



The Distribution of Household Income and the Middle Class

Linda Levine

Specialist in Labor Economics

November 9, 2011

Congressional Research Service

7-5700

www.crs.gov

RS20811

CRS Report for Congress

Prepared for Members and Committees of Congress

Summary

Although not itself a subject of legislation, the shape of the income distribution enters Congress's decision-making process concerning such policy issues as taxes, means-tested benefits, and social insurance programs. Congress also considers legislation specifically in the name of those in the middle class, which is variously defined as some income level or income range within the distribution of U.S. households with income. After briefly analyzing the distribution of household money income in 2010, the report attempts to put the term "middle class" into some perspective.

The first key point of the report is that, although there are a variety of ways to describe the income distribution, all show that income is concentrated among high-income households. For example, few households can be found in the upper end of the income distribution. Of the 118,682,000 households with income in 2010, only 2.1% had incomes of at least \$250,000. (The Census Bureau does not disaggregate income within the \$250,000-or-more income class.) In addition, a disproportionately large share of total money income accrues to those at the upper end of the distribution. That is to say, in an equal distribution, 5% of households would have an equivalent share of aggregate income. In 2010, the top 5% of households accounted for 21.3% of total income, and the top 20% of households (which includes the top 5%) had 50.2% of all money income.

The second major point is that there is no official government definition of who belongs to the middle class, perhaps because the term means different things to different people. The middle class may refer to a group with a common point of view or to those having similar incomes, for example. This report focuses on income (as defined by the Census Bureau).

Thirdly, it appears that both absolute and relative income may determine who belongs to the middle class. Based on combining money income data for 2010 with results from surveys that asked people to identify their social class, the middle class may refer to households with incomes in 2010 that ranged upward from \$38,044 (the bottom of the middle quintile, 20%, of households) and extended into the top quintile (households with income of \$100,066 or more)—perhaps up to households with income of about \$250,000.

The last key point of the report is that the middle class appears to identify itself relative to a reference group (e.g., the incomes of others in their neighborhood or in their companies). According to studies of self-reported well-being conducted by economists in recent years, those who constitute the middle class seemingly are of like minds with regard to their economic situation. Specifically, having incomes far above those at the lower end of the income distribution appears to be a source of satisfaction to the middle class, but when those at the upper end of the distribution fare much better than they do, it can be a source of consternation to the middle class. As authors of one study put it, staying ahead of the Smiths and keeping up with the Joneses is important to the middle class. This outlook may partly explain the current antipathy expressed in some quarters toward the compensation of senior executives, among others, at some of the nation's largest corporations generally and firms in the financial services industry specifically.

Contents

The Distribution of Household Income	1
The Middle Class	4
Absolute Income.....	4
Relative Income.....	6

Tables

Table 1. Distribution of Household Money Income by Selected Income Class, 2010	3
Table 2. Distribution of Household Money Income by Quintile, 2010	4

Contacts

Author Contact Information.....	7
---------------------------------	---

The shape of the income distribution is not itself a subject of legislation, but Members of Congress appear to consider it in their decision-making process concerning a number of policy issues such as taxes, means-tested benefits, and social insurance programs.

Although economic theory has little to say about the preferability of one income distribution over another and is ambiguous about the impact of income taxes on growth, those in the public policy community have developed very different ideas about the distribution's ideal shape and the effects of taxes and transfer programs on long-term economic growth. For example, some have advocated that gains from stock sales be taxed at a higher rate than income from wages because stock ownership is concentrated among wealthy households,¹ while others have argued that a higher tax rate on capital gains will reduce the incentive to invest and grow the economy.²

Congress also takes up legislation specifically in the name of those in the middle (however defined) of the income distribution who commonly are referred to as the middle class. Some Members have, for example, proposed bills to improve U.S. international competitiveness as a means of increasing exports manufactured by workers in “good” (middle-class) jobs. Similarly, training policy generally has been crafted to provide individuals with the skills thought necessary to attain a middle-class standard of living.

This report first presents a brief analysis of the distribution of income across households in 2010, the latest year for which annual data are available from the Census Bureau.³ It then attempts to put the term middle class into some perspective: first, by using the Census Bureau's income data and then applying results from subjective surveys to the income distribution; second, by reviewing findings from empirical studies on the contribution of relative (as opposed to absolute) income to the identity of the middle class.

The Distribution of Household Income

The Census Bureau conducts a survey from which it derives annual estimates of the distribution of income across households, families, and individuals with income.⁴ Households, which are more numerous than families, appear to be most relevant to the discussion here because household members are assumed to pool whatever income they have and share a common standard of living.⁵

The Bureau's official measure of income is “money income.” It includes earnings, interest, dividends, pensions, child support, and government nonmeans-tested income (e.g., Social Security benefits, unemployment compensation, and veterans' payments). Money income is

¹ See the discussion of asset ownership based on data from the Survey of Consumer Finances in CRS Report RL33433, *The Distribution of Household Wealth*, by Linda Levine.

² For information on the justifications included in legislation for changing the capital gains tax rate, see CRS Report R41480, *Raising the Tax Rates on High-Income Taxpayers: Pros and Cons*, by Nonna A. Noto.

³ For information on trends in the distribution of income, see CRS Report RL32639, *Income Inequality in the United States: Trends and International Comparisons*, by Linda Levine.

⁴ The complete Census Bureau report (*Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance: Coverage in the United States: 2010*) is available at <http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/p60-239.pdf>.

⁵ In the Current Population Survey (CPS), a household is defined as all of the individuals who occupy a housing unit as their usual place of residence. A family is defined as a group of two or more individuals who reside together and who are related by birth, marriage, or adoption. A household may be composed of one or more families or no families at all; that is, a person living alone in a housing unit is counted in the CPS as a household.

calculated on a pre-tax basis; that is, it excludes payments for personal income taxes, Social Security, union dues, Medicare deductions, etc. It also excludes the value of noncash means-tested benefits (e.g., food stamps, housing subsidies) and capital gains. Money income is the measure on which official estimates of poverty are based.⁶

Data describing the distribution of income across households can be presented in a number of ways. The top portion of **Table 1** displays the number and share of households with income by income class. The income class sizes range from about \$5,000 toward the lower end of the distribution to about \$50,000 at the upper end of the distribution, in which relatively few households are found. Only 1.8% of households had incomes between \$200,000 and \$249,999 in 2010, for example. Another 2.1% of 118,682,000 households had incomes of \$250,000 or more. (The Census Bureau does not disaggregate income within the group of households with incomes of \$250,000 or more.)

The concentration of income among the relatively few households in the upper tail of the income distribution also can be seen by comparing two summary measures of the shape of the income distribution shown at the bottom of **Table 1**. Median income is the level below and above which one-half of all households lie. It is a better indication of the income of the “typical” household than is the mean (average), which can be greatly affected by the upper end of the distribution. In 2010, one-half of households had income above the median of \$49,445, whereas many fewer households (about one-third) had income above the mean of \$67,530. The mean being greater than the median reflects the concentration of total money income among high-income households.

⁶ The Census Bureau periodically calculates alternative measures of income which can be used to assess the effects of federal (cash and noncash) transfers, capital gains, employee health benefits, return on own-home equity, federal and state income taxes, payroll taxes, and the Earned Income Tax Credit on the shape of the income distribution and on the number of persons living below the poverty threshold. The latest estimates cover 2009, and are available at <http://www.census.gov/hhes/www/cpstables/032010/rdcall/toc.htm>.

Table 1. Distribution of Household Money Income by Selected Income Class, 2010

Income Class	# of Households (in thousands)	% of Households
All Households	118,682	100.0
Less than \$5,000	4,176	3.5
\$5,000 to \$9,999	5,055	4.3
\$10,000 to \$14,999	7,061	5.9
\$15,000 to \$19,999	7,260	6.1
\$20,000 to \$24,999	6,937	5.8
\$25,000 to \$29,999	6,730	5.7
\$30,000 to \$34,999	6,148	5.2
\$35,000 to \$39,999	5,907	5.0
\$40,000 to \$44,999	5,624	4.7
\$45,000 to \$49,999	4,933	4.2
\$50,000 to \$59,999	9,291	7.8
\$60,000 to \$69,999	7,991	6.7
\$70,000 to \$79,999	6,887	5.8
\$80,000 to \$89,999	5,823	4.9
\$90,000 to \$99,999	4,626	3.9
\$100,000 to \$124,999	9,008	7.6
\$125,000 to \$149,999	5,294	4.5
\$150,000 to \$199,999	5,305	4.5
\$200,000 to \$249,999	2,143	1.8
\$250,000 and above	2,484	2.1
Median Income	\$49,445	
Mean Income	\$67,530	

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplement to the Current Population Survey.

Another often-used way to describe the distribution of income is the share of total money income going to different household groups in order of increasing income. In 2010, there were a total of 118,682,000 households with income, so each quintile (fifth) in the distribution represents 23,736,000 households. The Census Bureau separately calculates the total income share of the top 5% of households because these 5,933,000 households account for a disproportionately large percentage of aggregate income. In other words, if income were equally distributed, 5% of households would have an equivalent share of total income. In fact, as shown in **Table 2**, the top 5% of households accounted for 21.3% of all income in 2010. By comparison, the lowest quintile (20%) of households had only 3.3% of aggregate income. This pattern, like the relationship between median and mean income, reflects the unequal distribution of income across U.S. households.

Table 2. Distribution of Household Money Income by Quintile, 2010

	Quintiles					
	Lowest	Second	Third	Fourth	Highest	Top 5%
Number of households	23,736,000	23,736,000	23,736,000	23,736,000	23,736,000	5,933,000
Range of income class	\$20,000 or less	\$20,001 to \$38,043	\$38,044 to \$61,735	\$61,736 to \$100,065	\$100,066 or more	\$180,810 or more
Share of household income (%)	3.3	8.5	14.6	23.4	50.2	21.3

Source: Bureau of the Census, 2011 Annual Social and Economic Supplement to the Current Population Survey.

The Middle Class

Although Congress often considers legislation specifically in the name of the middle class, there is no official government definition of the group, and it is not the aim of this report to develop one. What constitutes the middle class is subjective and comparative, meaning different things to different people. The term may refer to a group with a common point of view or to those having similar incomes. Most people likely have decided views as to whether they are middle class. At the same time, those who refer to the middle class have a rough idea of whom they have in mind. How closely these definitions correspond is another matter.

Absolute Income

Any discussion of the middle class necessarily starts with those at the very middle of the income distribution. As previously discussed, median household income was \$49,445 in 2010. How far the middle class stretches above and below the median is the question.

A narrow view of the middle class might include only those in the middle (third) quintile, that is, those households with money income between \$38,044 and \$61,735 in 2010 (see **Table 2**). It seems unlikely, however, that so narrow an income range would account completely for those commonly considered to be middle class. For that reason, the three middle quintiles are often combined to broaden the definition. In 2010, according to this broader definition, the 71,208,000 households with income between \$20,001 and \$100,065 might have composed the middle class. These 60% of all households in the distribution accounted for 46.5% of total income in 2010.

A still broader definition of middle class can be constructed by adding that part of the top quintile up to the point at which the top 5% of households begins. In 2010, then, 89,011,000 households with incomes above \$20,000 and below \$180,810 might have composed the middle class. These 75% of all households in the distribution accounted for an equivalent share of total household income in that year.

The results of opinion surveys offer further insight into the income bounds that may define the middle class. A number of surveys in recent years asked people to indicate their social class. In a 2005 *New York Times* survey, for example, 1% of respondents identified themselves as upper class, whereas 15% considered themselves to be upper-middle class and another 42% reported

that they were middle class. An additional 35% identified themselves as working class and 7% said they were part of the lower class.⁷ In the Census Bureau's detailed data on the household income distribution shown in **Table 1**, the top income class (\$250,000 or more) accounted for 2.1% of all households. In contrast, only 1% of *Times* survey respondents reported they were members of the upper class. Assuming some correspondence between the survey responses and Census income data, this discrepancy suggests that the 15% of respondents who said they were upper-middle class include some households with incomes over \$250,000. Comparing just the 42% of respondents who identified themselves as middle class with the Census data suggests that the upper bound of the middle class might instead be somewhat under \$125,000. The lower bound of the middle class might have been slightly over \$40,000, based on a comparison of the 42% of respondents who reported they were working or lower class with the Census data.

The National Opinion Research Center (NORC) at the University of Chicago began asking people in 1972 to identify their social class in the General Social Survey (GSS). The cumulative results of self-reported class divisions in the GSS can be compared with the Census income distribution as was done above with the *Times* survey. According to the 1972-2010 GSS data,⁸ 3.2% of the population consider themselves to be upper class. This would put the dividing line between middle and upper class at just over \$200,000. The GSS further indicates that 5.0% of the population consider themselves to be lower class and 45.9% identified themselves as working class. This would put the lower income level for the middle class at about \$50,000.

The Pew Research Center sampled opinions regarding class in 2008.⁹ It found that 6% of Americans consider themselves to be lower class; 19%, lower-middle class; 53%, middle class; 19%, upper-middle class; and 2% consider themselves to be upper class. If the lower class and lower-middle class are treated as one group (as Pew did), then applying 25% to the Census income data produces a middle class that might start at just under \$25,000. Similarly, if the 53% of survey respondents who self-identified as middle class is compared to the Census income distribution, the upper bound of the middle class might be somewhat under \$100,000. If, instead, the 19% of respondents who considered themselves to be upper-middle class is added, the middle-class income range might be just shy of \$250,000.

Taken together, the survey responses suggest that the lower bound of the middle class might start in the middle (third) quintile of the income distribution shown in **Table 2** (households with income of \$38,044 to \$61,735). The surveys' results further suggest that the middle class includes households in the fourth quintile (\$61,736 to \$100,065) and extends into the top (fifth) quintile of the income distribution (households with income of \$100,066 or more)—perhaps up to about \$250,000.¹⁰

⁷ *The New York Times* published a series of articles in May 2005 under the title "Class Matters," which is available at <http://www.nytimes.com/indexes/2005/05/15/national/class/index.html>.

⁸ NORC, *General Social Survey*, <http://www.norc.uchicago.edu/GSS+Website/>.

⁹ Pew Research Center, *Inside the Middle Class: Bad Times Hit the Good Life*, April 2008, available at <http://pewsocialtrends.org/pubs/706/middle-class-poll>.

¹⁰ If those who consider themselves to be upper class were underrepresented in the surveys, the number of those who consider themselves to be upper class would be larger. If that is the case, the actual level of income that divides the middle from the upper class would be lower than is suggested by the surveys.

Relative Income

The satisfaction (utility) that households derive from their income appears to be associated both with their absolute level of income and how that income level compares to the incomes of others. While the middle class may be content with absolute income levels that afford them a much better-than-subsistence standard of living, the satisfaction of the middle class also may be affected by their income relative to a reference group. If individuals care about how their income compares to that of their neighbors or coworkers, for example, it lends support to the notion of like-income groups possessing a shared outlook on economic (and perhaps other) policy.

Since the late 1990s, economists have increasingly turned their attention to identifying factors that contribute to utility (well-being or happiness), including one's position relative to others.¹¹ One study, for example, analyzed whether group-specific suicide rates are associated with interpersonal comparisons of income.¹² Daly and Wilson used the suicide rate as an indicator of current and expected future happiness, and developed three measures of relative income: the ratio of income at the 90th percentile to median income (90/50), the ratio of median income to income at the 10th percentile (50/10), and the ratio of income at the 90th percentile to income at the 10th percentile (90/10). Among their findings was that an increase in the 50/10 ratio was associated with a decrease in the suicide rate, and that an increase in the 90/50 ratio was associated with an increase in the suicide rate. That is to say, those in the middle-income group (the 50th percentile) were (a) happier the larger the gap was between them and those at the low end of the distribution and (b) unhappier the larger the gap was between them and those at the high end of the distribution. Daly and Wilson considered the results evidence that relative income influences a group's sense of well-being. More specifically, increases in inequality at the upper and lower tails of the income distribution appear to have opposite effects on the satisfaction of the middle-income group.

Luttmer also presented evidence that relative income is an important determinant of well-being.¹³ He matched survey data on self-reported happiness and other measures of well-being (e.g., frequency of marital disagreements, score on a depression index) with income data by locality. Luttmer estimated that an increase in neighbors' income had a negative effect on one's own happiness. Dynan and Ravina built on Luttmer's study by utilizing the GSS in order to assess the effect of differences in relative incomes over recent decades on happiness. Like Luttmer, they found that relative income is strongly associated with self-reported happiness. Dynan and Ravina further estimated that relative income most affects well-being when a group's income is above the average in its state but not at the top (90th percentile) of the income distribution. Or, as the authors put it, "relative concerns primarily affect people who have above-average income but are not extremely rich."¹⁴

¹¹ Andrew E. Clark, Paul Frijters, and Michael A. Shields, "Relative Income, Happiness, and Utility: An Explanation for the Easterlin Paradox and Other Puzzles," *Journal of Economic Literature*, vol. 46, no. 1 (2008), pp. 95-144.

¹² Mary Daly and Dan Wilson, "Keeping Up with the Joneses and Staying Ahead of the Smiths: Evidence from Suicide Data," *Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Working Paper 2006-12*, April 2006.

¹³ Erzo F.P. Luttmer, "Neighbors as Negatives: Relative Earnings and Well-Being," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, August 2005.

¹⁴ Karen E. Dynan and Enrichetta Ravina, "Increasing Income Inequality, External Habits, and Self-Reported Happiness," *AEA Papers and Proceedings*, vol. 97, no. 2 (May 2007), pp. 226-231.

Guven and Sorensen concluded that relative income plays a substantial role in explaining self-reported happiness and is more important to well-being than is absolute income, particularly for the middle-income group.¹⁵ Because the GSS asks respondents how they think their income compares to that of the average family, the economists also were able to measure the relationship between happiness and perceived (as opposed to actual) relative income. Guven and Sorensen estimated that well-being is more affected by the perception of relative income than by actual relative income for the middle-income group. They further found that perceptions about relative income are more important in explaining the well-being of the middle-income group than the happiness of the low- and high-income groups.

The conclusions of these studies might not seem robust because they are based on self-assessments of well-being, but if they are correct, they appear relevant to the notion of like-minded income groups. Together, the studies suggest that the satisfaction of the middle class (however defined) depends not only on keeping up with the Joneses but also staying ahead of the Smiths, as Daly and Wilson put it in their study. In other words, whatever else they may have in common, those who constitute the middle class seemingly have similar sentiments with regard to their economic situation. Specifically, having incomes far above those at the lower end of the income distribution is a source of satisfaction to the middle class, but when those at the upper end of the distribution fare much better than they do, it can be a source of consternation to the middle class. This outlook may partly explain the current antipathy expressed in some quarters toward the compensation of senior executives, among others, at some of the nation's largest corporations generally and firms in the financial services industry specifically.

Author Contact Information

Linda Levine
Specialist in Labor Economics
llevine@crs.loc.gov, 7-7756

¹⁵ Cahit Guven and Bent E. Sorensen, *Subjective Well-Being: Keeping Up With the Joneses, Real or Perceived?*, November 2007, available at http://www.uh.edu/~cguven/papers/JonesesCahit_SEP262007.pdf. See also Cahit Guven and Bent E. Sorensen, "Subjective Well-Being: Keeping Up with the Perception of the Joneses," *Social Indicators Research*, August 2011, pp. 1-31.