.04	0.01	0.74	0.00
Total	0.65	0.05	0.04	0.25	0.02

N.B. The employment status refers to the head of household.

Table 37. The employment status partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

	Share of sample	Ave. no of members	Ave. no. of mouths
Central gov't employee	0.07	2.45	2.20
Local gov't employee	0.15	2.37	2.14
Private sector employee	0.44	2.47	2.21
Self-employed	0.11	2.47	2.23
Not employed	0.21	1.59	1.60
Other	0.01	2.05	1.88
Total	1.00	2.26	2.07

N.B. The employment status refers to the head of household.

Table 38. The occupation partition. Averages. Current SEK. 1992.

	Earnings	Factor income	Total income	Disposable income	Wealth
Unskilled manual manuf.	203207	211745	262735	198555	257791
Unskilled manual services	188153	195712	247372	188479	218594
Skilled manual manuf.	232755	242823	298199	224530	281869
Skilled manual services	172465	179564	230888	178041	134632
Unskilled clerical	201447	216392	265861	201085	296794
Skilled clerical	276069	294359	338823	248373	419844
Lower-level management	300340	326975	372305	269976	595421
Middle management	393156	426509	473018	331993	704892
Top-level management	509696	564975	610870	414952	818885
Self-employed	152694	189485	243429	181254	603938
Farmer	101424	136233	188901	139101	1375471
Other employed	176575	194709	259999	191072	388259
Student	13381	16489	62664	56965	24023
Retired	10249	31303	194100	144100	579396
Other not employed	19399	32209	171476	131957	280021
Total	191913	212236	282018	207587	480879

Table 39. The occupation partition. Gini coefficients. 1992.

	Earnings	Factor income	Total income	Disposable income	Wealth
Unskilled manual manuf.	0.26	0.26	0.20	0.21	0.85
Unskilled manual services	0.30	0.30	0.24	0.24	1.01
Skilled manual manuf.	0.23	0.23	0.17	0.18	0.83
Skilled manual services	0.28	0.28	0.23	0.23	1.48
Unskilled clerical	0.30	0.32	0.25	0.24	0.84
Skilled clerical	0.28	0.29	0.24	0.23	0.88
Lower-level management	0.26	0.27	0.23	0.22	0.71
Middle management	0.26	0.27	0.23	0.22	0.68
Top-level management	0.23	0.25	0.22	0.21	0.68
Self-employed	0.47	0.45	0.36	0.34	0.72
Farmer	0.50	0.44	0.31	0.31	0.46
Other employed	0.43	0.45	0.34	0.32	0.99
Student	0.53	0.50	0.43	0.43	2.08
Retired	0.99	0.67	0.29	0.26	0.55
Other not employed	0.97	0.86	0.38	0.35	0.89
Total	0.48	0.47	0.33	0.31	0.79

Table 40. The occupation partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

	Labor	Capital	Business	Transfers	Other
Unskilled manual manuf.	0.77	0.03	0.00	0.19	0.02
Unskilled manual services	0.76	0.03	0.00	0.21	0.02
Skilled manual manuf.	0.78	0.03	0.00	0.19	0.01
Skilled manual services	0.74	0.03	0.00	0.22	0.06
Unskilled clerical	0.75	0.03	0.00	0.19	0.07
Skilled clerical	0.82	0.04	0.00	0.13	0.01
Lower-level management	0.80	0.05	0.00	0.12	0.02
Middle management	0.83	0.04	0.00	0.10	0.02
Top-level management	0.84	0.04	0.00	0.08	0.01
Self-employed	0.30	0.07	0.39	0.22	0.02
Farmer	0.23	0.11	0.37	0.28	0.01
Other employed	0.67	0.05	0.01	0.25	0.02
Student	0.21	0.04	0.00	0.74	0.09
Retired	0.05	0.09	0.01	0.84	0.01
Other not employed	0.12	0.05	-0.01	0.81	0.02
Total	0.65	0.05	0.04	0.25	0.02

Table 41. The occupation partition. Fraction of sample and no. of members.

	Fraction of sample	Ave. no. of members	Ave. no. of mouths
Unskilled manual manuf.	0.05	2.43	2.17
Unskilled manual services	0.09	2.29	2.08
Skilled manual manuf.	0.09	2.62	2.31
Skilled manual services	0.02	2.25	2.04
Unskilled clerical	0.02	2.18	2.01
Skilled clerical	0.05	2.43	2.19
Lower-level management	0.16	2.63	2.33
Middle management	0.08	2.77	2.44
Top-level management	0.02	2.70	2.40
Self-employed	0.06	2.45	2.22
Farmer	0.05	2.48	2.24
Other employed	0.09	1.88	1.79
Student	0.03	1.17	1.28
Retired	0.11	1.62	1.63
Other not employed	0.08	1.72	1.68
Total	1.00	2.26	2.07

N.B. The occupation refers to the head of household.

Table 42. The marital status partition. Averages. Current SEK. 1992.

	Earnings	Factor income	Total income	Disposable income	Wealth
Married w children	285588	309734	377061	281400	525883
Married w/o children	211486	238195	330695	238209	707443
Single w children	108045	121705	210834	169781	171818
Single w/o children	91088	101291	145082	107363	216158
Single men w children	154715	167599	234331	179469	258338
Single men w/o children	103906	115566	155004	112952	221982
Single women w children	93966	107860	203746	166858	145717
Single women w/o children	73271	81449	131291	99593	208064
Total	191913	212236	282018	207587	480879

N.B. The category 'married' includes all cohabiting couples.

Table 43. The marital status partition. Gini coefficients. 1992.

	Earnings	Factor income	Total income	Disposable income	Wealth
Married w children	0.30	0.31	0.22	0.20	0.79
Married w/o children	0.47	0.45	0.26	0.23	0.63
Single w children	0.45	0.46	0.22	0.19	1.12
Single w/o children	0.56	0.54	0.32	0.29	1.00
Single men w children	0.36	0.36	0.21	0.19	0.97
Single men w/o children	0.53	0.52	0.33	0.30	1.00
Single women w children	0.46	0.48	0.21	0.19	1.18
Single women w/o children	0.60	0.56	0.30	0.26	0.99
Total	0.48	0.47	0.33	0.31	0.79

N.B. The category 'married' includes all cohabiting couples.

Table 44. The marital status partition. Sources of total income. 1992.

	Labor	Capital	Business	Transfers	Other
Married w children	0.73	0.04	0.03	0.18	0.01
Married w/o children	0.60	0.06	0.04	0.28	0.02
Single w children	0.49	0.05	0.02	0.42	0.04
Single w/o children	0.60	0.05	0.04	0.30	0.04
Single men w children	0.60	0.03	0.07	0.28	0.05
Single men w/o children	0.63	0.05	0.04	0.25	0.04
Single women w children	0.46	0.05	0.00	0.47	0.03
Single women w/o children	0.54	0.05	0.02	0.38	0.03
Total	0.65	0.05	0.04	0.25	0.02

N.B. The category 'married' includes all cohabiting couples.

Table 45. The marital status partition. Fraction of sample and no. of members. 1992.

	Fraction of sample	Ave. no. of members	Ave. no. of mouths
Married w children	0.29	3.88	3.19
Married w/o children	0.36	2.00	1.92
Single w children	0.04	2.48	2.19
Single w/o children	0.31	1.00	1.16
Single men w children	0.01	2.41	2.16
Single men w/o children	0.18	1.00	1.16
Single women w children	0.03	2.51	2.20
Single women w/o children	0.13	1.00	1.16
Total	1.00	2.26	2.07

N.B. The category 'married' includes all cohabiting couples.