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#### Abstract

Comparing the experiences of different types of families, this report analyzes family incomes in tre United States from 1970 to 1986 . The adjusted family income (AFI) measure used in the analysis corrects for family size and for inflation, but does not take account of either in-kind income or taxes. After a section summarizing the report's contents, Chapter I discusses issues in measuring family income. Chapter II reports family income in 1986, in terms of income by (1) family type, (2) age of family head, (3) number of workers, and (4) sources of income. Chapter III reports income trends across the l6-year period, discussing trends in terms of the four categories enumerated above. Chapter IV focuses on factors affecting family income, including macroeconomic conditions, government policies and cash transfer programs, demographic characteristics, and number of workers per family. Appendices provide demographic and income data, 1970-1986; data on income, price indexes, and poverty thresholds; poverty statistics for families, 1970-1986; a note on limitations of the March 1987 Current Population Survey for the years 1971 through 1987; and data on income distributions by family type. (RH)
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In response to separate requests from the Senate Budget Committee and the House Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families, this study examines what has happened to the incomes of different types of families since 1970. In addition, the analysis discusses economic and demographic factors that have influenced the trends in family incomes.
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nraonly expressed view of trends in family income holds that median income has grown little if at all since 1970, a sharp change from the rapid income gains of the 1950s and 1960s. This perception inaccurately represents what has happened to family well-being over the period; indeed, it ignores four important factors:

0 It fails to account for reduced living costs resulting from declining average family size;
o It uses an inflation index that has overstated the increase in living costs;

0 It understates income by omitting items received in kind, such as employer-provided health insurance, Medicare, and food stamps; and

- It overctates income available for consumption by usin3 a pretax measure.

A lack of data on individual families precludes consideration of either in-kind income or taxes, but the analysis in this report adjusts for family size and uses a price index that is a better indicator of inflatioz. The resulting measure--termed "adjusted family income" (AFI)--indicated a 20 percent increase during the 16 -year period from 1970 through 1986, in contrast to a 4 percent drop in the unadjusted income measure (see Summary Figure 1). Nearly one-third of the difference was the result of the revised inflation indicator and over twe thirds stemmed from adjustments in family size.

Median AFI increased for each major family type, althougn some groups fared better than others. (Summary Figure 2 shows the distribution of families among major types in 1986.) Among the elderly, income rose by half, from about twice the poverty thresholds to over three times the poverty thresholds for those in families, and from just above the poverty level to more than one and one-half times th:
poverty thresholds for unrelated individuals. At the sther extreme, single mothers with children experienced only a slight growth in income: their median income rose and fell, but was just above the poverty thresholds over the period as a whole.

Although each major family type saw its AFI grow, families headed by people under age 25, and families with children and no fulltime, full-year workers had median AFIs that were between 10 percent and 20 percent lower in 1986 than the AFIs of their counterparts 16 years earlier. Furthermore, the uneven growth in AFI among income levels generally resulted in greater inequality in 1986 thar in 1970, particularly among families with children.

Summary Figure 1.
Median Family Income and Median Adjusted Family Income, Relative to i970 Values, All Families, 1970-1986


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987.
NOTE: Unrelated individuals are considered to be one-person families.

Using the AFI measure takes account of changes in prices and family composition but excludes the effects of taxes and noncash income. If incomes were measured net of income and payroll taxes, growth in income would probably appear to have been less during the 1970s, more rapid during the 1980s, and somewhat less oves the entire period than what is reported in this study. In contrast, including in-kind income, such as health insurance and food stamps, would probably make growth in income look somewhat greater for the 16 years, with the gains being concentrated in the first 10 years. The net effect of both omissions cannot be estimated.

Summary Figure 2. Distribution of Families by Family Type, 1986 (As a percentage of all families)


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of March 1987 Current Population Survey data

These income trends for groups of families imply nothing about changes in the incomes of individual families. Because families move among classifications over time, the families that make up a specific group in one yca" will generally not be the same families that make up that group in a later year. As a result, the aggregate findings cannot be used to infer what happened to the incomes of particular families.

## MEASURING FAMILY INCOME

Trends in family income are commonly tracked by looking at real median family cash income over time, but this approach has four significant shortcomings.
o Family Size. Because of changes in family size and composition, the trend in median family income is an inaccurate indicator of what has happened to family well-being. A better measure adjusts income to account for the fact that larger families need more resources in total but less per person than do smaller families.
o Inflation. Using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) to correct for inflation overstated the increase in living costs until the index was modified in 1983. Alternative indexes better reflect cost changes.

0 In-Kind Income. Only cash income is generally included in measures of well-being; income received in kind has been ignored. Yet, noncash benefits have accounted for a growing share of total income over the last two decades, and their omission overstates losses or understates gains in family income.

0 Taxes. Although after-tax income more accurately measures a family's purchasing power, pretax income is generally used as the indicator. Because income and payroll taxes rose as a share of income through the 1970 s before dipping slightly in more recent years, using pretax income misstates changes in family well-being.

This study deals with the first two of these problems by using adjusted family income. AFI equals family pretax cash income reported on the Current Population Survey (CPS), divided by the appropriate poverty threshold to adjust for family size and inflated with an alternative price index, the CPI-X1, to correct for price changes. Measuring income as a percentage of poverty thresholds takes account of variations in the resources needed for families of different sizes to achieve the same standard of living, while the CPI-X1 is a better indicator of changi-y diving costs than the CPI. Unfortunately, because of limitations in family-level data, it is not possible to correct for the last two problems.

## TRENDS IN FAMILY INCOME

In 1970, the median incomes of elderly unrelated individuals and single mothers with children were just above their adjusted poverty lines-that is, poverty lines inflated with the CPI-X1 rather than the CPI. At the other extreme, nonelderly childless families had a median income more than four times their adjusted poverty threshold (see Summary Figure 3). Median incomes of other family types clustered around two and one-half times their adjusted poverty levels.

By 1986, different rates of income growth had broadened the range: the median income of single mothers was still only slightly above their adjusted poverty lines, while that of elderly unrelated individuals had climbed about 50 percent to more than one and onehalf times their adjusted poverty thresholds and that of nonelderly childless families had grown about 20 percent to nearly five times their aujusted poverty levels. For the elderly, whose median AFI grew fastest, the upward trend was fairly steady throughout the 16year period (see Summary Figure 4). Other groups were more subject to economic tides that caused incomes to fall in recessions in the mid1970s and the early 1980s and rise during intervening upswings, including the current recovery that began in 1983.

Particular trends highlight these shifts in income during the 1570-1986 period:

## come Inequality

0 AFI fell sharply for low-income, single-mother families with children. While AFI rose at every income level for married couples with ciiildren and childless families, for low-income, single mothers with children it rose by one-sixth between 1970 and 1977 and then fell one-fourth over the next nine years, for an overall drop of 13 percent. As a result, in 1986, one-fifth of all families composed of a single mother and her children had less than half the income needed to live at the poverty level.

Summary Figure 3.
Trends in Median Adjusted Family Income, by Family Type, 1970-1986


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987
o Income growth sharply reduced poverty among the elderly. but the poverty rates of other groups experienced little change. The fraction of elderly unrelated individuals with incomes below the adjusted poverty line fell by more than half from 46 percent in 1970 to 20 percent in 1986, while that of elderly childless families was cut from 14 percent to 4 percent. In contrast, the adjusted poverty rate of single mothers with children fluctuated around 45 percent throughout the period.

Summary Figure 4.
Trends in Median Adjusted Family Income, Relative to 1970
Median Adjusted Family Income, Selected Family Types, 1970-1986


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987.

0 Income inequality increased for families with children and for nonelderly childless families over the entire 16-year period. Furthermore, for all major family types, inequality grew between 1979 and 1986. While high- and low- income families had roughly comparable gains in income during most of the 1970 s , the incomes of low-income families rose only slightly or fell between 1979 and 1986, while incomes of wealthier families rose sharply. The greater inequality was especially pronounced for single mothers with children.

## Age of Family Head

o Median AFI grew fastest for the elderly, but fell sharply for the youngest families. The median adjusted income of families headed by people age 65 and over grew by more than 50 percent. In contrast, the median adjusted income of families headed by people under age 25 dropped nearly 20 percent, with the entire decline coming since 1979.
o Young, low-income families with children suffered marked income losses between 1970 and 1986. As a result, two-fifths of all young families with children had incomes at or below half of the poverty level in 1986.
o Income inequality increased for all age groups except the elderly. Among the youngest families, for example, the 20th percentile AFI fell by more than one-third, compared with an 18 percent drop in the median AFI and a 5 percent dip in the 80 th percentile. On the other hand, adjusted incomes became slightly more equal among the elderly over the full 16-year period, but even for that group, inequality increased between 1980 and 1986.

## Employment

o Median AFI increased-by between 12 percent and 37 per-cent-for all family types with at least one full-time, fullyear worker. On the other hand, the median adjusted in-
comes of families with children and no such workers fell by more than 10 percent.

## Sources of Income

0 Private income other than earnings and non-means-tested transfers such as Social Security became more important as income sources for middle-income families, while earnings made up a smaller share of their total income. In contrast, income sources changed only slightly for low-income families as a group.

0 Means-tested transfers such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) became a greater income source for low-income families with children, while less of their income came from earnings. On the other hand, middleincome, single mothers with children received an increasing fraction of their income from earnings over the period.

0 Income of the elderly continued to be dominated by non-means-tested transfers, primarily Social Security. The share of these transfers rose slightly, earnings declined, and other private income increased among elderly family units with middle incomes.

## FACTORS AFFECTING FAMILY INCOME

Many factors affect family incorne, but four appear to have been particularly important in recent years. Macroeconomic conditions have perhaps the greatest influence, through the effects of the business cycle on earnings and property income and through the inverse relationship between transfer payments and economic conditions. Government policies directly affect transfer payments and indirectly influence other income sources through their impact on the general economy as well as on people's behavior. Demographic characteristics of the population help determine family income levels, in part through the effects on family composition and in part through the age distribution of workers. Finally, labor market behavior--specifically
the number of earners in each family-has a major impact on total family earnings.

Some specific factors were particularly important in determining income trends between 1970 and 1986:

## Macroeconomics

o Much of the fluctuation in adjusted family income resulted from macroeconomic conditions. The significant drops in median AFI in the mid-1970s and early 1980s correspond closely to periods of sharply rising unemployment. Overall, however, both income and the unemployment rate moved upward over the 16 -year period.

## Government Transfers

o Changes in government transfer policies strongly influenced income changes for affected groups. For example, much of the rapid growth in income for the elderly resulted from policies that increased Social Security payments.

## Demographics

o Demographic shifts in family composition caused the median income for all families to be lower than it would otherwise have been. Unrelated individuals under age 65 and single mothers with children became relatively more common over the 16 -year period. Their generally lower incomes pulled down the median income of all families, independent of the income changes of incividual types of families.
o Median family incomes were lower than they otherwise would have been because families were generally younger. As the baby-boom generation left their parents' homes, the avei age age of family heads declined. Median family incomes were depressed, both because incomes are lower at the
$2 i$
beginning of careers and because earnings were held down by the number of new workars entering the labor force.

## Employment

- Among nonelderly families, an increase in the average number of full-time, full-year workers appears to have been the principal reason that incomes rose. For example, the fraction of married couples with children that had two such workers climbed from 14 percent in 1970 to 26 percent in 1986. This rise offset the fact that earnings did not keep pace with inflation for some workers. At the same time, among low-income fannilies, the average number of workers did not increase, and they experienced less growth in income than other families.

In combination, these factors led to the trend of rising family incomes since 1970. While families as a whole were markedly better off in 1986 than they had been 16 years earlier, however, some types of families, particularly low-income, single mothers with children and families with heads under age 25, became worse off during the period. These income patterns resulted in greater inequality of incomes among families in 1986 than in 1970.

Trends in family income over the past two decades have been the topic of many discussions. A commonly expressed view is that $\mathbf{w}^{\text {h }}$ le family incomes rose rapidly and consistently in real terms from shortly after World War II until the early 1970s, little or no real growth has taken place since that time. This assertion is based on the trend in Bureau of the Census estimates of median farnily income, adjusted for inflation by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) (see Figure 1).1/ From this trend, some analysts have drawn pessimistic inferences about the lack of economic growth, the worsening of jobs, and the failure of government policies.

In fact, however, the basic conclusion about family incomes is misleading for a number of reasons. First, it does not account for differences in family size that have important effects on the adequacy of incomes. Second, the adjustment for inflation that was used overstates the actual erosion of the purchasing power of the dollar. Furthermore, the income mearure employed includes only cash income, and thus ignores the significant and rapidly growing part of full income that is in kind--such as food stamps or health insurance. Finally, the use of pretax income omits the changing effects of direct taxes. Lack of appropriate family-level data precludes correcting these last two shortcomings of the conventional measure of family income, but income can be adjusted to account fur family size and

[^1]inflation. Once those adjustments are made, a quite different conclusion about family income becomes apparent: median family income have continued to grow since 1970, albeit more slowly than in earlier years and at widely differing rates for different groups. At the same time, the group of families with children that is at the bottom of the income distribution is markedly worse off now than the corresponding group was 16 years earlier.

This paper analyzes what has happened to family incomes since 1970, comparing the experiences of different types of families. The adjusted family income measure used in the analysis corrects both for family size and for inflation, but does not take account of either in-kind $i$ come or taxes. While much of the discussion is descriptive, possible explanations for the observed trends in income are suggested.

Figure 1.
Trend in Real Median Family Income, 1947-1986


SOURCES: 8ureau of the Census, Money Income of Households, Families, and Persons in the United States: 1984, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 15! (April 1986), p. 29; Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the United States: 1986, Series P-60, No. 157 (July 1987), pp. 11 and 38

## ISSUES IN MEASURING FAMILY INCOME

Family income trends are most commonly tracked by looking at real median family cash income over time, but using this measure to assess income trends poses a number of problems. First, median family income is not the appropriate statistic to use in evaluating well-being when family size and composition have changed as they have over the last two decades. Other measures, specifically those that take into account the reduced needs of smaller families, are better for this purpose. Second, incomes have generally been adjusted or inflation with the CPI. Because technical flaws in this particular price index made it rise more rapidly than other indicators of inflation since 1970, its use makes the growth in real incomes look lower than it actually was.

Third, measures of well-being have included only cash income: income received in kind has been ignored. Yet, noncash benefits have provided a growing share of total income over the last two decades, and omitting them overstates losses or understates gains in family incomes. Finally, even though after-tax income more accurately measures a family's purchasing power, pretax income is generally used as th: indicator. Because of both "bracket creep" and rising payroll taxes, the share of income going for taxes rose between the mid-1960s and the early 1980s, before dipping slightly in more recent years. Thus, the well-being of most families rose less quickly than changes in the: r pretax incomes indicate for the bulk of this period, with the reverse occurring since 1981.

Unfortunately, appropria e family-level data on taxes and in-kind income do not exist for the entire period covered by this analysis. Therefore, as an income measure, this study uses family cash income before taxes, measured as a percentage of the relevant poverty threshold; this measure is termed adjusted family income (AFI). 2 To take account of price inflation, the analysis has indexed poverty thresholds since 1967 by using the CPI-X1 as an alternative to the Consumer

[^2]Price Index. Such thresholds are therefore referred to as "adjusted Foverty thresholds."

The trend in median adjusted family income for all families and unrelated individuals is quite different from the trend in the unadisted measure, as shown in Figure 2. While the median income of all units--inflated using the CPI and not adjusted for family size--declined by about 4 percent between 1970 and 1986, the median AFI grew by roughly 20 percent. In 1986, just under one-third of the difference stemmed from the revised inflation indicator--the CPI-X1--and more than two-thirds from adjustments for family size. Nearly all of the difference between the two trends occurred before 1981.

Figure 2.
Median Family Income Using Alternative Adjustments for Price Change and Family Size, 1970-1986


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 19711987

## Adjustments for Family Size

Median income-the income of the middle family or individual in a ranking by income of all families or individuals--is usually preferred over mean-or average--income as an indicator of family well-being because it gives less weight to very large or very small incomes. In general, mean income is significantly higher than median income. Both measures fail, however, to take account of differences in family needs arising from differences in family size. This failure matters both when one compares groups with differing family size and when one looks at income over time for groups with changing family size.

Analysts can use two basic approaches to adjust incomes to take account of differing family needs. First, incomes can be measured on a per- capita rather then a family basis. This approach will remove all differences based on family size, including the economies of scale that come from people living together and sharing living costs. In particular, using per-capita income to adjust for differences in needs assumes implicitly that it costs twice as much for two people living together to maintain the same level of well-being as for one person living alone. Because economies of scale exist, this approach understates the well-being of larger families relative to that of smaller families, thus overcompensating for differences in family size.

The second approach uses an equivalence scale to make incomes comparable for families of different sizes. The purpose of such an equivalence scale is to take account directly of the differing needs of families of different sizes; while needs rise with family size, the increase in needs caused by an additional member is less for larger families than for smaller ones. Aithough analysts disagree over which equivalence scale should be used for this purpose, one readily available candidate is that scale implicit in the official federal poverty thresholds. This scale assumes, for example, that a family of four needs about twice as much income as a single person to maintain an equivalent standard of living (see Table 1).

Although the scale implicit in the poverty thresholds may not be an accurate inducator of the disparate needs of families of different sizes, it probably yields a better assessment of relative well-being than either unadjusted or per-capita measures. Figure 3 compares the three approaches, using median family incomes for 1984. The analy-
sis in this paper adjusts incomes for differences in family size by dividing cash incomes by the appropriate poverty thresholds, and thus uses the needs equivalence scale implicit in those thresholds to define adjusted family incomes.

## Adjustments for Inflation

To assess economic well-being, two adjustments for inflar on are required: first, incomes from different years need to be made comparable by evaluating them in dollars with the same purchasing power; cacond, the equivalence scale used to adjust for family size dif-ferences-poverty thresholds, in this analysis--has to be updated to take account of increases in living costs. In both cases, the adjustment for inflation is generally made using the CPI, an index of the cost of a market basket of goods and services representing the average

TABLE 1. FAMILY SIZE EQUIVALENCE SCALES IMPLICIT IN OFFICIAL POVERTY THRESHOLDS

| Family <br> Size <br> (Persons) | Equivalence <br> Value <br> (One Person = 1) | Increase From <br> Next Smaller <br> Family Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| 1 | 1.00 | -- |
| 2 | 1.28 | 0.28 |
| 3 | 1.57 | 0.29 |
| 4 | 2.01 | 0.44 |
| 5 | 2.38 | 0.37 |
| $i$ | 2.69 | 0.31 |
| 7 | 3.05 | 0.36 |
| 8 | 3.38 | 0.34 |
| 9 or more | 4.04 | 0.65 |

SOURCE: Derived from Bureau of the Censun, Moncy Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the Unuted States: 1985 (Adva). Data From the March 1986 Current Population Surocy), Current Population Repc.ta, Series P-60, No. 154 (Augurt 1986), p. 33.

Figure 3.
Median Family Income by Family Size Using Alternative
Adjustments for Family Size, 1984


SOLRCE: Bureau of the Census, Money Income of Households, Families, and Persons in the United States: 1984, Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 151 (April 1986), pp. 26 and 35.
consumption of the urban population.3/ To the extent that the CPI accurately meaqures changes in living costs, inflating poverty thresholds or past-year incomes with the CPI is appropriate.

Unfortunately, through 1982, the CDI measured housing costs in a way that led to excessive growth in the index during the late 1970 s when interest rates increased rapidly. In particular, the housing
3. Before 1969, poverty threaholde were adjusted using the CPI for food items only. Since that time, the CPI for all itoma has been used.

The market basket used in calculatiag the CPI, defined on the basis of Consumer Expenditure Survey data on consumption patterns, has until recently been held constant for extended periods, with updating taking plece only about once each decade. Because it does not account for changes in consumption patterns between updaten, the CPI--like all fired-weight price indices-mismeasures changen in the cost of living.
component of the CPI gave inordinate weight to the costs of newly purchased houses, including both the purchase price and mortgage interest rates, as well as property taxes, insurance, and maintenance costs. This approach picked up both the flow of services and the investment aspects of homeownership, but only the former is appropriate in an index measuring consumption costs. Because of the large weight assigned to homeownership costs, many analysts think that the CPI overstated the true rise in living costs in the late 1970s. Using it to adjust poverty thresholds or incomes for inflation has consequently made families appear to be worse off than they really are.

In 1983, the Bureau of Labor Statistics began using a revised method to calculate the CPI, known in experimental analyses and referred to as CPI-X1. This revised method uses estimates of the cost of renting equivalent housing to measure homeownership costs. This rental equivalence" approach incorporates only the consumption aspects of owning a home, not the investment aspects, and consequently is less affected by changes in housing prices and mortgage rates. In addition, the relative importance of homeowner-ship costs in the CPI-X1 is only about half of that in the CPI. Estimates have been made of the values this revised index would have taken, had it been in place since 1967; these values provide an alternative price index for adjusting both poverty thresholds and incomes for inflation. $4 / \mathrm{Be}-$ tween 1967 and 1985, the CPI rose roughly 10 percent faster than the CPI-X1.5/

Because of the greater accuracy of the CPI-X1, this study uses it to adjust both incomes and poverty thresholds for the effects of inflation, though other price indices might have been used to make inflation adjustments. For example, some analysts have chosen the Personal Consumption Expenditure (PCE) implicit price deflator from the National Income and Product Accounts, a price index based on the cur-rent-year consumption patterns of all Americans. $6 /$ Others prefer the
4. See John C. Weicher, "Mismeasuring Poverty and Progress," American Enterprise Institute, unpublished manuscript, revised April 15, 1986.
5. Note that this divergence of the two price irdices occurred entirely between 1967 and 1983. Since that time, the official CPI has followed the CPI-X1, because both have been calculated using the same methodology.
6. See, for example, Social Security Administration, Office of Research, Statistics, and International Policy, "Changes in the Money Income of the Aged and Nonaged, 1967-1983," Studres in Income Distribution, no. 14 (September 1986).
gross national product (GNP) deflator, which uses the composition of ail produced goods and services to weight individual prices into an index. Because it is based on the prices of both consumption and nonconsumption goods, however, the GNP deflator is not appropriate for indexing family incomes. Figure 4 shows how these indices and the CPI-X1 have varied relative to the official CPI since 1967. Over the 19-year period, the PCE deflator and the CPI-X1 were quite similar, while the GNP deflator rose more and experienced wider swings.7/

A final note is in order with regard to poverty thresholds and inflation adjustments. Any set of poverty thresholds is arbitrary in that it is implicitly based on a particular concept of what constitutes a minimally adequate income. Reasonable people differ in how they define poverty, and definitions change over time to reflect what poverty is perceived to be. As a result, for any single year, it is relatively arbitrary what thresholds are used or how they are derived from the previous year's thresholds; thresholds simply define what poverty is.8/ How one year's ihresholds relate to those of other years is important, however, when making comparisons over time; if such comparisons are to have any meaning, they must be based on thresholds that represent the same concept of poverty. Thus, while adjustments of poverty thresholds for inflation matter relatively little for any given year, they are crucially important for temporal comparisons. $9 /$

## Noncash Income

A family's well-being is determined not only by its cash income, but also by any noncash income it receives. Yet, analyses of how families have fared over time generally ignore noncash benefits, both those received from employers in the form of fringe benefits and those pro-
7. Adjusted family incomes roported in this study would be about 1 percent lower in 1986 if the PCE deflator were used to index incomes, and about 6 percent lower if the GNP deflator were used.
8. The relationships between poverty thresholds for different types of families are, however, important for single-yoar comparisons. The central issuo is difforences in living costa for different family typea, arising from variations in size, composition, and prices paid for consumption goods. The threabolds currently used account only for differences in family size, number of children, and--for one-person and two-person families only--whether the family head is under age 65.
9. Of course, what poverty thresholds are used has obvious effects on the poverty rate, but this again simply reflecta the arbitrary nature of the threaholds.
vided through social welfare transfer programs. As a result, such analyses understate how well off families are. Also, because in-kind income has grown as a share of personal income, omitting it from income comparisons over time means that the understatement becomes progressively greater, the longer the period of observation. As shown in Figure 5, in-kind income--employer-provided benefits and government transfers-increased from 11 percent of personal income in 1970 to about 18 percent in 1984.

Unfortunately, it is not possible to include noncash benefits in income distribution calculations because the necessary family-level data do not now exist. While information is available about the aggregate amounts of employer-provided fringe benefits, no large-scale data sets allocate such benefits among individ":als. As part of its Current

Figure 4.
Comparison of Alternative Price Deflators Relative to the Consumer Price Index, 1967-1986


SOURCES: Derived from dita in the Economic Report of the President (U.S Government Printing Office, January 1987), pp. 251 and 307, and John C. Weicher "Mismeasuring Poverty and Progress," the American Enterprise Institute. unpublished manuscript (April 1986).

Figure 5.
Noncash Benefits as a Percentage of Personal Income, 1970-1985


Population Survey (CPS), the Bureau of the Census has been sollecting information about receipt of in-kind transfers from the govern-ment--such as Medicaid, Medicare, food stamps, and housing assis-tance--but only since 1980. While these benefits could be included in total income estimates, the omission of most noncash income from private businesses would skew the income distribution toward lowincome families, thus giving an inaccurate picture of the well-being of families across the income scale and over time. Consequently, this analysis omits all in-kind income from its dollar-value estimates.10/ Thus, it is important to keep in mind that this omission understates family well-being for any given period and that trends in family incomes probably appear worse than they actually are.

[^3]
## Taxes

While analyses of trends in family well-being are generally based on income before taxes, after-tax income would provide a better measure of the resources available to families to meet their needs. Both income and payroll tazes reduce disposable income; using pretax income therefore overstates how well off families are.11/ In terms of examining trends over time, this factor would not matter if taxes remained a fixed fraction of income. Between 1970 and 1986, however, the Social Security tax rates increased by nearly half, and the maximum amount of earnings subject to the tax roughly doubled in real terms. Over the same period, the percentage of income paid in federal income taxes fluctuated between 13 percent and nearly 17 percent with a generally upward trend until the 1981 tax reduction. At least until recent years, ignoring taxes would thus have caused trends in family income to look better than they have actually been.

Again, the lack of appropriate family-level data makes this problem difficult to solve. Only since 1980 has the Buraau of the Census provided annual estimates of income and payroi' taxes paid by families in their CPS files. To account for taxes before that time would require developing tax simulation programs that would be of limited use. Therefore, the following analyses are based on pretax incomes; as a result, the growth in family well-being throughout the 1970s is overstated, while the growth in more recent years is understated.

[^4]
## CHAPTER II

FAMILY INCOME IN 1986

The median income of all families in 1986--adjusted for inflation using the CPI-X1-was just over three times the adjusted poverty threshold, the highest level attained since detailed income data became available in the late 1960s. 1 / This aggregate figure, however, masks a wide variation in incomes among family types and age groups, and it gives no indication of the distribution of income among families. While most families had incomes that were well above adjusted poverty levels, the majority of single mothers with children were either below or just above the adjusted poverty line; if they were under age 35, they were more likely than not to be poor. At the other extreme, the median income of middle-aged families without children was more than five times the adjusted poverty threshold.

Because looking only at the population as a whole can generate misleading conclusions, much of the following analysis examines individual types of families. It discusses five basic family types-incorporating both families and unrelated individuals as shown in Figure 6. These family types are defined as follows: $\mathbf{I}^{/ /}$

1. Two "adjusted" measurea aro used in this analysis:

0 Adiustod poverty thrasholds are identical to the official poverty thresholds except that they are adjusted for inflation since 1967 using the CPI-XI rather than the CPI; and

0 Adjusted family income is cash family income before taxes, measured as a percentage of the appropriate adjusted poverty threahold.

See Chapter I for further discuasion.
2. While these family unita are generally reforred to in this paper as "famılies," not all of them are families under the definitions used by the Bureau of the Census. In partıcular, unrelated individuale-people not living with any relatives-are included as two of the family types. On the other hand, the Census Bureau counts as families only groups of two or more related people living together.

Figure 6.
Distribution of Families by Family Type, 1986 (As a percentage of all families)


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of March 1987 Current Population Survey data

Families with Children: families composed of two or more related people living together, at least one of whom is under age 18 and not married ( 34.3 million families in March 1987);
o Nonelderly Childless Families: families composed of two or more related people living together, in which neither the family head nor the spouse of the family head is age 65 or over, and there are no children under age 18 ( 20.7 million families);

- Nonelderly Unrelated Individuals: people over age 17 and under age 65 who are not living with relatives ( 22.4 million families);
o Elde:ly Childless Families: families composed of two or more related people living together, in which either the family head or the spouse of the family head is at least 65 years old, and there are no children under age 18 ( 10.1 million families); and

Elderly Unrelated Individuals• people age 65 and over who are not living with relatives ( 9.2 million families).

In addition, for some specific analyses, families with children are separated into three subgroups:3/

0 Married Couples with Children: families composed of a married couple living only with their own children, at least one of whom is under age 18, or related children under age 18 , or both ( 24.4 million families);
o Single Mothers with Children: families composed of unmarried mothers (inciuding those never married, widowed, divorced, or separated) living only with their own children,

[^5]at lesst one of whom is under age 18 , or related children under age 18, or both ( 6.9 million families); and

Other Families with Children: all other families with at least one member under age 18 ( 3.0 million families).

Finally, at times, all family types are combined into a single group:
o All Families: all families or unrelated individuals. This category combines all of the family types listed above. It differs from the Bureau of the Census definition of families in that it includes unrelated individuals as families with just one member ( 96.6 million families).

## INCOME BY FAMILY TYPE

Adjusted family incomes in 1986 varied widely by family composition. Single mothers with children and elderly people not living with relatives were worst off, while nonelderly families without children had the highest incomes relative to adjusted poverty thresholds.

## Median Family Income

Median incomes in 1986 varied from only slightly above the adjusted poverty level for single mothers with children to nearly five times the adjusted poverty threshclds for nonelderly childless families (see Figure 7). All families with children and nonelderly unrelated individuals were near the middle of this range, with median incomes just under three times their respective adjusted poverty thresholds. Families with children, however, showed wide divergence in median income levels; married-couple families were at more than three times adjusted poverty, compared with only about 15 percent above adjusted poverty for single mothers. The elderly in families had significantly higher incomes than their counterparts not living with relatives: the median income of elderly childless families was more than three times the adjusted poverty level, while that of elderly unrelated individuals was only about one and one-half times the adjusted poverty level.

Figure 7.
Median Adjusted Family Income by Family Type, 1986



[^6]This inequality in incomes among family types was further evidenced by the fact that 46 percent of single mothers with children were below adjusted poverty in 1986, compared with just 7 percent of married couples with children and 4 percent of both elderly and nonelderly childless fa nilies. Unrelated individuals also had high poverty rates: 18 percent of those under age 65 and 20 percent of their elderly counterparts had incomes below the adjusted poverty line.4/

## Distribution of Incomes within Family Types

The distribution of incomes within family types also varied markedly. $5 /$ Incomes among married couples with children, for example, were more equally distributed than incomes imong single mothers with children. For married couples, incomes clustered fairly tightly around their median, while single mothers were more likely to have incomes significantly lower or higher than their median. Similarly, among nonelderly family units, the incomes of unrelated individuals were more unequal than those of childless families. The reverse was true for elderly units: the incomes of unrelated individuals were highly concentrated near their median, while those of elderly families showed greater dispersion.

## INCOME BY AGE OF FAMILY HEAD

iamily incomes as a percentage of poverty in 1986 rose with the age of the family head through middle age before declining when family heads were in their late fifties or older. Among all families, median income was lowest-less than twice the poverty level--for those with heads under age 25 (see Figure 8). The median then rose to a peak of nearly four times poverty for families whose heads were between 35 and 54, and declined to under two and one-half times poverty for fami-
4. See Appendix C for additional data on poverty rates.
5. Figures depictıng the 1986 income distributions for the various family types are precented in Appendix E.

Figure 8.
Median Adjusted Family Income by Age of Family Head,1986


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of data from the March 1987 Current Population Survey
lies with elderly heads. Similar variation occurred within each of the individual family types. $\mathbf{6 /}$

## FAMILY INCOME bY NUMBER OF WORKERS

The number of workers in a family during a given year depends on how working is defined over a 12 -month period. Because this study concerns family incomes, it considers workers with limited job attachments-and, therefore, limited total earnings--as less important to its purposes. As a result, the analyfis focuses on full-time, full-year workers-those people who reported that they normally worked at
6. If all childlem families are conaidered, thow with elderly heada have median incomes below those with heads in any othe1 age group. The same is true for all unrelated individuals. Appendix Tables A-18 and A-19 provide data on median family incomes by age of family head and family type.
least 35 hours each week and that they were employed at least 50 weeks during the year. Alternative definitions count more people as workers, but there is little difference among these definitions in terms of changes over time in either the average number of workers per family or family incomes by number of workers.7/

Not surprisingly, family incomes in 1986 increased as families had more nembers working, although not proportionately. The median income for families with no full-time, full-year workers was somewhat less than twice the poverty level, while families with one such worker had a median income of nearly four times poverty, more than twice as great (see Figure 9). Doubling the number of workers-by adding a second one-raised the median to just over five times poverty, a gain of about 40 percent relative to one-worker families. The smaller income gain as a result of the second worker may derive from the fact that families with more workers are likely to be larger, so their higher incomes are diluted by increased family size.

The number of workers in a family was closely associated with the family's position in the income distribution. Nearly 85 percent of families in the bottom income quintile had no full-time, full-year workers (see Figure 10). By contrast, nearly two-thirds of families in the middle three income quintiles had at least one full-time, full-year worker. Among families at the top of the income distribution, about half had one full-time, full-year worker, and over one-third had at least two.

Median incomes within individual family types also tended to rise with the number of workers, although the major differences discussed earlier in income levels among family types remained. Moreover, families with children needed more workers to reach a given income level: married couples with two full-time workers had a median income roughly equal to that of childless families with just one worker, while the median income of single-mother families with one worker

[^7]Figure 9.
Median Adjusted Family Income by Number of Family Members Working Full-Time, Fu!l-Year, 1986

was less than that of childless familits with no workers.8/ Despite these diffrences arong family types, having a single full-time, fullyear $w^{-} \quad$ increas $t i t$ the meaian family income by at least one and one-ha s the poyerty threshold for every type of family.

## SOURCES OF INCOMÉ

Because rnacroeconomic conditions and public policies can have varying effects on incomes of different kinds, it is useful to know what fractions of families' incomes come from various sources. While most families receive the largest share of their income from wages and salaries, significant fractions also come from government transfer payments and investments. This section examines the distribution in
8. Soe Appendix Tatles A-16 and A-17 for median incomes by number of workers and family type.

1986 of family income among five major sources to determine the degree to which each contributed to family resources.

The five income sources examined were:

- Earnings of the primary worker ("Primary Earnings"): income from wages and salaries and self-employment for that family member with the greatest such income.
- Earnings of other family members ("Other Earnings"): income from wages and salaries and self-employment for all family members other than the primary worker.

Figure 10.
Distribution of Families by Number of Members Working Full-Time, Full-Year, by Income Level, 1986


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of data from the March 1987 Current Population Survey.

0 Private income not from employment ("Other Private Income"): rent, interest, and dividend income; private and government pensions and annuities; alimony and child support payments; and any other income received from private sources.

0 Non-means-tested government transfers: government transfer payments that are not conditioned on recipients having low incomes. Major sources include Social Security, Unemployment insurance, and Worker's Compensation.

0 Means-tested government transfers: government transfer payments that are provided on the basis of recipients having incomes below specified limits. Major sources include Supplemental Security Income (SSI), Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC), and general assistance.

Incomes reported on the Current Population Survey are reported only as "more than" specified limits when they exceed those limits-often referred to as "top-coding." Consequently, it was not possible to obtain accurate estimates of the distribution of incomes by source for families with high incomes, a.선 thus for the population as a whole. 9 / This analysis taerefore reports income sources only for two groups, the bottom 20 percent of the income distribution and the middle 60 per-cent-that is, the bottom quintile and the middle three quintiles.

Earnings, mostly from the primary earner, provided the largest single share of family income for families in each income grouping: 47 percent for those in the bottom quintile and 79 percent for those in th: middle three quintiles (see Figure 11). Low-income families were much more reliant on transfer income than were middle-income families, receiving one-fourth of their income from non-means-tested sources such as Social Security and one-sixth from welfare, compared with one-twelfth and a negligible share, respectively, for middle- income families. Other private income accounted for about 12 percent of the income of each group.

[^8]Figure 11.
Distribution of Family Income by Source, by Family Income Level, 1986 (As a percentage of total family income)

Families in Bottom Quintile of Income Distribution


Families in Middle Three Quintiles of Income Distribution a/


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabuiations of data from the March 1987 Current Population Survey.
a Means-tested transfers made up less than 05 percent

TABLE 2. DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY INCOME BY SOURCE, BY FAMILY TYPE AND INCOME LEVEL, 1986 (In percents)


Families in Middle Threes Guintiles of Income Distribution


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of data from the March 1987 Current Population Survey.

NOTE: Percentages may not sum to 100 because of rounding.
a. This category includes families composed of children living with their single fathers, children living with their parents and other people besides their siblings, and children not living with their parents. Data for such families are not shown separately, however.
b. Unite in which the head (and the head's spouse, if any) is under age 65.
c. Unite in which the head (or the spouse of the inead, if any) is age 65 or over.
d. Leas than 0.5 percent.

Different types of families relied on different sources of income in 1986 (see Table 2 on preceding page). For the elderly, non-meanstested transfers were the dominant income source, particularly in the bottom quintile, with nonemployment private income providing most of the remainder; welfare was important only for low-income varelated individuals. Single-mother families were much more reliant on welfare, especially those with low incomes who received nearly two-thirds of their income from that source. All other groups got at least half of their incomes from earnings, with substantial contributions by secondary workers; middle-income married-couple and childless families received over one-fifth of their income from such workers, while those with low incomes received at least one-tenth.

## INCOME TRENDS: 1970-1986

Between 1970 and 1986, median adjusted incomes of all major family types increased, albeit more slowly than during the previous two decades and at different rates for different types of families.1/ After adjustments for inflation and family size changes, median adjusted family incomes (AFI) rose by half for elderly families and individuals, compared with 14 percent ier all families with children and just 2 percent for single mothers with children.2 At the same time, among families with children, those with the lowest incomes became worse off over the 16 years: the AFI of the family at the 20th percentile w $\varepsilon, 12$ percent lower in 1986 than in 1970.3/

## INCOME TRENDS BY FAMILY TYPE

Between 1970 and 1986, median AFI increased for each of the different family types, albeit with some ups and downs in the intervening years. Overall, the median income of all family units rose from about two and one-half times adjusted poverty in 1970 to more than three times adjusted poverty in 1986, an increase of 20 percent. At the same time, however, there were wide variations in both income levels and growth rates among family types.

[^9]
## Median Adjusted Family Income

In 1970, the median incomes of elderly unrelated individuals and single mothers with children were just above the adjusted poverty line, compared with over four times the adjusted poverty threshold for nonelderly childless families. Incomes of other family types clustered around two and one-half times adjusted poverty. By 1986, the range had broadened: the median income of single $n$ ithers was still only slightly above adjusted poverty, while that of elderly unrelated individuals had grown to over one and one-half times the adjusted poverty level, and that of nonelderly childless families had increased to nearly five times adjusted poverty (see Figure 12). Growth of median AFI was greatest for the elderly--up 50 percent--and least for singlemotrer families with children--up just 2 percent o jer the 16 -year period (see Figure 13).

Among elderly families, the upward trend in median AFI was fairly steady with only a few seemingly random downturns, while other families experienced much greater income variation over the 16 years. For the latter, incomes rose until 1973 before falling moderately through the 1975 recession. In the late 1970s, incomes gained steadily. But from 1980 through 1982 they dropped--and quite sharply for some groups. Since 1982, all but one of the groups experienced consistent increases in median AFI; the exception was single mothers with children for whom a decline in income between 1985 and 1986 erased most of the small gains they had made since 1970.

The wide differences in growth of AFI across family types is reflected in the marked drop in poverty rates among the elderly compared with the virtually constant rates for families with children (see Figure 14).4/ Between 1970 and 1986, the adjusted poverty rate for elderly units was cut by more than half--from 46 percent to 20 percent for unrelated individuals and from 14 percent to 4 percent for childless families. By comparison, 46 percent of single mothers with children and 7 percent of married couples with children were poor in 1986, both rates virtually unchanged from 16 years earlier.

[^10]Figure 12.
Median Adjusted Family Income by Family Type, 1970-1986



SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987.

Figure 13.
Median Adjusted Family Income, Relative to 1970 Value, by Family Type, 1970-1986


[^11]In interpreting these income trends, keep in mind that changes in AFI for groups of families imply nothing about changes in the AFI of individual families. Over time, families alter their composition, move among classifications as their demographic characteristics change, and move up and down throughout the income distribution. As a result, no firm conclusions about changes in the incomes of the particular families in a group can be drawn from the aggregate findings. For example, the median AFI of families with childien increased 14 percent between 1970 and 1986. On the one hand, the adjusted incomes of some families might have risen 50 percent, while other families' incomes fell. On the other hand, it ir , ossible that the ATI of every family that had children in 1970 rose more than 14 percent during the period. Many of those families would no longer contain children in 1986-and thus would not affect the group's 1986 median in-

Figure 14.
Adjusted Poverty Rates by Family Type, 1970-1986


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987
come--while new families with children and lower incomes would pull the median downward.

## Distribution of Income within Family Types

Income growth between 1970 and 1986 also varied widely among income levels, leading to greater income inequality for all family types as a group, for families with children, and for nonelderly childless families, while reducing inequality of incomes for other family types. Figure 15 shows the growth since 1970 of median AFI anu of the adjusted income level。 that define each income quintile, defined separately for each family type. 5 /

For all families and unrelated individuals considered as a single group, the adjusted incomes $d$ ning each quintile grew at roughly the same pace from 1970 th. agh 1978. After that time, however, growth rates diverged shargly, with those at the top of the income distribution experiencing greater income gains than those a. the bottom. Over the entire 16 -year period, the 80 th percentile adjusted income rose 29 percent, compared with only a 9 percent gain for the 20th rercentile income. This divergence reflected a videning of the gap between high- and low-income families.

A similar pattern of increasing income inequality occurred for families with children--who experienced the greatest divergence among adjusted income levels (see Figure 13). Except among lowincome families, the incomes of families with children tracked reasonably closely through the 1970 s-climbing roughly 15 percent by 1979--before experiencing different growth rates in more recent years. In contrast, the 20th percentile income barely grew between 1970 and

[^12]Figure 15.
Percentiles of Adjusted Family Income, Relative to 1970 Value, by Family Type, 1970-1986 ( $1970=10 \mathrm{C}$ )


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of data from the Current Population Survey, 1971-1987

1979, and then. il sharply during the 1980s. Over the entire period, the 80th percentile income increased 27 percent, compared with a 12 percent drop in the 20th percentile income.

Figure 16.
Percentiles of Adjusted Family Income, Relative to 1970 Value, by Type of Family With Children, 1970-1986 (1970 = 100)


These income trends for all families with children reflect both the trends of specific types of families with children and the changing distribution of families among the different types within this group. The adjusted incomes of both married couples and single mothers with children grew at roughly the same rates through the 1970 s before showing consistent divergences begirning in $\mathbf{1 9 7 9}$. While this meant that the gaps between those with high incomes and those with low became wider, neither subgroup experienced as great a widening as the aggregate group. Between 1970 and 1986, the ratio of the 80th percentile income to the 20th percentile income rose 22 percent for married couples and 33 percent for single mothers, compared with the 44 percent increase for all families with children.

This apparent contradiction--that inequality within the aggregate family type increased more than within any subgroup-was the result of the gr wing proportion of single-mother families (who tend to have lower in umes) within the group of all families with children. Because over half of all single-mother families had adjusted incomes below the 20th percentile income for all families in 1986, the simple fact that their numbers increased led to a greater disparity among adjusted family incomes.

The divergence of adjusted incomes was smaller but still pronounced among nonelderly childless families. AFIs at all levels grew by about 15 percent between 1970 and 1978, after which the lower percentile incomes fell, while the higher ones continued to rise. Over the full 16 years, the 80th percentile income grew by 27 percent, but the 20th percentile income increasel only 12 percent, again expanding the gap between low- and high-income families.

Among other family types, either no change or some lessening of inequality took place. The AFIs of elderly childless families became more equal between 1970 and 1975, as the 20th percentile income increased 27 percent, while the 80th percentile income rose only 11 percent. For the next 11 years, however, adjusted incomes at different levels grew at roughly the same rate, and little further change in income differentials occurred for this group.

Elderly unrelated individuals experienced a similar reduction in inequality between 1970 and 1975, but those changes were erased by 1986. Over the first period, low AFIs grew more than 30 percent while
high incomes increased half as fast. Between 1975 and 1986, howevar, the sit :ation reversed: high incomes rose an additional 34 percent and lc incomes only 12 percent.

This pattern of increasing equality followed by reversal also occurred for unrelated individuals under age 65, although the periods were different. In the early 1970s, high and low AFIs moved erratically with little change in their relative levels. Between 1972 and 1979, however, the 20th percentile income grew by 28 percent while the 80 th percentile income rose only 8 percent. The higher incomes then continued to increase, climbing an additional 13 percent by 1986, while low incomes retreated slightly. Thus, almost no net change took place in income inequality over the 16 years.

Comparisons of the 1970 and 1986 income distributions for individual family types show the cumulative effects of these various changes in AFI. The greatest shift occurred for single mothers with children whose adjusted incomes became sharply less equal over the 16-year period; a much larger share of these families had incomes either below three-fourths of their median or above twice their median in 1986 than in 1970.6/ Similar but less pronounced increases in inequality affecte $\dot{A}$ married couples with children and nonelderly childless families. In contrast, other family types showed little change in income inequality.

## INCOME TRENDS BY AGE OF FAMILY HEAD

Growth of AFI varied widely among families with heads of different ages between 1970 and 1986. Families headed by people age 65 and orer experienced the greatest income gains--their median AFI rose 54 percent-while young families with heads under age 25 saw their median AFI fall 18 percent (Figure 17 shows the trends in absolute AFI levels, wh:le Figure 18 depicts the growth in AFI over time).7/
6. Figures comparing the 1970 and 1986 income distributions for each family type are presented in Appendia E.
7. These changes in income lovela for the various age groups do not udicate anything about changea in the incomes of particular families, because families shit age groups over time. For oxamplo, if it did not change otherwise, a family whone head was in the 25 through 34 age group in 1970 would be clamified in the 35 through 64 age group in 1986.

Figure 17.
Mediar: Adjusied Family Income by Age of Family Head, 1970-1986


SOURCE: Congressional Eudget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987

Income growth for elderly families was consistent throughout the period, but that of the youngest group was erratic, rising and fa:ling through 1979 before dropping 20 percent over the succeeding four years. The I dian adjusted family income increased 14 percent for those betwet. 55 and 64 and 28 percent for those in the 35 through 54 age range. 8 , For each of these groups, income gains occurred almost entirely during the 1970s, with smaller gains or even losses in more recent years.

The widening gap between high- and low-income families observed above for all families also occurred within each of the age

[^13]Figure 18.
Median Adjusted Family Income, Relative to 1970 Level, by Age of Family Head, 1970-1986


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office :abulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987.
groups except the elderly, and the degree to which the gaps expanded was inversely related to age. $\underline{/}$ Among families with heads under age 25, adjusted incomes fell at all levels between 1970 and 1986, but dropped most for those who were poorest: the 20th percentile income declined 34 percent, compared with an 18 percent drop in the median income and only a 5 percent fall in tine 80 th percentile.10/ On the other hand, adjusted incomes of the elderly, which increased by more than those of any other group, became slightly more equal o:er the 16year period, as the 20th percentile income climbed 48 percent while the 80 th percentile rose 41 percent. Nevertheless, even among the elderly, income inequality increased between 1980 and 1986.
5. See Appendis Tables A. 9 and A-10 for data on income trends by age of family head and by income percentiles.
10. This pattern varied among family types. Ainong unrelated individuals under age 25, whose incomes rose during the 16 -year period, AFI grew fastest for those with lower incomes, while among families with children, the reverse was the case. See Apperdir Tables A-18 and A.19.

## INCOME TRENDS BY NUMBER OF WORKERS

Between 1970 and 1986, the median adjusted incomes of families with at least one full-time, full-year worker grew for every family type, with increases ranging from 12 percent to 37 percent.11/ At the same time, for families with no workers, median AFI rose by even more for the elderly-more than 50 percent. It increased by less than 10 percent, however, for the nonelderly without children and fell by 11 percent for married couples with children and by 18 percent for single mothers with children.

Gains in adjusted family income between 1970 and 1986 were roughly the same for families with one full-time, full-year worker as for those with two. Median adjusted incomes of both married couples with children and nonelderly childless families rose roughly 20 percent over the 16 years, for families with either one or two workers. By contrast, AFI gains for elderly families with no workers were greater than those for those with at least one worker, but the reverse was true for the nonelderly.

## TRENDS IN SOURCES OF INCOME

For all families considered as a single group, the distribution of family incomes by source changed between 1970 and 1986 for families in the middle three income quintiles but stayed relatively constant for those in the bottom quintile (see Figure 19). $12 /$ For middle-income families, earnings became less important, while other private income and non-means-tested transfers accounted for a growing share of income. On the other hand, low-income families experienced some year-to-year variation, but only small changes in their sources of income over the 16 year period. At the same time, individual family types experienced significant changes at both income levels.

[^14]Figure 19.
Distribution of Family Income by Source, by Income Level, 1970-1986




Among families witin children, earnings as a share of income dropped for those in the bottom quintile, stayed constant for middleincome married couples, and grew markedly for middle-income single mothers (see Figure 20). Among low-income families, primary earnings for both married couples and single mothers fell, but some of the drop for married couples was made up by a rise in the earnings of other family members. Of greater importance was an increase in welfare in-come-especially among single mothers--and the growth in the share of families with children headed by single mothers. Among middleincome families, an increase in secondary earnings offset a decline in primary earnings for married couples, while single mothers received markedly larger shares of income from earnings--up from 53 percent to 66 percent-with the gain replacing mostly transfer income.

Among the nonelderly, childless families received significantly less from earnings and more from other private income in 1986 than they had in 1970 (see Figure 21). Middle-income families, which received 93 percent of their income from earnings in 1970, saw that share drop to 88 percent by the end of the 16 -year period, while the earnings share of income for low-income families fell from 78 percent to 68 percent. Unrelated individuals in the bottom quintile had slight gains in earnings and other private incom; sources balancing small declines in transfer incomes, while those in the middle three quintiles had virtually no changes.

Incomes of the elderly continued to be dominated by non-meanstested transfers, primarily Social Security, which grew slightly in importance over the 16 -year period (see Figure 22). The earnings of middle-income families, the only elderly group for whom earnings were significant, declined from one-third to one-fifth of total income, replaced by a sharp rise in other private income. Low-income elderly families and unrelated individuals in both income categories showed little change in their income from other private sources. The share of income from welfare fell for all elderly groups; by 1986, only lowincome unrelated elderly people received more than 5 percent of their income from that source.

Figure 20.
Distribution of Family Income by Source, by Income Level, Married Couples and Single Mothers With Children, 1970-1986 (As a percentage of total family income)

Married Couples With Children


Single Mothers With Children

$\boldsymbol{x}$ Means-Tested Transfers

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Populat'on Survey data, 1971-1987

Figure 21.
Distribution of Family Income by Source, by Income Level, Nonelderly Childless Families and Unrelated Individuals, 1970-1386 (As a percentage of total family income)

Nonelderly Childless Families


SOURCE: Congressiona: Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987.

Figure 22.
Distribution of Family Income by Source, by Income Level, Elderly Childless Families and Unrelated Individuals, 1970-1986 (As a percentage of total family income)

Elderly Childless Families


Elderly Unrelated Individuals

$\ldots$ Means-Tested Transfers
SOURCE: Cor,gressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987.

## CHAPTER IV

## FACTORS AFFECTING FAMILY INCOME

Four major factors influence family incomes-macroeconomic conditions, government policies, demographic characteristics of the population, and labor market behavior--and their effects vary for different sources of income. The general state of the economy has perhaps the greatest influence on incomes for a variety of reasons: labor market conditions cause earnings to rise and fall across business cycles; property income is affected by business activity and interest rates; and transfer payments vary inversely with economic conditions.1/ Government policies directly affect transfer payments and indirectly influence other income sources through their impacts on the general economy as well as on economic behavior. Demographic characteristics of the population help determine adjusted family income levels, in part through family composition effects and in part through the age distribution of workers. Finally, labor market behavior--specifically the number of earners in each family--has a major impact on total family earninge. The remainder of this chapter discusses what has happened to each of these factors and how they might have affected family income trends since 1970.

## MACROECONOMIC CONDITIONS

The state of the economy--and particularly the availability of jots:--has obvious and important effects on family incomes. Family incomes rise in strong labor markets in which there are jobs for virtually everyone who wants one, in which workers are often able to work additional hours, and in which productivity gains allow real wages to increase.

[^15]Property income also varies with economic conditions. affected both by aggregate business activity and by the level of interest rates. A wide range of factors influences the overall performance of the American economy; among the most visible are the government's fiscal and monetary policies, although their precise effects are highly uncertain.

Since 1970, the American economy has . erformed erratically. There have been four recessions, the most recent in 1981 and 1082 being the deepest since the Great Depression. Unemployment rates have moved across a wide range, from a low of just under 5 percent in the early 1970s to a peak of nearly 10 percent in 1982; between 1970 and i986, unemployment increased, averaging 5.4 percent from 1970 to 1974, 7.0 percent from 1975 to 1979, and 8.0 percent from 1980 to 1986. Since 1983, however, the unem $i_{i}:$ cyment rate has dropped markedly to 7 percent in 1986, and continues to follow a downward trend.

Between 1970 and 1986, median adjusted family incomes moved in a cyclical pattern corresponding to that for the national em; loyment rate, with reriods © - -ising employment corresponding to periods of increasing median Al see Figure 23). At the same time, median AFI followed a general upward trend over the 16 years, while a declining fraction of the labor force held jobs. Two possible explanations are changes in the relat.onship between the two measures and the influence of other factors on income levels.

An important element that appears to have affected incomes during the 1970s and 1980s has been the ability of the economy to absorb vast numbers c¢ additional workers. Between $19^{\circ} 0$ and 1986, employment grew from just under 80 million workers to nearly 110 million workers, an increase of about 40 percent, and the labor force participation rate climbed from 60 percent to 65 percent. Although ecoromists disagree about whether recently created jobs are comparable to previously existing jobs, the growth wa. inuch greater between 1970 and 1986 than in earlier periods: employment grew 31 percent in the preceding 16 years from 1954 to 1970.

Aggregate economic performance also affects property income, although the impact on family incomes is much less thar that from

Figure 23.
Median Adjusted Family Income and Percentage of Labor Force With Jobs, 1970-1986


SOURCES: Congre -ional Bucget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 19711987, and Economic Report of the President (U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1987), p 285
labor income. $2 /$ While the precise impacts are difficult to identify empirically, rising interest rates generaily lead to increased incomes from financial assets. Similarly, corporate profits are high in a strong economy; this may lead to increased dividend income for investors, as well as to rising stock values. Because asset holdings are distributed
2. For families in the middle three quintiles, only 12 percent of income was derived from private cources other than sarnings in 1986, compared with about 80 percent from earninge. At the same time, wheh income was more important in 138f than it hed been in 1970, when 88 percent of income came from earninga and just 6 percent from other privaic sour sas.
very uneq $\sim^{\sim} l^{\prime \prime}$, changes in property income have significant effects on both the levers and distribution of family incomes.

GOVGRNMENT POLICIES AND CASH TRANSFER PRCGRAMS

Guiernment policies have an impact on family incomes through their effects on the general economy and through the effects of regulations and taxes on the economic behavior of individuals. But tis eir most direct impact is through cash transfer programs. Overall, cash transfers in 1985 accounted for about 8 percent of family incomes, and over 40 percent of the incomes of families in the bottom quintile. Social Security benefits were by far the dominant component, accouiating for about 70 percent of all cash transfers. Means-tested tiansfers such as Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) were much less important in the aggregate, but were the major source of income for single mothers with children in the bottom quintile; means-tested transfers constituted about two-thirds of their income in 1986.3/Government policies influence both the levels of benefits available and, in many cases, who is eligible to receive payments.4/

## Social Security

Much of the rapid growth in the incomes of the elderly has resulted from increases in Social Security payments, the major source of income for the elderly. Among all retired workers receiving Social Security, average ronthly benefits rose 57 percent from $\$ 311$ to $\$ 488$-in 1986 dollars-between 1970 and 1986, somewhat more than the 50 percent gain in the median adjusted incomes of elderly families

[^16]and individuals. Three factors were largely responsible for the Social Security increase, two of which involved government policies. First, the Congress raised benefit levels almost every year through either one-time increases or automatic cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs) that affected all recipients. Second, benefit levels were changed by other policy actions affecting program elements, such as the way in which basic benefits are calculated, the reduction in benefits for early retirement, or the amount of earnings exempt from the earnings test. Finally, new retirees as a group received higher benefits than their older counterparts, in large part as a result of their greater earnings during their working years. Only the last factor was not a result of legislated policies.

Social Security benefits were increased markedly between 1970 and 1986, both through ad hoc s-iustments in the early 1970s and later through sutomatic COLAs. Primary insurance amounts were raised 10 percent in 1971, 20 percen! more in 1972, and an additional 11 percent in 1974, before automatic annual COLAs were begun in June 1975. Since that time, benefit levels have been increased in line with the CPI-W, the price index for urban wage earners and clerical workers. $5 /$ These increases caused Social Security benefits to grow sharply in real terms, both because of the large ad hoc increases and because the CPI-W rose more rapidly than the CPI-X1. Relative to the CPI-X1, basic benefit levels rose roughly 15 percent between 1970 and 1973, leveled off through 1979, and then moved fitfuliy with in upward trend to a 1986 level more than 20 percent above that in 1970 (see Figure 24). This recent increase explains a large part of the growth in the median incomes of the elderly observed in Chrpter III: incomes ruse most rapidly between 1970 and 1973, more slowly through the rest of the 1970 s, and then somewhat faster since 1980.

Other policy changes affecting Social Security are harder to quantify. Legislation enacted in 1972 altered the rothod by which basic benefits were calculated in a way that led te inarkedly higher payments for workers retiring during much of tne 1970s. On the other hand, 1977 legislation to correct a "double-indexing" flaw in the

[^17]Figure 24.
Percentage Growth Since 1970 in Average Real § scial Security Benefits, Total and Amount Resulting from Statutory and Automatic Increases, All Retirees, 1970-1986


SOURCE: Social Securty Eulletin, Annual Statistical Supplement, 1986, p0. 32 and 170; and 1977-1979, p. 151; and Social Security Bulletin, vol. 50, no. 7 (July 1987), p. 41.

NOTE: Bencfit lovels inflated using CP1 - X1.
method for calculating benefits lowered payments to workers born after 1916. By themselves, these laws would have caused incomes of the elderly to move upward during the mid-1970s and then downward in succeeding years, but other factors such as higher lifetime earnings have kept average real benefits rising.6/
6. For examplo, between 1970 and 1966 , the avorage payment for all rotirees roes 57 percenc in real terma (mep Piure 24). About ose-third of the increase stemmed from the legialated and automatic beacit changes difecomed above, and moet of the remainder probsbly resulted from higher carninge of bew rotirsee.

## Aid to Families with Dependent Children

Government policies since 1970 have made major changes in the AFDC program, the largest single source of cash income for lowincome single mothers with children, but the effects of those changes on family incomes are difficult to identify. Government policies in the 1970s and 1980s have affected the AFDC program in two important ways: benefit levels, which are set by the individual states, have not been raised in line with inflation, so they have fallen significantly in real terms, and changes in eligibility criteria and net income formulas, which are set by the federal government, have reduced or eliminated benefits for some families. While these factors are likely to have led to smaller incomes for low-income families, the relationships are complicated and the effects unclear.

Over the last 16 jears, most states allowed AFDC benefit levels to fill in real terms by not increasing payments in line with inflation. Between 1970 and 1986, only three states maintained real benefit levels; maximum payments for four-person families dropped in real terms by at lea: 40 percent in 10 states, and by 25 percent or more in half the states. $7 /$ The median maximum payment fell over 30 percent from $\$ 581$ to $\$ 399$ (in 1986 dollars). If nothing else had changed, these passive reductions would not only have cut the insomes of recipient families, but would also have made some recipients ineligible for fi. ther benefits.

The second polic $y$ effect resulted from program modifications enacted by the Congress. Legislation passed in 1981 tightened AFDC eligibility criteria in ways that made some families with earnings unable to qualify for assistance.8/ Opinions differ on whether these changes have reduced welfare rolls and made families more selfsufficient or caused some AFDC mothers to quit their jobs to maintain their benefits. No direct evidence supporting either view has been found. Although the percentage of recipients with earnings did fall,

[^18]that finding is consistent with either working families moving off the AFDC rolls or recipient families quitting their jobs.

Any effects, however, of these two factors on the incomes of singlemother families with children are difficult to detect. The 20th percentile income rose irregularly between 1970 and 1977 to a level 16 percent above that in 1970, even though real AFDC benefits were falling in most states and families were increasingly unlikely to contain any workers. 9 / Furthermore, in spite of declining benefit levels, low-income, single-mother families became more dependent on welfare and less reliant on employment. Over the same period, the fraction of their income coming from welfare rose from 45 percent to 57 percent, while the fraction derived from earnings fell from 36 percent to 27 percent.

Although these apparent contradictions are difficult to understand, two explanations are possible. First, recipient families might have become relatively more common in states with high AFDC benefits. If so, incomes could rise and a larger share of income could derive from AFDC, even if real benefits were declining in each state. A second possibili'y is that families changed size in ways that increased benefits relctive to poverty thresholds. In 1985, for example, the maximum benefit level in every state was a larger percentage of the relevant poverty threshold for single mothers with two children than for single mothers with three children. Because the average size of AFDC families declined between 1970 and 1986, this relationship could have led to higher adjusted incomes, even if real benefit levels and unadjusted family incomes were falling.

Between 1977 and 1986, the 20th percentile income of single mothers with children fell 25 percent to just under half the poverty threshold. At the same time, such families in the bottom quintile became even less likely to have any earnings; earnings fell from onequarter of family income to one-fifth, while means-tested transfers grew in importance from 57 percent to 65 percent. Although the decline in incomes of single $n$ nthers with children probably stemmed largely from the deep recession in the early 1980s, it is likely that

[^19]falling real benefit levels and tightened eligibility criteria and benefit calculations also played a role.

## DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

The composition of the population influences family incomes in two distinct ways. First, the distribution of people into families affects both family needs and the number of potential workers (or earners) aviilable to meet those needs. Second, the distribution of people by age--both overall and in terms of living arrangements--affects ircomers because the earning power of woriers changes as they grow older, described by what is known as the "age-earnings profile." These demographic characteristics have changed markedly over the past 16 years, and their effects show up in family income trends.

## Composition of Family Units

The composition of family units in 1986 was significantly different from that in 1970. Families with children had fewer children.10/ Moreover, the fraction of families with children declined from 45 percent in 1970 to 35 percent in 1986, while households consisting of nonelderly people not living with any relatives became more common, growing from 14 percent of all family units to 23 percent (see Figure 25). In addition, among families with children, single-mother families gruw in importance, roughly doubling from 10 percent of families with children in 1970 to 20 percent in 1986. In combination, these changes caused a reduction in the average family size from 3 people to 2.5 people.11/

[^20]Figure 25.
Distribution of Families by Family Type, 1970-1986



SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987.

Apart from any changes in the average income of each family type, these demographic shifts had two effects on family incomes. First, because smailer families need less income to maintain a given standand of living, families would have become better off over the period, even if their real incomes had remained fixed. This phenomenon only affected families with children, however, since they were the only family type that, as a group, saw their average family size change markedly.

The second effect was the result of the growth in relative importance of two family types with lower incomes-single mothers with children and nonelderly unrelated individuals. As noted earlier, among families with children, single-mother families became relatively more numerous over the period; combined with the fact that their median income was markedly lower than that for other families, this growth caused the observed drop in the median income for all families with children. Similarly, because nonelderly u.related individuals have a lower median income than most other families, their increasing numbers lowered the median income for all families.

## Age Composition of the Population

The shift in the age distribution of the population toward younger families would also tend to have caused family incomes to be lo Ner than otherwise. The maturing of the baby-boom generation during the 1970 s meant that large numbers of young people were both entering the work force and forming families, with two likely effects. First, vecar-se the earnings of younger workers tend to be less than those of their older counterparts, the greater numbers of younger families would have led to lower incomes for individual family types. Batween 1970 and 1986, the fraction of all families whose heads were under age 45 rose from 46 percent to 52 percent, while families with heads between ages 45 and 64 became less common, falling from 35 percent of all families to 27 percent (see Figure 26). Again, all else the same, this shift toward younger families with lower earnings would have caused median family income to fall over the 16 -year period. At the same time, because incomes rise with age, this trend is likely to be reversed, at least in part, as the baby-boom population grows older.

Figure 26.
Distribution of All Families by Age of Head, Selected Years, 1970-1986


The second effect of the entry of the baby-boom generation into the labor force was a reduction in the incomes of workers in that group, a loss that is likely to persist even as the cohort ages. Between 1970 and 1984, as the bulk of the baby boomers entered the labor force, real incomes of full-time, full-year male workers between 20 and 24 years old dropped 21 percent; since 1975, as the group has moved into the next age category, real incomes of men between 25 and 34 years of age who were employed full time throughout the year fell by 8 percent.12 These drops are likejy to stem in large part from the size of this cohort
12. Pemale workers had a momewhat different experience. The real medinn income of those between 20 and 24 foll 7 percent between 1970 and 1984. Between 1975 and 1984, however, the income of the 25- to 34 -year-uda increased 3 percent. The difiorence from the experience of male workers is probably the result of improved job opportunities for women.

Theme date may mot be fully securate reflections of the labor market for two reasons. Firat, the Bureau of the Consus definee full- time, full-year workera as people who worked at least 50 weeks during the year and whoee normal work week was at least 35 bours long. This dofinition leaves considerable room for variation in total hours worked, so incomes could be affected not by lower wages but rathor by reduced hours. Second, the trend described is for total cash income, not earnings, and could thus be influenced by changes in other income sources such as tranefers.
of workers and the resulting increased competition for johs. Because the cohort will always be larger than its predecessors, the lower incomes are likely to continue into the future. This cohort effect is likely to be larger than any wage gains coming from the tendency of earnings to rise with age.

## NUMBER OF WORKERS PER FAMILY

A final factor that appears to have affected family incomes since 1970 is the changing number of workers per family.13/ While two opposing trends combined to leave the average number of full-time, full-year workers unchanged for all families, they resulted in significant changes in employment patterns for individual femily types. On one hand, the demographic shift toward one-person and single-mother families meant that families had fewer potential earners, and average earnings per family would thus be expected to fall. On the other hand, adults were more likely to be workers: the labor force participation rate for women rose from 43 percent in 1970 to 55 percent in 1986, while that for men fell from 80 percent to 76 percent, resulting in an overall increase from 60 percent to 65 percent (see Figure 27). The increase was particularly marked among married women with children under the age of six, whose participation rate rose from 30 percent to 54 percent over the 16 -year period.

This rise in labor force participation among women led to marked increases in the average number of full-time, full-year workers per family for individual family types. $14 /$ Married couples with children were nearly twice as likely to have two full-time, full-year workers at the end of the period than at the beginning--up from 14 percent to 26 percent--while the fraction of nonelderly childless families witi two such workers rose from 27 percent to 32 percent (see Figure 28). Single-mother families became more likely to have at least one fulltime, full-year worker- 40 percent in 1986 compared with 33 percent in 1970--and unrelated individuals under age 65 were more likely to have full-time jobs throughout the year--57 percent in 1986 versus 51

[^21]percent in 1970. Only for the elderly did the average number of workers per family decline.

The increase in workers per family provides part of the explanation for the income growth for each family type between 1970 and 1986. If there had been no change in the earnings of individual workers, incomes would have risen because of the increased likelihood that single mothers and nonelderly unrelated individuals would be employed and that married couples with children and nonelderly childless families would have two workers. In fact, earnings have not

Figure 27.
Labor Force Participation Rates of Males, Females, and All People, 1970-1986


SOURCE: Economic Report of the President (U.S. Government Printing Office, January 1987), p 284.

Figure 28.
Distribution of Families by Number of Full-Time, Full-Year Workers, by Family Type, 1970-1986


[^22]Figure 29.
Distribution of Families in the Bottom Income Quintile by Number of Full-Time, Full-Year Workers, by Family Type, 19; 0-1986


[^23]kept pace with inflation for many workers, especially those in the younger age groups.15/ The rise in the $n \times m b e r$ of workers per family appears to be the principal risason why incomes increased.16/ Families in the bottom income quintile did not increase their average numbers of workers during the period; this lack of growth in workers provides at least a partial explanation for their not having experienced the same income growth as other families (see Figure 29 on preceding page and Appendix Table A-15). Foi sxample, the fraction of low-income married couples with no full-time, full-year worker rose from 42 percent in 1970 to 52 percent in 1975, fell to 43 percent in 1979, and climbed to 53 percent in 1982 before dropping back to 46 percent in 1986. Other family types showed similar fluctuations throughout the period wich little overall change.
15. There is a growing literature discussing the question of why real earnings have fallen for many workers. One line of argument points to the changing s.at.are of jobs in the American economy. It claims that rapid growth of service industries, particularly compared with, the decline of manufacturing, has rosulted in a polarization of jobs, with relatively few high- and many low-paying service sector jobs replacing traditional middle-income manufacturing jobs. An alternative view lays blame on the grea influx of women and young people into the labor market. It asserts that the renulting increased supply of workers depressed wages below levois they otherwise would have reached. For a brief review of this literature and bibliograr,hic referenzes, see Frank Levv, Dollars and Dreaine: The Changing American Income Distribution (New York: Ruesell Sage Foundation, 1987), chapters 5 and 7.
16. Families are likely to bear a cont, however, when more of thoir members work. In particular, there are direct costs associated with omployment, such as for childcare or for commuting. Furthermere, the now workers have le time available to perform household chores, so either costs rise-if services are purchased-or some chores are not done.
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## APPENDIX A

## DEMOGRAPHIC AND INCOME NATA, 1970-1986

so

TABLE A-1. muner of familigs and fercentace distaisution, By fanily typa, 1970-1986

|  | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 198 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wuaber of Fanilios (In chousanda) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Fealliea | 67,261 | 69,522 | 71,095 | 73,166 | 74.450 | 76,365 | 78,041 | 80,195 | 12,246 | 84,229 | 87,702 | 88,969 | 89,625 | 91,665 | 93,398 | 95,297 | 96,602 |
| Fealliee vith Childrea Married esuplea | 30,067 24,457 | 30,798 24,913 | 30,916 24,332 | 31,098 | 31,401 24,723 | \% $\begin{array}{r}192 \\ 20.639\end{array}$ | 31,436 24,465 | 31,638 | 31,737 24,219 | 32,166 | 33,116 | 32.901 | 32,931 | 33,130 | 33,353 | 33,952 | 34,267 |
| Hexriad emuplae <br> single eethere | 24,457 3,386 | 24,913 3,639 | 24,132 3,858 | 24,798 | 24,723 4,472 | 20.639 4.678 | 24,465 | 24, 248 | 24,219 | 24,10s | 24,611 | 24,149 | 24,105 | 24, 101 | 23,960 | 24,444 | 24, 426 |
|  |  |  | 3, | 4.126 | 472 | ,678 | 4.873 | 5,256 | 5,353 | 5,650 | 6,014 | 6,205 | 6.250 | 6,410 | 6,571 | 6,646 | 6.852 |
| Honoldarly Unice Childiane feallios Unreleted individuale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 14.977 | 15,343 | 16,083 | 16,363 | 16,579 | 16,965 | 17,309 | 17.439 | 17,702 | 17.931 | 18,534 | 19,195 | 19,487 | 19,805 | 20,181 | 20,175 | 20,677 |
|  | 9,469 | 10,154 | 10,533 | 11,820 | 12,222 | 13,252 | 14,304 | 15,660 | 16.831 | 17.799 | 19,008 | 19.445 | 19,384 | 20,573 | 21,403 | 22,312 | 22,360 |
| Elderiy Uaiee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Childlaee Lamiliae | 6,907 | ; 156 | 7,372 | 7.590 | 7,772 | 7,904 | 7.967 | 8,091 | 1.369 | 8,676 | 9.050 | 9.294 | 9,414 | 9,567 | 9,603 | 9,935 | 10,113 |
| Unralared individuals | 5,840 | 6,673 | 6,189 | 6.294 | 6,515 | 6,851 | 7,029 | 7.319 | 7,610 | 7.655 | 7,991 | 8.134 | 8,406 | 8,567 | 8.764 | 9,935 8,922 | 10,113 9,185 |
|  | Farcontage Diatriburitin of All Feallies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All Fealliea | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Taplifas Wich Childran | 45 | 44 | 43 | 43 | 42 | 41 | 40 | 39 | 39 | 38 | 38 | 37 | 37 | 36 | 36 | 36 | * |
| Merriad couplas | 36 | 35 | 35 | 34 | 33 | 32 | 31 | 30 | 29 | 29 | 28 | 27 | 27 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 25 |
| Single mothare | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Wonelderly Units Childiene fanlif. Uncaleced individumla |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 22 | 22 | 23 15 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 21 | 21 |
|  | 14 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 23 | 23 |
| Eldariy Uniea Childlese fenilias Unrelered individual. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 |
|  | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 |
|  | Percontage Distribution of Familles Wich Childran |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Fanllife vith Children | 100 | 100 | 105 | 200 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | :00 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Marriad couplea | 81 | 81 | 10 | 30 | 79 | 78 | 78 | 76 | 76 | -8 | 14 | 73 | 73 | 73 | 12 | 200 72 | 100 71 |
| Single mothers | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 13 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 20 |
| Ocher familias | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | - | 8 | 8 | 8 | 8 | - | , |



are es


411 Faniles

| Culer 25 | 6.102 | 6.670 | 6.921 | 7,483 | 7.506 | 7.438 | 7.739 | 8.000 | 4.4) | 4.531 | 0.718 | 6, 153 | 7.068 | 7.927 | 0.043 | 0.037 | 7,763 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25-34 | 12.74 | 13.691 | 14.427 | 15.331 | 16.090 | 16.355 | 17.070 | 17.866 | 18.297 | 10,376 | 20,803 | 21.135 | 21.005 | 21.826 | 22.099 | 22,187 | 23,049 |
| 35-54 | 24,105 | 24.659 | 24. 821 | 25.114 | 25.066 | 25,638 | 25.947 | 26.2186 | 26.732 | 27.329 | 27.993 | 28.733 | 29.320 | 30.183 | 11,245 | 246 | 13,140 |
| 53-64 | 10.663 | 10,841 | 10.941 | 10.926 | 11.06, | 1.594 | 11.723 | 12,088 | 12.210 | 12.102 | 12.566 | 12.762 | 12,864 | 12.969 | 12.92 | -2.730 | 12,707 |
| 45 \% Pue | 13.140 | 13,662 | 13.915 | 14.310 | 14.720 | 15.341 | 15,561 | 15.953 | 16,506 | 16.892 | 17.621 | 17.986 | 18,466 | 18.740 | 15,082 | 19.495 | 19,944 |
| 411 Fanilise With Chiliren |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Teler 25 | 2,653 | 2,838 | 2.921 | 2,86 | 2.958 | 2,358 | 2.314 | 2,386 | 2,413 | 2,526 | 2,616 | 2.426 | 2,422 | 2.364 | 2.351 | 2.316 | 2,217 |
| 25-34 | \$.251 | 9,7e1 | 10.026 | 10,237 | 10.537 | 10.275 | 10.304 | 10,493 | 10.535 | 10.795 | 11.467 | 12.317 | 11.127 | 11.515 | 11.451 | 11.610 | 11,689 |
| 35-34 | 16.086 | 16.093 | 15.921 | 15.854 | 15.8ns | 16.263 | 16,26 | 16.258 | 16.357 | 16.540 | 16.642 | 16.786 | 16.183 | 16.912 | 17,201 | 17.671 | 18.066 |
| 35-64 | 1.61 | 1.732 | 1.618 | 1,70 | 1.010 | 1.811 | 1.961 | 1.949 | 1.902 | 1,745 | 1.813 | 1.755 | 1.854 | 1,756 | 1.722 | 1.638 | 1.58 ? |
| 655 over | 393 | 4.31 | 354 | 423 | 431 | 585 | 567 | 545 | 529 | 559 | 319 | Sss | 645 | 583 | 621 | 636 | 646 |
| Margied Couplee With Chileren |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Emer 25 | 1.925 | 996 | 2.01, | 1.918 | 1. 3 | $1.31 \%$ | 1,479 | 1,472 | 1.414 | 1,433 | 1.456 | 1. 103 | 1.228 | 1.143 | 2.156 | 1.132 | 917 |
| 25-34 | 7.604 | -. 103 | 1. 209 | 6.329 | 6. $3=6$ | 6.312 | 6.117 | e, 249 | 0.238 | 0.287 | 4.686 | 6. 521 | 4.366 | E,578 | 6,317 | 1.327 | 13.492 |
| 35-54 | 13.238 | 13.183 | 13.072 | 12.915 | 12.822 | 13.126 | 12.985 | 12.113 | 12.937 | 12,94* | 12.959 | 12.816 | 12.927 | 4.. 339 | 13,082 | 13.438 | 13.611 |
| 53-64 | 1,368 | .,373 | 1.325 | 1,309 | 1.312 | 1.393 | 1.400 | 1.401 | 1,372 | 1,241 | 1.267 | 1,229 | 1.312 | 1.206 | 2,099 | 1. 112 | 1,058 |
| cs \% Ower | 242 | 237 | 213 | 246 | 275 | 290 | $2{ }^{13}$ | 265 | 236 | 249 | 243 | 274 | 213 | 229 | 216 | 236 | 267 |
| Strgle Methars Mith Chilerat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Encer 25 | 445 | 317 | 596 | 604 | 753 | 714 | 111 | 790 | 826 | 45 | 939 | 909 | 992 | 1,001 | 1.006 | 1.001 | 1.074 |
| 23-36 | 2.043 | 1.21E | 1.234 | 1,410 | :,542 | 2,532 | 2,5e1 | 1.767 | 2.500 | 1,993 | 3 381 | 2,204 | 2,117 | 2.717 | 2311 | 2.332 | 2.422 |
| 35-54 | 1.690 | 1,764 | 1,72: | 1.443 | -. 038 | 2,054 | 2.103 | 2,175 | 2,355 | 2,433 | 2,460 | 2, 105 | 2.654 | 2,142 | 2,796 | 2.887 | 2,918 |
| 5s-64 | 151 | 182 | 182 | 186 | 170 | 261 | 2185 | 267 | 268 | 241 | 110 | 266 | 260 | 295 | 294 | 271 | 282 |
| 4s Ovar | 57 | $6 \%$ | 64 | 82 | 68 | 17 | 104 | 105 | 105 | 125 | 122 | 119 | 126 | 139 | 145 | 130 | 158 |
| Childiese Fentimen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ealer 25 | 1.493 | 1.564 | 1.700 | 1.161 | 1.710 | 1, 18 | 1,763 | 1.630 | 1.632 | 2.547 | 1.547 | 1,569 | 1.455 | 1.3\% | 1.225 | 1.200 | 1.228 |
| 25-34 | 1.699 | 1.923 | 2,151 | 2,134 | 2,479 | 2,543 | 2,78 | 2.824 | 2,781 | 2,94\% | 3.017 | 3,073 | 3.270 | 3,116 | 3.307 | 3.212 | 3.423 |
| 15-54 | 5,544 | 5.499 | 5,783 | 5. 176 | 3,801 | 5.92C | 6.056 | 6 , 083 | 6.208 | 6.29 ) | 6.654 | 6.979 | 1.228 | 7.631 | 7.976 | 7.972 | 4.357 |
| 53-64 | \$,215 | 6.351 | 6.450 | 6.388 | 6.429 | 6.686 | 6.612 | 6.952 | 7.080 | 1.157 | 7.115 | 7.57x | 7.715 | 7.654 | 7.603 | 7.641 | 7.669 |
| 656 Orer | 6.907 | 7.153 | 7,373 | -. 399 | 7.713 | 7.905 | 7.067 | 6.090 | 6.367 | 6.677 | 9.051 | -.294 | 9,4.5 | -. 565 | 9.697 | -. 835 | 10.114 |
| Dacela*ed Imitituals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buter 25 | 1.946 | 2,268 | 2,364 | 2,853 | 2.817 | 3,262 | 3.621 | 3184 | 4.434 | 4.458 | 4.554 | 4.360 | 4.092 | 4.165 | 4.311 | 4.361 | 4.257 |
| 25-34 | 1.798 | 2.067 | 2.250 | 2,756 | 3.015 | 3,531 | 3.519 | 4.544 | 4.981 | 5.632 | 6.19 | 6.686 | 6.187 | 7,195 | 7.140 | 7.896 | 7.937 |
| 3s-5t | 2.913 | 3.066 | 3.116 | 3, 310 | 3.360 | 3.456 | 3.123 | 3.945 | 4.141 | 4.490 | 4.691 | 4. 96 | 5.209 | 5,614 | 6.069 | 6.604 | 6.717 |
| 5s-64 | 2,749 | 2.152 | 2.802 | 2.830 | 2.910 | 2.938 | 3.0.00 | 1,187 | 3.228 | 1.220 | 3,438 | 4.431 | 3.294 | 3..79 | 3.603 | 3,451 | 3.449 |
| 498 Orer | 5.841 | 6.873 | 6.188 | 6,294 | 6.516 | 6.851 | 7,04 | . 318 | 7.620 | 1.656 | 7.992 | 6.134 | 6,406 | C,591 | 6.764 | c. 324 | 9.184 |




|  | 1976 | 1971 | 1972 | 15-3 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 197: | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1932 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | A11 7asileo |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -uner 25 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | - | , | ¢ | 9 | B | ! |
| 25-34 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| 35-54 | 37 | 13 | 35 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 34 | 34 |
| $35-84$ | 18 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 11 |
| estor | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 21 |
|  | 411 Faplitee With Chilera |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unelar 23 | 9 | 9 | - | - | 1 | e | 7 | 6 | 4 | 1 | e | 7 | 7 | 7 | 1 | 7 | 7 |
| $25-34$ | 31 | 11 | 32 | 13 | 34 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 35 | 34 | 35 | 34 | 34 | 34 |
| 35-54 | 34 | 52 | 51 | 51 | 50 | 52 | 32 | 51 | 52 | 51 | 50 | 51 | 51 | 51 | 52 | 52 | 53 |
| 3s-84 | E | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| es 0ver | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Matried Couplee With Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| malar 25 | - | - | - | e | - | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| $25-34$ | 31 | 33 | 33 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 36 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| 35-54 | 34 | 53 | 53 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 53 | 34 | 53 | 33 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 55 | 56 |
| 3s-84 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 4 |
| 63 * Orer | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | : | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | Sigele Methere With Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -mat 25 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 15 | 16 |
| 25-34 | 31 | 30 | 34 | 34 | 36 | 33 | 33 | 34 | 34 | 35 | 36 | 36 | 34 | 35 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| $35-54$ | 50 | 48 | 45 | 45 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 4. | 44 | 43 | 41 | 44 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 |
| $5 s-\infty 4$ | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 | * | 6 | 6 | 3 | 3 | - | $\underline{E}$ | 4 | - | $\stackrel{3}{ }$ | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| est orer | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
|  | Chisidean Fanilien |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unles 23 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 23-14 | ! | 9 | 1 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | $\cdots$ | 31 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| 35-54 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 27 | 26 | 27 |
| 3s-84 | 28 | $2{ }^{18}$ | 21 | 27 | 26 | 27 | 26 | 27 | 27 | 27 | 27 | $: 7$ | 27 | 26 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| est orer | 32 | 12 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 12 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 33 | 32 | 33 | 33 |
|  | Ungeleted Individuele |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mocar 23 | 13 | 14 | 14 | ; 6 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 17 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 13 |
| 15-34 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 25 | 25 |
| 35-54 | 19 | 19 | 13 | 19 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 1) | 16 | 12 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 21 |
| 35-64 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 11 |
| us 6 Orer | 38 | 37 | 37 | 35 | 35 | 34 | 33 | 32 | 31 | 30 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 29 |



GALE A-4. MEDIAY ATD PERCEMTILES OF ADJUSTED FAMILY ITMCOME, BY FAMILY TYPE,
1970-1986 (In percents of porerty thresholds)


TABLE A-4.

TARLE A-5. MEDIAK AND PERCENTILES OF ADJUSTED FAMILY INCOME, RELATIVE TO 1970 , BY PAMILY IYPE, 1970-1986 (In percents of 1970 level)


Income
Inc


SOURCE Congressional Budget office tabulations of Cur tent Population Survey data, $1971-1987$.


|  | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1875 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | $198^{\circ}$ | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Percontage of Pamilies Ulth Income Below the Median Income for All Pamllies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Panliles Wieh Children | 52 | 53 | 52 | 52 | 53 | 53 | 52 | 52 | 53 | \$2 | 54 | 54 | 55 | 56 | 53 | 55 | 55 |
| Marcied couples | 48 | 47 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 46 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 44 | 45 | 45 | 47 | 47 | 46 | 46 | 45 |
| single morhers | 87 | 87 | 87 | 87 | 86 | E7 | 86 | 85 | 86 | 85 | 85 | 86 | 85 | 87 | 86 | 85 | 87 |
| Monelderly Onits <br> Childless fanllies | 23 | 23 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 23 | 23 | 23 | 25 | 26 | 25 | 27 | 26 | 25 |
| Uarelated individuals | 55 | 55 | 37 | 56 | 58 | 56 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 35 | 54 | 55 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 54 |
| Elderly Units <br> Childless falliet | 60 | 59 | 58 | 58 | 56 | 35 | 53 | 57 | 57 | 56 | 53 | 51 | 49 | 49 | 48 | 48 | 48 |
| Unrelared Individuals | 66 | 86 | 86 | 86 | 83 | 84 | 84 | 85 | 84 | 85 | 84 | 82 | 79 | 77 | 77 | 78 | 78 |
| Percentase of Pamilies w'th Income lelov 20ch Parcentlie Income for All Pamilies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pasilies With r'ildren | 16 | 17 | 11 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 18 | 19 | 19 | 19 | 40 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| Martied ...-1es | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 |
| SIngle mot.ers | 54 | 37 | 58 | 58 | 57 | 57 | 56 | 55 | 34 | 52 | 53 | 53 | 56 | 55 | 55 | 54 | 57 |
| Moncl :- $=15$ Unita Chlldiess fanllies | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 7 |
| Untelated Individuals | 28 | 30 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 28 | 28 | 26 | 26 | 25 | $<5$ | 25 | 25 | 26 | 25 | 24 | 25 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Child!eas fanllies | 22 | 20 | 18 5 | 19 54 | 16 53 | 15 50 | 15 51 | S0 | 46 | 51 | 48 | 44 | 40 | 37 | 39 | 40 | 41 |

SOURCE: Congressional Budser Office tabulations of Curtent Population Suivey deta, 1971-1987
table a-7. distribution of fakily incone by source, fanilies in the bottom income ouimeile, BY PAMILY TYPE, 1970-1986 (In percenta of totsl family income)


```
Table A-7. Contiaued
```


sounct: Congresional Budget Office tabulations of Curisnt Population Survay date, 1971-1987
e. Less then 0.5 darcant.

TABLE AGO. DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY InCOME BY SOURCE. FAMILIES IR TEE MIDDLE TREE INCOME QUIHTILES, BY FAMILY TYPE, 197C-1986 (In percent of family income)


| Income Source | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1971 | 1975 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Monaldarly Childles: Pamillas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Earnay | 11 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 69 | 68 | 67 | 61 | 66 | 65 | 64 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 | 63 |
| Oeher Earnars | 22 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 22 | 22 | 23 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 25 | 25 |
| Oeher Privara Income | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 8 | 8 | - | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 10 |
| Mon-Maens-Tested Trangfere | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Meane-Taeted Trenefers | al | (1) | al | al | $\underline{1}$ | 31 | $\underline{1}$ | E | E) | al | 21 | $\underline{1}$ | 31 | 1/ | 21 | 2/ | 21 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Monaldezig Unieleted Individuele |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primery Earnar | 89 | 87 | 87 | 88 | 81 | 85 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 58 | 88 | 87 | 87 | 66 | 87 | 35 | 88 |
| Other Eerners | -- | - - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Othar P-ivaea Income | 8 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 10 | 9 | 9 |
| Mon-Keang-Tested Tranefars | 3 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Means-Tested Tranefers | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 1/ | 21 | 31 | 21 | 2/ | 1 | 21 | 21 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Eldarly Childless Pamllas |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primery Eernar | 32 | 30 | 30 | 27 | 25 | 24 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 21 | 22 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 20 3 | 20 | 20 3 |
| Ottoe Eernare | . | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Othar Private Incoma | 23 | 27 | 23 | 22 | 23 | 29 | 29 | 29 | 23 | 31 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 35 | 35 | 35 |
| Won-Mans-Tasead Tranafars | 40 | 40 | 44 | 47 | 48 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 45 | 45 | 43 | 44 | 45 | 45 | 42 | 42 | 41 |
| Mane-Taerad Tranefare | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | a | $\underline{1}$ | 81 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Eldarig Unzalatad Individuale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Primary Earnar | 8 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| Other Eerners | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Other Privete Incore | 24 | 27 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 24 | 24 | 24 | 26 | 26 | 24 | 26 | 27 | 29 | 30 | 29 | 29 |
| ```Mon-Keane-Iasted Tranafera``` | 61 | 59 | 65 | 68 | 69 | 66 | 66 | 66 | 65 | 65 | 68 | 48 | 66 | 64 | 63 | 65 | 65 |
| Mens-Tested Tranefar: | 7 | 6 | * | 4 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |

SOURCE Congressionel Budset Office tabuletione of Currant Populetion Survay data. 1971-1987
s Less then 05 percent

TABLEA-9. ADJUSTED PAMILY INCOME BY AGE OF : :MILY EEAD, 1970-1986 (In pereents)

| Age of Facily Read | Income Percentile | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | All Femilies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 25 | 2078 | 96 | 88 | 92 | 92 | 93 | 88 | 85 | 91 | 92 | 95 | 88 | 76 | 73 | 63 | 65 | 66 | 63 |
|  | 20 TH | 175 | 161 | 169 | 178 | 169 | 153 | 160 | 164 | 171 | 177 | 166 | 151 | 146 | 136 | 135 | 138 | 133 |
|  | Median | 212 | 196 | 210 | 214 | 207 | 194 | 198 | 198 | 212 | 217 | 201 | 190 | 185 | 170 | 175 | 177 | 174 |
|  | 60 TH | 249 | 234 | 248 | 252 | 246 | 231 | 237 | 241 | 257 | 259 | 245 | 190 232 | 185 | 170 212 | 175 | 177 | 174 |
|  | 80 TB | 348 | 338 | 349 | 354 | 345 | 330 | 339 | 365 | 359 | 365 | 345 | 339 | 329 | 318 | 213 322 | 3184 | 217 332 |
| 25-34 | 20 TE | 156 | 154 | 159 | 170 | 164 | 160 | 163 | 165 | 165 | 169 | 158 | 144 | 141 | 134 | 144 | 148 |  |
|  | 4078 | 234 | 236 | 250 | 260 | 252 | 251 | 258 | 258 | 266 | 271 | 258 | 248 | 142 | 242 | 252 | 258 | 148 |
|  | Median | 270 | 273 | 291 | 303 | 294 | 291 | 300 | 305 | 312 | 318 | 353 | 295 | 293 | 242 290 | 352 | 354 | 328 |
|  | 6074 | 312 | 312 | 337 | 348 | 336 | 338 | 346 | 351 | 360 | 367 | 352 | 347 | 393 | 340 | 305 361 | 306 | 310 368 |
|  | 8078 | - 28 | 431 | 459 | 476 | 461 | 439 | 472 | 481 | 498 | 499 | 487 | 487 | 482 | 490 | 509 | 521 | 534 |
| 35-54 | 2078 | 169 | 167 | 176 | 181 | 173 | 169 | 175 | 179 | 186 | 190 | 179 | 174 | 163 | 170 | 176 | 179 | 188 |
|  | 40 TB | 256 | 251 | 277 | 284 | 273 | 272 | 279 | 289 | 299 | 304 | 294 | 289 | 282 | 295 | 301 | 179 307 | 188 323 |
|  | Median | 301 | 305 | 324 | 333 | 322 | 320 | 331 | 342 | 353 | 355 | 347 | 346 | 337 | 354 | 362 | 368 | 387 |
|  | 607: | 351 | 355 | 376 | 386 | 377 | 372 | 3.35 | 400 | 411 | 416 | 410 | 402 | 397 | 416 | 427 | 436 | 458 |
|  | seta | 485 | 494 | 530 | 536 | 525 | 522 | 535 | 551 | 569 | 577 | 568 | 567 | 567 | 593 | 615 | 625 | 652 |
| 5s-64 | 207n | 148 | 146 | 151 | 161 | 135 | 144 | 149 | 156 | 164 | 165 | 160 | 155 |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 40 TH | 266 | 262 | 280 | 283 | 273 | 271 | 275 | 279 | 293 | 296 | 292 | 158 | 153 279 | 169 | 151 | 152 | 198 |
|  | Median | 322 | 323 | 341 | 343 | 334 | 331 | 339 | 342 | 361 | 363 | 357 | 348 | 344 | 368 | 348 | 359 | 369 |
|  | 6078 | 381 | 380 | 402 | 410 | 397 | 393 | 407 | 409 | 431 | 441 | 429 | 419 | 417 | 422 | 427 | 435 | 448 |
|  | 807 | 536 | 341 | 569 | 582 | 560 | SE, | 577 | 589 | 617 | 622 | 615 | 612 | 613 | 613 | 638 | 052 | 665 |
| 65 and | 2074 | 83 | 89 | 96 | 103 | 105 | 107 | 107 | 110 | 112 | 111 | 112 | 113 | 118 | 118 | 126 | 123 | 123 |
| Over | 4078 | 127 | 134 | 144 | 150 | 151 | 156 | 157 | 157 | 163 | 165 | 166 | 170 | 176 | 183 | 128 | 189 | 123 |
|  | Median | 156 | 165 | 175 | 181 | 185 | 189 | 189 | 190 | 200 | 201 | 202 | 207 | 216 | 223 | 188 833 | 233 | 240 |
|  | 60 TH | 195 | 203 | 217 | 219 | 227 | 226 | 230 | 229 | 261 | 244 | 247 | 254 | 264 | 274 | 286 | 287 | 296 |
|  | 80 TH | 330 | 331 | 349 | 356 | 363 | 364 | 373 | 372 | 382 | 379 | 391 | 401 | 421 | 430 | 450 | 454 | 465 |

source. Congresaional Budeer office cabuletions of Current Populetion Survey dace, $1971-19 \varepsilon 7$.

TABLE A-10. ADJUSTED FAMILY INCOME, RELATIVE TO 1976 LEVEL, BY AGE OF FAMILY BEAD, $1970-1986$ (In percents)


Source: Congressional budget office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987

sounce. Consrespional budget Office tabulptions of Current Population Surver deta, 1971-1987



| Wurbar of Merkera | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 197\% | 1978 | 1979 | 1540 | 1981 | 1982 | 1903 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All Tanlies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ | 13 | 43 | 42 | 4 | 03 | 46 | 46 | 85 | 8 | 45 | 86 | 45 | 85 | es | 4 |  | 84 |
| 1 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 14 | 15 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| all Pamiliet Uith Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 61 | 63 | 64 | 64 | 69 | 74 | 72 | 11 | 70 | 70 | 74 | 15 | 78 | 78 | 76 | 76 | 76 |
| 1 | 15 | 33 | 34 | 33 | 29 | 24 | 25 | 26 | 21 | 23 | 24 | 23 | 20 | 20 | 22 | 22 | 22 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Married Couplee With Chiadren |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 42 | 43 | 42 | 41 | 43 | 32 | 50 | 47 | 44 | 43 | 49 | 48 | 33 | 52 | 49 | 48 | 46 |
| 1 | 53 | 52 | 53 | 54 | 49 | 43 | 45 | $4{ }^{4}$ | so | $51$ | 46 | 46 | 41 | 42 | 46 | 46 | 47 |
| 2 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Single Mothere With Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 95 | 96 | 96 | 95 | 93 | 98 | 98 | 96 | 91 | 96 | 98 | 99 | 93 | 99 | 98 | 99 | 97 |
| 1 | 5 | - | 4 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 |
| 2 | 31 | 81 | 81 | el | 21 | 81 | 4 | 81 | 4 | 4 | 41 | 4 | 41 | al | 41 | 21 | 31 |
| Henelderly Childiees Familiea |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 54 | 58 | 53 | 55 | 56 | 64 | 61 | 36 | 56 | 57 | 55 | 60 | 62 | 59 | 59 | 58 | 57 |
| 2 | 39 | 36 | 41 | 36 | 18 | 31 | 34 | 37 | 38 | 37 | 38 | 33 | 32 | 34 | 34 | 34 | 36 |
| 2 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| Monelderly Unreiated Individuala |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 92 | 92 | 92 | 90 | 90 | 94 | 94 |  |  |  | 93 | 93 | 93 | 94 | 92 | 93 | 91 |
| 1 | - | e | - | 10 | 10 | 6 | 6 | 6 | $6$ | $0$ | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | - | 7 | 9 |
| Elderly Childleat Familien |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 33 | 94 | 94 | 94 | 92 | 95 | 96 | 95 | 91 | 97 | 97 | 97 | 95 | 96 | 95 | 94 | 95 |
| 1 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3 | - | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | * | 4 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 41 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | al | 4 | al | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 1 |
| Elderly Unreleted Individuale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| - | 94 | 38 | 99 | 94 | 98 | 18 | 14 | 99 | 98 | 98 | 99 | 100 | 49 | 99 | 95 | 100 | 99 |
| 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 1 |

sompe. Congreaital Budget Office cabulatione of Curgent Populetion turver data, 1971-1987.

| Muaber of Werkere | 1970 | 1911 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1971 | 1978 | 1919 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1934 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | All famillea |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 32 | 33 | 32 | 32 | 34 | 38 | 31 | 36 | 35 | 36 | 37 | 38 | 39 | 31 | 37 | 36 | 36 |
| 1 | 57 | 56 | 56 | 56 | 35 | 32 | 52 | 53 | 53 | 52 | 52 | so | so | 49 | 30 | 51 | 30 |
| 2 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 11 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 13 |
| All Pamillea with childien |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 19 | 13 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 19 | 20 | 22 | 21 | 18 | 18 | 11 |
| 1 | 68 | 68 | - | 68 | 61 | 66 | 66 | 67 | 65 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 67 | 62 | 63 | 63 | 62 |
| 2 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 16 | 18 | 18 | 20 |
| Married Couples with Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 16 | 14 | 13 | - | 12 | 14 | 15 | 17 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 11 |
| 1 | 70 | 70 | 70 | 11 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 69 | 67 | 66 | 65 | 64 | 63 | 63 | 64 | 63 | 62 |
| 2 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 15 | 13 | 16 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 19 | 21 | 23 | 24 | 26 |
| Single Mothers With Childion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 70 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 69 | 11 | 10 | 67 | 65 | 61 | 62 | 61 | 64 | 64 | 61 | 61 | 62 |
| 1 | 29 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 29 | 28 | 21 | 32 |  | 38 | 37 | 31 | 36 | 33 | 38 | 38 | 37 |
| 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | i | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Wonalderly Childiess Families |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 |  |  |  |  | 14 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 14 | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 15 | 15 | 13 |
| 1 | 38 | 56 | 56 | 51 | 56 | 36 | 56 | 54 | 53 | 52 | 52 | 51 | 52 | so | 30 | 49 | 48 |
| 2 | 26 | 27 | 27 | 28 | 28 | 26 | 26 | 28 | 30 | 31 | 30 | 30 | 28 | 30 | 31 | 33 | 34 |
| Monelderiy Unralated Individusta |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 46 | 48 | 47 | 45 | 43 | so | 49 | 46 | 43 | 43 | 42 | 43 | 43 |  | 40 |  | 36 |
| 1 | 54 | 52 | 33 | 55 | 35 | So | 51 | 54 | 51 | 37 | 58 | 37 | \$7 | 58 | 60 | 64 | 64 |
| Elderly Childiesa Fanilies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 75 |  | 16 | 17 |  | 80 | 81 | 22 | 11 | 42 | 11 | 81 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 50 | 19 |
| 1 | 22 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 21 | 14 | 11 | 16 | 17 | 16 | 11 | 47 | 16 | 11 | 17 | 17 | 10 |
| 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| Elderly Uncelered Individuele |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 97 | 91 | 97 | 93 | 98 | 98 | 91 | 94 | 98 | 98 | 99 | 59 | 98 | 58 | 98 | 98 | 98 |
| 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |

sounct. Congrespioael budget office tebuletions of Curcenc Populetion Survey dera, 1971-1987


[^24]TARLE A-15. AVERAGE NUMEEK OF FULL-TIME, FULL-YEAR WORRERS, BY FAMILY IYPE, 1970 -1986 (In workers per family)


TABLE A-15. Continued

sOURCE. Congresitonal Pudet office tabulations of Current Population Survey dara, 1971 -1387

TABLE A-16. MEDIAN ADJUSTED PAMILY INCOME BY MUMBER OF HORKERS, BY FAKILY TYPE, $1970-1986$ (In per:enta)


SOURCE: Congressionel Budget office tabuletions of Jurrant Populetion Survay dere, 1971-1987.

$$
1: 3
$$

| table a-17 median adjusted fakily incone, relative to 1970 level, by number of workers, BY FAMILY TYPE, 1970-1986 (In percents of 1970 medien femily income) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Worker: | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| A11 Femilies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 100 | 101 | 104 | 108 | 108 | 110 | 111 | 113 | 114 | 116 | 114 | 113 | 115 | 115 | 116 | 117 | 119 |
| 1 | 100 | 101 | 196 | 109 | 106 | 109 | 112 | 113 | 116 | 117 | 114 | 114 | 114 | 115 | 117 | 118 | 122 |
| 2 | 100 | 100 | 105 | 108 | 105 | 106 | 106 | 110 | 112 | 112 | 111 | 110 | 110 | 113 | 116 | 118 | 120 |
| All Fewlliee With Chidiren |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 100 | 95 | 94 | 93 | 93 | 89 | 92 | 88 | 92 | 90 | 86 | 81 | 78 | 74 | 71 | 72 | 71 |
| 1 | 100 | 101 | 108 | 109 | 108 | 109 | 111 | 113 | 114 | 116 | 113 | 110 | 111 | 110 | 114 | 114 | 117 |
| 2 | 100 | 99 | 106 | 107 | 106 | 107 | 109 | 113 | 116 | 116 | 115 | 113 | 112 | 116 | 118 | 122 | 123 |
| Serried Couplea With Childien |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 100 | 99 | 101 | 104 | 101 | 93 | 95 | 96 | 102 | 102 | 96 | 94 | 90 | 86 | 86 | 85 | 89 |
| 1 | 100 | 101 | 107 | 110 | 108 | 110 | 113 | 114 | $1: 7$ | 118 | 116 | 113 | 114 | 114 | 116 | 117 | 121 |
| 2 | 100 | 99 | 107 | 107 | 107 | 107 | 109 | 113 | 116 | 116 | 115 | 114 | 113 | 116 | 120 | 123 | - 24 |
| Stagle Mothers With Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 100 | 98 | 102 | 102 | 102 | 101 | 102 | 102 | 99 | 100 | 93 | 88 | 82 | 82 | 81 | 82 | 82 |
| 1 | 100 | 98 | 103 | 106 | 104 | 106 | 108 | 112 | 111 | 116 | 112 | 107 | 106 | 108 | 110 | 114 | 113 |
| 2 | 100 | 90 | 102 | 101 | 106 | 103 | 101 | 113 | 118 | 113 | 111 | 94 | 102 | 110 | 114 | 112 | 109 |
| Nonelderly Childiess Families |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 100 | 92 | 106 | 102 | 100 | 98 | 103 | 104 | 108 | 111 | 110 | 102 | 99 | 10. | 100 | 100 | 107 |
| 1 | 100 | 102 | 106 | 107 | 106 | 109 | 111 | 113 | 116 | 118 | 115 | 114 | 111 | 113 | 114 | 115 | 120 |
| 2 | 100 | 102 | 106 | 107 | 105 | 105 | 105 | 106 | 110 | 110 | 109 | 107 | 107 | 110 | 114 | 116 | 119 |
| Nonalderiy Unreleted Individuela |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 100 | 97 | 98 | 106 | 101 | . 08 | 106 | 110 | 108 | 119 | 113 | 109 | 107 | 103 | 105 | 109 | 106 |
| 1 | 100 | 99 | 103 | 104 | 97 | 102 | 134 | 103 | : 06 | 106 | 104 | 105 | 106 | 108 | 109 | 111 | 112 |
| Elderiy Childiesa Femilics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 100 | 106 | 114 | 115 | 121 | 124 | 126 | 126 | 131 | 133 | 136 | 140 | 144 | 148 | 155 | 158 | 163 |
| 1 | 100 | 101 | 108 | 110 | 106 | 116 | 119 | 120 | 120 | 124 | 121 | 120 | 124 | 124 | 129 | 131 | 132 |
| - | 100 | 105 | 111 | 111 | 110 | 117 | 115 | 118 | 133 | 125 | 120 | 134 | 124 | 132 | 137 | 139 | 133 |
| Elderiy Unreietad Individuals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 100 | 108 | 116 | 122 | 123 | 126 | 127 | 130 | 136 | 132 | 133 | 136 | 142 | 149 | 152 | 150 | 151 |
| 1 | 100 | 94 | 105 | 114 | 110 | 108 | 110 | 110 | 116 | 120 | 127 | 134 | 135 | 135 | 127 | 140 | 137 |

SOURCE. Congresitonel Budget Office tebuletiont of Current Population Suiver dete, $1 \times 71-1987$

## table a-18. median and percentiles of adjusted family income by age of family mead AND FAMILY TYPE, 1970-1986 (In percents)



TABLE A-18. Continued

qable: A-18. Coneinued


```
Table A-18. Continued
```

| Ase of Fanily <br> Head | Income Percentile | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Single Mothers With Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 25 | 2078 | 38 | 39 | 38 | 40 | 39 | 42 | 42 | 38 | 38 | 35 | 38 | 34 | 31 | 29 | 26 | 29 | 27 |
|  | 4078 | 69 | 67 | 72 | 72 | 68 | 71 | 68 | 65 | 68 | 66 | 62 | 57 | 54 | 54 | 53 | 50 | 51 |
|  | Medien | 79 | 77 | 86 | 82 | 82 | 84 | 80 | 76 | 83 | 80 | 76 | 68 | 67 | 66 | 66 | 64 | 66 |
|  | 6078 | 94 | 90 | 94 | 93 | 101 | 94 | 87 | 90 | 100 | 93 | 91 | 85 | 81 | 80 | 79 | 76 | 76 |
|  | 80 TE | 162 | 139 | 144 | 136 | 170 | 150 | 127 | 139 | 161 | 163 | 165 | 144 | 154 | 142 | 141 | 146 | 132 |
| 25.34 | 2078 | 66 | 52 | 54 | 59 | 56 | 56 | 59 | 63 | 55 | 61 | 54 | 51 | 47 | 46 | 46 | 47 | 45 |
|  | 40 TH | 80 | 81 | ! | 87 | 87 | 89 | 90 | 91 | 87 | 94 | 87 | 85 | 76 | 76 | 78 | 74 | 73 |
|  | Medien | 96 | 98 | 111 | 105 | 104 | 110 | 110 | 115 | 112 | 424 | 112 | 109 | 97 | 96 | 102 | 95 | 93 |
|  | 60 TE | 117 | 120 | 126 | 138 | 131 | 137 | 142 | 150 | 153 | 151 | 143 | 142 | 129 | 129 | 137 | 132 | 120 |
|  | 30 TH | 193 | 188 | 209 | 218 | 220 | 217 | 228 | 226 | 237 | 240 | 732 | 215 | 215 | 214 | 225 | 224 | 205 |
| 35-54 |  | 70 | 67 | 69 | 70 | 69 | 69 | 74 | 77 | 74 | 73 | 73 | 68 | 65 | 63 | 65 | 68 | 67 |
|  | 2018 | 117 | 108 | 109 | 113 | 113 | 1:0 | 113 | 117 | 123 | 134 | 134 | 125 | 114 | 119 | 121 | 130 | 127 |
|  | Medien | 147 | 136 | 138 | 138 | 140 | 137 | 146 | 146 | 161 | 174 | 168 | 160 | 151 | 158 | 160 | 172 | 176 |
|  | 6078 | 179 | 165 | 171 | 172 | 175 | 173 | 180 | 185 | 201 | 219 | 204 | 200 | 192 | 198 | 201 | 216 | 226 |
|  | 8078 | 250 | 250 | 270 | 275 | 271 | 267 | 273 | 295 | 302 | 309 | 311 | 293 | 295 | 291 | 306 | 315 | 333 |
| 55-64 | 2078 | 52 | 48 | 51 | 72 | 63 | 71 | 67 | 68 | 66 | 80 | 66 | 71 | 61 | 67 | 55 | 62 | 62 |
|  | 401 H | 91 | 83 | 87 | 105 | 99 | 107 | 101 | 120 | 104 | 130 | 111 | 124 | 96 | 105 | 95 124 | 112 146 | 113 146 |
|  | Medien | 106 | 115 | 116 | 139 | 130 | 128 | 130 | 152 | 144 | 173 | 139 | 149 | 124 | 128 | 124 | 146 | 166 |
|  | 6071 | 134 | 140 | 142 | 169 | 173 | 155 | 155 | 190 | 187 | 211 | 170 | :90 | 156 | 160 | 184 | 213 313 | 286 |
|  | 80 TH | 254 | 243 | 226 | 240 | 280 | 234 | 260 | 302 | 282 | 299 | 252 | 259 | 245 | 263 | 284 | 313 | 286 |
| 65 and over | 2078 | 41 | 34 | 39 | 44 | 68 | 60 | 58 | 61 | 65 | 73 | 64 | 54 | 54 | 54 | 66 | 81 | 83 |
|  | 4078 | 59 | 62 | 71 | 70 | 84 | 78 | 86 | 101 | 92 | 108 | 96 | 81 | 84 | 89 | 109 | 110 | 103 148 |
|  | Medien | 68 | 79 | 82 | 81 | 89 | 88 | 100 | 115 | 110 | 151 | 112 | 104 | 99 | 117 | 141 | 126 | 148 |
|  | 6078 | 76 | 95 | 91 | 92 | 107 | 104 | 113 | 124 | 133 | 175 | 143 | 130 | 116 | 135 | 169 | 154 | 194 |
|  | 80TE | 167 | 146 | 162 | 126 | 206 | 196 | 179 | 241 | 162 | 275 | 206 | 233 | 222 | 213 | 225 | 236 | 305 |

table a-18. Continuad


TABLE A－1娄，Continued

| Age of Fanily Beed | Incona Percentile | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Unreleted Individuels |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Unde． 25 | 207月 | 56 | 50 | 56 | 63 | 68 | 71 | 67 | 80 | 81 | 90 | 82 | 66 | 69 | 55 | 65 | 68 | 63 |
|  | 4071 | 117 | 114 | 123 | 137 | 129 | 142 | 138 | 146 | 155 | 168 | 159 | 141 | 140 | 128 | 136 | 137 | 135 |
|  | Madian | 156 | 149 | 159 | 177 | 168 | 174 | 176 | 182 | 194 | 205 | 191 | 179 | 175 | 167 | 173 | 177 | 173 |
|  | 607 H | 195 | 187 | 201 | 213 | 210 | 207 | 218 | 217 | 236 | 237 | 230 | 216 | 219 | 212 | 207 | 216 | 212 |
|  | cort | 296 | 291 | 305 | 309 | 294 | 298 | 305 | 319 | 326 | 30 | 318 | 314 | 306 | 300 | 306 | 314 | 314 |
| 25－34 | 2051 | 163 | 170 | 158 | 171 | 159 | 161 | 163 | 169 | 164 | 180 | 172 | 153 | 163 | 148 | 161 | 173 | 165 |
|  | 4078 | 283 | 286 | 285 | 299 | 272 | 285 | 275 | 283 | 290 | 289 | 280 | 27！ | 273 | 265 | 280 | 282 | 289 |
|  | Medien | 342 | 338 | 346 | 344 | 323 | 333 | 327 | 325 | 330 | 332 | 328 | 317 | 328 | 318 | 326 | 335 | 337 |
|  | 607 B | 390 | 381 | 391 | 393 | 367 | 385 | 372 | 379 | 387 | 385 | 374 | 368 | 374 | 372 | 381 | 392 | 389 |
|  | c0\％ | 498 | 507 | 509 | 526 | 486 | 490 | 489 | 493 | 514 | 509 | 499 | 509 | 504 | 510 | 513 | 535 | 548 |
| 35－54 | 2018 | 119 | 115 | 116 | 119 | 105 | 107 | 109 | 115 | 131 | 130 | 125 | 126 | 109 | 127 | 129 | 137 | 135 |
|  | 4078 | 231 | 234 | 228 | 236 | 220 | 220 | 227 | 241 | 255 | 366 | 246 | 256 | 242 | 276 | 268 | 276 | 281 |
|  | Madian | 285 | 282 | 285 | 300 | 287 | 282 | 294 | 310 | 320 | 325 | 318 | 329 | 325 | 339 | 346 | 354 | 362 |
|  | 6078 | 342 | 339 | 351 | 368 | 350 | 352 | 363 | 383 | 388 | 383 | 390 | 396 | 394 | 424 | 422 | 432 | 443 |
|  | 3078 | 479 | 488 | 504 | 541 | 516 | 530 | 547 | 557 | 573 | 558 | 564 | 586 | 577 | 624 | 624 | 615 | 633 |
| 55－64 | 2078 | 80 | 71 | 76 | 84 | 69 | 84 | 88 | 87 | 87 | 84 | 87 | 91 | 91 | 87 | 91 | 85 | 87 |
|  | 4078 | 153 | 136 | 148 | 162 | 154 | 139 | 149 | 159 | 161 | 169 | 156 | 153 | 164 | 166 | 162 | 165 | 168 |
|  | Medien | 20. | 180 | 196 | 208 | 197 | 186 | 196 | 197 | 213 | 200 | 207 | 209 | 22C | 215 | 211 | 218 | 218 |
|  | 605月 | 252 | 235 | 246 | 256 | 252 | 245 | 253 | 252 | 266 | 258 | 264 | 261 | 269 | 267 | 264 | 279 | 281 |
|  | cors | 396 | 376 | 408 | 413 | 386 | 388 | 405 | 412 | 430 | 419 | ＋39 | 441 | 443 | 444 | 439 | 466 | 480 |
|  | 2078 | 67 | 70 | 76 | 82 | 87 | 88 | 88 | 91 | 94 | 91 | 92 | 92 | 97 | 98 | 101 | 101 | 100 |
| Over | 4078 | 92 | 98 | 196 | 115 | 114 | 118 | 118 | 121 | 125 | 123 | 124 | 125 | 131 | 135 | 137 | 136 | 136 |
|  | Medien | 107 | 115 | 122 | 130 | 129 | 132 | 134 | 136 | 142 | 139 | 140 | 145 | 149 | 159 | 160 | 159 | 160 |
|  | 6078 | 128 | 135 | 142 | 150 | 148 | 155 | 157 | 160 | 170 | 166 | 166 | 172 | 181 | 192 | 194 | 197 | 197 |
|  | cota | 208 | 216 | 228 | 229 | 245 | 240 | 243 | 249 | 263 | 260 | 257 | 275 | 295 | 311 | 324 | 320 | 323 |

Sovice：Congressionel Budget Office tebuletions of Current Population Survey dete，1971－1987．

SABLE A-19. mEDIAK AMD sERCEMTILES OF ADJUSTED FAMILY IMCOHE, RELATIVE TO 1970 LEVEL,
By agi of fanily gead and pamily type, 197r-1986 (In percents of 1970 income level)


```
Sanle A-19. Conel uad
```

| Eeed | Incone <br> Percant ${ }^{1}$ - | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 197 | 1979 | 1910 | 1911 | 1932 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Onder 25 |  | All Pamiles With Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 201景 | 100 | 91 | 91 | 46 | 12 | 76 | 78 | 72 | 74 | 73 | 66 | 59 | 52 | 48 | 47 | 45 | 44 |
|  | 40\% | 100 | 94 | 93 | 94 | 1 | 72 | 76 | 76 | 85 | 12 | 74 | 67 | 60 | 53 | 55 | 53 | 50 |
|  | Madian | 100 | 94 | 95 | 96 | 91 | 79 | 10 | 11 | 85 | 14 | 0 | 72 | 67 | 60 | 62 | 63 | 57 |
|  | 607. | 100 | 92 | 96 | 97 | 91 | 12 | 12 | 3 | 18 | 90 | 3 | 76 | 74 | 66 | \$6 | 68 | 64 |
|  | 0\%t | 100 | 98 | 101 | 100 | 95 | 07 | 90 | 92 | 94 | 93 | 92 | 86 | 12 | 76 | 79 | 79 | 79 |
| 25-34 | 261 | 100 | 98 | 103 | 100 | 104 | 101 | 101 | 101 | 103 | 102 | 92 | 86 | 10 | 77 | 0 | 10 | 12 |
|  | 4091 | 100 | 101 | 108 | 111 | 108 | 105 | 107 | 107 | 111 | 110 | 105 | 94 | 95 | 94 | 99 | 97 | 99 |
|  | Median | 100 | 101 | 107 | 111 | 107 | 104 | 104 | 107 | 111 | 111 | 106 | 102 | 99 | 94 | 102 | 103 | 103 |
|  | 60\% | 100 | 101 | 108 | 111 | 103 | 105 | 108 | 110 | 112 | 114 | 104 | 105 | 103 | 102 | 106 | 107 | 109 |
|  | 0\%t: | 100 | 101 | 109 | 112 | 109 | 106 | 109 | 112 | 115 | 117 | 111 | 111 | 109 | 109 | 116 | 117 | 119 |
| 35-54 | $20^{\circ}$ | 100 | 93 | 104 | 100 | 104 | 99 | 103 | 106 | 111 | 112 | 105 | 102 | 96 | 97 | 101 | 106 | 109 |
|  | 40\% | 100 | 101 | 108 | 111 | 107 | 106 | 109 | 112 | 116 | 119 | 114 | 112 | 108 | 111 | 114 | 119 | 123 |
|  | Modian | 100 | 102 | 109 | 112 | 209 | 107 | 111 | 115 | 119 | 121 | 117 | 114 | 113 | $+17$ | 119 | 123 | 128 |
|  | cota | 100 | 101 | 108 | 110 | 108 | 106 | 110 | 114 | 117 | 119 | 116 | 115 | 112 | 116 | 120 | 122 | 128 |
|  | OtI | 100 | 102 | 109 | 111 | 108 | 107 | 109 | 113 | 117 | 120 | 13 | 115 | 116 | 122 | 125 | 128 | 134 |
| 35-64 | 201 I | 100 | 100 | 107 | 107 | 167 | 95 | 102 | 102 | 108 | 113 | 102 | 102 | 94 | 93 | 18 | 95 | 92 |
|  | 407 | 100 | 99 | 100 | 106 | 105 | 100 | 103 | 105 | 108 | 110 | 101 | 99 | 93 | 98 | 98 | 103 | 9 |
|  | Medien | 100 | 101 | 105 | 110 | 105 | 104 | 106 | 106 | 109 | 111 | 107 | 102 | 100 | 102 | 105 | 107 | 102 |
|  | 60t\% | 100 | 101 | 105 | 109 | 104 | 102 | 104 | 104 | 108 | 110 | 108 | 102 | 101 | 102 | 108 | 106 | 103 |
|  | cota | 100 | 97 | 104 | 109 | 107 | 102 | 104 | 106 | 109 | 111 | 106 | 104 | 103 | 100 | 112 | 110 | 110 |
| 63 and | 20tri | 100 | 113 | 120 | 132 | 130 | 142 | 145 | 130 | 150 | 146 | 153 | 132 | 135 | 125 | 145 | 157 | 152 |
| Over | 40TE | 100 | 109 | 112 | 115 | 125 | 139 | 125 | 121 | 142 | 147 | 131 | 119 | 140 | 131 | 140 | 144 | 142 |
|  | Medier | 100 | $\bigcirc 04$ | 112 | 107 | 115 | 121 | 109 | 109 | 123 | 131 | 119 | 106 | 129 | 120 | 135 | 126 | 137 |
|  | 60 th | 100 | 91 | 104 | 96 | 99 | 104 | 96 | 94 | 110 | 109 | 105 | 95 | 115 | 107 | 109 | 116 | 120 |
|  | 107n | 100 | 97 | 98 | 93 | 99 | 97 | 93 | 93 | 101 | 101 | 100 | 94 | 9 | 101 | 104 | 112 | 115 |

TABLE A-19. Continued

| Ase of <br> Tanily <br> Heed | Incone Percentile | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Merried Couples With Children |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Under 25 | 20tE | 100 | 98 | 100 | 99 | 97 | 81 | 94 | 95 | 100 | 99 | 90 | 84 | 80 | 70 | 74 | 72 | 74 |
|  | 40tE | 100 | 94 | 98 | 101 | 97 | 87 | 91 | 94 | 99 | 100 | 92 | 84 | 83 | 79 | 76 | 32 | 82 |
|  | Medien | 100 | 94 | 98 | 100 | 95 | 88 | 91 | 92 | 99 | 100 | 94 | 6 | 86 | 79 | 78 | 84 | 83 |
|  | 607F | 100 | 96 | 100 | 102 | 98 | 91 | 95 | 96 | 100 | 107 | 98 | 89 | 89 | 85 | 83 | 87 | 90 |
|  | sotr | 100 | 100 | 103 | 104 | 99 | 93 | 98 | 98 | 105 | 110 | 101 | 99 | 100 | 91 | 94 | 93 | 96 |
| 25-34 | 2078 | 100 | 101 | 106 | 115 | 112 | 104 | 106 | 108 | 111 | 112 | 105 | 98 | 93 | 90 | 98 | 95 | 102 |
|  | $40 \% \mathrm{~B}$ | 100 | 102 | 108 | 113 | 110 | 106 | 110 | 110 | 114 | 115 | 110 | 107 | - 02 | 103 | 108 | 108 | 111 |
|  | Medien | 100 | 101 | 108 | 112 | 110 | 107 | 109 | 111 | 115 | 117 | 112 | 110 | 106 | 105 | 111 | 111 | 115 |
|  | $60 \%$ | 100 | 102 | 109 | 114 | 110 | 108 | 111 | 113 | 116 | 120 | 114 | 112 | 110 | 110 | 115 | 116 | 118 |
|  | cota | 100 | 101 | 109 | 113 | 110 | 106 | 111 | 114 | 117 | 120 | 114 | 116 | 114 | 114 | 120 | 122 | 125 |
| 35-54 | 207\% | 100 | 100 | 108 | 112 | 108 | 105 | 109 | 114 | 117 | 120 | 115 | 111 | 107 | 107 | 113 | 118 | 123 |
|  | 407E | 100 | 102 | 110 | 113 | 109 | 108 | 112 | 116 | 121 | 123 | 119 | 117 | 116 | 119 | 122 | 126 | 131 |
|  | Medien | 100 | 102 | 109 | 112 | 109 | 107 | 112 | 116 | 120 | 123 | 120 | 118 | 117 | 121 | 124 | 127 | 133 |
|  | $607 \%$ | 100 | 102 | 109 | 112 | 110 | 108 | 112 | 115 | 120 | 123 | 121 | 118 | 117 | 121 | 125 | 129 | 134 |
|  | coti | 100 | 103 | 111 | 111 | 109 | 109 | 110 | 115 | 119 | 122 | 120 | 119 | 121 | 124 | 128 | 132 | 139 |
| 55-64 | 209\% | 100 | 106 | 106 | 113 | 104 | 101 | 110 | 103 | 112 | 119 | 117 | 111 | 103 | 105 | 105 | 100 | 99 |
|  | 40\%. | 100 | 100 | 110 | 111 | 105 | 109 | 111 | 106 | 112 | 114 | 116 | 109 | 106 | 109 | 106 | 107 | 105 |
|  | Medien | 100 | 101 | 110 | 111 | 104 | 105 | 111 | 108 | 112 | 114 | 115 | 107 | 108 | 110 | 116 | 108 | 109 |
|  | 60\% | 100 | 102 | 108 | 113 | 105 | 106 | 112 | 107 | 113 | 116 | 117 | 112 | 110 | 111 | 117 | 116 | 113 |
|  | $80{ }^{2}$ | 100 | 97 | 105 | 108 | 108 | 104 | 105 | 109 | 111 | 112 | 110 | 109 | 107 | 112 | 117 | 115 | 115 |
|  | 20t5 | 100 | 101 | 104 | 116 | 115 | 123 | 134 | 112 | 134 | 151 | 123 | 109 | 124 | 132 | 127 | 150 | 128 |
| Over | 4078 | 100 | 107 | 125 | 129 | 121 | 136 | 130 | 119 | 155 | 155 | 130 | 113 | 146 | 152 | 137 | 147 | 148 |
|  | Medien | 100 | 100 | 114 | 114 | 103 | 113 | 116 | 103 | 134 | 125 | 116 | 94 | 121 | 133 | 123 | 120 | 122 |
|  | 60\% | 100 | 88 | 109 | 103 | 97 | 100 | 106 | 92 | 113 | 110 | 104 | 92 | 114 | 123 | 107 | 121 | 120 |
|  | 807: | 100 | 100 | 105 | 95 | 101 | 97 | 110 | 93 | 110 | 103 | 94 | 95 | 103 | 116 | 113 | 114 | 130 |
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SovRcE: Congreational Budget office eabulationa of Currant Population Survey data. 1971-1987

APPENDIX B
INCOME, PRICE INDEXES, AND
POVERTY THRESHOLDS

TABLE B-1. MEDIAN FAMILY INCOME, 1947-1986

| Year | Median Family Income |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | In Current Dollars | $\begin{aligned} & \text { In } 1986 \\ & \text { Dollars } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1947 | 3,031 | 14,859 |
| 1948 | 3,187 | 14,522 |
| 1949 | 3,107 | 14,302 |
| 1950 | 3,319 | 15,124 |
| 1951 | 3,709 | 15,640 |
| 1952 | 3,890 | 16,066 |
| 1953 | 4,242 | 17,401 |
| 1954 | 4,167 | 16,978 |
| 1955 | 4,418 | 18,082 |
| 1956 | 4,780 | 19,301 |
| 1957 | 4,966 | 19,361 |
| 1958 | 5,087 | 19,292 |
| 1959 | 5,417 | 20,373 |
| 1960 | 5,620 | 20,791 |
| 1961 | 5,735 | 21,001 |
| 1962 | 5,956 | 21,592 |
| 1963 | 6,249 | 22,335 |
| 1964 | 6,569 | 23,210 |
| 1965 | 6,957 | 24,156 |
| 1966 | 7,532 | 25,421 |
| 1967 | 7,933 | 26,045 |
| 1968 | 8,632 | 27,204 |
| 1969 | 9,433 | 28,205 |
| 1970 | 9,867 | 27,846 |
| 1971 | 10,285 | 27,853 |
| 1972 | 11,116 | 29,143 |
| 1973 | 12,051 | 29.741 |
| 1974 | 12,902 | 28,673 |
| 1975 | 13,719 | 27,948 |
| 1976 |  | 28,817 |
| 1977 | 16,009 | 28,960 |
| 1978 | 17,640 | 29,629 |
| 1979 | 1'f,587 | 29,577 |
| 1980 | 21,023 | 27,964 |
| 1981 | 22,388 | 26,982 |
| 1982 | 23,433 | 26,610 |
| 1983 | 24,674 | 27,150 |
| 1984 | 26,433 | 27,898 |
| 1986 | 27,735 | 28,266 |
| 1986 | 29,458 | 29,458 |

SOURCES: Bureau of the Census, Moncy Income of Households, Famulies, and Persons in the Unued States: 1984, Current Population Reports, Serien P-60, No. 151, April 1986, p. 29; Money Income and Poverty Statuc of Families and Persons in the United States: 1986, Series P-60, No. 157, July 1987, pp. 11 and 38.

TABLE B-2. COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVE PRICE INDEXES, 1967-1986

|  | Official Consumer Price Inder | CPI-XI |  | Personal Consumption Expenditures Deflator |  | Gross Nationci Product Deflator |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Value | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio } \\ & \text { to CPI } \end{aligned}$ | Value | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio } \\ & \text { to CPI } \end{aligned}$ | Value | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio } \\ & \text { to CPI } \end{aligned}$ |
| 1967 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 1.00 | 100.0 | 1.00 | 100.0 | 1.00 |
| 1968 | 104.2 | 103.7 | 1.00 | 104.5 | 1.00 | 105.0 | 1.01 |
| 1969 | 109.8 | 108.3 | 0.99 | 109.0 | 0.99 | 110.9 | 1.01 |
| 1970 | 116.3 | 113.6 | 0.98 | 114.0 | 0.98 | 117.0 | 1.01 |
| 1971 | 121.3 | 118.5 | 0.98 | 119.4 | 0.98 | 123.6 | 1.02 |
| 1972 | 125.3 | 122.1 | 0.97 | 124.1 | 0.99 | 129.5 | 1.03 |
| 1973 | 133.1 | 129.7 | 0.97 | 131.8 | 0.99 | 137.9 | 1.04 |
| 1974 | 147.7 | 142.8 | 0.97 | 145.7 | 0.99 | 150.4 | 1.02 |
| 1975 | 161.2 | 154.5 | 0.96 | 157.3 | 0.98 | 165.2 | 1.02 |
| 1976 | 170.5 | 163.5 | 0.96 | 166.3 | 0.98 | 175.7 | 1.03 |
| 1977 | 181.5 | 173.9 | 0.96 | 177.1 | 0.98 | 187.5 | 1.03 |
| 1978 | 195.4 | 185.7 | 0.95 | 190.0 | 0.97 | 201.2 | 1.03 |
| 1979 | 217.4 | 203.6 | 0.94 | 207.5 | 0.95 | 219.1 | 1.01 |
| 1980 | 246.8 | 226.4 | 0.92 | 229.7 | 0.93 | 238.8 | 0.97 |
| 1981 | 272.4 | 247.9 | 0.91 | 250.9 | 0.92 | 262.0 | 0.96 |
| 1982 | 289.1 | 263.0 | 0.91 | 265.2 | 0.92 | 278.7 | 0.96 |
| 1983 | 298.4 | 271.5 | 0.91 | 276.0 | 0.93 | 289.6 | 0.97 |
| 1984 | 311.1 | 283.0 | 0.91 | 286.5 | 0.92 | 300.6 | 0.97 |
| 1985 | 322.2 | 293.1 | 0.91 | 296.6 | 0.92 | 310.5 | 0.96 |
| 1986 | 328.4 | 298.7 | 0.91 | 302.8 | 0.92 | 318.9 | 0.97 ' |

SOURCES: Economic Report of the President (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1987), pp. 251, 307, and 312; unpublished data from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

TA BLE B-3. ADJUSTED POVERTY THRESHOLDS, WEIGHTED AVERAGE BY FAMILY SIZE, 1967-1986 (In dollars) a/

| Year | Family Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unrelated Individual |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Two } \\ \text { Persons } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Three Persons | Four Peraons | Five Persons | Sir Persons | Seven or More Persons |
|  |  |  | Head | Head |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & 65 \end{aligned}$ | Over 65 | Under 65 | Over 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1967 | 1,722 | 1,600 | 2,238 | 2,017 | 2,661 | 3,410 | 4,019 | 4,516 | 5,550 |
| 1968 | 1,788 | 1,659 | 2,322 | 2,092 | 2,761 | 3,536 | 4,168 | 4,683 | 5,761 |
| 1969 | 1,867 | 1,733 | 2,424 | 2,185 | 2,884 | 3,692 | 4,355 | 4,890 | 6,018 |
| 1970 | 1,963 | 1,818 | 2,544 | 2,293 | 3,027 | 3,876 | 4,571 | 5,138 | 6,318 |
| 1971 | 2,050 | 1,895 | 2,653 | 2,391 | 3,154 | 4,042 | 4,767 | 5,362 | 6,595 |
| 1972 | 2,113 | 1,954 | 2,736 | 2,465 | 3,254 | 4,166 | 4,915 | E.528 | 6,80¢ |
| 1973 | 2,248 | 2,076 | 2,908 | 2,619 | 3,457 | 4,424 | 5,221 | 5,874 | 7,245 |
| 1974 | 2,477 | 2,286 | 3,202 | 2,883 | 3,805 | 4,871 | 5,753 | 6,477 | 7,979 |
| 1975 | 2,682 | 2,475 | 3,469 | 3,124 | 4,117 | 5,275 | 6,233 | 7,016 | 8,653 |
| 1976 | 2,838 | 2,618 | 3,669 | 3,304 | 4,354 | 5,576 | 6,594 | 7,441 | 9,194 |
| 1977 | 3,020 | 2,784 | 3,901 | 3,512 | 4,631 | 5,932 | 7,013 | 7,915 | 9,788 |
| 1978 | 3,224 | 2,972 | 4,165 | 3,748 | 4,943 | 6,331 | 7,489 | 8,450 | 10,456 |
| 1979 | 3,538 | 3,258 | 4,568 | 4,111 | 5,417 | 6,942 | 8,218 | 9,285 | 11,500 |
| 1980 | 3,935 | 3,623 | 5,079 | 4,571 | 6,022 | 7,719 | 9,142 | 10,338 | b/ |
| 1981 | 4,304 | 3,967 | 5,561 | 5,004 | 6,598 | 8,452 | 10,017 | 11,329 | b/ |
| 1982 | 4,566 | 4,208 | 5,901 | 5,309 | 6,998 | 8,972 | 10,629 | 12,015 | b |
| 1983 | 4,713 | 4,345 | 6,093 | 5,480 | 7,222 | 9,260 | 10,963 | 12,401 | b/ |
| 1984 | 4,912 | 4,529 | 6,352 | 5,715 | 7,529 | 9,651 | 11,431 | 12,924 | b |
| 1985 | 5,088 | 4,690 | 6,578 | 5,916 | 7,799 | 9,997 | 11,832 | 13,369 | b/ |
| 1986 | 5,186 | 4,780 | 6,706 | 6,031 | 7,948 | 10,191 | 12,061 | 13,633 | b/ |

SOURCE: Derived from data in Tables B-2 and B-4.
a. Povecty threaholds have been adjusted for inflation using the CPI-X1 since 1967. See tert for discursion of adjustment methodology.
b. Until 1979, families with seven or more people had the same poverty threshold. Since 1980, there have been eoparate thresholds for families with seven, eight, and nine or more members. These thresholds are:

| Year | Seven <br> Persons | Eight <br> Persons | Nine <br> or More <br> Persons |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 11,706 | 13,025 | 15,499 |
| 1981 | 12,841 | 14,247 | 16,902 |
| 1982 | 13679 | 15,210 | 17,920 |
| 1983 | 14,103 | 15,622 | 18,479 |
| 1984 | 14,642 | 16,339 | 19,328 |
| 1985 | 15,152 | 16,840 | 20,089 |
| 1986 | 15,509 | 17,094 | 20,465 |

TABLE B-4. OFFICIAL POVERTY THRESHOLDS, WEIGHTED AVERAGE BY FAMILY SIZE, 1967-1986 (In dollars)

| Year | Family Composition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Unrelated Individual |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Two } \\ \text { Pertions } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  | Three Persons | Four Persona | Five Persons | $\begin{gathered} \text { Six } \\ \text { Pertons } \end{gathered}$ | Seven or More Persons |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Under } \\ 65 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Over } \\ 65 \end{gathered}$ | Unaer 65 | Over 65 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1967 | 1,722 | 1,600 | 2,238 | 2,01; | 2,661 | 3,410 | 4,019 | 4,516 | 5,550 |
| 1968 | 1,797 | 1,667 | 2,333 | 2,102 | 2,774 | 3,553 | 4,188 | 4,706 | 5,789 |
| 1969 | 1,893 | 1,757 | 2,458 | 2,215 | 2,924 | 3,743 | 4,415 | 4,958 | 6,101 |
| 1970 | 2,010 | 1,861 | 2,604 | 2,348 | 3,099 | 3,968 | 4,680 | 6,260 | 6,468 |
| 1971 | 2,098 | 1,940 | 2,716 | 2,448 | ¢,229 | 4,137 | 4,880 | 6,489 |  |
| 1972 | 2,168 | 2,005 | 2,808 | 2,530 | 3,339 | 4,275 | 5,804 | 5,489 | 6,751 |
| 1973 | 2,307 | 2,130 | 2,984 | 2,688 | 3,548 | 4,540 | 5,358 | 6,028 | 7,435 |
| 1974 | 2,562 | 2,364 | 3,312 | 2,982 | 3,936 | 5,038 | 5,960 | 6,699 | 8,253 |
| 1975 | 2,797 | 2,581 | 3,617 | 3,257 | 4,293 | 6,500 | 6,499 | 7,316 | 9,022 |
| 1976 | 2,959 | 2,730 | 3,826 | 3,446 | 4,840 | 5,815 | 6,876 | 7,760 | 9,588 |
| 1977 1978 | 3,152 3,392 | 2,906 | 4,072 | 3,666 | 4,833 | 6,191 | 7,320 | 8,261 | 10,216 |
| 1978 1979 | 3,392 3,778 | 3,127 3,479 | 4,383 4878 | 3,944 | 5,201 | 6,662 | 7,880 | 8,891 | 11,002 |
| 1980 | 4,290 | $3,4,949$ | 8,537 | 4,983 | 5,784 $\mathbf{6 , 5 6 5}$ | 7,412 8,414 | $\mathbf{8 , 7 7 5}$ $\mathbf{9 , 9 6 6}$ | 9,914 11,269 | 12,280 a/ |
| 1981 | 4,729 | 4,359 | 6,111 | 5,498 | 7,250 | 9,287 | 11,007 | 12,449 |  |
| 1982 | 5,019 | 4,626 | 6,487 | 6,836 | 7,693 | 9,862 | 11,684 | 13,207 | a |
| 1983 | 5,180 | 4,775 | 6,697 | 6,023 | 7,938 | 10,178 | 12,049 | 13,630 | -1 |
| 1984 | 5,400 5,693 | 4,979 | 6,983 | 6,282 | 8,277 | 10,609 | 12,566 | 14,207 | - |
| 1985 | 5,693 | 5,156 | 7,231 | 6,503 | 8,573 | 10,989 | 13,007 | 14,696 | a/ |
| 1986 | 5,701 | 5,255 | 7,372 | 6,630 | 8,737 | 11,203 | 13,259 | 14,986 | al |

SOURCES: Social Securty Bulletin, Annual Statistical Supplement, 1986, p. 73; Money Income and Poverty Status of Families and Persons in the Unuted States: 1986, Current Population Feports, Sories P-60, No. 157, July 1987, p. 38.
a. Until 1979, femilies with seven or more people had the same poverty threshold. Since 1980, there have ioeen separate threaholds for families with seven, eight, and nine or more members. These threaholds are:

| Year | Seven <br> Persons | Eight <br> Persons | Nine <br> or More <br> Persons |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1980 | 12,761 | 14,199 | 16,896 |
| 1981 | 14,110 | 15,655 | 18,572 |
| 1982 | 15,036 | 16,719 | 19,698 |
| 1983 | 16,500 | 17,170 | 20,310 |
| 1984 | 16,096 | 17,961 | 21,247 |
| 1985 | 16,656 | 18,512 | 22,083 |
| 1986 | 17,049 | 18,791 | 22,497 |

## APPENDIX C

POVERTY STATISTICS FOR FAMILIES, 1970-1986
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## TABLE C-1. DISTRIBUTIOM OP PAMILIES BY PERCEMTAEE OF AD.JUSTED POVERTY TBRESBOLDS.

 BY PAMILY TYPs, 1970-1986 (In percente of fanilies of siven type)Peally Income
as a Percentase
of the Adjueted


(Continued)

TABLE C-1. Continued

Fally Income
a* Percentage

- Et the Mdjueted


| Monelderly Childiess Pamilies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Leee than 50 | Parcent | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 50-100 | Percent | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 100-125 | Parcant | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 125-150 | Percent | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| $150-200$ | Percont | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| Orer 200 | Percant | 86 | 85 | 87 | 88 | 87 | 86 | 87 | 88 | 89 | 89 | 38 | 86 | 85 | 86 | 86 | 36 | 87 |
| Monelderiy Unreleted Individuele |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lees then 50 | Parcont | 10 | 11 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 |
| 50-100 | Percent | 12 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 |
| 100-125 | Percent | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | * | 4 |
| 125-150 | Percent | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 150-200 | Parcant | 10 | 10 | 9 | 10 | 10 | 11 | 9 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 9 | 9 | 8 | 9 | - | 9 |
| Over 200 | Percant | 57 | 56 | 57 | 59 | 58 | 58 | 59 | 60 | 62 | 64 | 63 | 62 | 62 | 62 | 84 | 64 | 64 |
| Elderly Childless Pamiliee |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leee rlen 50 | Parcant | 2 | 2 | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 50-100 | Percent | 22 | 10 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| 100-125 | Parcant | 2 | - | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 125-150 | Parcant | , | \% | 8 | 7 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 4 |
| $150-200$ | Parcent | 15 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 11 |
| Over 200 | Parcant | 54 | 57 | 61 | 61 | 63 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 67 | 68 | 59 | 70 | 71 | 72 | 74 | 74 | 77 |
| Elderiy Unrelated Individupis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Leea then 50 | 0 Percent | 10 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 2 | ? | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 50-100 | Parcant | 36 | 32 | 29 | 24 | 25 | 24 | 24 | 22 | 21 | 22 | 22 | 22 | 19 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 17 |
| 100-125 | 5 Parcant | 13 | 14 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 16 | 17 | 17 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 | 14 |
| 125-150 | Percent | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 12 |
| 150-200 | Percent | 10 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 15 | 15 | 13 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| Over 200 | Percant | 21 | 23 | 24 | 26 | 27 | 28 | 29 | 29 | 32 | 31 | 30 | 33 | 35 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 39 |



## taile C-2. ADJUSTED poverty ratzs by family type, 1970-1986 (In percente of familiea of given type)

| Panlly Type | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | 1977 | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 | 1983 | 1984 | 1985 | 1986 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| All Taniliea | 13 | 14 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 14 | 13 | 13 | 13 |
| Pealiles With Children | 11 | 12 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 16 | 16 | 16 | 15 | 15 |
| Marifed couplee | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 7 | * | 9 | 8 | 7 | 7 |
| Single methera | 43 | 46 | 45 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 44 | 41 | 41 | 39 | 42 | 43 | 47 | 46 | 44 | 44 | 46 |
| Hasalderly Unita Childleas faniliea | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Onceleted individusle | 23 | 24 | 23 | 21 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 18 | 18 | 17 | 17 | 18 | 18 | 19 | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| Iderly Unita |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Childleas fanilies | 14 | 12 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| Dnceleted individuala | 46 | 41 | 36 | 30 | 29 | 28 | 27 | 25 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 24 | 22 | 21 | 19 | 19 | 20 |

sodnce: Congreasional eudget Office tabulationa of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987.
$13 t$

APPENDIX D

## LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT

POPULATION SURVEY

Virtually all of the income and demographic data used in the analysis come from the March Current Population Survey for the years 1971 through 1987. A supplement to the March survey obtains detailed information about incomes and work experience during the preceding calendar year for all members age 14 and over in nearly 60,000 interviewed households. Sample weights alluw estimating values for the total noninstitutional population of the United States.

The reader should keep in mind a number of weaknesses in the data when zamining the analytic findings. First, survey respondents do not fully report their incomes from all sources. compared with independent estimates, only about 72 percent of aggregate money income is reported on the CPS. Nearly two-thirds of the unreported income is subsequentl " imputed to CPS families by the Bureau of the Census. As a result, total income shown on the CPS--both reported and im-puted--is about 90 percent of independent estimates of income.1/This underreporting of income means that family well-being is urderstated. At the same time, the degree of underreporting of income has changed orly zarginally over time, so relative changes over the years are probably more accurately estimated.

A second problem with the CPS income data involves "topcoding," the lumping together of incomes exceeding a maximum value. For example, the data file for the March 1987 CPS reported wage and salary income for all people with earnings greater than $\$ 99,999$ as equal to " $\$ 99,999$ or greater." While top-coding does not affect the vast major:iy of families or most descriptive statistics such as medians, it does mean that one cannot accurately estimate either

[^25]incomes of those at the very top of the income distribution or distributions of aggregate income. This stuay omits estimates that would be influenced by top-coding.

Sampling problems of the CPS appear to affect income analyses at both ends of the distribution. Wealthy households seem to be more likely to refuse interviews, while low-income households are apparently more difficult to locate. As a result, both groups seem to be underrepresented in the CPS population, and estimates of their incomes may be inaccurate.

A final problem involves differences in family composition between the ime of the CPS interview and the previous year to which income data apply. The r.PS implicitly assumes that the family composition when the survey is conducted in March is the same as that for the previous year when reported incomes were received, even though many families will have changed. Because the incume analyses in this paper are based on families, any differences in family composition between the two times will lead to inaccurate estimates of family well-being. The direction of any resulting bias is unknown.

INCOME DISTRIBUTION BY FAMILY TYPE

The figures in this appendix show the distribution of adjusted family income (AFI) among families of different types. Family incomes vary widely both among family types and over time. To compare two income distributions, the absolute variation must be removed so that incomes are measured on comparable scales. In this appendix, such standardization is accomplished by measuring each family's income relative to the median AFI for the relevant family type-that is, the income measure depicted on the horizontal axis equals AFI divided by median AFI. Each point on the curves represents the percentage of families of a given type whose AFI fell in a range equal to 20 percent of the median AFI. Thus, for example, the highest point on the solid line in Figure E-1 shows that about 14 percent of married-couple families with children had adjusted incomes between 70 percent and 90 percent of the median AFI for all married couples with children in 1986.

The shape of each curve indicates how equally incomes are distributed among families of a given type in a given year. The more equally incomes are distributed, the higher will be the percentage of families with iacomes near the median. In the figures, greater equality is shown by a high and narrow hump centered on the median AFI. In the extreme, perfect equality in which every family had the same AFI would be represented by a vertical line at the median reaching a vertical value of 100 percent. Convercsly, shorter and wider humps indicate greater inequality of incomes. F. . example, in Figure E-2, the taller hump centered on the median AFI for nonelderly childless families shows that their incomes were distributed more equally than were the incomes of nonelderly unrelated individuals, whose curve is both shorter and more widely spread.

Figure E-1.
Income Distribution of Families
With Children, by Family Type, 1986


Figure E-2.
Income Distribution of Nonelderly Families
Without Children, by family Type, 1986


Adjusted Family Income Relative to Median Adjusted Family Income for Family Type

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of N.arch 1987 Current Population Survey data.

NOTE: Adjusted family income is measured as incnme divided by the poverty threshoid.

## Figure E-3.

Incrme Distribution of Elderly Families Without Children, by Family Type, 1986


Adjusted Family Income Relative to Median Adjusted Family Income for Family Type

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of March 1987 Current Population Survey data.

NOTE: Adjusted family income is measured as income divioed by the poverty threshold.

Figure E-4. Income Distribution of Married Couples With Children and Single Mothers With Children, 1970 and 1986



Adjusted Family income Relative to Median Adjusted Family Income for Family Type

SOURCE. Conaressional Budget Office tabuiations of Current Population Survey data, 1971 and 1987.

NOTE: Adjusted family income is measured as income divided by poverty threshold.

Figure E-5.
Incrme Distribution of Nonelderly Families Without Children, 1970 and 1986


Nonelderly Unrelated Individuals
Percentage of All Families of Given Type


SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971 and 1987

NOTE: Adjusted family income is measured as income divided by poverty threshold.

Figure E-6.
Income Distribution of Elderly Families Without Children, by Family Type, 1970 and 1986


Elderly Unrelated Individua's
Percentage of All Families of Given Type


Adjusted Family Income Relative to Median Adjusted Family ' come for Family Type

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971 and 1987

NOTE: Adjusted family income is measured as income divided by poverty threshold.


[^0]:    
    *
    Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made

[^1]:    1. Unlike income measures used elsewhere in this paper, median family income ahown in Figure 1 includes only families as defined by the Bureau of the Census--that is, only groups of two or more related people living together. It excludes unrelated individuals--those people not living with relatives. Including the latter group would make the trend since 1970 look worse, as can be seen by comparing Figures 1 and 2.

    Real median family income increased at a 3.1 percent average annual rste between 1949 and 1973, declining in only 3 of the 24 years. Between 1973 end 1986, however, the measure has $\mathrm{l}^{\prime}, 0$ ved up and down irregularly with declines in 6 of the 13 years. During this latter period, real median family ircome foll by more than 10 percent by 1982, bafore regaining virtually the entire lose during the last four yeara. See Appendix Table B-1.

[^2]:    2. The data on family inccmes are from the Current Population Survey (CPS). While this is the best available source for income data, ite shortcomings limit the accuracy of the analysis. Most significantly, survey respondente-particularly the elderly-fail to report their full incomes, so the data undereatimate their true well-boing. At the same time, the degroe of incomo underreporting-aftor mputacions by the Bureau of the Censur--has changed little over time, so this problem may have on'rg a small impact on the analysis of income trends. See Appendir $\mathbf{D}$ for further discumion of the '́PS.
[^3]:    10. In addition, if in-kind benefits were to be counted as income, the analysis would require a procedure for valuing thowe benefita in dollars. While some items-such as food stamps--are relatively eary to value, others are both more difficult and more controversial. Analyste disagree for oxample, about how to value medical benefits from employer-provided insurance, Medicad, and Medicare.
[^4]:    11. Measuring income before tazes omits only the pffects of direct tazes such as payroll and income tazes. The inspact of indirect tares, auch as excise and sales tares, is taken into account through their effocts on prices. The same is true of corporate tazes, at least to the extent that they are shifted to consumers in the form of higher prices.
[^5]:    3. Some families classified as married couples with children or as single mothers with children include families that should be counted as "other families with children." For example, a family headed by an unmarried woman and containing only he"self, her grown daughter, and the daughter's child under age 18 would be clasaified as a single-mother family with children. Such a three-generation family should properly be clasaified as an "other family with children." These misclasifications appear, howe rer, to have little effoct on the income data reported in this study.
[^6]:    SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of data from the March 1987 Current Population Survey

[^7]:    7. These other definitions include: (1) al. people who worked more than 26 weeka during the year, regardlem of the number of houre worked per week; (2) all full-time workers, regardless of how many weoks they worked, plus all part-time, full-year workera; (3) all people who reported working at least 500 hours during the year; and (4) people who worked at least 400 houra, earned at least 400 times the minimum wasd, or earned at leant half as much as their families' principal earners.
[^8]:    9. See Appendix 9 for further discusaion of limitations of the CPS as a source of income data.
[^9]:    1. The terma "adjusted poverty thresholda" and "adjusted family income" are defined in Chapter I and summarized on p. 13.
    2. In interpreting thene observations, note that families in 1986 were not the same as those in 1970: over the 16 years, existing families changed types and new families formed, resulting in significant changes in the mix of family types. See further discuasion below.
    3. Percentile incomes were determined by ranking families in order of their incomes as a percentage of poverty threaholda from lowest to highest. The 20th percentile income is that of the family 20 percent up from the bottom, the 40 th percentile income in that of the fromily 40 percent up from the bottom, and 80 forth. The median income in the 50 th percentile income, that of the family halfway up the distribution. Unless otherwise stated, percentile incomes are calculated separutoly for each family type.
[^10]:    4. See Appendix C for additional statistics on adjusted poverty rates.
[^11]:    SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of data from the March Current Population Survey, 1971-1987

[^12]:    5. Income quintiles are fifths of the income distribution, defined by ordering all units of a given family typs from that with the lowest income--defined as a percentage of the poverty threshold--to that with the highest. The bottom quintila is the lowest fifth of that ordering, while the top juintile is the bighest firth. Because quintiles are defined separately for each family type, the intile a particular family is in saya nothing about its place in the everall income distribution for al. families as a group. See earlier discuscion in Chapter II.

    The 20th percentild income is the income of the family unit at the top of the lowest quintile, the 40 th percentile income in that of the family unit at the top of the second quintile, and wo forth.

[^13]:    0. Income trends for particular age groupa varied among family types (see Appendix Tables A-18 and A-19). For example, among family units with heads under age 25, median AFI dropped sharply for families with children, was virtually unchanged for childless families, and rose for unrelated individuals.
[^14]:    11. See Appendix Tables A-16 and A-17 for data on median family incomes ev number of workers and by family type.
    12. Becsuse of data limitations for high-income families, distributions of incomes by source are roported here only for the bottom 20 percent and the middle 60 percent of the income distrib: ion. See Chapter II for further discusaion.
[^15]:    1. One other macroeconomic factor that abould be noted is the tendency of family incomes to rise with incresses in worker productivity and consequent hisher real wages. In recent years, productivity has not risen as quickly as in earlier years, and this factor has had loss influence on incomes.
[^16]:    3. While vare many other government transfer paymenta such as Unemployment Insurance (UI) and Sr. aental Security Income (SSI), only Social Security and AFDC provide significant amounta of income to any single family type. As a result, this analysis discusses only the latter two income sources.
    4. The federal govarnment sets manimum categorical eligibility requirements for various transfer programs, while atates often are allowed to choose some options, such as AFDC for two-perent families (AFDC.UP). Similarly, the federal government may set minimum benefit levels, as is the case with SSI, while states may offer supplements to the minimum levels or may be free to select eny payment amounts, as in the AFDC program.
[^17]:    5. The 1983 COLA-and all subsequent COLAs-were delayed for six months in order to shift the adjurtment from June to December.
[^18]:    7. Between 1970 and 1975, the median decrease in the maximum benefit level for a four-person family was 9 percent, compared with 14 percent butweoa 1975 and 1980 and 11 percent betwpnn 1980 and 1986. The trend was roversed womewhat in very recent years: between 1985 and 1987, , $\langle$ stater and the District of Columbia raised real benefite.
    8. Sabeequent legialation pased in 1884 relaxed eligibility reyuiremente nomewhat, but did not change the qualitative nature of the effecte of the 1981 act.
[^19]:    9. In 1970,95 percent of ainglo-mother families in the bottom quintile had no members working full time throughout the year. In 1977, 96 percent had no working members, and by 1985 , the percentege had climbed to 99 percent.
[^20]:    10. In part, the drop in the avorage number of children per family may result from declining famuly income. Parentes may have decided they could not afficd to have as many children as families had in earlier yeara.
    11. Within family typee, avorage size changed significantly only for families wth children-down from 4.4 peoplo to 3.9 people. Much of the decreace in average size of all families came from the increase in the rolative number of unrelated individuale.
[^21]:    13. This analyais is based on full-time, full-year workers. See Chapter II, page 20 for other definitions considered in initial analyses.
    14. See Appondix Table A-15.
[^22]:    SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1971-1987.

[^23]:    SCURCE: gressional Budget Office tabulations of Current Population Survey data, 1y/1-1987

[^24]:    soukct: Congraesional budgat office tabulationa of Currant Populailon survay date, 1971-1907.

[^25]:    1. Even with the addition of imputed incomes, the CPS shows larger fractions ef income--entimated on the basis of other data-for come cources of income than for others. For exemple, tiout 99 percent of wage and salary income is identified, compared with between 75 persent and 85 percent of meantrested transfor income and less than half of income from interest, dividends, and rent.
