A CROSS-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE DISTRIBUTION

OF INCOME ACROSS STATES FOR THE

YEARS 1960, 1970 AND 1980

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

North Texas State University in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

By

Yongdo Shin, B.A.

Denton, Texas

August, 1984

Shin, Yongdo, <u>A</u> <u>Cross-Section</u> <u>Analysis</u> <u>of</u> <u>the</u> <u>Distri</u>-<u>bution</u> <u>of</u> <u>Income</u> <u>Across</u> <u>States</u> <u>for</u> <u>the</u> <u>Years</u> <u>1960,</u> <u>1970</u> and <u>1980</u>. Master of Science, August, 1984, 82 pp., 49 tables, bibliography, 25 titles.

Labor market performance measures are not designed to reflect levels of economic well-being. Therefore, other criteria should be utilized in addition to unemployment statistics in ascertaining economic need and allocating funds earmarked to alleviate the problems of the needy.

The purpose of this thesis is to provide another measure of economic need to be used in the process of allocating funds to states. In Chapter I, an appropriate function form of the actual income data and a robust measure of inequality were chosen. Chapter II presented the model of inequality. Measures of inequality were derived for states in Chapter III. Chapter IV presented the policy implication of the empirical results in Chapter III. And then, the study was summarized in Chapter V.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Table   Page

Table   Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

According to a recent study by Nilsen (13), the Federal
Government allocated over $17 billion for programs of eco-
nomic assistance to state and local governments on the basis
of unemployment statistics, usually local unemployment levels
or rates, or both. As Nilsen notes, this application of the
unemployment statistics has occasioned much study and con-
troversy about their conceptual and definitional adequacy
for this purpose (13, p. 502). As Ashenfelter and Solon
(2) note, the unemployment rate is neither an accurate in-
dicator of labor market performance nor a suitable measure
of economic hardship. The implication, then, is that other
criteria should be utilized in addition to unemployment
statistics in ascertaining economic need. The purpose of
this study is to provide another measure of economic need to
be used in the process of allocating funds to states. This
paper will analyze the distribution of income across the
fifty states and the District of Columbia for the years 1960,
1970 and 1980. Using Bureau of the Census data, measures of
inequality will be derived for the fifty states and the
District of Columbia based on total income for the entire
populace of each state. In addition, this study will analyze
demographic characteristics of inequality in the individual

1

states. The distribution of income in each state will be analyzed by rural and urban classification as well as by racial mix. By providing measures of income inequality across states and disaggregating within states by race and region, this research gives the policymaker (at the state and federal level) timely and relevant information to use in allocating funds earmarked to alleviate the problems of the needy.

To utilize census data to examine inequality across states necessarily requires that assumptions be made about the underlying distribution of the actual income data. The choice of an appropriate hypothetical statistical distribution to approximate the actual empirical size distribution of income has been explored by economists ever since the seminal work by Pareto (14). Aitchison and Brown (1) found that the Pareto distribution fit the tails of the income distribution very well but did poorly in fitting the overall empirical distribution. They suggested using the lognormal distribution, but it too has been found to be flawed. The lognormal distribution fits the middle of the empirical distribution well, but does poorly at the tails. Numerous other probability density functions have been proposed as models of the actual empirical income distribution. Champernowne (5), Fisk (7), Salem and Mount (15), Singh and Maddala (16) and others, have all attempted to use various statistical distributions but the models all have had some

problem in estimating the actual empirical distribution of income. Thurow (18) was the first to attempt to estimate the actual size distribution of income by utilizing a Beta distribution. The Beta distribution is an attractive candidate since only two parameters have to be estimated in approximating the actual empirical distribution of income. McDonald and Ransom (11) subsequently tested the Beta distribution against different functional forms and found it fit better than most other forms. Basmann, Molina and Slottje (3, 4) analyzed income data for the United States and Mexico by hypothesizing that the income data was distributed as a Beta distribution of the second kind. Slottje (17) found that the Beta distribution of the second kind provided a very good fit to Internal Revenue Service income data for the years 1952-1981. Standard tests of the goodness of fit of a hypothetical distribution to actual empirical data include the sum of squares of errors, the sum of absolute errors and the chi-square test. All of these tests are computed by finding predicted frequencies (based on the assumption that the data is of a particular distributional form) and subtracting the predicted values from observed values (10). Given the success that all of the aforementioned authors have demonstrated in utilizing the Beta distribution of the second kind in doing their empirical work, the Beta distribution of the second type will be used in this study. The model of inequality based upon the Beta distribution of the second kind will be developed in the next chapter.

After choosing an appropriate functional form to approximate the data, the next question is one of finding a robust measure of inequality. Measures of inequality can be divided into normative and positive measures. Since normative measures require welfare comparisons and valuations, this study only considers positive measures. The first measure to be described is the range. The range measure is based on comparing the extreme values of the distribution, i.e., the highest and lowest income levels. The range can be defined as the gap between these two levels as a ratio of mean income. The problem with the range is that it ignores the distribution in between the extremes. A measure that examines the entire distribution is the relative mean deviation. This measure compares the income level of each individual with the mean income, to sum the absolute values of all the differences, and then to look at that sum as a proportion of total income. The major flaw with the relative mean deviation is that it is not sensitive to transfers from a poorer person to a richer person as long as both lie on the same side of the mean income. A very common statistical measure of the variation is the variance. The problem with looking at the variance is that it depends on the mean income level, and one distribution may show much greater relative variation than another and still end up having a lower variance if the mean income level around which the variations take place is smaller than the other

distribution. A measure that doesn't have this deficiency and concentrates on relative variation is the coefficient of variation, which is simply the square root of the variance divided by the mean income level. A question that arises with the coefficient of variation asks whether it is best to measure the difference of each income level from the mean only, or should the comparison be carried out between every pair of incomes? By utilizing pairwise comparisons, everyone's income difference from everyone else's is taken into account. The standard deviation of logarithms is a measure of inequality that eliminates the arbitrariness of the units and therefore of absolute levels, since a change of units, which takes the form of a multiplication of the absolute values, comes out in the logarithimic form as an addition of a constant, and therefore disappears when pairwise differences are being taken.

A measure of economic inequality that has been widely used is the Gini coefficient attributed to Gini (8). The Gini measure may be viewed in terms of the Lorenz curve. The Lorenz curve was devised by Lorenz (9), whereby the percentages of the population arranged from the poorest to the richest are represented on the horizontal axis and the percentages of income enjoyed by the bottom x percent of the population is shown on the vertical axis. A Lorenz curve runs from one corner of the unit square to the diametrically opposite corner. If everyone has the same

income the Lorenz curve is simply the diagonal. If bottom
income groups have a proportionately lower share of income,
the Lorenz curve will obviously lie below the diagonal.
The Gini coefficent is the ratio of the difference between
the line of absolute equality (the diagonal) and the Lorenz
curve--to the triangle underneath the diagonal. The Gini
coefficient may be defined as exactly one half of the relative
mean difference, which is defined as the arithmetic average
of the absolute values of differences between all pairs of
incomes. Morgan (12) and Champernowne (6) have both demon-
strated that based on various evaluative criteria, the Gini
measure is a satisfactory measure of inequality. Given
the economic intuitive nature of the measure and the sim-
plicity of calculation, the Gini measure will be used in
this study.

Having chosen an appropriate functional form (the Beta
distribution of the second kind) and a robust measure of
inequality (the Gini coefficient), the model of inequality
will now be presented in Chapter II. Following the frame-
work of analysis in Chapter II, empirical results are given
in Chapter III. After presenting the empirical results in
Chapter III, the public policy ramifications of the results
are discussed in Chapter IV. The study is summarized in
Chapter V.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Aitchison, J. and J. A. C. Brown, The Lognormal
    Distribution with Special References to its Uses
    in Economics, Cambridge, Cambridge University
    Press, 1960.

2. Ashenfelter, Orley and Gary Solon, "Employment Statistics:
    The Interaction of Economics and Policy," American
    Economic Review, LXXII, No. 2 (May, 1982), 233-236.

3. Basmann, R. L., D. J. Molina, M. Rodarte and D. J. Slottje,
    "Some New Methods of Predicting Changes in Economic
    Inequality Associated with Trends in Growth and
    Development," Working Paper VII, Department of
    Economics, Texas A & M University, College Station,
    Texas, 1983.

4. Basmann, R. L., D. J. Molina and D. J. Slottje, "Variable
    Preference, Economic Inequality and the Cost of
    Living Index," Advances in Econometrics (forthcoming).

5. Champernowne, D. G., "The Graduation of Income Distri-
    bution," Econometrica, XX, (October, 1952), 591-615.

6. _____, "A Comparison of Measures of
    Inequality of Income Distribution," Economic Journal,
    LXXXIV, (December, 1974), 787-816.

7. Fisk, P. R., "The Graduation of Income Distribution,"
    Econometrica, XXIX, (April, 1961), 171-185.

8. Gini, C., Variabilità e Mutabilità, Bologna, 1912.

9. Lorenz, M. C., "Methods of Measuring the Concentration
    of Wealth," Publications of the American Statistical
    Association, IX, 1905, 209-219.

10. McDonald, J. B., "Some Generalized Functions for the
    Size Distribution of Income," Econometrica, LII,
    (May, 1984), 647-665.

11. McDonald, J. B. and M. Ransom, "Functional Forms,
    Estimation Techniques and the Distribution of
    Income," Econometrica, XLVII, (November, 1979)
    1513-1516.

12. Morgan, J. N., "The Anatomy of Income Distribution,"
    Review _of_ _Economics_ _and_ _Statistics_, XLIV, (August,
    1962), 270-283.

13. Nilsen, Sigurd R., "Employment and Unemployment Statistics
    for Nonmetropolitan Areas," Background Paper No. 33
    of National Commission on Employment Statistics,
    Washington, Government Printing Office, 1979.

14. Pareto, V., _Manual_ _of_ _Political_ _Economy_, edited by A. S.
    Schwier and A. N. Page, London, Macmillan, Inc.,
    1972.

15. Salem, A. B. and T. D. Mount, "A Convenient Descriptive
    Model of Income Distribution: The Gamma Density,"
    Econometrica, XLII, (November, 1974), 1115-1127.

16. Singh, S. K. and G. S. Maddala, "A Function for the Size
    Distribution of Incomes," _Econometrica_, XLIV,
    (September, 1976), 963-970.

17. Slottje, D. J., "A Measure of Income Inequality Based
    Upon the Beta Distribution of the Second Kind,"
    Economics _Letters_ (forthcoming).

18. Thurow, L. L., "Analyzing the American Income Distri-
    bution," _American_ _Economic_ _Review_, LX, (May, 1970),
    261-269.

CHAPTER II

THE MODEL

The study of income distributions between and within states requires the use of a hypothetical joint distribution function to approximate and compare actual income data for all of the states, with a view to the practical application and flexibility of the functional form chosen. This study utilizes a beta distribution of the second kind. As noted above, this functional form has performed well in approximating actual empirical income data. The model presented below was developed by Basmann and is reported in Basmann et al., (1, 2). The beta distribution of the second kind is a two parameter distribution that allows for exact decomposition of total national income into the marginal distributions of income for all fifty states. A unique feature of the beta distribution of the second type is that the marginal distributions (of the joint distribution) retain the same form as the joint distribution. Thus, the joint distribution of total national income is hypothesized to be distributed as a beta of the second kind. If this is the case, then the marginal distributions of income are also distributed as betas of the second kind for all fifty states. By deriving a measure of inequality (in this case, the Gini measure) assuming this particular functional form, the

framework will be developed to analyze income inequality for the entire nation as well as to make comparisons between states and, of course, within states. The same framework allows for comparison of marginal distributions of income based on demographic characteristics, as will be seen below. Consider the following setup:

Let

$$g(S_1, \ldots, S_{51}; C_1, \ldots, C_{51}, b^*, k)_t =$$

$$(1) \quad \frac{K^{b^*} S_1^{C_1 - 1} \ldots, S_{51}^{C_{51} - 1}}{B(C_1, \ldots, C_{51}, b^*)[K + S]^{b^* + C}}$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{otherwise} \quad t = 1960, 1970, 1980$$

where $C = C_1 + \ldots + C_{51}$

$$C_j > 0 \quad j = 1, \ldots, 51$$

Si is defined as income in the ith state. The K is called the lower terminal K and b* the Pareto parameter because under certain conditions on the Ci's and b*, equation (1) becomes the well known Pareto distribution. The Ci's are called inter-income inequality parameters for reasons that will be clear shortly. By summing over the Si's we find the marginal distribution of total national income which takes the form:

$$g(S) = \frac{K^{b^*} S^{C - 1}}{B(C, b^*)[K + S]^{b^* + C}}$$

$$(2)$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{otherwise} \quad C > 0$$

Similarly, the marginal distribution of income for the ith
state takes the form:

$$(3) \quad g(Si) = \frac{K^{b*} Si^{Ci} - 1}{B(Ci,b*) [K + Si]^{b* + Ci}}$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{otherwise } Ci > 0$$

Now from equation (2) and equation (3) Gini measures of
inequality are derived which (for total income) take the
form:

$$(4) \quad G(C,b*) = \frac{\Gamma(C + \frac{1}{2})\Gamma(* + \frac{1}{2})\Gamma(b* + C)}{\Gamma(\frac{1}{2})\Gamma(b* + C + \frac{1}{2})\Gamma(C + 1)\Gamma(b*)} \times \left[1 + \frac{2C_j}{2b* - 1}\right]$$

To derive the Gini measure for the marginal distributions of
income by individual state, simply change the C to Ci. From
equation (4) it can be seen that inequality in the various
marginal distributions is solely a function of the interincome
inequality parameters C (Ci's) and the b*. The b* and C (Ci's)
can be estimated from actual empirical data by the method of
moments (3). The lower terminal K is found by locating the
individual in the survey with the lowest income level. This
income figure is the K.

The actual data utilized in this study is from the
Bureau of the Census. The census is done every ten years.
Thus, this study reports results for 1960, 1970 and 1980.
The income data is reported in frequency form for all fifty
states and the District of Columbia. Within each state,
income data is given based upon race and urban-rural mix,

as well as just upon total income. By using equations
(1) - (4) and integrating out everything but the demo-
graphic characteristic in question, the marginal distributions
of income for various demographic characteristics within
states can be derived and compared across states. The
results are now reported in Chapter III.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Basmann, R. L., D. J. Molina, M. Rodarte and D. J. Slottje, "Some New Methods of Predicting Changes in Economic Inequality Associated with Trends in Growth and Development," Working Paper VII, Department of Economics, Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas, 1983.

2. Basmann, R. L., D. J. Molina and D. J. Slottje, "Variable Preference, Economic Inequality and the Cost of Living Index," Advances in Econometrics (forthcoming).

3. Elderton, W. P., Frequency Curves and Correlation, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1938.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF EMPIRICAL DATA

The empirical data used is from the 1960, 1970 and 1980 Census of the Population. Characteristics of the Population were produced and distributed by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce (3, 4, 5). In defining each term of data, definitions and explanations of subject characteristics from each volume of the Census of the Population are followed. The data of enumeration for each Census (1960, 1970 and 1980) was April 1st of each year in accordance with the requirements of the Act of Congress of August 31, 1954, which codified Title 13 of the United States Code. Therefore, although the income statistics cover the calendar year 1959, 1969, and 1979, the characteristics of persons and the composition of families refer to the time of enumeration.

In analyzing income inequality across states, the distribution of income should be examined from all sources among consuming units, for a concern with the distribution of current income implies a concern for the distribution of potential consumption. If income is pooled within a household for the purpose of consumption, then the household is an appropriate unit. However, families may share consumption, but not all households do (2, pp. 10-11). Because

income is typically not shared among unrelated cohabiting
individuals and the proportion of unrelated individuals
in the population is growing, as it has been in recent
years (1, p. 22), the family unit (the families and unrelated
individuals) is a more appropriate focus.

From the 1960 and 1970 Censuses of the Population, data
is easily obtained about the income of the family unit. But,
unfortunately, the same data is not available from the 1980
Census of the Population. Accordingly, household income
data is used instead of the family unit income data in 1980.
Given this condition, the results for empirical data in 1960,
1970 and 1980 are presented.

Presentation of Data in 1960

National Data Results

Table I shows the national summary statistics of mean
income, variance and Gini coefficient by nation, region and
race in 1960, 1970 and 1980. As indicated in the table, the
mean income for the nation was $5,767; the mean income for
urban residents was $6,216; and the mean income for rural
dwellers was $4,624. The rural regions had, on average,
roughly 74 per cent of the mean income of the urban areas.
Moreover, the Gini coefficient of the rural regions show
that the income distribution in rural residences had more
inequality than in urban residences, but the variance of the
income distribution in the rural areas was less than in the

urban areas. The mean income in the nonwhite group was $3,274 which was about 54 per cent of the mean income in the white group. Similar to the regional case, the Gini coefficient for the nonwhites was greater than in the white, but the variance for the nonwhite population was less than among the white populace. The mean incomes for the urban and the white categories were both above the national average.

Results of State Data

From Table II-XVI, the rank ordering of states by mean income, variance and Gini coefficent in the state, the urban, the rural, the white and the nonwhite are shown. In addition, the characteristics of each state can be examined by using the same tables. (States of which characteristics were different from the national characteristics in 1960, were only discussed.)

In Connecticut, mean income and the variance of income in the rural areas were greater than those in the urban areas. But, because the Gini coefficient of the rural regions was greater than that of the urban areas, the income distribution in the urban areas was more equal than in the rural areas. Specifically, though the mean income of the nonwhite population was less than that of the white population, the Gini coefficient for the nonwhites was greater than for the whites.

In Massachusetts, although mean income of the state was less than in Connecticut, the same patterns developed.

However, the income distribution in the rural areas was more equal than in the urban areas in Massachusetts. In Hawaii, the mean income of the nonwhite population was greater than that of the white population and the income distribution in the nonwhite population was more equal than among the white.

In addition, the empirical results in 1960 show that the Gini coefficient of the rural population was less than that of the urban population in such states as Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Louisiana, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, Utah, Vermont, Washington and West Virginia. Also the Gini coefficient for the nonwhites was less than that of the whites in such states as California, Washington D.C., Florida, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, Wisconsin and Wyoming.

Presentation of Data in 1970

National Data Results

Table I shows the national statistics for 1970. The mean income of the nation was $9,579. The mean income in the urban regions and for the white population were all above the mean income of the nation. Also, the mean income of the rural regions was $8,431 which was about 85 per cent of the

urban areas mean income. The mean income of the nonwhites ($6,334) was about 63 per cent of the white population mean income. Although the Gini coefficient in the rural areas was less than in the urban areas, the Gini coefficient for the nonwhites was greater than for the whites. The variance of income for the urban areas was greater than that of the rural regions, and the variance of income of the white population was also greater than that of the nonwhite segment of the population. Therefore, it is clear that the income distribution for the whites and the urban regions was more dispersed than for the nonwhites and in the rural regions.

Results of State Data

In Tables XVII-XXXI, the characteristics across states and within each state can be observed. As in 1960, Connecticut and Hawaii had the same characteristics for 1970. That is, Connecticut had a higher mean income in the rural areas than in the urban areas, and the Gini coefficient for the nonwhite population was less than for the white population. In Hawaii, mean income of the nonwhites was greater than that of the whites, and the Gini coefficient for the nonwhite group was less than for the white group. In Massachusetts, as in 1960, rural mean income was greater than urban mean income. But the Gini coefficient for the nonwhite cohort was greater than for the white cohort. In Idaho, rural mean income was higher than urban mean income,

and the income distribution in the rural residences showed less inequality than in the urban residences. New Jersey had higher mean income in the rural regions than in the urban regions, but the Gini coefficient in the rural areas was higher than in the urban regions. Indiana, Maine, Montana, New Hampshire, North Dakota and Vermont had similar characteristics to those in Idaho. In North Dakota, the Gini coefficient for nonwhites was less than that for whites.

Contrary to the national trend, the Gini coefficient of the rural regions was higher than that of the urban areas in such states as Arizona, California, Delaware, Kentucky, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, Rhode Island, South Dakota and Virginia. The Gini coefficient for the nonwhite cohorts was less than that for the white cohorts in such states as New York, Washington D.C., Nebraska, Colorado, and Delaware. Therefore, when we compare this attribute in 1970 with the same attribute in 1960, it can be reasoned that the income distribution for nonwhites was relatively more unequal in 1970 than in 1960.

Presentation of Data in 1980

National Data Results

Table I also shows the national statistics for 1980. Because data in 1980 was collected from the household instead of the family unit, it is not precisely comparable to data for 1960 and 1970. Urban area mean income was greater in

the rural areas but the income distribution was more equal in the rural regions than in the urban regions. Rural area mean income ($19,102) was about 91 per cent of that of the urban areas. The white cohort mean income was greater than the nonwhite cohort and nonwhite group had mean income ($15,351) that was about 72 per cent of mean income for the white population. The Gini coefficient for the nonwhites was larger than for the whites. The variance of income was also higher in the urban regions and for the whites than in the rural regions and for nonwhites.

Results of State Data

Tables XXXII-XLVI show the characteristics across states and within each state. In Indiana and Massachusetts, mean income and the Gini coefficient for the urban dwellers were all higher than those for the rural dwellers, and the non-whites mean income was less than the whites mean income, but the income distribution was more equal for the nonwhites than for the whites. In Hawaii, nonwhite mean income was greater than white mean income, and the nonwhite income dis-tribution was more equal than the white income distribution. In Ohio, Oregon and Rhode Island, mean income and the Gini coefficient in the urban areas were higher than in the rural areas, and the Gini coefficient for the nonwhites was less than that for the whites. In Colorado and Nevada, rural mean income was greater than urban mean income, but the income

distribution in the urban areas was more equal than in the rural areas. In Connecticut, Illinois, New Hampshire, New Jersey and Washington, rural mean income was greater than urban mean income and the rural areas had a more equal income distribution than did the urban areas. In Idaho, Maine and Pennsylvania, the income distribution was more equal in the rural areas and among the whites than in the urban regions and among the nonwhite dwellers. The rural areas had a more equal income distribution than the urban dwellers in such states as Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, West Virginia and Wyoming. In Chapter IV the policy implications of these empirical results will be discussed.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Moroney, John R., editor, <u>Income Inequality</u>, Massachusetts, D. C. Health and Company, 1978.

2. Osberg, Lars, <u>Economic Inequality in the United States</u>, New York, M. E. Sharpe, Inc., 1984.

3. U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population: Characteristics of the Population, Vol. I, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1963.

4. _____, 1970 Census of Population: Characteristics of the Population, Vol. I, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1973.

5. _____, 1980 Census of Population: Characteristics of the Population, Vol. I, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1983.

CHAPTER IV

POLICY IMPLICATIONS OF THE
EMPIRICAL RESULTS

During the 1970's unemployment rates had become the

basis for divvying up billions of dollars of the Comprehensive

Employment and Training Act and other federal revenue-sharing

funds among states and localities (1, p. 233). Until now,

unemployment statistics were also used to determine area

eligibility, to rank areas for assigning priorities for

receipt of assistance, and to help determine funding levels

for several human resource and economic development programs.

The use of the unemployment rate in assessing need for pro-

grams for local areas assumes that this measure identifies

the groups and areas in greatest need as defined by the

particular program's objectives. But these programs are

almost all exercised to alleviate individual or area economic

hardship.

Thus, the fundamental problem is that although labor

market performance measures were not designed to reflect

levels of economic well-being, the two concepts are frequently

confused by users of unemployment statistics (2, p. 502).

Use of unemployment statistics as funding allocators may

achieve the programs' overall objectives of job creation and

revenue supplementation, but the specific distribution of

funds may not reflect the actual distribution of economic
hardship resulting from recessionary impacts (2, p. 504).

The official practice counts a person as unemployed if
he worked no hours during the reference week, was available
for work, and actively sought work at some time during the
previous four weeks (3, pp. 1-2). But this definition has
two main definitional problems. First, there are discouraged
workers who want to work but have given up looking because
of the awareness of limited job opportunities. Areas char-
acterized by small labor markets with more limited employment
diversity and lower population densities tend to have higher
rates of worker discouragement than large labor markets.
The exclusion of these workers from the labor force and un-
employment counts reduces unemployment rates for the areas
and groups with particularly severe and persistent labor
market dislocations. Secondly, though self-employment may
be a full-time permanent activity, a secondary activity, or
an emergency response to unemployment, it is treated in all
cases as employment. That is, self-employed workers do not
leave the labor force nor do they become officially unemployed
because they have some work. For example, members of labor
force are considered employed if they worked one hour or more
a week for pay, or if they worked fifteen hours or more as an
unpaid family member (2, pp. 506-507). Therefore, the
unemployment rate is inaccurate as an indicator of individual
or area economic hardship.

The main goal of federal assistance programs is to alleviate economic hardship and upgrade income status in specific areas or groups. Then income statistics or the other indexes of economic well-being would be more appropriate indicators. Indexes of labor market performance only furnish an indication of labor market's ability to provide employment to those seeking work. These measures are a function of the number of persons wanting to work. Thus, these measures are distinguished from indexes of economic hardship, which provide an indication of economic well-being by supplementing the labor market measures with measures relating to an individual's or a family's economic status (2, p. 505).

Tables XLVII-XLIX show the annual unemployment rates at the state level for the white group and the nonwhite group in 1979. (Data for regional unemployment rates is not available from any source). When we compare these rates with Gini coefficients in Table XXXIV, XLIII and XLVI, it is found that the rank orderings of unemployment rates in states, the white group and the nonwhite group, are different from the Gini coefficients in the various states, the white group and the nonwhite group. Thus, if public funds are entirely allocated to areas on the basis of unemployment rates, and the target of funds is to upgrade the economic well-being of those areas, there is no assurance that those are areas which are experiencing the greatest relative shortage of public

funds. In such a case, while unemployment statistics are not good indicators of economic well-being, and provide a poor means of targeting funds to economically disadvantaged groups and areas (2, p. 521), Gini coefficients in Tables XXXIV, XLIII and XLVI, can be used as another measure in addition to unemployment rates.

The Gini coefficient is a satisfactory measure of income inequality, and to reduce the gap of income inequality within states is generally thought to be related to economic welfare in each state. Therefore, Gini coefficients in our tables will provide relevant information in allocating public funds.

CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Ashenfelter, Orley, and Gary Solon, "Employment Statistics: The Interaction of Economics and Policy," _American Economic Review_, LXXII, No. 2 (May, 1982), 233-236.

2. Nilsen, Sigurd R., "Employment and Unemployment Statistics for Nonmetropolitan Areas," Background Paper No. 33 of National Commission on Employment and Unemployment Statistics, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1979.

3. U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, _Handbook of Labor Statistics_, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1980.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study has been to demonstrate that policymakers should use otherrelevant information in addition to unemployment statistics in assessing economic need. In 1976, over $17 billion in federal funds were allocated on the basis of unemployment rates. If we use the labor market performance indexes as economic well-being indexes, we must make assumptions about the relationship between economic and employment status. But the economic hardship indexes provide direct indicators of economic hardship with a minimum of assumptions. The current measures of employment or unemployment have no direct relationship to levels of economic hardship or economic well-being. It may be inferred that those groups or areas with significantly greater levels of unemployment are less well-off compared with areas or groups with very low unemployment levels. But, it is only an inference. That is, the current measures of employment or unemployment can not be exclusively used for allocating federal funds without any other supplementing measures of economic well-being. In view of this point, we can consider Gini coefficients (in our empirical results) as another measure of economic need to be used in the process of allocating funds to states.

This study developed a model of economic inequality based upon the beta distribution of the second kind. This model allowed a detailed and systematic analysis of inequality across states and over time for the periods 1960, 1970 and 1980. It was found that inequality varied across states. For example, Wyoming and Utah were relatively less unequal than Washington D.C. and Mississippi in 1980.

Finally, in comparing the inequality ratios across states with unemployment rates, we found considerable divergence in the measures. The major conclusion reached here is that policymakers should examine other criteria besides unemployment rates assessing economic need. This study provided another source of information to the policymaker, inequality indexes of a specific form.

APPENDIX

TABLE I

NATIONAL STATISTICS OF MEAN INCOME*, VARIANCE AND GINI COEFFICIENT BY
NATION, REGION AND COLOR IN THE YEARS 1960, 1970, AND 1980

	Nation	Urban	Rural	White	Nonwhite
1960					
Mean	$5,767	6,216	4,624	6,053	3,274
Variance	31,045,831	35,645,270	20,835,248	32,748,998	9,660,176
Gini	0.387038	0.384792	0.394926	0.382103	0.393727
1970					
Mean	$9,579	9,942	8,431	9,987	6,334
Variance	90,855,989	98,325,785	65,656,333	95,440,285	42,148,903
Gini	0.388727	0.388681	0.383864	0.385025	0.400684
1980					
Mean	$20,561	21,058	19,102	21,441	15,351
Variance	275,862,051	291,233,357	232,618,715	288,124,878	180,132,772
Gini	0.34738	0.347821	0.34568	0.342968	0.366349

*in current dollars

TABLE II

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN
INCOME* IN THE STATE: 1960

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Connecticut	$7,273	26	New Hampshire	$5,405
2	New Jersey	7,027	27	Rhode Island	5,378
3	California	6,604	28	Kansas	5,337
3	Illinois	6,604	29	Idaho	5,263
5	New York	6,600	30	Montana	5,236
6	Nevada	6,568	31	Texas	5,211
7	Delaware	6,523	32	Missouri	5,175
8	Maryland	6,466	33	Virginia	5,149
9	Michigan	6,332	34	Iowa	5,074
10	Massachusetts	6,230	35	Florida	5,055
11	Ohio	6,226	36	Nebraska	4,966
12	Alaska	6,218	37	Oklahoma	4,806
13	Hawaii	6,097	38	Louisiana	4,707
14	Washington	5,993	39	Vermont	4,702
15	D.C.	5,965	40	West Virginia	4,687
16	Wyoming	5,936	41	Maine	4,673
17	Utah	5,890	42	Georgia	4,607
18	Wisconsin	5,878	43	North Dakota	4,542
19	Pennsylvania	5,851	44	Tennessee	4,394
20	Oregon	5,808	45	Kentucky	4,390
21	Indiana	5,800	46	Alabama	4,368
22	Arizona	5,744	47	North Carolina	4,307
23	Colorado	5,742	48	South Dakota	4,266
24	New Mexico	5,621	49	South Carolina	4,074
25	Minnesota	5,498	50	Arkansas	3,680
			51	Mississippi	3,446

*in current dollars

TABLE III

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE STATE: 1960

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Connecticut	45,602,491	26	Washington	27,237,935
2	Delaware	39,658,471	27	Wisconsin	27,147,904
3	New York	39,626,886	28	Minnesota	26,502,599
4	D.C.	39,018,220	29	Virginia	26,133,731
5	California	37,423,161	30	Wyoming	25,342,545
6	Illinois	35,832,004	31	Indiana	25,197,078
7	Arizona	35,759,594	32	Rhode Island	24,552,285
8	New Jersey	35,242,552	33	Tennessee	24,445,103
9	Hawaii	33,832,467	34	Iowa	24,321,479
10	Nevada	33,467,150	35	Utah	24,112,772
11	Maryland	33,341,420	36	Georgia	23,687,555
12	Florida	32,578,485	37	Kentucky	23,362,161
13	Texas	32,361,111	38	New Hampshire	23,096,290
14	Massachusetts	31,869,894	39	Nebraska	22,853,234
15	Alaska	30,389,678	40	North Carolina	22,654,977
16	Ohio	30,190,110	41	Alabama	21,367,767
17	Michigan	29,643,781	42	Montana	21,238,630
18	Colorado	29,184,079	43	West Virginia	20,843,330
19	Missouri	29,094,404	44	Idaho	20,037,033
20	Oregon	28,340,386	45	Vermont	19,479,135
21	New Mexico	27,903,892	46	South Carolina	18,950,352
22	Pennsylvania	27,726,100	47	Arkansas	17,805,563
23	Kansas	27,677,146	48	Maine	17,078,403
24	Oklahoma	27,327,063	49	South Dakota	16,649,198
25	Louisiana	27,256,106	50	North Dakota	16,252,399
			51	Mississippi	15,925,414

TABLE IV

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE STATE: 1960

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	Mississippi	0.432373	26	New Mexico	0.381998
2	Arkansas	0.428769	27	Colorado	0.381908
3	Tennessee	0.420971	28	Minnesota	0.381609
4	Florida	0.418567	29	Rhode Island	0.378598
5	North Carolina	0.418080	30	California	0.376940
6	Kentucky	0.416962	31	Oregon	0.376583
7	Louisiana	0.416818	32	Connecticut	0.376190
8	South Carolina	0.412934	33	North Dakota	0.373686
9	Oklahoma	0.412782	34	Massachusetts	0.373337
10	Texas	0.411843	35	Pennsylvania	0.372825
11	Alabama	0.409554	36	Illinois	0.372679
12	Georgia	0.408156	37	Maine	0.372494
13	Missouri	0.403372	38	New Hampshire	0.371480
14	D.C.	0.401764	39	Maryland	0.369993
15	Arizona	0.401313	40	Montana	0.369856
16	Virginia	0.394152	41	Wisconsin	0.369725
17	Kansas	0.392158	42	Alaska	0.369037
18	West Virginia	0.392042	43	Ohio	0.368104
19	Iowa	0.390426	44	Nevada	0.367061
20	South Dakota	0.390079	45	Washington	0.365903
21	Nebraska	0.388708	46	Indiana	0.365058
22	Delaware	0.385102	47	Idaho	0.362747
23	Vermont	0.384571	48	Michigan	0.362667
24	Hawaii	0.383471	49	Wyoming	0.360637
25	New York	0.382611	50	New Jersey	0.357946
			51	Utah	0.357231

TABLE V

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE URBAN RESIDENCE: 1960

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Alaska	$8,347	26	Kansas	$5,886
2	New Jersey	7,097	27	Missouri	5,835
3	Connecticut	7,084	28	Virginia	5,750
4	Nevada	7,075	29	Nebraska	5,688
5	Delaware	7,049	30	Iowa	5,657
6	Illinois	6,887	31	Texas	5,608
7	Maryland	6,817	32	Idaho	5,604
8	California	6,761	33	Montana	5,560
9	Hawaii	6,751	33	West Virginia	5,560
10	New York	6,702	35	New Hampshire	5,515
11	Michigan	6,595	36	Oklahoma	5,389
12	Ohio	6,434	37	Rhode Island	5,387
13	Wisconsin	6,377	38	North Dakota	5,356
14	Wyoming	6,293	39	Kentucky	5,285
15	New Mexico	6,271	40	Florida	5,279
16	Washington	6,256	41	Georgia	5,249
17	Maine	6,193	42	Louisiana	5,204
18	Massachusetts	6,170	43	South Dakota	5,094
19	Utah	6,075	44	Alabama	5,071
20	Arizona	6,046	44	North Carolina	5,071
21	Oregon	6,007	46	Tennessee	5,064
22	Pennsylvania	6,006	47	Vermont	5,033
23	Indiana	5,997	48	Maine	4,966
24	Colorado	5,990	49	South Carolina	4,721
25	D.C.	5,965	50	Arkansas	4,399
			51	Mississippi	4,311

*in current dollars

TABLE VI

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE URBAN RESIDENCE: 1960

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Connecticut	42,216,223	26	Wisconsin	31,002,861
2	New York	41,527,106	27	Colorado	30,923,087
3	Delaware	41,198,686	28	Georgia	30,031,808
4	D.C.	39,018,220	29	Iowa	29,956,390
5	Alaska	38,648,581	30	Washington	29,840,196
6	Hawaii	38,153,327	31	Pennsylvania	29,737,716
7	California	37,836,185	32	New Mexico	29,735,807
8	Illinois	37,782,059	33	Virginia	29,171,405
9	Florida	36,333,064	34	West Virginia	29,091,477
10	Texas	36,252,947	35	Kentucky	28,535,969
11	New Jersey	35,372,958	36	Nebraska	28,081,880
12	Nevada	34,912,805	37	Alabama	27,212,695
13	Missouri	34,617,493	38	Indiana	26,961,772
14	North Carolina	34,605,300	39	Wyoming	26,057,217
15	Oklahoma	34,135,747	40	Utah	25,931,873
16	Arizona	33,874,513	41	South Carolina	25,662,563
17	Maryland	33,690,324	42	Rhode Island	24,938,554
18	Ohio	33,023,171	43	New Hampshire	23,578,431
19	Kansas	32,888,174	44	Idaho	23,083,383
20	Louisiana	32,813,313	45	Arkansas	23,001,860
21	Oregon	31,872,550	46	Vermont	22,783,646
22	Michigan	31,868,648	47	Mississippi	22,246,453
23	Minnesota	31,761,155	48	Montana	22,028,535
24	Massachusetts	31,266,056	49	North Dakota	21,972,117
25	Tennessee	31,116,881	50	South Dakota	21,262,687
			51	Maine	18,928,189

TABLE VII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE URBAN RESIDENCE: 1960

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	North Carolina	0.423301	26	South Dakota	0.375967
2	Florida	0.419669	27	Minnesota	0.374284
3	Mississippi	0.416181	28	Hawaii	0.374246
4	Arkansas	0.415079	29	Pennsylvania	0.374244
5	Tennessee	0.414053	30	Connecticut	0.374133
6	Louisiana	0.413380	31	Massachusetts	0.373513
7	South Carolina	0.410610	32	California	0.373119
8	Oklahoma	0.409940	33	Delaware	0.372779
9	Texas	0.407424	34	Ohio	0.370087
10	Georgia	0.403426	35	Maine	0.369655
11	D.C.	0.401764	36	New Hampshire	0.369211
12	Alabama	0.401252	37	Illinois	0.369119
13	Kentucky	0.397156	38	North Dakota	0.368381
14	Missouri	0.395051	39	Washington	0.365910
15	West Virginia	0.388388	40	Wisconsin	0.365669
16	Kansas	0.388353	41	New Mexico	0.365047
17	Iowa	0.387633	42	Indiana	0.364729
18	Arizona	0.385628	43	Idaho	0.363573
19	Vermont	0.385522	44	Michigan	0.361286
20	New York	0.383955	45	Montana	0.360492
21	Virginia	0.381570	46	Maryland	0.359846
22	Oregon	0.381051	47	Utah	0.357947
23	Nebraska	0.380111	48	New Jersey	0.356218
24	Rhode Island	0.379921	49	Nevada	0.355557
25	Colorado	0.378677	50	Wyoming	0.350857
			51	Alaska	0.330813

TABLE VIII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE RURAL RESIDENCE: 1960

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Connecticut	$8,050	26	Vermont	$4,471
2	Massachusetts	6,572	27	Kansas	4,448
3	New Jersey	6,468	28	Florida	4,341
4	New York	5,911	29	Maine	4,335
5	Ohio	5,563	30	Iowa	4,322
6	Delaware	5,551	31	New Mexico	4,265
7	California	5,550	32	Hawaii	4,239
8	Michigan	5,526	33	Virginia	4,217
9	Maryland	5,495	34	Minnesota	4,179
10	Indiana	5,436	35	North Dakota	4,034
11	Wyoming	5,430	36	Nebraska	4,020
12	Oregon	5,429	36	West Virginia	4,020
13	Nevada	5,418	38	Texas	3,974
14	Pennsylvania	5,408	39	Missouri	3,780
15	Washington	5,372	40	Oklahoma	3,748
16	Rhode Island	5,321	41	North Carolina	3,714
17	Illinois	5,274	42	Georgia	3,705
18	Utah	5,260	43	Louisiana	3,687
19	New Hampshire	5,245	44	South Dakota	3,655
20	Alaska	5,068	45	Kentucky	3,552
21	Colorado	4,957	46	Tennessee	3,545
22	Idaho	4,906	47	South Carolina	3,533
23	Montana	4,870	48	Alabama	3,369
24	Wisconsin	4,859	49	Arkansas	3,038
25	Arizona	4,856	50	Mississippi	2,789

*in current dollars

TABLE IX

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE RURAL RESIDENCE: 1960

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Connecticut	59,513,215	26	Texas	18,908,786
2	Arizona	46,520,105	27	Kansas	18,321,780
3	Delaware	35,769,662	28	Wisconsin	18,237,335
4	New Jersey	35,225,568	29	Utah	17,433,199
5	Massachusetts	34,920,203	30	Kentucky	17,115,969
6	California	33,463,962	31	Vermont	17,083,356
7	Maryland	31,400,649	32	Iowa	16,775,178
8	Nevada	29,179,498	33	Idaho	16,591,053
9	New York	26,454,434	34	Hawaii	16,526,076
10	Wyoming	24,707,073	35	Missouri	15,263,274
11	Illinois	24,405,218	36	Louisiana	14,901,793
12	Colorado	22,991,467	37	Tennessee	14,887,779
13	New Hampshire	22,299,617	38	Maine	14,731,618
14	Alaska	22,192,932	39	Nebraska	14,621,573
15	Michigan	22,004,741	40	Oklahoma	14,601,295
16	Rhode Island	21,947,088	41	Minnesota	14,533,910
17	Indiana	21,798,141	42	West Virginia	13,666,638
18	Pennsylvania	21,756,224	43	Georgia	13,646,490
19	New Mexico	21,588,454	44	North Carolina	13,418,607
20	Oregon	21,466,852	45	South Carolina	12,755,934
21	Ohio	20,978,231	46	South Dakota	12,536,996
22	Washington	20,626,610	47	Arkansas	12,337,083
23	Virginia	20,524,171	48	North Dakota	12,222,480
24	Florida	20,230,335	49	Alabama	11,560,228
25	Montana	20,128,806	50	Mississippi	10,124,906

TABLE X

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE RURAL RESIDENCE: 1960

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	Arizona	0.455483	26	Iowa	0.387961
2	Arkansas	0.435622	27	West Virginia	0.383077
3	Mississippi	0.435557	28	Vermont	0.382318
4	Kentucky	0.432627	29	Illinois	0.382314
5	Tennessee	0.419763	30	Alaska	0.381399
6	Texas	0.418047	31	Connecticut	0.381014
7	New Mexico	0.415610	32	Minnesota	0.380733
8	Virginia	0.413209	33	Montana	0.380219
9	Louisiana	0.411204	34	Wyoming	0.377281
10	Delaware	0.409705	35	New Jersey	0.375358
11	Missouri	0.408080	36	New Hampshire	0.374441
12	Alabama	0.405854	37	Maine	0.373907
13	Florida	0.405629	38	Massachusetts	0.371154
14	Oklahoma	0.405539	39	Wisconsin	0.370630
15	South Carolina	0.405127	40	North Dakota	0.370561
16	California	0.402124	41	Rhode Island	0.369693
17	Georgia	0.401292	42	New York	0.365911
18	North Carolina	0.399032	43	Pennsylvania	0.365264
19	Maryland	0.398179	44	Indiana	0.364335
20	South Dakota	0.395676	45	Oregon	0.363043
21	Nevada	0.394104	46	Michigan	0.361719
22	Hawaii	0.390730	47	Washington	0.361241
23	Kansas	0.390551	48	Idaho	0.358658
24	Nebraska	0.390050	49	Ohio	0.355330
25	Colorado	0.389694	50	Utah	0.348366

TABLE XI

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE WHITE GROUP: 1960

Rank	State	Mean		Rank	State	Mean
1	Connecticut	$7,420		26	Louisiana	$5,648
2	New Jersey	7,293		27	Kentucky	5,619
3	D. C.	7,091		28	Texas	5,569
4	Delaware	7,057		29	Florida	5,529
5	Maryland	6,976		30	Minnesota	5,518
6	New York	6,869		31	Rhode Island	5,433
6	Illinois	6,869		32	Kansas	5,426
8	California	6,774		33	New Hampshire	5,417
9	Alaska	6,750		34	Georgia	5,357
10	Nevada	6,749		35	Missouri	5,354
11	Michigan	6,558		36	Montana	5,288
12	Ohio	6,415		37	Idaho	5,284
13	Massachusetts	6,290		38	Alabama	5,133
14	Washington	6,056		39	Iowa	5,086
15	Pennsylvania	6,022		40	Oklahoma	5,003
16	Arizona	5,995		41	Nebraska	4,997
17	Wyoming	5,982		42	South Carolina	4,932
18	Utah	5,928		43	North Carolina	4,879
19	Wisconsin	5,913		44	West Virginia	4,785
20	Indiana	5,901		45	Tennessee	4,765
21	Oregon	5,845		46	Vermont	4,708
22	New Mexico	5,803		47	Maine	4,687
23	Colorado	5,792		48	North Dakota	4,568
24	Hawaii	5,784		49	Mississippi	4,462
25	Virginia	5,666		50	South Dakota	4,319
				51	Arkansas	4,123

*in current dollars

TABLE XII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE WHITE GROUP: 1960

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	D.C.	59,324,354	26	Oregon	28,555,731
2	Connecticut	46,710,395	27	Kansas	28,362,025
3	Delaware	42,839,185	28	Georgia	27,802,573
4	New York	41,931,709	29	Washington	27,515,852
5	Hawaii	39,201,406	30	Wisconsin	27,437,635
6	California	39,040,604	31	Tennessee	27,044,099
7	Illinois	37,905,864	32	Minnesota	26,645,251
8	Arizona	37,364,739	33	North Carolina	26,119,563
9	New Jersey	36,761,129	34	Indiana	25,827,494
10	Florida	36,654,994	35	Wyoming	25,610,184
11	Maryland	36,068,542	36	Alabama	25,240,052
12	Texas	34,889,169	37	Rhode Island	24,877,627
13	Nevada	34,288,947	38	Iowa	24,419,117
14	Louisiana	33,356,285	39	Utah	24,154,759
15	Massachusetts	32,249,234	40	Nebraska	23,199,606
16	Alaska	32,050,594	41	New Hampshire	23,157,190
17	Ohio	31,481,549	42	South Carolina	22,493,883
18	Michigan	30,939,771	43	Montana	21,431,942
19	Missouri	30,659,853	44	West Virginia	21,367,738
20	Kentucky	30,426,394	45	Mississippi	20,516,871
21	Colorado	29,461,394	46	Arkansas	20,058,399
22	Virginia	28,985,732	47	Idaho	19,994,724
23	Pennsylvania	28,906,424	48	Vermont	19,502,921
24	New Mexico	28,589,058	49	Maine	17,090,506
25	Oklahoma	28,581,968	50	South Dakota	16,852,521
			51	North Dakota	16,350,929

TABLE XIII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE WHITE GROUP: 1960

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	Arkansas	0.415817	26	New York	0.379834
2	Tennessee	0.413581	27	Rhode Island	0.377852
3	Florida	0.411273	28	New Mexico	0.377633
4	Oklahoma	0.408685	29	Delaware	0.376052
5	Hawaii	0.408365	30	Oregon	0.375985
6	D.C.	0.405602	31	California	0.375785
7	North Carolina	0.405415	32	Connecticut	0.374405
8	Texas	0.405305	33	North Dakota	0.373041
9	Missouri	0.401289	34	Massachusetts	0.372513
10	Mississippi	0.401095	35	Maine	0.371903
11	Louisiana	0.398235	36	New Hampshire	0.371266
12	Arizona	0.396717	37	Pennsylvania	0.370850
13	Georgia	0.391809	38	Illinois	0.369990
14	Alabama	0.391421	39	Wisconsin	0.369521
15	Kansas	0.391050	40	Montana	0.368625
16	Kentucky	0.390523	41	Ohio	0.365942
17	Iowa	0.390136	42	Washington	0.364685
18	West Virginia	0.390038	43	Indiana	0.363844
19	Nebraska	0.388861	44	Nevada	0.363736
20	South Carolina	0.388614	45	Maryland	0.361808
21	South Dakota	0.388581	46	Idaho	0.361654
22	Vermont	0.384416	47	Wyoming	0.360040
23	Virginia	0.384053	48	Michigan	0.359501
24	Minnesota	0.381367	49	Alaska	0.356914
25	Colorado	0.381006	50	Utah	0.356013
			51	New Jersey	0.354329

TABLE XIV

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1960

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Hawaii	$6,322	26	Wyoming	$3,341
2	D.C.	4,565	27	Missouri	3,271
3	California	4,552	28	Delaware	3,224
4	Illinois	4,252	29	Montana	3,212
5	Wisconsin	4,227	30	New Hampshire	3,198
6	Washington	4,155	31	Rhode Island	3,131
7	Colorado	4,139	32	New Mexico	2,908
8	Connecticut	4,085	33	Arizona	2,808
9	Nevada	4,080	34	Virginia	2,799
10	Michigan	4,050	35	North Dakota	2,768
11	Ohio	4,033	36	West Virginia	2,766
12	Indiana	4,031	37	Maine	2,667
13	New York	3,996	38	Oklahoma	2,599
14	Iowa	3,963	38	Florida	2,599
15	Massachusetts	3,919	40	Texas	2,595
16	Oregon	3,897	41	Kentucky	2,495
17	Utah	3,892	42	South Dakota	2,473
18	Pennsylvania	3,787	43	Louisiana	2,390
19	Minnesota	3,783	44	Tennessee	2,354
20	Maryland	3,712	45	Georgia	2,335
21	Nebraska	3,675	46	Vermont	2,269
22	New Jersey	3,668	47	Alabama	2,249
23	Idaho	3,636	48	North Carolina	2,192
24	Alaska	3,508	49	South Carolina	1,917
25	Kansas	3,361	50	Arkansas	1,792
			51	Mississippi	1,653

*in current dollars

TABLE XV

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1960

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Hawaii	30,188,368	26	Arizona	9,382,362
2	Idaho	21,814,771	27	Pennsylvania	9,340,070
3	Iowa	20,414,271	28	North Dakota	8,996,933
4	Utah	20,000,385	29	Oklahoma	8,600,346
5	Colorado	18,921,322	30	Nebraska	8,588,551
6	Washington	15,625,663	31	Kansas	8,246,477
7	California	15,007,816	32	Delaware	8,221,101
8	Nevada	14,803,275	33	South Dakota	7,082,475
9	Oregon	13,431,641	34	Rhode Island	7,005,202
10	D.C.	13,247,244	35	New Hampshire	6,661,165
11	Alaska	13,088,403	36	West Virginia	6,586,507
12	New Jersey	12,946,180	37	Virginia	6,548,726
13	Illinois	12,476,668	38	Vermont	6,497,639
14	Michigan	11,142,051	39	Texas	6,094,616
15	Massachusetts	11,019,449	40	Maine	6,000,561
16	Minnesota	10,824,355	41	Wyoming	5,941,094
17	New York	10,562,179	42	Kentucky	5,450,579
18	Indiana	10,553,890	43	Tennessee	5,075,940
19	Ohio	10,519,802	44	Florida	4,933,766
20	Wisconsin	10,422,875	45	Louisiana	4,860,117
21	Connecticut	10,306,447	46	Alabama	4,742,012
22	Maryland	10,165,581	47	Georgia	4,709,690
23	Montana	10,153,389	48	North Carolina	4,385,470
24	New Mexico	10,060,705	49	Arkansas	3,814,370
25	Missouri	9,709,370	50	South Carolina	3,600,791
			51	Mississippi	2,823,995

TABLE XVI

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1960

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	Idaho	0.449478	26	Maine	0.390995
2	Arkansas	0.440090	27	Washington	0.389472
3	Vermont	0.438852	28	Virginia	0.388931
4	Oklahoma	0.435485	29	Oregon	0.388293
5	Utah	0.427733	30	Nevada	0.388002
6	South Dakota	0.427197	31	Delaware	0.380035
7	Mississippi	0.426735	32	Florida	0.375378
8	Arizona	0.426357	33	Minnesota	0.372362
9	Iowa	0.425833	34	Kansas	0.370557
10	North Dakota	0.425408	35	Maryland	0.370012
11	New Mexico	0.425364	36	Rhode Island	0.369455
12	South Carolina	0.416164	37	Massachusetts	0.366145
13	Colorado	0.409382	38	California	0.364885
14	Alaska	0.409327	39	Hawaii	0.364502
15	Alabama	0.406833	40	Illinois	0.360760
16	North Carolina	0.404417	41	Michigan	0.359782
17	Montana	0.403394	42	New Hampshire	0.358829
18	Tennessee	0.403078	43	New York	0.357117
19	Texas	0.399379	44	Pennsylvania	0.356220
20	New Jersey	0.398175	45	Indiana	0.355027
21	Georgia	0.396683	46	Ohio	0.354564
22	Kentucky	0.396640	47	Nebraska	0.354062
23	Missouri	0.394478	48	D.C.	0.351040
24	Louisiana	0.394429	49	Connecticut	0.349406
25	West Virginia	0.392428	50	Wisconsin	0.342788
			51	Wyoming	0.335719

TABLE XVII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE STATE: 1970

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Connecticut	$12,225	26	Utah	$9,014
2	New Jersey	11,725	27	Wyoming	8,910
3	Alaska	11,357	28	Missouri	8,783
4	Maryland	11,215	29	Florida	8,782
5	Michigan	10,876	30	Texas	8,777
6	New York	10,870	31	Iowa	8,681
7	Hawaii	10,869	32	Kansas	8,506
8	Illinois	10,765	33	Georgia	8,410
9	Nevada	10,447	34	Nebraska	8,312
10	Massachusetts	10,411	35	Vermont	8,286
11	California	10,396	36	Idaho	8,279
12	Delaware	10,199	37	New Mexico	8,252
13	Ohio	10,141	38	Montana	8,229
14	Washington	9,756	39	Oklahoma	7,873
15	Indiana	9,608	40	Louisiana	7,810
16	Wisconsin	9,578	41	North Carolina	7,781
17	Pennsylvania	9,489	42	Tennessee	7,717
18	Minnesota	9,484	43	Maine	7,696
19	D.C.	9,376	44	North Dakota	7,671
20	Arizona	9,243	45	Alabama	7,561
21	Rhode Island	9,184	46	Kentucky	7,519
22	Oregon	9,151	47	South Carolina	7,490
23	Virginia	9,143	48	South Dakota	7,343
24	Colorado	9,119	49	West Virginia	7,200
25	New Hampshire	9,101	50	Arkansas	6,589
			51	Mississippi	6,434

*in current dollars

TABLE XVIII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE STATE: 1970

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Connecticut	134,588,442	26	Oklahoma	80,618,533
2	New York	122,651,582	27	Virginia	80,265,362
3	D.C.	112,612,947	28	Wisconsin	79,110,021
4	New Jersey	110,203,206	29	Georgia	77,126,914
5	Alaska	104,851,508	30	Kansas	76,649,830
6	Hawaii	102,801,503	31	New Hampshire	76,161,840
7	Maryland	102,458,443	32	Utah	73,850,863
8	Illinois	101,418,060	33	Wyoming	73,468,756
9	California	100,920,094	34	Indiana	71,158,667
10	Florida	99,355,647	35	Iowa	71,007,081
11	Massachusetts	97,151,523	36	New Mexico	70,754,898
12	Michigan	94,466,836	37	Nebraska	69,801,214
13	Delaware	92,376,889	38	Montana	67,914,592
14	Rhode Island	91,357,747	39	North Carolina	67,673,010
15	Nevada	87,540,843	40	Tennessee	67,405,551
16	Ohio	86,695,074	41	Alabama	66,271,570
17	Missouri	86,430,654	42	Idaho	63,931,798
18	Texas	84,634,359	43	Vermont	63,854,645
19	Arizona	84,459,750	44	South Dakota	63,157,177
20	Pennsylvania	83,748,245	45	Kentucky	63,115,809
21	Minnesota	83,282,639	46	North Dakota	60,970,829
22	Oregon	82,921,031	47	South Carolina	57,996,796
23	Louisiana	81,572,434	48	Mississippi	57,108,470
24	Washington	81,268,458	49	Arkansas	54,816,839
25	Colorado	80,690,277	50	West Virginia	52,040,548
			51	Maine	48,421,283

TABLE XIX

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE STATE: 1970

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	Mississippi	0.425284	26	Colorado	0.387484
2	Louisiana	0.418738	27	Virginia	0.386461
3	Arkansas	0.416970	28	Iowa	0.385367
4	Oklahoma	0.416196	29	Idaho	0.385047
5	Florida	0.413495	30	Vermont	0.384758
6	D.C.	0.411965	31	Wyoming	0.383314
7	South Dakota	0.408164	32	Pennsylvania	0.382992
8	Alabama	0.406713	33	Minnesota	0.382571
9	Tennessee	0.404199	34	New Hampshire	0.382431
10	Kentucky	0.403374	35	California	0.382266
11	North Carolina	0.402916	36	Utah	0.381448
12	Missouri	0.401229	37	Massachusetts	0.378401
13	Texas	0.399466	38	Delaware	0.377758
14	Georgia	0.399430	39	Connecticut	0.377146
15	Rhode Island	0.397521	40	Illinois	0.375772
16	Kansas	0.396611	41	Wisconsin	0.375672
17	South Carolina	0.396295	42	Hawaii	0.375297
18	North Dakota	0.396128	43	Washington	0.374507
19	New Mexico	0.395270	44	Maine	0.373166
20	West Virginia	0.394147	45	Ohio	0.372847
21	Nebraska	0.392548	46	Maryland	0.368508
22	Montana	0.392007	47	Alaska	0.368186
23	New York	0.391467	48	Nevada	0.367728
24	Oregon	0.389309	49	Michigan	0.366901
25	Arizona	0.389046	50	New Jersey	0.366536
			51	Indiana	0.364720

TABLE XX

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE URBAN RESIDENCE: 1970

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	New Jersey	$11,723	26	Utah	$9,185
2	Connecticut	11,608	27	Texas	9,129
3	Maryland	11,405	28	Florida	9,041
4	Alaska	11,384	29	Wyoming	8,970
5	Hawaii	11,172	30	Kansas	8,926
6	Michigan	11,143	31	Georgia	8,887
7	New York	11,012	32	Nebraska	8,823
8	Illinois	10,998	33	New Hampshire	8,782
9	Delaware	10,553	34	Iowa	8,773
10	California	10,519	35	New Mexico	8,677
11	Nevada	10,507	36	Oklahoma	8,413
12	Ohio	10,251	37	Tennessee	8,333
13	Massachusetts	10,167	38	Kentucky	8,314
14	Minnesota	10,100	39	Alabama	8,275
15	Virginia	9,834	40	Louisiana	8,233
15	Wisconsin	9,834	41	Vermont	8,231
17	Washington	9,772	42	Idaho	8,220
18	Pennsylvania	9,581	43	Montana	8,212
19	Indiana	9,565	44	North Carolina	8,122
20	Arizona	9,476	45	West Virginia	7,916
21	D.C.	9,376	46	South Carolina	7,775
22	Missouri	9,351	47	North Dakota	7,629
23	Rhode Island	9,261	48	Maine	7,552
24	Oregon	9,241	49	South Dakota	7,493
25	Colorado	9,198	50	Arkansas	7,280
			51	Mississippi	7,178

*in current dollars

TABLE XXI

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE URBAN RESIDENCE: 1970

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	New York	133,305,393	26	North Carolina	86,600,765
2	Connecticut	115,925,825	27	Nevada	86,354,418
3	D.C.	112,612,947	28	Wisconsin	86,085,648
4	Alaska	110,969,110	29	Kansas	85,525,929
5	New Jersey	110,219,182	30	Washington	85,246,806
6	Florida	107,343,120	31	Colorado	82,609,913
7	Illinois	107,074,170	32	Tennessee	82,465,747
8	Hawaii	106,791,010	33	Alabama	81,414,122
9	California	102,699,412	34	Nebraska	79,826,427
10	Michigan	102,589,197	35	Utah	78,961,513
11	Maryland	102,288,520	36	Indiana	76,191,564
12	Missouri	96,988,820	37	Wyoming	74,767,652
13	Massachusetts	95,398,382	38	New Mexico	74,765,808
14	Ohio	93,797,584	39	Iowa	74,568,852
15	Louisiana	92,863,764	40	Kentucky	74,384,615
16	Minnesota	92,705,687	41	New Hampshire	72,533,347
17	Delaware	92,389,421	42	Arkansas	70,361,043
18	Rhode Island	91,548,335	43	West Virginia	69,626,437
19	Texas	91,513,254	44	South Carolina	68,632,072
20	Oklahoma	91,498,096	45	Montana	68,576,146
21	Georgia	91,360,062	46	Idaho	66,336,211
22	Pennsylvania	91,011,319	47	Mississippi	65,344,700
23	Virginia	88,857,715	48	South Dakota	64,097,119
24	Oregon	88,676,514	49	Vermont	63,168,105
25	Arizona	87,049,382	50	North Dakota	60,505,807
			51	Maine	48,219,928

TABLE XXII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE URBAN RESIDENCE: 1970

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	Louisiana	0.419831	26	Pennsylvania	0.388844
2	Arkansas	0.419432	27	Colorado	0.387956
3	North Carolina	0.416443	28	Iowa	0.387858
4	Mississippi	0.415696	29	Arizona	0.386896
5	Florida	0.414654	30	Vermont	0.385090
6	Oklahoma	0.414511	31	New Hampshire	0.385036
7	D.C.	0.411965	32	Utah	0.383994
8	Alabama	0.407472	33	Wyoming	0.383617
9	Tennessee	0.407257	34	California	0.381565
10	South Dakota	0.405478	35	Massachusetts	0.381427
11	South Carolina	0.404352	36	Virginia	0.381405
12	Georgia	0.403907	37	Minnesota	0.380053
13	West Virginia	0.402093	38	Washington	0.378747
14	Missouri	0.399407	39	Wisconsin	0.378401
15	Texas	0.398846	40	Ohio	0.378183
16	Kentucky	0.398393	41	Maine	0.376752
17	Kansas	0.397113	42	Illinois	0.376625
18	North Dakota	0.396526	43	Connecticut	0.373373
19	New York	0.396434	44	Hawaii	0.373238
20	Rhode Island	0.396077	45	Alaska	0.373121
21	Oregon	0.393591	46	Indiana	0.372322
22	Montana	0.393333	47	Delaware	0.370879
23	Nebraska	0.393077	48	Michigan	0.369930
24	New Mexico	0.390322	49	New Jersey	0.366585
25	Idaho	0.390016	50	Nevada	0.365231
			51	Maryland	0.364948

TABLE XXIII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE RURAL RESIDENCE: 1970

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Connecticut	$14,652	26	Montana	$8,249
2	Massachusetts	11,964	27	Utah	8,221
3	New Jersey	11,745	28	Arizona	8,168
4	Alaska	11,327	29	Minnesota	8,063
5	Maryland	10,532	30	Maine	7,867
6	Nevada	10,186	31	Virginia	7,755
7	New York	10,118	32	North Dakota	7,712
8	Michigan	10,031	33	Kansas	7,692
9	Ohio	9,764	34	Florida	7,595
10	Washington	9,710	35	Georgia	7,567
11	Indiana	9,700	36	North Carolina	7,440
12	New Hampshire	9,573	37	Nebraska	7,418
13	Illinois	9,519	38	Missouri	7,325
14	Delaware	9,284	39	Texas	7,314
15	Pennsylvania	9,226	40	South Dakota	7,200
16	Hawaii	9,184	41	South Carolina	7,170
17	California	9,083	42	New Mexico	7,063
18	Wisconsin	9,001	43	Louisiana	6,833
19	Oregon	8,939	44	Tennessee	6,722
20	Wyoming	8,809	45	West Virginia	6,644
21	Colorado	8,784	46	Oklahoma	6,593
22	Rhode Island	8,721	47	Kentucky	6,480
23	Iowa	8,541	48	Alabama	6,422
24	Idaho	8,361	49	Arkansas	5,801
25	Vermont	8,315	50	Mississippi	5,735

*in current dollars

TABLE XXIV

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE RURAL RESIDENCE: 1970

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Connecticut	208,378,689	26	South Dakota	62,443,240
2	New Jersey	110,823,557	27	Florida	62,083,509
3	Massachusetts	105,180,872	28	North Dakota	61,531,601
4	Maryland	103,851,353	29	Virginia	61,441,633
5	Alaska	98,068,144	30	Indiana	61,032,081
6	Delaware	97,961,902	31	Idaho	60,636,687
7	Nevada	93,402,185	32	Minnesota	59,023,468
8	Rhode Island	90,238,635	33	New Mexico	57,741,026
9	New Hampshire	84,038,005	34	Kansas	56,578,080
10	New York	82,645,727	35	Missouri	56,168,541
11	California	81,396,019	36	Louisiana	54,323,145
12	Hawaii	78,138,461	37	Texas	54,310,813
13	Colorado	72,799,822	38	Oklahoma	51,986,618
14	Wyoming	71,411,171	39	Nebraska	51,734,575
15	Illinois	69,997,101	40	Georgia	51,323,536
16	Washington	68,999,522	41	Mississippi	50,308,527
17	Oregon	68,785,653	42	Utah	49,762,485
18	Michigan	68,420,808	43	Maine	48,990,309
19	Montana	66,787,859	44	North Carolina	48,486,848
20	Iowa	65,667,960	45	Kentucky	46,365,578
21	Vermont	64,233,416	46	South Carolina	45,826,831
22	Wisconsin	63,825,849	47	Tennessee	41,897,854
23	Arizona	63,627,688	48	Alabama	39,960,663
24	Pennsylvania	63,169,886	49	West Virginia	37,692,512
25	Ohio	63,015,035	50	Arkansas	36,013,189

TABLE XXV

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE RURAL RESIDENCE: 1970

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	Mississippi	0.436821	26	Minnesota	0.382815
2	Oklahoma	0.412053	27	South Carolina	0.382707
3	South Dakota	0.411043	28	Georgia	0.382462
4	Louisiana	0.408855	29	Maryland	0.382362
5	New Mexico	0.407774	30	Connecticut	0.382292
6	Rhode Island	0.406447	31	New Hampshire	0.381544
7	Kentucky	0.404983	32	Iowa	0.381220
8	Arkansas	0.404115	33	North Carolina	0.380450
9	Delaware	0.401688	34	West Virginia	0.379575
10	Florida	0.399830	35	Nevada	0.379060
11	Missouri	0.397833	36	Idaho	0.377907
12	North Dakota	0.395903	37	Oregon	0.376328
13	Texas	0.394966	38	Maine	0.369669
14	Virginia	0.394636	39	New York	0.368689
15	Alabama	0.392622	40	Wisconsin	0.367582
16	Montana	0.389941	41	New Jersey	0.366732
17	California	0.389090	42	Illinois	0.365031
18	Kansas	0.388481	43	Alaska	0.362257
19	Tennessee	0.387567	44	Utah	0.361880
20	Nebraska	0.387391	45	Pennsylvania	0.361395
21	Arizona	0.387357	46	Washington	0.359475
22	Colorado	0.385337	47	Massachusetts	0.357927
23	Vermont	0.384607	48	Michigan	0.351828
24	Hawaii	0.383024	49	Ohio	0.349227
25	Wyoming	0.382928	50	Indiana	0.347386

TABLE XXVI

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE WHITE GROUP: 1970

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Connecticut	$12,530	26	Oregon	$9,231
2	New Jersey	12,247	27	Colorado	9,230
3	Alaska	12,218	28	New Hampshire	9,120
4	Maryland	11,967	29	Utah	9,109
5	D.C.	11,504	30	Missouri	9,040
6	New York	11,393	31	Louisiana	9,015
7	Michigan	11,229	32	Wyoming	8,985
8	Illinois	11,208	33	Iowa	8,713
9	Delaware	10,862	34	Kansas	8,662
10	Nevada	10,700	35	Alabama	8,533
11	California	10,682	36	New Mexico	8,506
12	Massachusetts	10,558	37	North Carolina	8,487
13	Ohio	10,438	38	South Carolina	8,472
14	Washington	9,861	39	Nebraska	8,387
15	Virginia	9,852	40	Montana	8,322
16	Indiana	9,766	41	Idaho	8,317
17	Pennsylvania	9,751	42	Vermont	8,288
18	Wisconsin	9,659	43	Tennessee	8,187
19	Hawaii	9,651	44	Oklahoma	8,176
20	Arizona	9,551	45	Mississippi	7,743
21	Minnesota	9,530	46	North Dakota	7,733
22	Georgia	9,433	47	Kentucky	7,732
23	Florida	9,350	48	Maine	7,718
24	Rhode Island	9,324	49	South Dakota	7,424
25	Texas	9,267	50	West Virginia	7,305
			51	Arkansas	7,129

*in current dollars

TABLE XXVII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE WHITE GROUP: 1970

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	D.C.	208,605,054	26	Oregon	83,229,335
2	Connecticut	139,247,579	27	Colorado	82,302,243
3	New York	131,622,211	28	Washington	82,255,703
4	New Jersey	116,263,560	29	Wisconsin	79,800,424
5	Alaska	110,432,042	30	Kansas	78,176,797
6	Maryland	109,776,733	31	New Hampshire	76,362,784
7	Illinois	107,412,432	32	Alabama	74,686,206
8	Florida	106,998,131	33	Utah	74,280,000
9	California	105,192,311	34	Wyoming	73,840,089
10	Hawaii	100,296,439	35	North Carolina	73,659,590
11	Massachusetts	98,823,593	36	Tennessee	72,819,893
12	Delaware	98,797,657	37	Indiana	72,670,827
13	Michigan	98,794,201	38	New Mexico	72,615,672
14	Rhode Island	93,592,973	39	Iowa	71,258,384
15	Louisiana	92,734,397	40	Nebraska	70,952,478
16	Ohio	90,079,684	41	Montana	67,877,239
17	Texas	89,936,100	42	Mississippi	65,809,555
18	Missouri	89,867,660	43	South Carolina	65,623,582
19	Nevada	89,119,081	44	Kentucky	65,124,775
20	Georgia	87,647,529	45	Idaho	63,682,798
21	Virginia	87,196,068	46	Vermont	63,610,171
22	Pennsylvania	86,974,442	47	South Dakota	62,437,694
23	Arizona	86,658,521	48	North Dakota	61,703,681
24	Oklahoma	84,338,815	49	Arkansas	58,394,167
25	Minnesota	83,666,550	50	West Virginia	52,973,955
			51	Maine	48,560,268

TABLE XXVIII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE WHITE GROUP: 1970

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	D.C.	0.425583	26	Iowa	0.384955
2	Oklahoma	0.412894	27	Arizona	0.384900
3	Florida	0.408091	28	Vermont	0.384331
4	Arkansas	0.406935	29	Idaho	0.383733
5	South Dakota	0.404931	30	South Carolina	0.382821
6	Louisiana	0.402475	31	New Hampshire	0.382259
7	Mississippi	0.401334	32	Wyoming	0.382090
8	Kentucky	0.400656	33	Minnesota	0.382032
9	Tennessee	0.399503	34	Pennsylvania	0.381084
10	Missouri	0.399119	35	California	0.380757
11	Rhode Island	0.396756	36	Utah	0.379866
12	Hawaii	0.396303	37	Virginia	0.379250
13	North Dakota	0.395612	38	Massachusetts	0.377207
14	Kansas	0.394813	39	Connecticut	0.375483
15	Texas	0.394330	40	Wisconsin	0.374791
16	Alabama	0.393580	41	Washington	0.373488
17	North Carolina	0.393377	42	Illinois	0.373145
18	West Virginia	0.392850	43	Maine	0.372846
19	Nebraska	0.392267	44	Delaware	0.371475
20	New Mexico	0.391597	45	Ohio	0.370667
21	Montana	0.389679	46	Michigan	0.364742
22	New York	0.388799	47	Nevada	0.364573
23	Georgia	0.388440	48	Indiana	0.363406
24	Oregon	0.387938	49	New Jersey	0.362907
25	Colorado	0.386912	50	Maryland	0.362034
			51	Alaska	0.358401

TABLE XXIX

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1970

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Hawaii	$11,929	26	Nebraska	$5,830
2	Michigan	8,064	27	New Hampshire	5,785
3	D.C.	8,005	28	Kansas	5,614
4	Vermont	7,772	29	Virginia	5,551
5	California	7,771	30	Wyoming	5,444
6	Illinois	7,611	31	Utah	5,421
7	Connecticut	7,517	32	Rhode Island	5,400
8	Maryland	7,480	33	Montana	5,308
9	New Jersey	7,438	34	Texas	5,221
10	Washington	7,390	35	Arizona	5,084
11	Indiana	7,320	36	South Dakota	5,013
12	New York	7,254	37	Florida	5,005
13	Ohio	7,180	38	North Carolina	4,984
14	Nevada	7,069	39	Oklahoma	4,954
15	Wisconsin	7,065	40	New Mexico	4,934
16	Minnesota	6,814	41	Georgia	4,880
17	Pennsylvania	6,729	42	Kentucky	4,862
18	Alaska	6,623	43	Tennessee	4,854
19	Massachusetts	6,548	44	North Dakota	4,728
20	Colorado	6,460	45	West Virginia	4,649
21	Iowa	6,363	46	Louisiana	4,585
22	Missouri	6,325	47	South Carlonia	4,523
23	Oregon	6,302	48	Alabama	4,322
24	Delaware	6,070	49	Maine	4,276
25	Idaho	5,931	50	Arkansas	4,171
			51	Mississippi	3,528

*in current dollars

TABLE XXX

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1970

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Arkansas	285,997,146	26	Kansas	43,526,937
2	Vermont	134,370,898	27	Connecticut	43,270,359
3	Hawaii	102,978,874	28	New Jersey	42,225,356
4	Nevada	99,735,695	29	Pennsylvania	40,733,680
5	Idaho	78,999,192	30	Wyoming	40,630,226
6	South Dakota	78,864,111	31	Arizona	38,566,507
7	Louisiana	72,574,418	32	Massachusetts	36,853,629
8	Oregon	67,419,763	33	Florida	36,774,386
9	Montana	61,407,779	34	Colorado	36,711,721
10	North Carolina	60,348,249	35	New Mexico	35,742,668
11	Iowa	58,677,093	36	Oklahoma	34,465,619
12	Minnesota	56,316,627	37	Delaware	33,396,812
13	Washington	55,045,947	38	Alabama	33,101,646
14	Wisconsin	55,007,771	39	Texas	32,433,821
15	California	54,444,143	40	Kentucky	31,416,737
16	Michigan	51,218,254	41	New Hampshire	30,892,826
17	D.C.	50,261,507	42	Virginia	30,353,127
18	Utah	49,802,794	43	Rhode Island	30,291,335
19	Maryland	49,191,950	44	Nebraska	28,684,554
20	Alaska	48,401,130	45	South Carolina	26,407,894
21	Illinois	47,767,442	46	Mississippi	26,066,475
22	New York	46,891,154	47	Tennessee	24,874,983
23	Missouri	46,094,783	48	Georgia	24,842,780
24	Ohio	44,627,621	49	West Virginia	22,103,112
25	Indiana	43,544,627	50	North Dakota	20,524,354
			51	Maine	15,276,880

TABLE XXXI

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1970

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	Arkansas	0.559217	26	Georgia	0.405152
2	Louisiana	0.502007	27	Alaska	0.404517
3	South Dakota	0.492930	28	West Virginia	0.404206
4	Mississippi	0.478365	29	Wisconsin	0.403246
5	North Carolina	0.476700	30	Rhode Island	0.402639
6	Montana	0.466924	31	Virginia	0.396862
7	Idaho	0.465677	32	Washington	0.394116
8	Vermont	0.457798	33	North Dakota	0.392853
9	Alabama	0.457288	34	New Hampshire	0.389636
10	Nevada	0.452550	35	Delaware	0.386985
11	Utah	0.446844	36	Maine	0.384920
12	Oregon	0.443072	37	Pennsylvania	0.384571
13	Arizona	0.437769	38	Colorado	0.382987
14	New Mexico	0.437142	39	California	0.382652
15	Florida	0.436752	40	New York	0.382503
16	Oklahoma	0.433058	41	Maryland	0.380739
17	Iowa	0.429776	42	Massachusetts	0.380457
18	Wyoming	0.428539	43	Nebraska	0.380439
19	Kentucky	0.428508	44	Ohio	0.379797
20	Kansas	0.428462	45	Illinois	0.374171
21	South Carolina	0.427640	46	Indiana	0.373238
22	Texas	0.416455	47	Michigan	0.368863
23	Minnesota	0.412697	48	D.C.	0.368537
24	Missouri	0.409421	49	Connecticut	0.366918
25	Tennessee	0.406459	50	New Jersey	0.366717
			51	Hawaii	0.356456

TABLE XXXII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE STATE: 1980

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Alaska	$33,791	26	Pennsylvania	$19,888
2	Hawaii	25,293	27	New Hampshire	19,885
3	Connecticut	24,330	28	Iowa	19,840
4	Maryland	24,291	29	Kansas	19,801
5	New Jersey	23,809	30	Nebraska	19,093
6	D.C.	23,113	31	Rhode Island	19,076
7	Illinois	22,850	32	Louisiana	19,073
8	California	22,780	33	Missouri	18,945
9	Wyoming	22,674	34	Florida	18,921
10	Michigan	22,400	35	Georgia	18,643
11	Nevada	22,167	36	Montana	18,410
12	Colorado	21,762	37	North Dakota	18,357
13	Washington	21,591	38	Oklahoma	18,317
14	Delaware	21,589	39	Idaho	18,239
15	Virginia	21,528	40	New Mexico	18,220
16	Massachusetts	21,078	41	Vermont	17,696
17	Minnesota	21,011	42	South Carolina	17,675
18	New York	20,848	43	West Virginia	17,495
19	Texas	20,678	44	North Carolina	17,479
20	Utah	20,579	45	Tennessee	17,468
21	Wisconsin	20,556	46	Kentucky	17,209
22	Ohio	20,532	47	Alabama	17,022
23	Indiana	20,343	48	South Dakota	16,306
24	Oregon	20,067	49	Maine	16,250
25	Arizona	20,025	50	Mississippi	15,714
			51	Arkansas	15,654

*in current dollars

TABLE XXXIII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE STATE : 1980

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Alaska	821,768,481	26	Oklahoma	237,277,620
2	D.C.	535,681,143	27	Missouri	234,004,015
3	Hawaii	386,968,564	28	Wisconsin	233,378,965
4	Connecticut	369,650,612	29	Iowa	232,856,286
5	California	348,153,588	30	Pennsylvania	232,091,144
6	New Jersey	345,314,089	31	Ohio	230,378,086
7	Maryland	342,163,114	32	Nebraska	229,352,352
8	Illinois	313,532,589	33	New Mexico	226,365,014
9	New York	312,680,573	34	Rhode Island	222,904,648
10	Virginia	298,249,986	35	Utah	219,612,854
11	Texas	290,850,572	36	Indiana	218,830,505
12	Delaware	289,652,465	37	Tennessee	214,227,870
13	Nevada	288,469,674	38	New Hampshire	213,426,174
14	Michigan	283,789,865	39	Montana	209,034,880
15	Colorado	283,466,497	40	North Dakota	208,281,531
16	Florida	276,884,365	41	Alabama	204,730,580
17	Louisiana	275,990,713	42	Kentucky	202,657,403
18	Massachusetts	275,058,406	43	South Carolina	201,126,098
19	Washington	267,161,044	44	Mississippi	199,072,359
20	Wyoming	263,212,000	45	Idaho	197,897,495
21	Minnesota	262,324,292	46	North Carolina	197,418,210
22	Kansas	249,498,919	47	West Virginia	195,135,274
23	Arizona	248,982,204	48	Arkansas	191,111,541
24	Georgia	247,021,412	49	Vermont	186,566,158
25	Oregon	242,438,760	50	South Dakota	185,670,830
			51	Maine	143,355,162

TABLE XXXIV

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE STATE: 1980

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	D.C.	0.387511	26	Arizona	0.342589
2	Mississippi	0.371380	27	Delaware	0.342058
3	Arkansas	0.368121	28	Massachusetts	0.341869
4	Florida	0.365106	29	Rhode Island	0.341631
5	Louisiana	0.363125	30	Connecticut	0.341625
6	Alabama	0.357228	31	Vermont	0.339453
7	New York	0.356989	32	Oregon	0.339441
8	Georgia	0.356869	33	New Jersey	0.339297
9	Oklahoma	0.356551	34	Idaho	0.339032
10	South Dakota	0.356503	35	Colorado	0.338202
11	Tennessee	0.356310	36	Hawaii	0.338162
12	Kentucky	0.353873	37	Illinois	0.338159
13	Alaska	0.353250	38	Iowa	0.337745
14	New Mexico	0.352936	39	Minnesota	0.337739
15	Texas	0.351496	40	Pennsylvania	0.336897
16	California	0.349288	41	Nevada	0.336100
17	Missouri	0.348029	42	Maryland	0.334200
18	North Carolina	0.347919	43	Washington	0.333853
19	South Carolina	0.347402	44	Michigan	0.332244
20	West Virginia	0.346504	45	Maine	0.330583
21	Virginia	0.345594	46	Wisconsin	0.330452
22	Kansas	0.345175	47	Ohio	0.329375
23	Nebraska	0.344344	48	New Hampshire	0.328343
24	North Dakota	0.342889	49	Indiana	0.326065
25	Montana	0.342643	50	Utah	0.323980
			51	Wyoming	0.322013

TABLE XXXV

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE URBAN RESIDENCE: 1980

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Alaska	$35,570	26	Missouri	$19,979
2	Hawaii	25,842	27	Indiana	19,925
3	Maryland	24,487	28	Oregon	19,921
4	New Jersey	23,620	29	Pennsylvania	19,876
5	D.C.	23,113	30	Nebraska	19,840
6	Virginia	23,056	31	North Dakota	19,588
7	Connecticut	23,038	32	Louisiana	19,512
8	Michigan	22,885	33	Georgia	19,433
9	California	22,833	34	Florida	19,211
10	Wyoming	22,793	35	Oklahoma	18,939
11	Delaware	22,530	36	New Mexico	18,868
12	Minnesota	22,248	37	West Virginia	18,834
13	Nevada	22,156	38	New Hampshire	18,639
14	Colorado	21,758	39	Rhode Island	18,631
15	Washington	21,550	40	Montana	18,570
16	Texas	21,074	41	Idaho	18,448
17	New York	20,974	42	South Carolina	18,397
18	Illinois	20,966	43	Tennessee	18,376
19	Utah	20,835	44	North Carolina	18,322
20	Wisconsin	20,808	45	Kentucky	18,280
21	Massachusetts	20,627	46	Alabama	17,951
22	Kansas	20,413	47	Vermont	17,744
23	Ohio	20,369	48	South Dakota	17,672
24	Arizona	20,346	49	Mississippi	16,885
25	Iowa	20,141	50	Maine	16,440
			51	Arkansas	16,299

*in current dollars

TABLE XXXVI

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE URBAN RESIDENCE: 1980

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Alaska	859,518,347	26	Missouri	250,898,402
2	D.C.	535,681,143	27	Pennsylvania	246,890,160
3	Hawaii	393,328,685	28	West Virginia	245,713,508
4	Illinois	372,758,647	29	Oregon	242,573,226
5	Maryland	351,422,125	30	Tennessee	241,457,669
6	California	347,633,428	31	Ohio	238,993,789
7	New Jersey	343,327,682	32	Wisconsin	235,572,810
8	Connecticut	332,125,165	33	North Carolina	232,659,595
9	New York	330,640,641	34	Alabama	232,203,827
10	Virginia	329,310,760	35	Iowa	231,554,613
11	Michigan	307,559,265	36	New Mexico	230,921,754
12	Texas	300,637,692	37	Nebraska	230,343,969
13	Delaware	298,292,221	38	Utah	225,794,101
14	Louisiana	289,155,746	39	Mississippi	225,641,766
15	Florida	286,430,151	40	Indiana	222,706,370
16	Nevada	286,172,439	41	South Carolina	221,530,838
17	Minnesota	281,367,776	42	Kentucky	219,879,980
18	Colorado	278,541,656	43	Rhode Island	218,580,417
19	Georgia	275,856,304	44	North Dakota	216,791,539
20	Massachusetts	271,848,352	45	Montana	208,613,311
21	Washington	269,556,477	46	Idaho	204,049,456
22	Wyoming	266,154,022	47	South Dakota	197,590,808
23	Kansas	262,448,008	48	New Hamsphire	197,143,783
24	Oklahoma	252,418,929	49	Vermont	192,322,459
25	Arizona	251,500,289	50	Arkansas	187,272,297
			51	Maine	162,631,401

TABLE XXXVII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE URBAN RESIDENCE: 1980

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	D.C.	0.387511	26	Connecticut	0.342243
2	Illinois	0.372947	27	Vermont	0.341992
3	Mississippi	0.368665	28	Virginia	0.341226
4	Florida	0.365285	29	Maine	0.341161
5	Louisiana	0.362995	30	Oregon	0.341043
6	New York	0.361248	31	Montana	0.340591
7	Georgia	0.359183	32	New Jersey	0.340377
8	Alabama	0.358639	33	Arizona	0.340250
9	Tennessee	0.357623	34	Idaho	0.339734
10	Arkansas	0.357467	35	Nebraska	0.336638
11	Oklahoma	0.355722	36	Colorado	0.336466
12	North Carolina	0.354519	37	Delaware	0.336080
13	West Virginia	0.354192	38	Michigan	0.335897
14	Texas	0.350843	39	Nevada	0.335394
15	Kentucky	0.349298	40	Hawaii	0.335347
16	South Carolina	0.348702	41	Maryland	0.335216
17	California	0.348659	42	Washington	0.335161
18	New Mexico	0.347549	43	Ohio	0.334819
19	Alaska	0.347423	44	New Hampshire	0.333999
20	South Dakota	0.345628	45	Iowa	0.333977
21	Massachusetts	0.345231	46	North Dakota	0.333153
22	Rhode Island	0.344654	47	Minnesota	0.332805
23	Kansas	0.343873	48	Indiana	0.332281
24	Missouri	0.343852	49	Wisconsin	0.328825
25	Pennsylvania	0.343312	50	Utah	0.324204
			51	Wyoming	0.322045

TABLE XXXVIII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE RURAL RESIDENCE: 1980

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Alaska	$30,194	26	Kansas	$18,500
2	Connecticut	29,664	27	Virginia	18,350
3	New Jersey	25,418	28	Minnesota	18,235
4	Massachusetts	23,588	29	Montana	18,221
5	Maryland	23,403	30	Arizona	18,079
6	Wyoming	22,453	31	Louisiana	18,037
7	Rhode Island	22,383	32	Nebraska	17,774
8	Nevada	22,270	33	Vermont	17,687
9	California	22,249	34	Georgia	17,241
10	Hawaii	21,902	35	Florida	17,216
11	Colorado	21,839	36	North Dakota	17,128
12	Illinois	21,829	37	Oklahoma	16,927
13	Washington	21,725	38	South Carolina	16,767
14	Indiana	21,175	39	North Carolina	16,682
15	Michigan	21,171	40	West Virginia	16,637
16	Ohio	21,060	41	Missouri	16,621
17	New Hampshire	21,028	42	Maine	16,339
18	Oregon	20,435	43	New Mexico	16,317
19	New York	20,189	44	Kentucky	16,003
20	Wisconsin	20,054	45	Tennessee	15,997
21	Pennsylvania	19,928	46	Idaho	15,699
22	Iowa	19,398	47	Alabama	15,553
23	Delaware	19,336	48	South Dakota	15,021
24	Texas	19,143	49	Arkansas	14,630
25	Utah	19,083	50	Mississippi	14,574

*in current dollars

TABLE XXXIX

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE RURAL RESIDENCE: 1980

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Alaska	729,691,119	26	Kansas	218,822,500
2	Connecticut	502,634,426	27	New York	216,448,396
3	California	362,380,023	28	Indiana	211,085,706
4	New Jersey	356,785,735	29	Montana	210,796,906
5	Hawaii	340,998,253	30	Minnesota	208,451,580
6	Colorado	312,438,092	31	New Mexico	208,133,958
7	Nevada	306,660,786	32	Ohio	205,034,621
8	Maryland	298,933,624	33	Oklahoma	201,094,874
9	Massachusetts	284,567,458	34	Pennsylvania	196,531,350
10	Delaware	266,397,590	35	North Dakota	196,340,723
11	Washington	260,797,086	36	Georgia	194,279,114
12	Illinois	258,237,803	37	Missouri	188,414,391
13	Wyoming	257,585,584	38	Vermont	185,508,310
14	Texas	255,802,221	39	Utah	181,591,631
15	Louisiana	244,647,353	40	Kentucky	180,639,868
16	Oregon	244,240,091	41	South Carolina	174,281,832
17	New Hampshire	243,201,278	42	South Dakota	171,010,058
18	Rhode Island	243,087,955	43	Mississippi	170,629,342
19	Iowa	236,244,631	44	Tennessee	167,513,270
20	Wisconsin	229,430,740	45	North Carolina	164,553,959
21	Arizona	228,550,614	46	Idaho	164,082,377
22	Nebraska	225,713,985	47	West Virginia	162,075,177
23	Michigan	224,194,745	48	Arkansas	161,143,887
24	Florida	219,370,728	49	Alabama	159,925,331
25	Virginia	219,007,926	50	Maine	152,872,995

TABLE XL

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE RURAL RESIDENCE: 1980

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	Mississippi	0.372007	26	Minnesota	0.344395
2	New Mexico	0.367850	27	South Carolina	0.344043
3	South Dakota	0.365761	28	Iowa	0.343991
4	Arkansas	0.365417	29	Nevada	0.341303
5	Alaska	0.364171	30	North Carolina	0.339217
6	Louisiana	0.362843	31	Vermont	0.338977
7	Florida	0.361770	32	West Virginia	0.338231
8	California	0.358110	33	Oregon	0.336348
9	Nebraska	0.357888	34	Maine	0.336085
10	Kentucky	0.357732	35	Wisconsin	0.333954
11	Delaware	0.356757	36	Connecticut	0.331428
12	Oklahoma	0.356609	37	Washington	0.330093
13	Arizona	0.355547	38	New Hampshire	0.329856
14	Hawaii	0.355358	39	New Jersey	0.328972
15	Texas	0.354804	40	Maryland	0.328323
16	Missouri	0.353898	41	Illinois	0.328078
17	Idaho	0.352045	42	New York	0.326557
18	North Dakota	0.351664	43	Wyoming	0.321870
19	Alabama	0.351430	44	Massachusetts	0.321657
20	Tennessee	0.350108	45	Utah	0.320481
21	Georgia	0.349184	46	Michigan	0.320079
22	Virginia	0.348084	47	Pennsylvania	0.319391
23	Colorado	0.347258	48	Rhode Island	0.316599
24	Kansas	0.346267	49	Indiana	0.313844
25	Montana	0.345699	50	Ohio	0.312005

TABLE XLI

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE WHITE GROUP: 1980

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	D.C.	$38,316	26	Georgia	$20,603
2	Alaska	35,584	27	South Carolina	20,443
3	Maryland	26,631	28	Indiana	20,313
4	Hawaii	25,180	29	Alabama	20,171
5	Connecticut	25,131	30	Kansas	20,151
6	New Jersey	25,018	31	Oregon	20,121
7	Illinois	24,499	32	Iowa	19,926
8	Michigan	24,040	33	New Hampshire	19,895
9	California	23,944	34	Tennessee	19,826
10	Virginia	22,964	35	Florida	19,789
11	Wyoming	22,886	36	Oklahoma	19,671
12	Delaware	22,787	37	Missouri	19,403
13	Nevada	22,699	38	New Mexico	19,354
14	Louisiana	22,433	39	Nebraska	19,287
15	New York	22,303	40	Kentucky	18,993
16	Colorado	22,282	41	Rhode Island	18,904
17	Texas	21,964	42	North Carolina	18,791
18	Washington	21,866	43	Idaho	18,614
19	Ohio	21,166	44	Montana	18,610
20	Minnesota	21,148	45	North Dakota	18,466
21	Massachusetts	21,039	46	Mississippi	18,106
22	Arizona	20,919	47	Arkansas	17,904
23	Wisconsin	20,778	48	South Dakota	17,852
24	Utah	20,777	49	Vermont	17,695
25	Pennsylvania	20,683	50	West Virginia	17,608
			51	Maine	16,427

*in current dollars

TABLE XLII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE WHITE GROUP: 1980

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	D.C.	1,739,093,751	26	Alabama	257,732,174
2	Alaska	728,359,958	27	Pennsylvania	255,552,820
3	Hawaii	437,093,516	28	Kansas	253,892,727
4	Maryland	388,554,130	29	Ohio	245,647,920
5	Connecticut	382,752,479	30	Oregon	244,744,944
6	California	377,264,428	31	New Mexico	244,302,380
7	New Jersey	361,253,364	32	South Carolina	242,186,225
8	Illinois	343,125,870	33	Missouri	241,443,515
9	New York	335,699,799	34	Wisconsin	235,395,997
10	Louisiana	328,724,058	35	Arkansas	234,992,115
11	Michigan	320,659,087	36	Iowa	233,867,224
12	Virginia	318,706,275	37	Nebraska	231,518,750
13	Texas	317,085,383	38	Kentucky	227,111,539
14	Delaware	305,616,885	39	Indiana	226,347,958
15	Nevada	298,645,433	40	Mississippi	225,776,463
16	Colorado	293,626,722	41	Utah	221,659,156
17	Florida	290,620,082	42	Rhode Island	220,830,758
18	Massachusetts	276,864,660	43	New Hampshire	213,513,190
19	Washington	271,219,877	44	North Carolina	213,375,023
20	Georgia	270,656,000	45	Montana	211,136,673
21	Wyoming	266,841,965	46	North Dakota	208,042,074
22	Oklahoma	266,169,088	47	Idaho	206,870,336
23	Minnesota	263,881,643	48	South Dakota	199,194,108
24	Arizona	261,593,284	49	West Virginia	194,751,136
25	Tennessee	260,408,535	50	Vermont	186,390,568
			51	Maine	160,323,671

TABLE XLIII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE WHITE GROUP: 1980

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	D.C.	0.397095	26	Maine	0.339854
2	Florida	0.360569	27	Oregon	0.339835
3	Arkansas	0.360385	28	Vermont	0.339368
4	Mississippi	0.354002	29	Idaho	0.339228
5	Oklahoma	0.353073	30	Virginia	0.338769
6	Hawaii	0.351173	31	Pennsylvania	0.338404
7	New York	0.350051	32	Connecticut	0.338397
8	Tennessee	0.349228	33	Arizona	0.338381
9	New Mexico	0.347868	34	Iowa	0.337269
10	Texas	0.347545	35	Minnesota	0.336969
11	California	0.346965	36	Colorado	0.336807
12	Louisiana	0.346751	37	Delaware	0.336156
13	Missouri	0.346143	38	South Carolina	0.335404
14	Georgia	0.345033	39	Nevada	0.334633
15	West Virginia	0.344925	40	New Jersey	0.333528
16	Alabama	0.344553	41	Washington	0.332718
17	Kentucky	0.344460	42	Illinois	0.332706
18	South Dakota	0.344288	43	Alaska	0.331149
19	Kansas	0.343244	44	Maryland	0.329997
20	Nebraska	0.343155	45	Indiana	0.329844
21	Massachusetts	0.342920	46	Michigan	0.329811
22	Rhode Island	0.342604	47	Ohio	0.329494
23	North Dakota	0.341509	48	Wisconsin	0.329054
24	Montana	0.341361	49	New Hampshire	0.328277
25	North Carolina	0.340376	50	Utah	0.322898
			51	Wyoming	0.321451

TABLE XLIV

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY MEAN INCOME*
IN THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1980

Rank	State	Mean	Rank	State	Mean
1	Alaska	$29,389	26	Minnesota	$16,110
2	Hawaii	25,402	27	Wisconsin	16,063
3	Massachusetts	21,226	28	Iowa	15,907
4	Maryland	21,080	29	Connecticut	15,848
5	Indiana	20,395	30	Louisiana	15,814
6	Nevada	20,380	31	South Carolina	15,707
7	Michigan	20,068	32	Kentucky	15,623
8	Rhode Island	19,963	33	Delaware	15,218
9	Oregon	19,962	34	Tennessee	15,171
10	California	19,566	35	Virginia	15,104
11	Illinois	19,423	36	Kansas	14,997
12	Ohio	19,352	37	Missouri	14,973
13	New Hampshire	18,616	38	South Dakota	14,946
14	Pennsylvania	18,585	39	Texas	14,778
15	Idaho	17,787	40	Nebraska	14,558
16	Washington	17,754	41	New York	14,523
17	Vermont	17,728	42	North Dakota	14,486
18	D.C.	17,723	43	West Virginia	14,454
19	Wyoming	17,704	44	Alabama	14,431
20	Arizona	17,080	45	Arkansas	13,932
21	New Jersey	16,874	46	New Mexico	13,615
22	Colorado	16,416	47	Montana	13,490
23	Maine	16,337	48	Florida	12,953
24	Utah	16,324	49	Georgia	12,565
25	Oklahoma	16,263	50	North Carolina	12,465
			51	Mississippi	10,231

*in current dollars

TABLE XLV

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY VARIANCE
IN THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1980

Rank	State	Variance	Rank	State	Variance
1	Alaska	709,917,948	26	Iowa	183,638,842
2	Hawaii	369,249,968	27	Wisconsin	178,293,638
3	Massachusetts	268,087,938	28	Connecticut	176,114,386
4	Maryland	260,983,093	29	Kentucky	175,472,593
5	California	259,807,471	30	New York	170,292,494
6	Nevada	251,380,801	31	South Dakota	169,867,185
7	Illinois	239,676,005	32	Wyoming	163,736,681
8	Oregon	238,162,399	33	Kansas	163,676,956
9	D.C.	233,009,654	34	South Carolina	162,989,271
10	Rhode Island	231,604,219	35	Colorado	162,396,566
11	Michigan	227,028,619	36	Delaware	162,253,566
12	North Dakota	210,558,292	37	Virginia	160,813,491
13	Indiana	209,140,366	38	Missouri	160,679,470
14	Louisiana	206,213,457	39	Tennessee	160,096,859
15	New Jersey	205,660,546	40	Utah	157,088,084
16	Ohio	201,874,970	41	Maine	153,525,622
17	Washington	198,462,228	42	Nebraska	153,064,502
18	Vermont	196,116,291	43	Arkansas	151,119,782
19	Arizona	195,517,782	44	Alabama	149,010,886
20	Pennsylvania	192,000,089	45	Texas	145,561,121
21	West Virginia	191,115,391	46	Florida	144,752,750
22	Minnesota	189,735,308	47	Montana	130,230,445
23	New Hampshire	188,802,705	48	Georgia	128,318,825
24	Oklahoma	188,014,847	49	New Mexico	124,875,012
25	Idaho	186,707,145	50	North Carolina	101,157,984
			51	Mississippi	94,701,161

TABLE XLVI

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY GINI COEFFICIENT
IN THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1980

Rank	State	Gini	Rank	State	Gini
1	North Dakota	0.393846	26	New Mexico	0.356918
2	Mississippi	0.389639	27	Tennessee	0.356917
3	West Virginia	0.384973	28	Wisconsin	0.355599
4	Florida	0.380845	29	Texas	0.352831
5	Georgia	0.375283	30	Arizona	0.351837
6	Louisiana	0.373534	31	California	0.351771
7	New York	0.372558	32	South Carolina	0.351249
8	Arkansas	0.369145	33	Illinois	0.345181
9	Alaska	0.366882	34	Washington	0.345088
10	South Dakota	0.366158	35	Vermont	0.344186
11	D.C.	0.361678	36	Colorado	0.341327
12	Kansas	0.361663	37	Nevada	0.339849
13	Minnesota	0.361280	38	Utah	0.339105
14	Nebraska	0.361248	39	Oregon	0.338741
15	Iowa	0.360689	40	Idaho	0.338430
16	Alabama	0.360402	41	Massachusetts	0.337802
17	North Carolina	0.360377	42	Maine	0.336554
18	Missouri	0.360126	43	Maryland	0.336526
19	Kentucky	0.359939	44	Rhode Island	0.335883
20	New Jersey	0.359541	45	Michigan	0.332729
21	Montana	0.359241	46	Hawaii	0.332565
22	Oklahoma	0.358340	47	Pennsylvania	0.331899
23	Virginia	0.358330	48	New Hampshire	0.329811
24	Delaware	0.357617	49	Ohio	0.328415
25	Connecticut	0.357240	50	Wyoming	0.325867
			51	Indiana	0.320865

TABLE XLVII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY THE
ANNUAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE
IN THE STATE: 1979*

Rank	State	Rate	Rank	State	Rate
1	Alaska	9.2%	26	Kentucky	5.6%
2	Delaware	8.0	27	Illinois	5.5
3	Michigan	7.8	27	Massachusetts	5.5
4	D.C.	7.5	29	Connecticut	5.1
5	Maine	7.2	29	Vermont	5.1
6	New York	7.1	29	Georgia	5.1
6	Alabama	7.1	29	Arizona	5.1
8	New Jersey	6.9	29	Montana	5.1
8	Pennsylvania	6.9	29	Nevada	5.1
10	Oregon	6.8	35	South Carolina	5.0
10	Washington	6.8	36	North Carolina	4.8
12	West Virginia	6.7	36	Colorado	4.8
12	Louisiana	6.7	38	Virginia	4.7
14	Rhode Island	6.6	39	Wisconsin	4.5
14	New Mexico	6.6	39	Missouri	4.5
16	Indiana	6.4	41	Utah	4.3
17	Hawaii	6.3	42	Minnesota	4.2
18	Arkansas	6.2	42	Texas	4.2
18	California	6.2	44	Iowa	4.1
20	Florida	6.0	45	North Dakota	3.7
21	Maryland	5.9	46	South Dakota	3.5
21	Ohio	5.9	47	Oklahoma	3.4
23	Mississippi	5.8	47	Kansas	3.4
23	Tennessee	5.8	49	Nebraska	3.2
25	Idaho	5.7	50	New Hampshire	3.1
			51	Wyoming	2.8

*Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, <u>Handbook</u> <u>of</u> <u>Labor</u> <u>Statistic</u>,
(Washington, December, 1980), p. 92.

TABLE XLVIII

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY THE
ANNUAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IN
THE WHITE GROUP: 1979*

Rank	State	Rate	Rank	State	Rate
1	Hawaii	8.7%	26	Tennessee	4.6%
2	Alaska	8.3	26	Illinois	4.6
3	Maine	7.1	28	Connecticut	4.5
3	Delaware	7.1	28	Louisiana	4.5
5	Oregon	6.7	28	Colorado	4.5
6	Washington	6.6	31	South Carolina	4.4
7	Rhode Island	6.5	31	Arkansas	4.4
7	Michigan	6.5	31	Wisconsin	4.4
9	New York	6.4	34	Maryland	4.2
9	West Virginia	6.4	34	Utah	4.2
11	New Jersey	6.2	36	Minnesota	4.1
12	Pennsylvania	6.1	37	Iowa	4.0
13	New Mexico	6.0	38	D.C.	3.8
14	California	5.8	39	Georgia	3.7
15	Indiana	5.7	39	North Carolina	3.7
16	Idaho	5.6	39	Mississippi	3.7
17	Massachusetts	5.5	39	Texas	3.7
18	Alabama	5.4	43	Missouri	3.5
19	Kentucky	5.3	44	Virginia	3.4
20	Vermont	5.1	45	Kansas	3.2
20	Ohio	5.1	45	North Dakota	3.2
22	Nevada	5.0	47	New Hampshire	3.1
23	Florida	4.9	47	South Dakota	3.1
23	Arizona	4.9	49	Oklahoma	3.0
25	Montana	4.7	49	Nebraska	3.0
			51	Wyoming	2.8

*Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Handbook of Labor Statistic,
(Washington, December, 1980), p. 94.

TABLE XLIX

RANK ORDERING OF STATES BY THE
ANNUAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE IN
THE NONWHITE GROUP: 1979*

Rank	State	Rate	Rank	State	Rate
1	Arkansas	17.3%	26	Wisconsin	9.4%
2	Michigan	16.3	26	California	9.4
3	Pennsylvania	16.2	28	D.C.	9.3
4	Indiana	15.2	29	North Carolina	8.9
5	Delaware	14.9	30	Oklahoma	8.6
6	Montana	14.7	31	Texas	8.5
7	Connecticut	14.3	32	Arizona	8.2
8	Alaska	13.7	33	Massachusetts	7.0
9	Ohio	13.6	33	Kansas	7.0
10	Missouri	13.4	35	South Carolina	6.9
10	New Mexico	13.4	36	Nevada	6.4
12	Alabama	13.0	37	Hawaii	5.3
13	Tennessee	12.8	..	Maine**	...
13	Louisiana	12.8	..	New Hampshire**	...
15	New Jersey	12.2	..	Rhode Island**	...
15	Maryland	12.2	..	Vermont**	...
17	New York	11.6	..	West Virginia**	...
18	Illinois	11.4	..	Iowa**	...
19	Georgia	11.1	..	Minnesota	...
19	Virginia	11.1	..	Nebraska**	...
21	Florida	10.9	..	North Dakota**	...
22	Mississippi	10.5	..	South Dakota**	...
22	Colorado	10.5	..	Idaho**	...
24	Washington	10.0	..	Utah**	...
25	Kentucky	9.6	..	Wyoming**	...
			..	Oregon**	...

*Source: U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Handbook of Labor Statistic,
(Washington, December, 1980), p. 94.

**Unemployment rates are not shown when they do not meet BLS Standards
of reliability for the State, based on the sample in that State.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Aitchison, J. and J. A. C. Brown, The Lognormal Distribution with Special References to its Uses in Economics, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1960.

Elderton, W. P., Frequency Curves and Correlation, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1938.

Gini, C., Variabilita e Mutabilita, Bologna, 1912.

Moroney, John R., editor, Income Inequality, Massachusetts, D. C. Health and Company, 1978.

Osberg, Lars, Economic Inequality in the United States, New York, M. E. Sharpe, Inc., 1984.

Pareto, V., Manual of Political Economy, edited by A. S. Schwier and A. N. Page, London, Macmillan, Inc., 1972.

Articles

Ashenfelter, Orley and Gary Solon, "Employment Statistics: The Interaction of Evonomics and Policy," American Economic Review, LXXII, No. 2 (May, 1982), 233-236.

Champernowne, D. G., "The Graduation of Income Distribution," Econometrica, XX, (October, 1952), 591-615.

_____, "A Comparison of Measures of Inequality of Income Distribution," Economic Journal, LXXXIC, (December, 1974), 787-816.

Fisk, P. R., "The Graduation of Income Distribution," Econometrica, XXIX, (April, 1961), 171-185.

McDonald, J. B., "Some Generalized Functions for the Size Distribution of Income," Econometrica, LII, (May, 1984), 647-655.

McDonald, J. B. and M. Ransom, "Functional Forms, Estimation Techniques and the Distribution of Income," Econometrica, XLVII, (November, 1979), 1513-1516.

Morgan, J. N., "The Anatomy of Income Distribution,"
Review of Economics and Statistics, XLIV, (August,
1962), 270-283.

Salem, A. B. and T. D. Mount, "A Convenient Descriptive
Model of Income Distribution: The Gamma Density,"
Econometrica, XLII, (November, 1974), 1115-1127.

Singh, S. K. and G. S. Maddala, "A Function for the Size
Distribution of Incomes," Econometrica, XLIV,
(September, 1976), 963-970.

Thurow, L. L., "Analyzing the American Income Distribution,"
American Economic Review, LX, (May, 1970), 261-269.

Reports

U. S. Bureau of the Census, 1960 Census of Population:
Characteristics of the Population, Vol. I, Washington,
Government Printing Office, 1963.

_____, 1970 Census of Population:
Characteristics of the Population, Vol. I, Washington,
Government Printing Office, 1973.

_____, 1980 Census of Population:
Characteristics of the Population, Vol. I, Washington,
Government Printing Office, 1983.

U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Handbook of Labor Statistics,
Washington, Government Printing Office, 1980.

Publications of Learned Organizations

Lorenz, M. C., "Methods of Measuring the Concentration of
Wealth," Publications of the American Statistical
Association, IX, 1905, 209-219.

Unpublished Materials

Basmann, R. L., D. J. Molina, M. Rodarte and D. J. Slottje,
"Some New Methods of Predicting Changes in Economic
Inequality Associated with Trends in Growth and
Development," Working Paper VII, Department of Economics,
Texas A & M University, College Station, Texas, 1983.

Basmann, R. L., D. J. Molina and D. J. Slottje, "Variable
    Preference, Economic Inequality and the Cost of Living
    Index," _Advances in Econometrics_ (forthcoming).

Nilsen, Sigurd R., "Employment and Unemployment Statistics
    for Nonmetropolitan Areas," Background Paper No. 33 of
    National Commission on Employment Statistics, Washington,
    Government Printing Office, 1979.

Slottje, D. J., "A Measure of Income Inequality Based Upon
    the Beta Distribution of the Second Kind," _Economics
    Letters_ (forthcoming).