

**A QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY IRC ARCHIVE DOCUMENT**

---

*Originally published by the IRC Press in 1988, as part of Queen's Papers in Industrial Relations*



# **The 'Vanishing' Middle Class: Evidence and Explanations**

**Charles M. Beach**



Industrial Relations Centre (IRC)  
School of Policy Studies  
Queen's University  
Kingston, ON K7L 3N6

Tel: 613-533-6628  
Fax: 613-533-6812  
Email: [irc@queensu.ca](mailto:irc@queensu.ca)  
Visit us at: [irc.queensu.ca](http://irc.queensu.ca)

ISBN: 0-88886-200-8

Printed and bound in Canada. May 1988

Industrial Relations Centre

Queen's University

Kingston, Ontario

Canada

K7L 3N6

© 1988 Queen's University IRC

## Table of Contents

|  |    |
|--|----|
| I. Introduction .....                                    | 1  |
| II. Review of Issues and Evidence .....                  | 1  |
| III. Supply-Side Explanations.....                       | 7  |
| 1) Baby-Boom Effect.....                                 | 7  |
| 2) Changes in Family Composition .....                   | 7  |
| 3) More Working Women .....                              | 8  |
| 4) Falling Labor's Share.....                            | 10 |
| IV. Demand-Side Explanations .....                       | 11 |
| 5) Traditional Business Cycle Effects .....              | 11 |
| 6) Deindustrialization Hypothesis .....                  | 13 |
| 7) Thurow's Trade-Based Industrial Shift Hypothesis..... | 15 |
| 8) Industrial Relocation Hypothesis .....                | 16 |
| 9) Increased Part-Time Work Hypothesis .....             | 16 |
| V. Concluding Remarks .....                              | 18 |
| References .....   | 19 |

*The author would like to thank members of the Institute for Research on Poverty, and particularly Sheldon Danziger and Peter Gottschalk, at the University of Wisconsin (Madison) for helpful comments, subject to the usual disclaimer.*

## I. Introduction

A considerable body of literature has arisen lately on the so-called "vanishing" middle class. Studies by Bluestone, Harrison and others have raised the issues of deindustrialization and a growing low-wage economy. Debate on what has been happening to the United States distribution and alternative explanations has been carried on in the popular press by Kuttner, Levy, and Thurow, among others. And the recent publication of a census monograph by Levy on *Dollars and Dreams: The Changing American Income Distribution* (1987) has highlighted the importance of on-going distributional changes in broad historical context.

Discussion of recent distributional changes, however, is often confused by lack of agreement among authors on what the major changes are and by different authors forcefully advocating different explanations for these changes. The time seems ripe to bring the various strands of debate together to try to reach a consensus on what the key distributional changes are that raise social concern, and to identify as completely as possible the range of sources effecting these distributional changes. This paper attempts to move the debate in this direction. It identifies three separate phenomena that have motivated recent concern with the distribution of income. The paper then examines nine distinct hypothesis that have been suggested in the literature as explanations for one or more of these phenomena. The principal change that is highlighted is the so-called vanishing middle class. The alternative hypotheses are evaluated especially with respect to how important or successful they appear to be in explaining this particular change. The paper also seeks to provide a broad analytical perspective on how to organize the disparate hypotheses in the recent literature. This may help to identify a research agenda to better evaluate and test the alternative hypotheses.

## II. Review of Issues and Evidence

First of all, what are the principal phenomena that the recent literature has highlighted and tried to explain? To focus the discussion, I shall concentrate on three claims:

- i) increasing inequality in family income, particularly at the top and bottom ends of the distribution
- ii) the shrinking middle class
- iii) new jobs, particularly for men, are associated with a more unequal distribution of earnings; ie., the replacement of high-paid more egalitarian manufacturing jobs by typically low-paid more unequal service-related jobs.

Evidence for the first two points is presented in Table 1 from Levy (1987). The general shape of the quintile share distribution of (census) family income Levy points out, while fairly stable over the post-World War II period, has shown two distinct periods of gradual change. From the late forties until 1967-69, the distribution became moderately more equal with bottom income shares increasing and the top shares decreasing. Since then, however, a reversal has occurred with a general increase in family income inequality back to roughly what it was in the 1947-49 period.<sup>1</sup> If one defines the "middle class" as the

---

<sup>1</sup> These broad trends appear to hold up after adjusting for taxes paid and non-money income received (Levy, App.D), although after such adjustments the 1984 family income distribution appears slightly more equal than in 1949.

middle three quintiles of the family income distribution, this group received 52.0 percent of family income in 1947, increased its share to 53.8 percent in 1969, and then lost ground to 52.4 percent in 1984. If one cumulates the quintile share figures for each year in Table 1, one finds that, in terms of quintile income groups, the 1969 Lorenz curve of family income lies uniformly above those for 1949 and 1984 and the Lorenz curve for 1984 lies uniformly below both of the others, including that for 1949. Under quite general conditions, the degree of family income inequality unambiguously decreased from 1949 to 1969 and then it became unambiguously greater by 1984, even compared to 1949. The figures indeed can be augmented by preliminary CPS figures for 1986 showing the income share of the bottom quintile of families to be 4.6%, the top quintile share to have risen still further to 43.7%, and the share of the middle sixty percent of families to have declined further to 51.6%. The resulting ratio of the top quintile income share to the bottom quintile share for census families is illustrated in Figure 1 from Burtless (1987) for 1947-1985. Clearly, the evidence suggests a marked widening of relative income differentials between the upper and lower portions of the family income distribution.

The definition of middle class, however, is somewhat arbitrary, and empirical support here is not quite so clear cut. Blackburn and Bloom (1987a), for example, define the lower middle class as 60-100% of median family income, the middle class as 160-225% of the median, and the upper class as families with incomes above 225% of the median.<sup>2</sup> The figures for selected years between 1967 and 1984 in Table 2 do not show any significant trend in the shares of the lower-middle and upper-middle class groups. For the middle class more narrowly defined here, though, one can still detect a downward trend, suggesting that whatever is happening to the middle-income share is concentrated in the region not far above the median. The marked rise in the upper share once again comes through strongly. More generally, Blackburn and Bloom (1985, 1987a) and Bradbury (1986) find that a declining middle of the family distribution is indeed robust to various alternative definitions of the middle class and income measures. The overall inequality rise, however, does not seem to be so sizeable as to warrant the trumpeting of a "vanishing" middle class (Levy, 1987b) or "surge" in inequality (Thurow, 1987). As pointed out by Blackburn and Bloom (1987a), "the concern over the so-called decline of the middle class related more to whether the trend will be ongoing rather than to the magnitude of the change that has occurred" (p.356).

Some international perspective may be provided by a comparison with family income share figures for Canada,<sup>3</sup> an economy closely linked with the U.S., having a broad industrial structure, and sharing many similar experiences such as the postwar Baby Boom. As the figures in Table 3 indicate, there appears to have been a more marked change in the shape of the U.S. income distribution than of the Canadian distribution. Any drop in the share of the middle three quintiles in the case of Canada appears to have been largely cyclical in nature, associated with the 1980-82 recession. Arise in the top quintile share, though, is noticeable since about 1977 and shows that this phenomenon is not unique to the United States.

Concerning the evidence on new jobs, one can turn to the work of Bluestone and Harrison (1986). They divide jobs into three groups according to a low-wage cut-off of 50% of median annual wages and salaries in 1973 and a high-wage cut-off of 200% of median wages and salaries. The two cut-off levels are then

---

<sup>2</sup> For a more extensive discussion of definitional and conceptual issues, see Blackburn and Bloom (1985, 1987a and b) and Bradbury (1986).

<sup>3</sup> On further international comparisons, see Burtless (1987).


**Table 1**

**Shape of the Family Income Distribution over the Postwar Period**

|   | 1949 | 1969 | 1984 |
|---|------|------|------|
| Percent of All Family Income<br>Going to: |      |      |      |
| 1st Quintile (bottom)                     | 4.5% | 5.6% | 4.7% |
| 2nd Quintile 3rd                          | 11.9 | 12.4 | 11.0 |
| Quintile 4th Quintile 5th                 | 17.3 | 17.7 | 17.0 |
| Quintile (top)                            | 23.5 | 23.7 | 24.4 |
| Top 5%                                    | 42.7 | 40.6 | 42.9 |
|   | 16.9 | 15.6 | 16.0 |

**Source:** Levy (1987), Table 2.1, p.14 based on data from Bureau of the Census, Current Population Reports, series P-60.

**Figure 1**  
**Income Ratio of Top to Bottom Quintiles of Families**  
**1947-1985**



Source: Burtless (1987, Fig. 2, p. 12).

**Table 2**  
**Family Income Shares, Selected Years, 1967-1984**

|      | LMC  | MC   | UMC  | UC   |
|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1967 | .203 | .275 | .143 | .083 |
| 1969 | .206 | .258 | .151 | .091 |
| 1974 | .198 | .262 | .143 | .095 |
| 1979 | .193 | .230 | .155 | .115 |
| 1984 | .202 | .225 | .145 | .130 |
| 1985 | .203 | .213 | .145 | .142 |

**Source:** Blackburn and Bloom (1987a, Table 1). 1985 figures from Blackburn and Bloom (1987b). The population in this table includes both census families and unrelated individuals.

**Table 3**  
**Family Income Shares for Canada, Selected Years, 1965-1985**

|      | Bottom 20% | Middle 60% | Top 20% |
|------|------------|------------|---------|
| 1965 | 6.2%       | 54.7%      | 39.0%   |
| 1969 | 6.2        | 54.0       | 39.7    |
| 1975 | 6.2        | 55.1       | 38.8    |
| 1979 | 6.1        | 55.7       | 38.3    |
| 1982 | 6.3        | 54.7       | 38.9    |
| 1985 | 6.3        | 54.3       | 39.4    |

**Source:** Statistics Canada, Income Distributions by Size in Canada, 1985.

extended to later years by multiplying up by the rate of CPI inflation. Three strata of jobs - low, middle, and high - are designated according to the two cut-offs, and they examine how net employment in each of these job strata has changed between 1973-79 and 1979-84. They find that the greatest growth in employment within the latter period has been in the low stratum of jobs (58 percent in 1979-84 vs. 20 percent in 1973-79), with there actually being a decrease in the net change of high stratum jobs (-51 percent vs. 16 percent).<sup>4</sup> More sophisticated analyses by Dooley and Gottschalk (1985) and McMahon and Tschetter (1986) obtain generally similar or consistent results.

Perhaps the principal issue of Levy's book (as well as in recent papers, Levy (1987a,b)) is the eroding middle class. While he reviews the statistical evidence up until 1984, he feels that the percentage declines have been rather minor. Yet the issue has come to the fore in a much more forceful fashion than the basic income share statistics suggest he feels because of perceptual reasons. The postwar trend in (median family) income levels - as seen in Figure 2 - also shows two distinct periods. From 1947 to 1973, median (census) family income increased quite steadily from \$14,100 (in 1984 dollars) to \$28,200 - essentially doubling over the twenty-six year period. But after 1973, real incomes basically stagnated through two cycles and by 1984 stood at \$26,433. The proportion of husband-wife families receiving over \$30,000 (in 1984 dollars) fell from 51 percent in 1973 to 45 percent by 1984. With the fall off of growth of real incomes after 1973, in spite of the increasing proportion of dual-earner families, many workers, Levy argues, feel as if they are losing ground or that it is becoming more difficult to keep up with a perceived middle-class standard of living. However, the recent evidence the last two years has further strengthened earlier trends. So, whatever is going on to bring about these changes in the distribution, is more than just perceptual. Consequently, a number of the leading hypotheses that have been offered concerning the sources of such changes will be examined below and evaluated in light of current findings. What they may imply about the transitoriness or likely permanence of the changes is also examined. We begin by looking at traditional supply-side explanations, and then shift in the following section to more recent demand-side explanations.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> Note, however, that since wages have generally not kept pace with inflation since 1973 (the year real incomes peaked), the construction of the cut-off points means that more and more jobs are brought into the low-wage category.

<sup>5</sup> Government Policy changes over recent periods and their likely distributional effects are not examined in the space of this review.

### III. Supply-Side Explanations

The two traditional supply-side explanations for distributional changes in the last ten years have been the labor market effects of the Baby Boom and the increasing proportion of working women entering the labor force. These as well as several others are addressed in turn.

#### 1) Baby-Boom Effect

The entrance of the large number of baby boomers into the labor market may have increased income inequality (eg., Lawrence, 1984) and contributed to the decline in the income share of the middle class. Young workers typically have high (within-cohort) wage dispersion (Mincer, 1974). The advent of a large cohort of young workers also widens between-cohort differences in wages, steepens experience-earnings profiles and widens experience-skill differentials, particularly for men and college graduates (Freeman, 1979; Berger, 1985; Connelly, 1986). Young cohorts may also experience higher amounts of unemployment, thus further widening annual age-earnings differentials in the economy (Bloom and Freeman, 1986). However, to the extent that the Baby Boom cohorts are getting older and now moving into middle-age higher-earnings stages, this source of increased inequality may be transitory.<sup>6</sup> Indeed, the percent of workers who are young (aged 16-34) has started to decrease over the 1978-84 period. So Bradbury (1986), using a shift-share analysis, now finds that the change in the age distribution of family heads over 1973-84 has raised median family income slightly and increased the share of the middle class. Further, Thurow (1987), also using shift-share analysis, finds that aggregate inequality increases are largely the result of growing earnings inequality *within* each age group. For every age group but the elderly, Bradbury (1986) finds lower median family earnings and a reduction in the proportion of families who belonged to the middle class. Clearly, there is more going on than just a Baby Boom effect.

#### 2) Changes in Family Composition

The Baby Boom cohorts also postponed marriage and family formation relative to earlier cohorts in order to get established, and more elderly people live in single-person households. Single-person households and households containing unrelated persons increased from about one-quarter of all family units (families plus unrelated individuals) in 1973 to about a third by 1984. Median income among unrelated individuals rose between 1973 and 1984, though this was due to rising real incomes among older individuals, particularly the elderly, not among younger workers. Based on several counterfactual examples, Bradbury (1986) concludes that, if family formation had continued on at its previous pace, the decline of the proportion of families in the middle class would likely have been less pronounced.

A second source of change in family composition, already remarked upon, is the rapid growth in single-parent families, particularly those headed by women, and the corresponding decline of the "traditional" husband-wife family. For example, Blackburn and Bloom (1985) report that between 1969 and 1983 the proportion of middle-class families headed by a married couple dropped from 86 percent to 68 percent; in the bottom income class, it declined from 371 to 28 percent; whereas in the top income class it rose from 86 to 892 percent. Since female-headed families typically have low incomes, the shift away from husband-wife families may be expected to increase the number of low-income families and reduce the

---

<sup>6</sup> Though the depressing effect of large cohort sizes on these cohorts' own relative earnings may continue, perhaps gradually attenuated, throughout their careers.

middle-class income share. Indeed, Bradbury (1986) estimates that the decline in the proportion of husband-wife families has reduced the middle-class share of all families by an amount more than four times the effect of the change of the age of the family head over the 1973-84 period. It is also estimated to have reduced median income among all families by 2.9 percent (compared to the effect of a 0.4 percent increase from the changing age of family head). In its depressing effects on middle-class and lower income shares, it appears that this factor has come to clearly dominate the ageing effect of the Baby Boom.

### 3) More Working Women


The marked and steady rise in the female participation rate, particularly that for married women, has also likely had several distributional effects. Between 1967 and 1984, for example, the participation rate of married women increased from 37 percent to over 52 percent. Since women typically earn substantially lower wages than men, at least partly because of lower average amounts of labour market experience, but controlling for factors such as part-time work activity, the direct effect is a widened dispersion and lower average earnings among individual workers overall. But Berger (1983) finds that women on average are to an extent substitutable in the labor market for younger and less educated males. So the marked increase in women's participation may have contributed significantly to the decline in earnings of younger relative to older workers without college degrees, helped widen experience-skill differentials, and steepened observed age-earnings profiles of workers as a whole. In a set of interindustry wage change regressions over the period 1970-82, Bell and Freeman (1987) find a highly significant dampening effect of the level and change in the percent of women workers over the period, but a nonsignificant (dampening) effect of the change in the percent of young workers (with a coefficient half the size of that on the change in the percent of women workers).

But the increased labor force participation of wives increases the frequency of two-earner families. Does this have the effect on *family* incomes of depleting the middle class by lifting upper-middle-class family incomes into dual-earner high-income families or of augmenting the middle class by having a second earner as necessary to prevent a lower-middle-class family slipping into a lower-income class because of the eroding of individual workers' incomes since 1973? Blackburn and Bloom (1985) argue that the upper-income class had undoubtedly benefitted from the increase in two-earner families. Whereas in 1969 only 14 percent of multi-earner families were in the upper-income class, by 1983 the proportion had risen to 26 percent. However, Danziger (1980) and Betson and van der Gaag (1984) conclude, on the basis of a comparison of actual incomes of married-couple families with simulated incomes obtained by setting the wives' earnings to zero, that the advent of working wives has a slight equalizing effect on married-couple family income inequality. The latter effect above appears to slightly dominate the former. When all families are included in the analysis, rather than just married-couple families, Blackburn and Bloom (1987a) find a similar but weaker equalizing effect overall that may even have become neutral in recent years. On the other hand, Bradbury (1986) finds, again on the basis of shift-share analysis, that the increased participation rate of wives between 1973-84 markedly increased the size of the middle class almost to an extent to offset the depressing effect of the rise in single-parent families. Since the rising labor force participation rate of women is expected to continue, this should help soften any further erosion in the position of the middle class. But, to the extent that the participation rate of women cannot keep rising indefinitely at the current rate until it approaches that of men and its equalizing effect may be becoming attenuated, its role in softening any further middle class erosion may itself attenuate.

As a separate though related issue, one may question whether increased early retirement (ie., before age 65), on the part of men principally, also has had a distributional effect. If those who retire early are largely in the upper-middle-class of the distribution where private pensions or healthy early-retirement incentives may occur, the expected effect would be to reduce mean incomes, particularly in the middle-class region of the distribution. This author, however, is unaware of any formal investigation of this issue or evidence on the relative importance of such an effect.

Two studies which consider a range of demographic effects on overall inequality are Bradbury (1986) and Tilly, Bluestone, and Harrison (1987).

**Figure 2**  
**Median Income of Families and Unrelated Individuals, 1947-1984**  
**(in 1984 dollars)**



Source: Levy (1987, Fig. 2.1, p. 18)

After adjusting individually for the major factors considered above, the former ends up concluding that "demographic changes are not responsible for the bulk of the 1973-84 decline in the size of the middle class or in median family income" (p.52). She finds decreasing proportion of families with middle-class incomes in virtually all demographic groups, and concludes that this study eliminates demographic change from the list of major causes of the decline of the middle class" (p.53). Similarly, on the basis of a series of variance decompositions of individual wage and salary incomes for the years 1978 and 1984, Tilly, Bluestone, and Harrison (1987) find that "demographic changes in the workforce account

for essentially *none* of the growth in wage and salary inequality. That is, all of the changes in inequality took place *within* race, age, and gender groups" (p.3). They interpret their results as indicating that it is essentially demand-side changes in the labor market that have driven increased wage and salary inequality over this period. Both studies lack desirable controls and results are based on series of univariate adjustments. Nonetheless, they strongly suggest that other factors are likely at work, and observed inequality changes cannot be dismissed as solely demographic in origin. But, before shifting to demand-side explanations, one further factor should be investigated.

#### 4) Falling Labor's Share

The major component of family income is wages and salaries, and it is also much more equally distributed than capital income and its various components. But in recent years, labor income's share has been declining. The figures in Table 4 show that (adjusted) labor's share in National Income fell from 82.2 percent to 77.5 percent over the period 1970-84 while (adjusted) property's share rose correspondingly. The largest component rise among property income sources was interest income which has been rising steadily from 1.8 percent in 1955 to 5.1 percent in 1970 to 9.6 percent in 1984. Since property or capital income is highly unequally distributed among families in the economy, the expected effect of this shift in income shares would be to increase the income share of upper-class families and reduce the income share of the middle class. Investigation of the relative importance of this source of distributional change, however, has not appeared in the literature to the author's awareness. One could, perhaps, update the work of Mirer (1973) on the disaggregative distributional effects of such shifts in income shares to tackle this issue. It is also not clear yet whether the decline in labor's share will continue or reverse itself.<sup>7</sup>

**Table 4**  
**Percentage Shares of National Income, United States 1970-1984**

|      | Employee Compensation | Adjusted Labor Share* | Net Interest | Rent + Profit + Interest | Adjusted Property Share* |
|------|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1970 | 75.5                  | 82.2                  | 5.1          | 16.3                     | 17.8                     |
| 1975 | 75.1                  | 81.0                  | 6.8          | 17.6                     | 19.0                     |
| 1980 | 75.6                  | 80.0                  | 9.1          | 18.9                     | 20.0                     |
| 1984 | 73.4                  | 77.5                  | 9.6          | 21.4                     | 22.5                     |

**Source:** Statistical Abstracts 1984, Table 745; Survey of Current Business, Oct. 1985, Table 1.11. Figures include stock appreciation and capital consumption adjustments.

\*The adjusted shares are calculated by dividing up self-employment income (which fell from 8.2% to 5.2% over the period) between labor and property income in proportion to the economy-wide shares of labor and property (in approximate ratio of 4-to-1).

<sup>7</sup> This is further complicated by evidence of a beginning rise in the share of self-employment income (Blau, 1987; Borjas, 1987).

## IV. Demand-Side Explanations

The principal demand-side explanations for distributional changes, particularly since the 1980-82 recession, have been the severe business cycle fluctuations and persistent high unemployment that followed and the so-called deindustrialization hypothesis. We proceed to examine both of these.

### 5) Traditional Business Cycle Effects

A considerable body of literature has developed, since the "trickling down" debate of the mid-sixties, on the distributional effect of macroeconomic fluctuations. Theoretical and empirical contributions are reviewed in Beach (1988). Perhaps the most succinct empirical results on the cyclical fluctuations of family income shares for the U.S. are by Blinder and Esaki (1978), and since updated by Blank and Blinder (1986). The latter run OLS regressions over the period 1948-1983 where the dependent variables are the set of quintile income shares and the regressors include a potential quadratic in the (prime-age male) unemployment rate, the rate of inflation (of the CPI), and a lagged dependent variable. Both Blinder and Esaki (1978) and Blank and Blinder (1986) find that "high unemployment has significant and systematically regressive effects on the distribution of income: the poorer the group, the worse it fares when unemployment rises" (Blinder and Esaki, 1978, p.13). The lowest two quintiles lose out significantly, the third and fourth quintiles experience negligible effects, and the top quintile receives the principal gain. The result of the rising unemployment over the decade 1973-83 has thus been to widen the degree of inequality in the distribution of family income. Blackburn and Bloom (1987a) also find, just from inspection of the proportion of families in different income-class groupings from year to year, that the proportion of families falling in the lowest income class varies strongly countercyclically. At the top end of the distribution, however, no clear cyclical pattern appears evident and only a steady upward trend appears.

When account is taken of (i) the differential unemployment experience of different types of household heads, (ii) what happens to work and earnings receipts of secondary workers within the family, and (iii) how income transfers help supplement reduced family earnings in response to a rise in the aggregate unemployment rate, Gramlich (1974) uses longitudinal PSIP data over 1967-72 to estimate the resulting reduction in family incomes. Table 6 from Gramlich (1974) shows the percentage reduction in family incomes for three family types — those with a white male head, black male head, and female head — and three income groups. Once again, lower income families experience a relatively larger reduction in income from higher unemployment rates. But also families headed by black males face a much greater exposure to income losses than those headed by white males, and both effects are much greater than that for families with a female head. Similar results are also found more recently by Blank (1985). While transfer payments serve to cushion the earnings decline of low-income and female-headed families, they have a relatively weaker cushioning effect for higher-income male-headed families. Updated results are provided in Gramlich and Laren (1984).

**Table 5**  
**Steady State Effects of Unemployment on Family Quintile**  
**Income Shares: United States 1948-83**  
 (standard errors in parentheses)

|                 | Regression Coefficients |                       | Steady-State Effect of 1-Point<br>Rise in Unemployment Rate (UR) |
|-----------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
|                 | <u>UR</u>               | <u>UR<sup>2</sup></u> |  |
| Bottom Quintile | -.100<br>(.023)         |                       | -.185  |
| 2nd Quintile    | -.238<br>(.050)         | .019<br>(.005)        | -.160  |
| 3rd Quintile    | -.033<br>(.016)         |                       | -.033  |
| 4th Quintile    | .030<br>(.016)          |                       | .053   |
| Top Quintile    | .198<br>(.046)          |                       | .289   |

**Source:** Blank and Blinder (1986).

**Table 6**  
**Percentage Change in Family Income Caused by a One Percentage Point**  
**Increase in the Unemployment Rate**

|  | Not Accounting For<br>Transfer Payments |                    |                | Accounting for Response of<br>Transfer Payments |                    |                |
|--|---|--------------------|----------------|---|--------------------|----------------|
|  | White Male<br>Head                      | Black Male<br>Head | Female<br>Head | White Male<br>Head                              | Black Male<br>Head | Female<br>Head |
| Family Income at<br>Poverty Line             | 2.9                                     | 3.9                | 1.0            | 2.0   | 2.5                | 0.4            |
| Family Income<br>Three Times<br>Poverty Line | 1.4                                     | 2.0                | 0.8            | 1.2   | 1.7                | 0.5            |
| Family Income<br>Five Times<br>Poverty Line  | 0.9                                     | 1.3                | 0.5            | 0.8   | 1.1                | 0.4            |
| Average                                      | 1.1                                     | 2.7                | 0.9            | 0.9   | 2.1                | 0.5            |

**Source:** Gramlich (1974).

Once again, however, there is no clear analysis or results on the relative importance of the traditional business cycle effect in the distributional changes of the past fifteen years. By its very nature, this effect is not long run. One would expect it to have played a major role during the strong 1980-82 recession and shortly thereafter as unemployment rates remained high. But the distributional trends that Levy highlights were already on the way before the recession and are continuing apace even in recent years when the unemployment rate has significantly dropped from its 1982-83 peak. Analysis of the detailed distributional burden of the 1980-82 recession would clearly be of interest. But it would likely show this effect to be only one contributing factor to the longer running pattern of distributional changes under inquiry.

Indeed, Summers (1986) has drawn attention to the changed nature of unemployment over the past fifteen years, and particularly since 1978. He reviews evidence to show that, between 1978 and 1985, unemployment increased relatively much more markedly among prime-aged males than other demographic groups, and among married and formerly married men. "The amount of unemployment attributable to teenagers has declined ...and the bulk of the increase in unemployment in recent years is attributable to men aged twenty and above" (p.351) and is the result of job loss resulting in a significant increase in long-term unemployment. "In fact, the increases in unemployment have been relatively greatest for mature men with dependents. And they have resulted primarily from job loss and increases in duration of unemployment" (p.355). The evidence is suggestive, Summers speculates, of structural changes that have shifted employment from high- to low-wage sectors. It is along this line of inquiry that the so-called deindustrialization debate is pursued.

## 6) Deindustrialization Hypothesis

The deindustrialization hypothesis was the first and perhaps best known among several hypotheses concerning the distributional effects of industrial restructuring. The hypothesis is strongly forwarded in the work of Bluestone and Harrison (1982, 1986), Harrison, Tilly and Bluestone (1986), and Tilly, Bluestone and Harrison (1987) and picked up by numerous others (eg., Mishel, 1986) as well as serving as the basis for a special issue on the "structuralist debate" in *Industrial Relations* (Spring 1986). The basic idea is that, since the late 1960s, employment in traditional manufacturing industries (particularly durable goods manufacturing) has declined as manufactured imports increase and as goods-producing firms seek to reduce costs by direct investment abroad, foreign out-sourcing, streamlining, and automation, while new low-wage jobs opening up have been primarily in the service industries. The concern is that this trend has accelerated with the severe 1980-82 recession and the high U.S. dollar on world markets. Since wages in manufacturing generally have a higher mean and lower degree of dispersion, whereas wages in the service sector tend to have a lower mean and greater degree of dispersion (Blackburn and Bloom 1986b; Levy, 1987, p.96), the result of such a displacement of labor is to generate greater earnings inequality, increased relative employment in lower-paying jobs, and a reduction in traditional middle- and upper-middle-class jobs.<sup>8</sup> If this effect is not primarily cyclical but is a long-term trend, then it suggests a continuing pattern of increased dispersion and reduced middle-class incomes for the future.

Note, immediately, that the focus of the discussion has shifted away from the family unit and to the distribution among *individuals*. The discussion has also shifted away from income in general to *earnings*

---

<sup>8</sup> Levy, in his book, also argues that manufacturing jobs are beneficial because of the well-paying job opportunities they provide to less educated labour and because of the interdependencies of goods production with accompanying service jobs (1987, p.88).

or wages and salaries. These readjustments of the focus actually raise a whole new set of conceptual and data issues and associated literature on what has been happening to the distribution of earnings or wages and salaries among individual workers. The reader may find a helpful critical guide through this literature in Blackburn and Bloom (1987b). The first issue to consider here is what has been happening to the distribution of earnings among workers. Tilly, Bluestone, and Harrison (1987), looking at the variance of the log (an inequality measure that is relatively sensitive to changes at the lower end of a distribution) of annual wage and salary income among all earners from the March CPS files, find evidence of a marked U-turn in equality, with a broad decline over 1963-75, a trough during the period 1975-78, and then a sharp rise over 1978-84. Blackburn and Bloom (1987b) review the evidence from a number of studies that use other inequality measures and also breakdown the population into male and female workers and into full-time year-round workers. They conclude tentatively that

"The weight of the evidence [seems]... to suggest an increase in male earnings inequality and a decrease in female earnings inequality over the years 1967-1975. It also appears that male earnings inequality increased from 1975 to 1983, while the results for females and all earners do not strongly support any conclusion". (p.22).

In their own empirical work based on the March CPS files for 1968-86 with less restrictive measures of inequality, Blackburn and Bloom (1987b) find that earnings inequality for men (both full-time year-round and all workers) increases over the period, while it did not change significantly for women who were full-time year-round workers, and actually fell among all women workers. Across all workers, earnings inequality does not appear to have changed significantly since the late sixties.<sup>9</sup>

The second issue to consider is the extent to which these inequality changes in individual earnings are the result of industrial shifts. Tilly, Bluestone, and Harrison (1987) perform an analysis of variance decomposition of the difference in the variance of log of annual wage salary income among all individual workers between the two years 1978 and 1984.<sup>10</sup> They find that about two-thirds of increased inequality over the, period is due to greater dispersion in hourly wage rates, and that 22 percent of the rise in annual wage and salary inequality is due to inter-industry shifts in employment. Blackburn and Broom (1987b), also employing a variance decomposition of the mean log deviation of annual earnings among all full-time year-round workers, found that 40 percent of the inequality change between 1967 and 1984 was due to inter-industry employment shifts. The inequality change on which this is computed, however, is an insignificant amount, so that the figure is tentative at best. They conclude that

Although high-inequality industries increased their share of total employment from 1967 to 1984, this change can only account for a small fraction of the small increase in earnings inequality over those years. Thus, our results provide little support for either part of the compound hypothesis that earnings inequality has increased and that the increase was primarily the result of sectoral shift in the U.S. economy" (p.36).

---

<sup>9</sup> Using wage data from establishment sources, rather than from household survey sources, however, Bell and Freeman (1987) present evidence that dispersion in wages and compensation (as measured by the log variance) across all workers has risen persistently since around 1970 to 1985.

<sup>10</sup> They argue that these two years occupy similar expansionary periods in the business cycle, and hence go some way towards controlling for cyclical effects.

A third issue is that, whatever employment shifts have occurred between industries, there have also occurred significant inequality increases *within* industries as well. Blackburn and Bloom (1987b) find that a Gini index of within-industry inequality of earnings among full-time year-round workers increased for *both* manufacturing and "traditional services" sectors between 1967 and 1984. Tilly, Bluestone, and Harrison (1987) estimate that 78 percent of inequality change in wage and salary income among all workers is due to within-industry inequality increases and all but one industry out of fourteen between 1978 and 1984 showed an increase in its variance. Similarly, Levy (1987) also remarks that "the problem was not that male workers shifted to services: rather, earnings inequality among full-time workers grew in *both* the goods- and the service-producing sectors..." (p.97). Consistent evidence is also found in Lawrence (1984), McMahon and Tschetter (1986), and Bell and Freeman (1987).

Conclusions with respect to these issues are still tentative. However, it does appear that, first, on the basis of household survey data, evidence for a marked increasing trend in earnings inequality across full-time workers is not robust, though there does appear to be an upward trend in earnings dispersion for men. Second, only a relatively small fraction of such inequality trends appear to be attributable to interindustry employment shifts and the increased employment of service workers. Third, increases in within-industry earnings dispersion appear to have a much more dominant effect and to be pervasive across a broad range of industries, including both manufacturing and services. All in all, the evidence does not appear very supportive of the deindustrialization hypothesis as a major source of distributional change, and is suggestive of more pervasive forms of structural adjustment<sup>11</sup> and changes in organizational structure and work patterns.

### **7) Thurow's Trade-Based Industrial Shift Hypothesis**

A more sophisticated version of the deindustrialization hypothesis has been provided by Thurow (1985, 1986, 1987). Using input-output techniques, he divides U.S. industries into those that are exporting or import-competing and the rest. He then finds that the distributions of earnings among individual workers in exporting and particularly import-competing sectors have both higher median earnings levels and lower dispersion than the rest of the economy grouped together. He concludes:

The meaning of these statistics is that when exports fall and imports rise to create a trade deficit, the distribution of earnings moves toward inequality. Jobs are lost in both exporting and import-competing industries and are replaced by jobs with lower, more unequal earnings in the rest of the economy. This factor is principal reason for the observed decline in earnings of males" (1987, p.34).

A declining U.S. dollar and the prospect of reduced foreign-trade deficits over the next few years would suggest that this effect, while possibly of significance over recent years with the large trade deficit, is less likely to persist in the future than some of the other considerations.

This hypothesis leaves a number of questions unanswered and raises several issues one would wish to test. First, why should there be a smaller degree of dispersion in exporting and import-competing industries than elsewhere in the economy? Thurow (1985) makes reference to the factor price equalization theorem,

---

<sup>11</sup> For example, increased contracting out for goods and services particularly in wake of the 1980-82 recession (McMahon and Teschetter, 1986, p.26).

but readily points out there are complexities in applying it to this situation. One would also wish to test the limits of this hypothesis with data from a range of different countries. Second, it is not at all clear exactly which industries fall into each of the three categories or what the criterion is for allocating the industries into categories. Third, the earnings distributions cited for the three categories do not appear to control for gender, degree of unionization, or incidence of part-time work activity. Consequently, one would wish to test further whether the smaller dispersion in the exporting and import-competing industries could be due to greater unionization, fewer women workers, fewer part-time workers, or even more homogeneously-aged workers. Fourth, the timing of the effect is off. Thurow associates this effect with the advent of the large U.S. trade deficits in recent years, whereas we have seen that earnings inequality increases among men date back at least to the early seventies. While the trade-based industrial shift hypothesis may have contributed in recent years to a broader on-going process of structural adjustment among industries, it does not appear to be the whole story.

### **8) Industrial Relocation Hypothesis**

An alternative hypothesis that could be offered on the basis of the work of Crandall (1986) is that U.S. industry, and particularly manufacturing, is shifting away from the traditional heavy manufacturing regions of the Northeast and Midwest to new locations in the South and West. The manufacturing sector is not dying since its output share of GNP has remained relatively stable since the late forties. But it is dramatically shifting location to regions that offer faster growing markets, Pacific and southern port access, lower wage and energy costs, lower tax rates, and a lower degree of unionization resulting in more flexibility in manning rules. Crandall (1986) presents evidence that, between 1967 and 1982, manufacturing employment in New England, Mid Atlantic, and East North Central regions declined by between 4 and 26 percent; while in the West South Central, Mountain, and Pacific regions, it rose by between 24 and 87 percent. "It is no exaggeration to say that the problems of U.S. manufacturing are generally problems of Northeastern and Midwestern establishments and the communities that they support. Elsewhere, the manufacturing sector has not only failed to decline, but it has grown rather rapidly" (Crandall, 1986, pp.122-3).

The distributional implications of this shift are potentially substantial, but have yet to be worked out in the literature. Employment shifts to regions with lower mean wages and greater degree of wage dispersion such as the South would be expected to have results that have been reviewed under item (6) above and would go towards explaining increased intra-industry wage dispersions across a broad range of industries. The accompanying shift toward a lower degree of unionization would also have the effect of lowering mean wages and widening skill differentials and thus wage dispersion. Empirical evaluation of these distributional effects remains to be undertaken. Since this regional migration of industry is likely to continue so long as the cost advantages persist, one would expect these effects also to continue as a long-run trend.

### **9) Increased Part-Time Work Hypothesis**

It should not be surprising that the degree of inequality among just full-time workers is considerably less than that among full-time and part-time workers combined. Blackburn and Bloom (1987b) also found that changes in inequality (separately for men and women) appeared generally less significant for full-time year-round workers than for all workers. An increase in the degree of part-time work in the economy, particularly in periods of recession, would thus have the effect of reducing mean earnings (to the extent

the part-time jobs do not go to multiple-job holders) and, once again, increasing dispersion of earnings among workers. Between 1973 and 1982, the proportion of workers on part-time work schedules (on the basis of CPS data) increased from 17.0 percent to 20.5 percent (McMahon and Tschetter, 1986). By 1985, it had moved back to 19.0 percent.

Clearly, part-time and part-year work activity reflects both demand- and supply-side behavior. More youths and women who would not otherwise be in the labor market may be seeking work with more flexible hours. The additional-worker effect may induce wives to enter the labor market for part-time or temporary employment when their husbands lose work. Older workers may ease into retirement through part-time work arrangements and self-employment activities. On the other hand, more part-time or temporary jobs may be created by firms by a shift toward increased outsourcing and subcontracting to reduce ongoing labor commitments, to avoid extra labor costs such as fringe benefits, and perhaps to escape labor union restrictions. Between 1973, 1982, and 1985, voluntary part-time employment is estimated (again from CPS data) to have changed relatively little from 14.0 percent to 14.3 percent and then down to 13.8 percent. Employment that is part-time "for economic reasons", however, manifests very significant fluctuations over the same period from 3.0 percent, up to 6.2 percent, and then back somewhat to 5.2 percent (McMahon and Tschetter, 1986).<sup>12</sup> Evidently, "involuntary" part-time employment has shown a dramatic increase in the 1980s.

Evidence on the relative importance of the hours worked effect can be found in Tilly, Bluestone, and Harrison (1987). Using a variance decomposition of the log of annual wages and salaries, they estimate that between the years 1978 and 1984 42 percent of the increase in inequality of annual wage and salary income is due to the combined effect of a higher proportion of part-time workers<sup>13</sup> and lower average annual wages of part-time workers relative to others. A similar decomposition by weeks worked per year<sup>14</sup> finds this dimension contributes little to the inequality change. Thus increased part-time work experience appears to be a significant determinant of increased wage and salary inequality in the 1980s, but not part-year work experience. Indeed Levy (1987, p.95) argues that it is differences in the frequency and role of part-time work activity that essentially accounts for the distributional effects of the shift in employment from manufacturing to the service sector in recent years.

Tilly, Bluestone, and Harrison (1987) also examine the reasons for increased part-time work activity. Using as their definition of part-time hours usually worked per week in the previous calendar year, they find from the March CPS data that 40 percent of the net increases in part-time workers between 1978 and 1984 stated they were working part-time "for economic reasons."<sup>15</sup> They conclude that a substantial part of the increase in part-time work activity is demand-side driven. These results are clearly tentative because of the paucity of controls, the use of only two end-point years of data, and reliance on a log variance inequality measure. But they do suggest that, to the extent that such increases in part-time work

---

<sup>12</sup> A generally similar pattern can be found in BLS data as well. See Mishel (1986), Table 3, p.10.

<sup>13</sup> Defined as less than 30 hours usually worked per week.

<sup>14</sup> That is, part-year workers (less than 50 weeks) vs. full-year workers (50-52 weeks).

<sup>15</sup> Based on the BLS definition (less than 35 hours worked in the previous week) and data for part-time work, the corresponding figure they find to be 78 percent. Indeed these data are the basis of such remarks in the public press that "between 1979 and 1985, part-time jobs grew twice as fast as full-time jobs, accounting for nearly 30 percent of total net employment growth" (Bluestone and Harrison, 1987).

activity are cyclical in their source, this source of contribution to inequality increases in the 1980s would be expected to attenuate as the current expansion continues.

## V. Concluding Remarks

We have reviewed the major evidence on the rising degree of income inequality and the declining middle class, and examined nine hypotheses that arise in the literature that claim to explain, at least in part, these inequality changes. Of the nine hypotheses, four appear to stand out as having significant impact. Among the supply-side hypotheses, it appears that changing family composition and particularly more single-parent female-headed households is having an important effect on reducing the middle class and increasing the number of low-income family units. This effect appears to dominate the Baby Boom effect which has now shifted to increasing the middle class and the increased labor market involvement of married women which on net may have close to a neutral distributional effect. On the demand side, several major interacting effects appear to be at work. The distributional experience of the eighties has been severely marked by the major recession and subsequent labor market adjustments which augmented or accelerated several underlying structural trends. The dramatic degree of industrial relocation from the Northeast and Midwest to the South and West appears to have broader and more significant distributional impacts than those of the deindustrialization hypotheses which have drawn such public attention. The increased importance of part-time work schedules in the 1980s, particularly among men who find themselves in part-time work involuntarily and would prefer full-time work, also appears to have had significant distributional impacts. Clearly, the latter three effects ((5), (8), and (9)) may be hard to disentangle fully.

Are the current inequality trends likely just transitory or likely to carry on for some time? The patterns of changing family composition and industrial relocation appear to be carrying on apace, so that these stimuli for widening income inequality are expected to continue. However, the business cycle and part-time work effects should help attenuate the widening inequality so long as the current long-lived cyclical expansion continues. But if the U.S. economy slips into recession, they would likely start reinforcing the trend towards greater inequality. The outlook then, at least for the near term, appears not optimistic for a reversal of the current trends.

## References

- Beach, C.M. (1988). "Wages Profits and the Distribution of Income", *Fundamentals of Pure and Applied Economics* (forthcoming).
- Bell, L.A., and R.B. Freeman (1987). "The Facts About Rising Industrial Wage Dispersion in the U.S.," Industrial Relations Research Association, 39th Annual Proceedings, 331-348.
- Berger, M.C. (1983). "Changes in Labor Force Composition and Male Earnings: A Production Approach", *Journal of Human Resources* 18 (Spring), 177-196.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1985). "The Effects of Cohort Size on Earnings Growth: A Re-examination of the Evidence", *Journal of Political Economy* 93 (June), 561-573.
- Betson, D. and J. van der Gaag (1984). "Working Women and the Redistribution of Income", *Journal of Human Resources* 19 (Fall), 532-543.
- Blackburn, M. L., and D.E. Bloom (1985). "What Is Happening to the Middle Class?", *American Demographic* (January), 18-25.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1987a). "Family Income Inequality in the United States: 1967-1984", Industrial Relations Research Association, 39th Annual Proceedings, 349-357.
- (1987b). "The Effects of Technological Change on Earnings and Income Inequality in the United States", Harvard Institute of Economic Research Discussion Paper No. 1339.
- Blank, R.M. (1985). "Disaggregating the Effect of the Business Cycle on the Distribution of Income", Princeton University unpublished paper (November).
- Blank, R.M., and A.S. Blinder (1986). "Macroeconomics, Income Distribution, and Poverty", in S. Danziger and D. Weinberg, ed., *Fighting Poverty: What Works and What Does Not* (Harvard University Press; Cambridge, MA.).
- Blau, D.M. (1987). "A Time-Series Analysis of Self-Employment in the United States", *Journal of Political Economy* 95 (June), 445-467.
- Blinder, A.S. and H.Y. Esaki (1978). "Macroeconomic Activity and Income Distribution in the Postwar United States", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 60 (November), 604-609.
- Bloom, D.E. and R.B. Freeman (1986). "The 'Youth Problem': Age or Generational Crowding?". NBER Working Paper No. 1829 (February).
- Bluestone, B., and B. Harrison (1982). *The Deindustrialization of America* (Basic Books; New York).

- \_\_\_\_\_ (1986). "The Great American Job Machine: The Proliferation of Low-Wage Employment in the U.S. Economy", U.S. Congressional Joint Economic Committee; Washington, D.C. (November).
- (1987). "A Low Wage Explosion: The Grim Truth About the Job 'Miracle'", *The New York Times* Forum (Sunday, February 1).
- Borjas, G.J. (1987). "The Self-Employment Experience of Immigrants", *Journal of Human Resources* 21 (Fall), 485-506.
- Bradbury, K.L. (1986). "The Shrinking Middle Class", *New England Economic Review* (September/October), 41-55.
- Burtless, G. (1987). "Inequality in America: Where Do We Stand?", *The Brookings Review* (Summer), 9-16.
- Cahill, K. (1985). "The Distribution of Income among Families with Children, 1968-1984", Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress, Education and Public Welfare Division, 85-1017 EPW (October).
- Connelly, R. (1986), "A Framework for Analyzing the Impact of Cohort Size on Education and Labor Earnings", *Journal of Human Resources* 21 (Fall), 543-562.
- Crandall, R.W. (1986). "The Transformation of U.S. Manufacturing", *Industrial Relations* 25 (Spring), 118-130.
- Danziger, S. (1980). "Do Working Wives Increase Family Income Inequality?", *Journal of Human Resources* 15 (Summer), 444-451.
- Danziger, S. , and P. Gottschalk (1986). "Do Rising Tides Lift All Boats? The Impact of Secular and Cyclical Changes on Poverty", *American Economic Review* 76 (May), 405-410.
- Dooley, M., and P. Gottschalk (1984). "Earnings Inequality Among Males in the United States: Trends and the Effect of Labor Force Growth", *Journal of Political Economy* 92 (January), 59-89.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1985). "The Increasing Proportion of Men with Low Earnings in the United States", *Demography* 22 (February), 25-34.
- Freeman, R.B. (1979). "The Effect of Demographic Factors on Age-Earnings Profiles", *Journal of Human Resources* 14 (Summer), 289-318.
- Gramlich, E.M. (1974). "The Distributional Effects of Higher Unemployment", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* (No.2), 293-336.
- Gramlich, E.M., and D.C. Laren (1984). "How Widespread Are Income Losses in a Recession?", in D.L. Bawden, ed., *The Social Contract Revisited* (The Urban Institute; Washington, D.C.).
- Harrison, B., C. Tilly, and B. Bluestone (1986). "Wage Inequality Takes a Great U-Turn", *Challenge* (March/April), 26-32.

- Kutscher, R.E. and V.A. Personick (1986). "Deindustrialization and the Shift to Services", *Monthly Labor Review* 109 (June), 3-13.
- Kuttner, R. (1983). "The Declining Middle", *The Atlantic Monthly* (July), 60-72.
- Lawrence, R. (1984). "Sectoral Shifts and the Size of the Middle Class", *The Brookings Review* (Fall), 3-11.
- Levy, F. (1987). *Dollars and Dreams: The Changing American Income Distribution* (Russell Sage/Basic Books; New York).
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1987a). "Changes in the Distribution of American Family Incomes, 1947 to 1984", *Science* (May 22), 923-927.
- McMahon, P.J. and J.H. Tschetter (1986). "The Declining Middle Class: A Further Analysis", *Monthly Labor Review* (September), 22-27.
- Mincer, J. (1974). *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*, N.B.E.R. (Columbia University Press; New York).
- Hirer, T.W. (1973). "The Effects of Macroeconomic Fluctuations on the Distribution of Income", *Review of Income and Wealth* 19 (December), 385-405.
- Mishel, L. (1986). *The Polarization of America: The Loss of Good Jobs, Falling Incomes, and Rising Inequality*, Industrial Union Department, AFL-CIO (Washington, D.C.).
- Radner, D. (1986). "Changes in the Money Income of the Aged and Nonaged, 1967-1983", Studies in Income Distribution No.14, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Social Security Administration, Office of Research, Statistics, and International Policy (September).
- Rosenthal, N.H. (1985). "The Shrinking Middle Class: Myth or Reality?", *Monthly Labor Review* 108 (March), 3-10.
- Statistics Canada (1986). *Income Distribution by Size in Canada, 1985*, Catalogue No. 13-207 (December).
- Summers, L.H. (1986). "Why Is the Unemployment Rate So Very High Near Full Employment?", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity* (No. 2), 339-383.
- Thurow, L.C. (1985). "A General Tendency Toward Inequality", unpublished paper for the December 1985 AEA Meetings.
- \_\_\_\_\_ (1987). "A Surge in Inequality", *Scientific American* 256 (May), 30-37.
- Tilly, C., B. Bluestone, and B. Harrison (1987). "The Reasons for Increasing Wage and Salary Inequality, 1978-1984", unpublished paper a shorter version of which was given at the Industrial Relations Research Association Meetings in December, 1986 (February).
- U.S. Bureau of the Census (1986). *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1987* (December).
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis (1985), *Survey of Current Business* (October).



Industrial Relations Centre (IRC)  
Queen's University  
Kingston, ON K7L 3N6  
[irc.queensu.ca](http://irc.queensu.ca)



SCHOOL OF  
**Policy Studies**  
QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY