GAINFUL WORKERS AND INCOME IN URBAN SINGLE-FAMILY HOUSEHOLDS

BARKEV S. SANDERS [*]

THE RELATIONSHIP between family income and the number of children in the family has been considered in earlier articles on the family composition study.[1]

The present article provides an analysis of the relationship between family income and number of gainful workers per family for single-family households—that is, households consisting of a single bio-legal family, in which the reported income is the income of the entire membership of the household. Gainful workers are individuals in the labor market, that is, persons who were reported as currently occupied, employed on work relief, or seeking work at the time of the canvass for the National Health Survey, made in the winter of 1935–36.

A comparison between families with and without gainful workers in single-family households and

[1] Falk, I. S., and Sanders, Barkev S., "The Economic Status of Urban Families and Children," Social Security Bulletin, Vol. 2, No. 5 (May 1939), pp. 25-34; and Sanders, Barkev S., "Children and Income in Urban Single-Family Households," Social Security Bulletin, Vol. 2, No. 11 (November 1939), pp. 3-10. For a description of the basis, purpose, and scope of the study of family composition and definitions of terms used in this article, see Sanders, Barkev S., "Family Composition in the United States," Social Security Bulletin, Vol. 2, No. 4 (April 1939), pp. 9-13.

those in multi-family households indicates that the proportion of families reporting no gainful workers is almost four times as high for families in multi-family households as for single-family households—26 percent as compared with 7 percent (table 1). This difference is to be expected. Economic security is one of the bulwarks against family disintegration, which gives rise to multi-family households. And since for the vast majority of American families economic security is made possible only through current earnings, it is not surprising that a larger proportion of families in multi-family households are without gainful workers.

The close correlation between presence of gainful workers and economic self-sufficiency of the family is suggested by the fact that, in terms of households, as distinguished from families, the proportion without workers is about the same for single and for multi-family households. However, when the component families in multi-family households are studied, it becomes apparent that a large proportion of these families are economically dependent because of the absence of gainful workers. This is emphasized in the percentages given in the accompanying tabulation, showing the low proportion of families without gainful workers in the first family of multi-family households as compared with other than the first family in these households. (The first family is

Table 1.—*Number and percent of urban families in households of specified type with and without gainful workers, by type of family*

[Preliminary data, subject to revision]

Type of family [1]	Number of families			Percent of families with gainful workers			Percent of families without gainful workers		
	All house-holds	Single-family house-holds	Multi-family house-holds	All house-holds	Single-family house-holds	Multi-family house-holds	All house-holds	Single-family house-holds	Multi-family house-holds
All types	[3] 931,140	[3] 532,290	398,850	84.9	92.9	74.1	15.1	7.1	25.9
Husband and wife	554,070	415,168	138,902	96.7	97.1	95.6	3.3	2.9	4.4
Husband or wife, husband	63,679	20,291	43,288	81.6	87.2	78.9	18.4	12.8	21.1
Husband or wife, wife	176,826	67,892	108,934	59.6	73.3	51.1	40.4	26.7	48.9
Nonparent, male	62,718	13,458	49,260	75.2	87.5	71.8	24.8	12.5	28.2
Nonparent, female	73,947	15,481	58,466	67.3	77.1	64.7	32.7	22.9	35.3

[1] For definitions of types of families, see footnote 2 in text.
[2] Excludes 486 families with unknown number of gainful workers.
[3] Excludes 94 families with unknown number of gainful workers.

the family of which the head of the household is a member; it is generally the less dependent of the families in multi-family households.)

Type of family	First family (percent)	Other families (percent)
All types	15.2	34.0
Husband and wife	4.2	5.3
Husband or wife, husband	15.4	23.0
Husband or wife, wife	40.5	54.3
Nonparent, male	16.9	29.3
Nonparent, female	29.7	36.3

It must be observed that the variation in the proportion of families without workers in single-family households as compared with those in multi-family households is conditioned by other factors as well. One of the most important of these is the fact that the proportion of husband-and-wife families,[2] among whom the percentage without workers is very small, is more than twice as high in single as in multi-family households— 78 as compared with 35 percent.

The elimination of these factors by standardizing for each family type and by eliminating differences in size does not vitiate the contrast

[2] The families studied are classified by 5 major types, as follows, according to the relationship of the members to the head: (1) *Husband-and-wife families.*—Families with both spouses, with or without unmarried children; (2) *Husband-or-wife families, husband.*—Families with only the male spouse, with or without unmarried children; (3) *Husband-or-wife families, wife.*—Families with only the female spouse, with or without unmarried children; (4) *Nonparent families, male.*—Families without either spouse, with an unmarried male as the head, with or without unmarried sisters and/or brothers; and (5) *Nonparent families, female.*—Families without either spouse, with an unmarried female as the head, with or without unmarried sisters and/or brothers. The head of the family was determined as follows: In husband-and-wife families, the husband was designated as the head; in one-spouse families, the spouse; and in nonparent families, the oldest person.

between single and multi-family households. In general, the larger the number of workers per family the greater is the probability that the family is a single-family household—this in spite of a number of counteracting factors. For instance, the employment statistics from the family composition study confirm definitely the hypothesis that economic insecurity of the family forces more of the adult members into the labor market; therefore, if other factors could be equated, there would be a negative association between economic security and the number of persons in the family who are in the labor market. Another counteracting factor is that, biologically and socially, a family is most cohesive when it is young and there are children to care for, and when, as a result, the number of adults who could enter the labor market is smallest.

The contrast between families in single-family households and those in multi-family households, especially families other than those containing the head of the household, would be enhanced still further if the definition of gainful workers excluded those who produce little or no income. This result could be approximated by considering only such workers as were gainfully occupied at the time of the canvass. This further phase of analysis will be considered in subsequent articles.

Table 1 indicates that both in single and in multi-family households the type of family in which the greatest proportion is without gainful workers is that of husband-or-wife families with the wife as the head, followed by nonparent families with a female head.

Table 2.—*Number of urban single-family households by number of gainful workers, and percentage distribution by income status*

[Preliminary data, subject to revision]

Number of gainful workers	Number of families	Income status of family							
		All families	Relief families	Nonrelief families					
				Under $1,000	$1,000–1,499	$1,500–1,999	$2,000–2,999	$3,000–4,999	$5,000 and over
Total	[1] 519,731	100.0	16.6	29.1	23.3	15.9	10.4	3.5	1.2
No workers	30,488	100.0	26.5	50.7	12.2	5.3	2.9	1.4	1.0
1 worker	351,226	100.0	16.3	29.2	24.6	16.0	9.8	3.0	1.1
2 workers	90,851	100.0	14.0	25.7	23.6	18.3	12.9	4.3	1.2
3 workers	27,938	100.0	16.3	17.9	22.5	19.5	15.9	6.2	1.7
4 workers	9,440	100.0	16.1	13.9	20.6	19.9	17.9	8.8	2.8
5 workers	2,848	100.0	14.6	11.0	18.8	21.0	19.9	10.9	3.8
6 workers	729	100.0	11.7	8.5	17.4	19.4	20.4	15.9	6.7
7 workers	170	100.0	12.4	4.1	14.7	19.4	21.6	16.2	9.4
8 or more workers	41	100.0	7.3	4.9	14.6	4.9	31.7	22.0	14.6

[1] Excludes 12,670 families with unknown income and 83 families with unknown number of gainful workers.

Single-family households account for more than 69 percent of the individuals and less than 66 percent of the gainful workers in the urban sample. The higher proportion of children in single-family households and, to a lesser extent, the less frequent employment of married women, especially those who have children, help to explain the smaller proportion of gainful workers.

The discussion of the associations between income and number of workers in single-family households concerns, therefore, about two-thirds of the urban workers in the sample population. With some minor differences, these associations may also hold true for the remaining third in multi-family households.

Income Distribution of Families With Specified Numbers of Gainful Workers

The least favorable income distribution is found in families reporting no gainful workers, and there is a general improvement in income distribution with increasing number of gainful workers per family (table 2). The greatest single change in income distribution is observed in passing from families without gainful workers to those with one gainful worker. The decrease in the proportion of families on relief or with annual incomes of less than $1,000 is sharpest in passing from families with no workers to those with one worker. There is a general tendency for the proportions of families on relief to decrease gradually with increasing number of gainful workers per family, and this tendency is even more strongly marked for families with incomes under $1,000. Conversely, there is a progressive increase in the proportion of families with incomes of $3,000 or more as the number of workers per family increases. In families with one or more workers, the positive association between number of workers and the proportion of families with incomes of $3,000 and over is markedly greater than the negative correlation between number of workers per family and proportion of families on relief. It may be said, therefore, that the presence or absence of one worker is the main factor in determining whether or not the family is on relief or, to a lesser extent, whether it has a very low income. The actual number of gainful workers, on the other hand, is of much more importance in determining the place of the family in the lower or upper income categories.

Income of Families of Specified Size With Varying Number of Gainful Workers

The effect on income of the number of workers in relation to family size is shown in table 3. For families without gainful workers the proportion reporting relief is clearly associated with size of family. In families of two, without workers, more than one-fifth reported relief; in families of three, two-fifths reported relief; and this proportion continues to rise to over four-fifths in families of seven persons without workers. The tendency for the proportion on relief to increase with increasing family size is also apparent, though not as marked, in families with a specified number of workers; the only exceptions are in those with five or more workers. This exception, however, merely indicates that large families in which every individual except one, or occasionally two, is gainfully occupied are less likely to be on relief and more likely to have incomes of $3,000 and over.

The percentages in the nonrelief categories, while demonstrating a definite relationship, show a more complex pattern. The proportions of families without workers in the income group of less than $1,000, when compared with all families, are highest for smaller families and lowest for larger families, since many of the latter reported relief status. When nonrelief families are used as a base, the proportion of families without workers in the income category under $1,000 shows an increase in larger families with increasing family size. In the income group $1,000–$1,499 the proportions are generally highest for families with one worker and tend to decrease with increasing number of workers. For higher income categories the percentages tend to rise progressively, with increasing number of workers, in all family sizes. The sharpest rate of change is observed in passing from families without workers to those with one worker, except in families of two, three, or seven persons with incomes of $5,000 and over. The extent of change is much less as one passes to families with a progressively larger number of workers; in fact there is frequently a decrease in the relative proportions between families with one less than the maximum possible number of workers and those with the maximum number of workers. This suggests a differentiation of these two groups of families in terms of family type, which is taken into consideration in table 4.

Variation of Income in Families by Type, Size, and Number of Workers

When family type and size are considered simultaneously (table 4), the general pattern discussed in connection with table 3 is still apparent, but there are some variations in the different family types as to the degree of the association.

In husband-and-wife families the range of variation is somewhat less than that for all types of families. Table 4 indicates a positive association, in this family type, between income and number of workers. It may be observed, however, that in the income group $3,000 and over this association between number of workers and the proportion of families in the income category disappears, or becomes negative, in passing from families with one less than the maximum possible number of workers to those with the maximum possible number of workers. This would suggest that frequently economic necessity is responsible for the wife's seeking employment. It is evident also that the extent of association between number of workers and the relative proportion of families with incomes of $3,000 and over is somewhat less marked than in all types of families.

In one-spouse families with a male head, the intensity of the association between income and number of workers in the family is less marked than in husband-and-wife families. On the whole, the associations are of the same nature, though numerous exceptions are found. For instance, in families of two, the relative proportions on relief are about the same regardless of the number of

Table 3.—*Number of urban single-family households by size of family and number of gainful workers, and percentage distribution by income status*

[Preliminary data, subject to revision]

Size of family and number of gainful workers	Number of families [1]	Income status of family							
		All families	Relief families	Nonrelief families					
				Under $1,000	$1,000–1,499	$1,500–1,999	$2,000–2,999	$3,000–4,999	$5,000 and over
2 persons	154, 307	100.0	12.3	33.2	23.8	15.9	10.2	3.3	1.3
No workers	12, 733	100.0	22.4	47.6	16.5	7.1	4.0	2.0	1.2
1 worker	115, 401	100.0	12.3	31.7	25.0	16.3	10.1	3.3	1.3
2 workers	26, 233	100.0	7.4	32.5	22.5	18.6	14.1	4.0	.9
3 persons	118, 604	100.0	13.5	25.3	26.0	18.2	11.9	3.9	1.2
No workers	2, 681	100.0	40.2	32.8	12.8	7.2	3.6	2.0	1.4
1 worker	82, 995	100.0	13.6	25.3	27.1	18.2	11.3	3.4	1.1
2 workers	30, 234	100.0	11.5	24.6	24.2	19.2	13.8	5.2	1.5
3 workers	2, 694	100.0	9.5	25.6	24.0	17.9	14.7	6.4	1.9
4 persons	89, 149	100.0	16.2	21.4	25.2	18.6	12.8	4.4	1.4
No workers	1, 586	100.0	56.1	26.6	9.3	3.9	2.6	.8	.7
1 worker	60, 095	100.0	16.7	22.0	26.4	18.4	11.6	3.6	1.3
2 workers	16, 401	100.0	14.6	21.9	24.6	19.2	13.5	4.7	1.5
3 workers	10, 411	100.0	10.3	16.7	22.0	21.1	19.2	8.4	2.3
4 workers	656	100.0	8.1	20.3	19.0	20.3	18.4	9.9	4.0
5 persons	48, 495	100.0	21.5	21.0	23.8	17.1	11.1	4.1	1.4
No workers	818	100.0	67.5	19.6	6.3	3.7	1.6	1.2	.1
1 worker	29, 229	100.0	23.4	22.3	24.7	16.0	9.5	2.9	1.2
2 workers	8, 480	100.0	20.0	22.3	24.6	17.5	10.5	3.9	1.2
3 workers	6, 558	100.0	15.1	17.0	23.2	21.4	15.8	5.8	1.7
4 workers	3, 261	100.0	10.1	13.8	20.4	20.7	20.5	11.2	8.3
5 workers	149	100.0	10.7	14.8	21.5	20.8	17.4	12.1	2.7
6 persons	25, 308	100.0	27.1	20.1	22.0	15.5	10.4	3.7	1.2
No workers	480	100.0	73.1	18.6	5.2	1.7	.6	.6	.2
1 worker	13, 478	100.0	30.7	22.1	22.7	13.9	7.8	2.0	.8
2 workers	4, 454	100.0	27.9	21.4	23.0	14.8	8.9	3.0	1.0
3 workers	3, 671	100.0	20.5	18.4	22.2	18.6	14.0	5.1	1.2
4 workers	2, 274	100.0	13.2	12.8	21.2	21.3	19.0	9.6	2.9
5 workers	920	100.0	8.8	10.4	17.5	22.7	22.4	13.0	5.2
6 workers	31	100.0	19.4		19.4	16.1	19.4		25.7
7 persons	13, 341	100.0	32.2	19.5	21.1	13.6	9.3	3.2	1.1
No workers	240	100.0	83.3	12.1	2.9	.9	.4		.4
1 worker	6, 338	100.0	37.2	22.6	21.2	10.6	6.6	1.5	.3
2 workers	2, 395	100.0	33.9	19.8	22.1	13.6	7.7	2.0	.9
3 workers	2, 067	100.0	26.7	17.4	23.3	17.0	11.8	2.9	.9
4 workers	1, 375	100.0	18.9	15.0	20.7	19.5	15.7	7.4	2.8
5 workers	696	100.0	13.2	11.1	19.7	21.8	18.7	11.6	3.9
6 workers	229	100.0	8.3	10.0	13.5	19.7	23.6	17.9	7.0
7 workers	1				(²)				

[1] Excludes families with unknown income and/or number of gainful workers.   ² Not computed, because base is less than 25.

workers per family. Also, in families of larger size, the differences between relative proportions of families on relief, for families without workers and those with one worker, are not as marked as in the husband-and-wife families. In the nonrelief group, a high relative proportion of families without workers and those with only one worker are found in the income group of less than $1,000. In the higher income groups the proportions tend to increase progressively with increasing number of workers per family. In smaller families, however, the relative proportions in the higher income groups are sometimes higher for families without workers than for those with one or more workers.

For one-spouse families with a female head, the positive association between income and number of workers in the family is more marked than for those with a male head. The rate of change in the percentage on relief is generally highest in passing from families which have two less than the maximum possible number of workers to those with one less. For the income group of less than $1,000, when all families are used as a base, the proportion of families without workers is smaller than that for families with one worker. However, when only nonrelief families are used as a base, the relative proportions in this income group appear to be somewhat higher in families without workers, and the proportions for families with two or more workers are lower in this income group. In the higher income groups, especially $3,000 and over, there is generally a positive association between income and number of workers except in families with two members. This situation is reversed in passing from families with one less than the maximum possible number of workers to those in which the number of workers is the same as the number of members in the family.

Very few of the nonparent families have no workers. On the whole there is a very close relationship in this family type between family size and number of workers, and, except in two-person families with male heads, there is a marked positive association between income and number of workers.

It may be generalized that the association between the number of gainful workers and income status of the family is most marked in nonparent families and in one-spouse families with a female head, and least marked in one-spouse families with a male head.

Family Income and Age of Head

In a previous paper on the relationship between family income and number of children,[3] it was pointed out that the association between income and age of family head is only in part attributable to the number of children under 16 in the family. Therefore, the question arises whether this association could be attributed to the number of workers in the family in relation to age of the head of the family.

In husband-and-wife families with specified number of workers per family the general pattern remains fairly constant between income and age of head. This pattern, as previously indicated,[4] shows a high proportion of families reporting relief or incomes under $1,000 in families with heads below age 25. Conversely, a low proportion of families headed by young persons are in the higher income categories. The proportions of families with heads in intermediate ages are lowest of all in the relief category and in the income group of less than $1,000, intermediate in the income group $1,000–$1,999, and high in the income groups $2,000 and over. Families headed by aged persons show a comparatively small proportion (though not the smallest) in the relief category and the income groups of less than $2,000, and a high proportion in the income categories of $2,000 and over.

When families are considered according to specified number of workers, the proportion on relief for those without workers is highest in younger ages and decreases progressively as the age of the head of the family advances. In the income group of less than $1,000, families with youngest heads and without gainful workers have the lowest proportion, those with heads in ages 25–44 and 65 and over have the highest proportions, and the remaining age groups are intermediate. With advancing income the proportion of these families is very small, but the general pattern is the same as that observed between age of family head and income, irrespective of number of workers. There is, however, some indication that in families headed by aged persons there is a more distinct advantage in families without workers than in all families irrespective of workers.

Families with one worker show high proportions in the relief and under-$1,000 categories in fam-

³ See the *Bulletin*, November 1939, pp. 3–10.
⁴ See the *Bulletin*, September 1939, pp. 25–36.

ilies with heads in the younger and older groups and low proportions in families with heads in the intermediate ages. In families with incomes of $1,000 and over they show decreased proportions with increasing age of head in ages above 60.

In families with two workers the pattern more closely follows that of all families irrespective of number of workers. Families with three workers also follow the general contour, although they show the lowest proportions of families with incomes of less than $1,000 and relatively higher proportions of families with incomes of $1,000 and over. Four-worker families are so few in number that no generalizations can be made.

Table 4.—Number of urban single-family households by size of family and number of gainful workers for selected family types, and percentage distribution by income status of family

[Preliminary data, subject to revision]

Size of family and number of gainful workers	Number of families[1]	Relief families	Nonrelief families Under $1,000	$1,000-1,499	$1,500-1,999	$2,000-2,999	$3,000 and over
Husband and wife							
2 persons	126,886	11.1	31.8	24.3	16.8	11.0	5.0
No workers	9,269	20.6	40.2	16.2	7.1	4.0	2.9
1 worker	97,328	11.2	30.2	25.4	17.1	10.9	5.2
2 workers	20,289	6.0	31.7	22.7	19.5	15.1	5.0
3 persons	103,252	12.0	24.6	26.8	19.0	12.3	5.3
No workers	980	26.5	37.1	17.3	9.1	4.9	5.1
1 worker	77,830	12.3	24.6	27.7	18.9	11.8	4.7
2 workers	23,328	10.5	24.2	24.1	19.7	14.3	7.2
3 workers	1,114	8.7	28.3	24.3	18.2	13.6	0.9
4 persons	81,362	14.8	21.1	25.9	19.2	13.1	5.9
No workers	545	44.6	30.1	13.2	5.3	4.4	2.4
1 worker	58,153	15.7	21.7	26.8	18.9	11.9	5.0
2 workers	14,471	13.1	21.5	24.8	20.0	14.2	6.4
3 workers	7,918	9.8	15.8	22.4	21.2	19.6	11.2
4 workers	275	8.7	22.2	21.8	22.6	17.1	7.6
5 persons	44,052	20.1	21.0	24.5	17.6	11.4	5.4
No workers	310	57.1	24.5	8.4	5.8	1.9	2.3
1 worker	28,388	22.4	22.3	25.1	16.3	9.7	4.2
2 workers	7,669	18.1	22.0	25.2	18.2	11.0	5.5
3 workers	5,084	14.3	16.6	23.2	22.1	16.3	7.5
4 workers	2,539	9.9	14.0	20.9	20.7	20.9	13.6
5 workers	67	9.0	17.9	23.9	22.4	16.4	10.4
6 persons	23,365	25.9	20.1	22.7	15.9	10.6	4.8
No workers	213	67.6	22.1	7.1	1.4	.9	.9
1 worker	13,119	29.8	22.0	23.1	14.2	8.0	2.9
2 workers	4,057	25.7	21.2	23.8	15.5	9.6	4.2
3 workers	3,299	19.3	17.7	22.7	19.3	14.4	6.6
4 workers	1,953	12.6	12.3	21.4	21.6	10.4	12.7
5 workers	717	7.8	10.2	17.6	23.3	23.8	17.3
6 workers	7	(²)	----	(²)	(²)	(²)	----
7 persons	12,388	31.2	19.6	21.6	13.9	9.4	4.3
No workers	116	81.9	12.9	4.3	----	----	.9
1 worker	6,177	36.4	22.6	21.6	10.9	6.7	1.8
2 workers	2,215	32.9	19.6	22.9	13.8	7.8	3.0
3 workers	1,873	25.4	17.3	23.5	17.5	12.2	4.1
4 workers	1,216	18.4	14.6	20.8	19.9	15.6	10.7
5 workers	601	13.0	11.2	18.1	22.6	18.8	16.3
6 workers	190	6.8	11.6	12.1	21.6	22.6	25.3
Husband or wife, husband							
2 persons	3,282	17.1	32.2	22.2	15.0	9.4	4.1
No workers	269	18.2	45.4	16.7	8.9	5.2	5.6
1 worker	1,779	18.4	32.2	22.9	15.4	8.2	2.9
2 workers	1,234	15.0	29.3	22.5	15.7	12.1	5.4
3 persons	2,154	20.1	23.4	22.8	16.9	10.8	6.0
No workers	32	31.2	43.8	9.4	9.4	3.1	3.1
1 worker	766	28.9	24.1	21.7	15.5	6.9	2.9
2 workers	854	16.9	24.8	23.8	16.8	11.5	6.7
3 workers	502	11.4	18.7	24.3	19.5	16.1	10.0
4 persons	1,196	21.5	19.1	21.1	16.6	13.7	8.0
No workers	9	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)

Size of family and number of gainful workers	Number of families[1]	Relief families	Nonrelief families Under $1,000	$1,000-1,499	$1,500-1,999	$2,000-2,999	$3,000 and over
Husband or wife, husband—Continued							
4 persons—continued							
1 worker	329	36.5	22.5	21.3	11.8	5.8	2.1
2 workers	325	20.9	19.4	24.3	16.6	11.1	7.7
3 workers	383	14.1	16.7	19.1	20.9	19.8	9.4
4 workers	150	6.7	17.3	20.0	16.0	22.0	18.0
5 persons	709	25.7	16.4	21.4	17.6	11.3	7.6
No workers	7	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
1 worker	163	41.7	23.3	19.0	10.4	3.7	1.9
2 workers	155	34.2	16.8	24.5	15.5	7.7	1.3
3 workers	178	16.9	13.5	27.5	20.8	12.9	8.4
4 workers	161	13.7	11.2	15.5	23.0	21.1	15.5
5 workers	45	11.1	15.6	20.0	22.2	11.1	20.0
6 persons	338	32.0	16.6	16.0	15.7	11.8	7.9
No workers	3	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
1 worker	72	48.6	20.8	12.5	11.1	7.0	----
2 workers	68	48.5	11.8	13.2	11.8	7.4	7.3
3 workers	63	25.4	17.5	14.3	19.0	17.5	6.3
4 workers	77	19.5	19.5	24.6	15.6	9.1	11.7
5 workers	42	7.1	11.9	16.7	26.2	23.8	14.3
6 workers	13	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
Husband or wife, wife							
2 persons	19,805	20.1	41.8	21.2	10.4	4.8	1.7
No workers	2,587	32.5	42.4	11.9	6.0	3.7	3.5
1 worker	14,676	18.8	41.3	22.7	10.0	4.9	1.4
2 workers	2,622	14.7	43.0	21.6	12.7	5.6	1.3
3 persons	11,013	28.4	31.5	19.6	11.9	7.7	2.9
No workers	1,604	50.2	29.9	9.9	5.4	2.5	2.1
1 worker	4,170	34.1	39.0	15.6	6.5	3.3	1.3
2 workers	5,466	15.2	26.1	24.7	17.6	12.2	4.2
3 workers	673	12.8	32.2	25.5	13.2	11.0	3.3
4 persons	6,154	33.9	26.0	16.9	11.3	8.2	3.7
No workers	1,020	62.7	24.7	7.4	2.7	1.6	.9
1 worker	1,579	49.7	33.1	11.3	3.4	1.7	.8
2 workers	1,515	27.5	28.4	23.0	13.0	7.5	2.6
3 workers	1,912	12.0	20.5	21.7	20.5	16.8	8.5
4 workers	128	10.9	26.6	19.5	18.8	18.7	5.5
5 persons	2,999	41.8	21.3	14.5	10.1	7.4	4.9
No workers	501	74.0	16.2	5.2	2.4	1.4	.8
1 worker	679	62.4	25.0	6.8	3.4	1.3	.5
2 workers	636	40.6	26.4	17.1	10.7	4.1	1.1
3 workers	660	22.1	21.1	23.0	15.2	12.1	6.5
4 workers	504	10.5	14.5	19.4	18.7	19.2	17.7
5 workers	19	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)	(²)
6 persons	1,580	45.4	20.2	13.1	9.9	6.6	4.8
No workers	262	78.2	15.3	3.8	1.9	.4	.4
1 worker	284	64.8	23.9	6.7	3.2	.7	.7
2 workers	326	50.0	25.5	14.7	7.1	.9	1.2
3 workers	301	31.9	25.2	18.3	12.3	9.3	3.0
4 workers	234	15.8	13.3	19.2	21.8	19.2	10.7
5 workers	149	14.1	11.4	17.5	18.8	15.4	22.8
6 workers	4	----	----	(²)	(²)	(²)	----

[1] Excludes families with unknown income and/or number of gainful workers.   [2] Not computed, because base is less than 25.

In one-spouse families with a female head the general pattern shows a sharp decrease in the proportion of families on relief with increasing age of family head. There is also a general decrease, though not as sharp, among families in the income group of less than $1,000; this decrease reverses itself at age 60 of the family head. In higher income groups, the proportions in general increase with advancing age of head, the increase being sharpest up to age 60.

In families of this type, those without workers show the highest proportions on relief in families with heads in ages below 60. In families with incomes of less than $1,000, those without workers show a relatively low proportion in the younger age groups, and the percentages tend to increase with increasing age of head. For the income groups $1,000 and over the proportions are lowest of all in families with heads under 25 and highest in those with heads in ages 45–59.

Families with one worker show decreasing proportions on relief with advancing age. The proportions in the income group under $1,000 are high for families with heads in ages 25–64 and show comparatively little variation with age. For higher income categories the percentages increase progressively with increasing age of head.

Families with two workers closely parallel the average proportions of families regardless of number of workers. To a lesser extent this is also true of families with three workers.

Despite the differentiations noted, a general pattern of association between age and income is apparent in the two family types—husband-and-wife, and one-spouse families with the wife as the head. The patterns for nonparent families are similar to those for husband-and-wife families, and those for one-spouse families with male head correspond, in general, to those for one-spouse families with female head.

An examination of the percentage distribution of families by income, in terms of the number of workers, brings out a number of significant relationships. On the whole, in husband-and-wife families with younger heads the number of workers per family is not a major factor in determining the correlation with income, although, in general, the most favorable income distribution is found in those with two or more workers. In intermediate ages, the most favorable income distribution is found in families in which the number of workers is one or two less than the number of persons in the family. This would tend to confirm the conclusion that, except in husband-and-wife families without children, the wife is in the labor market because the family income is relatively low. This economic selection of families in which the wife is a gainful worker means that, despite the addition of the wife's earnings, the family income is less favorable for these families than for those in which the wife is not employed. There is also some indication that in families with heads aged 60 and over, and more especially 65 and over, those economically most favored are the families in which the number of workers is two less than the number of persons in the family.

In one-spouse families with a male head, as in husband-and-wife families, there is little net association between number of workers and family income for families with very young heads. With increasing age of head the association becomes more and more significant, and, in general, the closer the number of workers approaches the number of persons in the family, the more favorable is the economic status of the family. Those composed entirely of gainful workers have most favorable income status.

In one-spouse families with a female head the degree of differentiation in family incomes in relation to number of workers increases with increasing age of family head, and in general, except in families with heads in intermediate ages, the most favored income groups are those in which the number of workers is one less than the number of persons in the family. One-person families without workers show a more favorable income distribution than those with workers, especially for younger persons. Among two-person families with heads less than 25 years of age this is also true, but among those with heads 60 and over the families without workers are generally the least favored and those with either one or two workers are relatively the more favored. In the younger age groups three-person families without workers have an income distribution at least as favorable as those with one and even two workers, but with increasing age of family head there is a differentiation favoring families with three or two workers. In four-person families, those with three workers have the most favorable income distribution in ages 60 and over. In general, similar tendencies are observed in families of still larger size.

In nonparent families with a male head, one-person families with a worker have a more favorable income distribution than those without a worker, especially for persons below the age of 60. In two-person families, those with two workers have the most favorable income status in all families except those with heads above age 65. In three-person families, likewise, families with the maximum number of workers have the most favorable income distribution.

In nonparent families with a female head, one-person families without a worker show on the whole a better income distribution among very young persons. In ages 25 and over, families without a worker show a relative excess in the very high and very low income groups, while those with a worker are more prevalent in the intermediate income groups. In two-person families with heads in ages below 25, those without workers predominate in the higher income groups; those with one worker predominate in the inter-mediate and lower income groups. In families with older heads, those with the maximum number of workers have, in general, the most favorable income distribution, especially for intermediate ages. In three-person families, those with the maximum number of workers have the most favorable income in families with heads below 60, while in families with heads over 65 those without workers have the most favorable income status.

It would appear that, in general, in families with adults who are available to enter the labor market the larger the number of adults in the labor market, the more favorable is the income. In families with children and with aged individuals, the employment of all adults is generally brought about by economic necessity; among such families those with all members in the labor market have a relatively lower income status than those in which the number of gainful workers is one less than the total number of persons in the family.