DEVELOPING A SOCIAL STATISTICS PUBLICATION

Daniel B. Tunstall, U.S. Office of Management and Budget

In the past few years, there has been a heightened interest in using quantified measures to explain social change. Profound changes have occurred within society that no one has been able to identify clearly nor to explain, much less devise means to deal with effectively. Economic progress of the past decade has not solved all social problems. No one ever expected it to, but neither did we expect that so many difficult and controversial problems would be left unsolved in a modern society if the rate of real economic growth was sustained at levels of five percent or more.

A further anomaly is that, although progress has been made with the assistance of government in many social areas -- delivery of medical care to the aged, payments to the needy, access to higher education, school desegregation, transportation, leisure time, and general mobility of the American people -- these advances have not kept us from experiencing major upheavals and discontent. The improvements themselves may even have helped bring on new and even more difficult problems. Not only are people concerned with the availability of social goods and services but they are now concerned about the quality of life of which those goods and services are a part. And they are beginning to ask not only how well existing systems meet social needs, but also whether entirely new ways of doing things might not be better.

Average life expectancy in the United States has remained relatively constant during the past 10 to 15 years, but with females having considerably higher levels than males, enough so to make us wonder why there is such a gap. Could male life expectancy be raised to the level of females or higher with better medical care and more preventive medicine, or will a change in male life expectancy come about only with a change in the life style of males? The environmental crisis is a problem of economics and values. People understand the importance of preserving open spaces and wilderness but to do so means not only great expense but changes in attitudes and life styles. To clean up what is now being dirtied can be done once, maybe twice, but it is too expensive and too dangerous to continue to pollute and clean up afterwards. What is a satisfactory balance between the use of resources and the disposal of wastes and the need to preserve and protect natural resources? Similar kinds of questions are being raised about education, employment, recreation, and almost all other areas that impinge on individual well-being.

If rapid economic growth and technological progress are not synonomous with quality, as it was long assumed they were, then we need to develop information that will permit us to examine the quality of life and its component parts -- information that will add to productive national debate and permit decision-makers to make their decisions on more than economics, pragmatic politics, and intuition. The quality-of-life issue may be divided into two dimensions: the objective, which includes conditions of the environment (housing, roads, recreational resources, ecological balances, etc.) and attributes of persons (health, educational achievement, family stability, etc.) and the subjective, which includes aspects of personal experience such as frustration, satisfaction, aspirations, and perceptions. The distinction between objective and subjective is drawn from ideas expressed by Eleanor Sheldon.

Three works have been extremely influential in suggesting new approaches to information. They are Social Indicators, edited by Raymond A. Bauer (Cambridge, Mass. and London: MIT Press, 1966); Indicators of Social Change: Concepts and Measurements, edited by Eleanor Bernert Sheldon and Wilbert E. Moore (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1968); and HEW's Toward a Social Report (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1969). These studies mark the beginning of a movement to identify social indicators that may not only help us monitor social systems but also develop entirely new means for analyzing social problems.

Underlying any new approach to social analysis, however, is the need for a foundation of well-organized and carefully selected social statistics that will appear periodically and be open to revision and change. The social statistics publication now being prepared by the Statistical Policy staff in the Office of Management and Budget is designed to be just that. It draws on the three studies mentioned above as well as the work of Mancur Olson, Stafford Beer, Nestor Terleckyj, Allen Schick, Milton Moss, and other innovative thinkers in the field.

Our publication will be concerned only with the objective dimensions of individual well-being. It will be composed almost entirely of statistical series presented in chart form with accompanying tables. The information will be drawn from existing statistical series, mainly those produced by government agencies, and important single-time series. It will be post-World War II national data, with totals broken down by race, sex, age, and, in some cases, region of the country or SMSA/non-SMSA. The degree of disaggregation will be based on our estimation of the usefulness of the components. Projections will be included only for relatively known quantities, such as number of pupils enrolling in primary school five years from now. There will be almost no information on peoples' preferences or their attitudes toward national social problems. The text will be limited to chapter introductions and short notes explaining the technical problems and limitations

of the data; there will be no interpretation of the statistics included.

The Statistical Policy staff began work on this publication in mid-1969. By February of 1970, we had a working outline, and, by September, three draft chapters were ready for review by our advisory groups and consultants. We hope to distribute a limited-edition, preliminary report during the coming summer.

We have organized statistics into nine broad categories -- health, public safety and legal justice, education, employment, income, housing, transportation, environment, and recreation. Basically, these categories, or social goals areas as we called them in earlier outline drafts, comprise a rough listing of basic human needs or wants that are intertwined with public policy.

Obviously, not every social area of national concern is treated separately. It has been suggested that we examine social opportunity or equal opportunity as an independent area. (HEW's Toward a Social Report included chapters on social mobility and participation and alienation.) We have not done so because it seemed that equal opportunity may be understood as opportunity within a specific area, such as employment or education, and so should be included under the respective category for continuity. Within each chapter, we are including detailed information on race, sex, and age. If others want to rearrange this information to construct a comprehensive picture of whether equality of opportunity in the United States is growing, they will have some of the tools to do so.

Essentially, though, these broad social areas are an organizational device. It is likely in the future that we will add new categories or combine some of those already identified, especially if we find that we can not develop them to our satisfaction. Of far more importance to the publication are the statements of what we are measuring within each category, of what we have labeled, for lack of a better name, social concerns.

Figure I is a summarized outline of the social concerns we are examining in five areas. All are stated positively and all reflect the state of affairs at the level of the individual.

Figure I

Social Concerns

Health

1. Long life
2. Physical and mental well-being

Public Safety and Legal Justice

1. Safety of life and property from crime
2. Adequate legal safeguards for the accused

Education

1. Basic skills for everyone
2. Educational opportunity for those able and interested in pursuing advanced learning

Employment

1. Employment opportunities for all who want work
2. Adequate earnings
3. Job satisfaction

Income

1. Rising general level of real income
2. Equitable distribution of income
3. Adequate income

These concerns have been broadly defined to reveal the general well-being of the entire population, not to represent immediately pressing social problems nor the problems of any particular group within society; to depict concerns that can be dealt with by national policies; and to encompass most of the important national social issues. More practically, they serve as a mechanism for sorting the tremendous amount of information available on society and social change and for clearly spelling out where meaningful information is lacking.

Obviously, the concerns within a category overlap. Yet it seems both logical and important to distinguish between, for example, health conditions and long life, for only by isolating important concerns and measuring them as best as we can will we be able to determine the interrelationships among them and to understand how the pursuit of one affects the outputs of others.

Examples from the employment, income, and education chapters will help make clear what we have identified as social concerns. The statistics selected to measure these social concerns in three draft chapters are listed in the Appendix.

Employment opportunities for all who want work, the first employment concern, was explicitly stated in the 1946 Employment Act in which the government was given the task of "creating and maintaining . . . conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for those able, willing, and seeking work." We broadened that goal to include all who want work, whether able or not. Although many individuals do not want employment -- youths in school, adult women

who choose to devote their time to household and volunteer duties, retired persons -- there ought to be a range of opportunities to permit all who seek work, full-time or part-time, to find it. This concern as stated is so broad that we have included a breakdown of information to measure labor force participation (Employment Status of Non-Institutional Population 16 Years and Over, Total Labor Force Participation Rates by Selected Age-Sex Groups, etc.), unemployment (Unemployment Rates for All Workers and for Married Men, Unemployment Rates by Race, Unemployment Rates for Sex and Age Groups by Race, etc.), underemployment (Persons on Part-time for Economic Reasons, Men 20-64 Working Part-Year by Major Reason, etc.), special social problems limiting an individual's opportunity for employment (Number of Migratory Workers and Days Worked at Wage Work per Year by Farm-NonFarm, Unemployment Rates of Male High School Dropouts and Graduates for Selected Age Groups, etc.), and those wanting work but not out looking for it, the so-called hidden unemployed.

Two other social concerns within the employment area are adequate earnings for those employed -- a broad measure of the extent to which the economy and society provide jobs with earnings sufficient to maintain various levels of living -- and job satisfaction. Adequacy of earnings is measured for our purposes by estimating the percent of full-time year-round workers with annual earnings, in constant dollars, below the minimum wage, the poverty level, and the Bureau of Labor Statistics low budget. Job satisfaction is more difficult to measure. We have included statistics on working conditions -- level of earnings, risk of unemployment, racial composition, work injury rates, and holiday and vacation time of various occupational groups -- as proxy measures of satisfaction.

The first income concern is also direct and specific: rising general level of real income. This means that income should rise over time, that it should rise for everyone, and that it rise in real terms. The measure is per capita personal income before and after taxes, in constant dollars, for the years 1947 to 1969.

A second concern in the income category is that there be equitable distribution of income. Although not as widely accepted as other income concerns, there is little question that most people would like to see those at the bottom receive more relative to others. Our income tax policies as well as certain government transfer payments rest on a similar assumption. Series included are: Mean Family Income by Quintiles of Families and Top Five Percent; Ratio of Mean Income of Each Quintile of Families to the Mean of All Families; Median Family Income by Race of Head and Ratio of Negro and Other Races to White by Median Family Income, etc.

A third concern is with adequacy of income. How many people have income insufficient to permit them to maintain a decent standard of living? There is consensus that those at the bottom of the income ladder should be helped out, but not over how high the "bottom" goes. In this case, the choice of a statistical series is critical. We have included statistics on the number and percent of persons in poverty (as defined by the federal government) and those with annual income lower than the BLS low budget estimate for the years 1959 to 1969. Characteristics of the poor are given by race, sex, type of family unit, age, and location. Details are also included on the changing composition of the poor and on the size of income deficit for families in poverty.

Not surprisingly, in both the employment and income areas, the social indicators we have selected are important economic indicators as well. Clearly, having the opportunity to work at a meaningful job and the resources with which to buy goods and services are important measures of well-being in the United States.

In identifying social concerns, we have drawn heavily on the unpublished Materials for a Preliminary Draft of the Social Report, prepared for the Panel on Social Indicators of HEW (April, 1968) and the resulting publication Toward a Social Report, and on the work of Nestor E. Terleckyj, some of whose most important ideas appeared in the recent article "Measurement Possibilities of Social Change" in Looking Ahead (the monthly report of the National Planning Association), August, 1970.

In our first outline, we distinguished between performance indicators, those statistics that would best measure the concerns statements, and what we labelled analytical information, statistics less useful for measuring the national picture but important for policy analysis because they pinpointed the groups most affected or identified causes of change in the performance indicators. However, when we put together a draft chapter, the distinction broke down and we found it much easier simply to arrange the information by social concern.

The choice of statistics has been based on two criteria. The first is that the data measure individual well-being. For each series, national totals are given in terms of persons or families and then broken down to reveal the age, sex, race, and other characteristics of those involved.

It has been relatively easy to meet this first criterion in health (Percent of Population with Chronic Ailments, Rate of Infant Mortality, for example), income (Per Capita and Family Income), education (Percent of Age Group Graduating from High School and Going on to College), and employment (Percent Unemployed or Underemployed). Within public safety, we can measure how many people are affected by violent crime (Rate of Victimization), but we do not have information on how violence done to one person affects others in the community, nor do we know how to describe the effect property crime has on those victimized.

It is simpler, although less satisfying and less meaningful, to produce statistics on the changing dollar value of crime than on the emotional costs of violence.

As we develop chapters on housing, transportation, and the environment, it would be tempting to rely on statistics that measure things: number of housing units, miles of road, number of automobiles, major pollutants in the air and water, acres of wilderness. But this information does not measure the objective dimension of well-being. For that, we need information even more difficult to find -- the percent of persons without adequate housing; the number living in poor neighborhoods; the percent having access to rapid, local transportation; or the percent of the population subjected to hazardous pollution. Nor do we have a quantifiable measure of an individual's need for wilderness and open space.

But we are not simply selecting information on people; we are also collecting information that reflects outputs. In the case of transportation, we need a measurable concept of access. We need standards for neighborhood quality and, in environmental matters, we need to know the levels at which major pollutants become harmful before we can determine the percent of the population subjected to hazardous or bothersome pollution. It may turn out that the information included in these chapters initially is less important than the fact that we will have identified some very important conceptual and statistical gaps.

I have already mentioned the second criterion -- that the statistics measure outputs. In the past, we were content to look at the processes by which social goods and services were produced. It was expected that the goals of organizations and bureaucracies were synonymous with the needs of individuals, and that, if competent managers ran those institutions, the products would then meet the needs of the people. These expectations carried over to the kinds of information considered important to collect and publish. In education, for example, there exists a great deal of data on enrollments, expenditures, teachers, buildings, and related input indicators, such as pupil-teacher ratios and per pupil expenditures, but little information on the important variables associated with learning, on the relative value of different learning experiences, or on just how well our education system is working toward its primary purpose of instruction.

So far, finding measures of outputs has been most difficult for the education chapter. We have chosen statistics from the Survey of Educational Opportunity (the Coleman Report) to measure the relative educational achievement between race and age groups. We may also be able to include statistics from the first report on school achievement of noninstitutionalized children 6 - 11 years of age, based on data from the Health Examination Survey of 1963-65. We lack adequate information on student achievement in universities and on changing values in higher education. However, we do have statistics from a number of one-time studies (Project Talent, SCOPE, the Preliminary Scholastic Aptitude Test and Academic Interest Measures, known as PSAT-AIM, conducted by the Educational Testing Service) which, when combined with statistics from Census' Current Population Survey, provide information on opportunities for students to attend institutions of higher education.

In many cases, though, the information we have included in the education chapter is not really adequate. We have compromised by including more statistics on school attendance and high school graduation than on student achievement, and we have no information on college achievement other than guaduation rates.

How can this collection of statistical information be put to work? We envision two main uses for the publication: as a tool in decision-making and as a guide in developing social statistics.

Policy-makers must now deal with technological changes in transportation, energy production and transmission, communications, and many other systems that transform scientific invention into mass-produced technological change for millions of people. Assessing the effects of future technological developments in light of the present social system is not easy. Social indicators may provide information on which planners can build a model of society in order to estimate its requirements for transportation, energy, communication, etc., and from which they can begin to understand the implications for individuals of massive new technological systems. In short, our publication may help them to adapt technology to man's expressed needs and values.

To assess technology, planners need broadly based social information for making decisions with pay-offs far in the future. Government, with its almost daily development and analysis of policy, faces decisions with more immediate consequences. In the past few years, the federal government and state governments have developed programs to lighten the burden of health expenditures for the poor and the elderly. One result has been an increased demand for health services, with rising costs for everyone. However, with only a brief examination of major health indicators currently available -- life expectancy at birth, rate of chronic disability, rate of mental illnes, etc. -- it is difficult to believe that health has improved commensurate with the rapid rise in cost. Soon there will be another round of national and state decisions on medical-care systems and the delivery of medical care, although this time the focus will probably be on paying some of the bills, at least the most expensive ones, for everyone.

The problem here is not simply one of efficiency of distribution, although it is obvious

that, if medical care is delivered as it has been in the past, costs will not go down. To meet the increased demand for more services at reasonable costs, there will have to be new systems. And as these systems are developed, basic questions will be raised: What is good health? How much more health output is technically feasible? What kind of care is necessary and desirable to provide greater health output? And, of course, what is the most efficient way of dispensing health care?

Social indicators can provide some of the information needed to develop answers to these questions. Alternative policies will need to rest on a common information base, which is likely to be composed of measures of effectiveness, that is, measures of health output.

Average years of life expectancy, at birth and at other ages, rate of infant mortality, and age-adjusted death rates, along with statistics on the major causes of death, provide information needed to measure the most serious level of health achievement. The percent of population with chronic mental and physical disability measures another important health output, as does rate of acute illnes and injury and levels of nutrition and fitness.

As the major causes of serious illness and death become scientifically linked with human behavior and less with communicable disease, it may be important for health organizations, including the government, to make the public aware of the health hazards of alcohol, drugs, pollutants, improper diet, obesity, smoking, and other physically and mentally debilitating activities. There may be significant trade-offs between expenditures on hospital facilities to care for heart disease and cancer patients and expenditures for preventive care facilities that would permit early detection of these diseases, or offer exercise and weight-reducing programs, or deal effectively with drug addiction or provide any one of a number of services that would reduce the need for medical care. Social indicators of health, if developed sufficiently to meet a wide variety of information needs, can provide a set of measures against which the government and private citizens can evaluate their changing system of medical and health care. Indicators of education, employment, housing, and other areas of social concern can be used to serve the same purpose.

In addition to its usefulness in decision-making, the information gathered in this publication can serve as a guide for the development of new social statistics. At present, the federal statistics community has few means with which to evaluate its social statistics program. It is particularly lacking in ways of incorporating suggestions from policy-makers and researchers to improve information relevant to their needs. One result of this lack of communication is that policy-makers have become satisfied with relatively little quantified social information. What is available is often administrative data produced from ongoing programs. This data is often insufficient to allow one to comprehend the magnitude of important social needs.

It may appear rather circuitous to say that the development of a social statistics publication or a set of social indicators will help to improve the main body of social statistics. However, as I mentioned earlier, we find in many instances that there are no adequate statistics to illuminate the social concerns we have identified and that we are confronted with inconsistent or conflicting information. One of the principal reasons the Statistical Policy staff is actively engaged in this project is to identify statistical gaps and shortcomings of this kind. We believe the approach and structure developed for this publication will provide an excellent framework for a thorough examination of the government's social statistics program and serve as a basis for directing additional resources or reallocating present ones to meet the problem-oriented demands for information that are heard every day.

APPENDIX

EDUCATION OUTLINE

A. Basic Skills for Everyone

Enrollment and Graduation

1. Number Enrolled in Elementary and Secondary Schools, Public and Private, 1950-1974 (projected)
2. Percent of Persons Enrolled in School by Age and Race, 1962-1968
3. Number of Students Graduating from High School, 1948-1968

4a. Percent of 17 Year Olds Graduating from High School, 1946-1968

4b. Percent of 17 Year Olds Graduating from High School by Race, 1960-1968

5. School Retention Rates from Fifth Grade, for Selected Years (percentages)
6. Percent of Persons 25-29 and 25 and Over with Less Than Five Years of School by Race, 1947-1967
7. Percent of Persons 25-29 and 25 and Over with Four Years of High School by Race, 1947-1967

Measures of Achievement

8. Test Scores from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, 1970 (Average raw score of ten Science exercises)
9. Test Scores from the Survey of Educational Opportunity (Coleman Report) 1966, by Grade Level Equivalent for Pupils in Sixth, Ninth, and Twelfth Grades by Race and by Socio-Economic Status of Parent

B. Opportunities for Advanced Learning

Enrollment

10. Number Attending Institutions of Higher Education by Degree-Credit Status and Level, 1957-1969
11. Number Enrolled in 4-Year and 2-Year Degree-Credit Programs by Sex, 1957-1970
12. Percent of 18 to 21 Year Olds Enrolled in Undergraduate Degree-Credit Programs by Sex, 1957-1969

13a. Number Enrolled for the First Time in Degree-Credit Programs by Age and Sex, 1947-1968

13b. Percent Enrolled for the First Time in Degree-Credit Programs by Age and Sex, 1947-1968

14. Percent of Twelfth Grade Students Going on to College, 1947-1968
15. Number and Percent of High School Graduates Enrolling in College the Same Year by Sex, 1960-1967
16. Percent of High School Graduates Attending College by Educational Ability and by Socio-Economic Status of Parents, 1960 (Project Talent)
17. Entrance Rates to 2-Year and 4-Year Institutions by Ability and by Socio-Economic Status of Parents, 1967 (ETS Growth Study)

Graduation

18. Number of Earned Degrees by Level and by Sex of Student, 1948-1968
19. Bachelor Degrees as Percent of 23 Year Olds and as Percent of High School Graduates Four Years Earlier, 1948-1967
20. Percent of Students Receiving Bachelor's Degrees Who Were Enrolled in Degree-Credit Programs Four Years Earlier by Sex
21. Percent of Persons 25-29 and 25 and Over with Four or More Years of College by Race, 1948-1967

EMPLOYMENT OUTLINE

A. Employment Opportunities for All Who Want Work

1. Employment Status of Noninstitutional Population 16 Years and Over, 1950, 1960, 1969 and Projected for 1980 (millions)
2. Major Changes in the Labor Force by Age, 1960's (estimated) and the 1970's (projected) (millions)
3. Total Labor Force Participation Rates, Selected Age-Sex Groups (annual averages; percent), 1947-1968
4. Labor Force Participation Rate of Married Women under 35, by Presence and Age of Children, March 1960, 1964, and 1969 (by labor force as percent of population)

Unemployment

5. Unemployment Rates for All Workers and for Married Men (annual averages; percent) 1947-1968
6. Unemployment Rates by Race and Ratio of Negro and Other Races to White, 1948-1968
7. Unemployment Rates for Sex and Age Groups by Race (annual averages), 1954-1968
8. Number Unemployed by Sex and Age Group by Race 1960 and 1969 (annual average; thousands)
9. Duration of Unemployment and Long-Term Unemployed as a Percent of Total Unemployed, 1947-1968

Underemployment

10. Persons on Part-time for Economic Reasons, 1957-1968, by Sex (thousands), 1959-1968
11. Men 20-64 Working Part-Year by Major Reason, 1960, 1965, and 1968 (percent of total)

Persons on Fringe of Labor Market

12. Persons Not in the Labor Force Who Want Jobs

Special Employment Problems

13. Number of Migratory Workers and Days Worked at Wage Work per Year by Farm - Non-Farm, 1960-1968
14. Unemployment Rates of Male High School Dropouts and Graduates for Selected Age Groups, 1962-1969
15. Number of Persons 16-64 Years Not Working During Year Because of Illness or Disability by Race and Age, 1968 (thousands)
16. Number of Mothers in the Labor Force with Husband Present and with Children under Six Years (millions), 1950-1968
17. Child Care Arrangements of Full-time Working Mothers, 1964 (percent of children of full-time working mothers)

B. Adequacy of Earnings

18. Estimated Percent of Full-time, Year Round, Workers with Earnings Below Certain Levels (1968 dollars), 1968
19. Percent of Full-time, Year Round Workers with Earnings Below Minimum Wage and BLS Low Budget, by Sex and Race
20. Percent of Full-time, Year Round Workers with Earnings Below Minimum Wage and BLS Low Budget, by Age and Family Size
21. Percent of Full-time, Year Round Workers with Earnings Below Minimum Wage and BLS Low Budget, Selected Occupational Groups and Educational Levels
22. Percent of Full-time,Year Round Workers, Who Were Heads of 4-Person Families with No Other Earners, Below BLS Low Budget

C. Job Satisfaction

23. Employment Trends Among Major Occupational Categories 1947-1968 (actual) and 1980 (projected for a services economy with 3 percent unemployment)
24. Median Earnings by Occupation: Year-Round Full-time Workers in 1968 by Longest Job and by Sex (dollars)
25. Percent of Workers Experiencing Some Unemployment in 1968 by Longest Job and by Sex
26. Proportion of Negroes and Other Races by Occupation Groups, 1960 and 1969 (percent of total for each occupation group)
27. Work Injury Rates in Selected Industries, 1950-1968
28. Average Days of Disability per Injury in Selected Industries, 1955 and 1968 (number of days)
29. Average Number of Paid Holidays Provided Plant and Office Workers, 1960 and 1968 (days)
30. Proportion of Private Non-Farm Office and Plant Workers Receiving Paid Vacations by Length of Vacation, 1968 (percent of workers in each category)
31. Life and Work-life Expectancy at Birth, by Sex, 1940, 1950, and 1960 (years)

INCOME OUTLINE

A. Rising General Level of Real Income

1. Per Capita Personal Income Before and After Taxes (in 1968 dollars), 1947-1969

B. Equitable Distribution of Income

2. Mean Family Income by Quintiles of Families and Top 5%(thousands of current dollars), 1947-1970
3. Ratio of Mean Income of Each Quintile of Families to the Mean of All Families, 1947-1969
4. Ratio of Mean Income of the Top 5% of Families to the Mean Income of the Lowest Fifth, 1948-1968
5. Median Family Income by Race of Head (thousands of current dollars) and Ratio of Negro and Other Races to White by Median Family Income, 1948-1968
6. Median Family Income by Race and Age of Head (thousands of current dollars), 1959 and 1968
7. Median Family Income by Sex of Head (thousands of current dollars) and Ratio of Male to Female Family Heads, 1948-1968
8. Median Family Income by Age of Head (thousands of current dollars), 1948-1968

C. Adequacy of Income

9. Number (millions) and Percent of Persons in Poverty and with Annual Income Lower than BLS Low Budget Estimate, 1959-1968
10. Number of Persons in Poverty by Race (millions), 1959-1968
11. Number of Persons in Poverty by Living Arrangement (millions), 1959-1968
12. Number of Persons in Poverty by Age (millions), 1959-1968
13. Number of Persons in Poverty by Residence (millions) by Rural-Urban; Farm-Nonfarm; Inside SMSA-Outside SMSA; Central City-Suburban Ring; 1959-1968
14. Number of Families in Poverty by Sex and Race of Head (millions), 1959-1968
15. Percent of White Persons and Negro and Other Persons in Poverty, 1959-1968
16. Percent of Males and Females in Poverty, 1959-1968
17. Percent of Each Age Group in Poverty, 1959-1968
18. Percent of Farm Population in Poverty, 1959-1968
19. Percent of Persons in Poverty by Region and Race, 1959-1968
20. Changing Composition of the Poor, Selected Groups - Race, Age, Region, Family Relationship (percent of total poor persons), 1959 and 1968
21. Changing Composition of Poor Families, Selected Groups (Sex of Family Head), (percent of total Poor families), 1959 and 1968
22. Size of Income Deficit for Families in Poverty (percent of total poor families), 1959 and 1968