INFORMATION TO USERS

8113242

GREENWOOD, DAPHNE THORNTON

A METHOD OF ESTIMATING THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE WEALTH
AMONG AMERICAN FAMILIES, 1973

The University of Oklahoma   PH.D.   1980

University
   Microfilms
International 300 N. Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106

PLEASE NOTE:

In all cases this material has been filmed in the best possible way from the available copy. Problems encountered with this document have been identified here with a check mark __√__ .

1. Glossy photographs or pages _____

2. Colored illustrations, paper or print _____

3. Photographs with dark background _____

4. Illustrations are poor copy _____

5. Pages with black marks, not original copy _____

6. Print shows through as there is text on both sides of page _____

7. Indistinct, broken or small print on several pages __✔__

8. Print exceeds margin requirements _____

9. Tightly bound copy with print lost in spine _____

10. Computer printout pages with indistinct print __✔__

11. Page(s) _____ lacking when material received, and not available from school or author.

12. Page(s) _____ seem to be missing in numbering only as text follows.

13. Two pages numbered _____ . Text follows.

14. Curling and wrinkled pages _____

15. Other_____

University
Microfilms
International

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA

GRADUATE COLLEGE

A METHOD OF ESTIMATING

THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE WEALTH AMONG

AMERICAN FAMILIES, 1973

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

BY

DAPHNE THORNTON GREENWOOD

Norman, Oklahoma

1980

A METHOD OF ESTIMATING

THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE WEALTH AMONG

AMERICAN FAMILIES, 1973

APPROVED BY

W. Nelson Peach

James D. Smith

Ed J. Crim

Benjamin J. Taylor

James F. Horrell

Ronald M. Peters

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

THE DISTRIBUTION OF PRIVATE WEALTH AMONG

AMERICAN FAMILIES, 1973

CHAPTER I

THE STUDY OF WEALTH AND ITS DISTRIBUTION

Introduction

The distribution of wealth has long been an area of
interest for the study of three diverse economic problems:
the degree of concentration of economic power, relative in-
equalities in economic welfare, and the potential market for
financial assets. The banking sector has had a long-stand-
ing interest in knowledge of the distribution for its use in
analyzing this market. Large banks financed a few early
studies, and the Federal Reserve Board sponsored the most
comprehensive wealth survey of the twentieth century. Critics
and defenders of the American economic system have focused
on the distribution of wealth, relative to other nations or
to earlier periods of American history.

One approach to studying economic concentration is to
look at the structure of major industries and analyze the

1

degree of monopoly which exists within them and in the business sector as a whole. An alternative is to study the distribution of wealth among persons or families. A large proportion of corporate wealth is personal wealth (the remainder is held by pension funds or non-profit foundations) and we find that it is a major component of the wealth of the very wealthy.

The distribution of wealth is of use for purposes other than the study of economic concentration. Wealth is a means of providing economic security, and a measure of independence and control over one's life. Assets which provide income or are readily saleable are income stabilizers in times of unemployment or heavy financial burdens. Families who own no significant amount of financial assets will find it difficult to borrow, and tend to pay more for the loans which they do acquire. Thus, ownership of wealth is an important aspect of economic welfare.[1]

Banks, savings and loan associations, brokerage houses, and mutual funds are all interested in the distribution of financial assets, the extent of home ownership, and other portfolio information which detailed wealth estimates yield. Some surveys have been aimed exclusively at higher income and wealth groups and have dealt with the motivations

---

[1]For an extensive analysis see Burton A. Weisbrod and W. Lee Hansen, "An Income - Net Worth Approach to Measuring Economic Welfare," American Economic Review 58 (December 1968) 1315-19.

for holding different types of assets in the portfolio.[2]

A recent empirical study indicates no major changes in the share held by the top wealthholders over the last fifty years.[3] In spite of the significant structural changes which have occurred in the economy, along with changes in tax policies and an increasing rate of inflation, the share has remained virtually stable. The income distribution, however, appears to have altered over this same time period, with upper-middle class groups gaining at the expense of the lower three deciles and the highest decile.[4] Changes in the distribution of wealth among lower and middle wealth groups are not known.

A distribution of wealth for the entire wealthholding population is necessary for answering questions about redistribution via taxes, inflation, or other economic forces and addressing many social and economic issues. Estimates based on estate tax methods have been limited to the upper few percentiles of the population by the filing requirement of $60,000 in gross wealth. A recent modification of the estate tax law by Congress raises this limit to $250,000,

[2]For example, see Robin Barlow, Harvey Brazer, and James Morgan, Economic Behavior of the Affluent, Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1966.

[3]James D. Smith and Stephen D. Franklin, "The Concentration of Personal Wealth, 1922-1969", American Economic Review 64 (May 1974): 162-167.

[4]Lester C. Thurow, Generating Inequality: Mechanisms of Distribution in the U.S. Economy. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1975, p. 3.

limiting the use of the returns as a data base even more

severely. In addition, the use of trusts and gifts in an-

ticipation of death cause a downward bias in wealth esti-

mated from estate tax returns, tending to understate the

concentration of wealth.[5]

The most recent surveys of wealth are the 1962 Survey

of Financial Characteristics of Consumers and the 1967 Survey

of Economic Opportunity.[6] Both yielded valuable information

about the distribution and composition of wealth, but did not

arrive at a complete distribution of wealth, due to problems

of incomplete asset coverage, inaccurate reporting, and

non-response.   The Survey of Income and Program Parti-

cipation will collect information on tangible wealth and some

financial assets for the U.S. Department of Health, Educa-

tion and Welfare in the early 1980's.

A Review of the Methodology and Organization

Estimates of the distribution of wealth have been based

in the past on (1) estate tax returns, (2) surveys of wealth,

or (3) income capitalization. There are problems inherent in

both the methodology and the data available for each of these

methods. Chapter II reviews the literature regarding studies

---

[5]John A. Brittain, Inheritance and the Inequality of Material Wealth, Studies in Social Economics, Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1978, pp. 4-5.

[6]See Chapter II of this work, pp. 12-13 and 32-33.

of the distribution of wealth in the United States, their

methodology, and their findings. The method used here, out-

lined in Chapter III, combines income capitalization with

information from estate tax returns and survey data in order

to arrive at a complete distribution of wealth. By using

a sample of income tax returns merged with observations from

the Current Population Survey, the OTA file, it covers vir-

tually the entire population.

Dividends for each family unit were capitalized into

the value of corporate stock owned, and interest into the

value of debt instruments owned. Survey data were analyzed

to test the validity of varying rates of return with income

level. Property tax paid divided by the effective property

tax rate yielded estimates of the value of real estate owned.

These three components of wealth were directly estimated by

capitalization. Chapter III explains the calculation of

effective property tax rates by state and the analysis of

information regarding differential rates of return.

In order to estimate the value of total wealth less

debts held, the relationship between net wealth and the

above three components of wealth was estimated by regres-

sion methods from estate tax return data. Combining the

parameters estimated from the estate tax returns with the

components estimated from each individual family record

yielded an estimated value of net wealth for each family.

A frequency distribution of wealth by wealth classes was

then constructed. Chapter IV outlines the regression anal-
ysis based on estate tax records with which net wealth may
be estimated from the gross value of corporate stock, debt
instruments, and real estate. The estate tax data and the
income tax and survey data which comprise the OTA file are
discussed. The results of the wealth estimation are pre-
sented, and related to income and age of family head.

The strengths of this new method of estimation lie
in its reliance upon a broad data base and its combination
of income capitalization with data available from other
sources. A simple capitalization approach cannot include
wealth which does not produce income, and has difficulty
dealing with debt and certain types of wealth which are
hard to estimate by capitalization. In Chapter V the method
and results of this estimate are compared to other wealth
estimates. Possible ways of improving the data and future
estimates are addressed.

Definition of the Wealth Concept

Net wealth, as defined in this estimate, includes all
items of durability and realizable market value, less all
debts held by the economic unit. It is equivalent to the
estate tax measure of wealth, and broader than most survey
concepts because it includes all debt, as well as personal
possessions and the value of equity in life insurance, annui-
ties, and retirement funds. It does not include any

capitalization of earnings into "human capital" or the value

of individuals' contingent rights to social security or other

pension funds.

The possibility of including these flows of income has

been discussed by a number of economists in recent years.[7]

The inclusion of these items in any formal estimate has not

been pursued due to both data problems and the conceptual

difficulties of treating human and non-human wealth in one

measure.

From a philosophical point of view, it is hard to find

merit in the position that physical and human capital are

equivalent. A very basic difference is that tools are made

to serve human beings. Treatment of the individual as a com-

modity indistinguishable from inanimate commodities is in

violation of both religious and humanistic values. In fact,

some see the emphasis on human capital as primarily "one of

the more interesting efforts to restore capital theory to full

health and integrity" in the wake of serious attacks on the

capital concept in neoclassical theory.[8]

---

[7]Martin Feldstein, "Social Security, Induced Retirement, and Aggregate Capital Accumulation", Journal of Political Economy 82:5 (September/October 1974); John W. Kendrick, "The Accounting Treatment of Human Investment and Capital", Review of Income and Wealth 20:4, (December 1974); and Brittain, Inheritance and Inequality, pp. 5-13.

[8]R. B. Melton, "Schultz's Theory of Human Capital", Social Science Quarterly 46:3 (December 1965): 264, see also Alfred S. Eichner and J. A. Kregel, "An Essay on Post-Keynesian Theory: A New Paradigm in Economics," Journal of Economic Literature 13:4, Dec. 1975, pp. 1293-1314.

Aside from these controversies, there are important differences in the markets for labor and for capital which constrain investments in each differently, and prevent the sale of "human capital". Thus, the market for physical capital is in stocks, while the market for human capital is in flows of labor services. Psychic or "consumption" factors are a much greater influence in human capital investment and use, due to the long-observed phenomenon that persons must be a part of the surroundings in which their human capital is developed or utilized. The liquidity and ease of transfer which mark many assets do not exist in the human capital case. In addition, time places a restriction on possible investments in human capital whereas the accumulation of physical capital may be unlimited.[9] All of these important distinctions suggest that human and non-human wealth may not realistically be treated as additive.

A distribution of human capital would obviously be more equal than one of physical capital since it would primarily reflect the already known distribution of income which in turn reflects the distribution of marketable skills. The upper limit on skills acquisition and use which time places would also push this distribution towards relatively greater equality. A comparison between the distribution of income and the distribution of wealth seems to be more fruitful than an attempt to force the two into one measure. The fact that

---

[9]For an interesting discussion of these differences see Thurow, Generating Inequality.

the distribution of marketable skills, as reflected in the distribution of income, does tend so much more towards equality raises the question of why heavy concentrations of non-human wealth are generated.

Accumulations in social security or private pension funds are not included, unless they provide for a sum to be transferred to heirs at death. Proponents of including them argue that their inclusion would tend to greatly equalize the distribution of wealth, which is not surprising. The validity of doing so is debatable, however. While they are a substitute for private saving, which is measured, they do not offer liquidity until quite late in the life-cycle and cannot be withdrawn in toto in most cases. Pension-rights are often lost through job transfer or compulsory early retirement, and social security payments are contingent upon a maximum level of earned income by the recipient. In case of early death, they may not be consumed at all. For these reasons and others they cannot be measured with the same accuracy as other forms of wealth.

Income, wealth, and social security or retirement benefits are all components of economic welfare. Wealth stands out as an index of economic power. Given the theoretical and empirical problems of combining these measures, it seems best to treat them separately. Wealth distribution has not received the attention which income has. It is in this area that an improved measure can be most meaningful.

CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF THE LITERATURE ON THE DISTRIBUTION OF
WEALTH IN THE UNITED STATES

Introduction

Two central themes of early economics were the size
of a nation's wealth and the causes of its growth. The mea-
surement and analysis of the distribution of wealth came later.
The awareness that wealth, and its corresponding economic power,
could affect the workings of the economic and political system
motivated inquiry into its distribution. The major focus of
Ricardo's economic analysis was on the laws governing the dis-
tribution of the social product between the three social and
productive classes of landowners, laborers, and capitalists.
In the writings of Marx, this distribution is explicitly tied
to production and to the development through time of the eco-
nomic system. Veblen also emphasized the importance of the
distribution of wealth, or capital, to the overall performance
of the economy.

The maintenance of democratic systems and competitive
markets have been held to be dependent upon a diffusion of eco-
nomic and political power. Thomas Jefferson warned against
the establishment of an aristocracy of wealth in America in

the early days of the republic. Great inequalities of wealth were considered detrimental to the functioning of a capitalistic economy by major economic thinkers such as Alfred Marshall, John Maynard Keynes, and R. H. Tawney.[1]

Liberal capitalism, beginning with Adam Smith, promised efficiency through the market mechanism, and increasing prosperity for persons of all social strata. By the late 1800's, its defenders were responding to the Marxian attacks with claims of increasing diffusion of property ownership, particularly in the United States. It was held that a wide distribution of wealth, and opportunities to obtain wealth, were basic to the American economic system. They spurred productivity and innovativeness, increased labor and entrepreneurial mobility, and contributed to social stability.[2]

The purposes of the early studies of wealth distribution were to determine the degree of concentration which existed, observe the secular trend of property ownership, and provide information on savings, capital formation, and consumer behavior. Studies of the distribution of wealth have followed three basic

---

[1]See Thomas Jefferson, The Jefferson Cyclopedia, John P. Foley, ed., New York: Funk and Wagnalls Co., 1900, pp. 935-936; Alfred Marshall, Principles of Economics 7th edition, London: McMillan, 1916, pp. 609-628,689-722; and R. H. Tawney, Equality, New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1931, pp. 150-156.

[2]W. I. King, Wealth and Income of the People of the United States, New York: MacMillan & Co., 1915, pp. 53-61.

approaches: (1) inventories of personal wealth, (2) estate-projections, and (3) income capitalization. These have been used, in various combinations, to estimate the distribution of wealth in America.

An inventory of wealth, by census or sampling, has the intuitive appeal of directness. An official census of wealth was taken in the United States in 1860.[3] In the latter half of the nineteenth century, data on the distribution of farm property collected by the Department of Agriculture was used to make inferences about the property holdings of the general population. [4] The Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers, sponsored by the Federal Reserve Board, contains detailed wealth information on a sample of about 2,500 families for 1962, and the 1967 Survey of Economic Opportunity conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity includes similar information from a panel of 30,000 households.[5] The Survey Research Center at the University of Michigan has

---

[3]Lee Soltow, "The Wealth, Income and Social Class of Men in Large Northern Cities of the United States in 1860," in James Smith, ed., The Personal Distribution of Income and Wealth, New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.

[4]See the discussion of Holmes, Ingalls, and King, pp. 19-24, below.

[5]Conducted by the Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, for the Office of Economic Opportunity. Interviews with approximately 30,000 households included income information for 1966 and supplemental financial and demographic data.

collected information on specific asset holdings in numerous studies.[6] These surveys have yielded a great deal of information, but tend to be limited to particular types of property and to be subject to errors of nonresponse or inaccurate reporting of information.

The estate-projection method utilizes information from probate records or estate tax returns to project the total value of estates held by the living. Early studies in America used state probate information, while more recent work has relied on the national estate tax returns.[7] Estate taxes existed in England before their enactment in the United States. The estate-multiplier technique of estimating personal wealth holdings from estate-tax returns was first used by Bernard Mallet in 1905 to make estimates of the distribution of wealth in England.[8]

The estate-multiplier method is based on the assumption that decedents of a given age are a random sample of the living persons of that age, regarding the size and composition of their wealth. Inferences about the total wealth of an age group can then be made by multiplying the wealth of each decedent by the inverse of the mortality rate for a person of his

[6]Surveys of Consumers (formerly, Survey of Consumer Finances) Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

[7]See pp. 19-24 and 28-35,below.

[8]Bernard Mallet, "A Method of Estimating Capital Wealth from Estate-Duty Statistics," Journal of the Royal Statistical Society of London, LXXI, March 1908, pp.64-84.

or her age. The general formula is

$$W_a = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \times \frac{P_a}{D_a}$$

where W_a = total wealth of the age group

w_i = wealth of the ith decedent in the age group

P_a = living population of the age group

D_a = number of deaths in the age group

and $\dfrac{P_a}{D_a}$ = the inverse of the mortality rate in the age group

The accuracy of the mortality rates used is critically important to the success of the estate-multiplier technique, as they are the basis of the estate-multipliers. Since mortality differs within an age group depending on sex, social class, and marital status, the accuracy of the estimates is improved when such breakdowns of the population can be made.

White mortality rates, although lower than overall mortality rates for the United States, are generally considered too high for use with the estate tax group.[9] Numerous studies have shown that persons of wealth, or in high-paying occupations, have substantially lower mortality rates than the average white American, up through their late seventies.[10]

---

[9]This is true of the federal estate-tax returns, but not always of state or local estate-tax samples. Washington, D.C., which is 75% black, had mortality rates higher than the national average. See pp. 40-41, below.

[10]See I.M. Moriyama and L. Guralnick, "Occupational and Social Class Differences in Mortality," in Trends and Differentials in Mortality, New York: Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Milbank Memorial Fund, 1955; and Evelyn M. Kitagawa and Philip Hauser, Differential Mortality in the United States, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

The application of separate mortality rates for each age-sex group is first found in G. H. Knibbs' estimate of the distribution of wealth in Australia for 1915. Daniels and Campion introduced social-class mortality rates into their estimates of the distribution of wealth in England and Wales in the early Twentieth Century. "Selected-risk" mortality rates used by life insurance companies have been used to approximate the lower mortality rates of the wealthy in studies of the distribution of wealth in America.[11]

The United States estate-tax law allows deductions for debts, property acquired through taxable gift or inheritance in the five years preceding death, charitable and public gifts, and funeral expenses. Data from the original returns, before audit, is published in Statistics of Income by the Treasury Department.[12] Understatement of the true value of property is likely to occur on real estate, tangible personal property, interest in unincorporated businesses, and ownership of unlisted or untraded stock. These assets are difficult to value, and estates generally have an economic

---

[11] G. H. Knibbs, The Private Wealth of Australia and Its Growth, Melbourne: McCarron, Bird, & Co., 1918; Daniels, G. W. and Campion, H. The Distribution of National Capital, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936; Mendershausen, Lampman, and Smith, pp. 28-32,34-35, below.

[12] Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, Statistics of Income - Estate Tax Returns, 1922 - present, annually.

interest in a low reported value. Declared value of estates is further reduced by gifts inter vivos, costs of last illness, and various forms of evasion.

C. L. Harriss studied a special tabulation of estate tax returns before and after audit and found that an average understatement of 10% of estate value existed before audit. A different, usually higher, tax was required in 56% of the cases. Of those reported as non-taxable, 5% were classed as taxable after audit.[13]

While underestimation of the value of property biases downward estate-multiplier estimates of wealth, it is partially offset by the fact that many smaller estates may not file. Their exclusion from the estimates tends to overestimate the concentration of wealth in the highest group.[14]

Estimation with this technique has the advantage of detailed wealth information on the tax returns, but at the national level has been limited to persons with $60,000 or more in gross wealth. The high minimum filing requirement has recently been raised to $250,000. As a result, estate-multiplier estimates are limited to the top several percentiles of the wealth distribution, and can be generalized to

---

[13]C. L. Harriss, "Wealth Estimates as Affected by Audit of Estate-Tax Returns," National Tax Journal, December 1949, p. 316.

[14]See pp. 21-24, below, for the views of several researchers on this issue.

the population at large only by means of extrapolation or arbitrary assumptions such as the assignment of estate value by annual income at lower levels.

Income capitalization uses information available on income tax returns to estimate the ownership of wealth. It thus has the advantage of relying on a much broader data base. The extension of the federal income tax to lower and lower levels of income has increased this base far beyond what it was for the early studies which used this method. A key advantage is its use of data from living persons, who will not have reduced their estate before death for tax purposes.

Ownership of various assets such as real estate, corporate stocks, and corporate or government bonds, is indicated by the receipt of annual revenues from them. These may be capitalized to indicate the present value of the asset. The choice of a capitalization rate, or rates, is critical to this type of estimation.

Capitalized values may overstate concentration in prosperous periods (and understate in recessions) because they include intangible asset values where national inventory aggregates do not. The retention of profits in closely held corporations will mean that capitalized dividend income may underestimate such stock holdings.

The greatest drawbacks to income capitalization as a method of estimation are its exclusion of non-income-yielding

property and property on which the income is not taxable, and the problem of allocating wealth to persons below the minimum filing requirement. This latter group may be accounted for by the use of supplementary information, such as agricultural or financial statistics. Extrapolation of the results, assignment of the residual, or the calculation of a relationship between net income and net wealth for the lowest wealth group, are other possible supplementary methods.

Income capitalization was used by many researchers in the early twentieth century, in conjunction with inventory, probate, or estate tax data. Combination with estate tax information makes possible the inclusion of non-taxable and non-income-yielding property in wealth estimates.[15]

The remainder of this chapter surveys studies of the distribution of wealth in America from 1890 to the present, along with related research into patterns of asset ownership and holdings of income-yielding wealth. Recent studies of the distribution of wealth at the state and local level are reviewed. Particular attention is given to the data used in the various studies, the methodology adopted, and the problems encountered. General results of major studies are also cited in brief.

---

[15]See Lehmann and Stewart, pp. 26-28.

Early Studies In America

The earliest studies of the distribution of wealth in America relied on combinations of methods and data sources. The first was published by G. K. Holmes in 1893.[16] He used farm and home proprietorship data and information on indebtedness to classify families into wealth categories, along with assumptions about the number of farms and families occupying non-farm houses. Arbitrary allowances for other assets of each category were used to arrive at each family's total wealth. Census estimates of total tangible property in 1890 were used to approximate the total wealth figure.

Holmes estimated that 9% of the families in the United States owned approximately 71% of total wealth, leaving the remaining 91% with 29% of personal wealth. He used the New York Tribune's estimate of 4,047 millionaires in the United States to make a further breakdown. By allocating an average wealth of $3 million to each millionaire, Holmes estimated that this .03% owned 20% of personal wealth.

Three years later, C. B. Spahr published estimates of the distribution of wealth in the United States based on estates probated in New York State in 1892.[17] He inferred the distribution of wealth among the living from the distribution

[16]G. K. Holmes, "The Concentration of Wealth," Political Science Quarterly Vol. III, 1893, p. 589.

[17]C. B. Spahr, The Present Distribution of Wealth in the United States, New York: Crowell, 1896.

of wealth reported for estates, with some adjustments made re-
garding underreporting of large estates.

Spahr constructed a frequency distribution of wealth hold-
ings, which showed great concentration of wealth in the highest
groups. However, as death is not a random sample of the living,
but one biased toward older (and consequently wealthier) per-
sons, the use of estates to reflect the actual distribution of
wealth results in overestimates of concentration. In addition,
the New York data used by Spahr could not be accepted as
representative of the United States.

W. I. King used data on estates probated in Massachusetts
and Wisconsin[18] as the basis for "the pioneer work in the field
of the distribution of wealth and income by size in the United
States."[19]   The Wealth and Income of the People of the United
States[20], published in 1915, contained a distribution of es-
tates of men dying for the two states, but did not attempt to
generalize it to the nation at large. Comparisons with similar

[18]Twenty-fifth Annual Report of the Massachusetts Bureau
of Labor; and The Distribution of Wealth in Six Wisconsin Coun-
ties, M.O. Lorenz, unpublished manuscript, cited by King,
Wealth & Income.

[19]C. L. Merwin, "American Studies of the Distribution of
Wealth," Studies in Income and Wealth Vol. III, New York:
National Bureau of Economic Research, 1939.

[20]King, Wealth and Income.

data from Prussia, France, and Great Britain were made.

The Massachusetts data ranged from 1829 to 1891, but showed almost no change in distribution over that period. The distribution of estates in Wisconsin was for 1900. It was very similar to that found in Massachusetts, with only slightly less inequality.

King classified the population into four groups for his analysis of the distribution of estate wealth:

(1) the poor - persons possessing no property other than personal belongings - constituted 65% of the population

(2) the lower middle class - persons with small property holdings (roughly $1000) - constituted 15% of the population

(3) the upper middle class - persons with a substantial share of income from property (from $2-40,000) constituted 18% of the population

(4) the rich - persons possessing sufficient wealth to live solely on property income (over $50,000) constituted 2% of the population.

The fraction of total estate wealth belonging to each class was tabulated from the probate records. The results from different periods in Massachusetts were very similar to each other and to those from Wisconsin. The poorest 65% owned 5-6% of total wealth, the lower middle class around 4%, the upper middle class approximately 32%, and the rich almost 60%.

The use of probate records to estimate the distribution of wealth among persons at the end of their careers was criticized by W. R. Ingalls, who charged that King and others had

overstated the concentration of wealth in the United States.[21]
He suggested that a great many small estates were never pro-
bated, and that a significant amount of real estate was held
by husband and wife in joint title, thus requiring no court
action at the death of either party. For these reasons, a
great many small estates were left out of the calculations,
biasing them toward greater concentration than actually ex-
ists, King alleged.

The method of capitalizing income reported on tax returns
in order to estimate holdings of wealth was first suggested
by Ingalls. A subsequent study by King estimated aggregate
national wealth and its distribution by a combination of in-
come capitalization and the use of aggregate statistics.[22]
The wealth of the non-farm population was estimated with infor-
mation from Statistics of Income on rents, interest, and in-
vestment income, and profits from the sale of real estate,
stocks, or bonds. With these, King calculated distributions
of holdings in corporate stocks and bonds, funded debt, and
government bonds.

Urban owner-occupied homes and other consumption goods
were distributed according to the current money income of

[21]W. R. Ingalls, Current Economic Affairs, York, Pa.:
G. H. Merlin Co., 1924, pp. 142-161.

[22]W. I. King, "Wealth Distribution in the Continental
United States at the Close of 1921" Journal of the American
Statistical Association, Vol. XXII, 1927.

the various sectors. Miscellaneous wealth was distributed on the basis of the data on profits. With all of the above, King compiled an estimate of wealth among non-farmers by income classes. He then devised a method to transfer the data to wealth classes.[23]

The wealth of farm owners and farm tenants was esti- . mated separately from Census records giving the value of farm property in farms having various acreages and the number of farms in each size class. Farm wealth and non-farm wealth for each wealth class were then added together.

King found the distribution of wealth among property owners less equal than that of income, but more equal than the distribution of estates. By his estimates, the highest tenth of wealthholders owned 50% of personal wealth, and the lower half owned about 4%.

This distribution of estates for the United States com- piled by King was patterned after his earlier work with Mas- sachusetts and Wisconsin data, but used a Federal Trade Com- mission report titled National Wealth and Income on estates probated in twelve widely scattered states and the District of Columbia in 1912-23. The resulting distribution was very similar to those which he had found within the two states at

---

[23]Merwin, "American Studies of the Distribution of Wealth", pp. 16-17, outlines the method used by King.

an earlier date, leading King to note "the remarkable tendency

of probate records at different times and places to have simi-

lar distributions."[24]

Robert R. Doane also used probated estates and tax payment

information appearing in federal government publications to

estimate the distribution of wealth by income classes in 1932.[25]

His analysis was based on the assumption that an individual's

real property is some multiple of his tax payments. Doane's

study therefore excluded persons not filing tax returns.

Income tax statistics were used as indicators of the owner-

ship of other forms of wealth such as homes and bank deposits

which might not be income-yielding. The method of allocation

of tax payments to income classes was not made clear in many

cases, and the method of ascertaining and distributing the

number of wealthholders was not specified. Holdings of secur-

ities, life insurance, and savings deposits were distributed

without taking into account multiple holdings by one individual,

biasing his results substantially.[26] Doane's demostration of

increasing diffusion of wealth between 1880 and 1930 seems to

---

[24]King, "Wealth Distribution in the United States," p. 145.

[25]Robert R. Doane, "Summary of the Evidence on National Wealth and its Increasing Diffusion," Annalist, July 26, 1935, cited by Merwin.

[26]Merwin, "American Studies of the Distribution of Wealth," p. 28.

have been based on manipulation of some of the earlier data with which he compared his results. He was criticized as an apologist by contemporaries for using such techniques.[27]

The ownership of income-yielding property by income-tax classes was estimated in the 1920's by Maxine Yaple using a pure income capitalization approach.[28] The purpose of the study was to measure the actual progressiveness of direct taxation on different income classes.

Net estate for the various income classes was estimated by capitalizing interest, rent, fiduciary, and dividend income, adding the value of wholly and partially tax-exempt bonds, and deducting specific exemptions. Lack of official data on the value of insurance owned by income class prevented its inclusion in the estimates.

A key problem in an income capitalization estimate is the rate of capitalization to be used. Rates were determined separately for the various major sources of income, and each was based on average yields over a business cycle. The amount of each source capitalized was also an average for 1928-32 of the average yearly return in any one class. Yaple found that

---

[27]Ibid., p. 20-23.

[28]Maxine Yaple, "The Burden of Direct Taxes as Paid by Income Classes," American Economic Review, Vol. 26, December 1936, pp. 691-710.

the one-half million highest income recipients owned $140 billion in income-yielding property, or approximately 2/5 of total private wealth.[29]

A major contribution to the use of income capitalization was made by Fritz Lehmann, who used it in conjunction with estate tax data to estimate the distribution of all private wealth among income tax payers.[30] Persons reporting more than $5000 income on federal tax returns were classified into four income classes:

(1) multimillionaires - over $1,000,000

(2) millionaires - $100,000-$1,000,000

(3) the rich - $10,000-$100,000

(4) the well-to-do - $5000-$10,000

The value of corporate stock held by each of the income classes was estimated by capitalizing income from dividends shown on the tax returns at the rate of 5%, which was the average yield on common and preferred stock in 1930.

From the estate tax returns, the relationship between the value of corporate stock owned and the value of net estate was

---

[29] Charles Stewart, "Income Capitalization as a Method of Estimating the Distribution of Wealth by Size Groups," Studies in Income and Wealth Vol. III, New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1939, p. 106.

[30] Fritz Lehmann, "The Distribution of Wealth," in Max Ascoli and Fritz Lehmann, eds., Political and Economic Democracy, New York: Norton, 1937.

estimated for each class. Based on assumptions relating estate
wealth to income, Lehmann matched each income class with the
wealth class holding the same average amount of stock. Esti-
mates of corporate stock per income class were multiplied by
the ratios of total wealth to corporate stock holdings for
each of the four wealth classes, in order to derive an esti-
mate of total wealth held by persons with incomes over $5000.

According to Lehmann's estimate, this 1.1% of the adult
population owned 36% of total personally held wealth. He
found that the distribution of national wealth remained about
the same throughout the 1920's, although the total increased
substantially during the same time period. During the early
depression years, there was increasing inequality of distribu-
tion shown in Lehmann's estimates. Due to the lack of national
wealth estimates, Lehmann had to rely on extrapolation to cover
the portion of national wealth not estimated from the income
tax returns.

Smaller holdings of corporate stock were found on the es-
tate tax data than from capitalization of dividend income in
some cases, probably due to gifts inter vivos designed to re-
duce tax on the estate at death. Lehmann speculated that other
types of wealth are probably underestimated by estate tax data
for the same reason.

Lehmann's method includes both income-yielding and non-
income-yielding wealth, which makes it superior in some respects

to either a direct capitalization or an inventory estimate.
In addition, it is simple enough to employ for estimates of
year-to-year changes in the wealth of the higher wealth groups.[31]
Deficiencies in the estate and income tax data and their ex-
clusion of lower income and wealth classes were a further limi-
tation on the estimates. However, the expansion of the income
tax to lower income groups would make this less serious today
than it was in the original estimation.

Recent Studies in America

Several studies since the Second World War have used the
estate-multiplier method to estimate the distribution of wealth.
The first application of the estate-multiplier method in the
United States was made by Horst Mendershausen, who estimated the
distribution of wealth among the top wealthholders, and their
holdings by type of asset.[32]

Mendershausen used preferred-risk mortality rates from
Metropolitan Life Insurance statistics to approximate the mor-
tality rates of the well-to-do. There was insufficient data
on the sex of the decedents to allow the use of separate male
and female mortality rates.

---

[31]The accuracy of this method for determining year-to-year
changes is discussed by Milton Friedman, W. L. Crum, Fritz
Lehmann, and Charles Stewart, in a section following the pre-
viously cited paper by Stewart.

[32]Horst Mendershausen, "The Pattern of Estate-Tax Wealth,"
in Raymond Goldsmith, Dorothy Brady, and Horst Mendershausen, eds.
A Study of Saving in the United States, Part III, Princeton:
Princeton University Press, 1956.

Corrections were made for the value of insurance recorded on estate tax returns in order to reflect the cash value before death. Mendershausen constructed a set of "reduction factors" from additional information found in the 1944 returns. The reduction factor for each age group was the ratio of insurance equity to face value. These ranged from 7% for policyholders in the 20-40 age group, up to 81% for those 85 and above. Estate value of insurance multiplied by the appropriate reduction factor yielded the estimated cash value of insurance before death. For 1944, the use of these reduction factors diminished insurance wealth by 82% and total estate tax wealth by 10%.

A special tabulation of returns filed in 1945 included information on the size of gross estate and the age of the decedent cross-tabulated with various asset holdings and the number of returns. Mendershausen calculated the relationship between asset-type, age, and size of gross estate from this data. He found a direct relationship between the size of gross estate and the percentage of it held in government bonds, corporate stock, and intangible property. The percentage held in real estate, mortgages, notes, cash, and insurance fell with increasing size of estate.

With the use of various asset-price indices, Mendershausen
made comparisons of the distribution of wealth among the top 1%
of wealthholders over the period 1922-46, and found that eco-
nomic estate per wealthholder rose steadily over the period in
current dollars, except for a sharp fall in 1941 which was due,
in part, to the relatively low asset prices of that year. Menders-
hausen compared his estimates with those made by Charles Stewart
in 1922 (using Lehmann's method),[33] and an unpublished study done
by Mary Painter in 1940 which used dividend capitalization.[34]
There was substantial variation among the estimates, which was
attributed in part to the choice of preferred-risk mortality rates
by Mendershausen, and to the age distribution of decedents in the
particular years studied.

The next estimate of the holdings of top wealthholders was
by Robert Lampman for 1953.[35] The availability of national bal-
ance sheet estimates of aggregate national wealth made possible
the first calculation of the share of top wealthholders in personal
wealth. Lampman improved the accuracy of the multipliers by
using age-sex specific mortality rates. He adjusted for the lower

---

[33]Stewart, "Income Capitalization," pp. 112-116; also see
Stewart, Charles, "Method of Estimating the Influence of the
Personal Income, Gift, and Estate Taxes upon Savings and the
Distribution of Wealth," Social Research Vol. 5, Supplement 1,
Appendix A, 1938, pp. 91-98.

[34]Mary Painter, cited in Mendershausen, "The Pattern of
Estate Tax Wealth," p. 388.

[35]Robert J. Lampman, The Share of Top Wealthholders in
National Wealth, 1922-1956, Princeton: Princeton University
Press, 1962.

mortality rates of the well-to-do by using a composite of rates for upper level occupations and rates for the holders of pre-ferred-risk insurance policies.

For 1953, Lampman found 1.6% of all adults to be in the top wealthholder group of over $60,000 in gross assets. This group held 25% of all personally held wealth and over half of all business assets, 80% of all corporate stock, virtually 100% of all state and local bonds, and from 10-35% of other types of property. They represented about 2.3% of all families in the United States.

Historical comparisons made by Lampman showed that the top 2% of wealthholding families held 33% of private wealth in 1922, and 29% in 1953. He concluded, however, that the reductions in inequality had occurred in the 1930's and 1940's, but the trend had reversed in the post-World War II era.[36]

Following the estate-multiplier estimates by Mendershausen and Lampman, James Smith estimated the wealth of top wealth-holders by age, sex, and type of asset, and the annual income accruing to each of the top wealthholder classes.[37]

Income flows of three types were imputed to top wealth-holders. Direct returns to capital such as rent, dividends,

---

[36]Ibid., p. 24.

[37] James D. Smith, "Income and Wealth of Top Wealthholders in the United States, 1958" (Ph.d. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966).

interest, and business income were estimated by the average
rate of return on capital. Capital gains, both realized and
unrealized, were estimated by the relative change in a price
index for each type of asset. Wage and salary income was
estimated by the use of means of ratios of wage and salary
income to asset holdings for persons with $60,000 or more
in gross assets, as determined from a Federal Reserve study
and Census data which was available. Income from trust funds
and unsettled estates was not included.

Smith estimated that the top wealthholders received 24%
of the income going to individuals in 1958. They were 1.5%
of the population, and their estimated share of wealth was 32%.
This result supported Lampman's conclusion that the share of
top wealthholders had been increasing since 1949.

The Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan,
with the support of the Board of Governors of the Federal Re-
serve System, has made estimates of income, wealth, savings,
and debt of families.[38] These have been based on personal
interviews. A detailed study was carried out in 1963 by the
Board of Governors.[39] Data was collected from a national
sample of 2,557 consumer units, with oversampling among the

---

[38]Ibid.

[39]Dorothy S. Projector and Gertrude S. Weiss, Survey of
Financial Characteristics of Consumers, Board of Governors of
the Federal Reserve System, Federal Reserve Technical Paper,
1966.

highest income groups. Special attention was given to the
components of wealth and debt and their diffusion throughout
the economy, the variation in patterns of asset ownership, and
the apparent determinants of the size of wealthholdings per
individual

The Survey was dependent on the voluntary co-operation
of respondents for its information, this reliance affected
its   accuracy, particularly among the highest wealth and
income units. It omitted the cash value of life insurance,
annuities, and retirement funds, consumer durables other than
automobiles, and miscellaneous items such as jewelry and works
of art and so could not yield complete wealth estimates.

The 1967 <u>Survey of Economic Opportunity</u>[40] included 30,000
households from the Census Current Population Surveys. This is
a much larger sample than the previously cited survey contained,
with greater detail of information in many cases. But like the
previous study, it does not include information on miscellaneous
assets such as art works (which are chiefly owned by the weal-
thy) and it had a high rate of nonresponse, particularly in the
highest wealth groups. While it can provide valuable information
not available from other sources, its application is limited by
the problems mentioned here.

---

[40] Ibid.

A later publication by Smith focussed on those individ-
uals with net worth over $60,000,[41] a group he called the
"super-rich" after Ferdinand Lundberg.[42] Microdata tapes of
federal estate tax returns filed in 1962, 1965, and 1969 were
made available for research purposes by the Internal Revenue
Service, with information which made possible this concept-
ually more satisfying classification.

The mortality rates used in the 1969 study by Smith
were similar to those used earlier by Lampman, except for the
addition of marital status differentials. Nine other sets of
mortality rates were compiled by Smith in order to test the
sensitivity of the estimates to the different rates. His con-
clusion was that estimates are extremely sensitive to the rate
chosen.[43] No one set of mortality rates can confidently be
applied to the estate tax payers. He chose a set of
rates which split the difference between white rates adjusted
for occupational mortality differentials and preferred-risk
life insurance policy rates.

---

[41]James D. Smith, "The Concentration of Personal Wealth
in America, 1969," Review of Income and Wealth 20:2, June
1974, pp. 143-179.

[42]Ferdinand Lundberg, The Rich and the Super-Rich, New
York: Stuart, 1968.

[43]Smith, "The Concentration of Personal Wealth," p. 163.

A subsequent paper by Smith and Stephen Franklin examined
in greater detail changes in the personal concentration of
wealth from 1922 to 1969.[45] The share of wealth held by the
richest 1% and .05% was estimated by the estate multiplier
technique and compared with the total. On the basis of these
estimates, Smith and Franklin concluded that the distribution
of wealth had become more equal in the 1930's and 1940's, but
had remained essentially unchanged since then.

> "Observable point-to-point differences in the
> estimated concentration of wealth since 1945
> are due to inconsistencies and inadequacies
> in IRS data, sampling errors, short-run stock
> market variations, and a valuation bias in the
> basic data which understates the wealth of the
> rich in declining market periods by permitting
> estates to select between the most beneficial
> of two valuation dates."[46]

The estate-multiplier estimates and the federally spon-
sored surveys have provided most of the current information
on the distribution of wealth in the United States. There
is still a need for better information on the various types
of wealth and the amounts held by those below the estate tax
limit. In addition, estate tax wealth will not be as high
as the true wealth of the living top wealthholders where the
use of trusts is prevalent. Further research into the effect
of trusts on wealth estimates would be highly useful.

---

[45]James D. Smith and Stephen D. Franklin, "The Concentra-
tion of Personal Wealth, 1922-1969," American Economic Review
Vol. 64, May 1974, pp. 162-167.

[46]Ibid., p. 164.

Recently, Stanley Lebergott has estimated the distribu-
tion of wealth among consumer units by income class for 1970.[47]
He allocated aggregate estimates of components of household
wealth (from Flow of Funds accounts) among income classes,
in accordance with the distribution of income flows, and some
other supplementary data. Estimates were first made using IRS
income tax returns, and then converted to consumer units using
calculations of wealth per dollar of income, by income level,
and applying these to census family income data. Lebergott
found the wealth-income ratios to be very stable for incomes
between $6,000-20,000 (ranging only from 3.2 to 3.9). Below
$6,000 the wealth-income ratio declined as income rose, from
8.7 to 4.7. Above $20,000 there was a sharp and steady increase
in wealth-income ratios. For incomes above $50,000 the average
was 12.8; over $500,000 the average was 18.7.

The initial method of estimation of wealth per IRS in-
come class was as follows. On the assumption that capitali-
zation rates for dividends do not vary with income, the Flow of
Funds corporate stock total was allocated among income classes
in accordance with the percentage of total dividends received
by each class. Debt instruments and currency were allocated on
the basis of interest received. Property ownership was allocated
on the basis of real estate taxes paid by each class. Lebergott

---

[47]Stanley Lebergott, The American Economy - Income,
Wealth, and Want, Princeton: Princeton University Press,
1976, pp. 215-247.

relied on two studies which found that assessment ratios and

median effective tax rates were not affected by income level.[48]

Business equity was allocated in accordance with tax return

data on net profit of business, profession, farm, or partner-

ship. Automobiles and other consumer durables were also in-

cluded, by a method based on Census Survey findings.

According to Lebergott's estimates, the top 1% of con-

sumer units in the income distribution held 17% of total per-

sonal wealth, 36% of privately held corporate stock, 13% of

short-term claims (which included bank deposits, bonds, mort-

gages, notes, and currency), 5% of real estate and 25% of

business equity. Wealth is also estimated for 13 income classes.

Comparability with estimates of the wealth of top wealthholders

is unfortunately limited since wealth is estimated for income

classes. The strengths of this approach lie in its extensive

coverage of the population and its reliance on readily acces-

sible data.

Studies of Regional Distribution

Although the earliest wealth studies in America relied

heavily on state data sources, there was a subsequent shift

to the use of federal income and estate tax returns when these

---

[48]David Black, "The Nature and Extent of Effective
Property Tax Rate Variations Within the City of Boston,"
National Tax Journal, June 1972, p. 207; and E. Scott Maynes
and J. N. Morgan "The Effective Rate of Real Estate Taxation:
an Empirical Investigation," Review of Economics and Statis-
tics, February 1957, p. 18.

became available. In recent decades, researchers have used state and local information to study the distribution of wealth within states and localities.

The pattern of financial asset ownership in Wisconsin was analyzed by Thomas R. Atkinson from information found in a sample of Wisconsin state income tax returns.[49] Wisconsin law requires that the source of corporate dividends and corporate or foreign government interest payments be specifically named. This made possible the use of more accurate capitalization rates, rather than an average as Lehmann had used, and the analysis of holdings of speculative issues, closely held or untraded stocks, and large bonds.

Atkinson found that the average return on stock was substantially higher for the income group of $50,000 and over, due to their substantial holdings of speculative issues. Estimates were made of the distribution of untraded stock and large bonds. Atkinson concluded that

> "Ownership of closely held or seldom traded corporate issues is enormously important in the total equity picture and is to a very great extent concentrated in the topmost income groups. Moreover, it is largely

---

[49]Thomas R. Atkinson, The Pattern of Financial Asset Ownership, Wisconsin Individuals, 1949. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.

concentrated with individuals who receive wages or salaries from the issuing corporations; such persons held nearly two-thirds of the total values of untraded stock."[50]

An estimate of total wealth in Wisconsin, and its distribution, could not be made due to the nature of the data used. Many pensioners with significant asset holdings would fall below the income level for filing the return. In addition, a substantial number of financial assets were not required to be listed on the return. These included cash, demand deposits, life insurance, federal government obligations, stock not paying dividends, real estate outside Wisconsin, federal and state pensions, mineral and timber leases, and the value of ownership in unincorporated businesses. This study was, in any case, a major contribution to the literature on wealth estimation, because of the information it revealed on the different kinds of assets held at various income levels. Similar data does not exist for any other state, or at the national level.

Richard French used the estate-multiplier technique to estimate personal wealth and its distribution in Oklahoma in 1960.[51] His has been the only such estimate that has been made at the state level. The low filing requirement of $100 in Oklahoma resulted in a much more extensive coverage of the

---

[50]Ibid., p. 7.

[51]Richard French, "An Estate-Multiplier Estimate of the Personal Wealth of Oklahoma Residents, 1960" (Ph.d. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1967).

population than is possible at the national level.

French found that the top 1% of Oklahoma wealthholders held 43.5% of the total estimated wealth in Oklahoma, a greater concentration than has been estimated for the United States at large. Wealth was concentrated in the metropolitan areas surrounding Tulsa and Oklahoma City. The age of decedents was not required information on the return. The Oklahoma Department of Health provided this information, along with mortality rates for persons residing in Oklahoma.

James Smith used the estate-multiplier technique to estimate total wealth and its distribution for Washington, D. C. in 1967.[52] The major data sources were estate tax returns filed in the District of Columbia and death certificates for District of Columbia residents filed in the District or at the place of death.

Washington also has its own estate tax, with a filing requirement of $1000 in gross assets. Information regarding the decedents age, sex, occupation, and marital status is requested, along with the itemization of all assets except the cash surrender value of life insurance policies and the owner-

---

[52] James D. Smith, "White Wealth and Black People: The Distribution of Wealth in Washington, D. C. in 1967," in James D. Smith, ed., The Personal Distribution of Income and Wealth, New York: Columbia University Press, 1975.

ship of real estate outside the District. The latter were excluded from the wealth estimate.

Mortality rates used to calculate the multipliers were age-sex-race-marital status specific, adjusted for occupational class mortality rates. An estimate of total wealth was made by fitting log-normal functions to the estate-multiplier estimates and extrapolating them into the lower tail of the distribution for blacks and non-blacks.

Smith found a mean net worth of $19,300 for non-blacks residing in Washington, D. C., which was quite close to his estimate of the mean value for the United States as a whole. Blacks, who were 67% of the District's population, held a mean net worth of $1000. Composition of assets and holdings of various types were analyzed in relation to sex, race, age, and level of net worth.

Atkinson, French, and Smith were able to achieve greater depth and breadth of result in some aspects of their estimations because the particular data sources they used were superior in certain respects to those available for the United States as a whole.

Conclusion

Interest in the distribution of wealth in America dates back at least a century. The techniques, as well as the basic data available, for estimating the distribution have improved substantially during that time.

Early studies used combinations of various methods and types of data. State probate information was used to make inferences about the national distribution, and data on farm property and debt was used to estimate the total distribution of property. Census data, income and estate tax returns, and large amounts of common observation were relied upon. Inventories, income capitalization, and the distribution of estates at death were the methodologies used. A promising application of income capitalization to the estimation of national wealth was made by Fritz Lehmann, who combined it with estate tax information to estimate total wealth held by the wealthy.

Recent studies have used the estate-multiplier technique to estimate the share of wealth held by the estate tax payers and its distribution among them. The development of better mortality rates has contributed to improving the accuracy of these estimates. The existence of national balance sheet estimates of total wealth has made possible comparisons with this independent estimate.[53]

The estate tax payers represent a rather small, though significant, portion of the United States population. A lower

[53]Raymond W. Goldsmith, The National Wealth of the United States in the Postwar Period, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962; and Goldsmith and Lipsey, Studies in the National Balance Sheet of the United States, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

filing requirement on the federal estate tax, such as Washington,
D. C. or Oklahoma require, would make possible estate-multiplier
estimates of the wealth of greater numbers of the population.

Another possible method of estimating the wealth holdings
of a substantial part of the population is that of income cap-
italization, in combination with supplementary methods of esti-
mating non-income wealth. Lebergott's method combines capital-
ization of major income flows and use of national aggregates.
The extension of the federal income tax to low levels of income
has broadened the coverage of capitalization techniques,
and greater detail in the specification of the origin of dividends
(as on the Wisconsin state income tax returns) would enable more
accurate capitalization of dividends to stock holdings.

In this study, income from interest and dividends, along
with property taxes paid, are used in the estimation of family
wealth from income and Census data.

CHAPTER III

DETERMINATION OF CAPITALIZATION AND PROPERTY TAX RATES

Introduction

While detailed studies of wealth distribution among the

top wealthholders have made significant advances in expanding

the state of knowledge regarding the very wealthy, attempts

to estimate the entire distribution of wealth have been few

and far between. The recent availability of large microdata

files which include extensive financial and demographic infor-

mation for each observation makes possible the use of indivi-

dual family income and asset data to model the unknown variable,

wealth.

Family wealth levels are estimated in this study using

gross values of real property, debt instruments,[1] and corporate

stock as the independent variables in a linear regression model.

These are important components of the stock of wealth which

must themselves be estimated from financial flows (dividends,

---

[1]Debt instruments refers to all assets yielding interest
income to the owner, including corporate and foreign bonds,
U. S. government securities, loans and mortgages, state and
local bonds, and all savings deposits and credit union accounts.

interest, and property taxes). Data on these flows comes from the personal income tax returns of members of the family and Current Population Survey reports, through the 1974 OTA file (Office of Tax Analysis, Department of the Treasury) in which these are merged by family. The characteristics of this file and the merging techniques are discussed in Chapter IV.

In this chapter, the choice of a rate of return and rate of interest to be used when capitalizing dividends and interest income is analyzed empirically from survey data, following a review of the literature on differences in rates of return between income classes. Based on this information, a single rate is used across all income classes, as there is no clear relationship between income and rate of return. Average property tax rates are calculated for each state, based on a combination of available Census data, since these are found to vary more between states than within states.

The Accuracy of Reported Dividends and Interest

A central part of this method of wealth estimation is the capitalization of income flows from stocks and debt instruments, as reported on federal income tax returns, into estimates of the value of those assets. The income tax has been extended over the years, so that population coverage of income recipients is quite good. The adequacy of coverage on the federal tax return of dividends and interest is discussed in the following paragraphs.

46

Underreporting of dividend and interest income occurs for a variety of reasons. In some cases, the income of the recipient is below the minimum filing requirement.[2] The dividend exclusion of $100.00 per person probably results in the failure to report small amounts of dividends on many returns. Although regulations require corporations, banks, and other institutions to file reports with the Treasury department listing the recipients of dividends or interest paid out, these figures are rarely cross-checked with individual income tax filings. Sample audits by the Internal Revenue Service provide a basis for estimating the degree of underreporting which occurs, and the income groups in which it is most frequent.

Some stock, particularly in closely-held corporations, is non-dividend paying. Shareholders of small business corporations also have the option of being taxed as partnerships, thereby eliminating the listing of their receipts as dividends. When stock is held in trust, dividends are paid directly to the trust and the individual reports trust income separately. For these reasons, some stock ownership will not be revealed by dividends received.

---

[2] A great many of these persons are minors.

The gap between aggregate reported dividends and actual total dividends was estimated by Daniel Holland in the late 1950"s and by Blume, Crockett, and Friend in the 1960's. Holland concluded that 5-10% of total dividends were not reported by individuals. Errors in interest income reporting appeared to be of greater magnitude. Previous audits which he examined indicated that underreporting was most prevalent in the middle income group.[3] Blume, Crockett, and Friend used an estimate of 2% of reported dividends to account for illegal underreporting, on the basis on unpublished IRS studies which have shown a substantial reduction since 1959.[4] The remainder of the dividend gap (which amounted to 5.8% of reported dividends) was assumed to be due to non-filers or persons below the legal exclusion limit.

According to an earlier study, approximately 5% of total corporate stock did not pay dividends in 1960. Only 2% of New York exchange listed stocks did not pay dividends, whereas 10% of the stock which was unlisted or was listed on other exchanges did not pay dividends during that year.

---

[3]Daniel Holland, Dividends Under the Income Tax, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962, p. 5.

[4]Marshall E. Blume, Jean Crockett, and Irwin Friend, "Stockownership in the United States: Characteristics and Trends," Survey of Current Business 54:11, November 1974, p. 20.

Since there is an inverse correlation between the income of
a stockholder and the importance of New York exchange listings
in his portfolio, higher income returns probably have a greater
percentage of stock which is not captured through dividend
capitalization.[5]

Underreporting is most common in the middle income group
because small amounts of interest or dividends are often re-
ceived. Interest from savings accounts is probably the most
seriously underreported, also for this reason. Underreporting
in the high income group is probably due for the most part to
the holdings of stocks in trust and the ownership of non-
dividend paying stock.

The Choice of an Appropriate Capitalization Rate for Dividends

The average rate of return on common stock for 1973 was
3.4%, according to Moody's Investors Service. In this sec-
tion, the appropriateness of adjusting that average rate for
different income classes will be discussed. Given the struc-
ture of the federal income tax, it is commonly expected that
persons of higher income will prefer capital gains to dividend
income. Their measureable average rate of return (dividends/
value of stock) would therefore be lower than that of middle
income investors, even though their eventual total profit
might be much greater. It has been suggested, however,

---

[5]Jean Crockett and Irwin Friend, "Characteristics of
Stock Ownership," Proceedings of the Business and Economics
Statistics Section of the American Statistical Association,
1963, p. 148.

that high dividend payout and increased stock value
are often positively related rather than being alternatives
in investment.[6]

Furthermore, age, occupation, and many other motivational
forces may affect investment goals sufficiently to offset any
pattern in rates of return by income class. A survey conducted
under the auspices of the Brookings Institute dealt consider-
ably with the motivations behind investment decisions and port-
folio composition, and found that tax considerations were not
as important as economists often assume them to be.[7]

Investment outcomes, which are measured in part by cur-
rent rates of return, are not necessarily the investment goals
of the individuals. It has been argued that higher income
individuals have greater access to information and so might come
closer to attaining investment goals than other investors. The
recent literature on efficient capital markets suggests that
with the exception of specialists and a very small group of cor-
porate insiders, there has been no group (or method) which has
systematically outperformed the market, since stock prices ad-
just quickly to reflect all available information.[8]

---

[6]Holland, pp. 38-56.

[7]Robin Barlow, Harvey E. Brazer, and James N. Morgan,
Economic Behavior of the Affluent, Washington, D.C.: The
Brookings Institution, 1966, pp. 151-170.

[8]Eugene F. Fama, "Efficient Capital Markets: A Review of
Theory and Empirical Work," Journal of Finance, vol. 25, May
1970, pp. 384-87.

Recent Literature on Rates of Return by Income Class

The long-range study of stock ownership characteristics which is ongoing at the Wharton School of Finance supplies some empirical information on differential rates of return by income class. A stratified sample of returns used by the Internal Revenue Service for Statistics of Income -- Individual Income Tax Returns[9] in 1960 was further limited to persons reporting dividend income. Within this group, a subsample was taken, with higher sampling ratios in the upper income brackets. The 1960 price-dividend ratio of the paying corporation, as identified on Schedule A, was used to capitalize the receipts to a market value figure.[10]

Average price-dividend ratios (the inverse of the rate of return concept used here) were relatively constant for incomes under $50,000 but rose steadily for higher income classes. This may have been due to a much stronger preference which lower income stockholders[11] showed for telephone and communications stock (particularly AT&T), electric and gas utilities, and investment companies. Bank and insurance stocks were equally popular with all income groups. These four industry areas combined

---

[9]Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, Statistics of Income -- Individual Income Tax Returns, 1919 -- present, annually.

[10]Crockett and Friend, pp. 147-48.

[11]It is worthwhile to note that lower income stockholders are generally not lower income persons.

accounted for 40% of total stock owned in the under $10,000

group of stockholders, an average of 25% in the $10-150,000

group, and less than 20% in the over $150,000 group.[12]

In the Wharton study, the importance of industrial stocks

in the portfolio increased steadily with income. Upper middle

income stockholders held, relatively, the highest proportion

of stock in family or closely-held corporations, while persons

in the highest income brackets held the greatest proportion

of stocks in trust, according to the 1960 study. Friend and

Crockett proposed that the heavy preference of lower income

stockholders for utility stocks might be evidence of risk-aversion

or a result of widespread employee-stock ownership plans and a

greater familiarity of the public at large with utility stocks

than with industrials.[13]

In order to include stock which did not pay dividends

in their estimates, Friend and Crockett made the assumption that

a particular income class would hold the same proportion of all

non-dividend paying stock of a particular status and industry

as it held of all dividend paying stock of that type. For this

reason, they accompanied their estimates of the distribution of

stock by income class with the following caution.

---

[12]Ibid., pp. 158-61.

[13]Ibid., p. 161.

". . . the ratios for high-income classes are
almost certainly somewhat too low, since these
groups would be expected to hold a higher pro-
portion of non-dividend paying than of dividend
paying stock of a given type, in view of the
tax advantages of substituting capital gains
for dividend income."[14]

In a subsequent study, it was estimated that for 1971

the highest 1% of families and unrelated individuals in the

personal income distribution received 47% of dividend income

and held 51% of the market value of stock owned by all fam-

ilies, while the highest 10% received 71% of dividend income

and held 74% of the market value of stock.[15] The tendency of

upper income investors to hold low rate of return (high price-

dividend ratio) stock was more pronounced in 1971 than in 1960,

although the overall rate of return including capital gains did

not differ significantly among income groups.

The Wharton studies found that rate of return and income

were inversely related at very high level income levels. This

was explained in part by differences in portfolio composition

as income rose. Utilities, including telephone and communica-

tion stocks, were much more important in the portfolios of lower

and middle income stock owners than were industrials. As a

---

[14]Ibid., p. 155.

[15]Blume, Crockett, and Friend, p. 17.

general rule, they pay higher dividends per dollar of stock but do not confer the capital gains which "growth" stocks often do.

Analysis of Rates of Return from Survey Data

In order to further analyze the relationship which might exist between average family rate of return on stock and family income level, data from the Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers[16] was utilized in this study. For each family in the sample, the value of publicly traded stock and the value of closely-held stock was available, along with the value of dividends received for each type. Average rates of return were calculated for twenty income classes as follows.

First, total annual income was calculated for each family and the families were ranked in ascending order by income level. The sample was then divided into twenty income strata, each containing approximately 127 observations. The survey over-sampled the wealthy, so that roughly the top ten of the twenty strata represent "high-income" respondents. In addition, since the concept of total income used included farm and small business income there are observations with substantial negative income in the lowest stratum who also have a high wealth rank.

---

[16]Dorothy S. Projector and Gertrude S. Weiss, Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Federal Reserve Technical Paper, 1966.

Within each stratum, total dividend receipts were summed
across the group and divided by the sum of total value of
stock held, in order to arrive at the average rate of return
for the strata. In this manner, observations were weighted
by their economic importance in calculating the average rate
of return. In addition, this eliminated the problem of an
artificially high variance in average family rates of return
caused by the fact that the survey recorded the sum of divi-
dend income flows over the year, but asked for stock ownership
as of December 31, 1962. Thus, some families reported dividends
but no stock, or vice versa, due to the fact that transactions
had occurred during that year. Calculation of the average rate
of return may be expressed as:

(1) $r_i = \Sigma D_i/\Sigma s_i$

where r_i represents the average rate of return
on all corporate stock in the ith
stratum

D_i represents dividends received by families
in the ith stratum

s_i represents value of stock owned by families
in the ith stratum

Average rates of return, as calculated from the sample data,
may be seen in Figure 1 , page 55 , and in Table 1 on page 56 .
They range from roughly 1% in the first, fifth, and thirteenth
strata to over 4% in the fourth and eighth strata. No consis-
tent pattern between the average rate of return and income strata
seems to be present, other than the pronounced reduction in the

55

Figure 1

AVERAGE RATES OF RETURN ON CORPORATE STOCK
BY -INCOME CLASS, 1962

Income Strata

SOURCE: Compiled using microdata from the Survey of Financial
Characteristics of Consumers. See equation (1), p. 54.

TABLE 1

Average Rates of Return on Corporate Stock and Debt Instruments by Income Strata

Stratum	Avg. Rate of Return Corporate Stock	Avg. Rate of Return Publicly Traded Stock	Avg. Rate of Return Closely-Held Stock	Avg. Rate of Interest Debt Instruments
1	0.011	0.012	0.001	0.020
2	0.015	0.015	0.000	0.039
3	0.026	0.039	0.000	0.034
4	0.044	0.043	0.454*	0.033
5	0.011	0.023	0.000	0.021
6	0.040	0.044	0.000	0.032
7	0.025	0.025	na	0.032
8	0.047	0.050	0.000	0.029
9	0.022	0.033	0.000	0.023
10	0.033	0.036	0.000	0.023
11	0.016	0.029	0.002	0.038
12	0.020	0.019	0.020	0.031
13	0.012	0.012	0.005	0.039
14	0.030	0.035	0.002	0.030
15	0.031	0.033	0.027	0.032
16	0.028	0.035	0.013	0.039
17	0.023	0.034	0.007	0.028
18	0.025	0.032	0.011	0.037
19	0.022	0.027	0.015	0.030
20	0.024	0.025	0.021	0.032

56

Source: Rates of return and interest have been calculated from the Survey of Financial Character-istics of Consumers data on family income and assets for 1962, as described on pp. 52-61.

* This figure is assumed to be due to errors in reporting the value of closely-held corporate stock. In Figure 2 it has not been plotted.

dispersion of average rates for the higher income classes.

Average rates of return on publicly traded stock were very

similar to those for all stock, primarily because it is much

more important than closely-held stock in most portfolios.

Figure 2 shows the average rates of return on publicly traded

and closely held stock for the twenty income classes used here.

$$(2) \quad rpt_i = \Sigma\ DPT_i/\Sigma\ SPT_i$$

where rpt_i represents the average rate of return on publicly traded stock in the ith stratum

DPT_i represents the dividends from publicly traded stock received by families in the ith stratum

SPT_i represents the value of publicly traded stock owned by families in the ith stratum

For closely held stock, the seventh income class was the

sole case in which no family held any of that type of asset.

Eleven other classes had average rates of return of zero or

less than 1%. Discounting the abnormally high value for the

fourth stratum, the information yielded by the data suggests

that higher income persons tend to receive a higher rate of

return on stock in closely held companies. The importance of

these in the total stock portfolio is small enough, however,

that the overall rate of return is not significantly affected.

Valuation of closely held stock is a difficult matter, and the

results of this analysis must be accepted with far less confidence than the preceding discussion of rates of return on publicly traded stock.

$$(3) \quad rch_i \ = \ \Sigma DCH_i \ / \ \Sigma SCH_i$$

where rch_i represents the average rate of
return on closely-held stock
in the ith stratum

DCH_i represents dividends from closely-
held stock received by families
in the ith stratum

SCH_i represents the value of closely-
held stock owned by families
in the ith stratum

The average rate of return on closely-held stock is plotted for the twenty income strata in Figure 2 on page 59. and is also listed in Table 1 on page 56.

An analysis of the average rate of return using the survey data from 1962 does not support the hypothesis that the price-dividend ratio, or rate of return (ignoring capital gains) will vary consistently with income class for publicly traded stock or overall stock ownership. The variation in class means is less as income class rises, but the mean rate of return on stock is still the best predictor of the rate of return of any stockholder, regardless of his/her position in the income distribution.

This result does not diverge significantly from the conclusions of the Wharton study, which did not find a negative

Figure 2

AVERAGE RATES OF RETURN ON PUBLICLY TRADED AND CLOSELY HELD STOCK

BY INCOME CLASS, 1962

Income Strata

SOURCE: Compiled using microdata from the Survey of Financial
Characteristics of Consumers. See equations (2)
and (3), pp. 57-58.

relationship between the rate of return and income below incomes of $50,000. In the sample data the three top strata include some families with incomes above that level. There was no indication of a lower rate of return for this group using the survey data on assets and dividends. This difference of result may be due to the use of different data bases, one survey answers and the other tax returns, or to the difference in the years studied.

For the purpose of this estimate, the survey results will be accepted with reservations, and a single rate of return (the average on common stock) will be used to capitalize the dividend income of any recipients on the tax file. Such a method will tend toward some overstatement of the holdings of lower income stockholders, and understatement of the corporate stock held by the higher income groups, since studies such as the Wharton one previously reviewed indicate a lower rate of return, on average, for very high income persons. The major purpose of estimating stock here is to use it, along with debt instruments and real estate, to estimate net wealth. As the next section will discuss, the bias in stock estimation mentioned as a possibility here is likely to be balanced off by the nature of the estimation of debt instruments.

The Choice of An Appropriate Capitalization Rate

for Interest Income

Since interest income is the sum of interest paid on conventional savings accounts, certificates of deposit, all types of bonds, and privately held loans and mortgages, a variety of interest rates must be considered when we attempt to capitalize income into the value of debt instruments. An evaluation of survey or estate tax data shows that the importance of all types of large denomination bonds in the portfolio, and of loans and mortgages, rises with income and wealth. Conventional savings accounts are relatively more important at lower levels.[17] The distribution of different types of debt instruments, which yield varying rates of interest, is not equal across income classes.

For the purpose of analyzing the average rate of interest received by different income classes, data on the value of debt instruments owned and the amount of interest income received in the Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers file was used to calculate an average rate of interest for each of twenty income classes. Using the same basic method as with rates of return, the average rate of interest for each income class was defined as the sum of interest income across a stratum

---

[17]Ibid.; and, James D. Smith, "The Concentration of Personal Wealth in America, 1969," Review of Income and Wealth 20:2, June 1974.

divided by the sum of all debt instruments held by families in the stratum.

$$(4) \quad \rho i = \Sigma I_i / \Sigma DI_i$$

where ρi represents the average rate of interest for the ith stratum

I_i represents interest income received by families in the ith stratum

DI_i represents debt instruments owned by families in the ith stratum

Average rates of interest for each strata are plotted in Figure 3, page 63 and listed in Table 1 on page 56. They exhibit more of a positive relation with income level than do average rates of return on stock. The dispersion of mean rates of interest narrows as income class rises, as it does with corporate stock rates. Average rates of interest range from 2.02% in the lowest stratum to 3.94% in the second. The overall average rate of interest for the entire sample of 3.13% suggests that using the rate paid on conventional time deposits is a good approximation of the average. In 1962, the year of the survey, 55% of Federal Reserve Member banks paid 3% or less on conventional accounts, 25% paid an interest rate of 3½% and 20% paid as high as 4%.

Table 2, page 64, lists the average rates of interest on the major types of debt instruments for 1962 and 1973. Rates paid on

63

Figure 3

AVERAGE RATES OF INTEREST ON DEBT INSTRUMENTS

BY INCOME CLASS, 1962

SOURCE: Compiled using microdata from the Survey of Financial
Characteristics of Consumers. See equation (4), p. 62.

64

TABLE 2

A COMPARISON OF MONEY MARKET RATES FOR 1962 and 1973

Debt Instrument	Avg. Rate 1962	Avg. Rate 1973
Corporate bonds	4.62	7.79
Short-term business loans (bank rates)	5.00	7.40 (May) 10.10 (Nov.)
Municipal bonds	3.14	5.22
U.S. Govt. Securities		
3 month bills	2.77	7.03
9-12 month	3.02	7.30
3-5 years	3.57	6.92
10 or more years	3.95	6.30
Time deposits -- maximum rate paid	4.00	5.00*
New home mortgages -- FHA insured	5.50	8.19

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1965, pp. 470-4, and 1974, pp. 463-5.

* Certificates of deposit paid from 5% to 7½% depending on the term and the denomination in 1973.

loans and mortgages refer to those held by financial institu-
tions, and may not be representative of those held by individ-
uals. It is apparent that by 1973 bonds were offering a far
higher relative rate of return than they were at the time this
survey data was collected. Municipal (state and local) bonds,
which are held primarily by the highest wealth group due to
the large denominations in which they are sold and the tax-free
income which is most valuable to that group, pay a relatively
low rate of interest which is generally close to the rate paid
on ordinary time deposits. Fortunately, state and local bonds
may be included in the debt instrument concept in this analysis
although interest from them is not reported on federal tax re-
turns, due to imputations which have been made by the Office
of Tax Analysis for this special tax file. [18]

The inclusion of state and local bond interest in
interest income probably accounts, in part, for the small
positive relationship between income strata and average rate
of interest in the survey data ; shown in Figure 3, page 63 . The
relative difference between the return on corporate bonds and
savings accounts, for example, was much greater by 1973 than
it had been in 1962. In using the survey results shown in Fig-
ure 3 , the actual trends present in the 1973 data may be
understated. It is possible that the average rate of interest
was more highly correlated with income in 1973 than in 1962,
and that therefore the use of the rate of interest paid on

---

[18]For a more detailed explanation see Chapter IV, pp. 90-92
below.

savings accounts to capitalize all interest income . may

overestimate the value of debt instruments held by higher

income groups. Fortunately, this bias is in the opposite dir-

ection from that which occurs when all dividends are capital-

ized using the average rate of return. Since lower income

stockholders probably owned relatively more utility stocks

than industrials, and for 1973 the average rate on utilities

was 7% versus 2.9% for industrials, and an average of 3.4%,

corporate stock ownership in lower income groups will tend

to be overestimated in contrast to that of debt instruments.

Estimation of Average Effective Property

Tax Rates by State

In this section, the estimates of statewide property

tax rates will be explained. These rates will be used to

estimate the value of real estate held using property taxes

paid, as listed on the income tax returns of family members.

The state is the most detailed level of location information

available for families in the sample. Since effective tax

rates vary more between states than within states, it is use-

ful to calculate average tax rates by state.

Nominal tax rates range from 0.7% in Owensboro, Ken-

tucky to 29.2% in Charleston, South Carolina. Where nominal

rates are low, however, assessments of property value gene-

rally reflect almost the full market value. As nominal rate

rates rise the ratio of assessed value to full market value
declines, so that the effective rate paid is lower than the
nominal.

Effective property tax rates are calculated as the
total tax paid divided by the market value of the property,
or the nominal rate time ratio of assessed value to sales
price. The 1972 Census of Governments[19] contains median
effective rates for 2,002 jurisdictions, based on samples of
measurable sales taken over a six-month period in 1971. Rates
range from 0.1% in Jackson, Mississippi to 5.7% in Trenton,
New Jersey, with a national average of 2.1%.

The Census of Governments data includes all counties
which are in Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA's),
in addition to all others with populations of over 50,000
and a random sample of remaining counties. Sales of over
$500,000 were excluded from the survey, on the assumption
that such transfers do not occur frequently and are not
likely to be representative. Sales of new houses were also
excluded, since the assessed value on the local tax roll
was generally based on the land value only. Single-family

---

[19]U. S., Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census,
Census of Governments, 1972, vol. 2, part 2, Assessment-
Sales Price Ratios and Tax Rates.

nonfarm residences accounted for 63.9% of the measurable

sales which made up the survey. In some localities, there

was insufficient data on sales prices, either because of

errors in collection or low turnover of property, so that

estimates could not be included in the published data.[20]

In order to estimate an average effective property

tax rate for each state from the rates which were listed for

counties, cities, and portions of counties, local rates were

weighted by the number of housing units within the locality.

The median effective rate on all property as listed in the

1972 Census of Governments was used. In the majority of

cases it is identical to the effective rate on single-family

housing.

$$(5) \quad rpt_j = \Sigma(rpt_i * u_i / \Sigma u_i)$$

where rpt_j represents the effective rate of property tax in the jth state

rpt_i represents the rate in the ith locality within the jth state

u_i represents the number of housing units in the ith locality

Table 3, page 69 , contains   the average

effective property tax rates which were calculated using

the method and data described above. Rates were generally

---

[20] Ibid.

TABLE 3

EFFECTIVE PROPERTY TAX RATES BY STATE, 1971

State	Average Effective Tax Rate (%)	No. Of Localities in the Sample
Alabama........	0.6	12
Alaska.........	2.1	*
Arizona........	1.4	7
Arkansas.......	1.1	6
California.....	2.3	79
Colorado.......	2.1	12
Connecticut....	2.4	16
District of Columbia.....	1.5	1
Delaware.......	2.2	1
Florida........	1.3	22
Georgia........	1.6	9
Hawaii.........	0.4	2
Idaho..........	1.6	2
Illinois.......	2.4	27
Indiana........	2.2	15
Iowa...........	3.0	12
Kansas.........	2.5	7
Kentucky.......	0.9	6
Louisiana......	0.6	7
Maine..........	2.8	1
Maryland.......	3.4	1
Massachusetts..	4.1	22
Michigan.......	2.3	23
Minnesota......	2.0	8
Mississippi....	0.1	1
Missouri.......	1.7	6
Montana........	2.0	3
Nebraska.......	2.5	4
Nevada.........	1.3	3
New Hampshire..	2.9	2
New Jersey.....	4.5	11
New Mexico.....	1.5	2
New York.......	2.2	13
North Carolina.	1.3	11
North Dakota...	1.9	2
Ohio...........	1.5	32
Oklahoma.......	1.2	11
Oregon.........	2.5	7
Pennsylvania...	2.1	15
Rhode Island...	2.6	4
South Carolina.	1.2	3
South Dakota...	2.5	3
Tennessee......	1.6	6
Texas..........	1.6	21
Utah....... ...	1.4	6
Vermont........	2.1	*
Virginia.......	1.3	10
Washington.....	1.6	9
West Virginia..	0.6	4
Wisconsin......	3.7	10
Wyoming........	2.1	*

* No sample data was available from the Census of Governments of 1972 regarding these states, so the national average effective rate was used.

SOURCE: Compiled using data from the 1972 Census of Governments. See equation (5), p. 68.

lower in the southern states, and highest in the North Central

and Northeastern sections of the country. The original data

show a tendency for rates to be highest in medium-sized cities,

and lowest in very large cities and in unincorporated areas.

Information on housing units, for the weighting factor,

came from the County-City Data Book for 1970.[21] For some

smaller towns, and for cities which are in two different

counties, the housing unit series was not sufficient. In

these cases, the General Characteristics of the Population[22]

series for 1970 provided data of sufficient detail on population.

Where 40% of the population of a city was in County A, that

same proportion of the housing units of the city was assumed

to be in County A. Where a city occupies two different counties,

the effective tax rates will often differ between the sections.

Therefore, if a city or town contained 10% of the population

of a county it was assumed to contain 10% of the housing units

in cases where a published breakdown was not available. For

the majority of cases, however, data on housing units was pub-

lished. Although this series is highly correlated with pop-

ulation it is probably a more accurate weighting factor, and

was used to weight most of the observations.

---

[21] Bureau of the Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, County-City Data Book, A Statistical Abstract Supplement, 1972.

[22] U. S. Department of Commerce Bureau of the Census, Census of Population, 1970, vol. 1, parts 2-52, Characteristics of the Population.

Conclusions

The method of wealth estimation which will be used here requires the capitalization of dividends into stock, interest income into debt instruments, and property tax paid into the value of real estate held. The rate or rates which should be used in each case have been the focus of the discussion in this chapter.

The results of the analysis of the average rate of return in different income classes using Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers data, and the Wharton studies reviewed here, indicate that the average rate of return on stock is probably the best estimate of the rate of return of any individual observation, regardless of income level. While this rate may overstate the holdings of lower income stockholders, any bias will be counterbalanced by the estimation of the value of debt instruments using the reciprocal of the rate of interest paid on savings accounts, which tends to overstate the holdings of the higher income groups. Since the final estimate of net wealth is the object of this study, and the components of stock and debt instruments are inputs into the function which estimates net wealth, this method is the best available solution.

Effective property tax rates have been estimated by state, since the variation between states is much greater than the variation within states. Each observation in the tax file

has property tax capitalized by the value of the average effective rate for the state of residence.

In the following chapter, a relationship between net wealth and the ownership of corporate stock, debt instruments, and real estate will be estimated from the 1972 estate tax return sample. Using the coefficients from this estimate and actual values for the components from the 1973 income tax file, net wealth will then be estimated and a frequency distribution constructed.

CHAPTER IV

THE ESTIMATION OF NET WEALTH FROM

INCOME TAX DATA

Introduction

In this chapter, the method of estimating net wealth

from the value of corporate stock, debt instruments and real

estate held is reviewed. The nature of the estate tax re-

turn data which is used to estimate the wealth-asset relation-

ship is discussed, and the assumptions necessary to apply

this method of wealth estimation to the final set of data on

the OTA (Office of Tax Analysis) file are stated.

The properties of the 1973 OTA file, the sample on

which this estimate is based, and the methodology for merg-

ing of microdata sets is reviewed in sections 3 and 4, pages

83-92. The results of this wealth estimate are then sum-

marized, including the percentage of total private wealth

held by respective proportions of family units. Two key

variables which explain differences in wealthholding are age

and income level. The distribution of income among wealth-

holders is illustrated here, as well as the distribution of

73

wealth between and within six age groups. Lorenz diagrams
of wealth, income, and assets by both wealth and income
classes show the relative concentration of these variables
through the population.

The Nature of the Estate Tax Data

The 1973 estate tax return sample, provided by the
Internal Revenue Service, consists of over 54,000 returns
selected out of 175,000 filed during that year.[1] Where the
gross estate, before debt, of any citizen or resident alien
exceeded $60,000, the executor or administrator was required
to file with the Internal Revenue Service, generally within
nine months of death. The IRS sample of these returns is
stratified, with returns over $300,000 selected at a 100%
rate, and the remainder selected at a 20% rate.

Sample returns were selected before audit of any of
the returns. The market value of gross estate at the date
of death was the basis for filing the original return, al-
though an alternative valuation date of six months later
could be used for tax purposes where the executor so desired.
The gross estate measure includes all property or interests
in property before reduction by debts, mortgages, or adminis-
trative expenses. Property over which the decedent held a

---

[1]Internal Revenue Service, Dept. of the Treasury,
Statistics of Income - 1972 Estate Tax Returns, describes
the full sample from which the IRS magnetic tape used here
is derived.

general power of appointment, gifts of property which the
decedent retained the right to alter, amend, revoke, or
terminate, the decedent's interest in annuities received by
a surviving beneficiary, and inherited property were in-
cluded. Gifts made within three years prior to death were
assumed to have been made "in contemplation of death" and
are reported as part of gross estate.

The decedent's portion of community property or
jointly-owned property was added into the gross estate mea-
sure. Death benefits paid by Social Security for funeral
expenses, and the proportionate share of all post-death
benefits attributable to the decedent's contribution to
annuities or similar contractual agreements were included.
For qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans
the employer's contribution to the annuity were excludible
from gross estate.

The corporate stock figure includes all issues of
listed and unlisted corporate stock, domestic or foreign,
including stock in closely-held corporations. Also included
were certificates of deposit issued for stock, stock scrip,
and dividends accrued on all stocks.

The debt instrument measure includes the total value
of all bonds, corporate or government, domestic or foreign,
regardless of their tax-exempt status for income tax pur-
poses. Thus, state and local bonds, all Federal issues

(including savings bonds) and accrued interest on any of
the above were accounted for. The value of cash in check-
ings and savings accounts, savings and loans deposits,
bank notes, safety boxes, or otherwise on hand was included.
Any loans or debts due the decedent, including promissory
notes, mortgages, trust deeds, contracts to sell land, and
any accrued interest were added to the above for a full
measure of interest-bearing assets.

The real estate figure included the full value of
personal or noncorporate business real property such as land,
buildings, improvements, and natural resources, owned or
under contract by the decedent whether here or abroad, and
accrued rents.

In addition to corporate stock, debt instruments, and
real estate, all tangible and intangible personal property
(such as household effects, royalties, patent and mineral
rights, cemetery lots, automobiles), life insurance received
by the estate or over which the decedent had power to change
the beneficiary, cancel an assignment, or borrow on the
policy were included. Noncorporate business assets, farm
and non-farm, were incorporated into the measure.

To arrive at a net wealth measure, gross estate
valued at the date of death less all debts and mortgages was
computed. The latter included claims against the estate
for medical expenses, unpaid mortgages plus accrued interest,

unpaid debts, unsecured notes, accrued property taxes,

unpaid gift taxes, and policy loans against life insurance.

Thus, the estate tax concept of wealth used in this

estimate is inclusive of virtually all wealth, unlike many

survey wealth concepts. Chapter II provides a thorough dis-

cussion of these alternate measures on pages 12-13 and 32-33.

Constructing a Sub-sample of Estate Tax Returns

In order to utilize the estate tax return data for

estimating the relationship between net wealth and asset

ownership, a sub-sample of returns was drawn from the avail-

able data. Due to the great variability in size of net

wealth within this group, a large stratified sample was

deemed appropriate, with optimal allocation employed in de-

termining which observations would be sampled. A total

sample size of 300 was selected on the judgment that this

was large enough to allow sufficient sampling within the

various strata, but of a reasonable size for computation

purposes.

It has been demonstrated that the method of optimum

allocation minimizes the portion of error due to sampling

variability where there are substantial differences in the

sizes of the strata and the variances within each stratum.[2]

_____

[2]William G. Cochran, Sampling Techniques, 2nd ed.
(New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1963), p. 97. Proportional
sampling is a special case of this situation and is optimal
if variances are equal in each of the strata.

For a given sample size, n, the equation (6) below, in-
dicates the appropriate apportionment of the sample.

$$(6) \quad n_h = n \; \frac{N_h s_h}{\sum\limits_{h=1}^{L} N_h s_h}$$

where n_h = number to be chosen from a given strata

N_h = population of a given strata

s_h = standard deviation within the strata

L = number of strata employed

Since the primary purpose of this model is to esti-
mate wealth across <u>all</u> wealth levels (rather than focussing
on the very rich) observations with net wealth of more than
$300,000 were deleted from the large sample before sub-
sampling was performed. Persons with negative net wealth
were also deleted although their inclusion did not materially
affect results.[3]

Estimation of the Wealth-Asset Relationship

In order to estimate a relationship between net
wealth (NW) and corporate stock (V), debt instruments (DI),
and real estate (RE), a large number of models were postu-
lated and fitted in both linear and log-linear form to the
sample of estate tax data. Each model was run with and
without an intercept, on data grouped into age 65 and over

---

[3]Appendix A, p. 155, shows the sampling procedure
in greater detail.

versus rest of the population, and on stockholders versus non-stockholders. No significant improvement in signifi- cance of the models was realized by either of the latter two grouping methods, and the models discussed here were all estimated without grouping. Use of an intercept term was found to lower the estimated value coefficients so substan- tially as to make the model not meaningful in almost every specification.

Two basic assumptions have been made in using the estate tax data to estimate a relationship which will be applied to observations on the OTA file:

(1) The composition of wealth will not be sub- stantively different among the estate tax payers than among all living persons of the same wealth levels, although the size of total estate may be diminished by gifts, trusts, etc., in anticipation of death.

(2) Composition of family wealth will not differ substantively from composition of individual wealth. Therefore, the regression estimate from individual estate tax returns may be applied to family unit data and yield sensible results.

The models have been fitted to data from individuals who died owning at least $60,000 in gross wealth, and net

wealth which is positive but no greater than $300,000.
These are persons at the far upper end of the wealth dis-
tribution. Some models fit this upper segment well, but
applied to all of the population yield total net wealth
which is unrealistically high (or low) relative to national
balance sheet estimates of over $3 trillion. Table 4,
page 81, summarizes the major types of models used and how
they performed on the criteria used to select the final
model. In addition to the R^2, the mean square error, the
significance of the t-statistics, and the pattern of the
residuals, each equation was tested on the OTA file to
determine the sum it would yield for total personal net
wealth when wealth of all families is aggregated,

Models with squared independent variables yielded
either extremely high sums for net wealth (in spite of the
very low coefficients on the squared values) or negative
values where the squared value and the raw value were both
included in the equation. The coefficient of the cross-
product of stock and debt instruments was estimated with a
negative sign where stock and debt instruments were included
separately in the model also. F- and t-statistics were high
in all models (significant at the .0001 level in almost all
cases) and are not listed here. R^2 was highest on the loga-
rithmic models, but these did not yield reasonable net
wealth estimates when tested on the OTA file.

TABLE 4

Results of Major Regression Models Estimated*

Model	R^2	MSE	$\hat{\Sigma}NW$ (trillions)	Residuals
1. NW = 1.041*V + 1.484*DI + 0.808*RE	.86	5334	2.6	Not correlated with size of NW, underprediction with very high debt instruments
2. NW = 96.6 + 0.67*V + 0.76*DI + 0.41*RE	.52	2794	1.3	Positively correlated with size of NW, random with respect to V, DI, RE except at high levels
3. NW = 1.25*V + 1.63*DI + 0.78*RE - .006* DISTK	.87	5022	-8.2	Underprediction only at very high levels of DI or V
4. NW = 1.29*V + .007*SQDI + 0.953*RE	.79	5054	9.6	Variance of residuals increases with size of NW
5. NW = 117.4 + .671*V + .004*SQDI + .372*RE	.50	2794	54.9	Positively correlated with NW, underprediction with high DI
6. LNW = .372*LV + .687*LDI + .589*LRE	.94	1.67	439.0	Errors negatively correlated with size of debt instruments
7. LNW = .186*LSQV + .343*LSQDI + .295*LSQRE	.94	1.67	434.0	Errors tend to be positive, some correlation with DI
8. LNW = .372*LV + .343* LSQDI + .589*LRE	.94	1.67	434.0	Errors are random, some correlation with DI
9. LNW = 4.45 + .099*LV + .082*LDI + .062* LRE	.25	0.162	17.6	Errors positively correlated with size of NW
10. NW = 1.5*V + 1.41*DI + 0.719*RE - .002* SQV	.88	5061	-3.1	No correlation with NW, negatively correlated at high levels of debt and RE

* where   L denotes the natural log of a variable and SQ denotes the square of that variable, NW = net wealth, V = corporate stock, DI = debt instruments, RE = real estate, and DISTK = cross product of corporate stock and debt instruments.

81

The model selected is listed first in Table 4. It has an R^2 of .86, and all coefficients are significant at the .0001 level. A pattern of residuals with independent variables is detectable only at very high wealth levels (in the case of debt instruments), estimates of the coefficients are sensible, and the total net wealth is reasonably comparable to survey and national balance sheet estimates of recent history.

The coefficient is less than one on real estate, which typically carries sizeable debt along with it. It is roughly one on corporate stock, and is over 1.4 on debt instruments. These assets represent mainly savings accounts and certificates of deposit (with a small proportion of corporate or municipal bonds, and any privately held notes). No debt is associated with them, and the model suggests that the size of other types of wealthholdings (which we capture only indirectly) are most strongly tied to this variable. These would include life insurance, business proprietorships or partnerships, and interest in property held in trust. The relative sizes of the coefficients thus seems very reasonable in terms of what we know about portfolio behavior. Net real estate wealth probably averages far less than 80% of gross real estate, but the value of consumer durables and other personal possessions is highly correlated with home values and raises this coefficient. Level of debt instruments

is probably a very good indicator of many other types of
wealth which we must measure indirectly. For example, sur-
veys of financial behavior, such as those mentioned in
Chapter II, pages 32-33, indicate that ownership of pro-
prietorships or partnerships is associated with higher than
average savings rates.

Thus, the coefficients on gross asset values appear
highly reasonable in model 1, and its predictive capability
may be judged good. Other models tested were either weaker
statistically, or yielded coefficients or predictions which
are not reasonable in light of other available knowledge.

A Brief History and Explanation of
Merged Microdata Sets

The data base for the wealth estimates is the 1973
file produced by the Office of Tax Analysis (OTA), in the
Department of the Treasury from a sample of 50,160 observa-
tions from the Current Population Survey (CPS) and 45,030
tax records from the 1973 Individual Income Tax Model.
Although most of the information used in this estimate is
from the income tax record, the use of the OTA file ex-
tends the sample to observations not required to file a tax
return, makes possible the estimation of a distribution in
family units rather than tax filing units, and provides
information on head of household age where the income tax
record would not. In addition, imputations of state and

local bond interest received by a family unit were added by OTA, along with estimates of property taxes paid by non-itemizers. Construction of the file will be reviewed in greater depth in a subsequent portion of this chapter, following a discussion of the general history of data base merging.

The merging of two or more microdata sets into one involves either the exact matching of records through some unique identifier or the synthetic linking of non-identical records in a manner which correctly simulates the characteristics of the population. Through this linking of data sets, a much more extensive body of data is available for analysis.

Exact matching of income tax records, Current Population Survey responses, and Social Security history has been underway at the Social Security Administration since the early 1960's. Using the social security number as the primary identifier[4] a substantial proportion of records may be matched with their respective tax returns. This method necessitates a computerized search through the tax returns for records matching the sample survey records. For roughly 10-20% of the survey households no tax return can be located and matches must be made statistically, on the basis of certain decision criteria. Even when records are matched by

---

[4]The Census Bureau began collecting social security numbers in CPS interviews in late 1963.

social security number the overlapping information is often
non-identical. Income figures may differ due to reporting
error, the use of different concepts of income, or varying
time periods, for example. The question of which file is
the "best" source of income information on these exact matches
has been addressed extensively at the Social Security admin-
istration.

Synthetic, or statistical, matching was used in the
1960's by Daniel B. Radner and Edward C. Budd at the Commerce
Department's Office of Business Economics (OBE)[5] and by
Benjamin A. Okner at the Brookings Institute. During the
1970's it was further developed by Scott Turner at the Office
of Tax Analysis of the Treasury Department (with Ralph Bristol,
Gary Gilliam, Gary Robbins, and Richard Barr) in a series of
matches, by Nancy and Richard Ruggles at the National
Bureau of Economic Research (NBER) and by Horst Alter at
Statistics Canada.[6]

Statistical matching can be more efficient than exact
matching due in part to reduced computer search time. The
files to be matched must be samples from very similar popu-
lations, but are not necessarily the same reporting units.

---

[5]Now the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA).

[6]For a brief discussion of the history of merging
microdata bases see Benjamin A. Okner, "Data Matching and
Merging: An Overview," Annals of Social and Economic Measure-
ment 3 (1974) 347-52.

Rather than relying on a unique identifier, records are matched on the basis of common attributes (such as age, race, sex, and earned income), and the problem of violating confidentiality is not raised. For purposes of analysis, the relevant properties of the files are preserved and a new sample including more extensive information about the population is thereby simulated.

While exact matching might seem to be less fraught with error, there are many cases in which a tax record cannot be found where the available survey information indicates that there ought to be one in existence. According to Okner,

> "Regardless of whether exact or synthetic linking is used, there are several problems common to all work in this area. These include data comparability, missing data, specific techniques for linking and and data manipulation, and the definition and evaluation of goodness of a match."[7]

The MERGE file which Okner produced at Brookings was built from the 1966 IRS sample of 87,000 individual returns and the 1967 Survey of Economic Opportunity (SEO) which covered 30,000 households. By combining these data sets a file was created which encompassed the non-tax filing portion of the population and could correct for the nonresponse at high income levels with which surveys are generally plagued. This file was then used to study tax incidence, and the results were published in the Brookings monograph Who Bears

[7]Ibid., p. 348.

the Tax Burden?[8]

Radner and Budd matched March 1965 CPS data with the 1964 Individual Income Tax Model at OBE for the purpose of improving the quality of income data.[9] Supplemental information from the Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers and an IRS audit study of 1963 was also utilized in the match. In this merge, all CPS records were used and each was matched with one (but no more than one) tax record. Common information between the files was used wherever possible.

The 1973 OTA Merged File

The file which was used in this wealth estimation is comprised of approximately 45,000 individual income tax returns (a subsample of the annual sample used for Statistics of Income - Individual Income Tax Returns) drawn from 15-20 income strata and 50,000 observations from the Current Population Survey. This survey is conducted monthly by the Census Bureau for the primary purpose of collecting unemployment statistics, but in March includes a series of questions regarding income of the family unit and individuals within it.

The combination of Census survey data and income tax records (through statistical merging) results in a file

---

[8]Joseph A. Pechman and Benjamin A. Okner, Who Bears the Tax Burden? Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1974.

[9]Edward C. Budd, "The Creation of a Microdata File for Estimating the Size Distribution of Income," The Review of Income and Wealth 7:4 (December 1971): 317-333.

superior to either of these separately, due in part to differences in coverage.[10] The survey contains demographic and financial information on families, where the tax record is based on the tax-filing unit, which may be a single return, a married couple filing jointly, or a married person filing separately. Little demographic information is reported on a tax return, but the quality of the financial information is widely accepted as superior to Census figures. If a distribution of wealth was based on income tax returns, however, it would be neither a distribution of family wealth nor of individual wealth. Use of the Census data makes possible the merging of individual returns into families, where appropriate, and the inclusion of age of head of household information for the family. The more reliable tax return information on dividends, interest, and property taxes may thus be utilized at the family level.

The method of accomplishing the statistical merge was similar to previous techniques discussed, but is superior in that the statistical properties of both files are preserved through constrained matching (in contrast to prior unconstrained matches). For two microdata files with variable weights in each file and an unequal number of records, the

[10]Census surveys do not include capital gains in the "Census money income" concept, for example, but do include all non-taxable transfers of income which tax records exclude. Low-income families who have not filed a tax return may be included in the survey, while persons abroad or in the military may file a return, but are not included in the sample frame.

constrained merging problem may be thought of as one of

determining the set of values which minimize the after-

match aggregate "distance" between the records in one file

and their corresponding matched records in the other file.[11]

This is, in fact, a "transportation" problem, and the classi-

cal transportation model of linear programming may be applied

to its solution.[12]

Use of the transportation model permits a record

in either file to be split or matched with more than one

record in the other file, with the weight apportioned among

the otherwise identical split records. Thus, the marginal

and joint distributions of each file's variables are pre-

served and the means and variance-covariance matrices of

items in each file are preserved.

In order to match CPS family units with one or more

appropriate income tax returns, potential tax returns were

created from the survey records and matched with the in-

come tax returns. For households which appeared to fall into

the non-filer category, dummy tax records were created in the

[11]J. Scott Turner and Gary B. Gilliam, "Reducing and Merging Microdata Files"; Joseph Kadane, "Statistical Problems of Merged Data Files"; and Richard S. Barr and J. Scott Turner, "A New Linear Programming Approach to Microdata File Merging," Compendium of Tax Research, OTA Papers. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, 1975-78.

[12]David G. Luenberger, Introduction to Linear and Nonlinear Programming, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1973.

tax sample. Records were matched with other records within

$1000 of their AGI(adjusted gross income) based on an attri-

bute function containing wage and salary income, property

income and business income, and a penalty function which

compared data on age, race, sex, and family size with data

in the Census record.[13] Tax records were then combined into

the appropriate Census family units.

While the merged file included both Census and IRS

income concepts, for purposes of this wealth estimation the

dividends and interest came solely from the tax records.

They were stated, however, in terms of family units which

means that the distribution may be expressed in family units.

In addition, age of head of household has been taken from

the CPS record in order to analyze the distribution of wealth

between and within different age groups.

Imputations made by OTA staff where data is missing

have also served to make this a richer data base. In this

wealth estimate imputed state and local bond interest is

added to taxable reported interest for use in arriving at

an interest figure from which debt instruments may be esti-

mated, and property tax payments for non-itemizers are used

in estimating the value of their real estate.

State and local bond interest was imputed using

the total amount of these bonds held by individuals as a

---

[13]Social security numbers were previously used to
obtain demographic information for the tax returns.

control figure, and the average interest rate on these
obligations, to estimate total tax exempt interest re-
ceived in 1973. Families were classified into one of nine
classes based on adjusted gross income (AGI). For each
class, a given percentage of returns was randomly selected
and allocated a mean amount of tax exempt interest. Below
$10,000 no returns had such interest imputed. The percen-
tage of returns receiving interest was increased from .029%
in the $10-15,000 AGI class to .46% in the over $100,000
AGI class. The mean amount per return also increased with
class. An internal OTA memorandum summarizes this process.

Homeowners tend to be itemizers due to the provision
in the tax code for deduction of mortgage interest. How-
ever, some older persons who no longer hold a mortgage and
whose other potential deductible expenses are too low in
relation to income to cause them to itemize still own real
estate of moderate value. Imputations of property tax paid
by standard deductors such as these have been included along
with reported property taxes and are part of the real es-
tate estimates.

These imputations are a part of a full set estimated
for standard deductors (which included other items such as
medical expenses, state and local gasoline tax, etc.) at
OTA. The estimation relied on a technique of within-file

imputation called the Turner soft-link method.[14]

Itemizer records were matched with non-itemizer records on the basis of a linkage function of similar characteristics such as filing status and the ratios of AGI along with taxpayer race, sex, and year of birth, which had been brought from social security records to the tax record to aid in matching.

Using the full set of itemizers as a "donor file," data items passed through a transformation function as they moved from the donor file to the recipient file of non-itemizers. This function reduced the dollar amount of deductible items so that the total relative to AGI would no longer cause the filer to benefit by itemization. Since itemizers tend to have higher AGI than non-itemizers, trans-formation had to reduce the size of potential deductibles substantially. A total of $1,631,000 in property taxes was imputed to sample observations relative to $14,000,000 from tax records.

Methodology of the Wealth Estimate

Using the data for the 45,030 families on the merged OTA file, values of corporate stock were capital-ized from dividends, debt instruments from interest reported,

---

[14] Peter K. Cook, "The Turner Soft-Link Method," Memorandum to OTA Professional Staff, Office of Tax Analysis, U.S. Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C., November 18, 1976. (Typewritten.)

and real estate from property taxes paid, as outlined in

Chapter III, pages 66-72. Net wealth was then calculated

for each family, with the regression coefficients estimated

from the estate tax return sample. Thus, for each family

their estimated net wealth was calculated by equation (7):

$$(7) \quad NW_i = 1.041*V_i + 1.484*DI_i + 0.808*RE_i$$

$$(17.27) \quad (19.76) \quad (18.98)$$

In order to analyze the concentration of wealth in

this distribution (weighted by sampling fractions to approx-

imate the population distribution) the Lorenz curve and the

Gini coefficient were utilized. Price inflation and econ-

omic growth limit the usefulness of dollar estimates and

distributions with boundaries constructed to correspond

with round dollar figures (i.e., $10-20,000). The Lorenz

curve pictures the proportionate distribution of wealth

among percentiles of the population, using cumulative values

of each.[15] It is recognized as highly useful for comparison

of the distribution of different variables at one point in

time, the distribution of a variable in two different coun-

tries, and the comparison of distributions at different

points in time. Figure 4, page 93, illustrates the concept

of the Lorenz curve and the Gini coefficient of concentra-

tion which may be calculated from it. The horizontal axis

represents cumulative percentages of the population (families,

---

[15]Max O. Lorenz, "Methods of Measuring the Concen-
tration of Wealth," Journal of the American Statistical
Association 70 (June 1905), 209-19.

Figure 4

**ILLUSTRATION OF THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE
LORENZ CURVE AND THE GINI COEFFICIENT**

PERCENT
OF WEALTH/
INCOME

PERCENTILES OF THE POPULATION

in this case) and the vertical axis represents cumulative

percentages of the measured variable (wealth, income, etc.).

The 45° line is the comparison standard of complete equal-

ity of distribution, where 10% of the population holds 10%

of the variable, 50% holds 50% of the variable, and so forth.

In every distribution the end points of the Lorenz curve

will coincide with the 45° line at 0 and 100.

The Gini coefficient was first developed by the

Italian econometrician Coronado Gini in the early 1900's as

a summary measure which might be used to compare distribu-

tions.[16] It measures the ratio of the area between the

Lorenz curve and the 45° line to the total area below the

45° line. The closer to one is the measured Gini coeffi-

cient (G), the higher the degree of concentration, and the

closer to zero the more equality. From Figure 4 we can

see that the area between the Lorenz curve and the 45° line

may be calculated as $A = \frac{1}{2} - \sum_{i=1}^{n} T_i$ and G is A divided by

$\frac{1}{2}$. Appendix B, page 157 outlines the method of computation

of the Gini coefficients in this analysis in greater detail.

To fully describe the distribution of wealth among

families, we will look at its distribution among income

---

[16]For discussions of the Gini coefficient and its
history see Joseph L. Gastwirth, "The Estimation of the
Lorenz Curve and the Gini Index," The Review of Economics
and Statistics 54 (August 1972) 306-16; and Dwight B. Yntema,
"Measures of the Inequality in the Personal Distribution of
Wealth or Income," Journal of the American Statistical Asso-
ciation 28 (December 1933):423-33.

classes, as well as wealth classes, and use the age of the head of household to group families into broad age categories so as to analyze the distribution of wealth, income and major assets within and between these different age groups. Wealth is importantly related to income and position in the life-cycle, although not in a systematic manner. Some families may hold high wealth throughout their life cycle and some never attain any substantive wealth. At very low income levels, part of the population consists of retired persons with modest sums of wealth who derive all of their income from this wealth, thus have a high ratio of wealth-to-income.

In order to develop population estimates of the wealth and income distribution, families were arrayed in ascending order by level of wealth (and subsequently, income) and percentile boundaries were determined using a computerized routine designed for this purpose. The T'th percentile, Y, is defined as a weighted average aimed at $X(N*P)$ as below in equation (8), where $N*P$ is equal to $J+G$.[17]

(8)　$Y = (1 - G)*X(J) + G*X(J + 1)$

where $P = T/100$ for the T'th percentile, Y

N = number of non-missing observations

X_i = ordered values of the variable

J = integer portion of $N*P$

G = fractional part of $N*P$

---

[17]This procedure is documented in the <u>SAS Supplementary User's Guide</u>, Kingsport, Tennessee: Kingsport Press for SAS Institute Inc., 1977.

The values computed from this procedure represent the upper boundaries of each percentile. Table 5, page 98, lists values for 18 wealth groups, each consisting of five percentiles of the wealth distribution, with the exception of the first group (including the 35 lowest percentiles which hold zero wealth) and the last five wealth groups, which consist of only one percentile each. The 100th percentile represents the highest percentile of the distribution, and includes all families with wealth of over $502,066 in 1973.

Within each wealth class, values were first weighted by their respective sample weights and summed both within the class and cumulatively. Appendix C, page 158, includes programs used to weight and sum the variables within classes. Net wealth (and other variables analyzed here) were first multiplied by the unique weight attached to that family, and then summed across the class. Cumulative percentages represent the summing across the distribution divided by the sum of weights up to that point.

For the income distribution, the same procedure was followed, using 12 income classes calculated by the same computer routine. Table 6, page 99, lists the upper boundaries of these income classes, based on the Census money income of the total family unit. The 100th, or highest, percentile includes all families with combined income of over $61,941 in 1973. The classes represent deciles up to the highest decile, in which the 90th-95th percentiles are

TABLE 5

UPPER BOUNDARIES OF NET WEALTH CLASSES, 1973

Wealth Percentiles		Level of Wealth
Lowest 35	-	$ 0.00
35-40		1,088.27
41-45	-	3,429.69
46-50	-	6,463.64
51-55	-	9,595.00
56-60	-	13,033.40
61-65	-	16,713.90
66-70	-	21,279.30
71-75	-	26,978.80
76-80	-	35,624.30
81-85	-	50,836.40
86-90	-	75,797.10
91-95	-	137,098.00
-96	-	164,041.00
-97	-	205,055.00
-98	-	283,913.00
-99	-	502,066.00
100	-	Greater than 502,066.00

NOTE: These were computed for the OTA file using equation
(8), page 96.

99

TABLE 6

UPPER BOUNDARIES OF THE CENSUS MONEY INCOME DISTRIBUTION, 1973

Income Percentiles	Level of Income
0-10	$ 2,365.00
11-20	4,201.00
21-30	6,137.00
31-40	8,284.00
41-50	10,412.00
51-60	12,669.00
61-70	15,138.00
71-80	18,318.00
81-90	23,881.00
91-95	30,421.00
96-99	61,941.00
100	Over 61,941.00

NOTE: These were computed for the OTA file using equation (8), page 96.

grouped as one class, and the 96th-99th represent the next to highest class.

Distribution by Wealth Class

The cumulative distribution of wealth and income by wealth classes is portrayed in the Lorenz diagram in Figure 5, page 101. As one would expect, the wealth distribution is substantially more concentrated than is income by wealth class. Figure 6, page 102, shows the set of Lorenz curves representing the cumulative distribution of corporate stock, debt instruments, and real estate by wealth class. While real estate is significantly less concentrated than is total net wealth, corporate stock is clearly considerably more concentrated. Debt instruments are distributed more equally in the lower half of the distribution than net wealth. The first 35 percentiles of the wealth distribution, representing approximately 24.6 million families, hold no measureable wealth, contrasted with 16.8% of Census money income. The lower half of the distribution holds 1% of net wealth, 0.2% of corporate stock, 1% of debt instruments, and 1.8% of real estate but 28.5% of income. The lower three-fourths of American families who hold 55.4% of income own only 11.2% of wealth. Almost one-third of privately held real estate rests with this group, but less than 2% of corporate stock.

Figure 5

LORENZ CURVES OF WEALTH AND INCOME
BY WEALTHCLASS, 1973

PERCENT
OF ASSET

PERCENTILES OF THE POPULATION
(ranked by wealth level)

Wealth ———————————

Income ——————————

Source: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pp. 92-100

Figure 6

LORENZ CURVES OF CORPORATE STOCK, DEBT INSTRUMENTS, AND REAL ESTATE BY WEALTHCLASS, 1973

PERCENT
OF ASSET

PERCENTILES OF THE POPULATION
(ranked by wealth level)

Corporate Stock   — — — — —

Debt Instruments   — — — — — — —

Real Estate   ————————

Source: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pp. 92-100

In Table 7, page 104, the cumulative percentages used to construct Figure 5 and 6 are listed. The percentage of real estate held rises more rapidly than that of debt instruments, and particularly than corporate stock, with a reversal of this trend in the upper decile. Table 8, page 105, contains the simple percentages held by each wealth class. The highest 1% of the wealth distribution holds an estimated 32.6% of net wealth, although receiving only 8.7% of income. They own 60.3% of privately held corporate stock, 29.4% of debt instruments, and 8.4% of real estate. The upper 5% of the distribution holds 57.5% of net wealth, 85.3% of corporate stock, 59.4% of debt instruments and 22.7% of real estate, while receiving 16.8% of income on a Census basis.

A picture of highly concentrated wealth emerges from the figures, with only the upper 15% of families holding shares of wealth at least comparable to their share of population. Each of the middle wealth classes represents 5% of total families, but not until the 61-65th percentiles does share of real estate rise above 5%. Above the 80th percentile, share of debt instruments approaches 5%. Share of corporate stock does not rise above proportionate importance in the population until the 90th percentile has been passed. As a result, share of wealth and of these assets is far above share of the population at the top.

TABLE 7

CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF NET WEALTH, INCOME,
AND ASSETS HELD BY WEALTH CLASSES, 1973

Net Wealth Percentile	Net Wealth	Corporate Stock	Debt Instruments	Real Estate	Census Money Income
0-35	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	16.8
36-40	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	20.0
41-45	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.4	24.1
46-50	1.0	0.2	1.0	1.8	28.5
51-55	2.1	0.4	1.8	4.5	33.3
56-60	3.6	0.6	2.7	8.7	38.3
61-65	5.5	0.8	3.7	14.6	43.6
66-70	8.0	1.1	5.1	21.9	49.4
71-75	11.2	1.6	6.9	30.9	55.4
76-80	15.3	2.5	10.0	41.0	61.7
81-85	20.9	3.9	14.9	52.7	68.4
86-90	29.2	7.1	24.2	64.3	75.5
91-95	42.5	14.7	40.6	77.3	83.2
96	46.4	17.5	45.6	80.2	84.9
97	51.3	21.1	52.0	83.3	86.6
98	57.6	28.0	59.5	86.7	88.5
99	67.4	39.7	70.5	91.6	91.3
100	100.0	100.0	100.00	100.0	100.0

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100
of this chapter.

TABLE 8

SIMPLE PERCENTAGES OF NET WEALTH, INCOME,

AND ASSETS HELD BY WEALTH CLASSES, 1973

Net Wealth Percentiles	Net Wealth	Corporate Stock	Debt Instruments	Real Estate	Census Money Income
0-40	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	20.0
41-45	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.3	4.1
46-50	0.6	0.1	0.5	1.4	4.4
51-55	1.1	0.2	0.8	2.7	4.8
56-60	1.5	0.2	0.9	4.2	5.0
61-65	2.0	0.2	1.0	5.9	5.3
66-70	2.5	0.3	1.4	7.4	5.7
71-75	3.2	0.5	1.9	9.0	6.1
76-80	4.1	0.8	3.0	10.1	6.2
81-85	5.6	1.5	4.9	11.7	6.7
86-90	8.2	3.1	9.3	11.6	7.1
91-95	13.3	7.6	16.4	13.0	7.7
Top 1%	32.6	60.3	29.4	8.4	8.7
Top 5%	57.5	85.3	59.4	22.7	16.8
Top 10%	69.8	92.9	75.8	35.7	24.5

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100 of this chapter.

The Gini coefficient of wealth by wealthclass is
.81, while income by wealthclass is .36. The greater con-
centration of corporate stock is indicated by its coefficient
of .94, relative to .85 for debt instruments and .63 for
real estate. The concentration of total wealth is lessened
by the relative diffusion of real estate and other forms of
wealth relative to corporate stock. These Gini coefficients
summarize the information provided graphically by the Lorenz
curves in Figures 5 and 6 which were discussed on page 103.

In Table 9, page 107, the percentage of families in
each wealthclass who hold any amount of each of these assets
is listed. Debt instruments are most widely dispersed by
this measure, due no doubt to bank savings accounts and
credit union deposits of small savers. They appear to be
more popular at low wealth levels (85.2% of families reported
interest in the second wealth class versus 54.2% at the mid-
point of the wealth distribution), rising again in impor-
tance in the highest quadrant of the distribution. Over
80% of the families owned real estate in the 60th-75th per-
centiles of the distribution, and in the upper 1%. Below
the 45th percentile less than 30% owned real estate, while
in the upper quadrant roughly 75% were property owners.
Some corporate stock was held by 8.4% of the lowest wealth-
holding class, and slightly over 10% of median families.
Incidence of ownership increases slowly through the lower
75% of the wealth distribution. Within the upper quadrant

TABLE 9

PERCENTAGE OF FAMILIES HOLDING CORPORATE STOCK

DEBT INSTRUMENTS, AND REAL ESTATE

BY WEALTH CLASSES, 1973

Wealth Percentile	Corporate Stock	Debt Instruments	Real Estate
Lowest 35	0	0	0
36-40	8.4	85.2	9.3
40-45	8.3	74.7	29.1
45-50	10.9	57.6	55.9
50-55	10.5	54.2	67.1
55-60	12.0	59.5	75.2
60-65	13.1	61.8	80.2
65-70	15.3	68.0	82.9
70-75	19.6	74.0	83.0
75-80	28.2	83.5	78.9
80-85	37.7	90.0	76.9
85-90	45.7	95.6	70.1
90-95	58.4	97.3	68.2
96	70.0	97.2	64.8
97	70.7	98.5	74.6
98	78.4	98.0	69.7
99	85.7	97.8	76.2
100	89.5	99.5	83.3

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100 of this chapter.

it increases more rapidly; 58.4% of families in the 90-95th percentiles and 89.5% of the highest wealth percentile owned corporate stock.

These figures do not tell us the proportionate distribution of these assets, but simply what share of families in that wealthclass have nonzero holdings of net wealth and of each type of asset measured directly here.

Distribution by Income Class

Income is closely related to wealth, since it consists in part of a flow of financial services accruing from certain types of wealth (dividends from corporate stock, interest from all types of debt instruments, etc.). In addition, it is a primary prerequisite for acquiring wealth. Without inheritance or luck in the lotteries, persons depend upon investing a portion of the income above and beyond that necessary to satisfy basic needs (however defined) in order to accumulate wealth.

The relationship between income and wealth is often inferred in consumption theory, where wealth is assumed to be correlated with income. Theories such as Milton Friedman's "permanent income" hypothesis attempt to compensate in part for the incompleteness of using only a current income figure to describe a family or individual's financial position.[18] While future streams of income to a family may only be

---

[18]Milton Friedman, _A Theory of the Consumption Function_, Princeton: Princeton University Press for National Bureau of Economic Research, 1957:20-31.

hypothesized (and generally the data is too scanty to serve
as a valid basis for any hypothesis) the joint use of in-
come and wealth enriches our knowledge of the total financial
position of the family substantially.

For these reasons we will look at the distribution
of wealth by income classes in much the same manner as was
done by wealthclasses, and will be able to compare it to the
much more familiar concept of income distribution.

In Figure 7, page 110, the Lorenz curves showing the
cumulative distribution of wealth and income by income class
indicate that the lower 50% of American families, ranked by
total family income, receive 19.2% of income and hold an
estimated 17.9% of net wealth. At low income levels, the
proportion of wealth held exceeds the proportion of income
held, indicating that some of these families derive a large
part of that income from their wealth. Figure 8, page 111
represents the distributions of assets by income classes,
and the cumulative percentages of wealth, income, and assets
of these income classes are listed in Table 10, page 112.
The lower 90% of families receive 66.7% of income and hold
an estimated 49.9% of net wealth. Corporate stock is
heavily concentrated in the upper 5% of the income distri-
bution, just as it is in the wealth distribution. Debt
instruments are more heavily represented than is real estate
at lower income levels.

Figure 7

LORENZ CURVES OF WEALTH AND INCOME BY
INCOME CLASS, 1973

PERCENTILES OF THE POPULATION
(ranked by income level)

Income

Wealth

Source: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pp. 92-100

Figure 8

LORENZ CURVES OF CORPORATE STOCK, DEBT INSTRUMENTS, AND REAL ESTATE BY INCOME CLASS, 1973

PERCENT
OF ASSET

PERCENTILES OF THE POPULATION
(ranked by income level)

Corporate Stock

Debt Instruments

Real Estate

Source: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pp. 92-100

112

TABLE 10

CUMULATIVE PERCENTAGES OF NET WEALTH, INCOME,

AND ASSETS HELD BY INCOME CLASSES, 1973

Census Income Class	Census Money Income	Net Wealth	Corporate Stock	Debt Instruments	Real Estate
0-10	0.5	1.8	1.9	2.1	1.2
11-20	2.9	3.6	3.2	4.4	2.3
21-30	6.8	7.4	5.4	9.6	4.7
31-40	12.3	12.4	8.1	16.2	9.3
41-50	19.4	17.9	11.6	22.0	16.2
51-60	28.1	23.8	15.3	27.7	24.9
61-70	38.6	30.2	18.5	33.9	35.3
71-80	51.1	38.4	22.6	41.9	48.6
81-90	66.8	49.9	29.1	52.8	66.7
91-95	76.9	58.8	36.6	61.4	78.0
96-99	88.8	75.7	52.8	80.0	91.9
100	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100 of this chapter.

Table 11, page 114, includes the simple percentages
of wealth, income, and assets held by each income class,
and Table 12, page 115, lists the proportion of families
in each class owning nonzero amounts of each. Share of
wealth is higher than share of income in the highest 5% of
the income distribution, where 23.2% of income and 41.2% of
wealth is concentrated. This group owns 63.5% of corporate
stock, 38.7% of debt instruments, and 22% of real estate.
In the middle of the distribution (percentiles 31-70) each
decile of 7.3 million families holds around 3% of total
corporate stock and 6% of debt instruments, but the propor-
tion of real estate increases from 4.7% in the fourth decile
to 10.4% in the seventh. The highest decile has over four
times the wealth of the group immediately below it, while
only slightly more than twice the income.

The proportion of persons in each income class hold-
ing wealth, and particular assets measured directly here,
rises steadily with income. All of the families in the
highest 1% of the income distribution are wealthholders,
while less than 3% of the families in the lower two deciles
hold positive net worth. In the middle of the income dis-
tribution, at the fifth decile, 66% of families have positive
net worth, but only 12% own corporate stock. Over 40% hold
debt instruments and/or real estate. By the ninth decile,
representing family income in 1973 dollars of roughly

114

TABLE 11

SIMPLE PERCENTAGES OF NET WEALTH, INCOME, AND ASSETS HELD

BY CENSUS MONEY INCOME CLASSES, 1973

Census Class	Net Wealth	Census Money Income	Corporate Stock	Debt Instruments	Real Estate
Lowest 10	1.8	0.5	1.9	2.1	1.2
11-20	1.8	2.5	1.4	2.4	1.1
21-30	3.7	3.9	2.2	5.2	2.4
31-40	5.1	5.5	2.7	6.5	4.7
41-50	5.5	7.1	3.5	5.8	6.9
51-60	5.9	8.7	3.6	5.7	8.7
61-70	6.4	10.5	3.2	6.2	10.4
71-80	8.3	12.6	4.1	8.0	13.3
81-90	11.4	15.7	6.5	10.9	18.1
91-100	50.1	33.3	70.9	47.2	33.3
Top 1%	24.3	11.2	47.2	20.0	8.1
Top 5%	41.2	23.2	63.5	38.7	22.0

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100 of this chapter.

TABLE 12

PERCENTAGE HOLDING NET WEALTH, CORPORATE
STOCK, DEBT INSTRUMENTS, AND REAL ESTATE
BY INCOME CLASS, 1973

Income Percentile	Percentage of Class Holding			
	Net Wealth	Corporate Stock	Debt Instrument	Real Estate
0 - 10	15		13	4
11 - 20	26	6	22	7
21 - 30	44	11	36	15
31 - 40	56	11	40	30
41 - 50	66	12	44	41
51 - 60	75	13	51	50
61 - 70	81	15	57	57
71 - 80	88	20	67	65
81 - 90	93	28	74	74
91 - 95	97	41	84	80
96 - 99	98	59	91	83
Highest 1%		81	97	88

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100 of this chapter

$24-62,000, 93% of families were wealthholders, with 28% owning some corporate stock. In the highest decile, over half of all families held corporate stock, more than 90% held debt instruments, and over 85% owned real estate.

The Gini coefficients computed by income class show wealth more concentrated than income, at .56 versus .46 for income, but the difference is not as extreme as when looking at the wealth distribution. Corporate stock is most heavily concentrated, with a Gini coefficient of .72, while debt instruments is less concentrated than wealth at .51 and the coefficient for real estate is .49.

Distribution by Age Class

Since wealth tends to be low early in the life-cycle and peak prior to retirement, according to economic theories of accumulation, information about the ages of persons holding wealth is highly important to our analysis of its distribution. Ideally, one would trace persons (or families) through the life-cycle, measuring their wealth at various points in time. If age explained a great deal of the variation in wealth levels then we might conclude that this variation is not of fundamental social importance. This study deals with a cross-section of families at one point in time, but assigns each family to an age class based on the reported age of the head of household (see Table 13) to aid in determining the wealth-age relationship. A number

of interesting aspects of differences by age class are re-
vealed. Below age 45 families held a share of wealth less
than proportional to their share of the population, as a
group, but a greater share of income. The reverse was true
above age 55. In the 46-55 year age group the shares of
aggregate wealth and income were both greater than the weight
of this group in the population.

TABLE 13

AGE CLASSIFICATION OF FAMILIES, 1973 OTA FILE

Age of Head of Household	Class
Under 25	1
26-35	2
36-45	3
46-55	4
56-65	5
Over 65	6

NOTE: Families classified for purposes of summing by classes

Figure 9, page 118, pictures the proportionate distribution
of families using this classification. Only 8% were headed
by persons age 25 or less. Within this group, 77% had zero
net wealth and 1.9% fell in the high wealth category of
$60,000 or over in net assets. The second age group, of

Figure 9

DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILIES BY AGE
OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, 1973

20% OVER 65

20% 26-35

18% 46-55

6% 25 & UNDER

17% 36-45

17% 56-65

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100.

Figure 10

DISTRIBUTION OF NET WEALTH
BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, 1973

21% 46-55

27% OVER 65

2% UNDER 25

20% 56-65

13% 26-35

16% 36-45

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100.

families headed by persons 26-35 years of age, represented

20% of families. Only 36% of these had zero net wealth

(almost the same proportion as of the total population), and

5.1% were in the high wealth category. The groups represent-

ing the middle years of the life cycle, 36-45 and 46-55,

accounted for 17% and 18% of total families, respectively.

In the former, 30% were zero wealthholders and 10% were high

wealthholders, while in the latter, 26% had zero wealth and

14% had wealth of $60,000 or over. Within the 56-65 year

age group, representing the peak of the accumulation cycle,

26% had zero wealth and 20% were high wealthholders. This

group also accounted for 17% of families. The over 65 group

represents 20% of American families (many of whom will be

single person households), 52% of whom had zero net wealth

and 21% of whom had wealth of $60,000 or over. Within this

group there were the highest proportion of wealthy persons,

and (with the exception of families headed by persons 25 or

under) the highest proportion of wealthless persons.

Table 14, page 120, provides a summary of the varia-

tion with and between these age classes, with reference to

net wealth and Census money income. Mean net wealth rises

steadily with age, while mean income peaks in the 46-55

year group and falls sharply thereafter. Relative variation

is calculated as the ratio of the coefficient of variation

$(\frac{\sigma^2}{\mu})$ within the age class to the coefficient of variation

TABLE 14

VARIATIONS IN WEALTH AND INCOME BETWEEN AGECLASSES, 1973

Age Class Of Head Of Household	Net Wealth				Census Money Income	
	Mean	Relative Variation*	% With Zero Net Wealth	% In Top Wealth Holder Group	Mean	Relative Variation*
1. 25 and Under	9,750	1.1	.77	1.9	8,432	.14
2. 26-35	24,084	2.6	.36	5.1	13,331	.71
3. 36-45	36,418	1.3	.30	10.0	16,317	.75
4. 46-55	43,575	.9	.26	14.0	17,280	.64
5. 56-65	48,023	.4	.26	20.0	13,914	.97
6. 65 and Over	50,847	.5	.52	21.0	8,225	2.90
TOTAL	37,675	1.0	.35		13,245	1.0

*Relative variation is the ratio of the coefficient of variation σ^2/μ within the age class to the coefficient of variation of the statistic over the entire distribution.

SOURCE: Data derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100 of this chapter.

of the statistic over the entire distribution.[19] Thus, a value greater than one indicates greater than average variability from the group mean, and a value less than one indicates less than average variability. Variability of wealth is greatest in the 26-35 year group, where presumably some families are experiencing rapid accumulation and others are not. Variability is lowest among families headed by persons age 56 and over. Relative variability of income follows almost the opposite pattern, very low in the youngest group and almost three times the average in the oldest group.

Figures 10-14 (pages 118,122, and 123) illustrate the percentage distribution of dollars of net wealth, corporate stock, debt instruments, real estate, and Census money income by the age groups listed in Table 13. Table 15, page 124, summarizes these, along with the relative importance of each group in the population. As one would expect, the share of wealth, income, and each of the assets is significantly lower in the youngest group of families than is their weight in the population. For the second age group, headed by persons 26-35, share of real estate and share of income are close to their relative weight, but corporate stock, debt instruments, and net wealth are significantly lower. Relative share of net wealth, debt instruments, and corporate

---

[19]Appendix D lists the program developed to calculate variances of the distribution and specific age classes within it.

Figure 11

DISTRIBUTION OF CORPORATE STOCK
BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, 1973

29% OVER 65

22% 46-55

2% 25 AND UNDER

17% 36-45

14% 26-35

17% 56-65

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100.

Figure 12

DISTRIBUTION OF DEBT INSTRUMENTS
BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, 1973

34% OVER 65

23% 56-65

2% 25 AND UNDER

10% 26-35

19% 46-55

12% 36-45

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100.

123

Figure 13

DISTRIBUTION OF REAL ESTATE
BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, 1973

23% 36-45   26% 46-55

3% 25 AND UNDER

20% 26-35   10% OVER 65

18% 56-65

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100.

Figure 14

DISTRIBUTION OF CENSUS MONEY INCOME
BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, 1973

21% 36-45   24% 46-55

5% 25 & UNDER

21% 26-35   12% OVER 65

17% 56-65

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100.

TABLE 15

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF NET WEALTH, INCOME AND ASSETS

BY AGE OF HEAD OF HOUSEHOLD, 1973

|	Age Class	Percent of Families	Percentage of				
			Net Wealth	Census Money Income	Corporate Stock	Debt Instruments	Real Estate
1.	25 & Under	8.0	2.0	5.0	2.0	2.0	3.0
2.	26-35	20.0	13.0	21.0	14.0	10.0	20.0
3.	36-45	17.0	16.0	21.0	17.0	12.0	23.0
4.	46-55	18.0	21.0	24.0	22.0	19.0	26.0
5.	56-65	17.0	20.0	17.0	17.0	23.0	18.0
6.	Over 65	20.0	27.0	12.0	29.0	34.0	10.0

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100.

124

stock is highest in the over 65 group, with real estate the
most heavily concentrated in the 46-55 year age group.
Family patterns explain part of this early peaking of real
estate wealth relative to other forms of wealth, with income
also playing a role. Relative share of income is also high-
est for the 46-55 year age group, and it has most to gain
from tax-subsidization of mortgage debt and can thereby afford
more real estate investment. For the older groups, share of
income drops along with share of real estate.

The analysis above deals with variation within and
between families at different points in the life-cycle. An
alternative way to approach the wealth-age relationship is
to look at the distribution of age of family heads within
each wealthclass. The proportion of each belonging to one
of the six age groups used here is listed in Table 16, page
126. Within the non-wealthholding group (percentiles 0-35),
there is a higher representation of families headed by per-
sons over 65 (28.6%) and of families headed by persons under
25 (12%) than there is in the total population. That these
would be low wealth groups is not surprising, given the assump-
tion that little accumulation or inheritance occurs before
age 25, and that over 65 decumulation through consumption
or transfers to heirs is likely to occur. This does not ex-
plain zero wealth for older families, however, and the re-
sults indicate that not only are many older families income-
poor, they are also wealth-poor. Many of these low-income

TABLE 16

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF AGE CLASS WITHIN

WEALTH CLASS, 1973

(Percentages may not add to 100 across a class due to rounding)

Wealth Percentile	Percent in Age Class					
	25 and under	26-35	36-45	46-56	56-65	Over 65
0-35	12.0	20.0	13.8	13.4	11.6	28.6
36-40	18.9	30.1	16.4	13.9	11.8	8.8
41-45	14.3	27.9	16.3	17.1	13.6	10.9
46-50	11.9	26.8	17.8	17.8	16.2	9.5
51-55	9.9	26.3	19.4	20.7	15.2	8.5
56-60	7.2	26.3	21.1	22.3	14.9	8.3
61-65	5.7	24.4	23.6	23.0	14.4	8.9
66-70	5.4	24.3	23.3	21.8	16.5	8.7
71-75	3.6	21.7	22.5	24.6	18.0	9.7
76-80	2.4	19.6	20.0	25.1	20.2	12.7
81-85	1.7	13.7	17.1	27.2	22.9	17.4
86-90	1.7	12.7	17.5	23.6	23.6	20.9
91-95	1.1	7.8	13.3	21.1	26.4	30.2
96	2.3	5.6	11.3	17.3	27.8	35.8
97	0.7	4.7	8.2	15.6	28.1	42.7
98	0.4	5.3	8.4	14.7	27.8	43.4
99	1.5	4.5	7.0	17.9	24.5	44.5
100	1.8	10.8	18.7	22.2	16.8	29.7
Total	8.0	20.0	17.0	18.0	17.0	20.0

SOURCE: Derived from the OTA file, as documented on pages 92-100.

families would take the standard deduction rather than item-
izing, so that the deduction of property tax from which we
calculate real estate ownership would be missing. The OTA
file does include imputations of property tax for an appro-
priate group of standard deductors, however, as discussed on
pages

In the lowest wealth group, we find a higher pro-
portion of younger families (49% with a head of household
35 years of age or less) and only 8.8% from the over 65 group.
The proportionate importance of young families declines fairly
steadily as wealthclass rises, up to the highest percentile
of wealthholders. Conversely, the proportionate importance
of the over 65 group varies between 8-11% through the third
quartile and then rises steadily up to the highest percentile.
In the intermediate age groups, the proportionate importance
in each wealth class shows considerable variation. The 36-45
group constitutes 17% of the overall population of families,
but are a greater share of wealthclasses in the middle of the
distribution. Above the 90th percentile they are a smaller
share of each wealthclass, except for the highest. The 46-55
group are 18% of all families and are more heavily in the
50th-95th percentiles. The 56-65 group are also 17% of fam-
ilies, and are disproportionately in the upper quartile of
the distribution.

The wealth-age relationship appears to be relatively
positive in the middle and upper wealthclasses, although the

highest wealth percentile does not follow this pattern.
The percentage of families over 65 in this group (those
with over $.5 million in net assets) is 20.7%, signifi-
cantly less than in the rest of the uppper decile. Just
as interesting is the fact that the proportion of young
families (headed by persons 35 or under) is substantially
higher than in the rest of the upper decile. The results
support the notion that the life-cycle model explains a
significant part of wealth distribution within the "middle
classes" but very little among the poor or the wealthy.
The former are important because there are so many of them
and the latter because they hold so much of America's wealth.

Summary of Results

Based on the estimating procedures outlined through-
out this chapter, net wealth was estimated at the family
level for 45,030 units on the OTA file. Population estimates
were derived by multiplying the wealth (or income) of each
family by the unique weight associated with it, constructing
percentile boundaries within the distribution, and summing
within these boundaries. From these percentages of wealth
or income held by each class were constructed, and used to
plot Lorenz curves of concentration. The Gini coefficients
computed from this data are summarized in Table 17, page 129.

TABLE 17

THE GINI COEFFICIENTS OF CONCENTRATION, 1973

Variable	Wealth Distribution	Income Distribution
Net Wealth	.81	.56
Census Income	.36	.46
Corporate Stock	.94	.72
Debt Instruments	.85	.51
Real Estate	.63	.49

Source: Computed for data derived from the OTA file, as
          documented on pages 92-100.

As one would expect, wealth and each of the assets
is more concentrated by wealth class than by income class.
Corporate stock shows a high degree of concentration, viewed
from either perspective, however, at .94 by wealth class and
.72 by income class. Income by wealth class is the least
concentrated of any of the measured variables, with a Gini
of .36.

The top 1% of wealthholding families in the United
States held an estimated 32.6% of net wealth and received
8.7% of income in 1973, while the top 1% of families in the
income distribution held 24.3% of wealth and received 11.2%
of income. The highest wealth percentile held 60.3% of
corporate stock. 29.4% of debt instruments, and 8.4% of
real estate, while the highest income percentile held 47.2%

of corporate stock, 20% of debt instruments, and 8.1% of
real estate.

Only 1% of net wealth rests with the lower half of
the wealth distribution. The lower three quartiles owned
approximately one-third of privately held real estate, but
less than 2% of corporate stock. As one would expect, com-
position of wealth changes with position in the distribution,
as modest savings accounts are prevalent at lower levels,
growing amounts of real estate are seen in the middle levels,
and corporate stock becomes important at very high levels.
The same trends are apparent in the composition of wealth in
different income classes. Although there are low-income
families with wealth from which they draw some of that in-
come, only 3% of families in the lower two income deciles
show positive net worth. Over 97% of families in the high-
est income decile (those earning $23,881 or more) were wealth-
holders, and they owned more than half of all personally
held net wealth.

Although mean net wealth rose with age of head of
household, and the relative variability of wealth declined,[19]
over half of all families in the over 65 group showed zero
net wealth. While in the middle ranges of the wealth dis-
tribution one can see a significant positive relationship
between age and wealth, this does not apply to very low or

---

[19]See Table 14, page 120.

zero wealth groups or to the highest wealth group which
has holdings of over $502,000 per family.

The addition of wealth and age data to our knowledge
of a family's income enhances the quality of any relation-
ships we wish to posit between income and consumption or
investment behavior and of our evaluation of the economic
and political systems which generate the distributions of
income and wealth. The last chapter will address the ques-
tion of the reliability of various types of wealth estimates,
and compare the results derived here with those of recent
major estimates in areas where this is possible.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND COMPARISON OF EMPIRICAL WEALTH ESTIMATES

In this last chapter, the estimates of the distribution of personal wealth derived from income tax information on the OTA file are compared with prior findings of major studies based on surveys, estate-tax multipliers, and income capitalization. Due to the differences in coverage of the various methods, in addition to varying data and methodologies employed, no strict comparisons can be made. The strengths and shortcomings of the various methods are reviewed here, and areas in which further research would be meaningful are discussed.

Relation to Prior Wealth Estimates

Share of wealth held by the top wealth-holder group has been computed at intervals over the post-war period on an individual basis. For 1969, Smith showed the top 1% of individuals holding 24.9% of net wealth and the top 4% (those with net wealth of over $60,000) holding 33% of the total.[1] This same group was estimated to hold 53% of corporate stock and 23% of real estate. Totals were adjusted national balance sheet figures. Prior estimates of share of the top 1% in

---

[1] James D. Smith, "The Concentration of Personal Wealth in America, 1969," Review of Income and Wealth 20:2 (June 1974), p. 148.

prior years, by Lampman and Smith, ranged from 24.9% to 33%.[2]

The top 1% of _families_ are estimated by this study to hold 32.6% of all personal wealth. That family wealth would be more concentrated than individual wealth is not surprising, since many members of a family may possess wealth. The top 4% of families, which includes all those with wealth of greater than $164,000 in 1973, are estimated to hold 53.6% of net wealth, 82.5% of corporate stock, 54.4% of debt instruments, and 19.8% of real estate. The concentration of wealth and corporate stock is greater in the distribution of families than the distribution of individuals at the upper end of the distribution, while concentration of real estate appears to be slightly lower. Totals are computed in this study by summing the product of each sample family's net wealth (or asset value) times the sampling weight.

The total value of corporate stock estimated for families in this study was $669.2 billion, relative to $761.5 billion estimated as an aggregate in the flow of funds accounts. Total interest paying assets were estimated here as $892.6 billion versus $632.4 billion in time deposits and other savings plus $247.7 in credit market instruments in the flow

[2]James D. Smith and Stephen D. Franklin, "The Concentration of Personal Wealth, 1922-1969, _American Economic Review_ 64:2 (May 1974), p. 166.

of funds accounts for 1973.[3] Total personally held real

estate was estimated at $774.2 billion for 1973. While the

former two estimates are quite comparable with aggregate

estimates, the latter appears to be on the low side, al-

though no strictly comparable figures exist. Total net

wealth was estimated at $2.6 trillion, lower than the ad-

justed national balance sheet figure for 1972 of $3.5 tril-

lion. Surveys have generally produced lower total estimates

than the national aggregates and this appears to be a charac-

teristic of this method also. The discrepancy in corporate

stock totals may be due to non-reporting of small amounts of

dividends or to ownership of non-dividend paying stock. The

low total for real estate is probably due to non-reporting

of property taxes (rather than underestimation of property

values) with only 32.5% of families reporting such taxes

through itemization, and another 10.7% to whom property

taxes were imputed.

Special tabulations from the 1962 SFCC study show 24%

of net wealth held by the upper 1% of consumer units.[4] The

concept of consumer unit is fairly close to that of the census

family used on the OTA file. The wealth concept used in the

1962 study is less inclusive, however. Debts were deducted

[3]Statistical Abstract 1973, Table 712, p. 446.

[4]Dorothy S. Projector and Gertrude S. Weiss, Survey of
Financial Characteristics of Consumers, Federal Reserve Tech-
nical Paper, Washington, D.C.: Board of Governors of the
Federal Reserve System, 1966.

from gross wealth only if they were secured by assets covered in the survey, and no business debts were included although the values of businesses and professional practices were treated as assets. Therefore we cannot unequivocally say that concentration among the top 1% increased over the decade to 32.6% although this is what the data indicate.

In a recent estimate of wealth by income class, Lebergott estimated that the top 1% of family units in the _income_ distribution held 17% of net wealth, 35.8% of corporate stock, 12.7% of short term claims (including all credit market instruments yielding a fixed interest return, plus currency) and 4.9% of real estate in 1970.[5]

In this estimate, we find the top 1% of income-receiving families holding a greater share of net wealth, 24.3%. Estimates of each asset share are significantly higher also. The top 1%, in 1973, are estimated to have held 47.2% of personally held corporate stock, 20.0% of debt instruments, and 8.1% of real estate. Wealth appears to be somewhat more concentrated than the Lebergott estimates indicated when estimated from microdata rather than aggregates.

The distribution of wealth among age groups in 1973 may be compared with a similar distribution constructed in the

---

[5]Stanley Lebergott, _The American Economy, Income, Wealth, and Want_, Princeton: Princeton University Press, p. 246.

1962 SFCC study.[6] Tables 18 and 19 compare the estimates

of the two years. The survey measured equity in owned home

whereas the real estate measure in the present estimate

includes the gross value of all real property, including

investments. While it is probable that large real estate

investments are incorporated for tax purposes, there is

still a significant difference between these two concepts.

A significantly larger percentage of real estate is owned

by the under 35 group in the 1973 study, and a significantly

lower percentage by the over 65 group, than in the 1962

survey. The gross value concept in 1973 versus the net

value in 1962 explains a great deal of this. It is also

plausible that a real shift did occur, however, with

changes in the age distribution of the population, the

perception of real estate as an investment good, and

the advent of the two-income household among young families.

Liquid assets included checking accounts and time

deposits, as well as U. S. government bonds in the survey

estimate, where debt instruments included all interest-

paying assets (such as corporate or municipal bonds, gov-

ernment securities, and mortgage assets). The 1973 estimate

shows a higher percentage being held by the under 35 group and

a lower percentage by the 56-65 group than does the survey.

---

[6]Projector and Weiss, p. 12.

TABLE 18

SFCC Distribution of Wealth
Between Age Groups, 1962
(Percentage Held)

Age Of Head Of Consumer Unit	Under 35	35-44	45-54	55-64	65 & Over	All Units
Net Wealth	7	16	22	28	28	100
Equity in Owned Home	6	18	27	26	23	100
Liquid Assets	5	12	20	28	35	100
Investment Assets	3	10	17	31	39	100

Source: Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers, P. 12.

TABLE 19

DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH   BETWEEN
AGE GROUPS, 1973
(PERCENTAGE HELD)

Age of Head of Household	35 and Under	36-45	46-55	56-65	Over 65	All Families
Net Wealth	15	16	21	20	27	100
Corporate Stock	16	17	22	17	29	100
Debt Instruments	12	12	19	23	34	100
Real Estate	23	23	26	18	10	100

Note: Percentages may not add to 100 due to rounding.

Source: Data derived from OTA file, as documented on pp. 92-100.

"Investment assets" in the survey included not only corpor-
ate stock but mortgage assets, investment real estate and
other miscellaneous forms of liquid investment. It cannot
really be compared to any of the categories used in this
study since it includes portions of all three.

Review of the Strengths and Weaknesses of Major Estimating Techniques

The method of wealth estimation presented here represents
a highly useful alternative to the survey method of collec-
tion of wealth data. At present, there exists no reliable
source of wealth data except for the estate tax returns.
These are on an individual rather than a family basis, are
limited to persons with an estate of $250,000 or more, and
are biased by the incidence of transfers of wealth inter vivos,
particularly through trusts. While detailed analysis of
wealth by type among top wealthholders are highly useful in
that they represent a large percentage of personal wealth,
a knowledge of the entire wealth distribution is required
when we wish to analyze wealth effects on the "middle class"
of inflation, tax policy, changes in valuation in the stock
market, etc.

The 1962 Survey of Financial Characteristics was the
most thorough example of a wealth-measuring survey, and
yielded a great deal of useful data, some of which was util-
ized here in analyzing rates of return on financial assets

by income class. Due in part to the substantial time and money required to replicate such a survey, it still stands as a major data source, although it has been 18 years since it was taken. Problems of nonresponse, particularly among high wealth or income families, along with the large commitment of time and funds required, are major drawbacks to relying on surveys for regular wealth estimates. A more efficacious method of making regular wealth estimates has been based on aggregated income tax data, and yields estimates of the distribution of wealth by income class. However, it cannot be used to develop wealth by wealth class due to the aggregation of the basic data.[7]

The method presented here in Chapters 3 and 4 is based on microdata which is much more flexible and may be grouped by income, wealth, or age level, in addition to many other variables. Wealth is estimated directly for each family unit and the frequency distribution of wealth or income is constructed from these estimates. Imputations, where appropriate, are made at the level of the individual family, based on differentiating characteristics of the family. Examination of demographic and financial characteristics is thus possible at the family level, such as the breakdown of age class within wealth class discussed in Chapter IV.[8]

---

[7] Lebergott, pp. 215-246.

[8] See pp. 125-28 ,above.

140

The synthetically merged microdata base offers a myriad of possibilities for further analysis of wealthholders and their characteristics. The creation of such data sets is becoming more prevalent as the techniques discussed on pages 83-91 are developed, and a later wealth estimate based on similar methodology (which may then be compared to this 1973 estimate) would be a meaningful contribution, in allowing some comparison over time. Given the volatile nature of returns in the stock market and the substantive changes in real estate values which have occurred during the last seven years, another estimate would be interesting to compare with this one. In particular, any one-year estimate must be appraised in light of the fact that the value of stock can change radically from year to year. In 1973 there was a decline in stock market prices, as the market value of stocks on the New York Stock Exchange fell 17.3% and the Dow Jones Index of 65 stocks fell 10.2%,[9] influencing distribution.

Stronger estimates of asset values could be made if access to the IRS's Schedule A forms on each family were permitted, as in the Wharton study referenced in pages 50-53. This would allow the use of specific capitalization rates on dividends from separate companies and avoid the problem of potential bias in use of the average rate of return for all stockholders. However, the analysis done in this study

[9]1974 Statistical Abstract, Tables 782 and 784, p. 477.

of rates of return by income class found no basis for adjust-
ing the rate of return at different income levels. The Wharton
studies did suggest that at very high levels of income rates
of return would be lower, and therefore the probable nature
of bias in this estimate is to underestimate the share of
stock held by high income families. Whether the share of
high wealthholders is underestimated is really a separate
question, since not all of these families are high-income.

While the preponderant source of interest income for
American families has been time deposits at commercial banks,
credit unions, or savings and loans, a minority of families
hold state and local, U.S. government, or corporate bonds.
Since we do not have access to Schedule A, we are unable to
separate these receipts and capitalize them separately. The
maximum rate paid on commercial bank savings, $4\frac{1}{2}$% , has been
used to capitalize all interest received by the family, in-
cluding imputed state and local bond interest.[10] The average
rate of interest paid on the latter was 5.2% in 1973, very
close to the average used here, but mortgages and other per-
sonally held loans may have carried higher or lower rates
depending on the date and circumstances in which they were
contracted. Corporate or foreign bonds would have paid
significantly higher rates. While most corporate bonds are
held by institutions such as banks, life insurance companies,
etc., Smith's 1972 estimates show $94.8 billion in total

---

[10]See Table 2, page **64** , for a comparison of average
interest rates paid on a variety of debt instruments.

bonds held by the top 1% of the population. For these families, the value of debt instruments is overstated when the lower interest rate is used for capitalization on high return bonds.

Real estate has been estimated here by multiplying property taxes paid times the reciprocal of the average effective tax rate in the family's state of residence. Income tax itemizers have an incentive to report all of these property taxes, as they lessen the federal tax burden, but for standard deductors we have had to rely on imputed taxes added by OTA to the file. The majority of "homeowners" actually own only a percentage of the equity in their home(s), and since interest on the mortgage debt is also deductible they tend to be itemizers. Thirty-three percent of the families on the OTA file were itemizers reporting property taxes, and slightly over ten percent had property taxes imputed to them although they were standard deductions. Presumably their potential itemizations were too low to warrant claiming them.

In addition to potential reporting problems, we again have the question of accuracy of the capitalization rates. The average effective tax rate for each state was calculated from Census of Government data on median rates by county or township within each state. Coverage of local districts was more extensive in some states than in others, and a potential for improvement in basic data exists there also.

CONCLUSIONS

When trying to estimate wealth, that most fundamental
of economic forces, there are always problems of accuracy
and coverage. Not all assets have a readily known market
value, privately held businesses being a prime example. Many
persons have difficulty ascertaining the sum total of their
wealth, and some feel that doing so is an invasion of their
privacy. Wealth surveys are limited by these understandable
human attitudes. Other data on wealth is not systematically
collected, so that economic discussions of wealth distribu-
tion have been based on a great deal of supposition below
the level of the estate tax filers, to date.

By combining the best available data that currently
exists to create family wealth data across the entire dis-
tribution, this study extends the empirical analysis of
wealth and its distribution to lower and middle wealth classes.
Its basis in microdata makes possible the analysis of wealth
by income and age classes also. The critical steps in the
method are 1) the choice of asset capitalization rates,
2) the regression equation linking net wealth to a subset
of assets and, 3) the reliance on the accuracy of the basic
data.

Without more specific knowledge of the particular port-
folio of securities generating the flows of dividends and
interest there is no solid empirical basis for using any-
thing other than the average rate of return to capitalize

these streams of income, but the potential for bias exists. From what we know about portfolio composition, we would be most likely to err in the direction of underestimating the stock ownership of high wealthholders and overestimating the dollar value of their debt instruments. Conversely, we may overestimate stock ownership for lower wealth groups and underestimate the dollar value of their interest bearing assets. Estimates of real property ownership are similarly dependent on an average effective tax rate for the state in which the family resides. These will tend to be closest to the actual rate for urban and suburban families living in neighborhoods with a reasonable rate of turnover in homes. The rates published by the Census of Governments are based on samples in non-rural counties market value and property tax bills for homes sold in the year 1971. Where very few homes are traded appraisal values are typically less accurate.

The linear relationship between net wealth and the gross value of these three assets used to arrive at each individual family's wealth was estimated from estate tax returns filed for persons leaving a total gross estate of $60,000 or more in 1972. While the statistical properties of the equation used and the inherent reasonableness of the estimated coefficients suggest that it yields good estimates, the net wealth estimate of any one family is obviously dependent on the appropriateness of the estimating equation as well as the accurancy of the asset value estimates.

Data from five major sources (the Survey of Financial
Characteristics of Consumers, the Census of Governments,
estate tax returns, income tax returns, and the Current
Population Survey) was used in developing these wealth esti-
mates. The OTA file, a statistically merged set of CPS and
income tax data, was the primary basis of the actual wealth
estimates. The accuracy of the end results are in large a
product of these data sources used to produce the results,
and the quality of each of these sources appears to be
quite good. While problems of response levels and measure-
ment exist in any data base, each of these sources provides
fairly reliable data, subject to the caveats we have dis-
cussed in each section.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitchison, John; and Brown, J. A. C. The Lognormal
Distribution. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969.

Ascoli, Max; and Lehmann, Fritz, eds. Political and
Economic Democracy. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., Inc.,
1937.

Atkinson, Anthony B. "On the Measurement of Inequality"
Journal of Economic Theory 2 (1970) pp. 244-263.

Atkinson, Thomas R. The Pattern of Financial Asset
Ownership, Wisconsin Individuals, 1949. Princeton: Princeton
University Press, 1956.

Barlow, Robin; Brazer, Harvey; and Morgan, James.
Economic Behavior of the Affluent. Washington, D. C.: The
Brookings Institution, 1966.

Barr, Richard S.; and Turner, J. Scott. "A New Linear
Programming Approach to Microdata File Merging." Compendium
of Tax Research. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of the
Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, 1978.

Black, David. "The Nature and Extent of Effective
Property Tax Rate Variations within the City of Boston".
National Tax Journal 25:2 (June 1972): 203-210.

Blume, Marshall E.; Crockett, Jean; and Friend, Irwin.
"Stock Ownership in the United States: Characteristics and
Trends". Survey of Current Business 54:11 (November 1974):
16-40.

Bossons, John. "The Distribution of Assets Among Indi-
viduals of Different Age and Wealth". Appendix V, pp. 394-428.
In Raymond Goldsmith, ed., Institutional Investors and Corporate
Stock. New York: Columbia University Press for National Bureau
of Economic Research, 1973.

Brittain, John A. Inheritance and the Inequality of
Material Wealth. Studies in Social Economics. Washington, D.C.:
The Brookings Institution, 1978.

146

Budd, Edward C. "The Creation of a Microdata File for Estimating the Size Distribution of Income". <u>Review of Income and Wealth</u> 17:4 (December 1971): 317-334.

_____. "Comments", on Benjamin Okner's "Constructing A New Data Base from Existing Microdata Sets". <u>Annals of Social and Economic Measurement</u> 1:3 (1972): 349-354.

Cochran, William G. <u>Sampling Techniques</u>. 2nd Edition. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1963.

Cook, Peter K. "The Turner Soft-Link Method". Memorandum to OTA Professional Staff, Office of Tax Analysis, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C., November 18, 1976.

_____. "Imputation of Itemized Deductions to Personal Income Tax Returns of Standard Deductors in the 50,160 Return 1973 SOI Sample, REVISED." Memorandum to OTA Professional Staff, Office of Tax Analysis, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C., December 27, 1976.

_____. "Transformation Functions for Imputations". Memorandum to OTA Professional Staff, Office of Tax Analysis, Department of the Treasury, Washington, D.C., January 13, 1977.

Crockett, Jean; and Friend, Irwin. "Characteristics of Stock Ownership". <u>Proceedings of the Business and Economics Section, American Statistical Association</u> (1963): 146-68.

Crum, W. L. "Individual Shares in the National Income". <u>Review of Economics and Statistics</u> 18 (1935): 116-30.

Daniels, G. W.; and Campion, H. <u>The Distribution of National Capital</u>. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1936.

Doane, Robert R. "Summary of the Evidence on National Wealth and its Increasing Diffusion". <u>Annalist</u>. July 26, 1935. Cited by Merwin.

_____. <u>The Measurement of American Wealth</u>. New York: Harper and Bros., 1933.

Draper, N. R. and Smith, H. . <u>Applied Regression Analysis</u>. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1966.

Fama, Eugene F. "Efficient Capital Markets: A Review of Theory & Empirical Works". <u>Journal of Finance</u> 25 (May 1970): 383-417.

Feldstein, Martin. "Social Security, Induced Retirement, and Aggregate Capital Accumulation". Journal of Political Economy 82:5 (September/October 1974): 905-926.

Fisher, Lawrence; and Lorie, James H. "Rates of Return on Investments in Common Stocks". Journal of Business 37:1 (January 1964): 1-21.

_____. "Rates of Return on Investments in Common Stock: The Year-by-Year Record, 1962-65". The Journal of Business 41:3 (July 1968): 291-316.

Friend, Irwin; and de Cani, John "Stock Market Experience of Different Investor Groups". Proceedings of the Business and Economics Statistics Section of the American Statistical Association (1966): 44-51.

French, Richard. "An Estate-Multiplier Estimate of the Personal Wealth of Oklahoma Residents, 1960". Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1967.

_____. "Estate Multiplier Estimates of Personal Wealth". American Journal of Economics and Sociology 29 (April 1970): 150-61.

Gastwirth, Joseph L. "The Estimation of the Lorenz Curve and Gini Index." The Review of Economics and Statistics 54 (August 1972) 306-16.

Goldsmith, Raymond W. The National Wealth of the United States in the Postwar Period. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Goldsmith, Raymond W., and Lipsey, Robert E., Studies in the National Balance Sheet of the United States, Vol. 1. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.

Goldsmith, Raymond W. and Saunders, C., eds. The Measurement of National Wealth, Income and Wealth Series VIII. London: Bowes & Bowes Publishers, Ltd. for the International Association for Research in Income and Wealth, 1959.

Harriss, C. L. "Wealth Estimates as Affected by Audit of Estate-Tax Returns". National Tax Journal 2:4 (December 1949): 316-333.

Holland, Daniel. Dividends Under the Income Tax. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Holmes, G. K. "The Concentration of Wealth". Political Science Quarterly 3 (1893): .

Ingalls, Walter R. Current Economic Affairs. York, Pa.: G. H. Merlin Co., 1924.

Jantscher, Gerald R. Trusts and Estate Taxation. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1967.

Jefferson, Thomas. The Jefferson Cyclopedia. Edited by John P. Foley. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1900.

Johnston, J. Econometric Methods, 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

Kadane, Joseph. "Statistical Problems of Merged Data Files". OTA Paper 6. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, 1975.

Katona, George and Lansing, John B. "The Wealth of the Wealthy". Review of Economics and Statistics 66:1 (February 1964): 1-13.

Kendrick, John W. "The Accounting Treatment of Human Investment and Capital." Review of Income and Wealth 20:4 (December 1975): 439-482.

Keynes, John Maynard. The General Theory of Employment, Interest, and Money. New York: Harcourt, Brace, and Co., 1935.

King, W. I. Wealth and Income of the People of the United States. New York: MacMillan & Co., 1915.

_____. "Wealth Distribution in the Continental United States at the Close of 1921." Journal of the American Statistical Association. 22:158 (June 1927): 135-153.

Kitagawa, Evelyn M.: and Hauser, Philip. Differential Mortality in the United States. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1973.

Knibbs, G. H. The Private Wealth of Australia and Its Growth. Melbourne: McCarron, Brid, and Co., 1918.

Kolko, Gabriel. Wealth and Power in America. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1962.

Kuznets, Simon. "The Measurement of National Wealth". Studies in Income and Wealth vol. 2, part 1: 1-61. Baltimore: Waverly Press for National Bureau of Economic Research, 1938.

_____. Shares of Upper Income Groups in Incomes and Savings. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1953.

150

Lampman, Robert J. The Share of Top Wealthholders in National Wealth, 1922-1956. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1962.

Lebergott, Stanley. The American Economy: Income, Wealth and Want. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Lehman, Stephen C. "Relationship Between Personal Income and Taxable Income, 1947-74." Survey of Current Business (December 1976): 17-20.

Lehman, Fritz. "The Distribution of Wealth". In Political and Economic Democracy. Edited by Max Ascoli and Fritz Lehmann. New York: Norton Publishers, 1937.

Lorenz, M. D. "Methods of Measuring the Concentration of Wealth". Journal of the American Statistical Association 70 (June 1905) 209-219.

Luenberger, David G. Introduction to Linear and Non-linear Programming. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1973.

Lundberg, Ferdinand. The Rich and the Super-Rich. New York: Stuart, 1968.

Mallet, Bernard. "A Method of Estimating Capital Wealth from Estate-Duty Statistics". Journal of the Royal Statistical Society of London 71 (March 1908): 64-84.

Marshall, Alfred. Principles of Economics, 7th edition. London: MacMillan & Co., Ltd., 1916.

Maynes, E. Scott; and Morgan, J. N. "The Effective Rate of Real Estate Taxation: An Empirical Investigation". Review of Economics and Statistics (February 1957): 15-26.

Measuring the Nation's Wealth. Studies in Income and Wealth, vol. 29. New York: Columbia University Press for the conference on Income and Wealth, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1964.

Melton, R. B. "Schultz's Theory of Human Capital". Social Science Quarterly 46:3 (December 1965): 264-272.

Mendershausen, Horst. "The Pattern of Estate Tax Wealth". In A Study of Saving in the United States, vol. 3: Special Studies, pp. 277-384. Edited by Raymond Goldsmith, Dorothy Brady, and Horst Mendershausen. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1956.

Merwin, C. L. "American Studies of the Distribution of Income and Wealth". In Studies in Income and Wealth vol. 3. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1939.

Mill, John Stuart. Principles of Political Economy, 7th ed. With an introduction by W. J. Ashley. New York: Kelley, 1965.

Moriyama, I. M.; and Guralnick, L. "Occupational and Social Class Differences in Mortality". Proceedings of the 1955 Meeting of the Milbank Memorial Fund, New York.

Nearing, Scott. Income. New York: Macmillian, 1915.

Neter, John; and Wasserman, William. Applied Linear Statistical Models. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1974.

Okner, Benjamin. Income Distribution and the Federal Income Tax. Ann Arbor: Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan, 1966.

_____. "Constructing a New Data Base from Existing Microdata Sets: The 1966 Merge File." Annals of Economic and Social Measurement 1:3 (1972): 325-342.

_____. "Data Matching and Merging: An Overview". Annals of Economic and Social Measurement 3:2 (1974): 347-352.

Pechman, Joseph. "Analysis of Matched Estate and Gift Tax Returns". National Tax Journal 3 (1950): 153-164.

Pechman, Joseph A.; and Okner, Benjamin A. Who Bears the Tax Burden? Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1974.

Peck, Jon K. "Comments", to Benjamin Okner's "Constructing A New Data Base from Existing Microdata Sets". Annals of Social and Economic Measurement 1:3 (1972): 347-348.

Perlo, Victor. The Income Revolution. New York: International Publishers, 1954.

Projector, Dorothy S. "Consumer Asset Preferences". American Economic Review (May 1965): 227-251.

_____. "Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers". Federal Reserve Bulletin (March 1964): 285-293.

Projector, Dorothy S.; and Weiss, Gertrude S. Survey of Financial Characteristics of Consumers. Federal Reserve Technical Paper. Washington, D.C.: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, 1966.

Revell, J. R. S. "Assets and Age". Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Statistics 24:3 (March 1962): 363-378.

Ruggles, Nancy; and Ruggles, Richard. "A Strategy for Merging and Matching Microdata Sets". Annals of Economic and Social Measurement 3:2 (1974): 353-371.

Scheuren, Frederick; Bridges, Benjamin; and Kilss, Beth. "Subsampling the Current Population Survey: 1963 Pilot Link Study". Report No. 1, Studies from Interagency Data Linkages. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics, August 1973.

_____. "Exact Match Research Using the March 1973 Current Population Survey". Studies from Interagency Data Linkages. Washington, D.C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics, July 1975.

Seiver, Daniel A. "A Note on the Measurement of Income Inequality with Interval Data". Review of Income and Wealth 25:2 (June 1979): 229-233.

Seltzer, Lawrence. "Interest as a Source of Personal Income and Tax Revenue". Occasional Paper #51, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1955. Cited by Holland.

Sims, Christopher A. "Comments", on Benjamin Okner's "Constructing A New Data Base from Existing Microdata Sets". Annals of Social and Economic Measurement 1:3 (1972): 343-345, 355-359.

Smith, James D. "Income and Wealth of Top Wealthholders in the United States, 1958". Ph.D. dissertation, University of Oklahoma, 1966.

_____. "The Concentration of Personal Wealth in America, 1969". Review of Income and Wealth 20:2 (June 1974): 143-179.

_____. "White Wealth and Black People: The Distribution of Wealth in Washington D.C. in 1967". In The Personal Distribution of Income and Wealth, Studies in Income and Wealth, vol. 39, pp. 329-364. Edited by James D. Smith. New York: Columbia University Press for Conference on Research in Income and Wealth, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1975.

Smith, James D.; and Franklin, Stephen D. "The Concentration of Personal Wealth, 1922-1969". American Economic Review 64 (May 1974): 162-167.

153

Soltow, Lee. "The Wealth, Income, and Social Class of Men in Large Northern Cities of the United States in 1860". In The Personal Distribution of Income and Wealth, Studies in Income and Wealth, vol. 39, pp. 233-276. Edited by James D. Smith. New York: Columbia University Press for Conference on Research in Income and Wealth, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1975.

_____, ed. Six Papers on the Size Distribution of Wealth and Income. Studies in Income and Wealth, vol. 33. New York: Columbia University Press for Conference on Research in Income and Wealth, National Bureau of Economic Research, 1969.

Spahr, C. B. The Present Distribution of Wealth in the United States. New York: Crowell, 1896.

Steinberg, Joseph. "Some Observations on Linkage of Survey and Administrative Record Data". Studies from Inter-agency Data Linkage. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics, August 1973.

Stewart, Charles. "Method of Estimating the Influence of the Personal Income, Gift, and Estate Taxes Upon Savings and the Distribution of Wealth." Social Research 5, Supplement 1, Appendix A (1938): 91-98.

_____. "Income Capitalization as a Method of Estimating the Distribution of Wealth by Size Groups". Studies in Income and Wealth, Vol. 3. New York: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1939.

Streightoff, F. H. The Distribution of Wealth in the United States. Columbia University Studies, Vol. III, No. 2, 1912.

Surveys of Consumers (formerly Survey of Consumer Finances). Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Tait, Alan A. The Taxation of Personal Wealth. Urbana, Illinois: University of Illinois Press, 1967.

Tawney, R. H. Equality. New York: Harcourt,Brace & Co., 1931.

Thurow, Lester C. Generating Inequality: Mechanisms of Distribution in the U.S. Economy. New York: Basic Books, 1975.

Turner, J. Scott; and Gilliam, Gary B. "Reducing and Merging Microdata Files". OTA Paper 7. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, 1975.

Turner, J. Scott; and Robbins, Gary A. "Microdata Set Merging Using Microdata Files". Research report, OTA. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of the Treasury, Office of Tax Analysis, 1974. Cited by Barr and Turner.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. United States Census of Population: 1970. Vol. 1, Characteristics of the Population, pts. 2-52.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Census of Governments: 1972. Vol. II, pt. 2. Assessment Sales Price Ratios and Tax Rates.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. County - City Data Book, 1972. A Statistical Abstract Supplement.

U.S. Department of Treasury. Internal Revenue Service. Statistics of Income - 1972, Estate Tax Returns. Washington, D.C., 1974.

U.S. Department of Treasury. Internal Revenue Service. Statistics of Income - 1973, Individual Income Tax Returns. Washington, D.C., 1974.

Watkins, G. P. "The Growth of Large Fortunes". Publications of the American Economics Association Series 3, 8:4 (1907): 735-904.

_____. "Measurement of the Concentration of Wealth". Quarterly Journal of Economics 24 (1909): 160-179.

Weisbrod, Burton A., and Hansen, W. Lee. "An Income - Net Worth Approach to Measuring Economic Welfare". American Economic Review 58 (December 1968): 1315-1329.

Wyscarver, Roy A. Personal letter. Washington, D.C., Office of the Secretary of the Treasury, June 26, 1979.

Yaple, Maxine. "The Burden of Direct Taxes as Paid by Income Classes". American Economic Review 26 (December 1936): 691-710.

Yntema, Dwight B. "Measures of the Inequality in the Personal Distribution of Wealth or Income". Journal of the American Statistical Association 28 (December 1933): 423-433.

APPENDIX A

The data was assigned to strata, as listed in Table 20

below, and the variance and other necessary information was

computed on each stratum to satisfy equation (6), below:

$$(6) \quad n_h = \frac{N_h s_h}{\sum\limits_{h=1}^{L} N_h s_h}$$

as referenced in Chapter 4. The sample standard deviation,

s_h, has been substituted for the actual standard deviation,

σ_h.

TABLE 20
CONSTRUCTION OF ESTATE TAX STRATA

Strata	N_h			$N_h s_h$	$N_h s_h^2$
1. NW $\leq$ \$0	52	1635.3			
2. 0 < NW $\leq$ \$60,000	751	11.9	141.6	8,937.0	106,342
3. 60,000 < NW $\leq$ \$80,000	7180	5.6	31.4	40,208.0	225,452
4. 80,000 < NW $\leq$ \$100,000	5833	5.7	32.5	33,248.0	189,573
5. 100 < NW $\leq$ \$150,000	8854	13.9	193.2	123,071.0	1,710,593
6. 150 < NW $\leq$ \$300,000	8514	44.1	1,944.8	375,467.0	16,558,027
7. NW > \$300,000	4296	4638.8			
$\sum\limits_{L=2}^{6}$	31,132	81.2	2,424.7	580,931	18,683,645

The following set of program statements selected the appropriate number from each of stratum 2 - 6 by systematic sampling. Observations were posted by size of net wealth, and classified by S (Strata).

```
IF FIRST. S   THEN N = 0;
N + 1;
IF S = 2 AND MOD (N,150) = 0 THEN GO TO NEXT;
IF S = 3 AND MOD (N,342) = 0 THEN GO TO NEXT;
IF S = 4 AND MOD (N,343) = 0 THEN GO TO NEXT;
IF S = 5 AND MOD (N,138) = 0 THEN GO TO NEXT;
IF S = 6 AND MOD (N,44) = 0 THEN GO TO NEXT;
DELETE;
NEXT;
```

This yielded a sample of 300 estate tax returns containing 5 observations from stratum 2, 20 from stratum 3, 17 from stratum 4, 64 from stratum 5, and 194 from stratum 6.

APPENDIX B

COMPUTATION OF THE GINI COEFFICIENTS

The Fortran program below was developed for the purpose of computing Gini coefficients, using the percentages of net wealth, income, corporate stock, debt instruments, and real estate held by wealth and income classes. This is the same data used to plot the Lorenz curves in Figures 6 - 9. AREAUC is equal to T_i, where the area of the triangle $T_i = y*\frac{x}{2}$ and the remaining $T_i = x*\frac{(y_1 + y_2)}{2}$ (See Figure 4, page 93, for a graphical exposition). The area above the Lorenz curve and below the 45° line, A, is equal to 0.5 - AREAUC, and G, the Gini coefficient, is one-half of A.

```
       DIMENSION X(50),Y(50),TITLE (20)
       ICASE=0
 1     READ (5,1000) TITLE,N
       IF (N.EQ.0) STOP
       ICASE=ICASE+1
       READ (5,1001) (X(I),Y(I),I=1,N)
       WRITE (6,2003) TITLE
       WRITE (6,2000) ICASE,N
       WRITE (6,2001) (I,X(I),Y(I),I=1,N)
       AREA = AREAUC(X,Y,N)
       A=0.5-AREA
       GINI= A/0.5
       WRITE (6,2002) GINI,A
       GO TO 1
 1000  FORMAT (20A4,/,I5)
 1001  FORMAT (10F5.3)
 2000  FORMAT (' CASE ',I3,'. NUMBER OF POINTS= ',I3,/)
 2001  FORMAT (5X,I5,2F10.3)
 2002  FORMAT (5X,' GINI COEFFICIENT = ',F7.5,'  AREA=',F7.5)
 2003  FORMAT (1X,20A4)
       END
       FUNCTION AREAUC(X,Y,N)
       DIMENSION X(N),Y(N)
       AREAUC=0.0
       IF (N.LT.2)RETURN
       AREAUC=X(1)*Y(1)
       IF (N.EQ.2)GO TO 11
       J = 2
       DO 10 I=3,N
       AREAUC=AREAUC + ((X(I)-X(J))*(Y(I)+Y(J)))
       J =I
 10    CONTINUE
 11    AREAUC=AREAUC*0.5
       RETURN
       END
```

APPENDIX C

CALCULATION OF SUMS AND MEANS BY WEALTH CLASSES

The program below outlines the estimation of sums and means by wealthclass. A similar program was used to sum within income and age classes.

```
*ESTIMATION OF NET WEALTH BY WEALTHCLASS;
*INDIVIDUAL VALUES ARE MULTIPLIED BY WEIGHTS PRIOR TO SUMMING;

   WNW = NW * WT;
   WCMI = CMI * WT;
   WV = V * WT;
   WDI = DI * WT;
   WRE = RE * WT;

*CLASS SUMS ARE SET TO ZERO AT THE BEGINNING OF EACH CLASS;
 IF ^FIRST.WCLASS THEN GO TO COUNT;
        AGE1 = 0;
        AGE2 = 0;
        AGE3 = 0;
        AGE4 = 0;
        AGE5 =  0;
        AGE6 = 0;
        NNW = 0;
        NV = 0;
        NDI = 0;
        NRE = 0;
        CSWNW = 0;
        CSWV = 0;
        CSWDI = 0;
        CSWRE = 0;
        CSWCMI = 0;
        CWT = 0;
*CUMULATIVE AND CLASS SUMMATIONS OF WEIGHTED VALUES;
 COUNT:
        IF NW > 0 THEN NNW + WT;
        IF V > 0 THEN NV + WT;
        IF DI > 0 THEN NDI + WT;
        IF RE > 0 THEN NRE + WT;
        IF AGECLASS = 1 THEN AGE1 +WT;
        IF AGECLASS = 2 THEN AGE2 + WT;
        IF AGECLASS = 3 THEN AGE3 + WT;
        IF AGECLASS = 4 THEN AGE4 + WT;
        IF AGECLASS = 5 THEN AGE5 + WT;
        IF AGECLASS = 6 THEN AGE6 + WT;
        CWT + WT ;
        CSWNW + WNW;
        CSWV + WV;
        CSWDI + WDI;
        CSWRE + WRE;
        CSWCMI + WCMI;
        SUMWNW + WNW;
        SUMWV + WV;
        SUMWDI + WDI;
        SUMWRE + WRE;
        SUMWCMI + WCMI;
 IF ^LAST.WCLASS THEN RETURN;
 NWMEAN = CSWNW/CWT;
 CMIMEAN = CSWCMI/CWT;
```

APPENDIX D

CALCULATION OF VARIANCES

The programs below outline the computation of variances for the total distribution and within each age class.

```
* COMPUTATION OF NW AND CMI VARIANCES;

  Y = ((CMI-13245)**2)*WT;
  X = ((NW-37675)**2)*WT;
        SUMY + Y;
        SUMX + X;
        SUMWT + WT;
IF _N_=45030 THEN CMIVAR= SUMY/(SUMWT-2);
IF _N_=45030 THEN NWVAR = SUMX/(SUMWT-2);


*COMPUTATION OF VARIANCES BY AGECLASS;
IF ¬FIRST.AGECLASS THEN GO TO NOT1ST;
        SUMVNW = 0;
        SUMVCM = 0;
 *MEANS OF NW ARE ASSIGNED BELOW ON BASIS OF PRIOR ROUTINE;
  IF AGECLASS = 1 THEN MNW = 9749.89;
  IF AGECLASS = 2 THEN MNW = 24084.21;
  IF AGECLASS = 3 THEN MNW = 36418.47;
  IF AGECLASS = 4 THEN MNW = 43575.17;
  IF AGECLASS = 5 THEN MNW = 48023.26;
  IF AGECLASS = 6 THEN MNW = 50846.88;

*MEANS OF CMI ARE ASSIGNED BELOW ON BASIS OF PRIOR ROUTINE;
  IF AGECLASS = 1 THEN MCMI = 8432.03;
  IF AGECLASS = 2 THEN MCMI = 13331.20;
  IF AGECLASS = 3 THEN MCMI = 16316.91;
  IF AGECLASS = 4 THEN MCMI = 17280.44;
  IF AGECLASS = 5 THEN MCMI = 13913.59;
  IF AGECLASS = 6 THEN MCMI = 8225.16;
RETAIN MNW MCMI SUMVNW SUMVCM;

NOT1ST:
VNW = ((NW-MNW)**2)*WT;
VCM = ((CMI-MCMI)**2)*WT;
SUMVNW + VNW;
SUMVCM + VCM;
IF ¬LAST.AGECLASS THEN RETURN;

VARNW = SUMVNW/(CWT-2);
VARCMI = SUMVCM/(CWT-2):
```