

TECHNICAL WORKING PAPER SERIES

REPORTED INCOME IN THE NLSY:
CONSISTENCY CHECKS AND METHODS
FOR CLEANING THE DATA

Nancy Cole
Janet Currie

Technical Working Paper No. 160

NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMIC RESEARCH
1050 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02138
July 1994

This paper is part of NBER's research program in Labor Studies. Any opinions expressed are those of the authors and not those of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

NBER Technical Working Paper #160
July 1994

REPORTED INCOME IN THE NLSY:
CONSISTENCY CHECKS AND METHODS
FOR CLEANING THE DATA

ABSTRACT

The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth collects information about over 20 separate components of respondent income. These disaggregated income components provide many opportunities to verify the consistency of the data. This note outlines procedures we have used to identify and "clean" measurement error in the disaggregated income variables. After cleaning the income data at the disaggregated level, we reconstruct the measure of "family income" and re-evaluate poverty status. While people may not agree with all of our methods, we hope that they will be of some use to other researchers. A second purpose of this note is to highlight the value of the disaggregated data, since without it, it would be impossible to improve on the reported totals. Finally, we hope that with the advent of computerized interviewing technology, checks on the internal consistency of the data of the kind that we propose may eventually be built into interviewing software, thereby improving the quality of the data collected.

Nancy Cole
Abt Associates
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Janet Currie
Department of Economics
UCLA
405 Hilgard Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90024
and NBER

The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth collects information about over 20 separate categories of respondent income. These disaggregated income components provide many opportunities to verify the consistency of the data. This note outlines procedures we have used to identify and "clean" measurement error in the disaggregated income variables. After cleaning the income data at the disaggregated level, we reconstruct the measure of "family income" and re-evaluate poverty status. While people may not agree with all of our methods, we hope that they will be of some use to other researchers. A second purpose of this note is to highlight the value of the disaggregated data, since without it, it would be impossible to improve on the reported totals. Finally, we hope that with the advent of computerized interviewing technology, checks on the internal consistency of the data of the kind we propose may eventually be built into interviewing software, thereby improving the quality of the data collected.

"Family Income" and "Poverty Status" are two NLSY income variables that are often used by researchers. Family income is not reported directly by respondents (with the exception of years in which the respondent resided with parents), but is a "KEY" variable that is constructed by the NLSY staff from the multiple income items in the NLSY survey instrument.¹ Hence, errors in the components are reflected in the totals. However, it is difficult to identify measurement error in total family income because significant variance is induced by changes in household structure. (Given the age of respondents, many leave their parents' household, begin careers, and marry during the course of the survey.) It is therefore important to clean the data at the most disaggregated level possible.

We adopt three main strategies for identifying measurement error in the income components. First, we examine the individual components of income in a time series context (looking for large variation over non-missing years for each respondent). Second, we compare the responses in different categories of income. (e.g. is the same income being reported in multiple categories such as "self-employment income" and "wage and salary income"? Do siblings records contain consistent reports of their parents' income?) And third, income components that have a known upper limit, such as welfare receipts, are compared with the maximum entitlement amounts.

After "cleaning" the income data we reconstruct net family income to take account of the revisions in the underlying components. In addition, we make two changes in the construction of "net family income": First, we include domestic partner's income in the sum of income components (the NLSY construction excludes partner's income). Second, while the NLSY coded net family income as missing if any individual component of income was missing, we do so only if the average value of the missing income component is over \$1000 in years when it is not missing.

Poverty status is reevaluated using the revised family income measure. The determination of poverty status is based on the NLSY algorithm that compares total family income to the federal

¹ In the 1979-86 interviews, the parents' income was solicited as the measure of family income if the respondent resided with parents or lived in a group residence (i.e. dormitory). Thus there are two family income variables: the self-reported parents' income variable appears in the "Income and Assets File" (variable R1903.10 in 1979); the constructed variable for respondent's total income appears in the "Created Key Variables" file (R2179 in 1979). After the 1986 survey the parents income question was dropped from the survey as all respondents were at least 21 years of age at that time.

poverty threshold, conditional on family size, number of children under age 18, and state of residence (see NLSY Appendix II).²

I. The Impact of Measurement Error

Our work with the NLSY data has been limited to the NLSY women, hence all statistics in this memo refer to the sample of 6283 female respondents during the 1979-91 interview years.³ Table 1 lists the 22 categories of respondents' income that appear on the NLSY survey instrument. The number of NLSY women who EVER report income in each category is shown along with the total number of responses in each income category during the 1979-91 interviews. This information is also shown for parents' income, which was collected only during the 1979-86 interviews, and only for respondents residing with their parents.

Table 2 shows some examples of common problems in the income data. This table shows all years of data for a selection of respondents. All variables on the left side of the table are cleaned variables; INC is total family income. The variables on the right side of the table contain the original values; YNETFK is the constructed (KEY) annual net family income calculated by the NLSY.

The first page of Table 2 illustrates the effects of including partner's income. For example, Person 322 is a woman with a domestic partner earning between \$20,000 and \$30,000 per year from 1981 to 1985. The conventional NLSY definition of family income would exclude these earnings. A more minor change we made in this woman's income involved changing her report of parent's income in 1978 to correspond with that of her sibling's. Other examples of the use of sibling information about parent's income are shown on page 2 of Table 2. This type of change is discussed in more detail below.

The record for Person 876 on the first page of Table 2 also shows the effects of top coding (see YNETFK in 1989 and 1990). Further examples of the effects of top coding are shown on page 4 of Table 2. If we compare the last two years of data for persons 876, 7587, and 8226 (and the last three years for 7587 and 8226) we see that exactly the same values were reported for family income, even though the individual components of income sum to different amounts. Although they do not look like it, the values \$1,057,448, \$146,942, and \$159,805 are top codes the NLSY computed by taking the average values over all individuals who were top coded and substituting this average value for the original data. Between 1985 and 1987, top codes were set at \$100,001 (see ID's 7587 and 2908), and between 1982 and 1984 they were set at \$75001 (see 2908). In any case, using the sum of individual components instead generally leads to much smoother family income series in these cases. This can be seen in the records for ID 7587 and 8226. However, the last case on page 4 shows an example in which family income is topcoded because the earnings of the respondent's

² The federal poverty threshold applies to all 48 contiguous states. The threshold is multiplied by 1.15 for Hawaii and 1.25 for Alaska.

³ We use the 1990 interview release of data from ICPSR for all interviews up to and including 1990; We then merged the 1991 interview data from the 1991 release on CD-Rom. Note that income for 1978 is reported in the 1979 interview, etc.

spouse are topcoded. We treat this data as missing.

Page 3 of Table 2 shows several examples in which missing income components led the NLSY to report that family income was missing. For example, Person 876 apparently received no "other family" income in most survey years: The component is coded as a "valid skip". However, in 1981 and 1982, the component was coded as "don't know". This resulted in the total family income value being set to zero although the family income we compute for this woman by summing the other components of income is not out of line with her reported income in 1978, 1979, or 1980.

The fifth page of Table 2 gives examples of effects of errors in the reporting of entitlement income. Person 3068 reported receiving \$48,240 from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program in 1983. This report caused her family income to rise from \$14,414 in 1982 to \$60,754 in 1983. It then fell back to \$7,788 in 1984 when she reported a more reasonable \$4176. in AFDC income.

Finally, the last page of Table 2 shows several cases in which improbably large values of wage and salary income were replaced with values based on averages of the values in surrounding years (see below). For example, person 2928 reported wage and salary income of \$3,247 in 1985, \$100,001 (i.e. a top coded amount) in 1986, and \$26,766 in 1988. We replaced the 1986 value with \$15,006 which reduced family income in 1986 from a top coded value to \$15,012.

The impact of cleaning the earnings, welfare, and parents' income is shown in Table 3. The percentage of observations that were cleaned in each category is extremely small. However, 6% of women had own or spouses' earnings cleaned in at least one survey year; and 12.3% of women who ever received welfare had that income cleaned in at least one year. The fact that there is a noticeable impact on the means despite the small numbers of changes demonstrates that the "cleaning" involved extreme values.

The overall impact of our data cleaning is shown in Table 4. We separately examined the impact of our cleaning methods on family income values that were non-missing, and on family income values that were "missing" due to invalid skips or topcoding. The top panel of Table 4 shows that we "cleaned" approximately 10% of non-missing family income values in each survey year. The majority of these cases involved an increase in family income. The effect on poverty status was smaller, with less than 5% of cases changing poverty status in each year. The lower panel of Table 4 shows that in a large fraction of cases in which family income was missing, we were able to impute a value.

II. Methods

A detailed description of the method used to "clean" each component of income follows.

1. AFDC and Food Stamp Data.

The NLSY reports the following: 1) average monthly AFDC income in the survey year, 2) monthly Food Stamp Program income in the most recent month of the survey year, and 3) months

in which the income was received. These data exhibit a large degree of variance in the amounts received, both over respondents in any given year and over years for a given respondent. Of the 6283 women in the survey, 36.6% reported AFDC income in at least one year during the period 1979-1991, and 47.5% reported Food Stamp Program benefits in at least one year.

To check the accuracy of the data we compared the monthly benefit receipts to the actual maximum allowable AFDC and Food Stamp Program grant levels, given the year, state of residence, and family size. (AFDC grant levels vary by state while Food Stamp benefit levels are set at the federal level. The AFDC maximum benefit level is specific to the number of children under age 18 residing in the household; the maximum Food Stamp benefit level is specific to household size.) Of the 6639 annual observations of AFDC receipts we found that 10.5 % exceeded the maximum benefit level by more than 100 dollars (591 cases); the corresponding figure for Food Stamp receipts is 6.5% of 9427 observations.

It is clear that many gross outliers were due to the reporting of annual amounts in place of monthly receipts. (This would not be obvious if we examined only dollar amounts since 34% of the total years of AFDC receipt are years in which AFDC was received for fewer than 12 months; similarly, Food Stamps are received for fewer than 12 months in 44% of years in which they are received.) In order to adopt a simple rule, we therefore assumed that the reported monthly figure was actually an annual figure when the maximum grant level was exceeded by at least 100 dollars. Exceptions to our "cleaning" rule were mothers living in California and Illinois. These states have different grant levels according to geographic location.⁴ Also if a mother was observed to move to a new state between interviews, the standard for comparison was the maximum of the grant levels in the old and new state. These last rules account for the fact that 46% of all AFDC receipts that exceed the maximum grant level by more than \$100 were not corrected by our cleaning algorithm.

The before and after-cleaning values of AFDC and Food Stamp benefits, are shown in Table 5 for a selection of respondents. We imputed monthly receipts of AFDC (Food Stamp income) for 32 (53) observations for which the number of months was reported and the monthly receipt was missing. The imputed value is the average of monthly receipts in adjacent years.

2) Earnings data.

Earnings data is reported separately for respondent and spouse in three categories: 1) wages and salary, 2) self-employment income, and 3) military income. An additional variable contains partner's total income.⁵ The age of the women in this sample makes it difficult to infer measurement error in these variables, since one would expect earnings to change a great deal over time. However some checks on internal consistency were possible. We found very few gross outliers among the earnings

⁴ Most states with multiple payment standards have two standards (e.g. for urban vs. rural areas) and we used the highest standard so as not to falsely attribute misreporting to residents in the high payment areas. California and Illinois have more than two standards and we could not be sure that the payment standard in the Green Book was the maximum for the state. (States with multiple standards are: CT, IL, KS, LA, MI, NY, PA, VT, VA, WV.)

⁵ Beginning with the 1991 interview, partner's income is reported in a way comparable to spouse's income.

variables with the exception of apparent duplicate reporting of income in the self-employment category and wage and salary categories, and "isolated" topcodes - i.e. a single year in which earnings were topcoded while the earnings of adjacent years were less than three quarters of the topcode value.

We followed these steps (the order in which the steps are implemented is important):

- a) We identified duplicate reporting of earnings as "wages and salary" and self-employment income (this was done separately for respondent and spouse income). An apparent duplicate was eliminated only if the number of years of positive self-employment income was equal to the sum of: i) the number of duplicates, and ii) the number of years of self-employment income when no wages were reported. i.e. if the respondent ever reported differing amounts in the two categories then the duplicate entries were not "cleaned".
- b) We eliminated duplicate reporting of income in the spouse and partner categories.
- c) We identified "isolated" topcodes in the earnings variables and replaced them with the average of the variables in the adjacent years. Isolated topcodes were identified as those that occurred in years in which the average level of the variable in both of the adjacent years was less than three quarters of the topcode level.
- d) For each woman we identified potential "outliers" as reported earnings that did not lie within \$30,000 of the woman's average earnings over all years (where earnings are the sum of wages, self-employment income, and military income). We used the same method to identify outliers in spouse's earnings or partner's earnings. We then sequentially performed three checks on the data to minimize the potential for over-cleaning.

First, we checked to see if the same income was reported both for the respondent and the spouse or partner. For example, some respondents with outliers reported the same exact amounts for own and spouse's self-employment income.

Second, if earnings were judged to be outliers after the first step and both wages and self-employment income were reported for the same individual, then we eliminated potential duplicate reporting of income by taking the maximum of these values to be total earnings. For example, if a respondent's own earnings for a single year did not lie within \$30,000 of the average of earnings over all years, then we set wages equal to the maximum of wages and self-employment income and set self-employment income to missing. The same was done for the spouse's earnings variables.

Finally, we checked the remaining outliers to see if there were cases in which wages rose substantially in one year, followed by a large decline the next year. This was operationalized by checking to see if the (t-1) and (t+1) values were within \$6000 of each other. In this case we replaced the outlier by the average of the (t-1) and (t+1) values.

3) Parents' Income.

Respondents report their parents' income if they are residing with their parents or in-laws, or if they are permanent residents in their parents' home but are temporarily in group domiciles.

In the first case, the interviewer directly questioned the parent about family income; in the second case - when the respondent lived away from home - the interviewer asked the respondent to provide the information about her parents' income.⁶ When parents' income is reported, the NLSY constructs the KEY variable of net family income to be equal to this self-reported family income. (However, when parents' income is missing, due to nonresponse, then the NLSY constructs family income as the sum of the youth's reported income components, when possible. Parent's income was missing due to non-response in 25% of cases in which the youth resided with parents during the years 1979-1986; in 9% of these cases net family income was taken to be the sum of the youth's reported income).

Our primary strategy in cleaning parents' income was to rely on the presence of siblings in the dataset. We identified siblings among the NLSY respondents and checked the consistency of responses across sibling pairs. Among the NLSY women, 3240 (52%) have at least one sibling in the survey. This yields 2179 sibling groups containing at least one woman. Table 6 shows some of the inconsistencies present in the data.

We used the sibling pairs to "clean" the data as follows: 1) we identified all sibling groups for which a discrepancy in parent income was reported in any single year (35% of the 2179 sibling groups), 2) we identified the sibling who reported parent income with the least variability over time, 3) we used the report of the "least variable" sibling to correct the income reported by other siblings, 4) we filled in missing data (don't know, invalid skips, refusals) by taking the mean report of adjacent years, 5) we repeated steps 1-3. We found that it was important to fill in missing data only after going through a first round of corrections, so that the variance estimate for each respondent was as accurate as possible.

Admittedly, our cleaning algorithm may result in the cleaning of data that was not in error. This is apparent in cases of three siblings when our algorithm "corrected" two identical reports so that they agreed with the third. However, this is a rare occurrence and our algorithm does a good job of correcting the gross outliers that appear to be due to data entry errors. In addition, the comparison across siblings allows us to fill in missing data (coded as "don't know", "refusal", or "invalid skips").⁷

The 48% of NLSY women with no siblings account for 38% of all reports of parents' income. For these women we attempted to identify potential outliers in parents' income as a report of income

⁶ The survey question for parents' income is R1903.10 in 1979; this variable is called "net family income" but it is part of the INCOME file, thereby distinguishing it from the KEY variable with the same name.

⁷ It seemed to us that most discrepancies might be due to one sibling residing at home while the second one is at college - so that one report comes direct from the parent and the other report comes from a youth. We found that only 28% of discrepancies occurred in this situation.

that fell outside of two standard deviations of the mean for that respondent. Only 33 values of income were cleaned. Obviously, women with siblings end up with cleaner data. Part of the difficulty is that the group without siblings is older, on average, and have fewer years of parent income for a within-respondent comparison of values.

Parent's income presents an additional problem due to inconsistency in the survey instrument across years. As of 1987 the NLSY stopped asking for parent's income since all respondents were over 21 years old. However, in the year prior to this change 22% of all respondents were reporting parents' income - therefore respondents who reached age 22 in 1987 are not treated equivalently to respondents who reached age 22 prior to 1987. We investigated strategies to correct for this inconsistency - for example, we could set an age limit beyond which parents' income would not be used as the measure of respondent's income. We did this and compared the 1986 and 1987 income of respondents who resided with their parents in 1986; we found that own income in 1986 is then understated, probably because respondents do not report "income of other family members" when parent's income was separately solicited. Therefore, imposing the rule that we "sum the income components" and ignore parents' income for all respondents over age 21 in all years did not appear to be a good solution to this problem.

4) Remaining income variables.

The following income variables were reported as average monthly amounts together with months of receipt (analogous to the AFDC and Food Stamp income variables): unemployment income of respondent and spouse, Social Security income, and public assistance. These variables were inspected "by hand", primarily because of the small number of observations. Cleaning of UI benefits involved only 28 monthly amounts; all monthly SSI receipts and public assistance receipts above \$1000 were assumed to be annual figures. In all cases these corrections achieved internal consistency in the individual's receipts across years.

III. Conclusions

There are clearly difficulties with even our "cleaned" income data. We have not succeeded in eliminating or explaining all of the suspicious fluctuations in family income in the NLSY data we examine, and in some cases we may have "over-cleaned". It is also true that since we rely on the whole history of earnings data in order to clean outliers, revisions may occur with each new wave of data. Nevertheless, we believe that in many cases it may be possible for researchers to use the disaggregated income data collected by the NLSY to develop totals that are more appropriate for their purposes than the "KEY" variables that are provided. We hope that this note will provide useful information to researchers who wish to do so.

Table 1. NLSY INCOME COMPONENTS

Income Component	Women EVER receiving this income	Observations of receipt
<i><u>Respondent's income:</u></i>		
Wages and salary	6,003	49,395
Self-employment income	749	1,341
Military income	610	2,605
Unemployment income	1,684	3,040
Educational benefits	2,214	5,423
<i><u>Spouse's income:</u></i>		
Wages and salary	4,080	22,363
Self-employment income	659	1,407
Military income	828	2,894
Unemployment income	1,235	2,499
Educational benefits	426	737
Partner's Income	1,506	3,133
<i><u>Household income:</u></i>		
AFDC income	1,506	6,639
Food Stamp receipts	2,145	9,423
SSI	766	1,651
Veteran's benefits	1,280	2,195
Child Support	1,158	3,465
Alimony	321	452
From other persons	1,016	1,445
From other sources	4,211	18,895
<i><u>Other family member's:</u></i>		
Income- regular sources	1,844	3,337
Income- welfare	1,067	1,527
Parents' Income	4,646	16,142

Table 2.5 NLSY Income Variables - Before and After Cleaning (continued)

ID	Yr	Age	Cleaned Income						Uncleaned Income											
			Income (INC)	Parent Income	Respondent's Wages Self-em	Spouse's Wages Self-em	Partner Income	AFDC	Food Stamp	YNETFX	Parent Income	Respondent's Wages Self-em	Spouse's Wages Self-em	Partner Income	AFDC	Food Stamp	Other Sources			
3068	78	21	16,300	16,300	1200	V	V	V	350	38	16,300	16,300	V	V	V	V	2450	38	V	V
3068	79	22	7,900	7,900	5000	V	V	V	494	413	7,900	7,900	V	V	V	V	494	413	V	D
3068	80	23	10,950	V	9750	V	V	V	V	V	10,950	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
3068	81	24	46,200	V	11000	V	V	V	V	V	46,200	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
3068	82	25	14,414	V	9500	V	V	V	670	316	14,414	V	V	V	V	V	670	316	V	800
3068	83	26	16,331	V	0	V	V	V	4740	1944	16,331	V	V	V	V	V	4740	1944	V	570
3068	84	27	7,788	V	0	V	V	V	4176	2112	7,788	V	V	V	V	V	4176	2112	V	V
3068	85	28	12,170	V	7000	V	V	V	1880	890	12,170	V	V	V	V	V	1880	890	V	V
3068	86	29	16,700	V	14600	V	V	V	V	V	16,700	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
3068	87	30	20,400	V	18000	V	V	V	V	V	20,400	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
3068	88	31	19,600	V	19600	V	V	V	V	V	D	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
3068	89	32	23,000	V	21000	V	V	V	V	V	23,000	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
3068	90	33	26,200	V	25000	V	V	V	V	V	26,200	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
6101	78	21	4,000	4000	94	V	V	V	V	V	4,000	4000	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
6101	79	22	N	N	N	V	V	V	V	V	N	N	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	N
6101	80	23	1,968	V	0	V	V	V	852	1116	1,968	V	V	V	V	V	852	1116	V	V
6101	81	24	1,320	V	0	V	V	V	1320	V	15,840	V	V	V	V	V	15840	V	V	V
6101	82	25	4,464	V	0	V	V	V	2328	2136	4,464	V	V	V	V	V	2328	2136	V	V
6101	83	26	2,328	V	0	V	V	V	V	1068	2,328	V	V	V	V	V	V	1068	V	V
6101	84	27	4,608	V	0	V	V	V	2676	1380	4,608	V	V	V	V	V	2676	1380	V	V
6101	85	28	4,056	D	0	V	V	V	V	V	D	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
6101	86	29	5,292	V	0	V	V	V	V	2220	5,292	V	V	V	V	V	V	2220	V	V
6101	87	30	4,140	V	0	V	V	V	V	1956	4,140	V	V	V	V	V	V	1956	V	V
6101	88	31	5,304	V	0	V	V	V	V	V	5,304	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V
6101	89	32	4,764	V	0	V	V	V	3276	1488	4,764	V	V	V	V	V	3276	125	V	V
6101	90	33	2,496	V	0	V	V	V	V	696	4,764	V	V	V	V	V	V	696	V	V
6280	78	21	3,960	V	0	V	V	V	2256	1704	3,456	V	V	V	V	V	2256	1704	V	V
6280	79	22	5,172	V	0	V	V	V	2604	2568	5,172	V	V	V	V	V	2604	2568	V	V
6280	80	23	5,820	V	0	V	V	V	2700	3120	5,820	V	V	V	V	V	2700	3120	V	V
6280	81	24	5,136	D	0	V	V	V	2568	2568	5,136	V	V	V	V	V	2568	2568	V	V
6280	82	25	9,012	V	0	V	V	V	5940	3072	9,012	V	V	V	V	V	5940	3072	V	V
6280	83	26	9,288	V	0	V	V	V	5940	3348	9,288	V	V	V	V	V	5940	3348	V	V
6280	84	27	9,516	V	0	V	V	V	5940	3576	9,516	V	V	V	V	V	5940	3576	V	V
6280	85	28	9,528	V	0	V	V	V	6060	3468	9,528	V	V	V	V	V	6060	3468	V	V
6280	86	29	N	N	N	V	V	V	V	V	N	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	N
6280	87	30	1,044	V	0	V	V	V	V	1044	1,044	V	V	V	V	V	V	1044	V	V
6280	88	31	3,068	V	2000	V	V	V	V	1068	3,068	V	V	V	V	V	V	1068	V	V
6280	89	32	8,196	V	0	V	V	V	V	2964	D	V	V	V	V	V	V	247	V	V
6280	90	33	8,123	V	0	V	V	V	5232	2484	8,123	V	V	V	V	V	5232	2484	V	407

Note: D= don't know, R= refusal, I= invalid skip, V= valid skip, N= Non-interview, T= topcode.

Table 3.

**Impact of Data Cleaning:
Earnings, Welfare, and Parents' Income**

Income Component	# Ever rec'ving income	Before Cleaning		After Cleaning		# Obs Cleaned
		Obs of receipt	Mean Value	Obs of receipt	Mean Value	
<i>Respondent's Income:</i>						
Wages and salary	6,003	52,579	\$8,661	52,563	\$8,487	63
Self-employment	749	1,341	\$5,963	1,246	\$4,839	96
Military income	4,080	2,605	\$7,916	2,595	\$7,885	11
<i>Spouse's Income:</i>						
Wages and salary	659	22,363	\$20,382	22,277	\$19,459	135
Self-employment	828	1,407	\$20,175	1,232	\$14,665	181
Military income	610	2,894	\$12,677	2,881	\$12,668	13
<i>Welfare income:</i>						
AFDC income (monthly)	1,506	6,639	\$350	6,671	\$316	151
Food Stamp receipts (monthly)	2,145	9,427	\$167	9,476	\$147	197
Partner's income	1,506	3,133	\$17,624	3,062	\$16,126	73
Parents' income	4,462	16,105	\$23,141	19,027	\$21,962	1,051

Before cleaning" sample includes topcode values. "After cleaning" sample treats remaining topcodes as missing data. Zeroes are not included in the sample of receipts.

Table 4.

**Change in Total Family Income and Poverty Status
Due to Data Cleaning and Change in Definition**

Impact on Non-Missing Data

Year	<u>Total Family Income</u>				<u>Poverty Status</u>		
	# Obs (A)	No Change (B)	Increase (C)	Decrease (D)	No Change (E)	Poverty to Non-poverty Non-poverty to Poverty (F)	Non-poverty (G)
1978	4870	89.95%	7.78%	2.84%	95.51%	0.78%	2.68%
1979	4875	92.27%	5.61%	2.95%	96.54%	1.32%	1.91%
1980	4790	89.95%	7.40%	3.27%	96.15%	1.26%	2.40%
1981	4730	90.23%	6.97%	3.84%	96.81%	1.09%	1.84%
1982	4818	91.38%	7.12%	2.24%	96.63%	1.31%	2.01%
1983	4813	91.46%	7.00%	2.40%	96.37%	1.15%	2.42%
1984	4524	89.57%	8.29%	2.42%	96.28%	1.08%	2.64%
1985	4533	90.98%	7.40%	2.10%	97.44%	0.79%	1.77%
1986	4397	92.90%	5.66%	1.75%	97.73%	0.67%	1.60%
1987	4327	93.37%	5.53%	1.44%	97.49%	0.57%	1.94%
1988	4380	91.86%	5.57%	3.18%	97.29%	0.74%	1.97%
1989	4344	90.77%	6.23%	3.45%	97.20%	0.74%	2.05%
1990	3806	88.33%	9.10%	3.03%	97.15%	0.46%	2.38%

Impact on Missing Data*

Year	<u>Invalid skips in Total Family Income</u>			<u>Topcoded Total Family Income</u>		
	Number Missing (H)	Change to non-missing (I)	% of (I) in Poverty (J)	Number Topcoded (K)	Change to non-missing (L)	% of (L) in Poverty (M)
1978	1341	46.76%	36.22%	27	7.41%	0.00%
1979	1095	73.24%	33.72%	42	9.52%	50.00%
1980	1180	77.03%	36.69%	38	21.05%	0.00%
1981	1196	77.68%	34.80%	60	21.67%	7.69%
1982	1149	79.29%	43.82%	54	35.19%	0.00%
1983	1092	74.91%	39.72%	60	30.00%	5.56%
1984	934	72.59%	39.02%	22	45.46%	10.00%
1985	811	67.69%	44.32%	35	40.00%	7.14%
1986	870	62.64%	34.87%	53	75.47%	0.00%
1987	879	67.80%	28.60%	48	72.92%	2.86%
1988	887	61.89%	27.62%	89	70.79%	6.35%
1989	829	59.47%	23.23%	88	78.41%	0.00%
1990	593	63.41%	28.57%	94	81.92%	1.30%

* Columns (A), (H), & (K) do not sum to 6283 due to the exclusion of a) non-interviews and b) cases in which YNETFK was non-missing and our income measure was missing due to YPTOT missing.

Table 5a. Outliers in Reported AFDC Receipts

Mother's ID	Year	Max grant	Monthly AFDC amount	Months	Annual AFDC amount	CLEANED	
						Monthly AFDC amount	Annual AFDC amount
744	81	391	240	12	2880	240	2880
744	82	413	318	12	3816	318	3816
744	83	376	328	12	3936	328	3936
744	84	398	310	12	3720	310	3720
744	85	428	562	12	6744	562	6744
744	86	417	72	4	288	72	288
744	87	474	328	12	3936	328	3936
744	88	228	1200	12	14400	100	1200
761	79	338	D	9	.	.	.
761	80	86	500	3	1500	167	501
761	81	391	3264	8	26112	408	3264
761	82	413	472	12	5664	472	5664
761	83	231	422	11	4642	422	4642
761	84	240	V	0	.	.	.
761	85	252	V	0	.	.	.
761	86	264	V	0	.	.	.
761	87	558	V	0	.	.	.
761	88	543	D	4	.	.	.
761	89	546	471	12	5652	471	5652
761	90	555	550	12	6600	550	6600
1213	82	106	106	12	1272	106	1272
1213	83	142	1308	12	15696	109	1308
1213	84	187	168	12	2016	168	2016
1213	85	199	199	12	2388	199	2388
1213	86	199	199	12	2388	199	2388
1213	87	200	199	12	2388	199	2388
1213	88	206	210	8	1680	210	1680
1213	89	206	206	12	2472	206	2472
1213	90	210	189	12	2268	189	2268
1271	88	220	600	4	2400	150	600
1271	89	225	136	3	408	136	408
1271	90	.	N	0	.	.	.
1295	87	211	156	1	156	156	156
1295	88	220	531	12	6372	44	528
1295	89	294	225	12	2700	225	2700
1295	90	294	225	12	2700	225	2700

Note: D= don't know, R= refusal, I= invalid skip, V= valid skip.

Table 5a. Outliers in Reported AFDC Receipts

Mother's ID	Year	Max grant	Monthly AFDC amount	Months	Annual AFDC amount	CLEANED	
						Monthly AFDC amount	Annual AFDC amount
1306	82	161	592	4	2368	148	592
1306	83	178	1720	9	15480	191	1719
1306	84	185	1450	11	15950	132	1452
1306	85	194	150	12	1800	150	1800
1306	86	264	206	12	2472	206	2472
1306	87	275	275	12	3300	275	3300
1306	88	338	V	0	.	.	.
1306	89	346	V	0	.	.	.
1306	90	346	D	2	.	275	550
1376	79	89	89	10	890	89	890
1376	80	89	89	12	1068	89	1068
1376	81	89	V	0	.	.	.
1376	82	88	59	12	708	59	708
1376	83	118	1068	12	12816	89	1068
1376	84	118	118	12	1416	118	1416
1376	85	147	118	12	1416	118	1416
1376	86	147	118	5	590	118	590
1401	78	140	900	12	10800	75	900
1401	79	140	V	0	.	.	.
1401	80	140	V	0	.	.	.
1401	81	164	164	12	1968	164	1968
1401	82	183	164	10	1640	164	1640
1401	83	228	V	0	.	.	.
1401	84	258	140	1	140	140	140
1401	85	284	300	12	3600	300	3600
1401	86	284	351	1	351	351	351
1401	87	284	351	9	3159	351	3159
1401	88	184	351	12	4212	351	4212
2459	84	290	276	3	828	276	828
2459	85	302	2010	9	18090	223	2007
2459	86	302	309	12	3708	309	3708
2459	87	309	309	1	309	309	309
2459	88	397	170	8	1360	170	1360
2459	89	413	V	0	.	.	.
2459	90	413	413	9	3717	413	3717
2652	82	86	30	1	30	30	30

Note: D= don't know, R= refusal, I= invalid skip, V= valid skip.

Table 5a. Outliers in Reported AFDC Receipts

Mother's ID	Year	Max grant	Monthly AFDC amount	Months	Annual AFDC amount	CLEANED	
						Monthly AFDC amount	Annual AFDC amount
2652	83	128	281	3	843	94	282
2652	84	.	V	0	.	.	.
2652	85	158	V	0	.	.	.
2652	86	158	V	0	.	.	.
2652	87	158	V	0	.	.	.
2652	88	158	145	8	1160	145	1160
2662	84	167	1814	12	21768	151	1812
2662	85	221	221	12	2652	221	2652
2662	86	221	221	12	2652	221	2652
2662	87	221	221	12	2652	221	2652
2662	88	221	221	12	2652	221	2652
2662	89	221	221	12	2652	221	2652
2662	90	221	231	12	2772	231	2772
3068	78	260	350	7	2450	50	350
3068	79	260	247	2	494	247	494
3068	80	273	V	0	.	.	.
3068	81	332	V	0	.	.	.
3068	82	350	335	2	670	335	670
3068	83	350	4020	12	48240	335	4020
3068	84	364	348	12	4176	348	4176
3068	85	382	376	5	1880	376	1880
3543	84	238	230	12	2760	230	2760
3543	85	302	290	12	3480	290	3480
3543	86	302	302	12	3624	302	3624
3543	87	309	3708	12	44496	309	3708
3543	88	321	309	12	3708	309	3708
3543	89	413	321	12	3852	321	3852
3543	90	413	413	12	4956	413	4956
3729	79	363	350	6	2100	350	2100
3729	80	377	377	12	4524	377	4524
3729	81	473	473	12	5676	473	5676
3729	82	503	600	12	7200	600	7200
3729	83	513	612	12	7344	612	7344
3729	84	533	350	6	2100	350	2100
3729	85	544	700	1	700	700	700
3729	86	120	600	4	2400	150	600

Note: D= don't know, R= refusal, I= invalid skip, V= valid skip.

Table 5a. Outliers in Reported AFDC Receipts

Mother's ID	Year	Max grant	Monthly AFDC amount	Months	Annual AFDC amount	CLEANED	
						Monthly AFDC amount	Annual AFDC amount
3729	87	120	656	8	5248	82	656
3729	88	120	V	0	.	.	.
3729	89	.	N	0	.	.	.
3729	90	.	82	12	984	82	984
4110	85	117	71	1	71	71	71
4110	86	119	V	0	.	.	.
4110	87	159	V	0	.	.	.
4110	88	211	133	12	1596	133	1596
4110	89	224	140	12	1680	140	1680
4110	90	238	2832	9	25488	315	2835
4199	78	152	140	2	280	140	280
4199	79	152	139	12	1668	139	1668
4199	80	110	840	6	5040	140	840
4199	81	125	98	12	1176	98	1176
4199	82	234	217	12	2604	217	2604
4199	83	234	174	12	2088	174	2088
4199	84	234	217	11	2387	217	2387
4199	85	234	217	12	2604	217	2604
4199	86	234	V	0	.	.	.
4199	87	234	217	12	2604	217	2604
4199	88	234	217	12	2604	217	2604
4199	89	234	217	12	2604	217	2604
4199	90	138	V	0	.	.	.
4561	89	404	4764	12	57168	397	4764
4561	90	428	404	12	4848	404	4848
4641	83	424	526	10	5260	526	5260
4641	84	555	526	6	3156	526	3156
4641	85	587	126	1	126	126	126
4641	86	617	600	12	7200	600	7200
4641	87	753	750	12	9000	750	9000
4641	88	788	9000	12	108000	750	9000
4641	89	824	624	12	7488	624	7488

Note: D= don't know, R= refusal, I= invalid skip, V= valid skip.

Table 5b. Outliers in Reported Food Stamp Program Receipts

Mother's ID	Year	Max Food Stamp grant	Monthly Food Stamp amount	#Months	Annual Food Stamp amount	CLEANED VERSION	
						Monthly Food Stamp amount	Annual Food Stamp amount
1306	78	115	100	1	100	100	100
1306	79	115	112	7	784	112	784
1306	80	128	V	0	.	.	.
1306	81	128	V	0	.	.	.
1306	82	253	475	4	1900	119	476
1306	83	253	1082	9	9738	120	1080
1306	84	145	1500	11	16500	136	1496
1306	85	147	125	12	1500	125	1500
1306	86	214	154	12	1848	154	1848
1306	87	290	190	12	2280	190	2280
1306	88	356	V	0	.	.	.
1306	89	393	V	0	.	.	.
1306	90	418	362	4	1448	362	1448
2505	78	115	144	1	144	144	144
2505	79	115	49	7	343	49	343
2505	80	128	55	12	660	55	660
2505	81	128	638	12	7656	53	636
2505	82	139	56	12	672	56	672
2505	83	139	58	12	696	58	696
2505	84	264	33	10	330	33	330
2505	85	211	V	0	.	.	.
2505	86	271	70	12	840	70	840
2505	87	290	49	8	392	49	392
2505	88	300	60	5	300	60	300
2505	89	331	68	2	136	68	136
2505	90	352	68	2	136	68	136
2559	82	199	106	2	212	106	212
2559	83	253	2520	12	30240	210	2520
2559	84	264	248	12	2976	248	2976
2559	85	268	238	12	2856	238	2856
2559	86	322	138	10	1380	138	1380
2559	87	344	308	12	3696	308	3696
2559	88	356	280	12	3360	280	3360

Note: D= don't know, R= refusal, I= invalid skip, V= valid skip.

Table 5b. Outliers in Reported Food Stamp Program Receipts

Mother's ID	Year	Max Food Stamp grant	Monthly Food Stamp amount	#Months	Annual Food Stamp amount	CLEANED VERSION	
						Monthly Food Stamp amount	Annual Food Stamp amount
2559	89	393	316	12	3792	316	3792
2559	90	418	340	12	4080	340	4080
2792	79	248	108	12	1296	108	1296
2792	80	183	115	12	1380	115	1380
2792	81	183	350	3	1050	117	351
2792	82	253	255	12	3060	255	3060
2792	83	253	253	12	3036	253	3036
2792	84	264	167	3	501	167	501
2792	85	318	208	5	1040	208	1040
2792	86	271	271	12	3252	271	3252
2792	87	290	290	12	3480	290	3480
2792	88	300	82	12	984	82	984
2792	89	331	1824	12	21888	152	1824
2792	90	352	164	12	1968	164	1968
3260	82	569	139	6	834	139	834
3260	83	628	308	12	3696	308	3696
3260	84	652	308	12	3696	308	3696
3260	85	603	269	12	3228	269	3228
3260	86	611	3024	12	36288	252	3024
3729	80	419	51	12	612	51	612
3729	81	183	77	12	924	77	924
3729	82	253	132	12	1584	132	1584
3729	83	253	115	12	1380	115	1380
3729	84	264	200	12	2400	200	2400
3729	85	268	200	12	2400	200	2400
3729	86	322	120	4	480	120	480
3729	87	228	150	6	900	150	900
3729	88	427	1652	7	11564	236	1652
3729	89	.	N	0	.	.	.
3729	90	.	232	12	2784	232	2784
5069	85	268	267	9	2403	267	2403
5069	86	271	3252	12	39024	271	3252
5069	87	290	271	11	2981	271	2981

Note: D= don't know, R= refusal, I= invalid skip, V= valid skip.

Table 6. Discrepancies in Sibling Reports of Parents' Income

HHID	ID	Reported Parents' Income										"Cleaned" Parents' Income									
		1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985		
34	34	21000	15000	17000	V	V	V	D	V	D	V	18000	15000	17000	V	V	V	D	V		
34	35	18000	15000	17000	D	V	V	D	D	D	D	18000	15000	17000	V	V	V	D	D		
221	221	8400	7828	13197	D	D	7326	13056	D	D	D	8400	7828	4052	6000	6663	7326	13056	D		
221	222	8600	672	4052	8500	D	9000	D	D	D	D	8400	7828	4052	6000	6663	7326	13056	15637		
221	223	8900	7828	13197	7000	V	V	V	V	V	V	8400	7828	4052	6000	V	V	V	V		
221	224	8400	7828	4052	6000	V	V	V	V	V	V	8400	7828	4052	6000	V	V	V	V		
245	245	15000	42100	45000	25000	V	V	V	V	V	V	15000	42100	35000	35000	V	V	V	V		
245	246	15000	42100	35000	35000	30000	5000	V	V	V	V	15000	42100	35000	35000	30000	5000	V	V		
281	281	25000	D	40000	40000	35000	V	75000	80000	V	V	25000	35000	35000	37000	35000	V	60000	60000		
281	282	25000	35000	35000	37000	35000	45000	60000	60000	V	V	25000	35000	35000	37000	35000	45000	60000	60000		
283	283	29000	25000	V	I	33000	V	V	V	V	V	29000	25000	V	22560	33000	V	V	V		
283	284	27000	25000	32000	22560	V	V	V	V	V	V	29000	25000	32000	22560	V	V	V	50000		
283	285	29000	51000	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	29000	25000	V	V	V	V	V	V		
298	298	4872	5256	5256	4800	5200	9300	13100	13000	V	V	4872	5256	5256	4800	5200	9300	13100	13000		
298	299	4872	5256	5256	4800	200	9300	13000	16000	V	V	4872	5256	5256	4800	5200	9300	13100	11000		
307	307	D	35000	50000	47500	D	40000	30000	54000	V	V	D	35000	50000	47500	43750	40000	30000	54000		
307	308	I	30000	55000	8000	D	V	30000	54000	V	V	I	35000	50000	47500	43750	40000	30000	54000		
319	319	V	V	34000	V	V	V	25000	D	75000	V	V	V	V	34000	V	V	25000	50000	75000	
319	320	D	45000	15000	V	I	3000	V	60000	V	V	D	45000	15000	36000	V	I	25000	75000		
321	321	50000	40000	D	52490	25000	50000	40000	39000	V	V	50000	40000	8000	52490	25000	50000	40000	39000		
321	322	45000	40000	8000	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	50000	40000	8000	V	V	V	V	V		
357	357	25000	V	V	V	D	75001	V	V	V	V	40000	V	V	V	D	75001	V	V		
357	358	40000	37000	D	D	V	R	50000	M	V	V	40000	37000	32000	30000	V	65000	50000	M		
357	359	30000	37000	32000	30000	V	45000	50000	60000	V	V	40000	37000	32000	30000	V	45000	50000	60000		
377	377	5400	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	4900	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	D	
377	378	5400	6152	10000	D	5100	V	D	V	V	V	4900	6152	3360	4230	5100	V	D	V		
377	379	4900	6152	3360	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	4900	6152	3360	V	V	V	V	V		
404	404	22000	25000	30000	29754	32000	25000	35000	32000	V	V	22000	25000	30000	29754	32000	25000	35000	32000		
404	405	20000	25000	30000	29754	32000	25000	35000	47000	V	V	22000	25000	30000	29754	32000	25000	35000	32000		
404	406	22000	25000	30000	29754	32000	25000	35000	32000	V	V	22000	25000	30000	29754	32000	25000	35000	32000		

Note: M= noninterview, D= don't know, I= invalid skip, R= refusal, V= valid skip.

Table 6. Discrepancies in Sibling Reports of Parents' Income

HHID	ID	Reported Parents' Income										"Cleaned" Parents' Income									
		1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985				
677	477	I	D	35638	39000	35000	44500	41000	V	I	27000	35638	39000	35000	44500	41000	V				
677	478	Y	27000	35638	39000	35000	25000	V	Y	27000	35638	39000	35000	44500	44500	V					
552	552	35000	D	R	D	47000	V	M	M	35000	40000	45000	46000	47000	V	M					
552	553	35000	40000	45000	V	47000	V	65000	V	35000	40000	45000	V	47000	V	65000	V				
552	554	35000	40000	38000	40000	V	70000	V	Y	35000	40000	45000	46000	V	70000	V					
564	564	45000	32000	40000	V	V	V	V	V	45000	32000	40000	V	V	V	V	V				
564	565	45000	75000	V	V	V	V	V	V	45000	32000	V	V	V	V	V	V				
564	566	45000	V	V	V	V	V	V	M	45000	V	V	V	V	V	V	M				
722	722	60000	60000	V	V	V	V	V	V	60000	60000	V	V	V	V	V	V				
722	723	60000	10000	75000	D	D	V	V	V	60000	60000	75000	75000	V	V	V	V				
735	735	17000	20000	17000	17000	V	V	V	V	17000	20000	17000	17000	V	V	V	V				
735	736	17000	15000	17000	70000	V	V	V	V	17000	20000	17000	17000	V	V	V	V				
735	737	D	M	32000	D	V	D	3000	10000	17000	M	17000	17000	V	D	3000	10000				
758	758	20000	D	8000	450	9024	15000	V	V	20000	14000	8000	450	9024	15000	V	V				
758	759	20000	D	5000	3200	V	V	V	V	20000	14000	8000	450	V	V	V	V				
758	760	20000	D	8000	M	V	V	V	V	20000	14000	8000	M	V	V	V	V				
769	769	35000	D	75000	30000	30000	V	60000	10000	35000	27500	20000	30000	30000	V	50000	10000				
769	770	35000	D	20000	30000	30000	V	50000	V	35000	27500	20000	30000	30000	V	50000	V				
801	801	20000	V	43000	V	V	V	31000	V	20000	V	16000	V	V	V	31000	V				
801	802	20000	15340	16000	V	V	V	14400	V	20000	15340	16000	V	V	V	14400	V				
848	848	14000	V	36200	28000	24000	V	V	V	12000	V	26000	28000	24000	V	V	V				
848	849	12000	18000	26000	28000	24000	V	D	31000	12000	18000	26000	28000	24000	V	D	31000				
848	850	12000	18000	26000	28000	24000	V	V	V	12000	18000	26000	28000	24000	V	V	V				
859	859	25000	29000	20000	V	27000	25000	V	V	25000	29000	20000	V	27000	25000	V	V				
859	860	25000	29000	36000	40000	70000	29000	50000	45000	25000	29000	20000	30000	27000	25000	50000	45000				
859	861	15000	15300	20000	30000	27000	25000	D	D	25000	29000	20000	30000	27000	25000	50000	45000				
935	935	25000	48000	5000	55000	V	V	V	V	25000	48000	5000	55000	V	V	V	V				
935	936	25000	48000	50000	55000	69000	V	V	V	25000	48000	50000	55000	69000	V	V	V				
935	937	25000	48000	75000	55000	65000	V	100000	D	25000	48000	50000	55000	69000	V	60000	D				
935	938	25000	48000	50000	55000	69000	V	60000	D	25000	48000	50000	55000	69000	V	60000	D				
1045	1045	30000	40000	V	V	V	V	V	V	30000	40000	V	V	V	V	V	V	V			

Note: N= noninterview, D= don't know, I= invalid skip, R= refusal, V= valid skip.

Table 6. Discrepancies in Sibling Reports of Parents' Income

HHID	Reported Parents' Income										"Cleaned" Parents' Income									
	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985		
1045	30000	13000	31400	24000	12000	V	V	V	V	V	30000	40000	31400	24000	12000	V	V	V		
1045	1047	V	D	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	40000	V	V	V	V	V	V		
1133	25000	40000	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	25000	40000	V	V	V	V	V	V		
1133	25000	40000	50000	36000	36000	V	20000	30000	V	V	25000	40000	50000	36000	36000	V	20000	30000		
1133	25000	40000	50000	36000	V	V	45000	V	V	V	25000	40000	50000	36000	V	V	20000	V		
1154	16000	21000	35000	24000	D	V	58000	21000	V	V	16000	21000	35000	24000	24000	V	58000	21000		
1154	16000	21000	35000	24000	D	V	58000	21000	V	V	16000	21000	35000	24000	24000	V	58000	21000		
1383	22000	35000	29000	38000	V	11568	25000	V	V	V	22000	35000	29000	38000	V	11568	13000	V		
1383	22000	35000	29000	V	V	V	33000	14000	V	V	22000	35000	29000	V	V	V	13000	14000		
1383	22000	35000	29000	38000	37000	1560	35728	35000	V	V	22000	35000	29000	38000	37000	11568	13000	14000		
1721	37000	D	30000	50000	65000	50000	50000	50000	V	V	37000	25000	30000	50000	65000	50000	50000	50000		
1721	37000	25000	30000	50000	65000	50000	M	M	V	V	37000	25000	30000	50000	65000	50000	M	M		
1721	37000	25000	30000	50000	65000	50000	M	M	V	V	37000	25000	30000	50000	65000	50000	M	M		
1721	37000	D	30000	50000	65000	50000	50000	50000	V	V	37000	25000	30000	50000	65000	50000	50000	50000		
1891	9165	7000	12000	14400	18500	12000	17000	18000	V	V	9165	7000	12000	14400	18500	12000	17000	18000		
1891	9165	4000	12000	14400	18500	16300	V	V	V	V	9165	7000	12000	14400	18500	12000	17000	18000		
2882	2882	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V		
2882	2883	R	I	D	2500	D	D	67000	V	V	20000	17800	21400	25000	25000	32500	40000	67000		
2882	2884	200000	178000	D	250000	D	D	67000	V	V	200000	178000	214000	250000	250000	325000	400000	670000		
3034	3034	250000	R	340000	400000	250000	40000	65000	V	V	250000	295000	340000	400000	250000	400000	680000	650000		
3034	3035	250000	R	V	400000	D	600000	650000	V	V	250000	295000	340000	400000	250000	400000	680000	650000		
3152	3152	54100	29000	38000	43000	68000	75000	10000	V	V	54100	32500	36000	68000	75000	75000	96000	100000		
3152	3153	54100	32500	36000	68000	75000	96000	100000	V	V	54100	32500	36000	68000	75000	75000	96000	100000		
3266	3266	25000	18000	2000	66500	V	V	65000	V	V	25000	18000	20000	65000	V	V	50000	65000		
3266	3267	25000	18000	20000	65000	V	V	65000	V	V	25000	18000	20000	65000	V	V	50000	65000		
3289	3289	27000	27000	42000	40000	V	V	V	V	V	27000	27000	42000	40000	V	V	V	V		
3289	3290	27000	27000	4200	40000	30000	40000	V	V	V	27000	27000	42000	40000	30000	40000	V	V		
3289	3291	27000	27000	42000	40000	30000	40000	V	V	V	27000	27000	42000	40000	30000	40000	37500	35000		
3435	3435	V	4000	27000	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	4000	27000	V	V	V	V	V		
3435	3436	10000	4000	27000	V	V	V	V	V	V	10000	4000	27000	V	V	V	V	V		

Note: N= noninterview, D= don't know, I= invalid skip, R= refusal, V= valid skip.

Table 6. Discrepancies in Sibling Reports of Parents' Income

MHID	Reported Parents' Income										"Cleaned" Parents' Income									
	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985				
3435	3437	10000	4000	27000	D	D	V	V	D	10000	4000	27000	27000	27000	V	D				
3435	3438	10000	4000	27000	D	V	V	V	V	10000	4000	27000	27000	V	V	V				
4863	4863	26300	24000	V	V	V	V	V	M	26300	24000	V	V	V	V	M				
4863	4864	26300	24000	30000	31285	25000	15497	14709	19000	26300	24000	30000	31285	25000	15497	14700	19000			
4863	4865	26300	24000	30000	31285	25000	15497	10000	19000	26300	24000	30000	31285	25000	15497	14700	19000			
4997	4997	75001	55000	50000	60000	V	V	V	V	75001	55000	50000	75001	V	V	V	V			
4997	4998	75001	55000	50000	75001	V	75001	V	V	75001	55000	50000	75001	V	75001	V	V			
5242	5242	21000	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	12000	V	V	V	V	V	V	V			
5242	5243	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V	V			
5242	5244	24000	V	34000	V	17000	V	V	V	12000	V	25500	V	17000	V	V	V			
5242	5245	12000	22000	34000	18000	27500	V	V	V	12000	17000	25500	13500	17000	V	V	V			
5242	5246	12000	12000	25500	13500	17000	V	V	V	12000	17000	25500	13500	17000	V	V	V			
5778	5778	12000	13000	13000	26000	V	V	20000	V	12000	13000	13000	26000	V	V	20000	V			
5778	5779	36000	40000	36000	60000	75001	V	V	D	12000	13000	13000	26000	50000	V	V	D			
5778	5780	18500	36000	37000	35600	50000	V	V	V	12000	13000	13000	26000	50000	V	V	V			
5778	5781	18500	36000	37000	35600	50000	17000	23110	V	12000	13000	13000	26000	50000	17000	20000	V			
6218	6218	4000	10000	11000	V	8700	7000	9000	15000	4000	10000	11000	V	8700	7000	9000	15000			
6218	6219	4000	7000	1700	2568	4800	V	2329	16000	4000	10000	11000	2568	4800	V	9000	15000			
6373	6373	2908	3840	40400	D	10428	8000	8065	6682	2908	3840	5432	6282	10428	8000	8065	6682			
6373	6374	2908	3840	5432	6282	10428	8968	8065	7000	2908	3840	5432	6282	10428	8000	8065	6682			
6373	6375	2908	3840	5432	V	V	V	V	V	2908	3840	5432	V	V	V	V	V			
7368	7368	9050	15000	D	15000	20000	V	30000	30000	9050	12000	15000	12000	15000	V	16000	30000			
7368	7369	9050	12000	D	13000	20000	28000	V	V	9050	12000	15000	12000	15000	V	V	V			
7368	7370	9050	12000	15000	12000	15000	15000	16000	V	9050	12000	15000	12000	15000	15000	16000	V			
8502	8502	6000	6000	12000	V	V	4092	V	V	6000	6000	4956	V	V	8000	V	V			
8502	8503	6000	6000	4956	6000	7000	8000	8700	4952	6000	6000	4956	6000	7000	8000	8700	4952			
8502	8504	6000	6000	12000	5992	7000	8000	12000	16500	6000	6000	4956	6000	7000	8000	8700	4952			
9055	9055	V	V	9200	12500	3500	9358	4500	6300	V	V	4500	6500	5500	9358	6500	6300			
9055	9056	4460	2500	4500	6500	5500	9358	6500	6300	4460	2500	4500	6500	5500	9358	6500	6300			
9055	9057	4956	2500	6000	8000	8500	9358	5000	6300	4460	2500	4500	6500	5500	9358	6500	6300			
9197	9197	V	V	12000	V	44470	30000	26000	V	V	V	40000	V	44470	38600	20000	V			

Note: M = noninterview, D = don't know, I = invalid skip, R = refusal, V = valid skip.

Table 6. Discrepancies in Sibling Reports of Parents' Income

HHID	ID	Reported Parents' Income										"Cleaned" Parents' Income									
		1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985				
9197	9198	11000	15000	40000	18000	50000	46000	V	V	25000	33000	40000	18000	44470	38600	V					
9197	9199	25000	33000	60000	18000	44470	38600	V	V	25000	33000	40000	18000	44470	38600	V					
9197	9200	25000	33000	60000	18000	44470	38600	20000	35000	25000	33000	40000	18000	44470	38600	20000					
1220	1220	4000	6000	25000	8000	12000	35800	6000	6000	4000	785	8000	8000	10000	4300	8800					
1220	1220	4000	785	8000	8000	10000	4300	8800	4000	785	8000	8000	10000	4300	8800	4000					

Note: N= noninterview, D= don't know, I= invalid skip, R= refusal, V= valid skip.