

# Who's Who Among the Poor: A Demographic View of Poverty

by MOLLIE ORSHANSKY\*

*How many are poor in this country, and who are they? An earlier BULLETIN article ("Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile," in the January 1965 issue) offered an index of poverty to help answer these questions, in broad terms, for households of different size and type. That article focused largely on the number of families thus defined as poor in terms of 1963 income. The current article spotlights the 35 million individuals in poverty and gives details on their race, age, sex, and employment status in March 1964. Data for the households also appear here, where relevant.*

*Work is now under way to determine the poverty status of households in terms of 1964 income. Some advance findings for the 33.6 million persons in poverty in 1964 appear on page 4 of this issue.*

*A monograph incorporating all the analyses presented in the BULLETIN, with additional tabular material on characteristics of the poor in 1963 and 1964, will be published late in 1965.*

THE EYES of the Nation are now focused on the 35 million Americans who live on an income that must be rated insufficient for daily needs by even a most conservative standard. And the eyes of the world are trained on the Nation as for the first time in modern history an affluent state declares it has both the power and the persuasion to extend its bounty to all its citizens.

To translate the national concern into effective action, attention must now be directed to the different groups represented among the poor and so to set the target for particular types of programs. Earlier analyses<sup>1</sup> have suggested how much heavier the burden of achieving a tolerable level of living in keeping with today's standards weighs on some types of households—the aged, the family minus a man at the head, the large family with young children even when the father

is present, and the nonwhite family generally whatever its makeup. In the main, however, what was known could describe only some characteristics of the household head and, for those living as a family, give the number of persons to be supported out of family funds.

Further details are now available about all the persons counted as poor—their age, sex, race, employment, and family status—compared with persons in households more fortunate financially.

As might be expected, there are few surprises. The new data serve mainly to confirm and quantify patterns already penciled in before, but in some respects the very magnitude of the differences is sobering. They give clues to possible alterations in the family structure that may develop as the corollary of long-continued strain and privation. They show just how much worse off are our old people and our young people, compared with those of middle years. They vividly reenforce how poorly the Negro has fared in the struggle for economic rights for himself and his children. They reemphasize the extra risk of poverty faced by women compared with men, whatever their family status. And finally, they remind us once again that, though many are poor because they do not or cannot work, others do work and yet are poor.

The standard used to define poverty is admittedly arbitrary, but the differences in risks among certain groups are so great that an alternative criterion of need is not likely to erase them. With a different poverty threshold the indications of high vulnerability for the large family, the nonwhite family, the family headed by a woman might seem greater or smaller; they would hardly disappear altogether.

## THE POVERTY INVENTORY

The poorest fifth of the Nation includes a disproportionate share of persons whose earning capacity might be expected to be limited or

\* Division of Research and Statistics.

<sup>1</sup> See Mollie Orshansky, "Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile," *Social Security Bulletin*, January 1965.

# Poverty Inventory Down by 1.2 Million in 1964

(Advance data from March 1965 sample survey <sup>1</sup>)

In terms of money income United States households were better off in 1964 than in 1963. The nonfarm population did better than the farm population, and persons living alone averaged more improvement than families of two or more except for the aged.

As would be expected, the number in poverty declined too: By the SSA economy index the count of poor families dropped from 7.4 million to 6.8 million, but the number of aged persons living alone in poverty went up slightly. The total of all persons in poverty, who in 1963 numbered 35.3 million or 19 percent of the non-institutional population, by 1964 stood at 34.1 million, or 18 percent.

Except for a change in the farm-nonfarm relationship the incomes defining the level for the index were the same in 1964 as in 1963 because

the food plan that is the core of the index didn't go up in price. For the low-cost index, however, calling for about one-third more income, the criteria were raised 1.7 percent in 1964 to reflect higher prices of the low-cost food plan. Using the low-cost index brings the poverty tally for 1964 to 49.4 million.

In 1964, as earlier, households with a woman at the head were much more likely to be poor than those headed by a man, especially when young children were present. But there was some improvement: In 1964, three-fifths of the children in families headed by a woman were poor, compared with two-thirds the year before. All told, of the 14.8 million children counted poor, 4.4 million were in a family with no man at the head.

The plight of the large family also continued critical in 1964. Indeed, of all youngsters growing up in poverty, nearly half were in a home having at least five children.

The advance data suggest that in the midst of continued prosperity, the risk of poverty for some—notably the Nation's children and its aged—continues high enough to evoke concern.

<sup>1</sup> Based on special tabulations of the March 1965 Current Population Survey for the Social Security Administration. Grateful acknowledgment is made to the Census Bureau staff who made these tabulations possible, in particular Eva T. Auerbach, Arno I. Winard and their associates.

The poverty roster in 1964, compared with 1963 <sup>1</sup>

Type of unit	1964						1963					
	Total non-institutional population	The poor				Total non-institutional population	The poor					
		Total in poverty	Sex of head		Residence		Total in poverty	Sex of head		Residence		
		Male	Female	Non-farm	Farm <sup>2</sup>		Male	Female	Non-farm	Farm <sup>2</sup>		
Number of persons (in millions)												
Total.....	189.7	34.1	23.3	10.8	29.9	4.2	187.2	35.3	24.1	11.2	31.4	4.0
Unrelated individuals.....	12.1	5.1	1.4	3.7	4.9	.2	11.2	4.9	1.5	3.4	4.7	.2
Under age 65.....	7.5	2.3	.8	1.5	2.2	.1	6.9	2.4	1.0	1.4	2.3	.1
Aged 65 or over.....	4.6	2.8	.6	2.2	2.7	.1	4.3	2.6	.5	2.0	2.5	.1
Persons in families.....	177.6	28.9	21.8	7.1	24.9	4.0	176.0	30.4	22.6	7.8	26.6	3.8
With no children under age 18.....	44.9	5.1	4.1	.8	4.3	.6	44.0	5.5	4.4	1.1	4.7	.8
With children under age 18.....	132.7	23.6	17.7	6.3	20.6	3.4	132.0	24.9	18.2	6.7	21.9	3.0
Adults.....	63.3	9.2	7.3	1.9	7.8	1.4	63.2	9.6	7.5	2.1	8.4	1.2
Children under age 18.....	69.4	14.8	10.4	4.4	12.8	2.0	68.8	15.3	10.7	4.6	13.5	1.8
Number of family units (in millions)												
Total.....	59.9	11.9	6.4	5.5	10.9	1.0	58.6	12.3	6.8	5.5	11.2	1.1
Unrelated individuals.....	12.1	5.1	1.4	3.7	4.9	.2	11.2	4.9	1.5	3.4	4.7	.2
Under age 65.....	7.5	2.3	.8	1.5	2.2	.1	6.9	2.4	1.0	1.4	2.3	.1
Aged 65 or over.....	4.6	2.8	.6	2.2	2.7	.1	4.3	2.6	.5	2.0	2.5	.1
Families.....	47.8	6.8	5.0	1.8	5.9	.9	47.4	7.4	5.4	2.0	6.5	.9
With no children under age 18.....	19.5	2.3	1.9	.4	2.0	.3	19.1	2.5	2.1	.4	2.2	.3
With children under age 18.....	28.3	4.5	3.1	1.4	3.9	.6	28.3	4.8	3.3	1.6	4.3	.5
1-2 children.....	17.2	1.8	1.2	.6	1.6	.2	17.3	2.1	1.3	.8	1.9	.2
3-4 children.....	8.3	1.5	1.0	.5	1.3	.2	8.4	1.6	1.1	.5	1.4	.2
5 or more children.....	2.8	1.2	.9	.3	1.0	.2	2.6	1.1	.9	.3	1.0	.1

<sup>1</sup> Income for the year of family unit or unrelated individual below SSA index at economy level.

<sup>2</sup> Farm families assumed to need 70 percent as much cash income as nonfarm family of same size and composition, for 1963 as well as

1964. Other tables and analyses for 1963 in this article are based on a 60-percent farm-nonfarm equivalence ratio used earlier, and a corresponding total number in poverty of 34.6 million. All tabulations for 1964, now in process, are based on the 70-percent approximation.

lacking altogether, because they are too young or too old. Of the 34.6 million persons living in poverty during 1963—using as a criterion the Social Security Administration index at the economy level—nearly 6 million were children under age 6, and 9 million were aged 6 through 17. More than 5 million of those in poverty were at least 65 years old. Households judged poor thus included nearly a fourth of the Nation's children under age 18 and 30 percent of the aged not in institutions. But of the group most likely to be part of the work force, persons aged 18–65, the poverty inventory embraced only 1 in 7 (table 1).

Unemployment rates among the poor reflect the difficulty that many workers in poor households have in finding and keeping jobs. The 1-person households labeled poor include nearly half of all persons living alone who were out of work—looking for a job in March 1964. Among persons aged 14 and over living as part of a family unit, nearly a fourth of all those unemployed in March 1964 were in a poor family, including about 3 in 10 of the unemployed who were themselves the head of the family and 2 in 10 of those who were wives or other members. It should be noted that the poverty status is determined by the family's income for the year

1963, not by its current income in March 1964.

These data reflect a going unemployment rate among heads of poor families of about 10 percent, three times the rate in nonpoor families. In terms of work history during the year 1963, however, the job difficulties of the poor loom even larger: About a fourth of those family heads who were in the labor force at all reported they had experienced some weeks of unemployment. Among family members other than the head, almost 20 percent of those in poor families currently in the labor force were out of work—a rate two and one-half times that among workers in nonpoor families. Moreover, when the family head has lost his job the other workers in the family often are out of a job too.

What is perhaps more significant is that, age for age, men and women in poor families are more likely than those better off to be out of the labor force entirely. For some, particularly among women, the difference reflects the heavier household responsibility that goes with larger families and younger children. For others, it reflects a higher prevalence of disabling illness: In poor families, 5 percent of all members aged 14 and over—that is, 11 percent of family heads and 3 percent of other members who were not in the labor force—gave longterm illness or disabil-

TABLE 1.—Persons in poverty in 1963,<sup>1</sup> by age and family status

[In millions]

Age and family status	Total non-institutional population <sup>2</sup>	Economy-level index			Low-cost level index		
		Poor	Nonpoor		Poor	Nonpoor	
			Total	Hidden poor <sup>3</sup>		Total	Hidden poor <sup>3</sup>
Number of persons, total .....	187.2	34.6	152.6	2.8	50.3	136.9	2.9
Unrelated individuals .....	11.2	4.9	6.3	.....	5.6	5.6	.....
Under age 65 .....	6.9	2.4	4.5	.....	2.6	4.3	.....
Aged 65 and over .....	4.3	2.5	1.8	.....	3.0	1.3	.....
Members of family units .....	176.0	29.7	146.3	2.8	44.7	131.3	2.9
Children under age 18 <sup>4</sup> .....	68.8	15.0	53.8	.6	21.9	46.9	.5
Own children of head (or spouse) .....	65.7	13.8	51.9	.....	20.3	45.4	.....
Other related children .....	3.1	1.2	1.9	.6	1.6	1.5	.5
Persons aged 18-64 <sup>5</sup> .....	94.4	12.0	82.4	.5	18.4	76.0	.5
Head .....	40.6	5.6	35.0	.....	8.4	32.2	.....
Wife .....	38.8	4.3	34.5	.....	7.0	31.9	.....
Other relative .....	15.0	2.1	12.9	.5	3.0	11.9	.5
Persons aged 65 and over .....	12.8	2.7	10.1	1.7	4.4	8.4	1.9
Head .....	6.8	1.6	5.2	.....	2.5	4.3	.....
Wife .....	3.5	.8	2.7	.....	1.4	2.1	.....
Other relative .....	2.5	.3	2.2	1.7	.5	2.0	1.9

<sup>1</sup> Income of family unit or unrelated individual below the SSA index at the economy level for family size and sex of head or, alternatively, at the somewhat higher low-cost level.

<sup>2</sup> As of March 1964 there were 2 million persons in institutions, including 270,000 children under age 18; 1,100,000 persons aged 18–64; and 700,000 persons aged 65 or older. These persons, as well as the 200,000 children under age 14 who live with a family to no member of which they were related, are not represented in the poverty index because income data are not collected for inmates of institutions or unrelated individuals under age 14.

<sup>3</sup> Individuals or subfamily members with own income below the poverty level but living in a family above the poverty line. A subfamily represents a married couple with or without children or a parent and 1 or more children under age 18 residing in a family as relatives of the head.

<sup>4</sup> Never-married children. Excludes 300,000 children under age 14 (200,000 in households of nonrelatives and 100,000 in institutions), all of whom are likely to be poor.

<sup>5</sup> Includes any persons under age 18 living in families as family heads, spouses, or ever-married children.

ity as the reason, compared with 2 percent in non-poor families. But for others the available data give no clue. There is no telling for how many it was lack of skills or repeated difficulty encountered in finding and holding a job that made further looking seem pointless.

Particularly disturbing are the statistics for the teenagers in poor families, at least those who remain in the home. The poor families' share of the Nation's youngsters drops from 1 in 4 of the children under age 13 to 1 in 5 of those aged 14-17. By age 18 or 19, only 1 in 8 of all never-married youngsters who have not gone off on their own but are still a part of the parental family are found in poor families.

To be sure, some families that are poor when the children are small may move into the nonpoor category as the last youngster reaches his teens: Then perhaps he, and the mother as well, can take employment and raise the family income. On the other hand, some families remain in poverty, and the children leave one by one as they reach adolescence.

Those youngsters who take on family responsibilities of their own too early run the risk of poverty for themselves and their dependents, especially when they have given up their education, as is likely. The teenage youngster who does stay on in the poor family will also be less likely to attend school than one in a nonpoor family. A disturbing number of those not in school do not even report themselves available for work.

The family with income below the economy poverty line was larger, averaging about 4 persons, than the family with higher income, which had on the average 3.5 persons. The poor families as a group averaged two children each, and the nonpoor had one child.

Among families with children the poor generally had more children. Of the 15 million children counted as poor, nearly half were in families with five or more children, but the income for many of these large families was so low that they would be poor even if they had no more than two youngsters to support.

Of all the persons counted as poor, 10.7 million, or 3 out of 10, were nonwhite, reflecting the fact that the nonwhite population—which is largely Negro—sustains a risk of poverty about three and one-half times as high as white persons. Indeed, it can be said that 1 out of every 2 nonwhite per-

sons had to be considered as poor in terms of 1963 income. For those in the particularly vulnerable groups—young children and the aged—the incidence of poverty was closer to 3 in 5. Nonwhite children under age 18 in families below the poverty line accounted for 5¾ million of all the 15 million children considered in poverty.

A nonwhite child had four times the chance of being raised in economic deprivation as a white child, a disadvantage that was likely to continue in much this same degree almost throughout a lifetime. In old age, the nonwhite population had a poverty rate only slightly lower than in childhood. Among the white population, however, those aged 65 and older, as a group, have the highest poverty rate of all—29 percent. The aged nonwhite person was therefore only twice as likely to be poor as his white fellow citizen, thus achieving in late life a greater measure of parity in poverty.

Mothers bringing up children without a father had to choose in some measure—particularly when children were of preschool age—between privacy and poverty, between living in their own households on an inadequate income or doubling up with other relatives and easing financial strain. But for some, even giving up the one did not eliminate the other. Some had to choose between taking employment and caring for their children, but for many, especially nonwhite women, it was indeed a difficult choice: Staying home might keep them poorer, but going to work wouldn't necessarily make them not poor. Mothers who turned to public assistance would find almost without exception that under the payment practices in their State they would live on a budget below the poverty line.

And nonwhite men, with their high rate of unemployment and low earnings, might sometimes find but little difference in the living they could offer their family when they had a job and when they did not.

This is the tale that the numbers tell, counting as poor only those with income less than a stated minimum—an income that even in 1963 might, for a family of four, be typified by an average of about 70 cents a day per person for all food and only \$1.40 for everything else. In today's prospering economy, it is a most stringent test.

If the poverty threshold is lifted to a some-

what less stringent level of living, calling for income about a third higher than the economy level—still a far from generous standard—the poverty count rises to more than 50 million. There are thus at least a fifth of our people, perhaps as many as a fourth, who live in or on the verge of poverty.

It has been estimated that it would take an aggregate of \$11.5 billion to raise all the poor just to the economy poverty level and an additional \$8 billion to bring them up to the low-cost standard.

It would be less disturbing if poverty struck at random, with no one group singled out. The data make it clear that this is not so. For many of our aged, the poverty in which they near the end of their days mirrors a poverty that impended from the beginning, just as it still awaits so many of our children almost from the moment of their birth—because of their color, the occupation of their parents, or the place they happen to live; because they have come into a family that will be minus a father long before they are grown; or even because too many children have already arrived before them. The poor among us come disproportionately from the homes of those who are unemployed or do not work, but the ranks are filled with an awesome number from the homes of those who work and yet do not escape poverty.

### **DRAWING THE POVERTY LINE**

Much of the recent discussion of the war on poverty and the possibility of winning it centers on the number assumed as the target. How can we tell how many of our fellow citizens may be identified as poor and how many and which ones do we propose to aid in some measure to improve their status?

There is, to be sure, no hard and fast rule. Some households will have special needs that will not be met even with above-average resources. Others with income only temporarily low will in time find their own way unaided out of their present crisis. Even if there were agreement on a standard it could not apply with equal validity to all persons in every situation, and in reality there is no universally acknowledged infallible measure of adequacy.

It is perhaps more difficult to define poverty as a public issue than in some other context because in a sense such a procedure implies how much of its public funds and civic energy the Nation wishes to commit to the task. Moreover, the means by which one can make a comprehensive assay of need for individuals in a specific crisis are not available for assessing the economic well-being of all persons in the aggregate. Yet obviously it is necessary to know how many and what kinds of households are unlikely without aid to attain for themselves a tolerable degree of security and to provide reasonably well for dependents, particularly if they include any young children. Even if we assume some consensus as to the number who merit and will receive attention, it must be determined for how many the best solution is likely to be a job, for how many it will rather be preparation for a better one, and for how many the best help will be in the form of increased financial assistance or special services.

The Council of Economic Advisors in 1964, heralding the onset of the drive to eradicate poverty, drew the interim dividing line at annual income of less than \$3,000 for families of two or more and at half this amount for a person living alone as an unrelated individual. Admittedly less than ideal, the definition would set aside as not poor a family of six or seven persons with as little as \$3,100 while including in the poverty tally a family of two with as much as \$2,900. Inevitably then, the poverty status of some young children growing up in large families with low incomes would go unrecognized. Obviously lacking, too, was any consideration of the regularity or persistence of low income and the possible access to resources besides current money income.

### **THE SSA POVERTY INDEX**

An index of poverty has now been developed by the Social Security Administration. It is still interim and admittedly in need of greater precision, but nevertheless a tool more sensitive to different needs of families of different types. It allows also in some degree for the lower cash requirements of families on a farm who can produce some of their own food. This index affords a

more realistic appraisal of the diverse measures that might serve to help different segments of the poor rise above their present station.

The new poverty index represents an attempt to specify the minimum money income required to support an average family of given composition at the lowest level consistent with the standards of living prevailing in this country. At best such a figure can represent only the amount at which, on the average, an acceptable level of consumption is possible, not necessarily plausible.

It is not designed to be applied directly to an individual family with a specific problem. Nor even as a screening device can it be expected to stand unchallenged as an exact count of the poor in absolute numbers. But it can delineate broadly the relative incidence of poverty among discrete population groups and in this way outline targets for action.

To accomplish this purpose, the incomes selected should, if budgeted carefully, provide equally well for large families and for small, for children and for grownups, and as far as possible for families living on a farm and for those in a city. The latter relationship, indeed, is but an extreme variant of the sticky problem of approximating place-to-place differences in living costs.

In lieu of the pair of income cutoffs used originally, the new poverty line was drawn separately for each of 124 different types of families, described by the sex of the head, the total number of other adults, the number of children under age 18, and whether or not they live on a farm. Based essentially on the amount of income remaining after allowance for buying an adequate diet at minimum cost, the poverty criteria have been computed at two levels—one based on the plan for an adequate diet at low cost published for many years by home economists at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and a second in terms of a more restricted and less costly economy plan recently developed by the Department for emergency use when funds are especially limited.

These indexes were used to classify families (and unrelated individuals) as poor or nonpoor by the income for 1963 reported in the *Current Population Survey* of the Bureau of the Census for March 1964.

The newly defined poverty index at the economy level has now been adopted by the Office of

Economic Opportunity as a working tool pending completion of further research.

## DERIVING THE INDEX

The derivation of the index has been reported in detail in the *SOCIAL SECURITY BULLETIN* for January 1965. Only an abridged discussion is included below, with some additional evidence now available that lends credence to the index as a discriminant.

With no market basket to demarcate the line below which deprivation is almost inevitable and above which a limited measure of adequacy is at least possible, an adaptation was made of a principle most of us learn by heart: As income increases, families spend more dollars for food, but this larger amount takes a smaller share of income, leaving proportionately more money for other things. Accordingly, a low percentage of income going for food can be equated with prosperity and a high percentage with privation. Economists looking for a quick way to assess the relative well-being of dissimilar groups have long resorted to this device.

This procedure was followed but with an important modification. It was assumed that equivalent levels of adequacy were reached only when the proportion of income required to purchase an adequate diet was identical. The fact that in practice large families often seem to spend more of their income on food turns out on analysis to come about only because on the average the large families, particularly those with several children, have lower incomes than small families. The procedure had the important merit that for food a measure of adequacy is available in the Department of Agriculture food plans. Adequacy standards for other categories of family living are not available.

The food plans priced for nonfarm families today include both the low-cost one well known to welfare agencies and a newer economy level plan, costing about one-fourth less, designed for shortterm use when funds are extremely low. Most families spend considerably more. In 1955, the latest year for which there are details, only one-tenth of all nonfarm families spent less than the economy plan. Today, 10 years later, the number with such meager food outlays is no doubt even smaller. With this plan, adequate nutrition is attainable, but in practice nearly half the families spending so little fall far short of adequacy: Of families spending at this rate in 1955, more than 40 percent had diets providing less than two-thirds their requirements for one or more nutrients.<sup>2</sup>

The kind of diet made possible by the economy plan was taken to typify one level of living to be represented by the poverty index, and the low-cost plan an alternative higher level. A representative combination of members

<sup>2</sup> Betty B. Peterkin, "USDA Food Plans and Costs—Tools for Deriving Food Cost Standards for Use in Public Assistance," *Family Economic Review* (Department of Agriculture), March 1965.

by age and sex was developed for families of given size and type, and the food-plan cost determined. On the basis of average spending patterns observed in 1955 among both farm and nonfarm families, it was decided that the total should represent no more than one-third of income, although at today's higher incomes, families currently average more nearly \$1 out of \$4 for their food than \$1 out of \$3.

For families of two persons, on the basis of the 1955 pattern, only 27 percent of income was assigned to food, because so small a unit will have heavier per capita fixed expenses than a larger unit. One-person households, for whom reliable data were lacking, were assumed to need 80 percent as much as the appropriate 2-person unit at the economy level and 72 percent as much at the low-cost level. The lower the income and the more restricted the budget, the more difficult it will be to cut such expenses as housing and utilities below the minimum for a couple.

For the poverty index the total food allowance was cut down to the current cost of the economy plan assuming all food prepared at home. Retaining the same proportion of income allotted to food as that for families spending much more implied that other items of family living could be reduced to the same degree. Admittedly this procedure is unrealistic, particularly with respect to housing, which looms so large in the nonfarm family budget. Judicious management can cut food costs at the sacrifice of dietary adequacy if need be, but the slum landlord is not likely to be satisfied with cheaper rent. For large families in the low-income range, many of them nonwhite, obtaining any housing at a price they can afford is difficult. Many welfare agencies in allotting funds have to budget rent as paid by their clients. There were, however, no available budget standards for housing that could be applied at the poverty level.

Data now available for 1960-61 suggest that nonfarm families then averaged 23.5 percent of aggregate income for food. Actually, however, it was only families with incomes of \$6,000 or more that averaged food costs in this range. With incomes of \$2,000-\$3,000, families of two or more were devoting a third of income to food—the ratio assumed for the poverty index. Families in this income class, averaging slightly more than three persons, reported a per capita outlay for all food of \$5.25 a week. The \$4.55 spent for food at home is almost identical with the cost of the economy plan in 1964 for a 4-person family.<sup>3</sup> At this rate, the critical income—that is, the poverty line—for such a family would be set at \$3,150, compared with the \$3,130 derived *a priori*.

## THE FARM-NONFARM RELATIONSHIP

The food-plan quantities are priced only for nonfarm families. In setting the poverty line for farm families it was necessary to determine for

them how much on an average would be purchased and how much homegrown. In the absence of information to the contrary, the food-income relationship was given the same significance for farm as for nonfarm families in connoting income adequacy. Indeed, in 1955 farm families spent a third of net money income for purchased food—the same as other families—but their purchases represented only 60 percent of the retail value of all food they used. With no more recent information on the level of home production—an important cost element for the farm household—it was assumed that the average farm family in 1963 would still obtain 40 percent of its food requirement from the home farm, and therefore the poverty line was set at 60 percent that for a nonfarm family.

Home production obviously had declined since 1955, but the magnitude of the change was not yet known. It was recognized also that the manner in which the Bureau of the Census obtains its income data tends to understate farm income and therefore to overstate poverty to a greater degree for farm families than for nonfarm families. The farm family, asked for a quick estimate of its income (including operating expenses), is likely to assign all utilities, transportation, and shelter costs to the farm side of the

TABLE 2.—Households in poverty, by family status, race, and sex of head

Family status and sex of head	Total number of households in population (in millions)	Households with 1963 income—			
		Below economy level		Above economy, below low-cost level	
		Number (in millions)	Percent of total	Number (in millions)	Percent of total
Unrelated individuals, total.....	11.2	4.9	44	0.7	6
Male.....	4.3	1.4	34	.2	6
White.....	3.6	1.1	31	.2	6
Nonwhite.....	.7	.3	46	(1)	4
Female.....	6.9	3.5	50	.4	6
White.....	6.1	2.9	48	.4	6
Nonwhite.....	.8	.5	68	(1)	4
Families of two or more, total.....	47.4	7.2	15	3.7	8
Male head.....	42.6	5.2	12	3.3	8
White.....	38.9	3.9	10	2.8	7
Nonwhite.....	3.7	1.3	34	.5	14
Female head.....	5.9	2.0	40	.4	9
White.....	3.8	1.2	31	.3	9
Nonwhite.....	1.1	.8	71	.1	10
With children, total.....	28.3	4.8	17	2.3	8
Male head.....	25.5	3.2	12	2.0	8
White.....	23.1	2.2	10	1.7	17
Nonwhite.....	2.4	.9	37	.4	17
Female head.....	2.8	1.6	55	.3	11
White.....	2.0	.9	45	.2	10
Nonwhite.....	.9	.7	78	.1	11

<sup>1</sup> Fewer than 50,000.

account rather than prorate a share as the cost of family living. In approximating farm-nonfarm equivalence on the basis of Census income distributions—which must provide the basis for the poverty index—one may therefore postulate a lower ratio of farm to nonfarm money income than would apply if the income data were obtained by methods similar to those of the Department of Agriculture household expenditure studies.

Advance information now suggests that by 1961 home food production had dropped to no more than 31 percent the total value of food used by farm families. It would seem more appropriate, then, to peg the income required by a farm family at the poverty line at about 70 percent of the equivalent nonfarm figure rather than the 60 percent used before. A reclassification of farm families by the higher relative standard indicates that for the year 1963 the incidence of poverty among farm households increases by about 733,000 persons if the higher income cutoff point is used.

[Numbers in millions]

Item	Farm population counted poor in 1963	
	By 60-percent criterion	By 70-percent criterion
Total number of persons.....	3.23	3.96
Unrelated individuals.....	.15	.17
Family members.....	3.08	3.79
Adults.....	1.59	1.97
Children under age 18.....	1.49	1.82
Family units, number.....	.73	.88
Poverty rate (percent):		
Unrelated individuals.....	.38	.46
Family units.....	.23	.28

The total number of persons in poverty in 1963 accordingly rises to 35.3 million—15.3 million of them children. All data in the present article, as in the earlier report, are based on the original definition showing 34.6 million poor, of whom 15 million are children. Analysis for 1964, now in process, will incorporate the later definition—that is, a family on a farm will be assumed to need 70 percent as much income as a family in a city.

The reduction in the farm-furnished-food assumption raises from 1 in 11 to 1 in 9 the proportion of the poor who live on a farm. More than 40 percent of all households called poor in 1963 were rural (that is, farm and rural nonfarm combined).

Among farm families studied in 1961, average expenditure for food represented 20 percent of money income. Families with \$1,000–\$2,000 averaged 35 percent, and those in the next higher income class 28 percent. Food purchases by families spending 33 percent of income were estimated by interpolation at \$3.62 per person per week, with \$3.13 going for food at home. This figure represents 69 percent of the amount spent by the nonfarm families devoting the same proportion of income to food.

For farm families spending this way, the average family size was the same as for the parallel nonfarm families (3.1), and family income averaged \$1,838, or 71 percent that of the nonfarm families.<sup>4</sup>

## THE HOUSEHOLDS OF THE POOR

In the main this report is concerned with the persons on the poverty roster rather than with the characteristics of the family in which they live, discussed in the earlier report. Since poverty status for an individual, however, is so closely allied to the kind of household in which he lives, and since all data have been tabulated by sex of the family head, a brief review is in order.

The 187 million persons making up the non-institutional population as of March 1964 were living in about 58½ million households—11 million 1-person units<sup>5</sup> and 47½ million family groups of two or more related members. Every fifth household (12 million in all) was poor—that is, the income for the preceding year was below the economy poverty threshold for a family of its size and composition. An additional 4½ million units with incomes above this level fell below the low-cost level of the poverty index.

Households with no man at the head and non-white households generally were considerably poorer than others, and families with children under age 18 were worse off than those without children (table 2).

The median income of the unrelated individ-

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Department of Agriculture, *Consumer Expenditures and Income: Rural Farm Population, United States, 1961* (USDA Consumer Expenditures Survey Report No. 5), April 1965.

<sup>5</sup> These are unrelated individuals—that is, persons living alone or with nonrelatives.



uals in poverty, by the economy criterion, was \$930 for men and \$760 for women. The required income for independent living at this level is estimated at \$1,570 for men and \$1,480 for women. As a group, the individuals deemed poor had less than 60 percent of the income they needed.

Families labeled poor with a man at the head, averaging 4.3 persons overall, had a median income of \$1,760 in 1963. Poor families headed by a woman had, on the average, about an eighth fewer persons to support, but had one-fourth less income to do it with. Their median income was only \$1,300. The minimum income that families this large needed to meet basic requirements, as defined by the economy index, might average about \$3,220 for the man's family and \$2,960 for the woman's.

Among families headed by a man, the poverty rates are highest for families of the young and the old; about one-fifth of those with the head under age 25 and the same proportion for the families whose heads were aged 65 and over are poor. Families in the in-between years are less likely to be poor. Among families headed by a woman, the poverty rate declines steadily from 70 percent in families with a head under age 25 to a third among those with a head aged 65 and over. The drop comes about largely because of the decreasing responsibility for children under age 18. Although the presence of children in the home increases the risk of poverty considerably, obviously it does so to a much greater degree when a woman serves as family head, because of the difficulty of combining child care and a full-time job.

Poor households were larger, on the average, than the families that were better off: Mainly, they included fewer adults and more children. The difference was greater when there was a woman rather than a man at the head, as indicated by the averages (from table C), shown below.

Persons in family	All families		With male head		With female head	
	Poor	Non-poor	Poor	Non-poor	Poor	Non-poor
Total.....	4.1	3.6	4.3	3.7	3.8	2.9
Adults.....	2.0	2.3	2.3	2.3	1.5	2.1
Children under age 18..	2.1	1.3	2.0	1.4	2.3	.8

Adult members often contribute to family income; children are more likely to be wholly dependent. It is therefore not unexpected that the risk of poverty for families increases with a rising number of children but decreases with a rising number of adults. For nonfarm families headed by a man, for example (except for aged couples, a fourth of whom were poor), the risk of poverty for all-adult families decreased with family size, from 8 percent of the young couples to only 2 percent of the families of five adults. (There were virtually no families with six or seven adults and no children.) By contrast, when there were two adults and some children, the poverty rate rose from 8 percent of the 3-person families with one child under age 18 to 42 percent when there were two adults and six or more children.

#### PERSONS IN POOR HOUSEHOLDS

All told, as of March 1964, 34.6 million persons or nearly a fifth of the noninstitutional population were in households with reported income for 1963 below the economy level. Five million of the poor—half under age 65 and half aged 65 or older—lived alone (or with non-relatives), and the remainder lived in family groups of two or more persons. About 15 million—1 out of every 2 living in a family unit—were children under age 18. Together with their 7½ million parents (or other adult relative taking care of them), they accounted for three-fourths of all the persons in poor families. If to this group is added the 2.7 million aged persons who are living in a family, all but a fifth of the poor who do not live by themselves are accounted for.

Others in poverty are not included in this count. There are about 1.7 million aged whose own income of less than \$1,500 is not enough for independent living—even if health and other considerations made it feasible—but who escape poverty by sharing a household with a family above the poverty line. Likewise there are a million younger persons living as subfamily units in families above the poverty level. They include 600,000 children and their parents who would be counted poor were they to depend only on their own income (table 1).

There are marked differences in the makeup of families below the poverty line and other families (tables 1 and A). Not only are there more children—half of all members of poor families are under age 18 compared with a third in the nonpoor families—but more of the children, though related to the head, are not his own children. That is, they are not members of the primary family but represent some doubling up of units.

Aside from the children, poor families as a group include only three-fourths the proportion of persons under age 45 found in nonpoor families. More than a fifth of the adults in poor families are at least 65 years old, compared with a tenth in nonpoor families (table B).

## POVERTY IN OLD AGE

Of the 12 million households with 1963 income below the economy level, more than 4 million were headed by a person aged 65 or older, as shown below.

[Numbers in millions]

Family status and sex	All households with aged head	Poor households with aged head	
		Number	Percent of total
All households.....	11.1	4.1	38
Unrelated individuals, total.....	4.3	2.5	59
Male.....	1.2	.5	43
Female.....	3.1	2.0	65
Families of 2 or more.....	6.8	1.6	24
With male head.....	5.7	1.2	22
With female head.....	1.1	.4	32

A considerable number of persons in families with an aged head are under age 65, and some aged persons live in a family headed by a younger person. By and large, of the 13 million aged persons living in families, 7 million were family heads, 3 million the wives of heads, and the remainder were "other" relatives. As the poor are counted, these other relatives seem better off than household heads or their wives but only because the relatives they live with have incomes above the poverty line, not because they themselves do.

As the figures in tables 1 and A suggest, 30 percent of all persons aged 65 and over are in the poverty tally, and an additional 10 percent would be too except for sharing the home of relatives

better off than they. The aged population accordingly exhibits a smaller degree of economic security than any other age group, despite the fact that more of the aged than of any others currently draw some support from a public program. Moreover, the poverty of the aged affects considerably more than the persons aged 65 or older actually counted in the poverty roster. Some aged persons are married to persons not yet age 65 who are also poor, and others, with no spouse, are sharing the home of a younger relative. Still others, whether or not they are designated as poor, are being supported in part by relatives outside the home, and this burden cannot be represented at all in the poverty balance sheet.

The figures below summarize the living arrangements of the 5.2 million persons aged 65 and over who are included in the current count of the poor.

Living arrangements of aged poor <sup>1</sup>	Number (in millions)
Total.....	5.2
Living alone.....	2.5
Men.....	.5
Women.....	2.0
In family units:	
As head or spouse of head.....	2.4
Husband-wife family.....	1.9
Both aged 65 or older.....	1.2
Aged husband, wife under age 65.....	.5
Aged wife, husband under age 65.....	.2
Male head, no wife.....	.1
Female head, no husband.....	.4
As other relative of head.....	.3
Men.....	.1
Women.....	.2

<sup>1</sup> Income in 1963 of person living alone or of family unit below SSA index at economy level.

Some of the aged, to be sure, are better off than others. By far the worst in economic status are those, particularly aged women, who live by themselves. Of the 3 million women aged 65 and over living alone, 2 million were living in poverty. Among aged men, 40 percent of those living alone had too low an income, and the few aged men who still had young children to look after were poor in about the same proportion (table 7).

As the poverty tally counts them, the 2½ million aged persons living in families as neither the head of the household nor the wife of one were among the most fortunate. Only 13 percent of them were in a poor family. Had all these

aged relatives been required to live independently on their own income, fewer than 20 percent had the \$1,500 it would take as a minimum to keep them out of poverty.

By far the majority of all aged "other" relatives were women, about three-fourths of the total, and a disproportionate number were living in a household with a woman at the head. Only 3 percent of the families headed by a man included an elderly other relative whose own income was inadequate.

One out of every 9 families with a woman at the head, however, were supporting an elderly relative with too little income to live alone, and it was the family not in dire poverty but just on its brink that was most likely to do so: Of families themselves poor, 9 percent were sharing their home with a poor elderly relative; of families just above the economy level but below the low-cost level, 19 percent harbored such an aged person; and of the families headed by a woman with income above the low-cost standard, 12 percent had an aged relative living with them whose own income was inadequate. The heavy burden for a woman who must serve as the head of a family apparently includes care of the aged as well as bringing up children. To be sure, sometimes assuming the one responsibility may help in discharging the other.

### ASSETS AND POVERTY

There has been considerable speculation about the reliability of current income as the sole index of poverty, with no adjustment for the availability of assets that might help a small income go farther. The questions had more relevance in terms of the original definition, which counted as poor only those—and all those—families with less than \$3,000. Such a procedure did include among the poor a sizable number of aged persons with income of \$2,000–\$3,000, who are likely to have some assets, as well as a number of farm families with investment in the land that is the source of their livelihood. The present definition, which lowers the poverty threshold for aged couples and for farm families generally, should be less suspect. In any case the means of quantifying the possible degree of overstatement for the poor as a whole are not yet available.

For the aged, however, who generally are more

likely than the younger population to have assets, it was possible to estimate the number counted poor, in terms of current income, who might have sufficient other resources to enable them to live at a higher standard. Data collected in the 1963 Survey of the Aged made by the Social Security Administration calculated the additional amount that could be available to aged couples and non-married individuals for current living if all assets other than the home were considered invested and prorated actuarially for use over the average years of life remaining.<sup>6</sup>

Of all aged couples in the Survey, 25 percent had an income of less than \$1,850 and accordingly would be rated poor by the economy index. After allowance for the amount that could be available on the average if assets were used, over five-sixths as many, or 21.5 percent, would still be rated poor in terms of their potential income. For the nonmarried aged, a similar tally of the number with less than \$1,500 yielded 66 percent in poverty in terms of current income alone and 64 percent judged by current income plus potential income from assets.

The relationships derived in the Survey between potential income and actual income for married couples, nonmarried men, and nonmarried women were used to estimate how many of the aged, ranked as poor in 1963 by the poverty index, might have enough in assets to change that rating. The number of aged poor could thus be reduced by half a million, lowering the incidence of poverty among the aged from 31 percent to 27 percent, as the following figures suggest:

[In millions]

Family status	Estimated number of aged poor by—	
	Actual income	Income plus prorated assets
Total.....	5.2	4.7
Unrelated individuals.....	2.5	2.3
Male.....	.5	.4
Female.....	2.0	1.9
Family members.....	2.7	2.4
Male head.....	1.2	1.1
Wife.....	.8	.7
Female head.....	.4	.3
Other relative.....	.3	.3

<sup>6</sup> Janet Murray, "Potential Income From Assets: Findings of the 1963 Survey of the Aged," *Social Security Bulletin*, December 1964.

When the aged are identified by a poverty threshold as low as the economy standard (\$1,850 for a couple and \$1,470 for a person living alone, as opposed to the more liberal cutoffs of \$3,000 and \$1,500 used by some) few so identified—at most 1 in 10—can be assumed to have a cushion of resources in addition to income that will make comfortable living likely. With the younger population as a group having even less in assets<sup>7</sup> than the aged, there is little possibility that any sizable part of the 29½ million persons under age 65 counted as poor on the basis of their 1963 income have been misclassified because their savings were not taken into account. There may be other reasons why some should not be considered in poverty status, just as there are undoubtedly some not identified as poor in terms of current income who would be so identified if the full truth about their circumstances were known.

## CHILDREN IN POVERTY

The Nation's children sustain a risk of poverty second only to that of the aged; among the nonwhite population, in fact, children have an even higher incidence of poverty than persons aged 65 or older. The 15 million children already entered on the poverty balance sheet, together with the 600,000 children in low-income sub-families who would be poor if they and their parents were in a household of their own, constitute nearly a fourth of all children living in families. An additional 7 million children are being raised on an income that, although above the economy line, is still within its sights. There are thus well over a fifth and perhaps as many as a third of our children growing up in dire poverty or haunted by its specter.

Because families with children, and in particular families with several children, are more prone to poverty than families consisting only of adults, in poor families half the members were children compared with a third in households above the poverty line. In families headed by a woman, the

disparity was even greater: Children made up 60 percent of the members in the poor families compared with 27 percent of the nonpoor. Not only were there more children in poor families, there were younger children, especially preschool children under age 6, making it more difficult for the homemaker—be she wife or family head—to take employment in order to raise the family income (table B).

## The Large Family

In total number of persons per family, poor households averaged 4.1 to the nonpoor's 3.6, primarily because of the larger number of children. They had no more adults, on the average, than the better-off families and, among some subgroups of the poor, they had even fewer (table C). The larger the family, the greater the poverty hazards for children. The risks were compounded in a broken home and in nonwhite families generally. Of the 15 million children being reared in poverty, 6½ million or 43 percent were growing up in a home with at least five youngsters under age 18. Indeed, the poverty rate among families rose sharply from 12 percent when there was one child in the home to 49 percent when there were six or more children. And even among families with the same total number of persons, those with large numbers of children are poorer than others because the income tends to go down as the number of children goes up. Among nonfarm families of five headed by a man, for example, median income declined steadily from \$12,600 when all five members were adults to little better than half that amount (\$6,900) when three of the members were children under age 18.

The statistics relating poverty to presence of children, disturbing as they are, refer only to those under age 18 currently in the home. They cannot tell how many other children there had been, now past age 18, or the number still to come. The need for special consideration of the peril of poverty for families with many children is underlined by findings of a recent study, which pointed out that the number of families of six or more persons in poverty probably increased or at least remained constant during the

<sup>7</sup> George Katona, Charles A. Lininger, and Eva Mueller, *1963 Survey of Consumer Assets* (Monograph No. 34), Survey Research Center, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1964.

last decade.<sup>8</sup> A large majority of the families of this size include several children.

Although of all the Nation's children living in families only 14 percent are nonwhite, of the Nation's poor children 38 percent are nonwhite. Three out of 5 of all nonwhite children were living in families with income below the economy level, almost four times the proportion among white children (table A).

More than one-third of all poor children were in families in which the head was currently unemployed or out of the labor force (table E). But perhaps the more startling statistic is that, among white and nonwhite alike, nearly 40 percent of the children in poverty were in the family of a worker with a full-time job all through 1963, the period for which income was classified as above or below the poverty threshold.

Families of fully employed heads were in poverty partly because they were large—a fifth had at least five children, compared with only 5 percent of those who were not poor. But also important as a reason was the fact that they worked at occupations that often pay too little to support even a small family. Of the family heads who worked full time the year around and were poor, nearly half were farmers, service workers, or laborers. Only 2 percent were professional workers. Among the fully employed workers who were not poor, only 1 in 7 were listed as farmers, service workers, or laborers, but nearly as many were professional or technical workers.

It is true that the poverty rate for all families with five or six children is three and a half times as high as for families with one or two children and that it is precisely the families of farmers, service workers, and laborers that are most likely to have the larger number. Yet it is also true that among families of men in poverty, half of those with four or more children had income of less than \$3,000 for the year—an amount that would not be adequate even for two youngsters—and only 25 percent of them could have supported as many as three (table 3).

It is difficult to escape the conclusion that something more than family size is involved. Of all

<sup>8</sup> Robert J. Lampman, *Population Change and Poverty-Reduction, 1947-1975*, paper given at the West Virginia University Conference on "Poverty Amidst Affluence," May 3-7, 1965.

families with children who were in poverty, fully a fourth, it is estimated, needed at least \$2,000 more than they had. Among poor families with five or six children, nearly half had a deficit of \$2,000 or more, but even a tenth of the 1-child families needed \$2,000 more than they had. Of the 10½ million poor children in families headed by a man, almost 3 million were in families with at least \$2,000 less than required income, and more than 1 million were in families needing as much as \$3,000. The 4½ million children in poor families with a woman at the head were even worse off: Nearly 1 million of these ~~families~~ <sup>families</sup> were lacking \$3,000 or more, and more than 2 million altogether needed at least \$2,000 over and above what they had (table 4).

### The Broken Home

With changing patterns of family stability, many women are being left to bring up their

TABLE 3.—Money income of families in 1963: Medians for all families and medians and third quartiles for poor families, by race, sex of head, and number of children

Related children under 18	Male head			Female head		
	Total	White	Non-white	Total	White	Non-white
All families						
Median income, total..	\$6,560	\$6,790	\$4,140	\$3,210	\$3,810	\$2,000
No children.....	5,790	5,970	3,710	4,540	4,830	2,600
1 child.....	6,830	7,040	4,720	3,050	3,550	1,600
2 children.....	7,180	7,350	4,310	2,910	3,280	1,880
3 children.....	6,950	7,150	4,790	2,170	2,280	2,010
4 children.....	6,890	7,130	4,370	2,300	2,640	2,080
5 children.....	6,380	6,550	3,650	1,660	(1)	(1)
6 or more.....	5,520	6,380	3,050	2,170	(1)	(1)
Poor families <sup>2</sup>						
Median income, total..	\$1,760	\$1,690	\$2,000	\$1,300	\$1,230	\$1,410
No children.....	1,270	1,260	1,300	1,170	1,170	(1)
1 child.....	1,750	1,640	2,000	860	940	800
2 children.....	2,220	2,190	2,270	1,420	1,520	1,340
3 children.....	2,350	2,600	2,320	1,490	1,400	1,640
4 children.....	3,010	3,140	2,600	1,830	(1)	1,870
5 children.....	3,320	3,490	2,960	1,580	(1)	(1)
6 or more.....	2,750	3,310	2,340	2,000	(1)	(1)
Income at third quartile, total						
No children.....	\$2,690	\$2,610	\$2,800	\$1,970	\$1,870	\$2,170
1 child.....	1,660	1,650	1,690	1,480	1,490	(1)
2 children.....	2,260	2,200	2,450	1,630	1,670	1,480
3 children.....	2,790	2,830	2,730	2,060	2,100	1,950
4 children.....	3,270	3,290	3,200	2,230	2,160	2,350
5 children.....	3,680	3,760	3,350	2,470	(1)	2,390
6 or more.....	4,050	4,160	3,760	2,020	(1)	(1)
6 or more.....	3,840	4,080	3,230	2,850	(1)	(1)

<sup>1</sup> Not shown for base less than 100,000.

<sup>2</sup> Family income in 1963 below SSA index at economy level.

children alone—especially among the non white population. In 1960, only two-thirds of the non-white children under age 14 had both their father and mother in the home. Among the white children under age 14, 6 percent were living with the mother only and 2 percent with neither parent. The current statistics likewise suggest that, by March 1964, about 6 percent of the white children and more than a fifth of the nonwhite children were living only with the mother (table 5).

What the full toll of the broken home means for a child it is not possible to say. It is known that children without a father present are more likely to share quarters with relatives than children in an intact family, and it has been shown that children in a family headed by a woman are exposed to a far greater risk of poverty.

What cannot be said is how often the poverty itself may have antedated and even contributed to the family dissolution. Age for age, mothers without a husband present have borne more children than women still living with a hus-

band.<sup>9</sup> Knowing that it is often the worker with low earnings potential who has the larger family, one can only wonder about the possible relation between too many children, too little family income, and the breakup of a marriage. Whether or not any causal relationship exists, the effect on the financial status of children when the father leaves is such that it may be more important and perhaps even more economical to seek ways of strengthening the family and keeping it together than to remedy the poverty subsequent to its dissolution.

For very young children, the absence of a father's earnings is a particular hardship, because the mother may find it difficult to go outside

<sup>9</sup> In a paper entitled "Characteristics of Other Families," given at the Population Association of America meeting in April 1963, John C. Beresford and Alice Rivlin reported a cumulative fertility rate one-fourth greater among women who were mothers in 1960 but no longer living with a husband than among those still living with a husband.

TABLE 4.—Income gap of families in poverty: Percentage distribution of families with 1963 income below SSA index at economy level, by amount of income deficit, sex of head, and number of children

Sex of head and number of children under age 18	Total number (in thousands)	Percent	Difference between actual income and required income						
			Less than \$500	\$500-\$999	\$1,000-\$1,499	\$1,500-\$1,999	\$2,000-\$2,499	\$2,500-\$2,999	\$3,000 or more
All families									
Total.....	7,206	100.0	29.1	24.3	16.3	12.7	7.0	4.4	6.2
With no children.....	2,458	100.0	40.5	34.5	15.0	8.9	.7	.2	.2
With children.....	4,748	100.0	23.2	19.1	17.0	14.7	10.2	6.5	9.3
1 child.....	1,045	100.0	32.8	22.5	20.9	14.9	7.5	.8	.6
2 children.....	978	100.0	27.3	23.1	19.7	15.7	9.6	2.9	1.7
3 children.....	962	100.0	22.6	17.9	15.5	13.4	11.8	10.2	8.6
4 children.....	648	100.0	19.5	21.4	16.4	14.4	7.8	9.0	11.5
5 children.....	514	100.0	15.0	12.1	12.0	13.3	17.4	9.0	20.3
6 or more.....	601	100.0	11.7	11.8	12.4	16.1	10.2	11.6	26.2
Families with male head									
Total.....	5,228	100.0	33.1	26.2	15.6	11.1	5.7	3.5	4.8
With no children.....	2,043	100.0	41.8	34.9	14.1	8.2	.7	.2	.1
With children.....	3,184	100.0	27.6	20.5	16.5	13.0	8.9	5.7	7.8
1 child.....	652	100.0	37.4	26.0	18.3	7.8	8.9	.9	.7
2 children.....	618	100.0	31.7	22.9	18.9	14.6	6.6	3.5	1.8
3 children.....	625	100.0	31.3	19.4	14.9	11.4	8.7	6.2	8.1
4 children.....	455	100.0	25.0	24.6	15.3	14.0	7.0	6.9	7.2
5 children.....	386	100.0	18.4	12.4	16.6	15.9	15.0	7.9	13.8
6 or more.....	449	100.0	12.9	13.9	13.8	16.9	9.1	12.0	21.4
Families with female head									
Total.....	1,978	100.0	18.4	19.5	18.3	16.9	10.5	6.5	9.9
With no children.....	415	100.0	34.4	32.6	19.2	12.4	.9	.3	.3
With children.....	1,564	100.0	14.2	16.0	18.0	18.2	13.0	8.2	12.4
1 child.....	394	100.0	25.1	16.6	25.2	26.7	5.2	.8	.4
2 children.....	360	100.0	19.7	23.6	20.9	17.6	14.7	2.0	1.5
3 children.....	337	100.0	6.4	15.0	16.7	17.2	17.5	17.6	9.6
4 children.....	193	100.0	6.4	13.9	18.8	15.5	9.7	14.0	21.7
5 children.....	128	100.0	4.5	11.0	1.7	5.4	25.0	12.3	40.1
6 or more.....	152	100.0	8.1	5.5	8.3	13.6	13.5	10.5	40.5

the home to take employment. Of the 1½ million children under age 6 living in March 1964 in a family headed by the mother but with no father present, 600,000 had a mother either working or looking for a job. Seventy percent of these children were in poverty status, compared with 90 percent of the fatherless children with mothers not then in the labor force (table E). (Many mothers not in the labor force in March work at some other time during the year.) Obviously for some who worked it must have hardly paid to do so.

What kind of provision can such a mother make for care for her children when she works? And with the limited earnings her skills are likely to command, does she really have a choice? (In 1960, for example, more than a third of the nonwhite mothers in broken families and about a sixth of the white mothers had not gone through the eighth grade.) A look at the public assistance provisions in most States makes it clear how limited her choice is.

By the standards prevailing in most States, even if she could qualify for aid, the amount payable would still leave her family below the poverty line. In only six States does the standard set for basic needs for a mother and three children receiving aid to families with dependent

children approximate the \$250-\$260 a month that the economy poverty criterion sets as a minimum. And in only one of those States may the actual payment go as high as the standard: Most States place a lower limit on the maximum amount of the assistance grant that any one family may receive, even if it has no other resources. In only four States would the maximum amount payable to a mother of three, assuming she met all the eligibility requirements, be as much as 90 percent of the economy poverty threshold.<sup>10</sup>

### Nonwhite Children

The terrible plight of so many of our nonwhite children, whether or not their parents work, is unmistakable. Over a fourth of them are in a family with a woman at the head, and of these 86 percent are poor. When the mother or other female relative who serves as the family head does not work, 9 out of 10 children are in poverty,

<sup>10</sup> John M. Lynch, *Monthly Cost Standards for Basic Needs Used by States for Specified Types of Old-Age Assistance Cases and Families Receiving Aid to Families With Dependent Children, January 1963* (Bureau of Family Services, Welfare Administration), March 1964.

TABLE 5.—Incidence of poverty <sup>1</sup> among children under age 18, by age and relationship to family head and by race and sex of head

Age of children and sex of family head	In all families			In white families			In nonwhite families		
	Total	Own children	Other related children	Total	Own children	Other related children	Total	Own children	Other related children
Number of children (in thousands)									
<i>Male head</i>									
All children under age 18.....	62,150	59,980	2,180	55,050	53,600	1,450	7,100	6,370	730
Under 6.....	22,910	21,970	930	19,890	19,270	620	3,010	2,700	310
6-13.....	27,420	26,620	800	24,520	24,000	520	2,910	2,630	280
14-17.....	11,820	11,380	440	10,640	10,340	310	1,180	1,040	140
<i>Female head</i>									
All children under age 18.....	6,680	5,730	950	4,100	3,690	410	2,580	2,040	540
Under 6.....	1,930	1,590	340	1,060	930	130	870	660	210
6-13.....	3,130	2,720	410	1,910	1,740	170	1,210	980	240
14-17.....	1,620	1,430	200	1,120	1,020	110	500	410	90
Percent of children in poverty status									
<i>Male head</i>									
All children under age 18.....	17.1	16.6	29.3	12.8	12.6	20.7	50.0	50.3	46.6
Under 6.....	19.3	19.0	26.7	14.4	14.2	20.4	50.1	53.1	39.4
6-13.....	16.5	16.1	31.2	12.4	12.2	17.7	51.6	51.2	56.0
14-17.....	14.0	13.3	31.5	10.9	10.5	26.1	41.2	40.9	43.8
<i>Female head</i>									
All children under age 18.....	66.6	67.5	61.1	54.6	56.7	35.3	85.7	86.9	80.8
Under 6.....	78.9	83.2	58.7	71.7	78.0	26.9	87.6	90.6	78.0
6-13.....	68.6	68.6	68.2	57.2	58.1	48.5	86.5	87.4	82.6
14-17.....	48.1	47.8	50.5	33.8	34.8	24.1	80.4	79.8	82.9

<sup>1</sup> Family income in 1963 below SSA index at economy level.

but even when she works 3 out of 4 are poor. With a father out of the labor force as the family head, 55 percent of the nonwhite children are in poverty, but even with the father employed, almost half live below the poverty line. Nonwhite children accordingly are more likely to be poor with a father present and working than white children with a father not even in the labor force, a third of whom are poor. Despite women's low earnings and their often erratic labor-force participation, white children living only with a mother are, as a group, almost as well off financially as nonwhite children with a father present (tables 5 and E).

### Sharing Households With Others

In March 1964, judged in terms of income for the preceding year, two-thirds of all children in families with a woman at the head were in poverty, four times the rate of poverty prevailing among children in families with a father present. Another indication of economic stringency when the father is absent is the fact that, in families headed by a man, all but 4 percent of the children present were the man's "own" children—that is, members of the primary family. In families with a woman as the head, 14 percent were not her "own" children but related children, representing some doubling up of family groups (table 5).

On balance, whatever the sacrifice of privacy implied by shared households, the arrangement tended to improve the financial status of children without a father, at least for those under age 6. Presumably the mother could be freer to seek employment when there was someone to look after the child, or perhaps the related head of the family went to work while the mother assumed the task of keeping house for everyone. The financial advantage in combining households was evident at older ages, too, for the white children but not for the nonwhite children (table 5). There may have been other advantages as well, and though sharing a household would not always take children out of poverty it might make some less poor.

For children living in a family with a man at the head, the effect of doubling up was different: White children were less likely to be poor when

they were living in a household headed by their father than in one headed by another male relative, but for nonwhite children the reverse was true. The youngsters seemed better off in money terms when their father was not the head of the primary family. It must be acknowledged, however, that the Bureau of the Census designation of the family head may not necessarily reflect accurately just who is living with whom. In other words, is it the parent-child group that constitutes the primary family, or is it the other relatives?

Additional insight into the effect on poverty status of shared living arrangements is afforded by the statistics for subfamilies with children—that is, groups consisting of parent(s) and one or more children under age 18, living as part of a household headed by another relative. In March 1964, more than a third of the 400,000 such groups consisting of a father and children and about three-fourths of the half-million mother-child units would have been poor if left to live on their own income. Nearly a third of the half-million mother-child subfamilies were in a family headed by another woman.

About 770,000 children were part of mother-child subfamilies with too little income to be out of poverty on their own. For 420,000 of these children poverty was evaded by living with a nonpoor family. Of the children in poor subfamilies with a father, nearly half (160,000) were able to live with nonpoor relatives. These children and their parents constitute a group of more than 1 million not now part of the poverty inventory but who would be poor if they were not able to live with relatives.

That financial considerations loom large in the decision to live as a subfamily is suggested by the fact that virtually no subfamily group with enough income to be above the poverty line on its own lived with a family that would be considered poor in terms of its income.

### TEENAGERS IN POOR FAMILIES

The numbers confirm the findings of other studies that teenage youngsters among the poor have less educational attainment than those in better-off families. They suggest, in addition, that the poor family may not hold its youngsters as



long as other households. If so, the full measure of this precipitate break must still remain untold, because only those that are still there can be counted. No estimate can yet be made of the number who have left, perhaps to be family heads, whose limited education makes the odds high that they will bring up their own children in poverty. It is also likely that some families can move out of poverty when children reach their teens because the youngsters—or their mothers, now having lighter home responsibilities—find employment and combine their earnings with other sources of family income.

Data from the 1960 Census revealed school dropout rates disproportionately high in families with low incomes. More important, they revealed that school dropouts aged 18–24 who had formed their own families had incomes considerably less than those of high school graduates who had started their own families. And most ominous of all, the income differences between those without a high school diploma and those with one widened with age, promising no hope that the youngster who had no chance for the better deal at the beginning of his family life would gain it as family responsibilities grew.<sup>11</sup>

In any case, poor families have fewer never-married teenagers than one might expect, considering the number of younger children in poverty. Many teenagers who are poor are school dropouts, and of those who are not in school a larger proportion in poor than in nonpoor families do not even report themselves as in the labor force and looking for work. A small number but yet a disquieting proportion, particularly in the families headed by a woman, give as the reason they are not seeking work the fact that they are encumbered by housekeeping responsibilities for the family. For others the reason is not known, except that in virtually no cases is it illness or disability.

The high unemployment rate among teenagers, particularly nonwhite teenagers, is well documented, and half of all nonwhite teenagers who have not yet married or left home are in a poor family compared with 1 in 8 of the white youngsters.

<sup>11</sup> James D. Cowhig, *Characteristics of School Dropouts and High School Graduates, Farm and NonFarm, 1960* (U. S. Department of Agriculture Economic Report No. 65), December 1964.

One can only speculate what repeated rebuffs in his first attempt at a job connote for an ill-prepared youngster in his subsequent attitude towards work.

Fifteen percent of the nonwhite youngsters are no longer in school; most of them had not completed high school. Of these youngsters no longer in school, 60 percent are not even in the labor force. Of the white teenagers in poor families who are not in school, a third are neither working nor looking for a job. Of all teenagers not in school but available for work, a third are unemployed.

Poor families include one-third of all never-married persons aged 14–19 still living with the family who are not in school and yet not a high school graduate.

Though 1 in 4 children under age 6 are in poor families, such families include only an eighth of those aged 18–19, never-married and still living at home. Of teenagers still at home, 5 percent of those in poor families have not finished high school but are neither in school nor working or seeking work. An additional 9 percent have not finished school but are in the labor force. Among the nonpoor families, only 2 percent of the

TABLE 6.—School and labor-force status of teenagers in poor<sup>1</sup> and nonpoor families: Percentage distribution of never-married children aged 14–19, by school attendance and by sex of family head

School attendance and labor-force status in March 1964	All children aged 14-19				Children aged 18-19			
	Families with male head		Families with female head		Families with male head		Families with female head	
	Poor	Non-poor	Poor	Non-poor	Poor	Non-poor	Poor	Non-poor
Total number (in thousands).....	1,930	12,980	870	1,120	330	2,730	120	300
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Attending school.....	81.8	89.0	83.5	82.7	47.7	62.5	46.3	50.1
Employed.....	9.2	16.7	8.2	17.9	10.2	16.1	7.3	15.3
Unemployed.....	1.6	2.4	2.2	2.1	3.7	2.5	4.1	1.3
Not in labor force.....	71.0	69.9	73.1	62.6	33.8	43.9	34.9	33.5
Not in school.....	18.2	11.0	16.5	17.3	52.3	37.5	53.7	49.9
Employed.....	8.8	7.4	4.6	11.0	27.4	28.1	18.7	35.9
Unemployed.....	3.1	1.5	4.6	3.0	12.0	6.6	13.0	8.0
Not in labor force.....	6.3	2.1	7.3	3.3	12.9	3.8	22.0	6.0
Keeping house.....	2.9	.7	5.1	1.2	8.0	1.0	16.3	2.4
Not high school graduate.....	14.4	5.4	14.1	7.5	30.8	11.6	39.9	13.6
Employed.....	7.1	2.9	3.6	2.9	17.5	7.4	13.8	5.6
Unemployed.....	2.2	.9	4.5	1.6	6.8	2.5	11.4	3.7
Not in labor force.....	5.1	1.6	6.0	3.0	6.5	1.6	14.6	4.3
Keeping house.....	2.2	.6	4.2	.9	4.3	.5	11.4	.7
High school graduate.....	3.8	5.6	2.4	9.8	21.5	25.9	13.8	36.2
Employed.....	1.7	4.4	1.0	8.0	9.8	20.8	4.9	30.2
Unemployed.....	.9	.7	.1	1.5	5.2	3.1	1.6	4.3
Not in labor force.....	1.2	.5	1.3	.3	6.5	2.2	7.3	1.7
Keeping house.....	.7	.1	.9	.3	3.7	.5	4.9	1.7

<sup>1</sup> Family income in 1963 below SSA index at economy level.

youngsters are nongraduates of high school who are neither in the labor force nor attending school, and 4 percent are nongraduates working or looking for work (table 6).

## MEN AND WOMEN IN POVERTY

Age for age, almost without exception, women were more likely to be in a poor household than men, especially if they themselves were its head. They are, to be sure, less likely than men to have to assume such a role. As has already been noted, however, those that do take on the assignment are more likely than men to be faced with responsi-

TABLE 7.—Sex, age, and poverty status: Number and percent of persons aged 14 and over in households with 1963 income below SSA index at economy level, by family status

Age and family status	Men			Women		
	Total non-institutional population (in thousands)	Poor family— income below economy level		Total non-institutional population (in thousands)	Poor family— income below economy level	
		Number (in thousands)	Percent of total		Number (in thousands)	Percent of total
Total, aged 14 and over.....	62,510	9,000	14.4	69,260	12,980	18.7
Unrelated individual.....	4,280	1,440	33.7	6,910	3,470	50.3
Family head.....	42,550	5,220	12.3	4,880	1,960	40.1
Some own children under age 18.....	24,710	2,970	12.0	2,390	1,330	55.7
No own children under age 18.....	17,840	2,250	12.6	2,490	630	25.1
Other family members.....	15,680	2,340	14.9	57,470	7,550	13.1
Under age 25, total.....	14,950	2,570	17.2	1,600	2,980	18.6
Unrelated individual.....	410	200	49.0	580	270	46.6
Family head.....	2,490	530	21.0	260	190	70.8
Some own children under age 18.....	1,480	340	22.9	230	180	80.7
No own children under age 18.....	1,000	190	18.7	40	10	(1)
Other family members.....	12,050	1,850	15.3	15,160	2,520	16.6
Aged 14-19.....	9,390	1,600	17.0	9,430	1,740	18.5
Aged 20-24.....	2,660	250	9.3	5,730	780	13.5
Aged 25-54, total.....	32,350	3,440	10.6	35,110	4,960	14.1
Unrelated individual.....	1,870	430	22.9	1,700	550	32.5
Family head.....	27,830	2,650	9.5	2,740	1,230	44.8
Some own children under age 18.....	21,640	2,300	10.6	2,060	1,110	53.7
No own children under age 18.....	6,190	350	5.7	680	120	17.6
Other family members.....	2,660	350	13.2	30,660	3,170	10.4
Aged 55-64, total.....	7,720	1,140	14.8	8,600	1,630	18.9
Unrelated individual.....	840	310	36.8	1,490	600	40.7
Family head.....	6,560	790	12.0	810	190	24.3
Some own children under age 18.....	1,380	250	17.8	100	40	40.0
No own children under age 18.....	5,180	540	10.5	690	150	22.2
Other family members.....	310	40	14.2	6,300	840	13.3
Aged 65 and over, total.....	7,500	1,860	24.8	9,560	3,420	35.8
Unrelated individual.....	1,160	500	43.4	3,130	2,050	65.3
Family head.....	5,680	1,250	21.9	1,080	350	32.2
Some own children under age 18.....	210	90	40.8	10	3	(1)
No own children under age 18.....	5,460	1,170	21.3	1,080	350	32.1
Other family members.....	660	100	15.1	5,340	1,020	19.2

<sup>1</sup> Not shown for base less than 100,000.

TABLE 8.—Persons in poverty in 1963 by current labor-force status and family status

[Numbers in millions]

Labor-force status and family status, March 1964	Total in population	In poor households <sup>1</sup>	
		Number	Percent of total
All persons aged 14 and over, total.....	131.8	22.0	17
Unrelated individuals.....	11.2	4.9	44
Members of family units.....	120.6	17.1	14
Head.....	47.4	7.2	15
Other relative.....	73.1	9.9	14
Employed.....	67.9	7.3	11
Unrelated individuals.....	5.9	1.5	25
Members of family units.....	61.9	5.8	9
Head.....	37.2	3.7	10
Other relative.....	24.8	2.0	8
Unemployed.....	4.2	1.1	26
Unrelated individuals.....	.5	.2	45
Members of family units.....	3.8	.9	24
Head.....	1.4	.4	28
Other relative.....	2.3	.5	21
Not in labor force.....	59.7	13.6	23
Unrelated individuals.....	4.8	3.2	67
Members of family units.....	54.9	10.4	19
Head.....	8.8	3.1	35
Other relative.....	46.0	7.4	16

<sup>1</sup> Income of family unit or unrelated individual below the SSA index at the economy level.

bility for young children and old persons and to have fewer other adults to share the burden. In the home headed by a man there may be a wife who can help boost the family income. The woman who is the family head has no such helpmeet. And of course her own earnings, if she works, will average less than a man's.

The disadvantages of assuming family responsibilities too early—or continuing them too late—are suggested by the higher incidence of poverty among men under age 25 who were fathers. More than a fifth of the family heads who were this young and had children to support reported income for their family below the economy level. This poverty rate was exceeded among men only for the few aged fathers who still had young children at home (table 7).

Young men who were heads of childless families also had a high incidence of poverty compared with men at other ages. For some, at least, the poverty state presumably was temporary, pending attainment of training and skills that would eventually lead to a higher scale of living. Of the men under age 25 who were head of a family in poverty, 11 percent of those not yet a father and 6 percent of those who already had children were attending school (table F).

The high risk of poverty for a man under age

25 who is already the head of a family is more than surpassed by the plight of a woman this young who already is left to raise her children alone. Of the few young mothers under age 25 listed as a family head, 80 percent had insufficient income in 1963 to care for themselves and their children. Doubtless because their children were likely to be small, only a fourth of these mothers were employed. Half the mothers who were over age 25 and who were a family head were employed. The higher probability of marriage disruption likely to accompany teenage marriage<sup>12</sup> and the yet-to-be-developed earning capacity of young workers tend to subject the children of very young parents to a high risk of poverty.

## WORK AND POVERTY

It has always been true in our society that economic well-being rests primarily on earning power. Those who cannot or do not work—and their dependents—must expect to be poorer than those who do. Today, with unemployment continuing at uncomfortably high levels, there are many who bear current witness to this truism. Yet there are others who do work and find they cannot provide even a bare minimum of comfort for themselves and their families. Of the 15 million children counted poor in March, 5.7 million were in the family of a worker who had a regular job in 1963 and was not out of work at any time during the year.

To be sure, families of the poor had more than their share of unemployment. Often it was not only the worker at the head of the family who was out of work, but other members too were jobless. In poor households more than in those that were not poor, family members were likely to be out of the labor force altogether, but the number who work and yet are poor, particularly among the nonwhite population, is large.

### The Working Poor

For male workers designated as the head of a family it was apparently not the current jobless-

<sup>12</sup> Robert Parke, *Age at Marriage and Subsequent Marital Experience*, presented at meetings of the Population Association of America, Chicago, April 23–24, 1965.

ness that was the primary cause of poverty. It was rather a history of an erratic series of short-term jobs or a spell of uninterrupted employment at low pay, coupled with a large number to be supported out of the family income. In more than a fourth of the white families and nearly a third of the nonwhite families designated as poor—2 million in all—the family head worked full time the year around in 1963.

Most of these full-time workers were men. Of the few women in this unrewarding situation, 28 percent were in domestic service and 20 percent had other service jobs. Almost all the domestic service workers were nonwhite. Indeed, in keeping with the greater tendency for a nonwhite woman to be working, regardless of her family responsibility, 60 percent of the women whose family was in poverty despite their having worked full time all year were nonwhite. Among men fully employed in 1963 but whose family nevertheless remained poor, only 29 percent were nonwhite.

The 1.9 million men who were family heads and who were never out of a job all year, yet still were poor, represented more than 1 in 3 of all men at the head of a family in poverty. Their families averaged five persons each, and nearly 2 in every 4 had at least four children under age 18 to support. Close to 48 percent of these fully employed yet poor family men were working as farmers, service workers, or laborers—occupations ranking low on the pay scale. All but 4 percent were still working in March 1964.

Among those living alone who were poor, only 10 percent had worked throughout 1963 in a full-time job. The proportion was almost identical for white and nonwhite persons—9 percent and 11 percent, respectively. To put these numbers in perspective, 1 in 8 of all individuals living alone who had a full-time job all during 1963 earned too little to bring him up to the poverty threshold—roughly \$1,540—for the year. There was almost no difference between men and women in this respect—13½ percent of the fully employed men were poor and 12 percent of the women.

### Unemployment in March 1964

In March 1964 a total of 4.2 million persons aged 14 or older were reported as out of work and

looking for a job. A fourth of these unemployed were in a poor household. Of persons not in the labor force, nearly the same proportion were on the poverty rolls. By contrast, of the nearly 68 million workers who had a job, only 1 in 9 were counted among the poor. For persons living alone—so many of whom are past age 65—the situation was worse than for others. Irrespective of their work status, they were much more likely to be below the poverty line than persons living as part of a family (table 8).

When due allowance is made for the large number of family members not in the labor force, it becomes evident that the poor who do work are subject to a rate of unemployment more than twice that of workers in nonpoor families. Among those who are heads of families, the unemployment rate for the poor in March 1964 was more than three times that for the nonpoor, as the figures below indicate.

Family status of worker	Unemployment rate (percent) <sup>1</sup>	
	Poor households	Nonpoor households
Total in labor force.....	13	5
Living alone.....	12	5
In family units.....	13	5
Head.....	10	3
Other member.....	19	8

<sup>1</sup> Persons currently unemployed as a percent of those currently in the labor force.

The unemployment of the head may be more critical in a poor family than in a nonpoor family because there are fewer other members likely to be able to help out. Members of poor households generally are in the labor market to a lesser degree than those in nonpoor units, a fact that in itself may explain why some families counted poor are in that situation. The difference is particularly striking for families with the head currently unemployed (table 9).

Among nonpoor families, about a fourth more of the members other than the head are in the market for a job when the family head is out of work than when he is employed. Among the poor, however, where fewer of the members aged 14 or older are in the labor force to begin with, only 5 percent more are in the market for a job when the worker heading the family has lost his.

Unfortunately, for both poor and nonpoor alike, the additional effort does not always pay off. The unemployment rate among these auxiliary workers when the head is himself looking for a job is two and one-half times as high as when he has one.

Moreover, the situation is far worse for the poor than for those better off: Among poor families with the head unemployed, nearly 40 percent of the other members available for work are unemployed too. Nonpoor families in a similar situation have half as many of the supplementary earners unemployed, as the following figures for members aged 14 or more show:

Members other than head	Poor families with head—			Nonpoor families with head—		
	Em-ployed	Unem-ployed	Out of labor force	Em-ployed	Unem-ployed	Out of labor force
Number in labor force as percent of total.....	27	29	22	38	48	42
Number unemployed as percent of number in labor force.....	14	37	25	7	19	7

For some families, whether the wife can work or not makes the difference in whether they will be poor. The incidence of poverty was twice as great among husband-wife families when the wife was not in the paid labor force as when she was. Whether she works may be particularly relevant when her husband does not have a steady job. Women aged 25–54 in families with a man at the head—most of them wives rather than other family members—were more likely to seek a job when the head was not working than at other times, particularly among the nonpoor.

With larger, younger families and lesser job skills, the wives of men in poverty were less able to look for work and were much less successful when they did, as the following figures derived from table 9 suggest:

Female members aged 25-54	Poor families with male head—			Nonpoor families with male head—		
	Em-ployed	Unem-ployed	Out of labor force	Em-ployed	Unem-ployed	Out of labor force
Number in labor force as percent of total.....	27	31	26	40	58	46
Number unemployed as percent of number in labor force.....	8	35	13	4	13	4

By the same token, some families not counted as poor would undoubtedly have been if it were not for the wife's employment, particularly when the husband was out of a job or out of the labor force entirely.

The family in poverty is apparently doubly disadvantaged. There are fewer other adults to take responsibility for keeping up family income when the head is out of work, and those who do make the attempt are less able to find a job than members of families above the poverty line.

### The Large Family and Unemployment

A family with a man at the head who is currently unemployed is nearly three times as likely to be poor as one in which the family head has a job. Prolonged unemployment or even intermittent but frequent short spells obviously predispose a large family to poverty more readily than a small one. Unemployment insurance when available is not usually geared to the number of dependents, and many of our large families are at marginal levels even when the breadwinner is working. Families that were poor, however, and headed by an unemployed man were not noticeably larger than those in which the head was currently employed. Both groups, to be sure, had larger families and more children than the matching nonpoor households. It was their generally inadequate income for their size—and per-

haps the long-run employment pattern of the breadwinner—more than their current employment situation that served as a common bond in poverty.

The very few poor families headed by a woman who was currently unemployed were bigger and had more children than those families in which the woman currently had a job or the large number in which she was out completely of the labor force (table C).

### Unemployment in 1963

The data above refer only to current employment status—that is, the job situation in a single week in March 1964. The work experience during 1963 is undoubtedly more relevant since it was income for that year by which families and persons living alone were classified as poor. Such information is available at this time only for persons living alone and for those who were the head of a family.

In poor families where the person at the head worked only part of the year, more than half these men had spent some time out of a job and looking for work. The overall unemployment rate among men who were heads of impoverished families and had any work experience at all in 1963 accordingly was 26 percent. The corresponding rate in March 1964 among those then in the labor force was 9 percent. Among men living

TABLE 9.—Current labor-force status of persons other than the head in poor and nonpoor families and of women aged 25–54 in families with male head, by labor-force status of head

[Numbers in thousands]

Labor-force status of member other than head in March 1964	Total	Poor, <sup>1</sup> with head—			Nonpoor, with head—			
		Employed	Un- employed	Not in labor force	Total	Employed	Un- employed	Not in labor force
In families with male or female head								
All persons aged 14 and over.....	9,890	5,760	570	3,570	63,260	53,310	1,630	8,320
In labor force.....	2,530	1,590	160	780	24,570	20,310	780	3,480
Employed.....	2,040	1,350	100	590	22,720	18,670	630	3,230
Unemployed.....	480	230	60	200	1,850	1,450	150	250
Not in labor force.....	7,360	4,180	410	2,780	38,690	33,000	860	4,840
In families with male head								
All women aged 25–54.....	2,980	2,220	230	530	26,800	24,580	680	1,540
In labor force.....	800	600	70	140	10,830	9,720	400	710
Employed.....	710	550	50	120	10,330	9,300	340	680
Unemployed.....	90	50	30	20	500	420	50	30
Not in labor force.....	2,170	1,620	160	400	15,980	14,860	290	830

<sup>1</sup> Family income in 1963 below SSA index at economy level.

alone in poverty it was 28 percent for 1963 and 17 percent for the more recent date.

For many of the poor, unemployment is obviously a chronic rather than an acute ailment. Or perhaps one might say it is their poverty that is chronic; they will be poor whether or not the family head has a job. In this connection a recent study for the California State Social Welfare Board compared two sets of families—a representative group of those coming on the State rolls for aid to families with dependent children of an unemployed parent and a similar group of low-income families not then on the welfare rolls. Both were composed primarily of ill-educated, low-skilled, low-paid workers with large numbers of dependents. About 60 percent of the families receiving assistance and 66 percent of the others had at least six members.

The study concluded that “there are few and insignificant differences for the most part between the AFDC-Unemployed parent group and the low-income non-welfare group. They are interchangeable parts of *one* high-risk, dependency-prone group.”

According to the study, “the critical question for dependency—and for the welfare rolls—is not whether the breadwinner is unemployed at any given time, but whether he works over a *span of time* for an income which can support *his* family.”<sup>13</sup>

There was no difference observed in willingness to work or in work history. Both groups revealed a chronic vulnerability in terms of low skills and low wages, with frequent spells of un-

employment that could result in need for public assistance in the intervals between jobs.

Unfortunately, existing income-support programs are crisis-oriented. They are designed to deal with interruption in income rather than a continuing income deficiency.<sup>14</sup>

### Labor-Force Participation

Employment at low pay and unemployment are not the only labor-force characteristics distinguishing the poor from the nonpoor. Among family heads and other members, considerably more of those in poor than in nonpoor families are neither working nor looking for work; they are out of the labor force altogether. In some measure this disparity reflects merely the fact that the poverty rolls include a fair share of those who would normally not be expected to work, such as the aged and women—young or old—who have to care for a family and look after young children. But even allowing for these factors, the disparity exists—age for age, man for man, and woman for woman, with only one exception. In poor families headed by a man, men aged 20–24 were a little more likely to be working than in nonpoor families—undoubtedly an indication that the young men in the better-off families are more likely to be attending college just as in their teens they were more likely to be in high school.

Among family members other than the head, 3 out of every 4 of those in poor families who

<sup>14</sup> Eveline M. Burns, “Social Security in Evolution: Towards What?” Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Meeting of Industrial Relations Research Association, Chicago, December 1964.

<sup>13</sup> California Department of Social Welfare, State Social Welfare Board, *First Annual Report*, January 1965.

TABLE 10.—Family size of white and nonwhite families in March 1964, by sex of head and poverty status

Sex of head and family size	White families			Nonwhite families		
	Total	Poor <sup>1</sup>	Nonpoor	Total	Poor <sup>1</sup>	Nonpoor
All families, total number (in millions).....	42.6	5.1	37.5	4.8	2.1	2.7
Persons in families, total number (in millions).....	155.7	19.8	135.9	20.3	9.9	10.4
Number of persons per family.....	3.6	3.8	3.6	4.2	4.8	3.8
Families with male head, total number (in millions).....	38.8	3.9	34.9	3.7	1.3	2.4
Persons in families (in millions).....	144.4	15.8	128.6	15.9	6.5	9.4
Number of persons per family.....	3.7	4.0	3.7	4.3	5.1	3.8
Families with female head, total number (in millions).....	3.8	1.2	2.6	1.1	.8	.3
Persons in families, total number (in millions).....	11.3	4.0	7.3	4.4	3.4	1.0
Number of persons per family.....	3.0	3.4	2.8	4.1	4.4	3.3

<sup>1</sup> Family income in 1963 below SSA index at economy level.

were aged 14 or older were not in the labor force, compared with 3 out of 5 in nonpoor families. Disability rates were higher among the poor but hardly enough higher to account for the difference: Nearly 3 percent of those out of the labor force gave as a reason longterm illness or disability, compared with 1½ percent of the nonpoor (table D).

It is easier to offer possible explanations for some of the findings than for others: Women in poor families, whatever their age, are more likely to be needed at home to look after children. This is so whether they are wife and mother in a family headed by a man or must serve as homemaker for the family of another woman who goes out to work. But why boys aged 14–19 in poor families, already less likely to be in school than boys in families better off, should also be less likely to seek work is more difficult to rationalize. It is in any case more disturbing, even if it indicates only that our statistics on unemployment may leave out some who expect such difficulty in finding a job that they no longer report themselves in the market for one.

## RACE AND POVERTY

It is evident that nonwhite persons in 1963 were much poorer than others, regardless of family or work status, as their longstanding inferior income status should have led us to expect. Statistics for the Negroes often are taken to be synonymous with those for the general nonwhite population, more than 90 percent of which is Negro. In point of fact, the situation of the Negro may be even worse, as suggested by 1960 Census data for income, education, and employment among the separate nonwhite racial groups.<sup>15</sup>

A newly released report of data collected in March 1964 reaffirms the continuing current disadvantage of the Negro, both with respect to other nonwhite groups and to the white population.

In March 1964 the Negro population was, on the average, younger and had a smaller amount of regular schooling, a smaller proportion mar-

<sup>15</sup> Bureau of the Census, *U. S. Census of Population, 1960*, "Nonwhite Population by Race," PC (2)-1C.

ried, and lower median income than the white population. Half the Negro males aged 14 and over with any income in 1963 had no more than \$2,440—white males averaged twice this much. Negro females with income averaged only two-thirds as much income for the year as white females.<sup>16</sup> The nonwhite population of whatever race has less income than the white, but the Negroes are somewhat worse off even than other nonwhite groups, as the following figures suggest.<sup>17</sup>

Median income in 1963	White	Nonwhite	
		Total	Negro
All men with income <sup>1</sup> .....	\$4,820	\$2,510	\$2,440
Nonfarm.....	5,020	2,740	2,650
Farm.....	2,280	830	780
All women with income <sup>1</sup> .....	1,440	960	950
Nonfarm.....	1,480	1,040	1,020
Farm.....	790	390	390

<sup>1</sup> Noninstitutional population.

Regardless of race, persons living alone tended to be poorer than those of the same age and sex living as part of a family group, but among nonwhite persons there was less difference in this respect than among white. White families averaged three and one-half times as much income as white unrelated individuals, but nonwhite families had only two and two-thirds as much to live on as a nonwhite person living alone.

Nonwhite families, whether headed by a man or woman, had income little better than half that of white families, despite the fact that they were considerably larger (table 10). As a result, poverty among the nonwhite population generally was from three to four times as prevalent as among the rest of the Nation.

Among the white population, the proportion counted poor declined from 17 percent for children under age 6 to 11 percent for persons aged 45–64, and then rose to 29 percent for those aged 65 and over, the poorest of any age group. In the nonwhite population, by contrast, the poverty rate among young children was the highest

<sup>16</sup> Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports, Population Characteristics*, "Negro Population: March 1964," Series P-20, No. 137, May 1965.

<sup>17</sup> Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports, Consumer Income*, "Income of Families and Persons in the United States, 1963," Series P-60, No. 43.

of all, but the incidence in the aged population was almost as high. Accordingly, the poverty rate for the nonwhite population was four times the rate for the white population among young children, three and one-half times as high among those in the middle years, but less than twice as high among aged persons (table A).

This limited measure of parity in poverty among the races is echoed somewhat among families with children called poor. When identified by a poverty criterion that varies with the number in the family, families selected as poor exhibit less difference in income between white and nonwhite: All are uncomfortably and unconscionably low. Even among the poor, however, the nonwhite families are larger and so must make do with less per person than the white, as the figures below illustrate.

Item	All families		Poor families	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Male head:				
Median income.....	\$6,790	\$4,140	\$1,690	\$2,000
Persons per family.....	3.7	4.0	4.3	5.1
Female head:				
Median income.....	\$3,810	\$2,000	\$1,230	\$1,410
Persons per family.....	3.0	4.1	3.4	4.4

Some of the difference in the extent of poverty between white and nonwhite households might be explained away by the larger proportion of the nonwhite population living in the South, where incomes generally are lower than in the rest of the country. Yet as table G shows, even classifying the families separately by region does not wipe out the disparity in economic status, although it does reduce it.

Similarly, the fact that nonwhite families tend to have more children than white families and are more likely to have a woman as the head might account in some measure for their lack of economic security: Such families are no strangers to poverty even among the white population. If allowance is made for these differences by standardizing the rates—that is, by applying to nonwhite families the poverty rate for white families of the same size and composition—then the proportion of nonwhite families in poverty decreases from 42½ percent to 20 percent—still one and one-half times the rate of 12 percent among white households. It is obvious there is

more to the problem of poverty among Negroes than mere statistical artifact.

## SUMMING UP

The data cited document the disadvantage under which so many among us live. The criterion of reference is still far from ideal. Yet whether or not the particular poverty standard meets one's own, it is hard to believe an alternative criterion could seriously alter the impression of vulnerability for the aged household, the family with many children, the nonwhite family, the family with a woman at the head, the family of a nonworker or low-paid worker, and the multiple jeopardy when two or more of these risks are combined.

Much more could be and should be learned about the nature of poverty and its longterm consequences. Looking at a single point in time inevitably fuses cause and effect. It cannot be said for sure whether or when the broken home, or the problems of the family with more than its share of women and young children and its absent or idle teenagers, or the bleak privation of old age could have been averted by attacking poverty at some earlier stage.

But even before all the evidence is in it is safe to conclude that, for many in the underclass of present-day society, poverty is neither a sometime nor a one-time thing. For them there is no hope ahead for anything but privation from childhood to old age.

The father and mother with not enough to care for their family today are not likely to end their tomorrows in a retirement cushioned with the savings of a lifetime. In today's credential society, there is scant hope for the youngster raised in poverty, ill-equipped and shortchanged, to find a job that promises a better life as an adult than he knew as a child. For many a Negro still, a lingering legacy of discrimination will continue throughout his lifetime to deny him a better living. But what cold comfort is that for the white pauper who cannot even attribute his dreary fate to his color? Sixty percent of all children in poverty today are white, and without countervailing measures most of them have little to look forward to but more of the same.

But now it is proclaimed that these things



not only should not be—they need not be; if the Nation has the will, it has the means to strike at poverty: This is indeed a new dimension. Whatever the inadequacies of the past, we can seek for the future a better chance for all citizens. We now know who's who among the poor, even if the exact number is not known. The

groups most vulnerable to the risk of poverty have been identified. Remedial programs can go forward.

To end on a plaintive note, if we can think bold solutions and dream big dreams we may be able to ease the problem of poverty even if we cannot yet agree on how to measure it.

TABLE A.—Poverty status<sup>1</sup> of noninstitutional population in 1963: Number and percent of persons in unit with 1963 income below specified level of SSA poverty index, by age, sex, race, and family status

[Numbers in millions; data are estimates derived from a sample survey of households and are therefore subject to sampling variability that may be relatively large where the size of the percentage or size of the total on which the percentage is based is small; as in all surveys, the figures are subject to errors of response and nonreporting]

Age, sex, and family status	All persons					White					Nonwhite				
	Total noninstitutional population <sup>2</sup>	Income of individual or family unit—				Total noninstitutional population <sup>2</sup>	Income of individual or family unit—				Total noninstitutional population <sup>2</sup>	Income of individual or family unit—			
		Below economy level		Below low-cost level			Below economy level		Below low-cost level			Below economy level		Below low-cost level	
		Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total		Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total		Number	Percent of total	Number	Percent of total
Number of persons, total.....	187.2	34.6	18.5	50.3	26.8	165.4	23.9	14.4	36.7	22.2	21.8	10.7	49.3	13.5	62.1
Unrelated individuals.....	11.2	4.9	43.9	5.6	49.8	9.7	4.1	41.8	4.7	48.0	1.5	.8	57.5	.9	61.7
Members of family units.....	176.0	29.7	16.9	44.7	25.4	155.7	19.8	12.7	32.1	20.6	20.3	9.9	48.7	12.6	62.1
Children under age 18 <sup>3</sup> .....	68.8	15.1	21.9	21.9	31.8	59.2	9.3	15.7	14.9	25.1	9.7	5.8	59.5	7.0	72.6
Under 6.....	24.8	5.9	23.9	8.7	35.2	21.0	3.6	17.3	5.8	28.0	3.9	2.3	59.7	2.9	74.2
6-13.....	30.6	6.7	21.8	9.6	31.4	26.4	4.1	15.6	6.6	24.9	4.1	2.6	61.9	3.0	73.6
14-17.....	13.4	2.4	18.1	3.5	26.4	11.8	1.5	13.1	2.4	20.7	1.7	.9	52.9	1.1	66.5
Persons aged 18-45.....	63.4	9.0	14.2	13.7	21.6	56.2	6.2	11.0	9.9	17.6	7.3	2.9	39.7	3.8	52.8
Unrelated individuals.....	3.0	1.0	32.5	1.0	34.6	2.5	.7	30.1	.8	32.1	.5	.2	43.3	.2	46.1
Members of family units.....	60.4	8.1	13.3	12.7	21.0	53.7	5.4	10.1	9.1	16.9	6.7	2.6	39.4	3.6	53.4
Head.....	23.3	3.6	15.5	5.5	23.6	20.7	2.5	11.9	4.0	19.3	2.6	1.2	44.1	1.5	57.5
Wife.....	24.5	2.8	11.5	4.8	19.4	22.2	2.0	9.0	3.6	16.2	2.3	.8	34.8	1.2	49.5
Other.....	12.6	1.6	12.9	2.4	19.2	10.8	.9	8.8	1.5	13.9	1.8	.6	38.4	.9	52.3
Persons aged 45-64.....	37.8	5.2	13.9	7.3	19.2	34.3	3.9	11.3	5.5	16.1	3.6	1.4	39.0	1.7	48.8
Unrelated individuals.....	3.9	1.4	35.7	1.6	40.2	3.3	1.0	31.4	1.2	35.7	.6	.4	60.9	.4	66.1
Members of family units.....	33.9	3.8	11.4	5.7	16.8	30.9	2.8	9.1	4.3	14.0	3.0	1.0	34.8	1.3	45.5
Head.....	17.3	1.9	11.3	2.9	16.6	15.6	1.4	8.7	2.1	13.5	1.6	.6	36.3	.8	47.4
Wife.....	14.3	1.5	10.6	2.3	15.9	13.2	1.2	8.9	1.8	13.8	1.1	.3	31.6	.4	41.6
Other.....	2.3	.4	16.2	.5	23.2	2.1	.3	13.1	.4	19.6	.3	.1	37.9	.1	49.5
Persons aged 65 and over.....	17.1	5.3	30.9	7.4	43.3	15.8	4.6	28.9	6.5	41.0	1.3	.7	55.4	.9	71.3
Unrelated individuals.....	4.3	2.5	59.3	3.0	69.2	3.9	2.3	58.0	2.7	68.3	.4	.3	73.8	.3	78.3
Members of family units.....	12.8	2.7	21.3	4.4	34.6	11.5	2.3	19.2	3.8	31.9	.9	.4	48.4	.6	68.4
Head.....	6.8	1.6	23.4	2.5	36.9	6.2	1.3	20.8	2.1	33.8	.6	.3	52.5	.4	70.1
Wife.....	3.4	.8	22.7	1.4	39.2	3.3	.7	21.5	1.2	37.2	.2	.1	43.9	.1	76.1
Other.....	2.5	.3	13.5	.5	21.9	2.3	.8	11.4	.4	19.2	.2	.1	40.4	.1	55.2

<sup>1</sup> For description of poverty criteria, see Mollie Orshansky, "Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile," *Social Security Bulletin*, January 1965.

<sup>2</sup> As of March 1964 there were 2 million persons in institutions, including 270,000 children under age 18; 1,100,000 persons aged 18-64; and 700,000 persons aged 65 or older. These persons, as well as the 200,000 children under age 14 who live with a family to no member of which they were related, are not represented in the poverty index because income data are not collected for inmates of institutions or unrelated individuals under age 14.

<sup>3</sup> Includes never-married own children of the family head and all other never-married relatives under age 18; excludes an additional 300,000 children under age 14 (200,000 in households of nonrelatives and 100,000 in institutions).

<sup>4</sup> Also includes all unrelated individuals aged 14-17.

Note: Numbers in this report based on actual counts of individual persons in the households sampled, weighted and aggregated by family weights with units then adjusted by Bureau of the Census procedures to conform to known population characteristics, such as age, sex, and race. Group totals may therefore differ slightly from corresponding totals in other Census reports based on person rather than family weights. The counts of persons in families may also differ slightly from those in "Counting the Poor," which were derived from distributions of family units with an estimated average number assumed for units including 7 or more persons, or 6 or more related children under age 18.

TABLE B.—Comparing the poor and the nonpoor, according to the SSA poverty index: Percentage distribution of persons in families with 1963 income above and below specified levels, by age and relationship to head and by sex of head

Age and relationship to head	Total, family income—					All families with male head, family income—					All families with female head, family income—				
	Below economy level	Above economy level	Above economy level, below low-cost level	Below low-cost level	Above low-cost level	Below economy level	Above economy level	Above economy level, below low-cost level	Below low-cost level	Above low-cost level	Below economy level	Above economy level	Above economy level, below low-cost level	Below low-cost level	Above low-cost level
Families, total number (in thousands).....	7,180	40,260	3,720	10,900	36,530	5,220	37,340	3,280	8,500	34,060	1,960	2,920	445	2,400	2,470
Family members:															
Total number (in thousands).....	29,690	146,280	15,000	44,690	131,280	22,290	137,940	13,600	35,890	124,340	7,400	8,330	1,390	8,790	6,940
Number per family.....	4.1	3.6	4.0	4.1	3.6	4.3	3.7	4.2	4.2	3.7	3.8	2.9	3.1	3.7	2.8
Total percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Children under age 18, total.....	50.7	36.8	45.6	49.0	35.7	47.6	37.4	46.0	47.0	36.4	60.0	26.8	41.7	57.2	23.8
Own children.....	46.6	35.4	43.1	45.4	34.5	44.7	36.2	33.9	44.4	35.4	52.2	22.3	35.7	49.6	19.7
Under 6 years.....	18.5	12.3	17.6	18.2	11.7	18.7	12.9	18.8	18.8	12.2	17.8	3.2	6.3	16.0	2.6
6-13.....	20.7	15.8	18.6	20.0	15.5	19.2	16.2	18.9	19.1	15.9	25.2	10.2	15.9	23.7	9.1
14-17.....	7.4	7.3	6.9	7.2	7.3	6.8	7.1	6.2	6.5	7.3	9.2	8.9	13.5	9.9	8.0
Other related children.....	4.1	1.4	2.5	3.6	1.2	2.9	1.1	2.1	2.6	1.0	7.8	4.4	6.0	7.6	4.1
Under 6 years.....	1.5	.6	1.0	1.3	.5	1.1	.5	.9	1.0	.4	2.7	1.7	1.6	2.6	1.7
6-13.....	1.8	.5	.9	1.5	.4	1.2	.4	.8	1.0	.4	3.8	1.5	2.6	3.6	1.4
14-17.....	.8	.3	.6	.7	.3	.6	.2	.4	.6	.2	1.3	1.2	1.8	1.4	1.0
Other members, total.....	49.3	63.2	54.4	51.0	64.2	52.4	62.6	54.0	53.0	63.6	40.0	73.2	58.3	42.8	76.2
Under age 45.....	27.2	35.8	30.8	28.3	36.3	28.2	35.9	31.1	29.2	36.5	23.7	33.3	28.7	24.5	34.2
Head.....	12.2	13.5	12.6	12.3	13.6	11.1	13.6	12.5	11.6	13.8	15.4	10.4	13.4	15.1	9.8
Wife.....	9.5	14.8	12.9	10.6	15.0	12.6	15.7	14.3	13.2	15.9					
Other relatives.....	5.5	7.5	5.3	5.4	7.7	4.5	6.6	4.3	4.4	6.8	8.3	22.9	15.3	9.4	24.4
Aged 45-64.....	13.0	20.5	12.3	12.7	21.5	14.2	20.3	11.8	13.3	21.3	9.1	24.4	16.2	10.2	26.1
Head.....	6.6	10.5	6.2	6.4	11.0	6.7	10.1	5.5	6.2	10.7	6.2	15.7	12.3	7.2	16.4
Wife.....	5.1	8.7	5.0	5.1	9.1	6.8	9.3	5.5	6.3	9.7					
Other relatives.....	1.3	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.4	.7	.9	.8	.8	.9	2.9	8.7	3.9	3.0	9.7
Aged 65 and over.....	9.1	6.9	11.3	9.8	6.4	10.0	6.3	11.1	10.4	5.8	7.1	15.5	13.3	8.1	15.9
Head.....	5.4	3.6	6.1	5.6	3.3	5.6	3.2	6.1	5.8	2.9	4.7	8.9	6.3	5.0	9.4
Wife.....	2.6	1.8	3.8	3.0	1.6	3.5	1.9	4.2	3.8	1.7					
Other relatives.....	1.1	1.5	1.4	1.2	1.5	.8	1.2	.8	.8	1.2	2.4	6.6	7.0	3.1	6.5

TABLE C.—Number of persons and number of children in poor<sup>1</sup> and nonpoor families in 1963, by sex and current labor-force status of head

Labor-force status of head in March 1964	All families			Families with male head			Families with female head		
	Total	Poor	Nonpoor	Total	Poor	Nonpoor	Total	Poor	Nonpoor
All families, total number (in millions).....	47.7	7.2	40.2	42.5	5.2	37.3	4.9	2.0	2.9
Persons in families:									
Total number (in millions).....	176.0	29.7	146.3	160.3	22.3	138.0	15.7	7.4	8.3
Number per family.....	3.7	4.1	3.6	3.8	4.3	3.7	3.2	3.8	2.9
Children in families:									
Total number (in millions).....	68.8	15.0	53.8	62.2	10.6	51.5	6.7	4.4	2.2
Number per family.....	1.5	2.1	1.3	1.5	2.0	1.4	1.4	2.3	.8
Head employed, total number (in millions).....	37.1	3.7	33.4	34.9	3.2	31.8	2.2	.6	1.7
Persons in families:									
Total number (in millions).....	143.8	17.7	126.1	136.8	15.4	121.4	6.9	2.2	4.7
Number per family.....	3.9	4.7	3.8	3.9	4.9	3.8	3.1	3.9	2.8
Children in families:									
Total number (in millions).....	59.1	9.7	49.4	56.3	8.3	48.0	2.8	1.3	1.5
Number per family.....	1.6	2.6	1.5	1.6	2.6	1.5	1.2	2.4	.9
Head unemployed, total number (in millions).....	1.4	.4	1.0	1.3	.3	1.0	.2	.1	.1
Persons in families:									
Total number (in millions).....	5.5	1.9	3.6	5.0	1.6	3.4	.6	.3	.2
Number per family.....	3.9	4.8	3.5	3.9	4.9	3.6	3.7	4.4	2.9
Children in families:									
Total number (in millions).....	2.4	1.1	1.3	2.1	.9	1.2	.3	.2	.1
Number per family.....	1.7	2.8	1.2	1.6	2.8	1.2	2.0	3.0	1.0
Head not in labor force, total number (in millions).....	8.9	3.0	5.8	6.4	1.7	4.6	2.5	1.3	1.2
Persons in families:									
Total number (in millions).....	26.7	10.1	16.6	18.4	5.2	13.2	8.3	4.9	3.4
Number per family.....	3.0	3.3	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.8	3.3	3.7	2.9
Children in families:									
Total number (in millions).....	7.4	4.2	3.1	3.8	1.4	2.4	3.6	2.9	.7
Number per family.....	.8	1.4	.5	.6	.8	.5	1.4	2.2	.6

<sup>1</sup> Family income in 1963 below SSA index at economy level.

TABLE D.—Current labor-force status of persons other than the head in poor<sup>1</sup> and nonpoor families in 1963: Percentage distribution by sex and age of family member and by sex of head

Age and labor-force status of family member in March 1964	All families		Families with male head				Families with female head			
	All members		Male members		Female members		Male members		Female members	
	Poor families	Nonpoor families	Poor families	Nonpoor families	Poor families	Nonpoor families	Poor families	Nonpoor families	Poor families	Nonpoor families
All persons aged 14 and over, number (in thousands).....	9,890	63,250	1,520	11,510	6,590	47,730	820	1,830	960	2,190
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed.....	20.6	35.9	30.7	40.9	17.5	33.4	28.4	57.3	19.6	47.0
Unemployed.....	4.9	2.9	8.3	5.8	3.3	2.1	13.3	9.2	3.4	1.5
Not in labor force.....	74.5	61.2	61.1	53.3	79.2	64.6	58.2	33.5	76.9	51.5
Ill or disabled.....	2.1	.9	2.6	1.2	1.3	.7	4.2	2.1	5.2	3.7
Other.....	72.3	60.3	58.5	52.1	77.9	63.9	54.1	31.4	71.8	47.8
Aged 14-19, number (in thousands).....	3,340	15,480	1,120	7,170	1,240	7,050	480	630	510	640
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed.....	17.6	25.3	25.5	27.6	13.7	21.9	17.6	37.2	9.5	24.2
Unemployed.....	5.4	4.0	5.5	5.1	4.3	2.7	10.1	7.7	3.8	1.4
Not in labor force.....	77.0	70.7	69.0	67.2	82.0	75.4	72.3	55.1	86.8	74.4
Ill or disabled.....	.3	.2	.3	.2	.2	.2	.6	.6	.6	.9
Other.....	76.7	70.5	68.7	67.0	82.0	75.2	71.6	55.1	86.2	73.5
Aged 20-24, number (in thousands).....	1,020	7,370	140	2,110	700	4,690	110	300	80	270
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	( <sup>2</sup> )	100.0
Employed.....	27.5	50.1	52.5	57.4	17.1	44.1	48.6	65.8	( <sup>2</sup> )	77.4
Unemployed.....	11.9	5.8	18.4	8.3	8.5	4.3	30.8	12.3	( <sup>2</sup> )	4.8
Not in labor force.....	60.7	44.1	29.1	34.2	74.4	51.6	20.6	21.9	( <sup>2</sup> )	17.8
Ill or disabled.....	1.8	.5	5.0	.9	.4	.4	4.7	2.0	( <sup>2</sup> )	.9
Other.....	58.9	43.6	24.1	33.3	74.0	51.2	15.9	10.9	( <sup>2</sup> )	17.8
Aged 25-54, number (in thousands).....	3,520	29,790	190	1,630	2,980	26,800	160	680	200	680
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed.....	27.7	42.7	48.4	82.2	23.9	38.5	55.1	80.7	42.6	76.4
Unemployed.....	4.6	2.3	19.8	7.1	3.1	1.9	15.8	11.3	4.1	.7
Not in labor force.....	67.7	54.9	31.8	10.6	73.0	59.6	29.1	7.9	53.3	22.8
Ill or disabled.....	1.6	.5	9.9	2.8	.3	.2	5.7	2.8	9.6	4.2
Other.....	66.1	54.4	21.9	7.8	72.7	59.4	23.4	5.1	43.7	18.6
Aged 55-64, number (in thousands).....	880	5,730	20	190	770	5,270	20	80	70	200
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	( <sup>2</sup> )	100.0	100.0	100.0	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	100.0
Employed.....	18.6	34.8	( <sup>2</sup> )	66.8	17.1	32.3	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	57.4
Unemployed.....	2.0	1.7	( <sup>2</sup> )	6.3	1.6	1.4	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	2.6
Not in labor force.....	79.3	63.5	( <sup>2</sup> )	26.8	81.4	66.3	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	40.0
Ill or disabled.....	3.5	1.2	( <sup>2</sup> )	7.4	2.0	.8	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	4.1
Other.....	75.8	62.3	( <sup>2</sup> )	19.4	79.4	65.5	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	35.9
Aged 65 and over, number (in thousands).....	1,120	4,880	40	410	910	3,910	60	150	110	400
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	( <sup>2</sup> )	100.0	100.0	100.0	( <sup>2</sup> )	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed.....	2.9	7.9	( <sup>2</sup> )	11.4	2.3	7.4	( <sup>2</sup> )	11.3	2.6	8.0
Unemployed.....	.3	.3	( <sup>2</sup> )	.7	.2	.2	( <sup>2</sup> )	2.0	.6	.6
Not in labor force.....	97.1	91.8	( <sup>2</sup> )	87.9	97.7	92.5	( <sup>2</sup> )	86.7	97.4	92.0
Ill or disabled.....	8.5	5.9	( <sup>2</sup> )	9.5	6.6	5.2	( <sup>2</sup> )	6.0	12.3	9.7
Other.....	88.5	85.9	( <sup>2</sup> )	78.4	91.1	87.3	( <sup>2</sup> )	80.7	85.1	82.3

<sup>1</sup> Family income in 1963 below SSA index at economy level.

<sup>2</sup> Not shown for base less than 100,000.

TABLE E.—Incidence of poverty among children under age 18, by race, sex, and current labor-force status of family head, and relationship to family head

Age, relationship of children to head, and sex of family head	Labor-force status of head, March 1964								
	All families			White families			Nonwhite families		
	Employed	Un-employed	Not in labor force	Employed	Un-employed	Not in labor force	Employed	Un-employed	Not in labor force
Number of children (in thousands)									
<i>Male head</i>									
All children under age 18.....	56,290	2,090	3,780	50,210	1,710	3,130	6,070	380	650
Own children, total.....	54,780	1,990	3,210	49,200	1,650	2,760	5,570	340	450
Under age 6.....	19,960	810	1,200	17,640	650	980	2,320	160	230
Other related children, total.....	1,510	100	570	1,010	70	370	500	30	200
Under age 6.....	710	40	190	460	30	140	250	10	50
<i>Female head</i>									
All children under age 18.....	2,790	300	3,580	1,750	190	2,160	1,050	110	1,420
Own children, total.....	2,410	280	3,040	1,610	180	1,890	800	100	1,150
Under age 6.....	500	110	980	300	70	560	200	40	410
Other related children, total.....	390	20	540	140	10	270	250	10	270
Under age 6.....	170	20	160	70	10	60	100	10	110
Percent of children in poverty <sup>1</sup>									
<i>Male head</i>									
All children under age 18.....	14.7	43.5	36.7	10.8	37.2	31.9	47.5	72.3	60.0
Own children, total.....	14.5	44.1	35.4	10.6	37.8	32.2	48.5	74.1	55.3
Under age 6.....	16.7	50.0	36.5	12.1	42.7	32.8	51.4	79.7	52.8
Other related children, total.....	23.6	( <sup>2</sup> )	43.9	17.2	( <sup>2</sup> )	29.6	36.7	( <sup>2</sup> )	70.7
Under age 6.....	21.8	( <sup>2</sup> )	45.8	15.6	( <sup>2</sup> )	36.2	33.2	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )
<i>Female head</i>									
All children under age 18.....	48.0	76.5	80.2	31.5	66.8	72.1	75.6	92.9	92.5
Own children, total.....	47.7	77.0	82.3	33.2	69.1	75.6	77.1	( <sup>2</sup> )	93.3
Under age 6.....	68.8	86.7	90.2	61.7	( <sup>2</sup> )	86.1	79.7	( <sup>2</sup> )	95.7
Other related children, total.....	50.0	( <sup>2</sup> )	68.5	12.5	( <sup>2</sup> )	47.6	70.8	( <sup>2</sup> )	89.1
Under age 6.....	45.5	( <sup>2</sup> )	72.0	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	( <sup>2</sup> )	88.7

<sup>1</sup> Family income in 1963 below SSA index at economy level.

<sup>2</sup> Not shown for base less than 100,000.

TABLE F.—Current labor-force status of family heads in poor and nonpoor families in 1963,<sup>1</sup> by sex and age

Age and labor-force status of head, March 1964	All families		Families with male head				Families with female head			
	Poor	Nonpoor	Poor families		Nonpoor families		Poor families		Nonpoor families	
			Total	With own children under age 18	Total	With own children under age 18	Total	With own children under age 18	Total	With own children under age 18
All heads, number (in thousands).....	7,180	40,260	5,220	2,970	37,330	21,740	1,960	1,330	2,920	1,060
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed.....	51.9	83.1	60.4	77.8	85.1	93.3	29.1	33.4	57.1	71.8
Unemployed.....	5.6	2.5	6.2	8.2	2.5	2.3	3.9	5.0	2.6	3.8
Not in labor force.....	42.5	14.4	33.4	14.0	12.3	4.4	67.0	61.6	40.3	24.4
Keeping house.....	17.3	2.8	.2	.1	.1	.1	63.0	59.4	37.3	23.4
Going to school.....	1.0	.2	1.1	1.0	.3	.2	1.0	1.2	.1	.2
Ill or disabled.....	4.5	1.1	5.6	2.5	1.0	.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	.3
Other.....	19.7	10.3	26.5	10.3	10.9	3.9	1.6	1.0	1.5	.5
Heads under age 25, number (in thousands).....	720	2,040	530	340	1,960	1,140	190	180	80	40
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed.....	59.7	84.7	73.4	78.2	85.6	90.5	21.6	22.3	(2)	(2)
Unemployed.....	6.1	3.7	5.9	3.5	3.6	3.6	6.8	7.1	(2)	(2)
Not in labor force.....	34.2	11.6	20.7	18.3	10.8	5.9	71.6	70.6	(2)	(2)
Going to school.....	8.0	2.3	7.8	6.2	2.3	1.1	8.4	7.0	(2)	(2)
Ill or disabled.....	.4	.3	.6	.9	.3	.3	.3	.3	(2)	(2)
Other.....	25.8	9.3	12.3	11.2	8.5	4.8	63.2	63.6	(2)	(2)
Heads aged 25-54, number (in thousands).....	3,880	26,690	2,650	2,300	25,180	19,340	1,230	1,110	1,520	950
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed.....	66.1	92.8	79.5	80.9	93.7	93.9	37.0	35.3	77.9	74.6
Unemployed.....	7.9	2.5	9.3	9.2	2.4	2.2	4.9	4.9	3.2	3.7
Not in labor force.....	26.0	4.7	11.2	9.9	3.8	3.9	58.1	59.8	18.9	21.7
Ill or disabled.....	1.6	.3	2.4	1.8	.3	.3	.3	.3	.2	.3
Other.....	24.4	4.4	8.8	8.1	3.5	3.6	58.1	59.8	18.7	21.4
Heads aged 55-64, number (in thousands).....	980	6,370	790	250	5,770	1,130	190	40	590	60
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed.....	51.5	84.2	57.0	65.7	87.0	91.7	28.4	(2)	57.4	(2)
Unemployed.....	4.1	3.2	4.6	6.9	3.2	2.9	2.1	(2)	2.7	(2)
Not in labor force.....	44.4	12.6	38.4	27.4	9.8	5.4	69.5	(2)	39.9	(2)
Ill or disabled.....	7.9	1.9	9.8	9.4	2.0	1.1	.3	(2)	1.3	(2)
Other.....	36.5	10.7	28.6	18.0	7.8	4.3	69.5	(2)	38.6	(2)
Heads aged 65 and over, number (in thousands).....	1,600	5,160	1,250	90	4,420	130	350	(3)	740	10
Percent.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Employed.....	14.2	30.8	16.6	(2)	33.7	46.0	5.7	(2)	13.9	(2)
Unemployed.....	.7	1.6	1.0	(2)	1.7	2.4	.3	(2)	.8	(2)
Not in labor force.....	85.1	67.6	82.4	(2)	64.6	51.6	94.3	(2)	85.3	(2)
Ill or disabled.....	11.2	4.4	12.1	(2)	4.4	4.4	7.7	(2)	4.1	(2)
Other.....	73.9	63.2	70.3	(2)	60.2	51.6	86.6	(2)	81.2	(2)

<sup>1</sup> Family income in 1963 below SSA index at economy level.

<sup>2</sup> Not shown for base less than 100,000.

<sup>3</sup> Less than 5,000.

TABLE G.—Incidence of poverty<sup>1</sup> among white and nonwhite households, by sex of head and by region

[Numbers in thousands]

Sex and race of head	Total, United States		Northeast		South		North Central		West	
	Total	Percent poor	Total	Percent poor	Total	Percent poor	Total	Percent poor	Total	Percent poor
Families of 2 or more										
Male head.....	42,550	12.3	10,700	7.5	12,720	21.0	12,150	9.1	6,980	9.0
White.....	38,870	10.2	10,020	6.6	10,900	16.0	11,450	8.7	6,490	8.5
Nonwhite.....	3,690	34.1	680	19.9	1,820	51.0	700	17.0	490	14.5
Female head.....	4,880	40.1	1,210	30.4	1,670	51.9	1,200	35.7	800	36.4
White.....	3,800	31.2	1,000	26.4	1,100	36.3	1,020	28.6	680	33.7
Nonwhite.....	1,090	70.8	210	49.4	570	81.2	190	71.6	120	51.2
Unrelated individuals										
Male.....	4,280	33.7	1,130	28.0	1,030	44.6	1,090	36.1	1,030	26.6
White.....	3,590	31.3	1,000	26.3	730	38.5	970	34.8	900	27.4
Nonwhite.....	680	46.2	130	40.6	300	58.4	120	47.1	130	21.6
Female.....	6,910	50.3	1,990	50.2	1,800	57.3	1,890	51.0	1,220	39.0
White.....	6,130	48.1	1,790	50.5	1,440	50.7	1,750	49.6	1,150	38.9
Nonwhite.....	780	67.8	210	46.4	360	84.6	140	68.9	70	(?)

<sup>1</sup> Income in 1963 of family or unrelated individual below SSA index at economy level.

<sup>2</sup> Not shown for base less than 100,000.