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THE CHANGING DISTRIBUTION OF THE BURDEN OF FEDERAL INCOME TAX

## Preface

Nearly all U.S. taxpayers whose income includes wage and salary earnings have in common the fact that they must pay both Federal Personal Income Taxes (unless income is very low) and Social Security Taxes on such income. Since both taxes are based on income, we believe that it is the distribution of the combined burden of the two taxes that should be taken into consideration in any proposal to change either or both taxes. Considered separately, the two taxes may appear to result in a desirable distribution of the burden when in reality the resulting combined distribution may be undesirable. It is difficult to believe that either the Congress or the people would support the current system of taxes if they were aware of the combined distribution.

This is the first of four papers which shows the distribution of the combined federal personal income and social security tax burden on various categories of taxpayers in 1977. The burden is projected to 1981 based on the changes made in the 1977 Social Security Tax Amendments and the changes in Federal personal income taxes resulting from the Revenue Act of 1978. The distribution of the combined burden is shown by income class for:

1. Single persons
2. Married couples with one worker and no children
3. Married couples with one worker and two children
4. Married couples with two workers and no children
5. Married couples with two workers and two children
6. Self-employed families of four

The size and distribution of the tax burden depends on the incidence of the social security taxes and on whether the burdens for the various brackets aremeasured in current dollars or in constant dollars. The theories of the incidence of taxes are not very satisfactory. Many (perhaps most) public finance economists believe that social security taxes paid by employers are shifted to employees. Many economists and most business men and the general public believe the tax burden falls on the employer. The size and the distribution of the combined tax burden depends on which theory we accept. The size and distribution of the burden also depends on whether or not we adjust for inflation. Taxpayers pay more personal income taxes when their money incomes rise even though their real incomes stay the same. Partly because some readers will prefer the use of current dollars while others prefer the use of constant dollars, and partly because of the broad (and perhaps increasing) interest in indexing, we are planning to present the distributions both ways.

In this first paper it is assumed that employees do not bear the burden (as employees) of that portion of the Social Security tax which is paid by employers. Furthermore, no adjustments have been made for inflation.

The other three papers in this series will repeat the analysis with variations as follows:
2. Assumes that the social security taxes paid by employers are borne by employees but does not adjust for inflation.
3. Assumes that the social security taxes paid by employers are not borne by employees but does adjust for inflation.
4. Assumes that the social security taxes paid by employers are borne by employees and does adjust for inflation.

## I. Introduction

Federal income taxes include the personal income tax which is progressive, and the Social Security Tax (SST), which is regressive. The personal income tax exempts much of lower incomes by permitting personal deductions and personal exemptions and taxes income above this level at progressive rates. The Social Security Tax permits no deductions or personal exemptions and taxes all "earned income" I/ up to a certain leve1 - called the maximum covered income - at proportionate rates.

Recent legislation has reduced personal income taxes on earned income by reducing rates, expanding income brackets, increasing personal exemptions, and increasing the earned income credit. Prior to these changes, SST rates and the maximum covered income were increased. The purpose of this paper is to analyze the effects of these changes on the distribution of the total income tax burden under the assumption that all income is earned income. Such an assumption would lead to overstating the tax burden if a considerable portion of income were from other sources. Unearned income rises both absolutely and relative to total income as total income rises. Table 1 shows the various sources of income as a percentage of adjusted gross income by size of adjusted gross income. Since we consider here only incomes up to $\$ 75,000$, the degree to which tax burdens are overstated should be quite small. Part II considers the changes brought about by the Social Security Tax Amendments of 1977. In our analysis we assume that employees bear the burden of that portion of the tax which they pay and do not, as employees, bear the burden of the employer's portion. Alternative assumptions will be left to another report.

Part III describes the Revenue Act of 1978 as it pertains to individuals and analyzes its effects. Throughout this paper we assume that individuals take the average amount of deductions for all taxpayers in their income class as published in the Statistics of Income 1974. In addition we have ignored the effects of inflation which moves taxpayers up to higher brackets without necessarily increasing their real incomes. This also will be considered in a later report. Six categories of taxpayers are considered:
(1) single persons
(2) married couples with no children, one worker
(3) married couples without children, two workers
(4) married couples with two children, one worker
(5) married couples with two children, two workers
(6) self employed families of four

Finally, Part IV examines the combined effect of the SST Amendments and the Revenue Act of 1978 on each category of taxpayer. The Appendix provides data to support the graphical presentations in Figures A through F.
II. Social Security Tax Amendments of 1977

On December 20, 1977, in an effort to improve the current and projected financial condition of the OASDHI program President Carter signed into law the Social Security Amendments of 1977. The enactment of these amendments

TABLE 1
SOURGES OF InCOME AS A PERCENTAGE OF ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME BY SIZE OF ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME 1974

$1_{\text {Self employnent income consists of the sum of the following: }}$
Business and profession net profit or loss
Farm net profit or loss
Partnership net profit or loss
Small business net profit or loss
${ }^{2}$ Property income consists of the sum of the following:
Sales of capital assets (Net gain less Net loss)
Dividends
Interest
Rent (Net income less Net loss)
Source: Statistics of Income, Individual Returns, 1974, Internal Revenue
$\quad$ Service, Table 1.4 p .24 .
Explanation of above classifications are contained in Section 6, p. 221.
was a culmination of an extended national debate on alternative ways to restore the financial integrity of the social security program. When Congress last enacted social security benefit and financing legislation in 1973, it was thought that the program was soundly financed in the short-run and expected to be sound over the long range future. By 1977 , however, the program was projected to have a long range average annual deficit of $8.2 \%$ of taxable payroll. This expected deficit was the result of recent economic experience which has left us with both higher inflation and more unemployment than we experienced in most of the Post World War II period. The higher inflation led to indexing social security benefits to all beneficiaries. Also the greater unemployment has encouraged people, who lose their jobs and who are old enough to be eligible for benefits, to retire and thus add to the number of beneficiaries. Older people find it difficult to find new jobs even when we have full employment and the problem is aggravated by higher than normal unemployment. In addition, a lower fertility rate will result in a higher ratio of beneficiaries to workers than had previously been projected. In 1977 legislation was directed toward stabilizing the social security benefit structure, eliminating gender-based distinctions, and reestablishing the financial integrity of the system. 2/

Included in the changes brought about by the amendments were increases in the tax rates and increases in the maximum amount of earnings on which the tax is imposed (maximum covered income). Table 2 shows the scheduled increases and the maximum tax per worker. Tax rates are scheduled to increase to $7.65 \%$ for both employees and employers and to $10.75 \%$ for the self employed in 1990 and later years. The maximum covered income is scheduled to rise to $\$ 22,900$ in 1979 , $\$ 25,900$ in 1980 and $\$ 29,700$ in 1981. After 1981, the base will be automatically adjusted to keep up with average wage levels. The resulting maximum tax per worker is scheduled to increase from $\$ 965.25$ in 1977 to $\$ 1975.05$ in 1981 for employees and from $\$ 1303.50$ to $\$ 2762.10$ for the self employed.

Effects of Social Security Amendments on Various Categories of Taxpayers:
The following discusses the effects of the changes in the payroll tax on various categories of taxpayers under the assumption that the employer does not shift to the employee the burden of that portion of the tax which he pays. A comparison will be drawn between the combined federal income tax and social security tax in 1977 to that of 1981 where only the social security tax changes have been incorporated.

## Single Persons

Figure A illustrates the effect of the social security amendments on a single wage earner. Each curve shows the combined personal income tax and social security tax rate for money incomes up to $\$ 75,000$. The 1977 curve represents the situation prior to the enactment of the new social security law. The 1981a curve incorporates the change in the social security tax rate and maximum covered income for 1981 under the assumption of no change in federal personal income taxes from 1977.

Table 2. Social Security Taxes and Rates as of December 1977.

|  |  | Employer | mployee Each | Sel | Employed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Maximum Covered Income* | Tax Rate | Maximum Tax per Worker | Tax Rate | Maximum Tax per Worker |
| 1977 | 16,500 | 5.85 | 965.25 | 7.90 | 1303.50 |
| 1978 | 17,700 | 6.05 | 1070.85 | 8.10 | 1433.70 |
| 1979 | 22,900 | 6.13 | 1403.77 | 8.10 | 1854.90 |
| 1980 | 25,900 | 6.13 | 1587.67 | 8.10 | 2097.90 |
| 1981 | 29,700 | 6.65 | 1975.05 | 9.30 | 2762.10 |
| 1982 | 31,800 | 6.70 | 2130.60 | 9.35 | 2973.30 |
| 1983 | 33,900 | 6.70 | 2271.30 | 9.35 | 3169.65 |
| 1984 | 36,000 | 6.70 | 2412.00 | 9.35 | 3366.00 |
| 1985 | 38,100 | 7.05 | 2686.05 | 9.90 | 3771.90 |
| 1986 | 40,200 | 7.15 | 2874.30 | 10.0 | 4020.00 |
| 1987 | 42,600 | 7.15 | 3045.90 | 10.0 | 4260.00 |
| 1988-89 | ? | 7.15 |  | 10.0 |  |
| $\begin{gathered} 1990 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { after } \end{gathered}$ | ? | 7.65 |  | 10.75 |  |

*Note: Maximum Covered Income 1982-87 officially estimated Source: Social Security Bulletin, March 1978.

Figure A


TABLE A:
COMBINED SOCIAL SECURTTY AND FEDERAL PERSONAL INCOMF TAX RATES FOR A SINGLE PERSOA

| INCOME | $1977{ }^{1}$ | $1981 \mathrm{a}^{2}$ | $1981 b^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | 5.85\% | 6.65\% | 6.65\% |
| 2500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 3500 | 7.06 | 7.86 | 7.45 |
| 4500 | 10.26 | 11.06 | 10.43 |
| 5500 | 12.46 | 13.26 | 12.69 |
| 6500 | 14.06 | 14.86 | 14.53 |
| 7500 | 15.38 | 16.18 | 15.88 |
| 8500 | 16.49 | 17.29 | 17.03 |
| 9500 | 17.54 | 18.34 | 17.93 |
| 10,500 | 18.53 | 19.33 | 18.86 |
| 11,500 | 19.38 | 20.18 | 19.62 |
| 12,500 | 20.23 | 21.03 | 20.43 |
| 13,200 | 20.48 | 21.28 | 20.84 |
| 14,100 | 21.18 | 21.98 | 21.41 |
| 15,300 | 21.99 | 22.79 | 22.17 |
| 16,500 | 22.67 | 23.47 | 22.75 |
| 17,700 | 22.86 | 24.06 | 23.43 |
| 19,800 | 22.98 | 24.75 | 24.11 |
| 21,100 | 23.13 | 25.20 | 24.56 |
| 22,900 | 23.42 | 25.85 | 25.24 |
| 24,700 | 24.06 | 26.80 | 26.10 |
| 25,900 | 24.52 | 27.44 | 26.62 |
| 26,500 | 24.74 | 27.75 | 26.87 |
| 27,500 | 25.13 | 28.27 | 27.42 |
| 28,200 | 25.28 | 28.50 | 27.66 |
| 29,700 | 25.56 | 28.96 | 28.13 |
| 30,600 | 25.72 | 29.02 | 28.18 |
| 33,000 | 26.15 | 29.21 | 28.29 |
| 34,300 | 26.45 | 29.39 | 28.45 |
| 35,400 | 26.67 | 29.53 | 28.59 |
| 38,800 | 27.25 | 29.86 | 28.94 |
| 39,600 | 27.37 | 29.92 | 29.01 |
| 42,300 | 28.06 | 30.45 | 29.54 |
| 44,500 | 28.63 | 30.90 | 29.99 |
| 45,900 | 28.96 | 31.16 | 30.26 |
| 49,500 | 29.85 | 31.89 | 30.87 |
| 51,800 | 30.44 | 32.39 | 31.39 |
| 53,100 | 30.75 | 32.65 | 31.68 |
| 59,400 | 32.29 | 33.99 | 32.87 |
| 68,700 | 34.32 | 35.79 | 34.28 |
| 75,000 | 35.42 | 36.77 | 35.45 |

${ }^{1}$ Data taken from Appendix $I$.
${ }^{2} 1981$ incorporates Social Security Amendments of 1977 but not Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix II.
${ }^{3} 1981$ incorporates both the Social Security Amendments of 1977 and the Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix III.

In 1977, earned incomes ranging from $\$ 2950$ to $\$ 16,500$ were taxed highly progressively under the income tax and proportionately under the SST. The net effect was thus progressive. Single persons with incomes less than $\$ 2950$ paid no income tax hence the combined tax consisted solely of SST and was proportionate at the rate of $5.85 \%$. For earners whose income was in excess of $\$ 16,500$ the regressivity of the social security tax offset somewhat the progressivity of the income tax resulting in a combined tax that was nearly proportionate for incomes between $\$ 16,500$ and $\$ 23,000$ and progressive (but less so than in the $\$ 3,000$ to $\$ 16,000$ range) for higher incomes. 3/

The SST amendments increase the SST rate and maximum covered income to $6.65 \%$ and $\$ 29,700$, respectively, for 1981. These changes affect the level of the combined rates (an increase of nearly $14 \%$ ) and slightly reduce the progressivity of the rate structure for earned incomes less than or equal to $\$ 16,500$. Due to the increase in maximum covered income, the combined tax remains highly progressive, but less so, up to $\$ 29,700$ at which point the regressivity of the SST sets in and the combined taxes become still less progressive. Thus the largest effect takes place at incomes greater than $\$ 20,000$. It is interesting to note, however, that in 1977 more than $86 \%$ of all single person households earned less than $\$ 15,000$. (See Table 3) Thus, for the majority of single taxpayers the social security amendments result in an increase of 8 of a percentage point in their combined tax burden by 1981. The increase in burden on those with incomes below $\$ 2950$, those not subject to the personal income tax, is especially difficult to bear.

## Married Couples, One Worker:

Figures $B$ and C illustrate the effects of the new SST law on married couples where either husband or wife are working (but not both). The two figures differ due to the presence or absence of children. Since the SST does not allow for deductions, it treats both families identically. Thus any differences are due solely to federal personal income taxes which will be discussed later. As in Figure A the differences between the 1977 curves and the 1981a curves reflect the change in social security taxes.

One worker families are subject to the same social security taxes as are single persons. Thus the effects of the amendments of 1977 are the same in both cases. The combined rates increase by . 8 of a percentage point for incomes up to $\$ 16,500$ while the progressivity of the rate schedule is slightly reduced. Due to the increase in the maximum covered income, (MCI) the largest increases in SST are borne by those whose incomes lie between $\$ 16,500$ ( 1977 MCI ) and $\$ 29,700$ ( 1981 MCI ). Within this range, the progressivity of the combined tax rate schedule is increased as well as the combined rates themselves. The regressivity of the SST sets in for incomes greater than $\$ 29,700$ and as a result the burden of the increased SST decreases as income increases beyond $\$ 29,700$.

Table 3 reveals that in 1977 over $57 \%$ of all two person households earned less than $\$ 15,000$. Over $33 \%$ earned incomes between $\$ 15,000$ and $\$ 30,000$. It is this one third that will bear the largest burden of the
Table 3. Number of Households and Percent by Income Class and Number of Persons in Household, 1977.

| Income | Single Person Households |  | Two Person Households |  | Four Person Households |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number (thousands) | Percent of Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Number } \\ & \text { (thousands) } \end{aligned}$ | Percent of Total | Number (thousands) | Percent of Total |
| Total | 17,715 | 100.00 | 21,454 | 100.00 | 11,645 | 100.00 |
| Less than \$4,000 | 5,822 | 34.83 | 1,779 | 8.29 | 433 | 3.72 |
| \$4,000-\$6,999 | 3,625 | 21.69 | 3,233 | 15.07 | 714 | 6.13 |
| \$7,000-\$9,999 | 2,401 | 14.36 | 3,080 | 14.36 | 848 | 7.28 |
| \$10,000-14,999 | 2,629 | 15.73 | 4,258 | 19.85 | 2,023 | 17.37 |
| \$15,000-\$19,999 | 1,300 | 7.78 | 3,375 | 15.73 | 2,336 | 20.06 |
| \$20,000 - \$24,999 | 445 | 2.66 | 2,401 | 11.19 | 1,987 | 17.06 |
| \$25,000 - \$29.999 | 227 | 1.36 | 1,365 | 6.36 | 1,378 | 11.83 |
| \$30,000 - \$49,999 | 190 | 1.14 | 1,575 | 7,34 | 1,532 | 13.16 |
| \$50,000 and over | 79 | . 47 | 389 | 1.81 | 395 | 3.39 |

[^0]Figure B
Combined Social Security and Federal Personal Income Tax for a One Worker, Two Person Family


TABLE B:
COMBINED SOCTAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL PERSONAL INCOME TAX RATES FOR A 1 WORKER, 2 PERSON EAMILY

| TNCOME | $1977^{1}$ | $1981 a^{2}$ | $1981 b^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | 5.85\% | 6.65\% | 6.65\% |
| 2500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 3500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 4500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 5500 | 6.61 | 7.41 | 6.90 |
| 6500 | 8.77 | 9.57 | 9.02 |
| 7500 | 10.49 | 11.29 | 10.57 |
| 8500 | 11.85 | 12.65 | 11.99 |
| 9500 | 12.97 | 13.77 | 13.11 |
| 10,500 | 13.91 | 14.71 | 14.19 |
| 11,500 | 14.68 | 15.48 | 15.10 |
| 12,500 | 15.34 | 16.14 | 15.87 |
| 13,200 | 15.85 | 16.65 | 16.33 |
| 14,100 | 16.55 | 17.35 | 16.91 |
| 15,300 | 17.43 | 18.23 | 17.75 |
| 16,500 | 18.19 | 18.99 | 18.47 |
| 17,700 | 18.52 | 19.71 | 19,09 |
| 19,800 | 18.83 | 20.60 | 20.07 |
| 21,100 | 19.00 | 21.08 | 20.52 |
| 22,900 | 19.39 | 21.82 | 21.08 |
| 24,700 | 19.66 | 22.40 | 21.71 |
| 25,900 | 19.82 | 22.74 | 22.08 |
| 26,500 | 19.95 | 22.96 | 22.25 |
| 27,500 | 20.18 | 23.32 | 22.53 |
| 28,200 | 20.34 | 23.57 | 22.72 |
| 29,700 | 20.66 | 24.06 | 23.26 |
| 30,600 | 20.84 | 24.14 | 23.36 |
| 33,000 | 21.48 | 24.54 | 23.60 |
| 34,300 | 21.80 | 24.75 | 23.71 |
| 35,400 | 22.06 | 24.91 | 23.92 |
| 38,800 | 22.96 | 25.57 | 24.53 |
| 39,600 | 23.16 | 25.71 | 24.66 |
| 42,300 | 23.87 | 26.26 | 25.24 |
| 44,500 | 24.43 | 26.69 | 25.77 |
| 45,900 | 24.79 | 26.99 | 26.08 |
| 49,500 | 25.72 | 27.76 | 26.80 |
| 51,800 | 26.34 | 28.29 | 27.21 |
| 53,100 | 26.68 | 28.58 | 27.42 |
| 59,400 | 28.26 | 29.96 | 28.85 |
| $68,700$ | 30.29 | 31.76 | 30.53 |
| 75,000 | 31.51 | 32.85 | 31.70 |

I Data taken from Appendix I.
${ }^{2} 1981$ incorporates Social Security Amendments of 1977 but not Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix II.
$3_{1981 b}$ incorporates both the Social Security Amendments of 1977 and Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix III.

Figure C
Combined Social Security and Federal Personal Income Tax for a One Worker Four Person Family


TABLE C:
COMBINED SOCIAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL PERSONAL INCOME TAX RATES FOR A ONE WORKER FOUR PERSON FAYILY

| INCOME | $1977^{1}$ | $1981 \mathrm{a}^{2}$ | $1981 \mathrm{~b}^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | -4.15 | -3.35 | -3.35 |
| 2500 | -4.15 | -3.35 | -3.35 |
| 3500 | -4.15 | -3.35 | -3.35 |
| 4500 | -1.93 | -1.13 | -3.35 |
| 5500 | 1. 30 | 2.10 | -2.44 |
| 6500 | 3.54 | 4.34 | -. .08 |
| 7500 | 5.78 | 6.58 | 2.67 |
| 8500 | 8.18 | 8.98 | 6.26 |
| 9500 | 9.65 | 10.45 | 9.09 |
| 10,500 | 10.96 | 11.76 | 10.97 |
| 11,500 | 12.17 | 12.97 | 11.99 |
| 12,500 | 13.19 | 13.99 | 12.99 |
| 13,200 | 13.80 | 14.60 | 13.60 |
| 14,100 | 14.38 | 15.18 | 14.31 |
| 15,300 | 15.27 | 16.07 | 15.12 |
| 16,500 | 16.19 | 16.99 | 15.92 |
| 17,700 | 16.49 | 17.69 | 16.72 |
| 19800 | 16.94 | 18.71 | 17.70 |
| 21,100 | 17.23 | 19.30 | 18.25 |
| 22,900 | 17.57 | 20.00 | 18.96 |
| 24,700 | 17.96 | 20.70 | 19.51 |
| 25,900 | 18.20 | 21.12 | 19.92 |
| 26,500 | 18.31 | 21.32 | 20.14 |
| 27,500 | 18.48 | 21.62 | 20.49 |
| 28,200 | 18.64 | 21.87 | 20.72 |
| 29,700 | 19.04 | 22.44 | 21.19 |
| 30,600 | 19.27 | 22.57 | 21.26 |
| 33,000 | 19.84 | 22.90 | 21.66 |
| 34,300 | 20.23 | 23.17 | 21.85 |
| 35,400 | 20.53 | 23.38 | 22.00 |
| 38,800 | 21.46 | 24.06 | 22.62 |
| 39,600 | 21.68 | 24.23 | 22.79 |
| 42,300 | 22.38 | 24.77 | 23.31 |
| 44,500 | 23.01 | 25.28 | 23.83 |
| 45,900 | 23.38 | 25.58 | 24.20 |
| 49,500 | 24.36 | 26.40 | 25.06 |
| 51,800 | 24.95 | 26.90 | 25.55 |
| 53,100 | 25.33 | 27.23 | 25.80 |
| 59,400 | 26.99 | 28.69 | 27.20 |
| 68,700 | 29.13 | 30.60 | 29.10 |
| 75,000 | 30.45 | 31.79 | 30.26 |

${ }^{1}$ Data taken from Appendix $I$.
${ }^{2}$ 1981a incorporates Social Security Amendments of 1977 but not Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix II.
$3_{1981 b}$ incorporates both the Social Security Amendments of 1977 and Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix III.

SST increases among these two person households. Table 3 shows that in 1977 almost $50 \%$ of four person households earned incomes between $\$ 15,000$ and $\$ 30,000$ and it is this group that will bear the largest increase in burden among four person households.

## Married Couple, Two Workers:

Table 4 gives family characteristics by income class. It is not surprising that the average number of workers per family is one or less for families whose incomes are less than $\$ 10,000$ and greater than one for families earning more than $\$ 10,000$. Thus families whose incomes are most affected by the social security tax amendments are predominantly two worker families.

In order to determine the effects of the SST legislation on two worker families we must make some assumption concerning the relative share of household income earned by each worker. In this analysis we have assumed that the income is split between earners on a one third, two thirds basis. 4/ Each worker must pay SST on his or her share of earned, family income. Thus for household incomes of less than $\$ 16,500$, (MCI), in 1977 the SST paid by a two worker household was identical to that paid by a one worker or single person household. If household income exceeded \$16,500 two worker families paid more SST than did one worker families. For household incomes between $\$ 16,500$ and $\$ 24,750$ one worker families paid the maximum tax of $\$ 965.25$ or $5.85 \%$ of $\$ 16,500$, while two worker families paid $5.85 \%$ of their total income since each worker's share was not greater than the MCI of $\$ 16,500$. For household incomes between $\$ 24,750$ and $\$ 49,500$ two worker families paid the maximum tax ( $\$ 965.25$ ) plus $5.85 \%$ of one third of household income since this is still not greater than $\$ 16,500$, while one worker families paid only the maximum tax. For incomes in excess of $\$ 49,500$ two worker families paid twice the maximum tax since both workers' shares exceeded $\$ 16,500$. Thus the SST burden on two worker families is twice that on one worker families for the same level of household income if it equals or exceeds $\$ 49,500$.

The combined tax schedule for two worker families is illustrated in Figures $D$ and E. Again, the difference between the two schedules is the result of the presence or absence of children which affects the federal personal income tax burden but not social security taxes. For two worker families the SST was proportionate for incomes up to $\$ 24,750$ in 1977 and regressive for higher incomes. In 1981 the SST will be proportionate (at a higher rate) for incomes up to $\$ 44,550$ beyond which it will become regressive. Thus the progressivity of the combined tax will be reduced since the part of the tax that is proportionate has been increased. Two worker families with incomes between $\$ 24,750$ and $\$ 44,550$ will bear the largest increase in absolute burden due to the SST changes. The increase in the relative burden decreases as income increases. A two worker family of four earning $\$ 33,000$ will experience an increase of $9.25 \%$ in the combined rate from $19.35 \%$ to $21.14 \%$ as a result of the SST increases from 1977 to 1981. The same family with an income of $\$ 10,000$ would experience an increase of $7.34 \%$ from $30.67 \%$ to $32.92 \%$. 75,000

Table 4. Family Characteristics by Income.

| Income | Mean <br> Family <br> Income |  Persons Per Family | Avg \# of Children Per Family | Avg \# of Earners Per Family |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under \$2,000 | \$ 153 | 3.01 | 1.39 | . 75 |
| \$2,000-\$2,999 | 2,484 | 2.92 | 1.27 | . 62 |
| \$3,000-\$3,999 | 3,492 | 2.75 | 1.01 | . 53 |
| \$4,000-\$4,999 | 4,490 | 2.93 | 1.13 | . 67 |
| \$5,000-\$5,999 | 5,458 | 2.94 | 1.01 | . 79 |
| \$6,000-\$6,999 | 6,450 | 2.94 | . 97 | . 91 |
| \$7,000-\$7,999 | 8,442 | 3.03 | . 99 | 1.13 |
| \$10,000-\$14,999 | 12,436 | 3.23 | 1.10 | 1.50 |
| \$15,000-\$24,999 | 19,480 | 3.45 | 1.17 | 1.86 |
| \$25,000-\$49,999 | 32,220 | 3.71 | 1.06 | 2.39 |
| \$50,000 and over | 69,491 | 3.81 | 1.00 | 2.31 |

Source: Statistical Abstract of the U.S. 1978, Table 733, p. 454.

Figure D

Combined Social Security and Federal Personal Income Tax for a Two Worker, Two Person Family


TABIE D:
COMBINED SOCLAL SECURTTY AND FEDERAL PERSONAL INCOME TAX RATES FOR A TWO WORKER. TWO PERSON EAMILY

| INCOME | $1977^{1}$ | $1981 \mathrm{a}^{2}$ | $1981 \mathrm{~b}^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 2500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 3500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 4500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 5500 | 6.61 | 7.41 | 6.90 |
| 6500 | 8.77 | 9.57 | 9.02 |
| 7500 | 10.49 | 11.29 | 10.57 |
| 8500 | 11.85 | 12.65 | 11.99 |
| 9500 | 12.97 | 13.77 | 13.11 |
| 10,500 | 13.91 | 14.71 | 14.19 |
| 11,500 | 14.68 | 15.48 | 15.10 |
| 12,500 | 15.34 | 16.14 | 15.87 |
| 13,200 | 15.85 | 16.65 | 16.33 |
| 14,100 | 16.55 | 17.35 | 16.91 |
| 15,300 | 17.43 | 18.23 | 17.75 |
| 16,500 | 18.19 | 18.99 | 18.47 |
| 17,700 | 18.91 | 19.71 | 19.09 |
| 19,800 | 19.80 | 20.60 | 20.07 |
| 21,100 | 20.28 | 21.08 | 20.52 |
| 22,900 | 21.02 | 21.82 | 21.08 |
| 24,700 | 21.59 | 22.40 | 21.71 |
| 25,900 | 21.75 | 22.74 | 22.08 |
| 26,500 | 21.88 | 22.96 | 22.25 |
| 27,500 | 22.11 | 23.32 | 22.53 |
| 28,200 | 22.27 | 23.57 | 22.72 |
| 29,700 | 22.59 | 24.06 | 23.26 |
| 30,600 | 22.77 | 24.33 | 23.55 |
| 33,000 | 23.41 | 25.20 | 24.26 |
| 34,300 | 23.73 | 25.64 | 24.61 |
| 35,400 | 23.99 | 25.98 | 24.99 |
| 38,800 | 24.89 | 27.13 | 26.09 |
| 39,600 | 25.09 | 27.37 | 26.32 |
| 42,300 | 25.80 | 28.24 | 27.22 |
| 44,500 | 26.36 | 28.89 | 27.96 |
| 45,900 | 26.72 | 29.18 | 28.27 |
| 49,500 | 27.65 | 29.96 | 28.99 |
| 51,800 | 28.21 | 30.49 | 29.40 |
| 53,100 | 28.50 | 30.78 | 29.62 |
| 59,400 | 29.88 | 32.15 | 31.04 |
| 68,700 | 31.70 | 33.96 | 32.72 |
| 75,000 | 32.79 | 35.05 | 33.89 |

${ }^{1}$ Data taken from Appendix $I$.
${ }^{2} 1981$ a incorporates Social Security Amendments of 1977 but not Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix II.
${ }^{3} 1981$ b incorporates both the Social Security Amendments of 1977 and Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix III.

## Figure E

Combined Social Security and Federal Personal Income Tax for a Two Worker Four Person Family


TABLE E:
COMBINED SOCIAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL PERSONAL INCOME TAX RATES FOR A TWO WORKER, FOUR PERSON FAYILY

| INCOME | $1977^{1}$ | $1981 a^{2}$ | $1981 b^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | -4.15 | -3.35 | -3.35 |
| 2500 | -4.15 | -3.35 | -3.35 |
| 3500 | -4.15 | -3.35 | -3.35 |
| 4500 | -1.93 | -1.13 | -3.35 |
| 5500 | 1.30 | 2.10 | -2.44 |
| 6500 | 3.54 | 4.34 | -. 08 |
| 7500 | 5.18 | 5.98 | 2.48 |
| 8500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 4.44 |
| 9500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 5.99 |
| 10,500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 11,500 | 5.85 | 6.65 | 6.65 |
| 12,500 | 6.79 | 7.59 | 6.65 |
| 13,200 | 7.74 | 8.54 | 7.54 |
| 14,100 | 8.71 | 9.51 | 8.64 |
| 15,300 | 10.05 | 10.85 | 9.89 |
| 16,500 | 11.34 | 12.14 | 11.07 |
| 17,700 | 12.37 | 13.17 | 12.20 |
| 19,800 | 13.87 | 14.67 | 13.66 |
| 21,100 | 14.71 | 15.51 | 14.46 |
| 22,900 | 15.71 | 16.51 | 15.47 |
| 24,700 | 16.65 | 17.46 | 16.27 |
| 25,900 | 17.04 | 18.03 | 16.83 |
| 26,500 | 17.22 | 18.30 | 17.12 |
| 27,500 | 17.50 | 18.71 | 17.58 |
| 28,200 | 17.73 | 19.03 | 17.89 |
| 29,700 | 18.28 | 19.75 | 18.50 |
| 30,600 | 18.58 | 20.15 | 18.85 |
| 33,000 | 19.35 | 21.14 | 19.90 |
| 34,300 | 19.83 | 21.73 | 20.41 |
| 35,400 | 20.20 | 22.20 | 20.81 |
| 38,800 | 21.33 | 23.56 | 22.12 |
| 39,600 | 21.59 | 23.87 | 22.44 |
| 42,300 | 22.42 | 24.86 | 23.40 |
| 44,500 | 23.14 | 25.68 | 24.23 |
| 45,900 | 23.57 | 26.03 | 24.65 |
| 49,500 | 24.67 | 26.98 | 25.64 |
| 51,800 | 25.27 | 27.55 | 26.20 |
| 53,100 | 25.64 | 27.92 | 26.49 |
| 59,400 | 27.27 | 29.54 | 28.04 |
| 68,700 | 29.38 | 31.63 | 30.13 |
| 75,000 | 30.67 | 32.92 | 31.39 |

$1_{\text {Data }}$ taken from Appendix $I$.
${ }^{2} 1981$ a incorporates Social Security Amendments of 1977 but not Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix II.
$3^{3} 1981 b$ incorporates both the Social Security Anendments of 1977 and Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix III.

Figure F

Combined Social Security and Federal Personal Income For a Self Employed Four Person Family


TABLE F:
COMBINED SOCIAL SECURITY AND FEDERAL PERSONAL INCOME TAX RATES FOR A SELF EMPLOYED FOUR PERSON FAMILY

| INCOME | $1977^{1}$ | $1981 \mathrm{a}^{2}$ | $1981 b^{3}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1500 | -2.10 | -.70 | $-.70$ |
| 2500 | -2.10 | -. 70 | -. 70 |
| 3500 | -2.10 | -. .70 | -. 70 |
| 4500 | . 12 | 1.52 | -. 70 |
| 5500 | 3.35 | 4.75 | . 21 |
| 6500 | 5.59 | 6.99 | 2.57 |
| 7500 | 7.83 | 9.23 | 5.32 |
| 8500 | 10.23 | 11.63 | 8.91 |
| 9500 | 11.70 | 13.10 | 11.74 |
| 10,500 | 13.01 | 14.41 | 13.62 |
| 11,500 | 14.22 | 15.62 | 14.64 |
| 12,500 | 15.24 | 16.64 | 15.64 |
| 13,200 | 15.85 | 17.25 | 16.25 |
| 14,100 | 16.43 | 17.83 | 16.96 |
| 15,300 | 17.32 | 18.72 | 17.77 |
| 16,500 | 18.24 | 19.64 | 18.57 |
| 17,700 | 18.40 | 20.34 | 19.37 |
| 19,800 | 18.64 | 21.36 | 20.35 |
| 21,100 | 18.83 | 21.95 | 20.90 |
| 22,900 | 19.04 | 22.65 | 21.61 |
| 24,700 | 19.33 | 23.35 | 22.16 |
| 25,900 | 19.50 | 23.77 | 22.57 |
| 26,500 | 19.58 | 23.97 | 22.79 |
| 27,500 | 19.71 | 24.27 | 23.14 |
| 28,200 | 19.84 | 24.52 | 23.37 |
| 29,700 | 20.18 | 25.09 | 23.84 |
| 30,600 | 20.37 | 25.14 | 23.84 |
| 33,000 | 20.87 | 25.29 | 24.04 |
| 34,300 | 21.21 | 25.47 | 24.14 |
| 35,400 | 21.49 | 25.61 | 24.22 |
| 38,800 | 22.33 | 26.09 | 24.65 |
| 39,600 | 22.54 | 26.22 | 24.78 |
| 42,300 | 23.18 | 26.63 | 25.17 |
| 44,500 | 23.77 | 27.05 | 25.60 |
| 45,900 | 24.12 | 27.29 | 25.92 |
| 49,500 | 25.04 | 27.99 | 26.65 |
| 51,800 | 25.61 | 28.42 | 27.07 |
| 53,100 | 25.96 | 28.71 | 27.29 |
| 59,400 | 27.56 | 30.02 | 28.52 |
| 68,700 | 29.63 | 31.75 | 30.24 |
| 75,000 | 30.90 | 32.84 | 31.31 |

${ }^{1}$ Data taken from Appendix Table I.
2
1981 incorporates Social Security Amendments of 1977 but not Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix Table II.
$3_{1981 b}$ incorporates both the Social Security Amendments of 1977 and Revenue Act of 1978. Data taken from Appendix Table III.

## Self Employed Family of Four:

Figure F illustrates the combined tax rate schedule for a family of four whose income is earned through self employment. Since the self employed are both employee and employer, the SST rate applied to their income differs from that of a wage earner. The maximum covered income, however, is the same. The SST rate for the self employed was $7.9 \%$ in 1977 and it is scheduled to increase to $9.3 \%$ by 1981 and eventually to $10.75 \%$ by 1990 . $5 /$

The scheduled increase in SST rates will produce a proportionate increase in combined tax rates of 1.4 percentage points for incomes up to $\$ 16,500$, thus reducing somewhat the overall progressivity in this range. Incomes between $\$ 16,500$ and $\$ 29,700$ will bear the largest absolute burden of the tax change. For an income of $\$ 29,700$ the resulting increase in the combined tax rate will be $24.33 \%$ from $20.18 \%$ to $25.09 \%$. For an income of $\$ 75,000$ the increase will be 1.94 percentage points from $30.90 \%$ to $32.84 \%$ or a $6.28 \%$ increase. The points representing the maximum covered income in 1977 and 1981 are readily apparent in the 1977 and 1981a curves respectively as these points indicate where the regressivity of the social security tax sets in, resulting in a less progressive combined tax.

## Summary:

From this discussion of the effects of the SST amendments on various categories of taxpayers, it is apparent that it is not the increase in the social security tax rate that will burden taxpayers the most but rather the increase in the maximum covered income. It is families whose incomes lie between the old MCI and the new MCI who will experience the largest dollar increases in their combined tax burdens.

## III. The Revenue Act of 1978

This section highlights and explains those provisions of the Revenue Act of 1978 which primarily affect individual income taxes. These tax measures were passed by the 95 th Congress in its last minute rush to adjournment. In particular, the effects of the following tax reductions and extensions will be analyzed:

1. Widening of brackets; rate cuts in certain brackets; increase in zero bracket amounts.

The tables in Appendix IV show the tax rate schedules prior to the Revenue Act of 1978 and the schedules resulting from the Act which went into effect for tax years beginning after 1978.

The number of income brackets was reduced from 26 to 17 for single persons and 16 for married individuals filing joint returns. Within certain brackets the marginal tax rate was reduced. For example, in 1978 a single person with a taxable income of $\$ 8,000$ paid a marginal tax rate of $21 \%$ on the excess over $\$ 6,200$ while in

1979 the same taxable income is subject to a marginal tax rate of $19 \%$ on the excess over $\$ 6,500$. The net reduction in taxes for this individual is $\$ 91$. In addition, the zero bracket amounts are increased from $\$ 2,200$ to $\$ 2,300$ for single taxpayers and from $\$ 3,200$ to $\$ 3,400$ for married taxpayers filing joint returns.
2. Increased Personal Exemption:

The exemption amount for a taxpayer, spouse, and each dependent increases from $\$ 750$ to $\$ 1,000$ for tax years beginning after 1978.
3. General Tax Credit:

The general tax credit, $\$ 35$ per capita, expires for tax years beginning after 1978.

## 4. Earned Income Credit:

For tax years beginning after 1978, the earned income credit becomes permanent, the maximum credit amount is increased and the credit computation is simplified. The credit, which goes to working low income taxpayers with dependents, previously equalled $10 \%$ of income up to $\$ 4,000$, and it was phased out gradually up to $\$ 8,000$. After 1978 , the credit is an amount equal to $10 \%$ of the first $\$ 5,000$ of earned income. If, however, an individual's earned income or adjusted gross income exceeds $\$ 6,000$, the credit will be $\$ 500$ less $12.5 \%$ of the amount by which the individual's earned income (or, if higher, his adjusted gross income) exceeds $\$ 6,000$. Thus the credit is gradually reduced for incomes in excess of $\$ 6,000$, reaching zero for incomes of $\$ 10,000$ or more. In summary:

If earned income is: The tax credit is:

- $\$ 5000 \quad 10 \%$ of earned income

5000 - $6000 \quad \$ 500$
$6000-10,000 \quad \$ 500-12.5 \%$ of excess over $\$ 6000$
10,000 or more 0
Figures A - Fillustrate the effects of these provisions on the various categories of taxpayers. The relevant curves are 1981a and 1981b. Recall that 1981a incorporates the SST amendments but assumes that no change in federal individual income taxes has taken place since 1977. 1981b also incorporates the SST increases but differs from 1981a in that the tax reductions and provisions of the Revenue Act of 1978 have been taken into account. Thus the distance between 1981a and 1981b represents the federal income tax reductions effective after 1978.

## Single Person:

Figure A (p. 7) shows the effects of these changes on single taxpayers. Since single persons with incomes of $\$ 2,200$ or less paid no income taxes in 1977 and did not qualify for the earned income credit their combined tax burden


#### Abstract

is proportionate and consists only of SST. This zero bracket amount was raised to $\$ 2,300$ for 1979 and later years. As income increases above $\$ 2,300$ the reduction in income taxes also increases. For example, a single person with a taxable income of $\$ 8,500 \%$ in 1981 would pay combined taxes of $17.29 \%$ or $\$ 1,469.65$ under the old law while the same individual would pay taxes of $17.03 \%$ or $\$ 1,447.55$ under the new law resulting in a reduction of $1.5 \%$ or \$22.10. A single person with a taxable income of $\$ 75,000$ will experience a reduction in income taxes of $3.59 \%$ or $\$ 990$. Although the Revenue Act of 1978 reduces somewhat the tax burden on single persons, it has little effect on the high degree of progressivity at lower to middle income levels (less than $\$ 20,000$ ) and it reduces the progressivity at high income levels (greater than $\$ 60,000$ ).


## Married Couples Filing Jointly - No Children:

Curves 1981a and 1981b in Figures B, pg. 11, and D, p. 17, illustrate the effects of reductions in income taxes on a married couple who have no children or other dependents and who file joint returns. The resulting change is much the same as that for a single taxpayer with no effect in the proportionate range which consists solely of the SST since income taxes are zero for incomes below $\$ 4,700$ when the earned income credit is not available. This range is, however, broader for a married couple. Gradually increasing reductions in tax burden take place as income increases. The difference between Figures $B$ and $D$ is due to the presence or absence of more than one wage earner. Since couples filing jointly pay the same income taxes regardless of whether one or both parties earned the income the absolute differences in rates are the result of differential treatment under the Social Security Tax.

## Married Couples With Two Children Who File Joint Returns:

Figures C, p. 13, E, p. 19, and F, P. 21, all show the tax burdens on four person families. Their income tax burden is lower than that of couples with no children since they can claim two additional dependents and they are eligible for the earned income credit. It is this tax credit which results in negative income tax rates on incomes below $\$ 5,000$. The Revenue Act of 1978 made this a permanent part of the tax law and at the same time increased the credit so that four person families do not pay any tax until income exceeds $\$ 8,626$. Figures $C$, $E$ and $F$ differ only as a result of Social Security Tax differences with the exception that Figure E, involving two workers, takes account of the Child and Dependent Care Credit available to parents both of whom work. It is assumed here that such families take the maximum credit available. It is this Child Care Credit which results in a proportionate or flat region in the tax schedule for incomes between about $\$ 8,000$ and $\$ 12,000$ (Figure E). In all three cases the new income tax law has no effect on families whose income is less than $\$ 4,000$. For income between about $\$ 4,000$ and $\$ 8,000$ the reductions in tax rates were larger for taxpayers with children than for those without. The average reduction is about four percentage points in this income bracket. Above $\$ 8,000$ the rate reductions diminish to roughly one percentage point until incomes exceed $\$ 25,000$ after which the rate reductions again begin to increase gradually.

Summary:
Married couples with children and low incomes (between $\$ 4,500$ and $\$ 8,500$, see Tables $C, E$ and $F$ ) receive the most relief from the new income tax law. For single persons and married couples without children, the larger tax reductions go to those with the largest incomes. In all cases, taxpayers with incomes below $\$ 4,000$ receive no net reduction in their tax burden as the result of the Revenue Act of 1978.

## IV. Combined Taxes in 1981 Under Current Laws:

This section combines the effects of both the Social Security Amendments of 1977 and the Revenue Act of 1978 on taxpayers in 1981. Thus the relevant schedule is represented in $1981 b$ in Figures A through F. A comparison of $1981 b$ to 1977 describes the net effect of changes in both tax laws.

Single Persons:
That group of taxpayers which has historically suffered most from high tax rates and highly progressive distribution of the tax burden is the single taxpayer - since 1948, at least, when income splitting was permitted for married couples. $1981 b$ and 1977 in Figure A illustrate the net effects on this group. Single persons with incomes below $\$ 3,000$ will experience a net increase of $13.68 \%$ in their combined burden. Above $\$ 3,000$ the net increase gradually diminishes to $.35 \%$ for an income of $\$ 16,500$. Above $\$ 16,500$ the increase rises to $10.05 \%$ at an income of $\$ 29,700$ and then diminishes to virtually no net change (.1\%) at incomes in the $\$ 70,000$ range. A single person earning $\$ 12,500$ in 1981 will pay an additional $\$ 25$ in combined taxes over what he or she would have paid in 1977. The same individual earning $\$ 29,700$ will pay an additional $\$ 763.29$ while a single person earning $\$ 75,000$ will pay only $\$ 22.50$ additional combined taxes. The combined effects result in a slight reduction in the progressivity of the distribution at low incomes, an increase in progressivity between $\$ 16,000$ and $\$ 30,000$ and a reduction in the progressivity at high incomes.

## Married Couple With No Children, One Worker:

The changes in the combined tax burden on married couples without children and with only one wage earner are similar to those of single persons with the exception of an additional personal exemption for income tax purposes. This additional deduction extends the proportionate range of the combined distribution beyond the $\$ 4,000$ income level to $\$ 5,400$ ( $\$ 2,000$ of personal exemptions and $\$ 3,400$ of standard deduction) Married couples with incomes below this level will experience a net increase of .8 of a percentage point in their combined burden as is evidenced in Figure B. Between $\$ 4,000$ and $\$ 16,500$ the net increase in taxes is .05 of a percentage point or less with a minimum increase of .08 of a percentage point at an income of $\$ 7,500$. Beyond $\$ 16,500$ the net increase in tax burden rises to a maximum of 2.6 percentage points at an income of $\$ 29,700$ and then gradually decreases to an increase of .2 of a percentage point at an income of $\$ 75,000$. Thus here, as is the case for single persons, the largest increase in burden brought about by recent legislation falls on married couples whose incomes are between $\$ 16,000$ and $\$ 50,000$ which may well be considered middle income families by 1981.

Married Couples Without Children, Two Workers:
With the increased participation of women in the labor force, the average number of wage earners per family has increased. In particular, where there are no children, it is more likely that both husband and wife work. The effect of the second worker on the combined tax burden with given total income is due to Social Security taxes. Figure D illustrates the net increase in tax burden for a childless married couple when both parties work. If the couple's combined income is less than $\$ 16,000$, the net change is the same as that of a one worker married couple. If income exceeds $\$ 16,500$ but is less than $\$ 28,200$, the net increase remains less than .5 of a percentage point. Beyond $\$ 28,200$ the net increase rises to 1.6 percentage points at an income of $\$ 44,500$ and gradually decreases to a net increase of roughly 1 percentage point for incomes above $\$ 52,000$. Thus the maximum additional burden falls on couples whose combined income is at or near $\$ 45,000$.

## Married Couples With Two Children, One Worker:

Where one or more children are present it is more common for only one party to work. Figure $C$ illustrates the case of a four person family with one worker. The presence of dependent children allows the couple to take advantage of the earned income credit. This credit is obtainable in the absence of any federal income tax liability. In other words, couples whose income is below a specified limit actually receive a payment from the government in the form of a negative income tax. This explains the negative tax rates for families whose income is less than $\$ 4,500$ in 1977 or $\$ 6,500$ in 1981. Families with incomes below $\$ 4,000$ will experience a net increase in their combined tax rate of .8 of a percentage point by 1981 though the rate is negative for both 1977 and 1981. For example, a family in this class would have a combined tax rate of $-3.35 \%$ in 1981 compared to a rate of $-4.15 \%$ in 1977, a rise of .8 of a percentage point - i.e., the "refund" would be smaller. (See Table C.) Families with income above $\$ 4,000$ but below $\$ 17,000$ will experience a net decrease in their tax burden by 1981. The largest relief ( 3.74 percentage points) goes to families with incomes of $\$ 5,500$ since for these the decrease in Federal personal income taxes more than offsets the increase in Social Security taxes. If income exceeds $\$ 17,000$ the net change will be an increase in the combined tax rate which is directly related to income until it reaches a maximum of 2.15 percentage points at $\$ 29,700$. Beyond $\$ 29,700$ the net increase in combined rates gradually decreases and becomes a net decrease for income above $\$ 68,000$. Thus the very poor (less than $\$ 4,000$ ) will experience a net increase in their combined rate though it will still be negative, (See Figure C), the near poor ( $\$ 4,000-\$ 17,000$ ) will experience a net decrease, the middle income families ( $\$ 17,000-\$ 50,000$ ) will suffer from the largest increased burden while the rich ( $\$ 70,000$ and above) will actually pay less taxes in 1981 than in 1977.

Married Couples With Two Children and Two Workers:
When both husband and wife work and there are dependent children, families are eligible for a Child and Dependent Care Credit against Federal income taxes. This, together with the increased Social Security taxes
paid by the additional worker result in the differences in tax burden between the one and two worker, four-person families. (See Figure E). Again families with very low incomes (less than $\$ 4,000$ ) will pay . 8 of a percentage point more in 1981. Those whose incomes are between $\$ 4,000$ and $\$ 9,000$ will pay less, and between $\$ 9,000$ and $\$ 12,000$, slightly less. As income rises above $\$ 27,000$ the burden increases until families with incomes above $\$ 40,000$ will pay roughly 1 percentage point more in 1981 than in 1977.

## Seft Employed Family of Four:

One worker four person families and self employed four person families share different combined tax burdens as a result of different Social Security tax rates. (See Figure F). Under current law, a self employed family of four whose income is less than $\$ 4,000$ will pay an additional 1.4 percentage points in combined taxes in 1981 over that paid in 1977. If its income is $\$ 5,500$, it will pay 3.14 percentage points less. If its income is $\$ 29,700$ it will pay 3.66 percentage points more and finally if its income is $\$ 75,000$ it will pay only .4 of a percentage point more in 1981.

In summary, regardless of whether we are talking about single persons, married couples without children or married couples with children, the combined effect of the SST amendment of 1977 and the Revenue Act of 1978 is to increase the burden on the very poor, increase greatly the burden on middle income taxpayers and ever so slightly, increase and in certain cases decrease the burden on the rich. The distribution is still highly progressive in low to middle income classes and less progressive in the high income classes than was previously the case.
$1 / \mathrm{E}$
Earned income consists of salaries and wages and self employment income which includes business and profession net profit or loss, farm net profit or loss, partnership net profit or loss, and small business corporation net profit or loss as these are the proprietor's incomes. Earned income, therefore excludes all property income such as rents, interest, dividends, and capital gains.

2/ John She and Mary Ross, "Social Security Amendments of 1977: Legislative History and Summary of Provisions," Social Security Bulletin, March 1978.

3/ The definition of progressivity in taxation is clear enough. If the ratio of the tax to income rises as income rises, the tax is progressive. The measurement of degree of progressivity is not as simple. There is no single correct method of measuring the degree of progressivity. The Musgraves present three methods of measuring the degree of progressivity.

1. The ratio of the change in the effective rate to the accompanying change in income or average rate progression:
$\left(T_{1} / Y_{1}-T_{o} / Y_{o}\right) /\left(Y_{1}-Y_{o}\right)$
2. The ratio of the percentage change in taxes to the percentage change in income or liability progression:
$\left[\left(T_{1}-T_{o}\right) / T_{0}\right] /\left[\left(Y_{1}-Y_{0}\right) / Y_{0}\right]$
3. The ratio of the percentage change in after tax income to the percentage change in before tax income or residual income progression: $\frac{\left(Y_{1}-T_{1}\right)-\left(Y_{0}-T_{0}\right)}{Y_{0}-T_{0}} / \frac{Y_{1}-Y_{0}}{Y_{0}}$
The degree of progressivity (or regressivity) may increase measured by one of these formulae while it decreases measured by another.

Example: (Tax rates taken from Table A, page 8)


1. If we measure degree of progressivity by average rate progression, we find that the ratios are as follows:

For A: (22.67\%-16.49\%) / 8000 = 6.18\% / 8000
For B: ( $23.47 \%-17.29 \%$ ) / $8000=6.18 \% / 8000$
or the degree of progressivity of the two systems is the same.
2. If we measure by liability progression, the ratios are:

For A: [(3740.55-1401.65) / 1401.65] $\div$

$$
[(16,500-8,500) / 8500]=1.773
$$

For B: $\quad[(3872.55-1469.65) / 1469.65] \div$
$[(16,500-8,500) / 8,500]=1.737$
Since $1.737<1.773$, tax system $B$ is less progressive than tax system A.
3. If we measure by residual income progression the ratios are:

For $\mathrm{A}: \quad \frac{(16,500-3,740.55)-(8,500-1,401.65)}{(8,500-1,401.65)} \div \frac{(16,500-8,500)}{8,500}=.8474$
For $B: \quad \frac{(16,500-3,872.55)-(8,500-1,469.65)}{(8,500-1,469.65)} \div \frac{(16,500-8,500)}{8,500}=.8459$
or tax system B is less progressive than tax system A. (See Richard A. and Peggy B. Musgrave, Public Finance in Theory and Practice, 1973, pp. 261-263. See specifically "If all liabilities are raised by an equal number of percentage points, average rate progression remains constant, while liability and residual income progression fall" p. 263. Throughout this paper the degree of progressivity is measured by liability progression.

4/This assumption was based on actual data on income distributions within two worker families provided by the Research Division of the Minnesota Department of Revenue.
$\underline{5}^{5}$ In the case of two worker families there is an incentive toward selfemployment when the combined income exceeds a certain level since although self-employed couples pay a higher SST rate, they do not pay taxes on income beyond the MCI. If both workers are wage earners, however, they pay SST on their combined income beyond the MCI since each worker's share of income must equal or exceed the MCI before the maximum SST is reached. Under our assumption of a $1 / 3,2 / 3$ split in 1977 self-employed couples paid less SST than did wage earning couples if their combined income exceeded $\$ 22,282.05$. In 1981 the incentive toward self-employment will set in at combined incomes in excess of $\$ 41,535.34$.
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[^2]Appendix IV: 1977-78 SCHEDULE X:SINGLE TAXPAYERS


| TAXABLE INCOME |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: |
| OVER | NOT OVER | PAY |  | TAX <br> RATE |

T 1977-78 SCHEDULE Y: MARRIED FILING JOINTLY

| TAXABLE INCOME |  | PAY + | TAX | ON EXCESS |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| OVER | NOT OVER |  | RATE | 0 |
| 0 | $\$$ | 3,200 | 0 | 0 |
| OVER |  |  |  |  |

1979 SCHEDULE Y: MARRTED FILING JOINTLY

|  | Income | PAY | $+$ | TAX | ON EXCESS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| OVER | NOT OVER |  |  | RATE | OVER |
| 0 | \$ 3,400 | 0 |  | 0 | 0 |
| \$ 3,400 | 5,500 | 0 |  | 14\% | \$ 3,400 |
| 5,500 | 7,600 | \$ 294 |  | 16 | 5,500 |
| 7,600 | 11,900 | 630 |  | 18 | 7,600 |
| 11,900 | 16,000 | 1,404 |  | 21 | 11,900 |
| 16,000 | 20,200 | 2,265 |  | 24 | 16,000 |
| 20,200 | 24,600 | 3,273 |  | 28 | 20,200 |
| 24,600 | 29,900 | 4,505 |  | 32 | 24,600 |
| 29,900 | 35,200 | 6,201 |  | 37 | 29,900 |
| 35,200 | 45,800 | 8,162 |  | 43 | 35,200 |
| 45,800 | 60,000 | 12,720 |  | 49 | 45,800 |
| 60,000 | 85,600 | 19,678 |  | 54 | 60,000 |
| 85,600 | 109,400 | 33,502 |  | 59 | 85,600 |
| 109,400 | 162,400 | 47,544 |  | 64 | 109,400 |
| 162,400 | 215,400 | 81,464 |  | 68 | 162,400 |
| 215,400 | .... | 117,504 |  | 70 | 215,400 |


[^0]:    Source: $\frac{\text { Current Population Reports: Consumer Income }}{\text { Table } 7, \text { p. } 22 \text {, }}$ "Money Income in 1977 of Households in the U.S.,"
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[^2]:    

