

Shirahase, Sawako

**Working Paper**

## Japanese Income Inequality by Household Types in Comparative Perspective

LIS Working Paper Series, No. 268

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Luxembourg Income Study (LIS)

*Suggested Citation:* Shirahase, Sawako (2001) : Japanese Income Inequality by Household Types in Comparative Perspective, LIS Working Paper Series, No. 268, Luxembourg Income Study (LIS), Luxembourg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/160940>

**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.*

**Luxembourg Income Study Working Paper No. 268**

**JAPANESE INCOME INEQUALITY BY HOUSEHOLD  
TYPES IN COMPARATIVE PERSPECTIVE**

**Sawako Shirahase**

**July 2001**

# **Japanese Income Inequality by Household Types in Comparative Perspective\***

Sawako Shirahase  
National Institute of Population and Social Security Research  
2-2-3, Uchisaiwai-cho, Chiyoda-ku  
Tokyo 100-0011, Japan  
Fax: 03-3502-0636  
E-mail: [shirahase@ipss.go.jp](mailto:shirahase@ipss.go.jp)

July 4, 2001

\* I would like to thank Masanobu Masuda, Katsumi Matsuura, Yuji Genda, Katsuhisa Kojima, Atsuhiko Yamada, and Hiroshi Ishida for their helpful comments and Paul Alkemade for his technical advice on the LIS data. This research is conducted as part of the project of “The Current Situation and Assessment of Income Differentiation in Japan” which is supported by Health Science Research Grants (2001-2002), Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour, and Welfare.

# **Japanese Income Inequality by Household Types in Comparative Perspective**

Sawako Shirahase

National Institute of Population and Social Security Research, Tokyo, Japan

## 1. Introduction

The main purpose of this study is to examine the extent of income inequality in Japan and to speculate on the extent of Japan's economic inequality in comparative perspective. Among industrial societies, Japan has often been identified as occupying a distinctive place because it is the first non-western society in which industrialization has reached full maturity (Vogel 1979; Okochi et al. 1973) and because it has followed a particular course of industrialization, that is, a late and rapid course of development (Dore 1973; Cole 1979).

In the late 1970s and the 1980s, the emergence of the middle mass has been actively pointed out in Japan, where the homogeneity of Japanese society is emphasized. Murakami's work (1984) helped to spark this debate. He claimed that Japan was no longer a class society and people's life styles and attitudes had become homogeneous. Using attitudinal surveys, he and others argued that ~~the~~ class distinctions have become blurred and a mass middle class has emerged in Japan. Tominaga (1979) also joined the debate and claimed that the majority of the Japanese believed that they belonged to middle strata, because most scored high on one of the dimensions of status (such as

education, occupational prestige, income) while low on others.

In 1976, the OECD presented the results of its cross-national study on income inequality, and Japan was ranked fourth from the bottom, meaning that it was one of the most equal societies (Sawyer 1976). Even though there were some problems with the quality of the Japanese data from which the figure was computed (Tachibanaki 1998), people accepted the idea that Japan is an equal society. The results of the OECD report and of the attitudes surveys led people to believe generally that Japan exhibited a high degree of equality. However, this perception, of course, was not derived from rigid cross-national comparisons.

The recent best-seller, *Economic Inequality in Japan* by Tachibanaki (1998), has sparked a new debate on equality in Japan. He claims that Japan is no longer an equal society, but is instead as unequal as the United States. This was a shocking finding for many people, but has eventually been widely accepted because Japanese have increasingly voiced doubts about the persistent equality. Another best-seller written by a sociologist has also pointed out increasing inequality (Sato 2000). Although Sato did not present any international comparison of inequality, he stated that entry into the upper white-collar class has become more restricted from the 1980s to the 1990s, making Japan a more class-oriented society. Their arguments together point out the salience of socioeconomic inequality in Japan.

In the recent discussion on social and economic inequality in Japan, there are

two main arguments: one dealing with the trend in the degree of equality in Japan and the other dealing with the position of Japan among industrial societies in terms of socioeconomic inequality. On the first issue, there seems to be a shared view among scholars that inequality in Japanese society is increasing. Kanomata (1999), using the Social Stratification and Mobility Survey, claims that there has been a gradual increase in economic inequality in post-war Japan, although from 1965 to 1975, the trend was briefly toward greater equality. Ishikawa (1991; 1994) and Tachibanaki and Yagi (1994) have pointed out that Japan was not as equal a society as many people believed, and showed that the popular view of Japan as an equal and homogeneous society was misleading.

Ohtake and Saito (1999) identify a recent trend of increasing income inequality, which can be derived in part from the aging of population and from the increase in the dual-income families (Ohtake 2000; Ohtake and Saito 1999). Nishizaki, Yamada, and Ando (1998) also suggest that Japan's economic inequality increased for the ten years following 1984, confirming the effect of the aging population on the expanding trend of economic inequality. It thus appears that there is a common understanding of the growth of economic inequality in contemporary Japan.

Another significant debate exists over how unequal or equal Japan's income distribution is within a cross-national framework. While there are quite a few studies on Japanese peculiarities, rigid cross-national studies are limited in number. The

studies on intergenerational social mobility in Japan, done by Ishida (1993), Ishida, Goldthorpe and Erikson (1991) , and Erikson and Goldthorpe (1992), are a few exceptions that base their conclusions on rigid empirical analyses using highly comparable data. They find that Japan is peculiar in some ways but at the same time shares common patterns of social mobility. Specifically, the effects of social origin on mobility chances are similar in Japan and Europe, while the absolute mobility rates in Japan are different. The peculiarities in mobility regimes in Japan can be mostly explained by its distinctive course of late industrialization.

Nishizaki, Yamada, and Ando (1998) examine the Japanese level of economic inequalities using the National Consumption Survey in 1984 and 1994 and placing these against comparable European data sets. They conclude that Japan occupies a middle position in the extent of economic inequality among industrial societies, neither especially equal nor unequal. Ohta (2000) explores the position of Japan with respect to economic differentiation, and also concludes that Japan was in the medium level of income inequality among OECD countries. He does not see any dramatic increase in economic inequality in Japan nor in Europe. In these rigorous cross-national comparisons using comparable datasets, Japanese peculiarities do not emerge.

In this study, I focus on Japanese income distribution and examine the trends from mid-1980s to late 1990s and the comparisons with other societies. The main questions that are addressed in the analysis are: (1) whether or not Japan's income

distribution has become more unequal recently, and (2) whether or not income inequality in Japan is different from that in other industrial nations. I also identify the sources of the trends as well as possible reasons for observable international differences.

In particular, I will pay attention to income inequality by the type of household. It is possible that the trend of income inequality for a particular type of household is different from the general trend of income inequality among all households.

Furthermore, the differences emerging in cross-national comparisons may be explained in part by the cross-national difference in household composition among the elderly population.

## 2. Data and Variables

The Japanese data which we analyze in this study are derived from the National Survey of Living Conditions<sup>1</sup> (Kokumin Seikatsu Kiso Chosa) conducted by the Japanese Ministry of Health, Labor and Welfare every year since 1985. The National Survey of Living Conditions was constructed by merging four different surveys conducted by the former Ministry of Health and Welfare: the Welfare Administration Basic Survey from 1953 to 1985, the National Health Survey from 1953 to 1985, the National Living Survey from 1962 to 1985, and the Public Health Basic Survey from 1968 to 1985.

Every three years, the National Survey of Living Conditions used a larger sample with a

---

<sup>1</sup> The full translation of name of the survey is the Comprehensive Survey of Living Conditions of People on Health and Welfare.



more detailed questionnaire. In this study, I use five surveys of the National Survey of Living Conditions which had large samples, so as to look further into the income distribution by household type. I use information on the income of the household level, not on the individual level.

In order to elucidate the position of Japan in comparative perspective, I examine the United States (1986, 1994), Britain (1986, 1995), Sweden (1987, 1995), and Taiwan (1976, 1995), as reference groups. I include Taiwan because Japan is often compared only with American and European societies. The data for these four societies are derived from the Luxembourg Income Study (below, LIS) which assures high comparability across nations. I have recoded the Japanese data in order to make them as comparable to the LIS data as possible.

In examining the extent of income inequality, I focus on disposable income, which I calculate by subtracting tax and social insurance payments from total gross income. In all societies including Japan, I use disposable income with the equivalent scale of elasticity 0.5, following the previous study by Nishizaki et al. (1998)<sup>2</sup>. I assume that there is no difference in equivalence of elasticity between working adult and children or retired elderly<sup>3</sup>. Behind this assumption, it is supposed that family

---

<sup>2</sup> Atkinson, Rainwater, and Smeeding (1995) showed the results of family size exponents in different equivalence scales.

<sup>3</sup> Figini (1998) nicely discusses the consequences of measuring economic inequality, by taking into account household size and its composition.

members more or less equally share the economic well-being within the same household. Since the basic unit of consumption is the household, I believe that this assumption is in general reasonable in contemporary capitalist societies.

The degree of income inequality is measured by the gini coefficient shown below.

$$Gini = \left( \frac{2}{mn^2} \cdot \sum_k kW_k \right) - \frac{n+1}{n} = \frac{2 \text{cov} \left( W_k, \frac{k}{n} \right)}{m} = \frac{2 \sum_{k=1}^n (W_k - m) \cdot \left( \frac{k}{n} - \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{k=1}^n k \right)}{m}$$

where  $W_k$  is the disposable income with equivalent scale in the  $k$ th household;  $n$  is the total number of households; and  $m$  is the mean disposable income.

In order to ensure the validity of cross-national and cross-temporal comparisons, I excluded the following households from the analysis: (1) those with negative or zero disposable income, (2) those in which no pension income was reported even though the head of the household was 70 years old or more, and (3) self-employed households that reported no self-employment income.

Another important variable in this study is household type. I examine the extent of income inequality as a whole as well as by the type of household. First, I focus on whether the household contains elderly inhabitants (65 or older), because previous studies found the effect of aging on income inequality to be important. I first

break down two types of household: households with the elderly and those without the elderly. I then distinguish four types of household with elderly members: single male households, single female households, married couple-only households, and “other” types of household with the elderly. The “other” category denotes those shared by elderly and non-elderly family members. Figures from 1998 show that about 40 percent of the “other” households are three-generational household in which the elderly co-reside with their son’s or daughter’s family in Japan. Occasionally I combine the first three types of households with the elderly (that is, male and female single households and the married couple-only households) into a comprehensive “elderly-only household” category. I will examine the extent of income inequality by these different types of household with and without the elderly.

### 3. Analysis

#### 3-1 Household type

Table 1 shows the trend in household type in Japan. As of 1998, 37.2 percent of all households contain elderly family members aged 65 and over, and the share of this type of household increased by about 10 percent from 1986. The largest increase among households with the elderly is the couple-only household: that is, a 10 percent increase from 17.3 percent in 1986 to 27.5 percent in 1998. In contrast, the “other” type of the household with the elderly has declined by about 15 percent from 70.5

percent in 1986 to 54.7 percent in 1998, although it still constitutes the majority among all households containing elderly inhabitants. The percentage of elderly who live alone or live only with their spouse has increased recently, at the expense of those who live with other family members.

Table 2 presents household type in four societies in the mid 1990s. About one fourth of all households in the United States, Great Britain, Sweden and Taiwan include the family members aged 65 and over<sup>4</sup>. The corresponding figure in Japan in Table 1 is for 1995, and it shows that more than one-third of households contain the elderly. When the type of household with the elderly is further broken down in the United States, Britain, and Sweden, the large majority is the elderly-only type (single-member households and married couples). However, in Taiwan, 59 percent of the elderly live with non-elderly persons, and this figure is very close to the Japanese one: 59.8 percent in 1995. In the two Asian societies, Japan and Taiwan, a large number of the elderly aged 65 and over live with their single child(ren) or with child(ren) who are married. Coresidence with the younger generation appears to be one of the typical living arrangements for the elderly in these two societies. Martin (1989) pointed out that Japanese elderly were much more likely to share the same household with their children than in the West in the 1980s, and the situation has not changed in the 1990s. However,

---

<sup>4</sup> The proportion of the elderly aged 65 and over in the total population in the U.S., Britain, Sweden, and Taiwan is 12.54, 15.87, 17.56, 7.3, respectively, in 1995. The corresponding Japanese figure is

as we have seen in Table 1, coresidence with the younger generation among the elderly has decreased recently.

In sum, the most striking difference in the household type in Japan compared with that in the United States and Europe is that the majority of households with the elderly contain non-elderly members in the same household. In other words, the Japanese elderly, similar to their Taiwanese counterparts, belong to a greater variety of household types than in Europe and the United States, where the large majority of the elderly do not share the same household with non-elderly members.

### 3-2 Trend in income inequality in Japan

In examining the relevant developments in Japan, I first report trends in the extent of income inequality by different household type since the 1980s. The result reflects a test of whether economic inequalities have expanded recently (c.f. Tachibanaki 1998; Nishizaki et al. 1998). The first bar (left-hand side) of the Figure 1 represents the gini coefficient of the total sample. The figures have increased from 1986 to 1989, and have remained more or less stable since then. Judging from Figure 1, there is no dramatic increase in income inequality as a whole in the last 10 years. Instead, the overall extent of economic well-being has remained stable<sup>5</sup>. The generally stable

---

14.54 percent (NIPSSR 2000).

<sup>5</sup> The result of my analysis shows different trend than those reported by Tachibanaki (1998) and

degree of income inequality, however, does not always mean that the degree of income inequality within social subgroups has remained the same. In order to examine the difference in the extent of income inequality within the subgroups under investigation, I have computed the gini coefficients by different types of household.

When I divide the households into two types, one with the elderly and the other without the elderly, I find a similar trend in the extent of income inequality in the two subgroups. The gini coefficients among households without the elderly increased from 1986 to 1989, and stabilized until 1995, then slightly increased from 1995 to 1998. The gini coefficient among households with the elderly showed a similar increase from 1986 to 1989 and stability during the 1990. However, the extent of income inequality among households without the elderly is always lower than those including elderly inhabitants. If we shift our attention to the elderly-only households, which are represented by the white bar, we see that the gini coefficient among the elderly-only households is the highest among different sub-groups, while the extent of income inequality generally has declined over the period. Consequently, the difference in the degree of income inequality among these four sub-groups has become smaller in 1998. The results of analyses suggest that income inequality in the 1980s and 1990s has not

---

Nishizaki et al (1998). The difference may be real, but it may be due to the difference in the data source. Nishizaki et al (1998), for example, used the national Consumption Survey which contains more people with medium range income than the National Survey of Living Conditions which I analyzed (Matsuura 2001).

changed as much as other people often claimed (c.f. Tachibanaki 1999). The overall degree of income inequality in Japan has been more or less stable.

There has been a high degree of income inequality among households with the elderly, but let us look at the gini coefficient by the age of household head in order to examine the extent of income inequality by age group (Figure 2). In each year, the extent of income inequality increases along with the age of the household head. In general, there is no specific pattern in the change of income inequality by period, but if anything, there is a consistent increase in income inequality among the 25 to 39 age group from 1986 to 1998, while there is an overall decline in income inequality among the age groups of 65 and over from 1986 to 1998. In corresponding to the finding of the high extent of income inequality among elderly households, the age of the household head is positively related to the extent of income inequality throughout the period.

In order to investigate the results in more detail, I analyze the inequality among the elderly by dividing the elderly households into four groups: single men, single women, married couples, and the “other” type described above (Figure 3). In the 1998 data, the highest degree of income inequality can be found among the single male household, and the next highest among the single female household, and the “other” type of household with the elderly shows the lowest degree of income inequality. The single male household shows a large decline in income inequality over the period,

particularly after 1992. The married-couple only household also shows a decline, although the extent of change is small. The single female household shows a peculiar trend: an increase in income inequality from 1986 to 1992 and a slight decline afterwards. The “other” type of elderly household presents the highest degree of stability in the degree of income inequality and its figures are always the smallest over the period. Among the households containing elderly members, there are differences in the degree of income inequality depending on the type of household; the single male household is highly differentiated in terms of income, while the households in which the elderly and non-elderly live together show the lowest degree of income inequality.

Since the degree of income inequality differs by the type of household, we need to examine the income level among different types of household. Japan has been characterized by its large number of elderly people who cohabit with the family of their married children, usually the eldest son. This tends to be advantageous for them because they share the relatively high level of household income which is mainly derived from their son’s earnings (Martin 1987; Martin Tsuya 1991).

In order to compare the economic situation by the type of household, we set the household without the elderly at 100 and calculate the ratio of the median income in each type of household with the elderly to that without the elderly (Table 3). The “other” type of household which contains the elderly and the younger member is economically better-off than the household without the elderly and this advantage in the



economic well-being becomes larger over the period. In contrast, the elderly-only household is much more disadvantaged in its economic situation when compared with the non-elderly household. The median disposable income of the elderly-only household is only 64.75 percent of the median income of the household without the elderly. In 1986, however, this relative income level stood at 53.02 percent, and the improvement seems rather striking.

In dividing the households with the elderly into four groups and comparing the economic situation among these sub-groups, we see the relative economic advantage among households of the “other” type, which include both elderly and non-elderly inhabitants (Table 4). By setting the median disposable income among the “other” type of household at 100, we can compare the median incomes of the remaining three types of household, which are clearly below 100 -- a disadvantage in economic situation. In the 1998 data, the median disposable income of the single male household is only 59 percent of that of the “other” type of household, and the corresponding figures among the single female household and the married-couple only household are 41 and 71, respectively. The single female household is the most disadvantaged in economic situation, although there is a gradual improvement since 1992. We should also remember from Figure 3 that the single male and the single female households had higher levels of income inequality than did the “other” type of household.

In contrast, the extent of income inequality within the multi-generational

household (“other” type) is relatively small, and it also displays a more advantageous economic position than does the elderly-only household. We therefore need to bear in mind the variety in economic situations, depending on the type of household to which the elderly aged 65 and over belong, because the household types display significant differences. There has, however, been a recent reduction in disparities between both the income levels and extent of income inequality among different types of elderly-inclusive households

In sum, according to our analyses, the extent of income inequality as a whole has been more or less stable during the 1990s, so we do not find an obvious trend towards increasing inequality in contemporary Japan. However, the diversity in income inequality by the type of household cannot be overlooked. In the next section, I explore the comparative position of Japan in terms of the level of economic well-being.

### 3-3 Cross-national comparison of income inequality by household type

Gini coefficients by different household type in the mid 1980s and the mid 1990s in five countries are given in Figure 4. The bar on the left side for each country represents the gini coefficient for the entire sample, the second bar from the left for households without elderly members, the third from the left for households with the elderly, and the last bar for elderly-only households.

First, let us concentrate on the gini coefficients for the entire sample both in the mid 1980s and 1990s; the gini coefficient in Japan is ranked at the middle among the five countries. In the 1980s, the Japanese figures are almost the same as those for Britain, but in the 1990s, income inequality in Britain expanded faster than it did in Japan.

Between the 1980s and 1990s, the extent of income inequality has increased in four of five societies; only Sweden experienced a reduction of the gini coefficient, from .2219 to .2199. Increasing inequality took place not only in Japan but also in other societies, although the extent of change varies by country. Taiwan shows only a slight increase, while Britain and the United States show larger increase in the gini coefficients than does Japan. The degree of change in the Japanese figures is almost half the corresponding figures for Britain. Thus, as far as the entire sample is concerned, Japan does not deviate from other industrial societies in terms of the extent of income inequality and the extent of change in inequality. However, when we take into account the differences by household type, Japan exhibits some peculiar characteristics, compared with Europe and the United States.

In Japan, like Taiwan, the extent of income inequality among households with the elderly, particularly households which are composed of the elderly alone, is higher than that among the households without elderly members. In the mid-1980s, the elderly-only household showed the highest extent of income inequality in Japan; the

gini coefficient for that period is .4236. Taiwan similarly shows a high degree of income inequality among the elderly-only household, that is .3664. However, corresponding figures in the 1990s diminish significantly both in Japan and Taiwan, while income inequality among the elderly-only households is still higher in these societies than in the other three societies. In Sweden and Britain, on the other hand, the gini coefficient among households without the elderly is higher than that among the households with the elderly. In the United States, the gini coefficients among the households with and without the elderly are almost the same, although there is an increasing trend in the gini coefficients among households without the elderly between the 1980s and the 1990s. In Japan and Taiwan, the extent of income inequality varies more by the type of household than in Europe and the United States. In particular, the households which are composed only of the elderly (the elderly-only household) clearly have higher levels of income inequality than other types of households in the two Asian societies.

In order to confirm the importance of the age effect on income inequality, we examine the gini coefficients by the age of the household head (categorized into five-year age group) in the five countries (Figure 5). The most obvious feature in Japan is that the extent of the economic differentiation becomes larger as the age of the household head becomes older. In fact, a nearly linear increase in the degree of income inequality by the age of household head can be observed in Japan. Taiwan also shows

a similar trend in the gini coefficient by the age of household head, but the gini coefficients among the age groups of 65 and over declines, unlike in Japan. In contrast, Britain shows decline in the gini coefficients after the age of 55, while the gini coefficients among the younger age groups are overall higher. The extent of income inequality in the United States does not change significantly with the age of the household head; it is high across all the age groups. In Sweden, income inequality is relatively small, although the income inequality among the youngest age group is the highest. This high degree of income inequality among the younger age groups might be attributable to the high unemployment among youth in Sweden following the severe economic recession in the mid-1990s. Nevertheless, income inequality in Sweden by age groups is in general small.

In sum, Japan is distinctive because of a gradual increase in the extent of income inequality as the age of the household head becomes older. On the other hand, the relatively high degree of income inequality among the younger age groups can be found in Britain and the United States.

Why is the degree of income inequality among households with the elderly higher than that among households without the elderly in Japan? In the next section, we will speculate on the reasons for the effect of the type of household by examining the income level of each household type.

### 3-4 Income inequality among the households with the elderly

Once again, in this section, we differentiate households with elderly inhabitants as single-male, single-female, married couples, and “others,” referring to households containing elderly and non-elderly coresidents. We will compare the income level of the sub-groups to see their overall economic situation by calculating the ratio of their median disposable income to that among households without elderly inhabitants. In this analysis, we intend to show the effect of having elderly family members in the household on the level of economic well-being.

Table 5 shows the ratio of the median disposable income among households with elderly residents to that among households without the elderly in five countries. The most obvious finding in Table 5 is that the difference in the ratio between the elderly-only household and the household without the elderly is the largest in Japan (63.82), while the difference between the “other” type of household and the household without the elderly is the smallest (104.91). These households, composed of the elderly and other members, occupy a relatively advantaged economic situation compared with the households which do not have any elderly members. In Sweden, households with elderly members (regardless of their overall composition) are economically better off than are households with no elderly members. In contrast, in Great Britain, the United States, and Taiwan, the households without elderly are better off than those with the elderly. The most striking feature in Japan is, therefore, that

among households with elderly members, there is significant variation in economic well-being. Households which are composed of only the elderly are much more economically disadvantaged in Japan, compared with those in other societies, while households which contain both the elderly and the non-elderly members are not disadvantaged at all.

While there are variations in the extent of income inequality between households with the elderly and those without the elderly in all five societies, Japan shows greatest disparity. In order to examine the differences in economic well-being among households with elderly members, the median disposable income levels among the four types of households with elderly membership are given in Table 6.

The median disposable income figures of the single male, single female, and married couple households are much lower than that of the “other” (elderly and non-elderly) household, and the discrepancies in the economic situation by household type are larger in Japan than in other societies. In particular, the single female household stands out as the most disadvantaged in Japan: the median disposable income is only 40 percent that of the “other” category. The Japanese single male household is also economically disadvantaged: the median disposable income is 57 percent of that of the “other” category. As we have seen in Table 1, there are variations in the living arrangement among the Japanese elderly. The results shown in Table 6 suggest that differences in living arrangements among the elderly have direct relevance to their

economic well-being.

In contrast, in other societies, living independently from offspring does not always imply economic disadvantage, particularly for the male elderly. Living with the younger generation in Britain, Sweden, and the United States, does not necessarily bring a more favorable economic condition for the elderly. Instead, people with whom the elderly tend to share the living arrangement are probably non-elderly who cannot afford to earn a living by themselves or, alternatively, the unemployed. Consequently, coresidence is likely to reduce the economic well-being of the elderly in these nations.

Figure 6 presents the proportion of single-member households by income decile among households which are composed of only the elderly in five countries. Japan stands out in cross-national comparison. The proportion of the single-member households increases as income decile drops in Japan. Over 70 percent of households belonging to the first decile are single-member households, while less than 20 percent of the households in the tenth decile are single-member households. Japan thus displays a clear negative relationship between single-member households and economic well-being. In other words, the household structure, particularly for elderly living alone, is closely related to economic prosperity in Japan. On the other hand, in Sweden, one finds that a relatively large number of the single elderly are in good economic health and couples are less well-off than the single elderly. Therefore, the impact of the household type on determining the economic well-being of the elderly



differs across nations.

In sum, Japan shows more differences in the economic well-being by household type than do other societies. The economic situation among households with the elderly varies more than that among the households without the elderly. Among households with elderly inhabitants, those which are composed only of the elderly show more variation in income than do those in which non-elderly family members live together with the elderly. Furthermore, in Japan, the income level is more differentiated by household type (for those that contain the elderly on their own or with non-elderly) than it is in other societies. Consequently, income inequality among all the elderly in Japan is greater than in other societies.

### 3-5 Work of the elderly

One of the characteristics of the Japanese elderly population is a high rate of labour force participation, which, according to Yashiro and Oshio (1999), contributes to greater economic power and leads to higher levels of household savings. In this section, I examine whether the tendency of older Japanese to work is related to the extent of income inequality among the Japanese elderly.

Table 7 shows the proportion of household heads who are in employment by age group in five nations. Once again, Japan and Taiwan stand out. When the age of the household head is over 60, their labor force participation rates are much higher in

Japan and Taiwan than in other countries. In particular, the rates among those who are 65 and over are conspicuously high. This high rate of employment among the Japanese elderly is related to the high degree of self-employment among the working elderly. More than half of working elderly aged 65 and over are self-employed, and this figure goes up to about 70 percent when the household head is 75 or older. The same tendency can be seen in Taiwan as well. In these two Asian societies, self-employment seems to be a major avenue for the elderly to continue their work.

Figure 7 shows the proportion of wage and salary income to total disposable income by income decile among households composed only of the elderly. Japan is distinctive in the role of wage and salary income in differentiating the economic well-being among households with the elderly. A significantly higher proportion of wage and salary income at the ninth and tenth percentile can be seen in Japan than in other societies, and it suggests that the Japanese elderly who occupy the highest income brackets are those who continue to work and derive income as employees. In other words, the Japanese elderly with high levels of income are relatively young and their health permits them to continue employment. On the other hand, private pensions and bequests play a more important role in income inequality in Europe and the United States than in Japan.

In sum, the impact of employment income on determining economic well-being appears to be stronger in Japan, where the rate of labor force participation

among the elderly is relatively high. In Europe and the United States, labor force participation rates among the elderly are relatively low: 50 percent of those aged 60 to 64 in the United States, 36 percent in Britain, and 58 percent in Sweden. Consequently, employment income among the elderly does not have a major effect on differentiating the economic well-being among the elderly in these countries. In contrast, in Japan, 67 percent of those aged 60 to 64 and almost half of those aged 65 to 69 are still in the labor force, and employment continues to be one of major resources generating income among the Japanese elderly.

#### 4. Discussion

In this study, I examined the extent of income inequality in Japan, using cross-national comparisons. I constructed comparable measures of income inequality with the Luxembourg Income Studies data set in order to make rigorous cross-national studies of income inequality of Japan, Great Britain, Sweden, Taiwan, and the United States.

According to our analysis of income inequality, Japan is neither especially equal nor unequal in the aggregate; the level of income inequality using the gini coefficient is in the middle in our societies. However, income inequality among households composed of only the elderly is much higher in Japan because Japanese elderly live in a greater variety of household types; about 40 percent of the elderly live

in multi-generational households. The three-generational households used to be a typical living arrangement among the elderly in Japan, but it has declined gradually in the last ten years. In its place, one finds an increase in the households composed of elderly single people or older couples. Nevertheless, the proportion of multi-generational households among those that include the elderly is still higher in Japan than in Europe and the United States. In fact, in Sweden, almost all elderly live either alone or with their spouse; similarly in Britain, less than 10 percent of the elderly live with non-elderly family members.

Such a large difference in living arrangement among the Japanese elderly, compared with the European and American societies, appears to be directly responsible for larger income inequality among the elderly in Japan. In particular, living alone appears to have negative consequences for the economic well-being of the elderly; the single-female household has the worst economic conditions in contemporary Japan. Since women tend to live longer than do men and wives are generally younger than their husbands, elderly women face the risk of falling into the low-income groups after the death of their husbands. Indeed, the proportion of single-female households is gradually increasing in Japan, and the further improvement of the living conditions of these households will become a key policy issue. In contrast, in other societies, the degree of economic condition does not differ greatly by the type of household to which the elderly belong.

Smeeding and Saunders (1998) claim that coresidence with the younger generation can be a safety net for the elderly in Taiwan, and Japan appears to follow this pattern. Coresidence with non-elderly members leads to strengthening the economic level among the elderly, and, in fact, the median disposable income among households with the elderly is higher than that among the households without the elderly. This implies that living arrangements have determinant consequences for the economic well-being of the elderly in Japanese society. Furthermore, the Japanese elderly are more likely to hold jobs than their European and American counterparts, and the income from employment contributes to greater income inequality in Japan. The elderly are more likely to work and the income derived from their employment has a greater effect on the household's economic health in Japan than in other societies.

In summary, according to this research, there are two major reasons for a higher extent of income inequality among the elderly in Japan. One is the variety of the living arrangements among the elderly; such diversity of household types appears to be directly associated with the economic well-being of the elderly in Japan. The other is the large impact of employment income among the elderly. Whether the elderly work affects their level of economic well-being in Japan, where the proportion of the elderly who work is larger than that in other societies.

We should no longer treat the elderly as one homogeneous group; a wide range in the level of economic well-being among the elderly should not be overlooked. The

Japanese elderly as a whole are sometimes considered to be in a favourable economic condition (Takayama and Arita 1996), but it does not necessarily mean that all the elderly are better off. Due to recent budget cuts by the Japanese government, the imbalance between the contributors (the younger generation) to the pension system and beneficiaries (the older generation) of such a system is a major issue in reforming the social security system in Japan. Since we find that the elderly are by no means homogeneous in their level of economic well-being, the picture of the young versus the old generation is too simplistic. We then had better take into account the diversity in the economic situations among the elderly and consider the income redistribution within the older generation. In particular, the elderly who live alone face a high risk of falling into poverty in Japan. A policy specifically targeted to the economically disadvantaged elderly should therefore be seriously considered (c.f. Yashiro 1997).

## **Reference**

- Atkinson, Anthony B, Lee Rainwater, and Timothy M. Smeeding. 1995. *Income Distribution in OECD Countries*. OECD.
- Cole, Robert E. 1979. *Work, Mobility, and Participation: A Comparative Study of American and Japanese Industry*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dore, Ronald. 1973. *British Factory – Japanese Factory*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Erikson, Robert and John H. Goldthorpe. 1992. *The Constant Flux*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Figini, Paolo. 1998. "Inequality Measures, Equivalence Scales and Adjustment for Household Size and Composition" LIS Working Paper no. 185.
- Ishida, Hiroshi. 1993. *Social Mobility in Contemporary Japan*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- \_\_\_\_\_, John H. Goldthorpe, and Robert Erikson. 1991. "Intergenerational Class Mobility in Post-war Japan." *American Journal of Sociology* 96 (January): 954-992.
- Ishikawa, Tsuneo. 1991. *Shotoku to Tomi* (Income and Wealth). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- ..... 1994. *Nihon no Tomi to Tomi no Bunpai* (Wealth and Wealth Distribution in Japan). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Kanomata, Nobuo. 1999. "Shotoku Kakusa to Shotoku Kettei Kozo no Henka" (Income Inequality and the Change in the Structure of Income Determination). *The Monthly Journal of the Japan Institute of Labour* 472: 17-25.
- Martin, Linda G. 1989. "the Graying of Japan," *Population Bulletin* 44(2): 1-43.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Moriko O. Tsuya. 1991. "Middle-aged Japanese and Their Parents: Coresidence and Contact" *Population Studies* 45(2):299-311.
- Murakami, Yasusuke. 1984. *Shin Chukan Taishu no Jidai* (The Age of New

Middle Mass). Tokyo: Chuo Koron sha.

Matsuura, Katsumi. 2001. "Shotoku Saibunpai Chosa to Zenkoku Shouhi jittai Chosa niyoru Bunpai Jokyo Hikaku" (A Comparison of Income Distribution between Income Redistirbution Survey and National Consumption Survey). Interim Report for the Study of Income Differentiation in Contemporary Japan. Tokyo: National Institute of Population and Social Security Research.

Nishizaki, Fumihira, Yasushi Yamada, and Ando Eisuke. 1998. *Nihon no Shotoku Kakusa: Kokusai Hikaku no Shiten kara* (Income Inequality in Japan with Cross-national Perspectives). Tokyo: Economic Planning Agency Economic Research Institute.

National Institute of Population and Social Security Research. 2000. *Jinko Tokei Shiryō Shū* (Demographic Data). Tokyo: National Institute of Population and Social Security Research.

Okochi, Kazuo, Bernard Karsh, and Solomon B. Levine (eds.). 1973. *Workers and Employers in Japan: The Japanese Employment Relations System*. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Ohtake, Fumio. 2000. "90 Nendai no Shotoku kakusa (Income Inequality during the 1990s)." *The Monthly Journal of the Japan Institute of Labour* 480: 2-11.



- \_\_\_\_\_ and Makoto Saito. 1999. "Shotoku Fubyodo-ka no Haikei to sono Seisakutekigani: Nenreikaiso-nai Koka, Nenreikaiso-kan Koka, Jinko Korei-ka Koka" (The Background behind Unequalization and its Social-Policy Implication: Effect within the Age Groups, Effect between the Age Groups, and Aging Effect). *The Quarterly of Social Security Research* 35(1): 65-76.
- Sato, Toshiki. *Fubyodo Shakai Nihon* (Unequal Society, Japan). Tokyo: Chuo Koron Shinsha.
- Sawyer, M. 1976. "Income Distribution in OECD countries." *OECD Employment Outlook Occasional Studies*. Paris: OECD.
- Smeeding, Timothy and Peter Saunders. 1998. "How Do the Elderly in Taiwan Fare Cross-Nationally? Evidence from the Luxembourg Income Study (LIS) Project" LIS Working Paper no. 183.
- Tachibanaki, Toshiaki. 1998. *Nihon no Keizaikakusa* (Economic Inequality in Japan). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.
- \_\_\_\_\_ and Takumi Yagi. 1994. "Shotoku Bunpai no Genjo to Saikin no Suii" (Income Redistribution and Current Trend), in *Nihon no Shotoku to Tomi no Binpai* edited by Tsuneo Ishikawa. Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.
- Takayama, Noriyuki and Arita Fumio. 1996. *Chochuku to Shisan Keisei: Kakeishisan no Makuro Bunseki* (Savings and Capital Holdings: A Analysis of

Macro-data on Household Income). Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten.

Tominaga, Ken'ichi (ed.). 1979. *Nihon no Kaiso-kozo* (Stratification System in Japan). Tokyo: University of Tokyo Press.

Yashiro, Naohiro. 1997. "The Economic Position of the Elderly in Japan"  
Pp. 89-106 in *The Economic Effects of Aging in the United States and Japan*,  
edited by Michael D. Hurd and Naohiro Yashiro. Chicago: University of  
Chicago Press.

\_\_\_\_\_ and Takashi Oshio. 1999. "Social Security and Retirement in Japan."  
Pp. 239-67 in *Social Security and Retirement around the World*, edited by  
Jonathan Gruber and David A. Wise. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vogel, Ezra F. 1979. *Japan as Number One: Lessons for America*. Cambridge:  
Harvard University Press.

**Table 1 Trends in Household Type in Japan**

		1986	1989	1992	1995	1998
Household without the elderly		71.8	68.5	67.2	65.3	62.8
Household with the elderly		28.2	31.5	32.8	34.7	37.2
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
□		36136	37634	33388	30500	30688
Household with the elderly	Male-only	2.3	2.5	2.6	3.2	3.6
	Female-only	9.9	11.1	12.0	12.6	14.3
	Couple-only	17.3	20.7	23.2	24.3	27.5
	Other type	70.5	65.8	62.1	59.8	54.7
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 2 Household Type by Nation**

		Britain	Sweden	Taiwan	U.S.
Household without the elderly		71.2	72.0	75.6	74.5
Household with the elderly		28.8	28.0	24.4	25.5
Total		100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
□		5950	15684	12311	54171
Household with the elderly	Male-only	14.2	12.5	10.6	12.1
	Female-only	37.2	37.4	6.4	37.5
	Couple-only	40.7	48.5	24.1	38.9
	Other type	8.0	1.6	59.0	11.4
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

**Table 3 Median Disposable Income by Household Type in Japan**

	1998		1995		1992		1989		1986	
	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median
Other type	106.14	316.23	104.91	302.67	102.66	277.38	101.28	231.11	104.40	223.07
Elderly only household	64.75	192.90	63.82	184.13	59.85	161.72	59.50	135.76	53.02	113.28
Household without the elderly	100.00	297.93	100.00	288.50	100.00	270.20	100.00	228.28	100.00	213.67

Note: The unit of median income is in ten thousand yen.

**Table 4.****Median Disposable Income by Type of Household with the Elderly in Japan**

	1998		1995		1992		1989		1986	
	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median
Male-only	59.02	186.65	57.24	173.25	61.29	170.00	54.26	125.40	45.75	102.05
Female-only	41.11	130.00	40.13	121.45	37.85	105.00	44.39	102.60	35.57	79.35
Couple-only	71.15	225.00	71.49	216.37	69.34	192.33	69.99	161.75	64.63	144.18
Other type	100.00	316.23	100.00	302.67	100.00	277.38	100.00	231.11	100.00	223.07

Note: The unit of median income is in ten thousand yen.

**Table 5. Median Disposable Income by Household Type across Nations**

	Japan		U.S.		Britain		Sweden		Taiwan	
	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median
Other type	104.91	302.67	88.74	20809.00	85.52	10196.26	106.84	201845.00	82.60	339788.58
Elderly only household	63.82	184.13	97.94	22968.00	90.01	10731.60	102.09	192863.40	78.84	324296.12
Household without the elderly	100.00	288.50	100.00	23450.10	100.00	11923.13	100.00	188916.00	100.00	411338.22

Note: In Japan, the unit of median income is in ten thousand yen. In other societies, the unit of median income is in the original currency.

**Table 6. Median Disposable Income by Type of Household with the Elderly**

	Japan		U.S.		Britain		Sweden		Taiwan	
	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median	ratio	Median
Male-only	57.24	173.25	127.54	26540.00	115.90	11817.73	102.71	207314.00	115.11	391121.00
Female-only	40.13	121.45	99.43	20690.00	106.10	10818.08	101.97	205819.00	85.87	291780.00
Couple-only	71.49	216.37	116.74	24292.00	95.96	9743.19	87.19	175986.00	91.67	311500.00
Other type	100.00	302.67	100.00	20809.00	100.00	10196.26	100.00	201845.00	100.00	339788.58


Note: In Japan, the unit of median income is in ten thousand yen. In other societies, the unit of median income is in the original currency.

**Table 7.**

**Proportion of Labor Force Participation of Household Heads by Age in Five Countries**

	Japan	U.S.	Britain	Sweden	Taiwan
-19	21.9	55.6	26.7	17.0	98.0
20-24	69.1	76.5	62.5	69.3	97.3
25-29	97.9	84.4	75.6	81.1	99.0
30-34	97.9	86.4	81.9	87.4	98.8
35-39	97.6	86.8	82.3	88.1	98.7
40-44	96.7	86.7	83.2	89.8	96.8
45-49	95.2	85.9	83.5	90.3	96.0
50-54	95.0	82.3	74.3	89.1	93.6
55-59	89.7	73.4	61.1	82.3	91.0
60-64	67.2	49.6	35.7	57.5	74.4
65-69	49.3	25.0	12.0	19.5	41.4
70-74	34.1	13.0	6.1	7.1	24.8
75-	20.0	5.4	2.2	2.2	15.5

**Figure 1 Trends in Gini Coefficients by Household Type in Japan**



Sources: National Survey of Living Conditions, each year.

**Figure 2 Gini Coefficients by Age of Household Head in Japan**







Figure 3 Trends in Gini Coefficient by Type of Households with Elderly Members



**Figure 4 Cross-national Comparison of Gini Coefficients by the Type of Household**



Sources: National Survey of Living Conditions for Japan  
 LIS data for U.S., Britain, Sweden, and Taiwan.



Figure 5 Cross-national Comparison of Gini Coefficient by Age of the Head of Household




Figure 6 Proportion of Single Households by Decile among Elderly-only Households




Figure 7 Proportion of Wage and Salary in Disposable Income by Decile among the Elderly-only Household

