**THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION**

THE FLOW OF HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN THE 1984 SURVEY OF INCOME AND PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

No. 147   *9107*

D. B. McMillen
Bureau of the Census
H. W. Watts
Bureau of the Census/Columbia University
L. Moeller
Bureau of the Census/Columbia University

U. S. Department of Commerce BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

The Flow of Household Income in the 1984 Survey of Income and Program Participation

Harold W. Watts, Bureau of the Census and Columbia University,
David B. McMillen, Bureau of the Census, and
Linda Moeller, Bureau of the Census and Columbia University

ABSTRACT

This paper illustrates the construction of duration-weighted total and per-capita measures of household income, using a longitudinal definition of households in which continuity of physical location and household composition are joint criteria that determine their continuous existence. These measures are used to report the annual incomes and income sources of households headed by persons of different marital status, race, and gender, using subannual data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP).

KEYWORDS

household income, SIPP

INTRODUCTION

In this paper we report on the calculation of annual household incomes and per-capita household incomes with sub-annual data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). This work represents one component of a larger project to analyze status and change in the material welfare of individuals that is being undertaken during Watts' tenure as an ASA/NSF/Census Research Fellow at the Census Bureau.[1]

We assume that household members pool their economic resources, allocate their assets, and participate in income transfer programs in order to maximize their overall well-being, and that a certain level of material well-being is a major, but not the only, component of this more general concept of well-being.[2]

Money income, non-market work, and leisure are important determinants of material well-being. For historic, social and personal reasons some household members are likely to command a higher market wage than others, some will be more skilled at non-market work than others, and preferences for market or non-market work will vary among household members. Therefore their allocations of time to the labor market, non-market production and leisure will also vary.[3] All household members are assumed to have legitimate claims to the levels of material well-being that they jointly produce, so total household income is one of the key determinants of the well-being of individuals in the household. Thus the measurement of household income over time is an important first step in our project.

The procedures for the calculation of annual household income that we illustrate here could be useful in the administration of a variety of government programs. SIPP data are well suited for the analysis of income flows and the design of income transfer programs because they include information on a large number of income sources, and because they permit analysis of

---

[1]This paper was prepared for the Bureau of the Census 1991 Annual Research Conference. It is based upon work supported by the National Science Foundation under grant SES 87-13643, "On-Site Research to Improve the Government-Generated Social Science Data Base." The research was conducted at the U.S. Bureau of the Census while Watts and Moeller were participants in the American Statistical Association/Census Bureau Research Program, which is supported by the Census Bureau and through the NSF grant. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation, the Census Bureau, or the American Statistical Association.

[2]The characterization of expenditures necessary to achieve a specified level of material well-being is discussed in Harold W. Watts et. al. (1980), "New American Family Budget Standards," Report of the Expert Committee on Family Budget Revisions, U.S. Government Printing Office, and in Harold W. Watts and Linda Moeller (1981), "An Analysis of the Diversity of Expenditure Allocations," Center for the Social Sciences Working Paper, Columbia University.

[3]The analytical framework that motivates this approach is presented in the seminal works of Mincer, notably Jacob Mincer (1963), "Market Prices, Opportunity Costs, and Income Effects," in Measurement in Economics: Studies in Mathematical Economics and Econometrics in Memory of Yehuda Grunfeld, C. Christ et. al., Eds., Stanford: Stanford University Press, and in subsequent work by Mincer et. al. A good current review is provided in Reuben Gronau (1986), "Home Production - A Survey," in Handbook of Labor Economics, vol. 1, O. Ashenfelter and R. Layard, Eds., Amsterdam: North-Holland, 1986.

2

the types of income received concurrently during sub-annual periods of the year.[4] Since the expenditures and caseloads of means-tested income transfer programs are strongly counter-cyclical, it is helpful for budgetary and administrative planning purposes to establish a correspondence between the monthly income flows reported in the SIPP and the quarterly and annual economic data that characterize the macroeconomic environments within which other sources of income are generated.

For accounting purposes it is necessary to develop measures that can be aggregated over time and across individuals. And in order to avoid sample selection bias it is necessary to include data from households that exist for less than a year in these annual income measures, since changes in the economic well-being of individual household members are closely associated with changes in household composition, as documented by Bianchi, McArthur, and Hill,[5] Duncan and Hill,[6] Ruggles and Williams,[7] Citro and Watts,[8] and Watts,[9] among others.

We illustrate the construction of duration-weighted total and per-capita measures of annual household income that allow for consistent aggregation over time and across individual household members, using a longitudinal definition of households in which continuity of physical location and household composition are joint criteria that determine their continuous existence. These measures are used to report the annual incomes and income sources of households headed by persons of different marital status, race, and gender using subannual data from the SIPP.

The paper is organized as follows. After a brief review of some of the pertinent features of the design of the SIPP, we present a detailed discussion of the basic methods used in this paper to define households over time, and to measure the flows of income into households. In the body of the paper we present several tabulations of household income and income sources; we also present tabulations of per-capita household income. These two measures bound the range of values within which any reasonable household-size-adjusted measure of material well-being that is based on income alone would fall. We conclude with some observations about the advantages and disadvantages of our approach and recommendations for future research.

THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

The SIPP is a longitudinal survey conducted by the Bureau of the Census. It is a sample of addresses; the residents at those addresses are interviewed every four months for two and one-half years. The initial residents are called the original sample. Each individual at the address aged 15 and over is interviewed separately. Persons who move are followed as long as they remain in the sample population. Persons who join or are joined by someone in the original sample are also interviewed, in order to obtain a complete description of the household context of each individual in the original sample.

Monthly data are collected on some 57 different sources of income, including earnings, transfer payments, lump sum payments from insurance policies, and income from assets such as savings accounts, investments, and rents and royalties. In addition to the monthly data collected in the core of the questionnaire, most interviews include a topical module that collects information on special topics, such as individual marital and migration histories, the value of assets and liabilities, and the cost of child care and child support arrangements.

---

[4]Roberton Williams (1988), "Sources of Family Income in the SIPP," Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, pp. 53 - 62.

[5]Suzanne Bianchi, Edith McArthur, and Martha Hill, "The Relationship between Family Compositional Change and the Economic Status of Children: SIPP and the PSID," in Individuals and Families in Transition: Understanding Change through Longitudinal Data, Papers Presented at the Social Science Research Council Conference in Annapolis, Maryland, March 16-18, 1988, Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

[6]Greg J. Duncan and Martha S. Hill (1985), "Conceptions of Longitudinal Households: Fertile or Futile?" Journal of Economic and Social Measurement, 13, pp. 361 - 375.

[7]Patricia Ruggles and Roberton Williams (1987), "Determinants of Changes in Income Status and Welfare Program Participation," Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, pp. 523 - 528.

[8]Constance F. Citro and Harold W. Watts (1986), "Patterns of Household Composition and Family Status Change," SIPP Working Paper Series Number 8609.

[9]Harold W. Watts (1987), "The Dynamics of Children's Home Environments," Proceedings of the Social Statistics Section, American Statistical Association, pp. 10 - 16.

4

In this first example we count three households over the course of the year. The first, labeled 11/41 in the table labeled "Number of Persons by Month," has a duration of 12 months and an average size of 3.25. The second, labeled 31, has a duration of 6 months and an average size of 1. The third, labeled 41, has a duration of 3 months and also has an average size of 1. Address 41 is not counted as a new household because all three persons who were living at address 11 in the seventh month moved to address 41 as a group in the eighth month.

A second example is shown in Figure 2. All four persons in this example live together for 7 months, and then they separate to two addresses. Again we count three households. One has a duration of 7 months and a size of 4. The other two each have a duration of 5 months and size of 2.

Figure 2
Address Id's for Example 2

Person Number	Month											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
101	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	32	32	32	32	32
102	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	31	31	31	31	31
103	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	31	31	31	31	31
104	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	32	32	32	32	32

Number of Persons by Month

House-hold	Month											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
11	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	0
31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2
32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2	2

Alternative decision rules would count two households in this second example, and make a determination about which new address is the continuation of the initial address. Commonly used rules count the new address that contains the original householder or the principal person, i.e., the person with custodial responsibility for dependents, as the continuation. For simplicity and to allow for maximum change we chose not to use such distinctions.

In most cases no adjustment was made for household nonresponse. We retain part-year households whose interviews are not continuous, but we do not impute variable values for the missing months. For example, we would retain a household that has a duration of 4 months with persons in sample in months 1, 2, 11, and 12, but we would not impute variable values for months 3 through 10. The one case in which we do impute variable values occurs among households that miss 4 months (one interview), but have persons in sample both before and after the missing months. In such cases we impute variable values for the missing months by averaging data from adjacent interviews. A household is considered to be terminated when the number of persons in the household goes to zero and remains there for the rest of the year.

In order to measure household continuity, households were classified in one of four groups: 1) households with no change in composition during the period; 2) households that lost one or more persons during the period; 3) households that gained one or more persons during the period; and 4) households that both lost and gained members during the period. For all households the period for this classification was the duration of the household within the calendar year. That is to say, for full-year households change was measured across the 12 months. For part-year households change was measured across the subset of months during which the household existed.

Characteristics of the householder were associated with each household. For households that existed at the beginning of the period we used the householder characteristics in the first month. For households formed during the year the householder characteristics used were for the month in which the household was formed.

All of the estimates reported here are based on unweighted data from the 1984 Survey. Since the 1984 Survey was designed to be self-weighting, the frequency distributions reported here are representative of the corresponding true distributions for the U.S. population, and

6

and Citro,[16] and Citro and Watts.[17]

Tables 2.1 and 2.2 display distributions of per capita monthly income by duration for 1984 and 1985 respectively. Per capita monthly income is calculated as total annual household income divided by the total number of person-months for that household. This in effect controls for the fact that household that are shorter in duration have less time to accumulate income during the year. Here we see that there is little systematic difference in the distributions of full-year households from the lowest income group to the highest income group. This suggest that the dominant effect seen in Table 1 is a function of duration rather than an income effect on household stability. We believe that the results reported here are relatively robust, because they have been obtained consistently for two separate years, with larger sample sizes than those available to earlier researchers.

INCOME COMPONENTS OF LONGITUDINAL HOUSEHOLDS

The SIPP collects extraordinarily detailed information on income. In order to illustrate the application of the decision rules described above to the analysis of income sources, we calculated six annual income measures: total household income; total earnings; total property income; total means-tested transfer income; total income from other sources including income from entitlement programs; and per capita total income.

Tables 3, 4, 5, and 6 report the distribution of households by percent of income from earnings, property, means-tested transfer payments, and other transfer income respectively. The cells of these tables report the percent of households in that income group with a given percentage of their income from that source. The margin reports the number of households in that income group. These distributions were generated separately for full- and part-year households, in order to further illustrate the importance of working with duration-weighted estimates.

In broad terms, Tables 3 - 6 suggest that the composition of income sources among part-year households whose total income falls within a given range is comparable to the composition of income sources among full-year households with higher levels of total income. First, consider Tables 3, which report the distribution of households by percent of income from earnings within income groups. Earnings in these tables include those from wage and salary jobs as well as income in the form of earnings from nonfarm and farm self employment.

Among households that have any earnings, 85 percent of total income, on average, comes from that source. That average ranges from 80 percent at lower incomes up to nearly 90 percent in the top brackets. Clearly earnings are the predominant source of income for workers and proprietors.

Table 3.1 shows that 50 percent of the full-year households in 1984 received 90-100 percent of their income from earnings: 50-70 percent of the full-year households with incomes of $14,000 and above fell in this category, as did 30 percent of the households with incomes between $8,000 and $14,000. However, only 12 percent of full-year households with incomes less than $8,000 received 90 percent or more of their income from earnings, while 67 percent of the full-year households in this lowest income category received no income from earnings.

In contrast, the tabulations for part-year households in Table 3.2 show that 50 percent of these households in the lowest income group received 90 percent or more of their income from earnings; at all other income levels the fraction of households receiving 90 percent or more of their income from earnings is as high as, or higher than, the comparable fraction for the highest income categories among full-year households. Furthermore, only 26 percent of the part-year households in the lowest income group received no income from earnings. And at all income levels among part-year households, the fraction receiving no income from earnings is smaller than it is for full-year households at the same income level.

Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show the distribution of households by percent of income from property income within income groups. Included in property income is interest on savings and checking accounts, interest on money market deposits, certificates of deposits, money market funds, U.S. Government securities, and municipal or corporate bonds. Property income also includes dividends from stocks or mutual fund shares, income from rental property and mortgages, and royalties and other financial investments. Different percent groups are used in this table because of the small amounts of property income received by most households.

---

[16]John L. Czajka and Constance F. Citro (1982), "Analysis of Household Income and Poverty Statistics under Alternative Measures of Household and Family Composition," Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, American Statistical Association, pp. 347-352.

[17]Citro and Watts (1986), cited above.

household incomes. That is to say, a household that exists for one month is counted as one-twelfth of a household (0.083), a two-month household as one-sixth (0.167) and so forth. We present these data separately for households with Black and Nonblack householders. Part-year households are represented as fractional households in the class appropriate for the rate of income flow during that part of the year. In a given income group, a short-duration household will have a smaller weight than a long-duration household.

Tables 7 present the distribution of households by percent of income from earnings, by age, gender, and marital status of the householder. Looking at Table 7.1 for Nonblack households, we see that few married-couple households with householders below the age of 55 have no earnings; four out of five receive over 90 percent of their income from earnings. For married couple households with householders aged 55 or over, 38 percent have no income from earnings. Only 18 percent of the households with householders aged 55 or over receive over 90 percent of their income from earnings.

Single male households in Table 7.1, excepting the oldest group, show a similar fraction predominantly dependent on earnings, but a larger proportion with no earnings at all. The oldest groups appears to contain more totally retired households, relative to the couple households.

The pattern for households with Nonblack unmarried female householders is largely similar, although a larger fraction of these households with householders younger than 55 have no income from earnings, and a smaller fraction receive 90 percent or more of their income from earnings. Among households in this category with a householder aged 15 to 24, 3 out of 5 receive over 90 percent of their income from earnings. Only 7 percent of households headed by unmarried females aged 55 or over receive 90 percent or more of their income from earnings, and 66 percent have no earnings, reflecting a higher rate of retirement among, or more, non-working widows.

Table 7.2 presents comparable data for Black households. The most striking difference from Nonblacks is for prime-aged unmarried female householders. Less than half of these households, regardless of age, receive 90 percent or more of their income from earnings. The largest share of households receiving 90 percent or more of their income from earnings, 46 percent, occurs among households with female householders aged 25 to 34. Black female householders aged 55 and over appear less likely to be completely retired, and more likely to be earning a large share of their income, than Nonblack female householders in the same age group.

In Tables 8 through 11 household income and per-capita monthly household income are reported relative to their respective medians. This normalization serves to center the income distributions for comparison across time, and to highlight the relative income rankings of the groups considered. In 1984 the median income for all households, calculated without regard for the duration of the household, was $19,267; for duration-weighted households it was $22,548. These tables are based on the latter figure.

In 1984 there were 15,437 duration-weighted households. We divided them into five income groups: 1) households with less than 50 percent of the median, or $0 to $11,274; 2) households with 51 to 100 percent of the median, or $11,274 to $22,548; 3) households with 101 to 150 percent of the median, or $22,548 to $33,822; 4) households with 151 to 200 percent of the median, or $33,822 to $45,096; and 5) households with more than 200 percent of the median income, or $45,096 and over.

For household per capita monthly income the duration-weighted median is $760, and the break points for tabulations are at 50%, 100%, 150% and 200% of that figure.

Tables 8 and 9 report distributions of household income and household per capita monthly income respectively by marital status, gender, and age of the householder. The distributions for households with unmarried householders aged 15 to 24, and older than 55, are of particular interest since a high percentage of the households in these sub-populations are eligible for means-tested income transfers.

Tables 10 and 11 report distributions of household income and household per capita monthly income by marital status and gender of the householder and average household size. The distributions for households with not-married female householders, and the Black-Nonblack comparisons, especially for households with three or more members, are especially noteworthy in these tables.

Turning to Table 8.1 we see that Nonblack households with a married householder are more likely to be above the median and households with an unmarried female householder are more likely to be below the median. Nonblack households with unmarried householders are more likely than married couples to be in the lowest income category, regardless of gender. However, at all ages the percent of households with incomes below 50 percent of the median with an unmarried

However the per-capita measures in Table 11 show a quite predictable reversal relative to Table 10. Among Nonblacks, the smaller households are least likely to be in the lowest bracket and most likely to be in the highest one, with the single exception of one-person single-male households which are slightly more likely to be in the lowest income bracket than 1-2 person households headed by single males. Households headed by single males compare favorably with those headed by couples at all household sizes, again with the single exception of one-person households headed by single black males. It remains true that the Black distribution is well below the Nonblack, and within each, unmarried females are most likely to be in the lowest category. For female households bigger than two the chance of being in the lowest income group is 43 percent for Nonblacks and 71 percent among Blacks.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper we examine the distributions of both annual income and per capita monthly income for full- and part-year households in the 1984 SIPP panel. The part-year households are around 22 percent of all households existing in each of the years 1984 and 1985. About 2 percent fell in each of the monthly duration classes, 1 to 11. We found that the distributions of annual total income were very different among the 12 duration classes. When we examined the distributions of per-capita monthly income, however, they were very similar for all durations. This result suggests that using a monthly average or annual equivalent rate weighted by duration, i.e., the fraction of the year in the sample, would enable part-year households to be represented along with full-year households in comprehensive analyses of household income.

We also examine the distributions of four income component shares separately for full- and part-year households, further classified by total income. While there were differences in the distributional patterns between full- and part-year households, these appeared to be due to classifying by total annual income, rather than by an annualized income rate, for the part-year cases. Again, the evidence suggests that by using duration-weighted income flow rates it is possible to pool the observations on full- and part-year sample households.

Using duration weighting, the distribution of earnings shares shown in Table 7 for a dozen categories of Nonblack and Black households display interesting patterns that are quite consistent with common understanding of the importance of earnings as an income source. It is very helpful to present such tables without the qualification that of course part-year households were omitted and may have a different pattern. Even if they do have a different pattern, they can be fairly represented as "fractional" units in tabulations.

The next section looks at duration-weighted distributions of two quite different representations of household income: first as an annual rate, and second as a per capita monthly rate. Tables 8 and 9 show the distributions by household type and age of householder; 10 and 11 give breakdowns by household size. Quite different patterns are observed for the two income measures, but they are both reasonable given appropriate interpretation of the income concepts. Larger and typically younger households show up in higher annual income categories, and smaller and older households look relatively better when per capita measures are used. These findings further illustrate the feasibility of household-focused analyses of longitudinal panel data.

The duration-weighted analyses have been replicated for 1985 (in the 1984 SIPP panel) and show quite similar results, allowing of course for the actual difference in time. This again suggests that annual studies within a single panel can be carried out using all the full- and part-year data for the separate years.

Further work along these lines will be focused on more explicit tests of the differences between tabulations of full-year households and duration-weighted part-year households, and on the development of appropriate variances for duration-weighted estimates.

12

Table 2.1

The Distribution of Household Per Capita Monthly Income
by Duration in Panel During
1984

Duration in Months	Less than $300	$300-449	$450-599	$600-799	$800-1099	$1100-1549	$1550 or more	Cases
12	11.2	12.5	13.5	15.5	17.3	14.7	15.2	13500
11	11.2	9.2	16.0	14.8	16.4	16.0	16.4	250
10	15.3	12.6	13.4	13.0	17.2	14.1	14.5	262
9	11.0	13.8	12.4	17.0	13.5	16.7	15.6	282
8	13.2	9.4	14.5	13.9	15.8	16.1	17.1	310
7	14.4	11.0	11.6	16.6	18.5	15.0	12.9	319
6	10.7	14.1	10.7	16.9	15.0	19.3	13.2	326
5	18.9	13.8	13.5	13.8	15.1	12.8	12.2	312
4	16.4	14.7	12.1	15.8	15.6	12.1	13.2	537
3	21.4	10.8	8.9	12.8	16.0	15.0	15.0	406
2	19.4	13.7	10.8	16.5	15.7	10.8	13.1	351
1	23.9	16.0	9.2	12.3	13.2	11.7	13.8	326
All	12.3	12.6	13.2	15.4	17.0	14.6	15.0	17181

Table 2.2

The Distribution of Household Per Capita Monthly Income
by Duration in Panel During
1985

Duration in Months	Less than $300	$300-449	$450-599	$600-799	$800-1099	$1100-1549	$1550 or more	Cases
12	9.9	11.8	12.6	15.7	17.4	15.4	17.3	13050
11	10.0	15.6	16.3	16.9	13.8	13.1	14.4	160
10	12.7	9.0	12.7	14.9	16.3	17.2	17.2	221
9	12.7	8.7	10.0	17.0	17.0	16.6	17.9	229
8	11.4	11.1	12.5	13.1	16.8	15.9	19.3	352
7	14.0	10.5	11.4	15.2	14.6	15.2	19.2	343
6	12.9	12.9	11.9	11.3	18.2	16.0	16.9	319
5	12.6	12.9	9.1	15.6	19.1	15.6	15.1	372
4	16.0	10.7	12.7	11.5	15.2	17.0	17.0	513
3	15.9	11.8	11.5	12.9	15.1	15.1	17.6	364
2	18.6	13.9	12.0	17.5	11.5	12.0	14.4	382
1	16.4	11.3	11.3	14.6	14.9	16.1	15.5	336
All	10.9	11.8	12.4	15.4	17.0	15.5	17.2	16641

Table 4.1

The Distribution of Households by Property Income Share
in Annual Income Groups
Full Year Households
1984

Income	0	0.1-0.9	1.0-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-4.9	5.0-7.4	7.5-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-99.9	100	Cases
Less than $8000	53.4	15.1	4.0	3.0	3.1	3.4	2.4	6.9	3.2	4.5	0.8	1847
$8000 to 13,999	32.0	25.9	5.5	2.9	3.8	4.3	3.1	8.9	5.4	8.0	0.3	1939
$14,000 to 19,999	20.6	35.3	5.8	4.1	5.3	4.0	4.0	8.6	4.9	7.4	0.1	1996
$20,000. to 25,999	14.0	42.5	8.1	4.0	6.7	4.6	2.8	6.8	4.2	6.3	0.1	1873
$26,000 to 32,999	9.5	45.0	9.8	5.7	6.9	4.4	3.8	6.6	2.6	5.5	0.2	1885
$33,000 to 44,999	5.8	44.0	11.3	7.0	8.2	5.3	3.7	6.0	3.0	5.7	0.1	1948
$45,000 and over	2.0	28.8	14.3	8.1	10.2	8.8	5.6	10.3	4.0	7.7	0.2	2013
All	19.4	33.8	8.4	5.0	6.3	5.0	3.6	7.8	3.9	6.5	0.2	13500

Table 4.2

The Distribution of Households by Property Income Share
in Annual Income Groups
Part Year Households
1984

Income	0	0.1-0.9	1.0-1.9	2.0-2.9	3.0-4.9	5.0-7.4	7.5-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-99.9	100	Cases
Less Than $8000	48.1	27.3	4.0	2.8	3.2	2.5	1.7	3.9	2.2	2.6	1.7	1927
$8000 to 13,999	23.2	45.8	6.6	3.5	4.0	3.1	2.0	5.6	2.2	3.8	0.1	767
$14,000 to 19,999	17.9	44.9	8.2	4.0	4.5	5.7	2.7	5.5	2.2	4.2	0.2	403
$20,000 to 25,999	12.4	48.1	4.3	6.0	7.3	3.0	5.2	6.0	3.4	4.3	0.0	233
$26,000 to 32,999	4.4	58.8	8.8	3.7	5.1	3.7	2.9	5.9	2.2	3.7	0.7	136
$33,000 to 44,999	4.2	33.6	12.6	7.6	15.1	6.7	6.7	6.7	3.4	3.4	0.0	119
$45,000 and over	1.0	26.0	14.6	6.3	9.4	12.5	7.3	8.3	3.1	11.5	0.0	96
All	33.1	35.8	5.8	3.6	4.4	3.5	2.4	4.9	2.3	3.5	1.0	3681

Table 6.1

The Distribution of Households by Other Transfer Income Share
in Annual Income Groups
Full Year Households
1984

Income		Percent Income from Other Transfer Income											
	0	1-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-39.9	40-49.9	50-59.9	60-69.9	70-79.9	80-89.9	90-99.9	100	Cases
Less Than $8000	30.4	4.6	2.2	2.0	2.5	3.0	5.1	4.8	6.4	8.4	18.7	11.9	1848
$8000 to 13,999	29.3	8.7	5.0	4.4	3.7	5.2	5.8	5.6	7.0	7.8	13.2	4.3	1938
$14,000 to 19,999	38.5	12.9	6.6	5.0	4.3	4.4	4.1	4.2	5.5	6.3	7.8	0.6	1996
$20,000 to 25,999	45.4	16.8	6.9	5.3	3.6	4.2	3.5	3.4	4.4	3.0	3.1	0.3	1873
$26,000 to 32,999	51.5	21.2	7.2	4.6	3.9	2.8	2.5	2.0	1.8	1.4	1.1	0.1	1885
$33,000 to 44,999	54.7	21.7	6.7	4.7	3.3	2.3	1.8	1.3	1.4	1.1	0.9	0.1	1948
$45,000 and over	58.6	22.8	7.7	4.4	2.2	1.4	1.0	0.8	0.5	0.3	0.2	0.0	2013
All	44.2	15.6	6.1	4.4	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.8	4.0	6.3	2.4	13500

Table 6.2

The Distribution of Households by Other Transfer Income Share
in Annual Income Groups
Part Year Households
1984

Income		Percent Income from Other Transfer Income											
	0	1-9.9	10-19.9	20-29.9	30-39.9	40-49.9	50-59.9	60-69.9	70-79.9	80-89.9	90-99.9	100	Cases
Less Than $8000	58.2	5.8	5.5	4.0	3.0	2.4	2.2	2.1	2.6	3.3	5.3	5.6	1927
$8000 to 13,999	56.1	12.8	8.7	5.3	3.7	1.6	1.8	2.0	2.7	2.3	2.7	0.3	767
$14,000 to 19,999	58.8	16.1	10.2	4.5	3.2	2.2	1.2	2.5	0.7	0.2	0.2	0.0	403
$20,000 to 25,999	57.1	19.3	7.7	5.6	3.4	1.7	0.4	2.1	1.3	1.3	0.0	0.0	233
$26,000 to 32,999	58.8	19.1	10.3	4.4	3.7	0.7	1.5	0.7	0.0	0.7	0.0	0.0	136
$33,000 to 44,999	60.5	24.4	7.6	5.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.8	0.0	0.0	119
$45,000 and over	67.7	12.5	8.3	5.2	2.1	2.1	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	96
All	58.1	10.5	7.1	4.5	3.1	2.0	1.8	2.0	2.1	2.4	3.4	3.0	3681

Table 8.1

The Distribution of Annual Household Income
Relative to Median Income
by Age, Gender, and Marital Status of the Householder

Nonblack Households
1984

		Less than 50% Median Income	51% to 100% of Median	101% to 150% of Median	151% to 200% of Median	More than 200% of Med.	Cases
Married Couple Households	15 to 24	15.5	42.3	29.1	10.6	2.4	487
	25 to 34	6.5	25.7	34.0	19.7	14.1	1946
	35 to 54	4.6	14.9	26.0	21.4	33.1	3289
	55 and over	14.1	33.9	23.0	12.2	16.8	2655
	All	8.7	25.0	27.1	17.4	21.7	8376
Single Male Households	15 to 24	23.8	40.2	21.9	8.1	6.0	322
	25 to 34	14.2	35.0	27.4	14.0	9.4	519
	35 to 54	17.1	26.5	26.7	14.7	15.0	477
	55 and over	44.1	29.4	14.3	6.0	6.2	481
	All	24.7	32.2	22.7	11.0	9.4	1799
Single Female Households	15 to 24	39.3	36.8	15.2	6.4	2.3	346
	25 to 34	29.4	39.0	18.3	7.0	6.3	599
	35 to 54	29.4	33.1	22.8	8.5	6.3	767
	55 and over	57.0	27.8	9.5	3.4	2.3	1696
	All	44.1	31.9	14.6	5.5	3.9	3408
Overall		19.7	27.7	23.4	13.6	15.6	13583

Table 8.2

The Distribution of Annual Household Income
Relative to Median Income
by Age, Gender, and Marital Status of the Householder

Black Households
1984

		Less than 50% Median Income	51% to 100% of Median	101% to 150% of Median	151% to 200% of Median	More than 200% of Med.	Cases
Married Couple Households	15 to 24	11.9	47.4	29.4	11.3	0.0	27
	25 to 34	11.5	38.4	31.3	13.5	5.3	151
	35 to 54	9.9	26.4	30.0	19.3	14.3	226
	55 and over	28.6	39.2	15.3	5.5	11.3	188
	All	16.3	34.5	25.7	13.1	10.4	593
Single Male Households	15 to 24	40.3	31.4	19.9	6.2	2.2	35
	25 to 34	27.9	48.3	14.8	7.7	1.4	78
	35 to 54	27.9	35.8	20.8	8.2	7.4	82
	55 and over	66.2	19.0	7.9	6.9	0.0	81
	All	40.7	33.8	15.2	7.4	2.8	276
Single Female Households	15 to 24	69.9	24.8	4.9	0.0	0.4	75
	25 to 34	56.4	33.8	6.9	2.4	0.4	205
	35 to 54	47.8	32.5	13.3	4.7	1.8	231
	55 and over	70.9	17.4	7.8	2.4	1.6	249
	All	59.9	27.1	8.9	2.9	1.2	760
Overall		40.8	30.9	16.1	7.4	4.8	1628

Table 10.1

The Distribution of Annual Household Income
Relative to Median Income
by Gender and Marital Status of the Householder
and Average Household Size

Nonblack Households
1984

		Less than 50% Median Income	51% to 100% of Median	101% to 150% of Median	151% to 200% of Median	More than 200% of Med.	Cases
Married Couple							
Households	Two or less	14.0	34.6	24.0	12.8	14.6	2984
	2.1 to 3.0	8.4	22.8	29.9	19.6	19.3	1895
	3.1 or more	6.2	21.0	28.6	19.6	24.6	3497
	All	9.5	26.3	27.3	17.2	19.8	8376
Single Male							
Households	One	36.5	34.2	17.9	7.1	4.3	946
	1.1 to 2.0	15.2	34.4	26.3	13.3	10.9	550
	2.1 to 3.0	9.2	27.9	29.2	14.9	18.8	186
	3.1 or more	16.9	24.5	26.3	16.2	16.1	116
	All	25.9	33.0	22.2	10.4	8.6	1799
Single Female							
Households	One	59.9	28.9	8.2	2.2	0.8	1758
	1.1 to 2.0	28.5	40.3	18.0	8.1	5.2	850
	2.1 to 3.0	33.5	33.4	20.8	8.7	3.6	425
	3.1 or more	31.1	27.6	22.0	9.5	9.7	375
	All	45.6	32.2	13.7	5.3	3.2	3408
Overall		20.7	28.6	23.2	13.3	14.2	13583

The Distribution of Annual Household Income
Relative to Median Income
by Gender and Marital Status of the Householder
and Average Household Size

Black Households
1984

		Less than 50% Median Income	51% to 100% of Median	101% to 150% of Median	151% to 200% of Median	More than 200% of Med.	Cases
Married Couple							
Households	Two or less	34.6	37.5	18.0	6.5	3.4	155
	2.1 to 3.0	14.4	33.1	25.5	18.5	8.6	127
	3.1 or more	11.5	34.3	28.0	14.1	12.2	311
	All	18.1	34.9	24.8	13.0	9.1	593
Single Male							
Households	One	52.1	33.3	9.7	4.2	0.7	144
	1.1 to 2.0	36.4	32.0	17.0	10.6	4.0	75
	2.1 to 3.0	24.3	33.3	30.9	5.4	6.0	29
	3.1 or more	22.4	39.8	23.6	10.6	3.5	28
	All	41.9	33.6	15.4	6.7	2.4	276
Single Female							
Households	One	72.9	21.8	3.3	0.5	1.5	199
	1.1 to 2.0	62.3	27.5	6.0	3.6	0.5	193
	2.1 to 3.0	57.7	30.5	9.9	1.6	0.3	152
	3.1 or more	50.7	32.8	10.0	4.6	1.9	215
	All	60.9	28.1	7.2	2.7	1.1	760
Overall		42.1	31.5	15.0	7.1	4.3	1628