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The real disposable income of private households in Germany, accounting for inflation, rose by 12 percent between 1991 and 2014. This is what the present study based on data from the Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) has shown. However, the trends varied greatly depending on income group. While the middle income segment rose by more than eight percent, the highest income segment increased by up to 26 percent. The lower income segment, on the contrary, declined in real terms. Consequently, income inequality has increased overall, especially in the first half of the 1990s, in the period from 1999 to 2005, and after 2009. It stagnated or even decreased in the interim periods. The proportion of people at risk of poverty has recently become greater again. Gainful employment still provides the most effective protection against income poverty, but more and more employed persons are at risk of becoming poor. Containment of the low wage sector, by revoking the privileged status of minijobs, for example, could counteract this effect. And single parents should no longer be fiscally disadvantaged in comparison to childless coupled households – this could also reduce the number of children at risk of poverty.

The present study updates previous DIW Berlin studies on personal income inequality and the proportion of people at risk of poverty in Germany up to and including 2014 (box). The empirical analysis is based on Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) data collected by DIW Berlin in partnership with Kantar Public (formerly TNS Infratest Sozialforschung). Since the SOEP survey is repeated every year, it can be used to analyze trends in income over time. The following functional income analysis, which initially examines the distribution of income across the production factors “labor” and “capital,” was based on the German national accounts (Volkswirtschaftliche Gesamtrechnungen) of the German Federal Statistical Office (Statistisches Bundesamt).

Employee compensation trend no longer lags behind that of company profits

To analyze functional income distribution, we contrasted the two main production factors, “capital” (corporate profits) and “labor” (employee compensation from corporations).
We did not consider the overall economy but covered a substantial part of it; 71 percent of total employee compensation is included in the study. Three groups were excluded: business partnerships (small and micro businesses) and – of particular significance – the government and non-profit organizations. The present study also focused on investment income in the overall economy, which included income that was not directly generated from ongoing production (e.g., income from rentals and leases).

From 1991 to 2000, employee compensation from corporations rose by just under 33 percent in nominal terms. In the same period, corporate profits experienced vigorous growth, increasing by almost 50 percent (Figure 1). Subsequently, the gap widened. While profits almost doubled until 2007 – the year of the global financial crisis – employee compensation rose by only eight percent in nominal terms. In 2007 and 2009, corporations were forced to accept a massive decrease in profits, but all in all the financial crisis hardly made a dent in employee compensation.

Since the crisis did not last long in Germany, profits rose again after 2009 – at a rapid pace. They dropped again temporarily, but swiftly recovered as of 2013. Employee compensation showed a much steadier trend. After the financial crisis it increased continuously – at a higher rate than before. From the crisis year 2009 until 2015, employee compensation rose by 25 percent. During the same period, employment surged upward as well. In these years, profits rose to the same overall extent. On the whole the gap between the wages paid by corporations and their profits has not grown larger since the crisis.
That means, for example, that household income for a four-person household (parents, a 16-year-old, and a 13-year-old) is not divided by four as is the case in a per-capita calculation (=1+1+1+1), but by 2.3 (=1+0.5+0.5+0.3).

In all population surveys, a particular challenge is how to take proper account of missing values for individual people surveyed, especially concerning questions considered sensitive, such as those about income. The incidence of missing values is often selective, with households with incomes far above or below the average refusing to respond.

In the SOEP data analyzed here, missing values are replaced using an elaborate imputation procedure that is both cross-sectional and longitudinal.5 This also applies to missing values for individual household members refusing to answer any questions in households otherwise willing to participate in the survey. In these cases, a multi-stage statistical procedure is applied to six individual gross income components (earned income, pensions and transfer payments in case of unemployment, vocational training/tertiary-level study, maternity benefits/parental leave benefits, and private transfer payments).5 For each new data collection, all missing values are always imputed again retrospectively because new information from the surveys can be used to impute missing data from the previous year. This can result in changes to earlier evaluations. As a rule, however, these changes are minor.

In order to avoid methods-based effects in the time series of calculated indicators, the first survey wave of the individual SOEP samples was excluded from the calculations. Studies show that there are more changes in response behavior which cannot be attributed to differences in willingness to participate in the survey.6

After taking weighting factors into account, the SOEP microdata on which these analyses are based (version v32 based on the 32th survey wave in 2015) show a representative picture of the population in households and thus permit inferences about the entire population.

To stay abreast of changes in the number of migrants, independent sub-samples has been drawn in 2013 and 2015. However, for the inequality analyses the IAB-SOEP migration sample drawn in 2013 has been additionally considered only.7 The weighting factors allow for differences in the sampling designs of the various SOEP samples as well as in the respondents’ participation behavior. In order to increase compatibility with official statistics, these factors are adjusted to currently available framework data from the official microcensus. Populations living in institutions (for example, in retirement homes) are generally not taken into account.

**On average, real income has increased since 1991**

Adjusted for household size5 and inflation, between 1991 and 2005 the average annual market income6 of persons
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12 percent. Median growth was somewhat flatter. It was around 1,700 euros – an increase of nine percent.\(^10\)

The fact that the growth in mean disposable household income was flatter in comparison to the median indicates growth in income was not equal among income groups. Dividing the income groups into deciles\(^11\) and indexing the mean income of each decile to 1991 shows that income in the upper range experienced the highest growth (Figure 4). For example, the disposable real income of the highest income group (tenth decile) rose by almost 27 percent from 1991 to 2014,\(^12\) but the fifth decile saw an increase of only 15 percent.

\(^{10}\) One reason for the lackluster growth in median household income is the weak trend of pensions in the statutory pension fund, since they were not indexed to inflation during the 2000s. In 2004, 2005, 2006, and 2010, pensions were not raised. When adjusted for inflation, these years are marked by income losses.

\(^{11}\) Sorting the population by income level and dividing the results into ten groups of equal size results in ten deciles. The lowest decile indicates the income situation of the poorest ten percent of the population and the top decile, the richest. It should be noted that due to income mobility personal income positions can change, and people may not always be assigned to the same decile. For this reason, our statements refer to the mean changes in the ten income groups.

\(^{12}\) In the SOEP survey, people who earn top incomes are underrepresented and therefore in all likelihood, the actual trend in this decile is underestimated. See Stefan Bach, Giacomo Corneo, and Viktor Steiner, “From Bottom to Top: The entire income distribution in Germany, 1992–2003,” Review of Income and Wealth 55 (2009): 303–30.
growth of retirement income and the fact that on average, old-age pensions have an increasingly larger piece of the household income pie than income from employment due to the demographic shift in Germany. Unfortunately pensions usually represent lower sums of money. On the other hand, in many years income from capital investments and self-employment increased in the top decile, leading to income increases. And employment has special significance in this situation: overall, the proportion of employed persons increased, and growth was especially dynamic in the top income range. While the employment rate remained virtually constant in the lowest decile between 2005 and 2014, in the top three deciles it rose by around five percentage points.

Germany falls short of UN targets for reducing inequality

As part of the debate on alternatives to using GDP to measure society’s progress, the United Nations (UN) adopted a catalog of 17 sustainability targets. The Millen-
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In Germany, the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung, BMZ) is in charge: Die Agenda 2030 für nachhaltige Entwicklung, online at http://www.bmz.de/de/ministerium/ziele/2030_agenda/index.html.


19 In Germany, the Federal Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development (Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung, BMZ) is in charge: Die Agenda 2030 für nachhaltige Entwicklung, online at http://www.bmz.de/de/ministerium/ziele/2030_agenda/index.html.

20 Looking at the trend between 2004 and 2014, the income of the lowest 40 percent stagnated while the mean rose by slightly more than four percent. Between 2009 and 2014, the real income of the lowest 40 percent fell by more than one percent, while the mean rose by one percent.

21 Also see the term Gini-Koeffizient in the DIW Berlin glossary (in German only), online at http://www.diw.de/de/diw_01.c.413334.de/presse_glossar/diw_glossae/gini_koeffizient.html.


23 Data from the Institute for Employment Research (Institut für Arbeitsmarkts- und Berufsforschung, IAB) also indicate a slight decrease in wage inequality in Germany. See Joachim Möller, “Lohnungleichheit: Gibt es eine Trendwende?” IAB Discussion Paper 09 (2016): 17.

24 The relatively sharp increase in wages and salaries in the first decile are the result of sector-specific minimum wages and initial anticipatory effects in the wake of an announcement by the German government (or political parties) that a generally binding minimum wage would be implemented. In the fifth decile, real income has dropped by three percent since 1991, and in the tenth decile, it has risen by 17 percent in real terms. The difference in the growth of wages can be explained in part by a difference in demand for quali-
During inequality. It indicates the relationship between the income of the person with the lowest income in the top decile and the income of the person with the highest income in the bottom decile. In the 1990s, this indicator hovered around 3.0 (the rich person’s income was three times higher than the poor person’s income). Similar to the Gini coefficient, it rose to a value of 3.5 by 2005. It experienced a further statistically significant rise after 2011 – to a record high of 3.65 in 2014.

Upswing in the at-risk-of-poverty rate

In this section, we look at the people whose income is below the at-risk-of-poverty threshold, as they are a special focus socio-politically. People in households with less than 60 percent of the median net household income of the overall population at their disposal live below the at-risk-of-poverty line. Based on the SOEP sample, in

Return to increased inequality in disposable household income

The level of inequality in disposable household income remained virtually constant from 1991 to 1999 (Figure 8). It subsequently increased until 2005; the Gini coefficient rose from 0.25 in 1999 to 0.29 in 2005. Unlike inequality in market income, inequality in disposable household income regressed only slightly between 2005 and 2009. Since 2009, inequality has tended to increase again. The 90:10 percentile ratio is an alternative indicator for measured vs. unqualified employees (the “Skilled-Biased Technical Change” hypothesis).

25 For example, this occurs when a person with a minijob lives in the same household as someone with well-paid full-time employment.
In 1990s, the proportion of the population at risk of poverty was around 11 percent, but by 2014 it had risen to just below 16 percent (Figure 9). Since the turn of the millennium, the at-risk-of-poverty rate has risen continually, with brief interruptions in the upward trend in 2010 and 2011 only. In 2014, 12.7 million people in Germany were at risk of poverty. The latest results based on the German Federal Statistical Office’s microcensus showed a similar proportion. The alternative data of the European Union Statistics on Income and Living Conditions (EU-SILC) yielded an even higher value of 16.7 percent. All three data sources indicated the same slow upward trend in recent years.

There are clear differences in the extent to which the old and new federal states are affected. At 14.7 percent, the at-risk-of-poverty rate in western Germany in 2014 was around seven percentage points lower than in eastern Germany. This discrepancy chiefly reflects the lower levels of employment and investment income in the new federal states.

Especially high risk of poverty for children and teens

In 2014, more than 20 percent of all children and teens in Germany were at risk of poverty (Table 1). Looking at the trend in this group’s risk of poverty over the past 20 years, the increase occurred almost entirely in the second half of the period – the years between 2004 and 2014, when the proportion increased by more than four percentage points.

The 25–34 age group experienced the highest growth, almost nine percentage points over the past 20 years. This is surprising, since this group is typically of an employable age and should have benefited from the positive job market situation. The people in this group who received incomes from employment had an at-risk-of-poverty proportion that was seven percentage points higher than 20 years ago. Among the 25–34-year-olds who did not have income from employment, the proportion rose even more significantly. However, the age group’s behavior with respect to education has changed over time: more and more of the people in this age cohort go to university.


30 According to data from the SOEP, the proportion of people pursuing a university degree in this age group was around seven percent in the 1990s. This figure almost doubled to approximately 13 percent in 2014.

Note: Real incomes in prices of 2010. Population: Persons living in private households. Equivalized annual income surveyed the following year. Equivalized with the modified OECD-scale. Shaded area indicate a 95 percent confidence band.

Source: SOEPv32; calculations of DIW Berlin.

Since 2010 inequality of disposable income tend to increase again.
Germany, company-related or private pensions are the exception and not the rule.33

The 25–34 age group also exhibited a differentiated trend. While in western Germany their risk of poverty has risen somewhat more sharply than the population average since 2000 (by five percentage points to 17 percent), in the same period the risk of poverty in eastern Germany rose by 20 percentage points to slightly below 35 percent in 2014. It is interesting to note that this group’s risk of poverty continued to rise even after the financial crisis, although unemployment in Germany dropped sharply during the same time period. It is evident that this age group was not wholly able to benefit from the good job market situation.

The younger the age cohort, the higher the risk of poverty

In this section we examine age cohorts. Most of them contain ten consecutive birth cohorts, beginning with the cohort of those born between 1930 and 1939 and ending with those born between 2010 and 2015. For each year that income was recorded in the SOEP, we calculated the relevant risk of poverty. This made it possible to depict the risk of poverty for all older cohorts for 32 survey years and therefore for a major portion of their lives (Figure 10). We have shown the age of the youngest person in each of the various cohorts here.

Overall, we demonstrated that every time a younger cohort is added, the risk of poverty rises. The difference is greatest at age 30. While the risk of poverty of the cohort with those born between 1960 and 1969 was still around ten percent when the youngest person in the cohort was 30, the cohorts of those born between 1970 and 1979 had a proportion of around 15 percent. For those born between 1980 and 1989, at around 23 percent the proportion was even higher.34 These findings parallel those of analyses based on data from Deutsche Rentenversicherung Bund, the German pension fund,35 and show that the wage inequality of men across cohorts has increased in Germany. And starting with the 1955 birth cohort, the lifelong income of the lower 20 percent of wage-earning persons decreased in comparison to older birth cohorts. Amidst all of these observations, it should be considered that over time and thus, across age cohorts, education-related and pension-age behavior have changed – both of which can influence income.

31 These age groups’ comparatively high at-risk-of-poverty rates have recently triggered fundamental debates on the concept of relative poverty. See for example Georg Cremers, Armut in Deutschland (Munich: C. H. Beck, 2016), 47 et seq.

32 In the ongoing cross-sectional analysis, trainees and students are usually poor if they do not live in their parents’ households. In later life, however, they are rarely at risk of poverty.


34 The two oldest cohorts are an exception, since their risk of poverty are virtually the same between ages 55 and 64.
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Table

At-risk-of-poverty rate\(^1\) by age group

In percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>&lt;10 years</th>
<th>10-18 years</th>
<th>18-25 years</th>
<th>25-35 years</th>
<th>35-45 years</th>
<th>45-55 years</th>
<th>55-65 years</th>
<th>65-75 years</th>
<th>75 years and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference 1994/2014</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reporting:

with individual earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>&lt;10 years</th>
<th>10-18 years</th>
<th>18-25 years</th>
<th>25-35 years</th>
<th>35-45 years</th>
<th>45-55 years</th>
<th>55-65 years</th>
<th>65-75 years</th>
<th>75 years and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference 1994/2014</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

without individual earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>&lt;10 years</th>
<th>10-18 years</th>
<th>18-25 years</th>
<th>25-35 years</th>
<th>35-45 years</th>
<th>45-55 years</th>
<th>55-65 years</th>
<th>65-75 years</th>
<th>75 years and over</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference 1994/2014</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Persons with less than 60 percent of median disposable income.

Note: Real incomes in prices of 2010. Population: Persons living in private households. Equivalized annual income surveyed the following year. Equivalized with the modified OECD-scale.

Source: SOEPv32; calculations of DIW Berlin.

Figure 10

At-risk-of-poverty rate\(^1\) by age cohorts

In percent

Employed persons are increasingly at risk of poverty

Given the sharp drop in unemployment in Germany since 2005 and the current record employment rate, we asked whether the risk of poverty among employed persons has also decreased. The initial rule of thumb is that in households in which no one received employment income in the relevant previous year, the risk of poverty was higher than average.\(^{36}\) In 2014, the proportion of those affected was over 28 percent, but it initially regressed between 1991 and 1999. This was due to significant pension increases in eastern Germany in the

\(^{36}\) In 2014, this affected 23 percent of the population – especially people of retirement age.
Incomes Distribution

Figure 11

At-risk-of-poverty rate\(^1\) by number of employed persons in household

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In percent</th>
<th>1991</th>
<th>1993</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household without employed persons</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with one employed person</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with two employed persons</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with three employed persons</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Real incomes in prices of 2010. Population: Persons living in private households. Equivalized annual income surveyed the following year. Equivalized with the modified OECD-scale. Shaded area indicate a 95 percent confidence band.

Source: SOEPv32; calculations of DIW Berlin.

Households with one employed person only have now a higher at-risk-of-poverty than in the 1990’s.

1990s.\(^37\) Since that time, however, this segment’s risk of poverty has significantly increased.

In households with at least one employed person, the risk of poverty has slightly increased since 1991 – most recently to 12 percent. Further differentiating among households with employed persons by number of employed persons, we saw that the risk of poverty with two or more employed persons in the household (somewhat more than half of the population) has remained virtually the same since 2005, fluctuating around five percent. Households with only one employed person exhibited different behavior.\(^38\) For them the proportion at risk of poverty was 15 percent in the 1990s and rose to 24 percent in 2014.\(^39\) This shows that not every job protects against poverty – take for example those in the low-wage segment or hours that are less than full time. In addition to hourly wages and number of hours worked, whether or not household income is sufficient to exceed the at-risk-of-poverty threshold depends on household composition.\(^40\)

Conclusion

In Germany, real GDP rose by 22 percent between 1991 and 2014. However, not everyone benefited equally from the burgeoning economy. While real disposable household income has risen by eight percent in the middle income groups since 1991 and by even more in the upper income groups, the lowest income groups were forced to accept losses in real income. Consequently, income inequality has increased.

Employment income is one of income equality’s key drivers.\(^41\) With the implementation of the statutory minimum wage in 2015, policy makers took a step towards countering a further increase in income inequality.\(^42\) However, additional measures are necessary to achieve the goal set by the United Nations of increasing the income of the lower 40 percent of the population more sharply than that of the overall population on average. For example, deprivileging mini-jobs and creating incentives to convert their holders into employees who contribute to the social insurance system could contain the low wage sector in Germany. Additional measures should improve the work-famiy balance. It would also be helpful to remedy fiscal disadvantages to single parents as opposed to childless coupled households. This type of measure could also reduce the number of children at risk of poverty.

\(^{37}\) Since the calculations only go until 2014, the effect of implementing the statutory minimum wage cannot as yet be analyzed.

\(^{38}\) In 2014, this equaled 29 percent of the population.
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