เอกสารทางวิชาการ
DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

Number 50

Income Distribution in Thailand

by

Oey Astra Meesook

คณะเศรษฐศาสตร์
FACULTY OF ECONOMICS

มหาวิทยาลัยธรรมศาสตร์
กรุงเทพมหานคร

THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY
BANGKOK

May 1976

THAMMASAT UNIVERSITY

FACULTY OF ECONOMICS

DISCUSSION PAPER SERIES

Number 50

Income Distribution in Thailand

by

Oey Astra Meesook

The papers presented in this series are intended to be tentative in nature and should not be quoted without the author's permission. Comments and criticisms of papers presented are welcomed and will be included (if the commentor so wishes) with any subsequent dissemination of the corresponding discussion paper.

Draft

Income Distribution in Thailand*

by

Oey Astra Meesook
Faculty of Economics
Thammasat University
Bangkok, Thailand

May, 1975

Parts of this work were presented as a paper titled "Income Inequality in Thailand, 1962/3 and 1968/9" at the Joint JERC-CAMS Seminar on Income Distribution, Employment and Economic Development in Southeast and East Asia, in Tokyo, Japan, on December 17-20, 1974. That paper will be published jointly by the Japan Economic Research Center and the Council for Asian Manpower Studies.

* The author wishes to thank the Rockefeller Foundation and the Council for Asian Manpower Studies for their very generous financial support during 1973-4 and part of 1975 respectively. She is also very grateful to the National Economic and Social Development Board and the National Statistical Office for their very valuable assistance in terms of providing as well as processing the data.

CONTENTS

Income Distribution in Thailand

by Oey Astra Meesook
Faculty of Economics
Thammasat University
Bangkok, Thailand

May, 1975

1. Introduction

As in a great many other countries, the subject of income distribution has recently begun to attract attention in Thailand. In part, this has been kindled by the enormous interest shown by various international agencies in this topic, but it is undeniable that many Thai people themselves have come to question some glaring disparities in the standards of living of various subgroups of the population. Why is the Northeast so much poorer than all the other regions? Why have farmers' incomes lagged behind other people's? Has income inequality been increasing or decreasing during the recent period of rapid growth of overall income? These are the questions which demand answers.

Perhaps more importantly, income distribution as a topic for research has, in the past year or so, gained respectability. Whereas the military government disapproved of any discussion of income distribution, so that it was practically impossible to obtain assistance from government agencies or access to data needed for analysis, the governments succeeding it have openly vowed to reduce income disparities. Whether or not the effort succeeds, it has at least

improved access to information useful for a study on income distribution.

This paper addresses itself to two major questions in the context of Thailand, the first concerning a profile of income inequality and the second the sources underlying income disparities. On the one hand we wish to describe and assess the impact of the inequality of incomes on the total population, while on the other hand we should like to identify some of the factors which contribute towards income inequality. Since we are here examining a very poor country, the analysis will be oriented towards the poorer segments of the population. For it must be recognized that, apart from the academic fascination offered by the notion of income inequality, in poor societies where average incomes are already low, what income inequality means is that many people must be barely existing on extremely low incomes.

The rest of this section contains a brief discussion of the data used in this study on income distribution in Thailand. The next section describes the income distribution situation in Thailand as of 1968/9, and the adjustments made on the income data and their impact. Section 3 contains a treatment of household incomes in which we have tried to identify the poor and to determine whether or not income inequality has been increasing in Thailand, our analysis being concentrated on the poorer people. In section 4 we analyse the distribution of income of the economically active population in order to assess the contributions of various factors to total income in-

equality. Section 5 links the distribution of income of the economically active population with the question of poverty, while section 6 offers a few conclusions.

The question of the data used in this study will not be discussed in detail here, but interested readers are referred to a paper by this writer titled "Income Distribution Statistics for Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia" which covers this aspect at some length.[1/]

Although other sets of data exist, the major sources of income distribution information are the Household Expenditure Survey, 1962/3, and the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, both of which were carried out by the National Statistical Office. The Household Expenditure Survey has been published in seven volumes, one for each of the six regions, the North, the Centre, the East, the Northeast, the South and Bangkok-Thonburi, as well as a volume for the whole kingdom.[2/] The original data tapes have reportedly been erased, so that one has to make do with what has been published, and this can be problematic at times. The 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey has been processed and the results have been published.[3/] The tabulations are on the whole very similar to the 1962/3 Survey. Two changes in definition should

---

1/ The paper was written for the Joint Brookings-Princeton Project on Income Distribution in LDC's and has been published as Review of Income Distribution Data : Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia, Research Program in Economic Development, Woodrow Wilson School, Princeton University, Discussion Paper No.56, April 1975.

2/ Household Expenditure Survey, B.E. 2506, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

3/ Report, Socio-economic Survey, B.E. 2511-2512, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

be noted. The first is that the Central and Eastern regions of the earlier survey have been combined into one region in the later survey. This does not create problems since to make the two surveys comparable we simply have to combine the Centre and East for 1962/3 in the same way. A somewhat more serious change of definition concerns the breakdown into 'towns' and 'villages'. In the 1962/3 Survey, towns consisted of sanitary districts as well as municipal areas. The change in 1968/9 involved the inclusion of sanitary districts in villages rather than towns. Therefore the categories 'towns' and 'villages' are not strictly comparable in the two surveys.4/

Apart from this inconsistency in the definition of towns and villages in the two sets of tabulations, there seems to have been an attempt to keep the results comparable. Moreover, many improvements are evident in the later survey. For example, from the point of view of a researcher on income distribution, the increase in the number of income classes from five to twelve for towns and eleven for villages is most welcome.

The original data tapes for the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey are still in existence, although they have not been made generally available. Using them can help overcome many difficulties since one is then free to aggregate or disaggregate as one wishes. The tapes also provide additional information not already presented in

---

4/ In 1968/9, about 11% of all households were situated in municipal areas, 9% in sanitary districts and 80% in villages.

the tabulations, such as socio-economic characteristics of household members and detailed expenditure data. One of the most important inclusions is surely the information on nonmoney income or income in kind which is rather crucial in an analysis of income distribution in a highly agricultural country such as Thailand. Another thing which the tapes make possible is an analysis of the incomes of the economically active population. The published tabulations are all concerned with households only and never deal with individual household members.

2. The Distribution of Income in Thailand, 1968/9

In this section a simple description of the income distribution in Thailand in 1968/9 will be given. More importantly, the necessity for and the procedures used in adjusting the money income data to obtain total income, and the effects of the adjustments on the distribution of income will be presented.

The data used here are taken from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, conducted by the National Statistical Office. Even though it will later be argued that the distribution of household income as commonly used is not appropriate for comparing degrees of inequality in income, it is nonetheless the starting point for the concept of income distribution developed in this paper subsequently. Moreover, adjustments for nonmoney income are made directly on household income which therefore remains the unit worked with until income data have been adjusted. The order of magnitude of the income adjustments as well as the size and direction of change of income inequality can also be observed in the distribution of household income.

The first columns of Tables A.1.1 to A.1.18 in the Appendix give the frequency distributions of households and of income by household money income class, as well as by region and location.[5/] The

---

5/ The tabulations were obtained directly from the data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, and are not completely consistent with the official tabulations. The published results are given by twelve income classes for towns and eleven for villages, with the classes defined differently for the two locations.

average figures for money income show a great deal of variation in the level of household money income among regions, more especially between towns and villages. The Northeast, North and South are the poorest regions, while the Centre & East and Bangkok-Thonburi are considerably better off. In villages the North is somewhat better off than the South, but higher town incomes in the southern region and a larger proportion of town households there lead to a higher average income for the South as a whole. With the exception of Bangkok-Thonburi, towns generally accounted for only a small percentage of all households. It can be observed that average regional incomes for towns are not so different from each other as they are for villages. Northeastern towns do not follow the usual pattern of having the lowest average income of all regions, but have the next highest town average after Bangkok-Thonburi. Most of the data presented are self-explanatory and are given mainly for further comparisons and for their potential usefulness to other researchers.

The many problems associated with using any one measure of inequality to capture the various aspects of income distribution have been extensively discussed in the literature. In particular, the widely-used Gini coefficient cannot be considered a satisfactory measure of inequality for comparisons of different income distributions from different sources, in which the data may have gone through quite diverse treatments. Such factors as the total number of income classes specified, the choice of the means of the income classes in the case that these are not actually given, especially those of the bottom and open-ended classes, can make differences in the size of

the Gini coefficients computed which are of comparable orders of magnitude to differences between the distributions being compared. This is without mentioning the even more serious conceptual problems involving the definitions of income and of the receiving unit. Thus we purposely avoid making international comparisons since we feel that these have little chance of being valid.

Bearing all this in mind, we present some measures of inequality for two types of comparison which we consider to be reasonable. First is the comparison by region and location. This uses data from a single source, having the same definitions of income and recipient unit and having been similarly handled throughout. Each distribution has been described by thirty-five income classes, with each class being narrow enough not to include too large a percentage of all households. Thus the frequency distributions adequately capture the differences in the distributions of income and the comparison of their Gini coefficients, say, can at least technically be made, even though we must recognize the measure's own shortcomings.

The second type of comparison occurs when adjustments to the income data are made. Since the distributions before and after the adjustments are treated the same way and the calculations of the degrees of inequality are identically performed for both, the differences are reliable indicators of the direction in which the degree of inequality is changing, even when their orders of magnitude are not large.

The comparison of degrees of inequality here uses three different measures which are sensitive to different parts of the income distribution. The Gini coefficient and the Theil index are more sensitive to differences at the top while the variance of income logarithms is more sensitive to differences at the lower end of the distribution. If the measures move the same way then we can be surer of the results than if only one measure is used.

In terms of the level of inequality of money incomes we find that it is higher for villages than for towns in the Centre & East, the Northeast and Bangkok-Thonburi, as well as for the whole kingdom. For towns and villages combined the degree of inequality is higher than for either towns or villages alone, indicating the importance of the contribution of the disparity in incomes between towns and villages to total inequality. There is no clear correlation between the degree of inequality for a region and its level of income.

2.1 The Adjustment for Nonmoney Income

It is not worthwhile dwelling too long on the distribution of household money income. Economic activity in Thailand is concentrated in the agricultural sector and the country is not yet completely monetized. This being the case it does not make much sense to ignore nonmoney income, consisting mainly of income in kind or own consumption in the agricultural sector. If income in kind were omitted, the disparity in incomes between towns and

villages would be exaggerated, to the extent that income in kind or nonmoney income is an important part of total income in agricultural households. The proportion of poor families would be overstated in general, and for those in rural areas in particular.

It is possible to take into account income in kind for 1968/9 since every item of expenditure for each household is divided into what the household actually purchased and what was obtained free or was home produced.[6/] The latter category corresponds to nonmoney income or income in kind.

Income in kind is of such great interest and importance because it is not evenly distributed among the population. Rural people have a much larger proportion of their total income in the form of income in kind. Table 2.1.1 gives money income, income in kind and the percentage of income in kind in total income, the sum of money income and income in kind, by region and location. From this it can be seen quite clearly that income in kind is much more important in villages than in towns, making up 23% of all village income but only 4% of town income. Moreover, there are substantial differences across regions. In Northeastern villages income in kind accounts for nearly two-fifths of total income and in the North, South and Centre-East for 21%, 19% and 14% respectively.

6/ Items which were obtained free or were home-produced were valued at the prices paid for the same items in the same region and location when cash expenditures were made.

Table 2.1.1

Household Money Income, Income in Kind and Percentage of Income in Kind in Money Income plus Income in Kind, 1968/9, by Region and Location

Region	North	Centre & East	Northeast	South	Bangkok-Thonburi	Whole Kingdom
Money Income (baht/year)						
Towns	20,955	24,188	26,213	23,233	31,533	27,018
Villages	7,488	13,009	5,103	6,831	21,488	8,073
Income in Kind (baht/year)						
Towns	868	1,252	1,509	1,306	1,138	1,175
Villages	1,978	2,056	3,212	1,625	1,344	2,360
% Income in Kind in Money Income Plus Income in Kind						
Towns	3.98	4.92	5.44	5.32	3.48	4.17
Villages	20.90	13.65	38.63	19.22	5.89	22.62

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

More importantly, as shown in Table 2.1.2, income in kind forms a much larger share of total income among lower income groups. The average figures of 4% for town and 23% for village households hide the overwhelming importance of income in kind at low levels of money income. For village households with money incomes under ฿3,000 a year, income in kind is 62% of the total, so that income in kind is actually 165% of money income. The proportion of income in kind in the total decreases steadily with rising money income but, for any given income level, is consistently higher for villages than for towns.

Thus it is clear that the omission of income in kind from the analysis of the distribution of income is a serious one, not so much because income in kind forms a large part of total income, but because its importance varies systematically with the level of income and by location and region. Serious biases are built into the analysis as a consequence of ignoring it.

2.2 The Adjustment for Imputed Rent

This was made in order to include imputed rental income of owner-occupied dwellings in our estimate of total household income. Otherwise the incomes of households not paying rent would be underestimated. In the sample of households in the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey the percentages of households paying rent were between nearly 30% and 50% in municipal areas and between 2% and 9% in sanitary districts and villages when different regions were considered.[7/]

7/ These percentages tend to be higher than those given in the Population and Housing Census, 1970, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table 2.1.2

Percentage of Income in Kind in Money Income Plus Income in Kind, by Money Income Class and Location, 1968/9.

Towns		Villages	
Money Income Class (Baht per year)	% of Income in Kind in Money Plus Nonmoney Income	Money Income Class (Baht per year)	% of Income in Kind in Money Plus Nonmoney Income
< 3,000	44.26	< 3,000	62.21
3,000 - 5,999	21.58	3,000 - 4,499	39.14
6,000 - 8,999	9.15	4,500 - 5,999	28.88
9,000 - 11,999	7.47	6,000 - 7,499	25.07
12,000 - 14,999	6.77	7,500 - 8,999	21.74
15,000 - 17,999	6.87	9,000 - 10,499	17.90
18,000 - 23,999	5.30	10,500 - 11,999	13.59
24,000 - 29,999	3.91	12,000 - 14,999	13.41
30,000 - 35,999	3.25	15,000 - 17,999	12.09
36,000 - 47,999	3.54	18,000 - 32,999	8.38
48,000 - 59,999	4.36	33,000 or more	5.01
60,000 or more	1.48		
All Classes	4.17	All Classes	22.62

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

It would therefore be desirable to impute rental income to households living in owner-occupied dwellings. The characteristics of renters and nonrenters are not necessarily the same and, if possible, one should attempt to estimate rent as a function of as many household characteristics as possible. This would result in a better fit than if we simply assigned the average rent of those who paid rent, for example, to each of the individual households in owner-occupied dwellings. At the aggregate level, the total amount of rent estimated should be more accurate if we are able to take into account the different characteristics of renters and nonrenters. For example, the Population and Housing Census for 1970 shows a larger number of household members for nonrenters than renters, when each region is considered in turn. If household size should turn out to be correlated to rent, then total imputed rental income would be over - or under - estimated if we did not include household size as a determinant of rent.

2.2.1 Estimating the Rent Equation

It should be understood that our rent estimate has as its main purpose the prediction of rental income of nonrenters based on the rent actually paid by renters. The method is thus simply to use the sample of renters on the data tapes of the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey, and to fit a rent equation for this sample. The relationship obtained is then used to estimate the rental income of nonrenters. The form of the estimating equation was limited by the choice of variables available on the data tapes. There may, therefore, be any number of other vairables which would improve the prediction of rent had the

information been collected, for example the type and structure of the dwelling involved.

The rent equation as initially estimated makes use of two variables which are expected to have an influence on the amount of rent paid, namely family income and family size, and is estimated separately for different regions and locations. Family income is expected to have a positive relationship with rent, since income represents the ability to pay. Other things constant, a higher level of income should mean a larger absolute amount spent on rent for housing. The relationship between rent and family size is not so obvious since there are both positive and negative effects on rent to be expected from an increase in the size of the family. On the one hand, a larger family implies greater needs in terms of housing facilities; more space is needed to accommodate more people. On the other hand, other things the same a larger family size means reduced ability to pay since there are now more people to take care of with a given income. Since family size and the number of children are correlated, it depends on how fast the number of income earners increases with family size as to whether the greater needs of a larger family are matched by a greater ability to pay and hence whether or not rent increases with family size.

In order to utilize all the information available while at the same time limit the sample size of the regression analysis to a reasonable level, we first of all found the average rent paid by renters by four-way cells, the dimensions being family income class, family-size class, region and location. The number of categories were 12,

10, 5 and 2 respectively, so that there were potentially 1,200 cells altogether.[8/] For family income we used total family income, that is to say including nonmoney income. All the observations of renters were therefore included in the cells, even though the regression was not done on individual households.

Two estimating forms were used, the linear form and the double-log form, as shown in the following equations :-

$$R = a + b.Y + c.S$$

and $$\ln(R) = a + b.\ln(Y) + c.\ln(S)$$

where R is rent paid,

Y is total family income

and S is family size.

Tables 2.2.1 presents the resulting estimated relationships which were determined separately by region and location. Both forms of the estimating equation show a significant positive correlation between family income and rent, and a generally insignificant negative correlation between family size and rent. The fit is considerably better when the double-log equation is used than when the linear form is employed. In Table 2.2.2 the estimated coefficients when family size is left out of the rent equation are presented. On the grounds of good fit and significant coefficients, equation 2B in which a double-log equation is used to estimate rent as a function of family income alone

---

8/ Households with more than ten members were all included in the tenth class.

Table 2.2.1

Estimated Rent Equations As a Function of Family Income and Family size

	Estimated coefficients[a]				Number of observations
	a	b	c	R^2	
Equation 1A : R = a + b.Y + c.S					
Towns: N	1014.43	0.0463	19.7628	0.3975	76
	(3.28)	(4.90)	(0.32)		
C & E	1447.52	0.0197	-75.0377	0.4700	86
	(6.69)	(5.05)	(-2.02)		
NE	1065.63	0.0614	-86.9967	0.6576	70
	(3.14)	(9.98)	(-1.71)		
S	623.38	0.1152	-37.7983	0.4586	100
	(1.06)	(8.78)	(-0.39)		
B - T	1450.54	0.0228	9.9533	0.4006	107
	(4.63)	(5.69)	(0.21)		
Villages: N	807.03	0.0966	-200.4620	0.5744	21
	(2.26)	(4.31)	(-2.71)		
C & E	495.76	0.0062	55.5308	0.4446	30
	(1.65)	(0.61)	(1.06)		
NE	1234.90	0.0244	-18.4798	0.4405	66
	(5.06)	(4.88)	(-0.38)		
S	507.56	0.0737	64.9163	0.5532	24
	(2.16)	(3.96)	(-1.25)		
B - T	1062.56	0.0483	-2.0538	0.2122	20
	(1.07)	(1.41)	(-0.01)		
Equation 2A : ln(R) = a + b.ln(Y) + c.ln(S)					
Towns: N	1.6170	0.6100	-0.0838	0.9840	76
	(1.66)	(5.82)	(-0.81)		
C & E	3.2844	0.4046	-0.0698	0.9738	86
	(3.88)	(4.53)	(-0.65)		
NE	0.9886	0.6958	-0.2678	0.9744	70
	(1.18)	(7.87)	(-2.58)		
S	0.5051	0.7584	-0.0821	0.9883	100
	(0.97)	(13.50)	(-1.27)		
B - T	1.8371	0.6114	-0.2613	0.9873	107
	(3.38)	(10.60)	(-3.52)		
Villages: N	-2.6227	1.0954	-0.6150	0.9873	21
	(-1.46)	(5.52)	(-4.03)		
C & E	1.6596	0.4952	0.0642	0.9667	30
	(0.76)	(1.95)	(0.19)		
NE	-1.7280	0.9400	-0.0957	0.9573	66
	(-1.84)	(9.31)	(-0.73)		
S	-4.0392	1.2057	-0.3086	0.9586	24
	(-1.93)	(5.20)	(-2.02)		
B - T	4.8692	0.2752	-0.1305	0.8278	20
	(1.16)	(0.59)	(-0.23)		

[a] t - Statistics are given in parentheses under the corresponding coefficients.

Table 2.2.2

Estimated Rent Equations As a Function of Family Income.

		Estimated coefficients[a] a	b	R^2	Number of observations
Equation 1B ; R = a + b.Y					
Towns:	N	1081.54	0.0472	0.3967	76
		(4.84)	(5.33)		
	C & E	1106.55	0.0177	0.4434	86
		(8.01)	(4.60)		
	NE	603.52	0.0602	0.6426	70
		(2.89)	(9.71)		
	S	455.66	0.1137	0.4578	100
		(1.12)	(9.12)		
	B - T	1506.28	0.0230	0.4004	107
		(8.88)	(5.91)		
Villages:	N	285.91	0.0757	0.4007	21
		(0.82)	(3.12)		
	C & E	688.58	0.0128	0.4214	30
		(2.88)	(1.58)		
	NE	1158.53	0.0239	0.4392	66
		(8.52)	(4.96)		
	S	471.62	0.0585	0.5200	24
		(1.99)	(4.09)		
	B - T	1056.14	0.0481	0.2122	20
		(1.38)	(1.88)		
Equation 2B : ln(R) = a + b.ln(Y)					
Towns:	N	1.8366	0.5760	0.9838	76
		(1.96)	(6.01)		
	C & E	3.3824	0.3841	0.9737	86
		(4.08)	(4.61)		
	NE	1.3594	0.6152	0.9719	70
		(1.59)	(7.14)		
	S	0.6741	0.7284	0.9881	100
		(1.34)	(14.25)		
	B - T	2.2219	0.5289	0.9858	107
		(3.97)	(9.53)		
Villages:	N	-1.3887	0.8861	0.9758	21
		(-0.58)	(3.45)		
	C & E	1.4537	0.5272	0.9667	30
		(0.79)	(2.89)		
	NE	-1.6877	0.9218	0.9570	66
		(-1.81)	(9.46)		
	S	-1.5645	0.9072	0.9506	24
		(-0.86)	(4.76)		
	B - T	5.2612	0.2140	0.8272	20
		(1.40)	(0.57)		

[a] t-Statistics are given in parentheses under the corresponding coefficients.

is selected for imputing rental income for home owners, with the estimation being done separately for each region and location.

2.2.2 The Calculation of Imputed Rental Income for Home Owners

On the basis of rent equation 2B in which a double-log function is used to relate rent paid with total family income, rental income can be imputed to home owners. Imputed rent is calculated on the basis of family income, region and location of residence. The assumption made is that households at similar levels of income in similar locations spend similar sums on rent, either in the form of actual rent or imputed rent. This is reasonable because the only sensible way of assessing the rental worth of a dwelling is by asking how much it could be rented for and the answer is given by looking at similar dwellings in its vicinity. Accordingly, we have estimated the rent equation separately for each region and location. Although the estimation would have been better had we been able to take into account some physical characteristics of dwellings, we have to be contented with using just family income to represent the type and size of dwelling. Family size was not included since its coefficient was not statistically significant in a majority of equations.

The family income figure used in the regression included the amount which had to be spent on rent. In order to apply the results to home owners, we had to use family income exclusive of the rent imputed. Let R be rent and let Y_1 be family income exclusive of rent. Then the estimated relationship

$$R = e^{a}.(Y_1 + R)^{b}$$

gives the relationship between rent and family income excluding rent, a and b being the regression coefficients.

Now $R = e^{a}Y_1^{b}.(1 + R/Y_1)^{b}$

Since we can expect R to be considerably less than Y_1, the approximation

$R \simeq e^{a}Y_I^{b} (1 + b.R/Y_1)$ holds so that we have a relationship between rent and family income exclusive of rent, ie.

$$R \simeq \frac{e^{a}Y_1^{b}}{1 - be^{a}Y_1^{b-1}}$$

which was what we used to impute the rental income of each home owner.

2.2.3 The Effect of Including Imputed Rent on the Income Distribution

Imputed rent of owner-occupied dwellings is of comparable importance to own consumption in towns but not in villages. When we consider total household income as consisting of money income, nonmoney income and imputed rent, imputed rent is 4% of total income in towns and 7% in villages. As in the case of nonmoney income, however, the essential point is not the size of the income adjustment. Rather, it is the bias which would result if it were left out, between renters and nonrenters specifically, and also between towns and villages since imputed rent is relatively more important for village households. Table 2.2.3 gives the average rent paid by renters and the percentage of renter households by region and location.

Table 2.2.3

Average Rent Paid by Renters and Proportion of Renters, by Region and Location, 1968/9

	Average Rent per year (in baht)	Percentage of Renters
Towns :		
N	2,046	28.4
C & E	1,580	43.0
NE	2,170	28.3
S	3,225	46.5
B - T	2,201	49.7
Villages :		
N	1,214	1.6
C & E	1,025	1.7
NE	1,610	2.9
S	1,357	2.2
B - T	2,298	8.6

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Within each region and location, moreover, the degree of income inequality is affected when imputed rent is included. For all three measures of inequality used, and for every region and location, household total income including imputed rent is more equally distributed than that without it. The implication is that on the whole imputed rent is a larger proportion of total income for those households at the lower end of the income distribution. This may be the result of average imputed rent being a larger proportion of total income for lower income groups, which is unlikely, or of there being a higher percentage of owner-occupied dwellings among low-income households, which is to be expected.

2.3 Conclusion

Own consumption or income in kind and imputed rent form a not insignificant part of total household income in Thailand. Tables 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 summarize the results of adjusting household money income data to include nonmoney income or own consumption and imputed rent. Table 2.3.1 gives average incomes at each stage of adjusting, by region and location, and the percentages of the additions in total income, while table 2.3.2 compares the levels of inequality of the different distributions. Own consumption data were collected as part of the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey, although the results have not been officially tabulated and published. On a country-wide basis, own consumption is 17% of total household income and imputed rent is 6%.[9/]

9/ Total household income includes own consumption as well as imputed rent.

Table 2.3.1

Average Money Income and Total Income, including Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent, by Region and Location, 1968/9

	Money Income	Money + Nonmoney Income	Money + Nonmoney Income + Imputed Rent	Nonmoney Income	Imputed Rent	% of (iv) in (iii)	% of (v) in (iii)
	(i)	(ii)	(iii)	(iv)	(v)	(in per cent)	
	(in baht/year)						
Towns :	27,018	28,193	29,403	1,175	1,210	4.0	4.1
N	20,955	21,823	23,182	868	1,359	3.7	5.9
C & E	24,188	25,440	26,216	1,252	776	4.8	3.0
NE	26,213	27,722	29,161	1,509	1,439	5.2	4.9
S	23,233	24,539	26,172	1,306	1,633	5.0	6.2
B - T	31,533	32,671	33,800	1,138	1,129	3.4	3.3
Villages :	8,073	10,433	11,214	2,360	781	21.0	7.0
N	7,488	9,466	10,331	1,978	865	19.1	8.4
C & E	13,009	15,065	15,699	2,056	634	13.1	4.0
NE	5,103	8,315	9,079	3,212	764	35.4	8.4
S	6,831	8,456	9,244	1,625	788	17.6	8.5
B - T	21,488	22,832	24,290	1,344	1,458	5.5	6.0
Total :	10,140	12,371	13,198	2,231	827	16.9	6.3
N	8,294	10,206	11,100	1,912	894	17.2	8.1
C & E	13,911	15,901	16,547	1,990	646	12.0	3.9
NE	5,846	8,998	9,786	3,152	788	32.2	8.1
S	8,859	10,445	11,337	1,586	892	14.0	7.9
B - T	29,106	30,294	31,502	1,188	1,208	3.8	3.8

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.
Imputed rent was estimated on the basis of rent paid by renters. See text.

Table 2.3.2

Degrees of Inequality of Household Money Income and Total Income, including Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent, by Region and Location, 1968/9.

Measure of Inequality	Gini Coefficient			Variance of Income Logarithms			Theil Index		
	Y_M[a]	Y_{M+K}	Y_{M+K+R}	Y_M	Y_{M+K}	Y_{M+K+R}	Y_M	Y_{M+K}	Y_{M+K+R}
Towns:	.4468	.4370	.4290	.6360	.5807	.5480	.3906	.3717	.3586
N	.4726	.4525	.4404	.6699	.5770	.5327	.4515	.4165	.3955
C & E	.4160	.4081	.3996	.5894	.5259	.4938	.3290	.3131	.3006
NE	.4667	.4590	.4495	.6535	.6242	.5895	.4600	.4397	.4224
S	.4692	.4591	.4501	.6722	.5799	.5471	.4871	.4625	.4454
B - T	.4210	.4134	.4085	.5406	.5181	.5019	.3371	.3237	.3157
Villages:	.4957	.3907	.3813	.9073	.4459	.4263	.4699	.3002	.2840
N	.4052	.3488	.3450	.5514	.3937	.3844	.2827	.2129	.2081
C & E	.4463	.4002	.3917	.6726	.4890	.4641	.4012	.3226	.3091
NE	.5480	.3525	.3473	.9712	.3479	.3392	.5858	.2500	.2411
S	.3706	.3290	.3249	.4476	.3414	.3330	.2443	.1893	.1843
B - T	.4284	.4140	.3928	.5816	.5233	.4489	.3643	.3427	.3070
Total:	.5370	.4399	.4289	1.0459	.5434	.5175	.5700	.3947	.3734
N	.4364	.3753	.3697	.6064	.4317	.4196	.3616	.2706	.2607
C & E	.4544	.4096	.4010	.6995	.5116	.4855	.4106	.3346	.3205
NE	.5795	.3859	.3788	1.0694	.3948	.3833	.6880	.3220	.3073
S	.4585	.4086	.4013	.5984	.4554	.4420	.4599	.3669	.3518
B - T	.4302	.4208	.4119	.5806	.5441	.5072	.3533	.3371	.3229

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

[a] Notation :- Y_M is household money income; Y_{M+K} is Y_M + nonmoney income; Y_{M+K+R} is Y_{M+K} + imputed rent.

Excluding them would not only understate total income, but would also exaggerate the difference in income levels between towns and villages. Own consumption is 21% and imputed rent is 7% of total income in villages, while the corresponding figure is 4% in both cases for towns.

The degree of income inequality is reduced when each of the adjustments is made, for each region and location. Thus nonmoney income and imputed rent are more important for low-income households and their exclusion exaggerates the degree of inequality.

Whereas in terms of money incomes, the distribution of income is more equal in towns as a whole than villages, the situation is reversed when total income is considered. This reversion can be attributed to the inclusion of own consumption. Thus the somewhat surprising initial result is seen to be simply the effect of considering an inappropriate concept of income. In addition, the disparity in money incomes leads to a level of inequality for towns and villages together which is higher than either of the two components. Again this result does not hold for total income, which has a degree of inequality which is the same for towns and for towns and villages combined, both being higher than for villages.

Although the adjustments on household money income are not by any means completely exhaustive, they at least yield a concept of income which is closer to the real command over consumption of goods and services than the original. The overall order of magnitude of the addition to income in itself makes the adjustment desirable. Much more

important is the distortion which would prevail in subsequent analyses of the income data in the absence of the adjustments.

3. Income Inequality and Social Welfare

The disparity in incomes between the rich and the poor is the major concern of researchers on income distribution. Most of them have stressed that it is insufficient to consider only the level of income while ignoring the question of how that income is distributed. Thus rapid growth of total income may be meaningless if it is not accompanied by a reduction in the gap between the incomes of the rich and the poor.

Most measures of inequality are "mean-free", that is, the question of the mean level of a number of incomes is considered separately from that of the distribution of these incomes among the income recipients. Income equality is implicitly associated with economic welfare through a social welfare function, so that, given any level of average income, a fall in equality implies a worsening in total welfare. Welfare is here to be taken as the level of well-being which society as a whole assigns to a particular level of income; it is not intended to reflect each individual's subjective evaluation of his own income.

In human terms, however, the level of income necessarily enters in any consideration of the level of social welfare. It surely makes a great deal of difference to people on the verge of starvation should they experience a rise in income, quite regardless of the relative gains or losses of other income groups. Thus a serious consideration for the level of social welfare of the population means taking into

account both the average level and the distribution of income simultaneously. The problem of income distribution may accordingly be viewed in two parts. First, there is the question of how much total income there is to go round. Second, there is the question of how equally that total income is distributed among the population. Assume, for example, that the same welfare function is applied to each individual in the society, and that total social welfare is simply the sum of the individual parts. A general rise in income which does not affect the distribution leads to a general increase in total social welfare. But an increase in the overall level of income may be concentrated in certain parts of the income distribution, and the total welfare of the population will be unevenly affected in that case. An increase which affects lower income groups more than proportionately reduces total income inequality and has a two-fold effect on total welfare, so long as the rate at which welfare increases with income is decreasing. On the other hand a rise in income which affects higher income groups more than lower income groups will result in a negative impact on total welfare which may or may not counteract the welfare effect of the general increase in income.

3.1 The Measurement of Welfare

Total welfare of individuals may be divided into material welfare and nonmaterial welfare, the latter being beyond the scope of this paper. Material welfare is received through the consumption of goods and services which can be classified into public and private consumption.

Both the quantity and quality of public services provided tend to be positively related with the general level of income.[10/] A wealthy country or a wealthy province within a country gives more and better services than a poorer one, although a great deal depends on governmental policy in this matter. It should be pointed out, however, that one cannot always simply add private and public consumption together to get total consumption. At extremely low levels of income many public goods mean very little to individuals. After all, one cannot make up for the lack of food by being provided with a telephone service. Many public services are very valuable, schools, hospitals, roads and so on, and yet at very low incomes it is the most basic consumption needs such as food, clothing and housing which are required first and foremost by individuals.

The ability of individuals to pay for goods and services is dependent on the incomes they have at their disposal. In fact, the majority of the population does not work, being made up of children, elderly people and so on. The distribution of income as earned by the population, including those outside the labour force, is highly unequal because of the large number of zero incomes. But we know that this situation does not accurately reflect actual consumption since extensive redistribution of income takes place within each family or household.

10/ Work is in progress for a study which will relate the supply of public services to the level of income in the 71 changwads or provinces of Thailand. The study should be completed by September, 1975.

The fact that incomes of individuals are first pooled within each household and then redistributed to its members means that we must look to household incomes to determine what potential consumption is available to each member of society. It is impossible to get precise information on how each household redistributes total household income to its members. Accordingly, simplifying assumptions have to be made. For instance, we may assume that people's consumption requirements vary according to their age and sex, in which case each individual is allocated an income which reflects his fair share of the total. This approach demands very detailed data on household composition at the level of the household unit. Where such data are unavailable, the alternative method is to take into account family size only. This method is less satisfactory and yet captures the most important differentiating characteristic of households, namely the fact that two households of identical incomes cannot be considered at the same level of material well-being if they have different numbers of household members. What one person can live on comfortably may represent starvation level for a household of eight.

Incorporating family size into the analysis is equivalent to allowing for family composition in the simplest way, since consumption needs of persons of different sexes and ages are assumed to be identical. Where family composition is known, the refinement can be made but it is not as essential as the first step of allowing for family size.

Other refinements can be made. One is to allow for economies of scale in consumption to allow for the notion that a household with two

members need not have twice the income of a single-individual household to attain the same level of material welfare. It would also be desirable to adjust for price differentials among the various regions under study if these are significant.

In this paper we shall consider the Thai case and in order to keep the analysis simple at this stage, we shall define a cut-off level of economic welfare in terms of household income per equivalent adult. The cut-off level so defined can be raised or lowered to see how sensitive the results are to it. Adjustments can be made for economies of scale in consumption when family-composition information is not available, and also for price variations across regions and over time as necessary.

Two sets of readily available data are the published volumes of the Household Expenditure Survey for 1962/3 and the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey. For 1968/9, data at the level of the individual household unit from tapes are used for a more detailed analysis. The reason for using the published tables is that only then do we have a common method for comparing the situations in 1962/3 and 1968/9. The somewhat crude method used can be checked for 1968/9, making use of the more detailed information on tapes.

3.2 Defining the Poor

In order to contrast the compositions and characteristics of poor and rich households at a single point in time on the one hand, and compare the income distributions at two different dates on the other,

households are separated by a cut-off level of income into two categories, poor and nonpoor. The cut-off level is defined in terms of total household income per equivalent adult and is adjusted for regional variations in prices, as well as increases in the price level in the case of comparisons over time. The comparison between 1962/3 and 1968/9 using published tabulations is based on money income adjusted for nonmoney income, and the orders of magnitude of the 1968/9 results are checked using the more detailed information on tape. For 1968/9 we also adjust for imputed rent to get a concept of total income which is used to construct a profile of the poor in Thailand.

We shall not attempt to derive a poverty income in this paper, although reference will be made to poverty incomes defined elsewhere. The purpose of defining a cut-off level of income is not so much to identify a subgroup of the population living below a specified standard, as to compare two, and later more, nonoverlapping groups of the population who are above and below the level and also to find a way of comparing the situations at two different dates. Our attitude is that it makes better sense to test the sensitivity of the results by considering several different levels instead of settling for just one which we can never be sure is the poverty level.

We shall first of all compare the characteristics of poor and nonpoor households using information from the data tapes of the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey. The cut-off level of income is initially chosen to be ฿1,500 of household total income per equivalent adult per year,

in 1962/3 prices.[11] Since between 1962/3 and 1968/9 the overall consumer price index rose by about 15%, the cut-off is equivalent to ฿1,725 in 1968/9. The concept of household total income includes nonmoney income, or own consumption, and also imputed rent in the case of homeowners. It is thus a reasonably suitable measure of the availability of goods and services to the household. The cut-off level is adjusted by region and for towns and villages to take into account regional variations in the price level. Bangkok-Thonburi is taken as the base region and the following set of regional consumer price indices is used.[12]

Regional Consumer Price Indices for Thailand, 1970

Region	Urban	Rural
North	101	101
Centre & East	96	99
Northeast	107	104
South	110	116
Bangkok-Thonburi	100	100

11/ This is lower than poverty standards for Thailand defined elsewhere. For example, Trairong Suwankiri has calculated that the minimum wage for a worker in Bangkok-Thonburi should be ฿27.88 per day in 1974, under the assumption that he works 317 days in a year and that he has to support two more people, in order to be able to meet minimum caloric and other requirements. This standard is equivalent to ฿2,946 per person per year in 1974 which is ฿1,723 in 1962/3 prices. In per-equivalent-adult terms the figure would be higher. See his article on the minimum wage and its economic impact in the Thammasat University Journal, Vol. 5, No. 1, June-September, 1975 (in Thai).

12/ See Oey Astra Meesook, "Regional Consumer Price Indices for Thailand, 1970", mimeographed, 1975.

This means that the cut-off income for 1968/9 is taken to be ฿1,725 for Bangkok-Thonburi, while for Southern towns it is taken to be 110% of this, or ฿1,897.50, on the grounds that this is the amount necessary to purchase a similar basket of commodities in towns in the more expensive South.

In order to determine whether each household in the sample of households interviewed for the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey should be classified as poor or not, the number of equivalent adults in it is first of all calculated. A child under five years of age is counted as .42 of an adult, while one who is five or more but under fifteen is considered .63 of an adult. Everyone who is at least fifteen is counted as an adult.[13/] If more information were available, one should be able to take into account a breakdown by sex as well as a more detailed one by age.[14/] In practice this does not make any significant difference to most qualitative results, and in fact the most important thing is to take care of family size, whereas the actual weights given to household members of different ages and sexes make much less difference.

After nonmoney income and imputed rent, in the case the household owns its home, have been added on to money income, total income per equivalent adult is calculated and compared with the cut-off income

---

13/ The scale is taken from Kleiman, E., "A Standardized Dependency Ratio", Demography, Vol. 4, No. 2, 1967, p. 878.

14/ However, the simple breakdown by age alone chosen here adequately captures the variations in consumption requirements of different individuals.

for the appropriate region and location. The procedure classifies the household under consideration as being either poor or nonpoor, given the standard defined. Thus the distribution of poor and nonpoor households, their characteristics and the proportions of various subgroups of all households which are poor can be determined.

The choice of a single cut-off level of income for the whole country, with the exception of allowance for regional price differences, is quite deliberate and is based on two things. First, in separating households into the poor and nonpoor categories, we want it to be indisputable that the poor are poor. Less concern is given to the nonpoor and the idea is accepted that they may be anything but rich. Second, we wish to apply essentially the same standard to the whole country. Granted that from the point of view of a university lecturer, say, there are a large number of 'poor' people in Bangkok, it is interesting to find that compared with a great many other people they are not so badly off after all. It all depends with whom we are comparing them. Here we are not concerned with a subjective evaluation of well-being. It may well be the case that some people living in rural areas classified here as poor are more 'satisfied with life' than residents of Bangkok who have been classified as nonpoor, since, for example, the former live among similarly poor neighbours, while the latter are reminded of their position in society by the affluence of others. What is attempted here is an evaluation of every household from the point of view of its material well-being, by using a common standard for all. The cut-off income is thus an absolute standard for the whole country, not one which will evaluate Bangkok-Thonburi residents differently from Northeasterners. If one did not do this, one would run the risk,

for instance, of applying different standards to urban and rural households. The outcome of this is that one ends up saying that households which are poorer than others should have a lower standard applied to them on account of their being poor. We wish to avoid saying that poor households do not deserve such a high standard as better-off ones, which is why the only adjustments allowed for are price differentials across regions.

3.3 The Poor of Thailand

In 1968/9 average household total income was ฿ 13,198 per year which was equivalent to ฿ 2,288 per capita per year. Tables 3.3.1a and 3.3.1b give details by region for towns and villages separately, while Table 3.3.1c gives their corresponding Gini coefficients.

The tables show clearly that in terms of household total income, towns in all regions are considerably better off than the national average. Villages in the North, South and Northeast are conspicuously below the national level, having average family incomes which are only 78%, 70% and 69% of the average for the whole kingdom respectively. For each region village incomes are seen to be more equally distributed than town incomes. The tables suggest that if poverty income were to be defined in terms of total income, then a large number of poor people should be found in the North, Northeast and South. However, they do not really tell us how these people are distributed among the regions even when we are given the population weights of the different regions and locations.

Table 3.3.1a

Average Household Total Income[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9

	North	Centre & East	North-east	South	Bangkok-Thonburi	Whole Kingdom	
Average Household Total Income (Baht/Year)							
Towns	23,182	26,216	29,161	26,172	33,800	29,403	13,198
Villages	10,331	15,699	9,079	9,244	24,290	11,214	
Household Total Income per Person (Baht/Year)							
Towns	4,630	4,751	4,641	4,698	5,403	5,026	2,288
Villages	1,836	2,807	1,484	1,749	3,774	1,947	

Table 3.3.1b

Average Household Total Income Relative to the Whole Kingdom Average

Average Household Total Income (%)							
Towns	176	199	221	198	256	223	100
Villages	78	119	69	70	184	85	
Household Total Income per Person (%)							
Towns	202	208	203	205	236	220	100
Villages	80	123	65	76	165	85	

Table 3.3.1c

Gini Coefficients of Household Total Income

Towns	.4404	.3996	.4495	.4501	.4085	.4290	.4289
Villages	.3450	.3917	.3473	.3249	.3928	.3813	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

[a] Household total income includes money income, own consumption and imputed rent to home owners.

Table 3.3.2 gives a distribution of poor households, defined as those households with total income per equivalent adult under ฿ 1,500 per year, by location and region. The distributions for nonpoor families and for all families are given for comparison. For purposes of comparisons over time, the cut-off income is given in 1962/3 prices, so that its value in 1968/9 terms is actually ฿ 1,725. The cut-off level has been adjusted to take into account regional variations in prices.

The first column tells us where the poor households were to be found in 1968/9. The Northeast contained 48% and the North 27% of the country's poor families. Since the Northeast accounted for only 31% of all households, it had a much larger share of the poor relative to its size. The Centre and East, on the other hand, had a share of 22% of all households but only 9% of poor households. While 11% of Thailand's families lived in towns, only 1% of all poor families were found there in 1968/9; villages accounted for nearly all the poor households. It should be pointed out, however, that we are likely to have underestimated the number of poor households in Bangkok-Thonburi, where the poorest people live in slums. Many slum dwellers do not officially exist and their dwellings are not registered, thus they cannot get included in a sample survey such as this. This means that the proportion of poor households in towns as a whole is underestimated, and the distribution of the poor by region is distorted.

Although the type of information given in Tables 3.3.1a, b and c would have led one to expect a concentration of poor people in villages rather than in towns, and in the Northeast and North, the actual distri-

Table 3.3.2

Percentage Distributions of Poor, Nonpoor and All Households, by Location and Region, 1968/9

(Poor = Household total income/equivalent adult[a] < ฿ 1,725 per year)

Region	Poor Households	Nonpoor Households	All Households
North:	27.41	29.13	28.44
Towns	0.25	2.68	1.70
Villages	27.16	26.45	26.74
Centre & East:	9.01	30.01	21.58
Towns	0.15	2.80	1.74
Villages	8.86	27.21	19.84
Northeast:	48.26	19.95	31.32
Towns	0.15	1.74	1.10
Villages	48.11	18.21	30.22
South:	14.90	10.51	12.26
Towns	0.29	2.34	1.52
Villages	14.61	8.17	10.74
Bangkok-Thonburi:	0.42	10.39	6.38
Towns	0.20	7.96	4.84
Villages	0.22	2.43	1.54
Whole Kingdom:	100.00	100.00	100.00
Towns	1.05	17.52	10.90
Villages	98.95	82.48	89.10

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income and imputed rent. For comparability with the 1962/3 results the cut-off level of income has been adjusted for price increases over time. Regional variations in the price level have been taken into account.

bution of the poor is dependent not only on average household incomes per capita, but also on the distribution of households by income class in conjunction with family size and composition. What table 3.3.2 indicates quite clearly is that certain regions have higher than average representation in the poor group.

Using our cut-off income which classifies a household as poor if total income per equivalent adult is less than ฿ 1,500 per year, we can determine variations in the incidence of poverty, the percentage of poor families, of different groups of the population. Table 3.3.3 presents figures broken down by region, various characteristics of the household head and also of the household.

By this definition of poverty, 40% of all households have incomes below the poverty standard. But whereas 45% of all village households are poor, under 4% of town households are. By region, the Northeast, North and South are the poor areas, with 62%, 39% and 49% of households in poverty respectively. These regions contrast with the Centre and East with an incidence of poverty of 17% and Bangkok-Thonburi with just over 3%.

Somewhat surprisingly, households headed by females are less likely to be poor than those headed by males.[15/] Married or widowed people are more likely to be heads of poor households than people who are single, divorced or separated. The incidence of poverty rises with the age of the head of household, reaching a peak in the 30-39 age group, after which

---

15/ In 1968/9, 15% of all households in the sample were headed by females. The social situation is such that these were not likely to be single-person families.

Table 3.3.3

Incidence of Poor Families by Different Characteristics, 1968/9

(Poor = Household total income/equivalent adult < ฿ 1,725 per year)
(in per cent)

		Towns	Villages	Total
Region:	North	5.88	40.80	38.70
	Centre & East	3.52	17.93	16.77
	Northeast	5.55	63.94	61.88
	South	7.75	54.54	48.76
	Bangkok-Thonburi	1.68	5.77	2.67
Sex of Head:	Male	4.00	44.88	40.84
	Female	3.42	42.95	36.41
Marital Status of Head:	Single	1.20	29.47	20.19
	Married	4.35	45.40	41.20
	Widowed	3.70	44.29	41.17
	Divorced or Separated	2.20	36.49	30.60
Age of Head:	under 20	2.61	36.23	23.04
	20-29	2.52	39.98	34.70
	30-39	3.62	48.93	43.59
	40-49	5.40	45.17	40.51
	50-59	3.56	41.00	37.34
	60 and over	2.84	43.88	40.84
Education of Head:	None	5.54	46.61	43.26
	P1-MS2	4.52	45.67	41.96
	MS3-MS4	0.87	3.80	2.44
	MS5 or higher	0.96	3.33	2.20
Sector of Occupation of Head:	Agriculture	13.74	50.97	50.53
	Nonagriculture	3.07	24.68	17.80
No. of Members:	1	0.0	7.46	5.99
	2	0.70	19.01	15.92
	3	1.75	31.83	28.68
	4	1.91	39.44	35.89
	5	2.88	41.11	37.50
	6	2.45	49.14	44.83
	7	5.43	51.21	46.86
	8 or more	7.44	58.43	51.80
No. of Children Under 15:	0	1.16	30.98	26.24
	1	1.79	35.65	32.18
	2	1.48	39.18	35.67
	3	5.61	50.42	45.65
	4	5.11	51.76	47.28
	5 or more	9.82	60.58	55.33
No. of Earners:	1	4.73	47.42	44.18
	2	4.04	40.12	35.04
	3	1.78	37.54	30.83
	4	2.46	38.47	28.20
	5 or more	1.14	37.62	25.00
Total		3.87	44.61	40.17

Source: Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method: See text.

it declines steadily. This very likely reflects the fact that young families have less of a burden in terms of children, whereas family size increases for a while with the age of the household head. The rising incidence of poverty means that the rise in family income does not keep up with the rise in family size. Once the children get older they become less of a burden on the household. They may make a contribution to total family income and later may move out altogether to set up their own households. As would be expected, households whose heads have had more formal education tend to have a smaller percentage in the poor group than those whose heads are not so well educated.

The incidence of poverty increases directly with household size and with the number of children. Large households are associated with larger numbers of children as well as older people. Whereas only 6% and 16% of households with one and two persons respectively are poor, over 40% of large households with six members or more are. The large percentage of poor families out of those with many children is disturbing since it means that there is more pressure on the children to work as early as possible in order to assist the family. These children therefore have less opportunity to continue in school which means that they are more likely in the future to head poor families than if they had had more education.

The percentage of poor households declines as the number of income earners rises, indicating how the ability to earn income on the whole helps the relative position of the household.[16/] Households with a

16/ One serious defect of the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey for our purposes here is that the sampling of households was done not only on the basis of region and town/village location, but also of the occupation of the head. Households whose heads were unemployed thus became excluded automatically. This means that some of the poorest households have been left out of the analysis, since the incidence of poor families in households in which the head does not work can be expected to be higher than that in the sample actually collected.

larger number of earners have higher incomes per equivalent adult, even though a larger number of earners may be associated with a larger family size and hence a larger number of children.

Table 3.3.4 may be called a poverty profile for Thailand. It gives a distribution of poor households, those with total household incomes under ฿ 1,500 per equivalent adult per year, by geographical area, and various household characteristics. The distribution may be compared with that for all households. The subgroups of households with more than their fair shares of poor households coincide with those in which the incidences of poverty are higher than the whole-kingdom average.

Table 3.3.5 gives a comparison of poor and nonpoor families, again using total income per equivalent adult to define poverty. It can be seen that, for any given region and location, poor households are larger in size than nonpoor ones. They also have a larger number of children but a smaller number of income earners. It should be noted, however, that as well as having a larger number of children than nonpoor families, poor families are likely to have a larger number of older people who are unable to work. Moreover, in the agricultural sector there are many unpaid family workers who are not counted as income earners. If we take all these things into account, the proportion of workers, as opposed to earners, in the 15-64 age group, may well be higher for poor than non-poor families.

It is interesting to define an even more stringent cut-off income level than what we have used up till now. It can then be seen how sensitive the qualitative conclusions already stated are to the choice of the

Table 3.3.4

Distribution of Poor, Nonpoor and All Households, 1968/9

(Poor = Household total income/equivalent adult[a] < ฿ 1,725 per year)

		Poor Households	Nonpoor Households	All Households
Location :	Towns	1.05	17.52	10.90
	Villages	98.95	82.48	89.10
Region :	North	27.41	29.13	28.44
	Centre & East	9.01	30.01	21.58
	Northeast	48.26	19.96	31.32
	South	14.90	10.51	12.27
	Bangkok-Thonburi	0.42	10.39	6.39
Sex of Head :	Male	86.16	83.78	84.74
	Female	13.84	16.22	15.26
Marital Status of Head :	Single	1.70	4.51	3.38
	Married	83.52	79.99	81.41
	Widowed	12.40	11.90	12.10
	Divorced or separated	2.39	3.60	3.11
Age of Head :	Under 20	0.17	0.38	0.30
	20 - 29	8.57	10.83	9.93
	30 - 39	29.43	25.56	27.12
	40 - 49	26.23	25.86	26.00
	50 - 59	17.89	20.15	19.24
	60 and over	17.71	17.22	17.42
Education of Head :	None	25.89	22.79	24.03
	P1 - MS2	73.80	68.52	70.64
	MS3 - MS4	0.13	4.76	2.90
	MS5 or higher	0.18	3.93	2.43
Sector of Occupation of Head :	Agriculture	85.97	56.50	68.34
	Nonagriculture	14.03	43.50	31.66
No. of Members :	1	0.28	2.90	1.85
	2	1.96	6.93	4.93
	3	8.38	13.98	11.73
	4	12.46	14.94	13.94
	5	15.30	17.11	16.38
	6	17.79	14.70	15.94
	7	15.01	11.42	12.86
	8 or more	28.83	18.00	22.36
No. of Children under 15 :	0	9.86	18.60	15.09
	1	15.12	21.39	18.87
	2	16.95	20.52	19.09
	3	18.59	14.86	16.36
	4	15.71	11.76	13.34
	5 or more	23.77	12.89	17.26
No. of Earners :	1	68.20	57.83	62.00
	2	24.09	29.98	27.62
	3	5.71	8.60	7.44
	4	1.44	2.46	2.05
	5 or more	0.55	1.11	0.89

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income and imputed rent. For comparability with the 1962/3 results the cut-off level of income has been adjusted for price increases over time. Regional variations in the price level have been taken into account.

Table 3.3.5

A Comparison of Poor and Nonpoor Households, 1968/9

(Poor = Household total income/equivalent adult < ฿ 1,725 per year)

	Average Household Size	Average Number of Children	Average Number of Earners	Income of Household Head	Total Household Income
Poor Households	6.34	3.02	1.42	2,674	6,315
Towns:	7.47	3.69	1.63	4,971	8,234
North	7.07	3.38	1.59	3,546	7,295
Centre & East	6.95	3.37	1.21	7,101	8,296
Northeast	8.33	4.24	1.83	3,993	8,509
South	7.46	3.79	1.69	5,211	8,880
Bangkok-Thonburi	7.70	3.75	1.73	5,511	8,201
Villages:	6.33	3.01	1.42	2,650	6,295
North	6.25	3.08	1.61	2,979	5,937
Centre & East	6.42	3.04	1.64	3,772	7,024
Northeast	6.55	3.15	1.28	1,971	6,351
South	5.66	2.43	1.38	3,557	6,313
Bangkok-Thonburi	7.25	3.90	1.14	4,975	7,641
Nonpoor Households	5.39	2.27	1.60	11,149	17,813
Towns:	5.79	2.34	1.92	19,589	30,260
North	4.88	1.85	1.68	16,975	24,185
Centre & East	5.47	2.30	1.72	17,704	26,891
Northeast	6.16	2.72	1.96	17,405	30,374
South	5.41	2.14	1.83	18,485	27,623
Bangkok-Thonburi	6.23	2.49	2.10	21,935	34,240
Villages:	5.30	2.26	1.53	9,356	15,169
North	5.20	2.21	1.55	8,228	13,348
Centre & East	5.42	2.26	1.54	11,664	17,597
Northeast	5.35	2.36	1.46	7,316	13,915
South	4.83	1.98	1.44	7,975	12,761
Bangkok-Thonburi	6.39	2.85	1.92	15,717	25,308
All Towns	5.85	2.39	1.91	19,024	29,408
All Villages	5.76	2.59	1.48	6,365	11,211
Grand Total	5.77	2.57	1.53	7,745	13,195

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

cut-off income. Using ฿ 1,000 per equivalent adult to separate out the very poor from the rest of the households, table 3.3.6 shows that 16% of all households are below this cut-off level of income.[17/] The tendencies cited earlier, for example that the incidence of poverty increases with family size and the number of children, and decreases with the number of earners and the level of educational attainment of the head, can also be observed when this lower cut-off income is used. Table 3.3.7 which gives the distribution by various household characteristics of poor and nonpoor households shows how the population groups which can be considered poor tend also to have a greater share of the very poor. By region, for example, 48% of all households with income per equivalent adult under ฿ 1,500 per year are in the Northeast, but the percentage is 51% if the cut-off is set at ฿ 1,000, in 1962/3 prices. Similarly, the proportion of agricultural households in the poor group goes up from 86% to 90% when the lower cut-off standard is employed. So the choice of a lower cut-off level sharpens the analysis, but does not alter it, in terms of identifying the characteristics of poor households in comparison with nonpoor ones, thus providing a justification for favouring a low cut-off income. In other words, even if for policy purposes we may wish to define a higher cut-off level, based on whatever criterion, a low cut-off standard is more appropriate for the type of comparison being made here.

17/ This cut-off income is the one specified in the 1975 World Bank report entitled "The Assault on World Poverty" as that which will be used to identify the target group of the bank's agricultural and rural development projects to help the world's poorest people.

Table 3.3.6

Incidence of Poor Families by Different Characteristics, 1968/9

(Poor = Household total income/equivalent adult[a] < ฿ 1,150 per year)

(in per cent)

		Towns	Villages	Total
Region :	North	1.13	16.80	15.86
	Centre & East	0.22	3.74	3.46
	Northeast	3.05	26.92	26.08
	South	1.20	24.12	21.29
	Bangkok-Thonburi	0.56	1.11	0.69
Sex of Head :	Male	1.02	18.09	16.40
	Female	0.66	17.04	14.33
Marital Status of Head :	Single	0.23	9.67	6.57
	Married	1.04	18.36	16.59
	Widowed	1.21	18.35	17.03
	Divorced or separated	0.21	11.59	9.64
Age of Head :	Under 20	0.97	11.94	8.20
	20 - 29	0.08	17.14	14.80
	30 - 39	0.68	20.73	18.36
	40 - 49	1.94	17.20	15.41
	50 - 59	0.68	16.51	14.97
	60 and over	0.42	16.85	15.64
Education of Head :	None	1.27	18.27	16.88
	P1 - MS2	1.07	18.53	16.96
	MS3 - MS4	0.22	1.70	1.00
	MS5 or higher	0.40	0.98	0.77
Sector of Occupation of Head :	Agriculture	6.09	21.26	21.08
	Nonagriculture	0.52	7.55	5.31
No. of Members :	1	0.0	1.96	1.57
	2	0.0	7.17	5.96
	3	0.68	7.47	6.76
	4	0.23	14.38	13.05
	5	0.52	15.64	14.21
	6	0.65	21.94	19.98
	7	0.52	19.90	18.06
	8 or more	2.16	26.96	23.77
No. of Children under 15 :	0	0.50	11.57	9.81
	1	0.58	11.52	10.40
	2	0.30	15.39	13.98
	3	0.55	19.15	17.17
	4	1.63	26.91	24.48
	5 or more	2.50	24.86	22.58
No. of Earners :	1	0.78	19.05	17.66
	2	1.50	15.61	13.62
	3	0.07	17.30	14.07
	4	0.99	13.70	10.08
	5 or more	0.0	26.53	17.44
	Total	0.93	17.95	16.09

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income and imputed rent. For comparability with the 1962/3 results the cut-off level of income has been adjusted for price increases over time. Regional variations in the price level have been taken into account.

Table 3.3.7

Distribution of Poor, Nonpoor and All Households, 1968/9

(Poor = Household total income/equivalent adult[a] < ฿ 1,150 per year)

		Poor Households	Nonpoor Households	All Households
Location :	Towns	0.63	12.88	10.91
	Villages	99.37	87.12	89.09
Region :	North	28.05	28.51	28.44
	Centre & East	4.64	24.82	21.58
	Northeast	50.79	27.59	31.32
	South	16.25	11.51	12.27
	Bangkok-Thonburi	0.27	7.56	6.39
Sex of Head :	Male	86.40	84.42	84.73
	Female	13.60	15.58	15.27
Marital Status of Head :	Single	1.38	3.76	3.38
	Married	83.94	80.92	81.40
	Widowed	12.82	11.97	12.10
	Divorced or separated	1.86	3.35	3.12
Age of Head :	Under 20	0.15	0.33	0.30
	20 - 29	9.13	10.08	9.93
	30 - 39	30.96	26.38	27.12
	40 - 49	24.92	26.21	26.00
	50 - 59	17.90	19.50	19.24
	60 and over	16.93	17.51	17.42
Education of Head :	None	25.23	23.81	24.04
	P1 - MS2	74.47	69.90	70.64
	MS3 - MS4	0.18	3.42	2.90
	MS5 or higher	0.11	2.87	2.43
Sector of Occupation of Head :	Agriculture	89.55	64.27	68.33
	Nonagriculture	10.45	35.73	31.67
No. of Members :	1	0.18	2.17	1.85
	2	1.83	5.53	4.93
	3	4.93	13.04	11.73
	4	11.31	14.45	13.94
	5	14.47	16.75	16.38
	6	19.80	15.20	15.94
	7	14.44	12.56	12.86
	8 or more	33.03	20.31	22.36
No. of Children under 15 :	0	9.21	16.21	15.09
	1	12.20	20.15	18.87
	2	16.59	19.56	19.09
	3	17.46	16.14	16.36
	4	20.31	12.01	13.34
	5 or more	24.23	15.92	17.26
No. of Earners :	1	68.09	60.83	62.00
	2	23.39	28.43	27.62
	3	6.51	7.62	7.44
	4	1.29	2.20	2.05
	5 or more	0.72	0.92	0.89

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income and imputed rent. For comparability with the 1962/3 results the cut-off level of income has been adjusted for price increases over time. Regional variations in the price level have been taken into account.

Table 3.3.8

A Comparison of Poor and Nonpoor Households, 1968/9

(Poor = Household total income/equivalent adult< ฿ 1,150 per year)

	Average Household Size	Average Number of Children	Average Number of Earners	Income of Household Head	Total Household Income
Poor Households	6.55	3.14	1.43	1,864	4,877
Towns:	7.77	3.51	1.77	2,513	5,764
North	9.23	1.56	2.51	2,143	6,698
Centre & East	5.58	2.94	1.29	2,832	4,309
Northeast	8.40	4.65	1.86	2,393	6,546
South	7.75	4.36	1.62	3,103	6,292
Bangkok-Thonburi	6.27	2.98	1.28	2,483	3,968
Villages:	6.54	3.14	1.43	1,860	4,872
North	6.37	3.10	1.77	2,078	4,460
Centre & East	6.93	3.40	1.65	2,450	4,972
Northeast	6.85	3.32	1.24	1,414	5,079
South	5.76	2.54	1.38	2,705	4,909
Bangkok-Thonburi	7.63	4.82	1.15	2,694	4,412
Nonpoor Households	5.62	2.46	1.54	8,872	14,789
Towns:	5.83	2.38	1.91	19,180	29,631
North	4.96	1.94	1.67	16,345	23,379
Centre & East	5.52	2.34	1.70	17,362	26,285
Northeast	6.22	2.75	1.95	17,110	29,873
South	5.54	2.24	1.82	17,631	26,413
Bangkok-Thonburi	6.26	2.51	2.10	21,766	33,968
Villages:	5.59	2.47	1.49	7,349	12,596
North	5.48	2.46	1.54	6,896	11,509
Centre & East	5.55	2.36	1.55	10,552	16,118
Northeast	5.85	2.69	1.38	4,814	10,551
South	5.13	2.12	1.42	6,475	10,622
Bangkok-Thonburi	6.42	2.89	1.88	15,237	24,512
All Towns	5.85	2.39	1.91	19,024	29,408
All Villages	5.76	2.59	1.48	6,365	11,210
Grand Total	5.77	2.57	1.53	7,745	13,195

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

3.4 Shifting the Cut-off Income

In the previous section we have already considered the effect of shifting the cut-off income from ฿ 1,725 per equivalent adult per year down to ฿ 1,150 (฿ 1,500 and ฿ 1,000 in 1962/3 prices respectively). By shifting the cut-off level both up and down from our original definition of ฿ 1,725 we get a cross-sectional view of the entire population in terms of where along the spectrum of well-being various groups of the population are found.

Tables 3.4.1a, 3.4.1b and 3.4.1c present the incidences of families with incomes per equivalent adult per year under ฿ 1,000, ฿ 1,500, ฿ 2,000 and ฿ 2,500, in 1962/3 prices, for towns, villages and both locations combined. Now in 1968/9 the average household income per person was ฿ 2,288 per year, while average household income per equivalent adult was about ฿ 2,800 per year. Shifting our cut-off income up to ฿ 2,500 per equivalent adult per year, we catch most of the households with incomes per equivalent adult below the national average. These consisted of 21% of all town households, 74% of all village households, or 69% of all households. In fact in terms of the total population, the percentages living at a standard below the cut-off level of ฿ 2,500 a year, in 1962/3 prices, were 24%, 76% and 71% for towns, villages and both locations combined.

All the qualitative conclusions reached in the last section are seen to hold up when different cut-off standards are used. This supports our earlier contention that, for purposes of identifying the characteristics of poor and nonpoor households, the exact choice of the cut-off level

Table 3.4.1a

Incidence of Families below Different Cut-off Levels of Household Income per Equivalent Adult and by Various Household Characteristics, 1968/9

Towns (In 1962/3 prices)		Under ฿1,000	Under ฿1,500	Under ฿2,000	Under ฿2,500
Region:	North	1.13	5.88	15.87	28.19
	Centre & East	0.22	3.52	9.20	17.13
	Northeast	3.05	5.55	17.88	34.30
	South	1.20	7.75	20.34	31.38
	Bangkok-Thonburi	0.56	1.68	6.55	13.02
Sex of Head:	Male	1.02	4.00	11.79	21.48
	Female	0.66	3.42	10.49	18.34
Marital Status of Head:	Single	0.23	1.20	7.93	13.08
	Married	1.04	4.35	12.13	22.20
	Widowed	1.21	3.70	12.92	21.47
	Divorced or Separated	0.21	2.20	6.53	12.77
Age of Head:	under 20	0.97	2.61	12.94	31.17
	20-29	0.08	2.52	7.21	13.46
	30-39	0.68	3.62	10.39	18.58
	40-49	1.94	5.40	14.83	25.00
	50-59	0.68	3.56	9.44	19.38
	60 and over	0.42	2.84	13.39	24.13
Education of Head:	None	1.27	5.54	17.36	28.40
	P1-MS2	1.07	4.52	13.10	24.38
	MS3-MS4	0.22	0.87	4.62	9.67
	MS5 or higher	0.40	0.96	1.16	2.14
Sector of Occupation of Head:	Agriculture	6.09	13.74	26.66	46.28
	Nonagriculture	0.52	3.07	10.27	18.69
No. of Members:	1	0.0	0.0	4.83	5.23
	2	0.0	0.70	5.18	9.71
	3	0.68	1.75	5.74	12.16
	4	0.23	1.91	4.61	11.39
	5	0.52	2.88	8.88	18.88
	6	0.65	2.45	11.88	19.41
	7	0.52	5.43	14.69	24.59
	8 or more	2.16	7.44	19.36	33.35
No. of Children Under 15:	0	0.50	1.16	5.53	9.80
	1	0.58	1.79	5.03	11.05
	2	0.30	1.48	8.25	15.92
	3	0.55	5.61	13.06	25.48
	4	1.63	5.11	13.84	26.62
	5 or more	2.50	9.82	26.67	42.26
No. of Earners:	1	0.78	4.73	12.91	22.87
	2	1.50	4.04	11.56	20.88
	3	0.07	1.78	8.34	16.66
	4	0.99	2.46	10.66	17.93
	5 or more	0.0	1.14	5.75	11.91
Total		0.93	3.87	11.49	20.75

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

Table 3.4.1b

Incidence of Families below Different Cut-off Levels of Household Income per Equivalent Adult and by Various Household Characteristics, 1968/9

Villages (In 1962/3 prices)		Under ฿1,000	Under ฿1,500	Under ฿2,000	Under ฿2,500
Region:	North	16.80	40.80	61.67	75.34
	Centre & East	3.74	17.93	35.50	51.92
	Northeast	26.92	63.94	80.08	86.85
	South	24.12	54.54	75.34	84.69
	Bangkok-Thonburi	1.11	5.77	14.30	31.18
Sex of Head:	Male	18.09	44.88	63.49	74.83
	Female	17.04	42.95	59.44	71.71
Marital Status of Head:	Single	9.67	29.47	44.02	59.42
	Married	18.36	45.40	64.50	75.80
	Widowed	18.35	44.29	58.26	70.16
	Divorced or Separated	11.59	36.49	54.69	65.60
Age of Head:	under 20	11.94	36.23	53.05	58.71
	20-29	17.14	39.98	59.02	68.57
	30-39	20.73	48.93	67.86	76.63
	40-49	17.20	45.17	63.57	76.16
	50-59	16.51	41.00	59.50	73.02
	60 and over	16.85	43.88	60.49	73.31
Education of Head:	None	18.27	46.61	66.85	79.64
	P1-MS2	18.53	45.67	63.86	75.05
	MS3-MS4	1.70	3.80	9.90	18.98
	MS5 or higher	0.98	3.33	8.33	11.70
Sector of Occupation of Head:	Agriculture	21.26	50.97	70.05	80.58
	Nonagriculture	7.55	24.68	40.58	55.03
No. of Members:	1	1.96	7.46	13.79	29.44
	2	7.17	19.01	35.55	56.79
	3	7.47	31.83	53.02	65.14
	4	14.38	39.44	59.59	74.11
	5	15.64	41.11	59.64	71.02
	6	21.94	49.14	68.58	77.39
	7	19.90	51.21	69.33	81.03
	8 or more	26.96	58.43	74.43	83.12
No. of Children Under 15:	0	11.57	30.98	45.77	61.10
	1	11.52	35.65	55.39	68.11
	2	15.39	39.18	58.20	71.40
	3	19.15	50.42	69.28	79.95
	4	26.91	51.76	71.43	80.31
	5 or more	24.86	60.58	77.82	85.67
No. or Earners:	1	19.05	47.42	65.69	76.25
	2	15.61	40.12	57.74	70.80
	3	17.30	37.54	57.92	70.66
	4	13.70	38.47	65.72	79.31
	5 or more	26.53	37.62	43.54	62.53
Total		17.95	44.61	62.91	74.38

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

Table 3.4.1c

Incidence of Families below Different Cut-off Levels of Household Income per Equivalent Adult and by Various Household Characteristics, 1968/9

Total (In 1962/3 prices)		Under ฿1,000	Under ฿1,500	Under ฿2,000	Under ฿2,500
Region:	North	15.86	38.70	58.93	72.52
	Centre & East	3.46	16.77	33.38	49.12
	Northeast	26.08	61.88	77.89	85.00
	South	21.29	48.76	68.54	78.10
	Bangkok-Thonburi	0.69	2.67	8.42	17.41
Sex of Head:	Male	16.40	40.84	58.38	69.56
	Female	14.33	36.41	51.35	62.89
Marital Status of Head:	Single	6.57	20.19	32.17	44.20
	Married	16.59	41.20	59.14	70.32
	Widowed	17.03	41.17	54.76	66.41
	Divorced or Separated	9.64	30.60	46.42	56.53
Age of Head:	under 20	8.20	23.04	39.84	50.74
	20-29	14.80	34.70	51.81	60.85
	30-39	18.36	43.59	61.09	69.80
	40-49	15.41	40.51	57.86	70.17
	50-59	14.97	37.34	54.61	67.78
	60 and over	15.64	40.84	57.01	69.67
Education of Head:	None	16.88	43.26	62.82	75.47
	P1-MS2	16.96	41.96	59.28	70.48
	MS3-MS4	1.00	2.44	7.40	15.10
	MS5 or higher	0.77	2.20	4.94	7.10
Sector of Occupation of Head:	Agriculture	21.08	50.53	69.54	80.17
	Nonagriculture	5.31	17.80	30.92	43.45
No. of Members:	1	1.57	5.99	12.02	24.66
	2	5.96	15.92	30.42	48.83
	3	6.76	28.68	48.06	59.59
	4	13.05	35.89	54.40	68.18
	5	14.21	37.50	54.85	66.10
	6	19.98	44.83	63.34	72.03
	7	18.06	46.86	64.14	75.67
	8 or more	23.77	51.80	67.23	76.64
No. of Children Under 15:	0	9.81	26.24	39.37	52.94
	1	10.40	32.18	50.24	62.26
	2	13.98	35.67	53.55	66.24
	3	17.17	45.65	63.29	74.15
	4	24.48	47.28	65.90	75.15
	5 or more	22.58	55.33	72.57	81.17
No. of Earners:	1	17.66	44.18	61.69	72.20
	2	13.62	35.04	51.23	63.77
	3	14.07	30.83	48.62	60.53
	4	10.08	28.20	50.02	61.80
	5 or more	17.44	25.00	30.31	44.24
Total		16.09	40.17	57.30	68.54

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

of income is not very important, even though the compositions of the two groups do change as the cut-off income is shifted up and down within the range below the average, say. It is important to realize that, even though we can give a qualitative description of the poor group by using any one of many cut-off standards, government efforts to help the poor will be directed to different population groups by varying degrees, depending on the actual definition of the cut-off level of income used.

Tables 3.4.2a, 3.4.2b and 3.4.2c give the incidence of families by different income-per-equivalent-adult classes. In effect, these tables give the income distributions of households by various household characteristics as well as by town/village location, where income distribution refers to household income per equivalent adult, not household income. The income figures here, as before , have been adjusted for nonmoney income and imputed rent, and for regional price variations so that regional comparisons are valid. From these tables we have a convincing description of the differences between poor and nonpoor households. For example, for the Northeast, 26% of all households have incomes per equivalent adult under ฿ 1,000 per year whereas for Bangkok-Thonburi the figure is under 1% . At the same time 15% of Northeastern households compared with 83% of Bangkok-Thonburi households are above the ฿ 2,500 cut-off level. In the agricultural sector, 21% and 20% of households are below the ฿ 1,000 and above the ฿ 2,500 cut-off level, whereas in nonagriculture only 5% are below the lower cut-off level and 57% are above the higher level.

The "income distributions" presented in Tables3.4.2a, 3.4.2b and 3.4.2c in terms of household income per equivalent adult, instead of

Table 3.4.2a

Incidence of Families by Different Classes of Household Income per Equivalent Adult and by Various Household Characteristics, 1968/9

Towns (In 1962/3 prices)		Under ฿1,000	฿1,000-1,500	฿1,500-2,000	฿2,000-2,500	฿2,500 or more
Region:	North	1.13	4.75	9.99	12.32	71.81
	Centre & East	0.22	3.30	5.68	7.93	82.87
	Northeast	3.05	2.50	12.33	16.42	65.70
	South	1.20	6.55	12.59	11.04	68.62
	Bangkok-Thonburi	0.56	1.12	4.87	6.47	86.98
Sex of Head:	Male	1.02	2.98	7.79	9.69	78.52
	Female	0.66	2.76	7.07	7.85	81.66
Marital Status of Head:	Single	0.23	0.97	6.73	5.15	86.92
	Married	1.04	3.31	7.78	10.07	77.80
	Widowed	1.21	2.49	9.22	8.55	78.53
	Divorced or Separated	0.21	1.99	4.33	6.24	87.23
Age of Head:	under 20	0.97	1.64	10.33	18.23	68.83
	20-29	0.08	2.44	4.69	6.25	86.54
	30-39	0.68	2.94	6.77	8.19	81.42
	40-49	1.94	3.46	9.43	10.17	75.00
	50-59	0.68	2.88	5.88	9.94	80.62
	60 and over	0.42	2.42	10.55	10.74	75.87
Education of Head:	None	1.27	4.27	11.82	11.04	71.60
	P1-MS2	1.07	3.45	5.58	11.28	75.62
	MS3-MS4	0.22	0.65	3.75	5.05	90.33
	MS5 or higher	0.40	0.56	.20	.98	97.86
Sector of Occupation of Head:	Agriculture	6.09	7.65	12.92	19.62	53.72
	Nonagriculture	0.52	2.55	7.20	8.42	81.31
No. of Members:	1	0.0	0.0	4.83	0.40	94.77
	2	0.0	0.70	4.48	4.53	90.29
	3	0.68	1.07	3.99	6.42	87.84
	4	0.23	1.68	2.70	6.78	88.61
	5	0.52	2.36	6.00	10.00	81.12
	6	0.65	1.80	9.43	7.53	80.59
	7	0.52	4.91	9.26	9.90	75.41
	8 or more	2.16	5.28	11.92	13.99	66.65
No. of Children Under 15:	0	0.50	0.66	4.37	4.27	90.20
	1	0.58	1.21	3.24	6.02	88.95
	2	0.30	1.18	6.77	7.67	84.08
	3	0.55	5.06	7.45	12.42	74.52
	4	1.63	3.48	8.73	12.78	73.38
	5 or more	2.50	7.32	16.85	15.59	57.74
No. of Earners:	1	0.78	3.95	8.18	9.96	77.13
	2	1.50	2.54	7.52	9.32	79.12
	3	0.07	1.71	6.56	8.32	83.34
	4	0.99	1.47	8.20	7.27	82.07
	5 or more	0.0	1.52	4.61	6.16	87.71
Total		0.93	2.94	7.62	9.26	79.25

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

Table 3.4.2b

Incidence of Families by Different Classes of Household Income per Equivalent Adult and by Various Household Characteristics, 1968/9

Villages (In 1962/3 prices)		Under ฿1,000	฿1,000-1,500	฿1,500-2,000	฿2,000-2,500	฿2,500 or more
Region:	North	16.80	24.00	20.87	13.67	24.66
	Centre & East	3.74	14.19	17.57	16.42	48.08
	Northeast	26.92	37.02	16.14	6.77	13.15
	South	24.12	30.42	20.80	9.35	15.31
	Bangkok-Thonburi	1.11	4.66	8.53	16.88	68.82
Sex of Head:	Male	18.09	26.79	18.61	11.34	25.17
	Female	17.04	25.91	16.49	12.27	28.29
Marital Status of Head:	Single	9.67	19.80	14.55	15.40	40.58
	Married	18.36	27.04	19.10	11.30	24.20
	Widowed	18.35	25.94	13.97	11.90	29.84
	Divorced or Separated	11.59	24.90	18.20	10.91	34.40
Age of Head:	under 20	11.94	24.29	16.82	5.66	41.29
	20-29	17.14	22.84	19.04	9.55	31.43
	30-39	20.73	28.20	18.93	8.77	23.37
	40-49	17.20	27.97	18.40	12.59	23.84
	50-59	16.51	24.49	18.50	13.52	26.98
	60 and over	16.85	27.03	16.61	12.82	26.69
Education of Head:	None	18.27	28.34	20.24	12.79	20.36
	P1-MS2	18.53	27.14	18.19	11.19	24.95
	MS3-MS4	1.70	2.10	6.10	9.08	81.02
	MS5 or higher	.98	2.35	5.00	3.37	88.30
Sector of Occupation of Head:	Agriculture	21.26	29.71	19.08	10.53	19.42
	Nonagriculture	7.55	17.13	15.90	14.45	44.94
No. of Members:	1	1.96	5.50	6.33	15.65	70.56
	2	7.17	11.84	16.54	21.24	43.21
	3	7.47	24.36	21.19	12.12	34.86
	4	14.38	25.06	20.15	14.52	25.89
	5	15.64	25.47	18.53	11.38	28.98
	6	21.94	27.20	19.44	8.81	22.61
	7	19.90	31.31	18.12	11.70	18.97
	8 or more	26.96	31.47	16.00	8.69	16.88
No. of Children Under 15:	0	11.57	19.41	14.79	15.33	38.90
	1	11.52	24.13	19.74	12.72	31.89
	2	15.39	23.79	19.02	13.20	28.60
	3	19.15	31.27	18.86	10.67	20.05
	4	26.91	24.85	19.67	8.88	19.69
	5 or more	24.86	35.72	17.24	7.85	14.33
No. of Earners:	1	19.05	28.37	18.27	10.56	23.75
	2	15.61	24.51	17.62	13.06	29.20
	3	17.30	20.24	20.38	12.74	29.34
	4	13.70	24.77	27.25	13.59	20.69
	5 or more	26.53	13.07	5.92	18.99	35.49
Total		17.95	26.66	18.30	11.47	25.62

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

Table 3.4.2c

Incidence of Families by Different Classes of Household Income per Equivalent Adult and by Various Household Characteristics, 1968/9

Total (In 1962/3 prices)		Under ฿1,000	฿1,000-1,500	฿1,500-2,000	฿2,000-2,500	฿2,500 or more
Region:	North	15.86	22.84	20.23	13.59	27.48
	Centre & East	3.46	13.31	16.61	15.74	50.88
	Northeast	26.08	35.80	16.01	7.11	15.00
	South	21.29	27.47	19.78	9.56	21.90
	Bangkok-Thonburi	0.69	1.98	5.75	8.99	82.59
Sex of Head:	Male	16.40	24.44	17.54	11.18	30.44
	Female	14.33	22.08	14.94	11.54	37.11
Marital Status of Head:	Single	6.57	13.62	11.98	12.03	55.80
	Married	16.59	24.61	17.94	11.18	29.68
	Widowed	17.03	24.14	13.59	11.65	33.59
	Divorced or Separated	9.64	20.96	15.82	10.11	43.47
Age of Head:	under 20	8.20	14.84	16.80	10.90	49.26
	20-29	14.80	19.90	17.11	9.04	39.15
	30-39	18.36	25.23	17.50	8.71	30.20
	40-49	15.41	25.10	17.35	12.31	29.83
	50-59	14.97	22.37	17.27	13.17	32.22
	60 and over	15.64	25.20	16.17	12.66	30.33
Education of Head:	None	16.88	26.38	19.56	12.65	24.53
	P1-MS2	16.96	25.00	17.32	11.20	29.52
	MS3-MS4	1.00	1.44	4.96	7.70	84.90
	MS5 or higher	0.77	1.43	2.74	2.16	92.90
Sector of Occupation of Head:						
	Agriculture	21.08	29.45	19.01	10.63	19.83
	Nonagriculture	5.31	12.49	13.12	12.53	56.55
No. of Members:	1	1.57	4.42	6.03	12.64	75.34
	2	5.96	9.96	14.50	18.41	51.17
	3	6.76	21.92	19.38	11.53	40.41
	4	13.05	22.84	18.51	13.78	31.82
	5	14.21	23.29	17.35	11.25	33.90
	6	19.98	24.85	18.51	8.69	27.97
	7	18.06	28.80	17.28	11.53	24.33
	8 or more	23.77	28.03	15.43	9.41	23.36
No. of Children Under 15:	0	9.81	16.43	13.13	13.57	47.06
	1	10.40	21.78	18.06	12.02	37.74
	2	13.98	21.69	17.88	12.69	33.76
	3	17.17	28.48	17.64	10.86	25.85
	4	24.48	22.80	18.62	9.25	24.85
	5 or more	22.58	32.75	17.24	8.60	18.83
No. of Earners:	1	17.66	26.52	17.51	10.51	27.80
	2	13.62	21.42	16.19	12.54	36.23
	3	14.07	16.76	17.79	11.91	39.47
	4	10.08	18.12	21.82	11.78	38.20
	5 or more	17.44	7.56	5.31	13.93	55.76
Total		16.09	24.08	17.13	11.24	31.46

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

the conventional household income, make more sense and tell us more about income inequality than the standard tabulations of income distribution.

3.5 A Comparison Between 1962/3 and 1968/9

It is difficult to establish what has happened to the income distribution in Thailand over time because of lack of data. Apart from the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey, the only other survey which offers some basis for comparison over time is the 1962/3 Household Expenditure Survey.[18/] The results presented here suffer from the following limitations. First, as has been pointed out elsewhere[19/], the 1962/3 Survey results are not considered to be very reliable with regard to information on income. The primary objective of the Survey was to obtain information on household expenditures which would be used in the construction of consumer price indices. Second, in order to ensure that the comparison is valid, published tabulations have to be used for both surveys so that the same method of estimation is used in both cases and hence similar biases are built in. This leads to inaccuracies which we hope run in the same direction for both years but we cannot be entirely sure of this. Moreover, there were some serious problems in the tabulations of the 1962/3 Survey which means that certain inconsistencies exist which cannot be resolved and may well affect the results presented here.

18/ As of the time of writing, the 1971, 1972 and 1973 Socio-economic Surveys are not all ready for analysis. Together they constitute a survey of the entire country and will be used in further research on this subject.

19/ See "Income Distribution Statistics for Thailand, Malaysia and Indonesia", Op. Cit.

Third, only money income data are available for 1962/3. In order to make the comparison with 1968/9, we use information from the later survey to adjust the 1962/3 data to include nonmoney income. The assumption is that the relationship between money and total income in real terms remained unchanged between the two survey dates. If this is not in fact the case then the results would be affected. The use of 1968/9 information on nonmoney income to adjust 1962/3 money income means that we are putting our faith in the money income data in both years as indicators of what happened between the two periods.[20/]

In order to use the information pertaining to the 1968/9 Survey to adjust for nonmoney income in 1962/3, total household income is estimated as a linear function of money income for 1968/9.

$$Y_{M+K} = a + bY_M + \varepsilon$$ where a and b are regression coefficients to be estimated and ε is the error term.

The estimation is done for each region and location separately, the individual observations being households grouped by money income classes. The estimated results are given in Table 3.5.1. These are applied to the limits of the 1962/3 money income classes to obtain a distribution of households by money plus nonmoney income classes for each region and location.

For towns and villages in each of the regions of Thailand for each

---

20/ Nevertheless, it is felt to be less confusing to adjust for nonmoney income throughout instead of switching between money and total incomes.

Table 3.5.1

Relationship Between Household Money + Nonmoney Income and Household Money Income

Household Money + Nonmoney Income = a + b. (Household money income).

	a	b	R^2	Number of Observations
Towns:	1048.29 (12.07)[a]	1.0046 (523.93)	0.9999	35
North	960.38 (9.30)	0.9956 (336.61)	0.9997	35
Centre & East	946.52 (5.13)	1.0126 (187.99)	0.9992	35
Northeast	1261.93 (3.87)	1.0094 (136.44)	0.9984	32
South	1113.78 (7.40)	1.0082 (287.53)	0.9996	34
Bangkok-Thonburi	1022.45 (12.31)	1.0035 (642.60)	0.9999	34
Villages:	2398.91 (26.42)	0.9952 (149.38)	0.9956	35
North	1567.53 (7.33)	1.0548 (48.83)	0.9756	33
Centre & East	1962.38 (27.92)	1.0072 (300.92)	0.9994	35
Northeast	3399.25 (35.78)	0.9634 (96.46)	0.9813	35
South	1424.45 (15.99)	1.0294 (102.99)	0.9918	33
Bangkok-Thonburi	862.18 (5.80)	1.0225 (225.12)	0.9993	34
Total:	2307.06 (26.99)	0.9925 (228.65)	0.9989	35
North	1814.18 (10.06)	1.0118 (72.09)	0.9846	35
Centre & East	1910.12 (29.74)	1.0058 (349.36)	0.9996	35
Northeast	3301.54 (31.92)	0.9745 (117.20)	0.9934	35
South	1521.54 (23.80)	1.0072 (271.69)	0.9992	35
Bangkok-Thonburi	1041.70 (15.18)	1.0048 (718.04)	0.9999	35

[a] t - statistics are given in parentheses under the corresponding coefficients.

of 1962/3 and 1968/9, a distribution of households by annual money income class is available in the published tabulations. Also available is a distribution of households by family-size classes, and within any of these, by annual money income class.

One of the disadvantages of using the official tabulations, in addition to the lack of information on nonmoney income for 1962/3 already mentioned, is that there is no way of directly calculating income per equivalent adult. Only family size information is given, and even this is not in great detail since there are only five family-size classes. In order to keep the results here comparable with the earlier results which allowed for economies of scale in consumption whenever a larger size involved the addition of children under fifteen rather than adults, in the comparison between 1962/3 and 1968/9 a scale elasticity of .9 was applied. In other words, an increase in family size of 1% needs an increase in household income of .9% to maintain the original level of well-being. The scale elasticity of .9 was chosen because the equivalent adult scale used here, which counts children under five and between five and fifteen as .42 and .63 of adults respectively, implies a scale elasticity of approximately .9 at the aggregate level. Using data from the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey, for each region and location households were classified by size, and the number of equivalent adults was also obtained since for each household in the sample we have the age composition of its members. Regression equations of the following form were estimated for each region and location separately :

$$\ln(A) = a + b\ln(S) + \varepsilon$$ where A is the number of equivalent adults,

S is family size,

a and b are coefficients to be estimated

and ε is the error term.

The results are given in Table 3.5.2 and show the estimated coefficient to be roughly .9 for all regions and locations. So an increase of 1% in family size implies an increase of about .9% in the number of equivalent adults, at least in the aggregate.

Applying a scale elasticity in this way captures some of the effect of having a smaller number of equivalent adults than household members, but leaves some inaccuracies in the results obtained. Although on average a given family size may have a certain number of equivalent adults, the number does not necessarily apply to each of the households of this size. Thus for those families with a larger than average number of equivalent adults a cut-off standard which is too low is being used, while for those with below the average number of equivalent adults a too stringent standard is being applied. Too few households from the former group and too many from the latter are therefore classified as being below the cut-off income defined in per equivalent adult terms. Taking each family size as a whole the over- and under - estimation will tend to cancel out, but not necessarily exactly. In addition, tabulations which group more than one family size together compound the problem by increasing the variation associated with each group.

For purposes of comparison over time, exactly identical procedures are applied to the published tabulations for both 1962/3 and 1968/9, even though more detailed information is available for 1968/9 and has already

Table 3.5.2

Relationship Between Number of Equivalent Adults[a] and Household Size

ln(Number of equivalent adults) = a + b.ln(Household size).

		a	b	R^2	Number of Observations
Towns :	North	0.0302	0.8794	0.9990	14
		(1.55)[b]	(70.99)		
	Centre & East	0.0320	0.8730	0.9992	19
		(1.85)	(84.02)		
	Northeast	0.0180	0.8803	0.9992	16
		(0.81)	(70.97)		
	South	0.0098	0.8887	0.9985	16
		(0.51)	(76.79)		
	Bangkok-Thonburi	-0.0374	0.9191	0.9998	20
		(-1.79)	(80.58)		
Villages :	North	0.0536	0.8429	0.9998	15
		(2.58)	(69.61)		
	Centre & East	0.0329	0.8668	0.9998	16
		(1.83)	(82.86)		
	Northeast	-0.0383	0.8942	0.9997	14
		(-1.34)	(56.62)		
	South	0.0325	0.8593	0.9997	14
		(1.32)	(57.72)		
	Bangkok-Thonburi	0.0256	0.8734	0.9994	15
		(0.65)	(41.05)		

[a] The scale used here assigned weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

[b] t - statistics are given in parentheses under the corresponding coefficients.

been used earlier. This is because it would be undesirable to draw conclusions which may be sensitive to the methods used for the different years. By giving them similar treatment any biases resulting from the method of estimation are more likely to run in the same direction and the comparison has more chance of being independent from them.

The method of separating poor and nonpoor households is quite simple once a cut-off income in terms of household income per equivalent adult has been decided upon. Given each region and location, the total number of households is distributed by household size. In turn, within each size class, the households are distributed by annual money income class. We thus obtain a distribution of all households by income class, family-size class, region and location.

The basic cut-off income of ฿ 1,500 is adjusted upwards by 15% if we are considering 1968/9, and is also adjusted to reflect the consumer price level for the region and location under consideration. The ranges of each income class are adjusted to take into account nonmoney income, using the regression coefficients specific to each region and location given in Table 3.5.1. It is not possible to estimate imputed rent to home-owners, so that the results are expected to be somewhat different for 1968/9 from those obtained earlier, in addition to the reasons already given concerning the method of estimation in general.

We then consider each family-size class in turn. The cut-off income appropriate to this size class is calculated, using the average family size and a scale elasticity of .9. Then for each of the income classes the proportion of households under the cut-off income is estimated by

comparing the cut-off income for this size class against the top and bottom limits of household total income, that is to say adjusted for nonmoney income . For example, if the cut-off income is below the bottom limit, then clearly the whole class is nonpoor, whereas if it is above the upper limit, the entire class is poor. If the cut-off income falls within an income class we simply assume that households are distributed evenly within the class in order to calculate the proportion to be classified as poor.

Knowing the number of households which are poor distributed by family size means that we can also calculate the number of people who are poor, by taking into account the different numbers of people contained in different family-size classes.

As was done earlier, it is possible to calculate the incidence of poor households in various population groups which may be differentiated by household size, region and location. Looked at a different way we can construct a poverty profile showing the distribution of households or people who are poor by family size, region and location.

In 1962/3 average household money income was ฿ 6,644 per year or ฿ 1,211 per capita per year. Details by region for both towns and villages are given in Tables 3.5.3a and 3.5.3b.

Table 3.5.3a

Average Household Money Income, by Location and Region, 1962/3

	North	Centre	East	Northeast	South	Bangkok-Thonburi	Whole Kingdom
Average Household Money Income (Baht/Year)							
Towns	9,686	13,019	12,515	13,068	14,390	18,231	6,644
Villages	3,615	7,902	6,332	2,986	6,603	*	
Household Money Income per Person (Baht/Year)							
Towns	1,899	2,411	2,454	2,420	2,570	3,315	1,211
Villages	682	1,411	1,131	506	1,270	*	

* No information was collected in the 1962/3 Survey.

Table 3.5.3b

Average Household Money Income Relative to the Whole Kingdom Average

Average Household Money Income (%)							
Towns	146	196	188	197	217	274	100
Villages	54	119	95	45	99	-	
Household Money Income per Person (%)							
Towns	157	199	203	200	212	274	100
Villages	56	117	93	42	105	-	

Source : Household Expenditure Survey, 1962/3, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

From Table 3.5.4 giving a distribution of poor households, in this case defined as those with total incomes per capita under ฿ 1,500 per year, using a scale elasticity of .9 to adjust for family size, we see that in 1962/3 the Northeast contained 40% and the North 26% of the country's poor families. Table 3.5.5 gives the incidence of poverty, the percentage of households in a given group below the cut-off level, by region and location as well as by family size. According to this definition, 63% of all households in 1962/3 are classified as poor. The table also confirms our earlier conclusions. Villages had a much higher incidence of poverty than towns : 71% of all families in rural areas had household money incomes per equivalent adult under ฿ 1,500 per year, whereas only 29% of all town families were in this situation. The Northeast and North had a higher than average incidence of poverty considered either by location or as a whole, which is to be expected. The incidence of poverty increased steadily by family size, showing that a person from a larger family had a higher chance of being poor than one from a smaller family. Within each location and region, poor families were consistently larger than nonpoor ones. The poor population in each case was thus composed of a larger percentage of people from large families, making for a higher incidence of poverty among the population than among households. Table 3.5.5 gives the incidence of poverty by region and location for the population under the corresponding figure for households. Even though large families form a relatively small proportion of the total, the figures here have been weighted by average family size, so that a family of seven gets counted seven times in the population distribution.

Table 3.5.4

Percentage Distributions of Poor, Nonpoor and All Households, by Location and Region, 1962/3

(Poor = Household total income per person[a] < ฿ 1,500 per year)

Region	Poor Households	Nonpoor Households	All Households
North:	26.00	17.64	22.93
Towns	2.47	4.57	3.24
Villages	23.53	13.07	19.69
Centre:	14.64	26.37	18.94
Towns	1.44	6.18	3.18
Villages	13.20	20.19	15.76
East:	4.79	8.18	6.04
Towns	0.44	2.24	1.10
Villages	4.35	5.94	4.94
Northeast:	39.96	19.43	32.42
Towns	1.51	4.90	2.76
Villages	38.45	14.53	29.66
South:	12.66	13.94	13.14
Towns	0.96	3.94	2.06
Villages	11.70	10.00	11.08
Bangkok-Thonburi:	1.95	14.45	6.54
Towns	1.95	14.45	6.54
Villages	-	-	-
Whole Kingdom:	100.00	100.00	100.00
Towns	8.77	36.27	18.88
Villages	91.23	63.73	81.12

Source : Household Expenditure Survey, 1962/3, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income but not imputed rent. Price differentials across region have been taken into account, and a size elasticity of .9 has been applied in defining cut-off levels of income for families of different sizes.

Table 3.5.5

Incidence of Poverty : Percentage of Subgroups of Households and of the Population with Household Total Income per Person[a] < ฿ 1,500 per year, 1962/3

Family Size \ Region	N	C	E	NE	S	B-T	Total
Towns							
1	23.07	11.64	15.78	19.45	3.43	15.02	15.51
2 & 3	38.01	15.16	20.86	18.31	23.15	12.09	20.78
4 & 5	48.66	19.97	13.69	33.32	21.28	12.43	25.10
6 & 7	58.08	35.56	35.01	42.36	40.88	20.95	36.67
8 or more	57.89	48.20	39.90	49.14	40.26	28.81	40.41
All Households	48.25	28.59	25.30	34.72	29.62	18.83	29.40
Population	52.84	35.09	30.21	40.25	34.33	22.27	33.79
Villages							
1	26.60	23.90	29.43	21.78	26.78	-	25.46
2 & 3	60.50	35.66	37.35	54.04	46.12	-	49.75
4 & 5	78.63	46.87	50.27	81.02	69.60	-	70.32
6 & 7	82.35	61.91	64.92	89.92	76.44	-	79.79
8 or more	86.69	69.96	72.37	95.24	82.78	-	85.69
All Households	75.62	52.95	55.78	82.00	66.84	-	71.14
Population	79.92	58.09	61.80	87.22	72.52	-	76.29
Towns & Villages							
1	25.61	18.77	24.30	20.83	20.61	15.02	20.46
2 & 3	57.07	32.06	34.01	50.70	42.88	12.09	44.35
4 & 5	74.92	43.28	44.22	77.09	63.26	12.43	63.06
6 & 7	79.13	57.72	60.13	86.76	71.28	20.95	72.81
8 or more	82.56	66.00	67.18	91.70	73.47	28.81	76.35
All Households	71.75	48.86	50.22	77.98	61.01	18.83	63.26
Population	76.18	54.43	56.41	83.52	66.05	22.27	68.44

Source : Household Expenditure Survey, 1962/3, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income but not imputed rent. Price differentials across region have been taken into account, and a size elasticity of .9 has been applied in defining cut-off levels of income for families of different sizes.

To conclude in terms of the population, based on a cut-off level of ฿ 1,500 of household total income per equivalent adult per year, two-thirds of the country's poor were in the Northeast and North in 1962/3. Out of the poor population, 93% lived in rural areas. These figures reflect a situation in which the incidence of poverty varied among different groups of the population, so that some groups were more heavily represented among the poor group. For example, 76% of the rural population were in poverty but only 34% of the urban population. The Northeast and North were consistently worse off than average, and among towns the North had a much higher incidence of poverty than all other regions, including the Northeast. The incidence of poverty increased with family size which showed up in a larger average family size for poor than nonpoor families, considered as a whole or by region and location.

Between 1962/3 and 1968/9 average household money income grew by some 63% and household income per person by 57%. Tables 3.5.6a and 3.5.6b present average household money incomes, both total and per person, by region and location, as well as their relatives to the whole kingdom figures for 1968/9. From this a comparison with Tables 3.5.3a and 3.5.3b shows that the growth rates of income have varied by region and location. In general, town incomes have increased more rapidly than village incomes and the poorest regions, the North and Northeast, have made substantial gains over this period, Table 3.5.6c gives annual growth rates of money income between the two survey dates, by region and location. If the increase in income were shared more or less equally by each group, we should expect towns as a whole to be in an even better position than before vis-

Table 3.5.6a

Average Household Money Income, by Location and Region, 1968/9

	North	Centre & East	North-east	South	Bangkok-Thonburi	Whole Kingdom
Average Household Money Income (Baht/Year)						
Towns	20,812	23,611	24,962	23,079	33,193	10,844
Villages	7,520	12,625	5,522	7,671	21,654	
Household Money Income per Person (Baht/Year)						
Towns	4,162	4,293	4,231	4,121	5,354	1,896
Villages	1,343	2,254	920	1,447	3,383	

Table 3.5.6b

Average Household Money Income Relative to Whole Kingdom Average

Average Household Money Income (%)						
Towns	192	218	230	213	306	100
Villages	69	116	51	71	200	
Household Money Income per Person (%)						
Towns	220	226	223	217	282	100
Villages	71	119	49	76	178	

Table 3.5.6c

Annual Growth Rates of Household Money Income, 1962/3-1968/9 (%).

Average Household Money Income						
Towns	13.6	10.6	11.4	8.2	10.5	8.5
Villages	13.0	9.0	10.8	2.5	-	
Household Money Income per Person						
Towns	14.0	10.0	9.8	8.2	8.3	7 7
Villages	12.0	9.0	10.5	2.2	-	

Source : Report, Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

a-vis villages, and the North and Northeast to show an improved picture relative to the other regions. The South, on the other hand, has performed least well of all the regions in terms of income growth. Thus we expect its position to have deteriorated.

Using the same standard as before of a cut-off income of ฿ 1,500 per equivalent adult per year we again construct a poverty profile. Table 3.5.7 gives percentage distributions for poor and nonpoor households by region and location, while Table 3.5.8 gives the incidences of poverty for 1968/9.21/

Based on household total income, the overall percentages of families and of the population in poverty have gone down substantially in the six years between 1962/3 and 1968/9, from 63% to 49% of all households and from 68% to 54% of the total population. This shows that at least in absolute terms the gains in income have affected those previously with low incomes as well as those with high incomes. A considerable proportion of the Thai population has in fact managed to rise above the poverty level by this particular definition between the two periods.

Since town incomes have grown so much more rapidly than village incomes, we expect and indeed find that villages account for a larger proportion of poor households than before. By 1968/9 practically all, 98% of poor families lived in rural areas.

21/ These results cannot be expected to be completely consistent with the earlier results because the method used here is considerably cruder, the concept is exclusive of imputed rent and the regional weights differ slightly from those of the data tapes. The main purpose here is to ensure comparability between the two sets of published results in order to be able to make the comparison over time.

Table 3.5.7

Percentage Distributions of Poor, Nonpoor and All Households, by Location and Region, 1968/9

(Poor = Household total income per person[a] < ฿ 1,725 per year)

Region	Poor Households	Nonpoor Households	All Households
North:	24.13	22.08	23.08
Towns	0.45	2.35	1.43
Villages	23.68	19.73	21.65
Centre & East:	11.97	32.76	22.64
Towns	0.32	3.82	2.11
Villages	11.65	28.94	20.53
Northeast:	46.73	20.08	33.05
Towns	0.38	2.35	1.39
Villages	46.35	17.73	31.66
South:	16.02	10.58	13.23
Towns	0.46	2.30	1.40
Villages	15.56	8.28	11.83
Bangkok-Thonburi:	1.13	14.51	8.00
Towns	0.66	12.35	6.66
Villages	0.47	2.16	1.34
Whole Kingdom:	100.00	100.00	100.00
Towns	2.28	23.16	13.00
Villages	97.72	76.84	87.00

Source : Report, Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income but not imputed rent. For comparability with the 1962/3 results, the cut-off income has been adjusted for price increases over time.

Price differentials across region have been taken into account, and a size elasticity of .9 has been applied in defining cut-off levels of income for families of different sizes.

Table 3.5.8

Incidence of Poverty : Percentage of Subgroups of Households and of the Population with Household Total Income per Person[a] < ฿ 1,725 per year, 1968/9

Family Size \ Region	N	C & E	NE	S	B-T	Total
Towns						
1	14.95	9.10	16.14	9.96	6.91	10.47
2 & 3	11.87	8.15	4.56	9.03	2.76	6.38
4 & 5	9.57	2.15	5.07	7.33	0.73	3.30
6 & 7	19.05	7.06	15.88	20.97	5.77	9.63
8 or more	27.35	12.34	20.45	28.69	8.25	13.76
All Households	15.47	7.30	13.46	15.98	4.82	8.52
Population	18.04	8.24	15.40	20.07	5.82	9.84
Villages						
1	24.08	20.87	6.42	14.63	20.02	15.51
2 & 3	25.87	12.96	39.75	38.90	2.38	27.80
4 & 5	46.41	17.54	70.28	67.02	9.98	49.88
6 & 7	63.81	33.84	77.69	75.74	15.92	64.09
8 or more	74.68	49.82	83.74	74.12	27.47	71.80
All Households	53.23	27.62	71.24	64.04	17.25	54.66
Population	59.43	33.65	76.39	69.17	20.51	60.50
Towns & Villages						
1	22.38	19.34	7.27	13.65	8.05	14.46
2 & 3	24.44	12.41	38.49	35.26	2.70	24.71
4 & 5	44.42	16.29	67.69	61.92	2.08	44.64
6 & 7	61.85	31.62	75.48	71.43	7.32	57.84
8 or more	71.89	46.14	80.46	66.77	12.18	62.77
All Households	50.89	25.72	68.81	58.94	6.90	48.66
Population	57.10	31.32	73.86	63.69	8.34	53.78

Source : Report, Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income but not imputed rent. For comparability with the 1962/3 results, the cut-off income has been adjusted for price increases over time.
Price differentials across region have been taken into account, and a size elasticity of .9 has been applied in defining cut-off levels of income for families of different sizes.

Although in terms of increases in average total incomes we can say that the North and Northeast have fared noticeably better than the other regions, the picture is quite different when we look at the composition of poor households. Nearly the same proportion, 24%, are in the North as in 1962/3, while the Northeast now accounts for 47% of the total compared with 40% in the previous period. Contrast this with the South whose village income growth has been negligible compared with the rest of the country, but whose position has worsened only slightly. The figures suggest that while making gains in terms of average household income, the rate at which the poor have been raised above the cut-off level of income has only kept up with the national rate in the North, and has lagged far behind it in the Northeast. The South, on the other hand, has succeeded in getting its population out of poverty at a rate approaching the national average at a time when its income has been stagnating by comparison. From this we may conclude that the growth of income in the North and Northeast has had a smaller impact on the poor than the rich. In the South the poor have done comparatively well in spite of the slow overall growth, while income growth has had an appreciable effect on the poor in the Centre and East whose combined share of poor households has declined markedly, from 19% to 12%.

The same pattern can be observed as in 1962/3 in which the incidence of poverty tends to increase with family size. This tendency is clear for villages and shows up for towns and villages together. However, for towns alone we have the phenomenon of a U-shaped incidence-of-poverty curve, having its lowest value in each region for families with 4 or 5 persons. As family size falls or rises the incidence of poverty increases. This was not the case in 1962/3 (see Table 3.5.5) in which for towns and villages

alike the incidence of poverty was simply an increasing function of family size. The tentative hypothesis which is offered here as an explanation for this is that small families with fewer than four members include a large number of migrants from rural areas. These migrants have not shared in the prosperity experienced in urban areas to the same extent as nonmigrants. Recent migrants very likely have small families, being in general young and either single or newly married. When they first arrive in towns, because of lack of skill, exploitation on the part of employers or insufficient knowledge of job opportunities, they make up a sizable proportion of the poor population. For less recent and older migrants who have become absorbed into the town population, the incidence of poverty is more similar to nonmigrants. Before the period 1962/3, either the rural-urban migration was smaller or it was different in character from the later period.

The comparison between 1962/3 and 1968/9 using the same definition of the poverty level, namely ₱1,500 of household total income per equivalent adult per year, is useful in indicating the impact of overall income growth on the poor. This is seen to be a much smaller percentage of the total population below the cut-off income level. Of interest as well is the differential impact on different subgroups of the population. Slow growth in income for a group adversely affects its relative position : rural families make up a larger proportion of the poor in 1968/9 because of the lower rate of growth of average village incomes than that of urban incomes. However, a rapid growth of income does not guarantee a commensurate escape from poverty for the poorer population. This was the case in the North and Northeast where average incomes grew phenomenally but where the gains fell on the rich more than the poor.

The comparison between 1962/3 and 1968/9 can also be made using a lower cut-off income, namely ฿ 1,000 per person per year in 1962/3 prices with a scale elasticity of .9. The geographical distribution of poor and nonpoor households and the incidence of poor households by family size, region and location for both periods are given in Tables 3.5.9, 3.5.10, 3.5.11 and 3.5.12. Similar conclusions are reached when considering this very poor group as when the cut-off was defined as ฿ 1,500 per person per year in 1962/3 prices.[22/]

3.6 Conclusion

Using data from the 1962/3 Household Expenditure Survey and the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey, and defining a cut-off level of ฿ 1,500, and also ฿ 1,000, of household income per equivalent adult, we have compared the situations in the two periods in terms of the geographical distributions of poor households and the incidence of poverty for different groups of households. In general, the Northeast and North can be termed worse off and the other regions better off than average. Village households have an incidence of poverty much higher than town households.

Using a cut-off income of ฿ 1,500 of household total income per equivalent adult per year, we have constructed a poverty profile for

---

22/ The analysis was also carried out to compare 1962/3 and 1968/9 using both the ฿ 1,000 and ฿ 1,500 cut-off incomes, but with a scale elasticity of .8 instead of .9. None of the qualitative conclusions is affected which supports our earlier contention that it is the consideration of family size which has the major impact, whereas the adjustment for economies of scale resulting from family composition is less important.

Table 3.5.9

Percentage Distributions of Poor, Nonpoor and All Households, by Location and Region, 1962/3

(Poor = Household total income per person[a] < ฿ 1,000 per year)

Region	Poor Households	Nonpoor Households	All Households
North:	27.51	18.90	22.93
Towns	2.39	3.99	3.24
Villages	25.12	14.91	19.69
Centre:	11.77	25.25	18.94
Towns	.96	5.13	3.18
Villages	10.81	20.12	15.76
East:	4.00	7.83	6.04
Towns	.30	1.80	1.10
Villages	3.69	6.03	4.94
Northeast:	44.08	22.17	32.42
Towns	1.16	4.16	2.76
Villages	42.92	18.00	29.66
South:	11.32	14.73	13.14
Towns	.68	3.27	2.06
Villages	10.64	11.46	11.08
Bangkok-Thonburi:	1.32	11.13	6.54
Towns	1.32	11.13	6.54
Villages	-	-	-
Whole Kingdom:	100.00	100.00	100.00
Towns	6.82	29.48	18.88
Villages	93.18	70.52	81.12

Source : Household Expenditure Survey, 1962/3, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income but not imputed rent. Price differentials across region have been taken into account, and a size elasticity of .9 has been applied in defining cut-off levels of income for families of different sizes.

Table 3.5.10

Incidence of Poverty : Percentage of Subgroups of Households and of the Population with Household Total Income per person[a] < B 1,000 per year, 1962/3

Family Size \ Region	N	C	E	NE	S	B-T	Total
Towns							
1	15.38	7.76	10.52	12.97	2.29	10.01	10.34
2 & 3	25.34	10.11	13.91	12.20	15.39	8.06	13.85
4 & 5	36.45	8.88	4.38	17.19	8.95	8.29	15.13
6 & 7	40.91	17.46	16.03	23.78	22.98	7.32	20.07
8 or more	42.48	22.03	20.17	28.09	18.75	12.76	21.22
All Households	34.51	14.16	12.79	19.73	15.41	9.46	16.90
Population	38.11	16.69	14.63	22.64	17.27	10.17	18.65
Villages							
1	17.74	15.94	19.62	14.52	17.86	-	16.97
2 & 3	40.33	23.78	24.90	36.03	30.74	-	33.17
4 & 5	61.47	24.24	30.07	58.18	38.66	-	47.97
6 & 7	68.13	37.38	39.19	78.42	58.32	-	63.57
8 or more	74.40	46.76	47.74	89.76	62.08	-	72.46
All Households	59.69	32.09	35.01	67.70	44.95	-	53.74
Population	64.81	35.76	38.96	74.99	50.34	-	59.46
Towns & Villages							
1	17.07	12.52	16.20	13.89	13.74	10.01	13.64
2 & 3	38.04	21.38	22.68	33.80	28.58	8.06	29.56
4 & 5	58.37	22.19	25.81	54.80	34.76	8.29	42.70
6 & 7	64.51	34.22	35.48	74.79	53.20	7.32	56.53
8 or more	69.81	42.26	43.34	85.03	52.60	12.76	61.89
All Households	56.13	29.08	30.96	63.62	40.32	9.46	46.78
Population	61.12	32.73	34.81	70.86	44.74	10.17	51.92

Source : Household Expenditure Survey, 1962/3, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income but not imputed rent. Price differentials across region have been taken into account, and a size elasticity of .9 has been applied in defining cut-off levels of income for families of different sizes.

Table 3.5.11

Percentage Distributions of Poor, Nonpoor and All Households, by Location and Region, 1968/9

(Poor = Household total income per person[a] < ฿ 1,150 per year)

Region	Poor Households	Nonpoor Households	All Households
North:	22.07	23.53	23.08
Towns	0.35	1.90	1.43
Villages	21.72	21.63	21.65
Centre & East:	7.81	29.10	22.64
Towns	0.21	2.94	2.11
Villages	7.60	26.16	20.53
Northeast:	54.23	23.82	33.05
Towns	0.18	1.92	1.39
Villages	54.05	21.90	31.66
South:	15.27	12.34	13.23
Towns	0.30	1.88	1.40
Villages	14.97	10.46	11.83
Bangkok-Thonburi:	0.60	11.22	8.00
Towns	0.31	9.43	6.66
Villages	0.29	1.79	1.34
Whole Kingdom:	100.00	100.00	100.00
Towns	1.36	18.07	13.00
Villages	98.64	81.93	87.00

Source : Report, Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income but not imputed rent. For comparability with the 1962/3 results, the cut-off income has been adjusted for price increases over time.

Price differentials across region have been taken into account, and a size elasticity of .9 has been applied in defining cut-off levels of income for families of different sizes.

Table 3.5.12

Incidence of Poverty : Percentage of Subgroups of Households and of the Population with Household Total Income per Person[a] < ฿ 1,150 per year, 1968/9

Family Size \ Region	N	C & E	NE	S	B-T	Total
Towns						
1	9.97	6.07	10.76	6.64	4.60	6.98
2 & 3	7.91	5.43	3.04	6.02	1.84	4.25
4 & 5	5.56	1.44	2.58	3.30	0.27	1.73
6 & 7	4.38	1.68	1.01	3.49	0.87	1.55
8 or more	12.82	3.21	7.12	12.82	2.47	4.93
All Households	7.45	3.07	4.04	6.47	1.43	3.18
Population	7.92	2.71	4.30	7.76	1.58	3.28
Villages						
1	16.05	13.91	4.28	9.76	13.34	10.34
2 & 3	17.25	8.64	26.50	25.43	1.03	18.44
4 & 5	18.23	3.70	48.93	31.78	3.35	26.36
6 & 7	38.31	11.63	56.44	48.49	7.25	40.94
8 or more	53.95	23.93	64.26	54.60	10.01	50.67
All Households	30.44	11.23	51.80	38.42	6.67	34.40
Population	35.76	13.88	56.32	42.97	7.82	38.99
Towns & Villages						
1	14.92	12.90	4.85	9.10	5.37	9.64
2 & 3	16.30	8.28	25.66	23.06	1.71	16.40
4 & 5	17.55	3.51	47.09	29.34	0.72	23.59
6 & 7	36.83	10.81	54.45	44.95	1.85	36.42
8 or more	51.52	21.90	61.30	47.84	4.02	43.55
All Households	29.02	10.47	49.79	35.03	2.30	30.34
Population	34.21	12.86	54.16	39.05	2.65	34.25

Source : Report, Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Household total income includes nonmoney income but not imputed rent. For comparability with the 1962/3 results, the cut-off income has been adjusted for price increases over time.
Price differentials across region have been taken into account, and a size elasticity of .9 has been applied in defining cut-off levels of income for families of different sizes.

Thailand which identifies the poor as being concentrated in villages, especially in the Northeast and North. They tend to be headed by younger people and by those with little education. Poor families are associated with a larger number of children, a larger family size and a smaller number of income earners than nonpoor families. By this definition 40% of all households were poor in 1968/9.

The impact on the poor population of income growth between the two Survey dates was not evenly distributed geographically. Thus although the overall incidence of poverty for households based on household total income declined from 63% to 49%, indicating that poor households had shared in the general rise in income, the regional breakdown shows that a higher than average growth in income for a region does not imply an improved situation in terms of poverty relative to the other regions. The North and Northeast, whose average incomes had grown more rapidly than the other regions between the two Survey dates still found themselves with larger proportions of poor households than would be expected from their shares in all households. Thus compared with the other regions, their increase in income had not benefited those below the poverty line to the same extent. The South, on the other hand, had experienced a slow growth in income and yet its share of poor households has not gone up tremendously. Rapid growth of income may not have its main impact on the poor, while much slower growth may yet benefit the lower income groups.

The Northeastern region of Thailand has been the cause of concern for many people because of its very low average income. Large investments have been poured into the region in an attempt to narrow the gap between it and

the rest of the country. Our analysis shows that whereas some improvement has indeed taken place in the Northeast in terms of average incomes, the very poor households have not been taken out of poverty at as fast a rate as in the other regions. Although the incidence of poverty has declined in all regions, the poorest region, the Northeast, made up a much larger share of poor households in 1968/9 than it had done in 1962/3. Any serious attempt to improve the lot of the Northeast must accordingly be focussed more directly on the poorer groups. In general, moreover, attention must be given to rural areas where income growth has been slower and where, as income rises, more of the poor can be found.

In this paper we have narrowed the scope of our analysis to just two groups of the population separated by a poverty line. We have concluded that the situation in villages has deteriorated relative to towns and in the Northeast relative to other regions. These findings, in conjunction with the poverty profile, may be more relevant to policies designed to improve the position of the poor people than what has happened to the Gini coefficient for household incomes for Thailand. Instead of an emphasis on overall growth coupled with a vague hope that some of the benefits of the growth will accrue to the poor, measures to alleviate poverty must concentrate on helping those in agricultural households, those belonging to large families, those with many children and those with little education.

A major question which is raised in this section is whether it is in fact the case that rapid overall growth of income makes it easier to bring about changes in the way that income is distributed. The argument usually put forward is that a rapid rise in income makes it unnecessary to actually

redistribute income. By simply ensuring that a larger proportional increase accrues to the poor than to the rich, it is possible to improve the distribution of income in a way which is not disagreeable to the rich. Although this is a notion which is being bandied about a great deal, our analysis suggests that rapid growth of income may simply dull the pains of inequality: in a situation of high growth rates it becomes less noticeable that there is still a great deal of inequality around. People are fooled into thinking that their position has improved and are thus less likely to be politically troublesome.

4. Sources of Income Inequality

In this section a few preliminary results will be offered concerning some of the sources of income inequality in Thailand in 1968/9. The measure of inequality used here is the variance of income logarithms. Total income inequality is decomposed into a systematic part, the between-group variance, and an unexplained part, the within-group variance. Because of space limitations it will be assumed here that the reader is already familiar with the variance-decomposition technique.[23/]

4.1 Factors Included in the Analysis

The analysis is carried out on the sample of economically active individuals contained on the data tapes of the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey. The number of observations is 20,627. Total income, which includes nonmoney income, is used in the analysis.

Given the data situation there is not really a great deal of choice when it comes to selecting some factors to be included in the analysis. Moreover, these are subject to various shortcomings which should be noted.

The level of educational attainment of individuals is expected to be an important factor in terms of explaining income inequality.

23/ The underlying assumptions in applying this model to income distribution have been spelled out in Oey Astra Meesook, Income distribution in Brazil, Ph.D. Dissertation, University of California, Berkeley, 1972, Chapter 3.

However, the coding of education classes is highly unsatisfactory. Those without any schooling form one category. Of those who have had some schooling it is very unfortunately impossible to distinguish among people with from one to nine years of education. Although quite a fine breakdown is given for those with ten years or more, given the fact that the first two classes already cover most people, it is not worthwhile to separate out this group and so they are considered together as a third group.

Age as a classification presents no problem since it is given in single years. We have defined five age groups: under 20, 20-29, 30-39, 40-49 and 50 and over.

The classification 'type of income' is included in an attempt to see if income inequality can be explained by the major type of income an individual earns. Although there are originally seven different types of income, there are only two with large weights, wages and salaries[24/] and net earnings from self-employment. The rest are grouped into two categories, the first consisting of dividends, interest and rent income and the second of income from all other sources. The income of each individual in the sample is first grouped into these four components and classified according to whichever component is the largest. In other words the classification refers to the major type of income of an individual.

24/ This category includes wages, salaries, overtime, commission, bonuses and pensions.

The five regions included in the analysis are those coded on tape and given in the official tabulations. These are the North, Centre and East, Northeast, South and Bangkok-Thonburi.

The occupational code available is difficult to use, being in fact neither a sectoral nor an occupational code. In municipal areas and sanitary districts, six codes are given: government employees; trade and services workers; farmers; labourers; clerks and others. In villages only two codes are available, agriculture and nonagriculture. This is why in our analysis we have to use economic sector as a classification, having agriculture and nonagriculture as the only two categories. It is not possible to include occupation as a classification as well, and even if we were to consider the urban sector on its own it is unlikely that we shall obtain additional information by using the occupational breakdown given.

Since we already have an agriculture/nonagriculture sectoral classification, the urban/rural breakdown was considered superfluous, since to a very large extent it would coincide with the division by sector.

Thus it is seen that the data situation is far from satisfactory, the major problem being that categories are too aggregated, namely for education and economic sector.

4.2 One-Way Analysis

In a one-way analysis of variance, each classification is

considered in turn to see how much of total income inequality it can explain. The between-group variance is the variance which would exist if all individuals under a particular category had the same income. The difference between the total variance and the between-group variance for any category is the within-group variance, that part of total inequality which is due to the fact that incomes in each of the categories are themselves unequally distributed.

Table 4.2.1 presents the results of the one-way analysis for the five classifications used in our analysis. Considering the economically active population as a whole, we see that sector is the most important explanatory classification. Out of a total variance of income logarithms of 1.0242, sector can explain .1248 or 12%. Region accounts for .1050 or 10% and education for .0971 or 9% so that these two classifications also offer reasonably large explanations. Age accounts for considerably less, 5% of the total variance, while type of income explains very little at all.[25/]

In spite of the problem of having to use education classes which are over-aggregated, an examination of the class means of income logarithms shows considerable variation among classes which explains

---

25/ It is thought that the poor explanation of type of income in the analysis is that it is inappropriate to classify incomes of individuals by the largest source, since one is then obscuring the fact that each individual may have incomes from many sources. The classification used here would be reasonable if most individuals had incomes from single sources. In future work we shall attempt to see the significance of type of income by treating each individual's income as being the sum of different types of income, instead of being characterized by the largest source.

Table 4.2.1

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Income Logarithms

Classification	Category	Population Weight	Group Mean of ln(y)	Between-Group Variance[a]	% of Total Variance
Education:				0971	9.48
	None	.195	7.88		
	1-9 years	.754	8.11		
	10 years or more	.051	9.41		
Age:				.0547	5.34
	< 20	.090	7.50		
	20-29	.185	8.18		
	30-39	.252	8.33		
	40-49	.214	8.29		
	50 +	.259	8.01		
Sector:				.1248	12.19
	Agriculture	.601	7.85		
	Nonagriculture	.399	8.57		
Type of Income:				.0051	.50
	Wages & salaries	.358	8.21		
	Self-employment	.566	8.12		
	Interest & rent	.014	8.12		
	Other	.062	7.91		
Region:				.1050	10.25
	North	.294	7.94		
	Centre & East	.224	8.36		
	Northeast	.283	7.91		
	South	.117	8.11		
	Bangkok-Thonburi	.082	9.04		
Total		1.000	8.14	1.0242	

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Based on the F-test, all five classifications included in the analysis are statistically significant at the 1% level.

the relatively large between-group variance for education. In contrast, the means by type of income, in particular those of wages and salaries and net profit from self-employment which are the two largest classes, are not very different.

The striking aspects of the one-way analysis are the low degrees of explanation that are achieved on the whole, with no factor accounting for more than 12% of the total inequality, and the surprisingly large contributions of sector and region.

In Table 4.2.2 the one-way analysis is carried out for each of the two sectors separately. This is done in part because sector is the most important explanatory classification when considered individually, but also because it is expected that the four remaining factors will not have similar roles in the two sectors considered.

The results are indeed very different. The agricultural sector is seen to have incomes which are more equally distributed than the nonagricultural sector: the total variance there is .7790 as compared with 1.0812. But of the total inequality the factors considered are also able to explain considerably less. In agriculture, region remains an important factor so that the explanation accorded region in the analysis for the total economically active population is not simply due to different proportions of agricultural workers in the different regions. Age is the other factor of significance in this sector, while education is the least important of all the factors. The implication is clear that such factors as we have been able to

Table 4.2.2

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Income Logarithms, by Sector

Classification	Category	Agriculture: Population Weight	Agriculture: Mean of ln(y)	Agriculture: Between-Group Variance	Nonagriculture: Population Weight	Nonagriculture: Mean of ln(y)	Nonagriculture: Between-Group Variance
Education:				.0071(.91%)[a]			.1233(11.40%)
	None	.221	7.74		.154	8.18	
	1-9 years	.772	7.87		.727	8.51	
	10 years or more	.007	8.66		.119	9.47	
Age:				.0360(4.62%)			.1210(11.19%)
	< 20	.066	7.26		.125	7.70	
	20-29	.145	7.77		.244	8.54	
	30-39	.246	8.02		.261	8.77	
	40-49	.227	7.98		.196	8.84	
	50 +	.316	7.78		.174	8.64	
Type of Income:				.0194(2.49%)			.0046(.43%)
	Wages & salaries	.244	7.62		.531	8.61	
	Self-employment	.673	7.94		.404	8.55	
	Interest & rent	.011	7.62		.018	8.57	
	Other	.072	7.75		.047	8.29	
Region:				.0403(5.17%)			.0870(8.05%)
	North	.298	7.77		.287	8.21	
	Centre & East	.217	8.18		.235	8.60	
	Northeast	.347	7.68		.187	8.56	
	South	.129	7.89		.098	8.56	
	Bangkok-Thonburi	.009	8.52		.193	9.08	
Total		1.000	7.85	.7790	1.000	8.57	1.0812

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Figure in parentheses represents percentage of between-group variance in total variance.

include in this analysis do not really get to the heart of why incomes are unequally distributed in the agricultural sector.

In nonagriculture, region is again able to explain a relatively large proportion of total income inequality. But education and age emerge here as the strongest explanatory factors, lending some support to the human-capital theory so long as it is confined to the nonagricultural sector.

4.3 Total Decomposition of Income Inequality

It is possible to proceed from the one-way analysis of variance to a two-way, three-way analysis and so on in a similar fashion. In each two-way analysis, the two-way cells are taken as different groups. The between-group variance is based on the cell means of the income logarithms, while the within-group variance is the difference between it and the total variance.

Table 4.3.1 gives a decomposition of the total variance at different stages. It shows that using the five factors we are able to explain 36% of total income inequality, or .3642 out of 1.0242. There is a great deal of inequality therefore that has not been explained and which indicates a random element as well as excluded factors.

The contribution of two-way cells to the total variance can be either greater or less than the sum of the one-way contributions of the factors. For instance, age and region on their own explain .0547 and .1050 of the total variance respectively. But the age x region

Table 4.3.1

Decomposition of the Variance of Income Logarithms

Classification	Between-group Variance	Last-variable Contribution to Total Variance
Education	.0971	.0633
Age	.0547	.0977
Sector	.1248	.0871
Type of income	.0051	.0380
Region	.1050	.0845
A x S	.1946	
E x S	.1782	
E x A	.1504	
A x T	.0693	
E x T	.1031	
S x T	.1383	
E x R	.1766	
A x R	.1796	
S x R	.1837	
T x R	.1249	
A x S x T	.2161	
E x S x T	.1972	
E x A x T	.1642	
E x A x S	.2564	
A x S x R	.2675	
E x S x R	.2304	
E x A x R	.2522	
A x T x R	.2008	
E x T x R	.2009	
S x T x R	.2098	
E x A x S x T	.2797	
A x S x T x R	.3009	
E x S x T x R	.2665	
E x A x T x R	.2771	
E x A x S x R	.3262	
Between-group variance (E x A x S x T x R)	.3642	
Within-group variance	.6600	
Total variance	1.0242	

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

cells explain .1796 which exceeds the sum of the one-way contributions of .1597. What this means is that the cell means of income logarithms show more variation by age when considered by separate regions than for the whole kingdom, or put another way that the regional variations are more pronounced for the different age groups than for all ages combined. Some of the variation in incomes is lost when aggregation over age or region occurs. On the other hand, whereas education and sector account for .0971 and .1248 of the total variance respectively, the education x sector cells explain only .1782 which is less than .2219, the sum of their separate contributions. This means that the income variations by either of the factors taken singly is exaggerated because their effects tend to reinforce each other. The agricultural sector has a much lower mean of income logarithms than the nonagricultural sector not only because of the pure sectoral effect which can be seen within each education class, but also because the agricultural sector has a larger weight of people with little or no education who earn low incomes and bring down further the mean for this sector. So when education is considered alone, there is some sectoral effect already included, and when sector is considered alone there is some educational effect included. Accordingly, the joint contribution of education and sector is less than the sum of the separate contributions.

The last column in Table 4.3.1 gives the contribution of each factor when it is included last in the analysis. It is the difference between the total variance and the contribution of four-way cells

excluding the factor under consideration. Education and sector decline in their relative importance for reasons already given. But the contribution of age considered in this way becomes much greater, and type of income evidently does explain some of total income inequality as long as account is first taken of other factors, even though hardly any effect is apparent when gross group means are considered.

In Table 4.3.2 we give the decomposition results for each sector separately. The same conclusion as before holds when all four factors are included in the analysis simultaneously that income inequality cannot be explained as well in the agricultural sector as in nonagriculture, the four-way between-group variance amounting to 19% as opposed to 35% of the total sectoral variance.

In agriculture, contributions of all four factors are larger when considered as a last instead of first variable, indicating that one-way group means of income logarithms tend to mask variations which in fact exist as long as other factors are first taken into account. The same is true in the nonagricultural sector except for education whose contribution declines slightly when it is considered last, while age becomes by far the greatest contributor to income inequality there.

4.4 Conclusion

Using a sample of economically active individuals from the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey and defining income inequality as the variance of income logarithms, we have tried to identify some of the major

Table 4.3.2

Decomposition of the Variance of Income Logarithms, by Sector

Classification	Between-group Variance			
	Agriculture		Nonagriculture	
Education	.0071	(.0246)[a]	.1233	(.1218)
Age	.0360	(.0530)	.1210	(.1651)
Type of income	.0194	(.0319)	.0046	(.0472)
Region	.0403	(.0763)	.0870	(.0969)
A x T	.0551		.1460	
E x T	.0327		.1324	
E x A	.0438		.2643	
A x R	.0958		.2136	
E x R	.0513		.1876	
T x R	.0714		.1056	
A x T x R	.1211		.2591	
E x T x R	.0927		.2158	
E x A x R	.1138		.3337	
E x A x T	.0694		.2840	
Between-group variance (E x A x T x R)	.1457		.3809	
Within-group variance	.6333		.7003	
Total variance	.7790		1.0812	

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

[a] Figure in parentheses represents contribution if classification is included last.

sources of income inequality.

The sectoral contribution to total inequality is evidently of great importance. The analysis identifies education and age as the most significant contributors to income variance in the nonagricultural sector, while the same factors explain considerably less in the agricultural sector. In particular, education is of no significance in explaining the inequality in agricultural incomes. The major type of income, or whether it is mainly wages and salaries, net profits from self-employment, or interest and rent income, does contribute to income inequality, but the effect can only be detected when the other factors are also included.

Regional income disparities in Thailand have always been a great source of concern. The analysis shows that the regional variations in incomes are not simply derivative. The Northeast is not poorer than the other regions just as a result of having an unfavourable educational, age or sectoral distribution. There is clearly a strong additional regional effect. Attempts to narrow or close regional income disparities cannot rely on correcting inequalities due to these other factors, but must also address themselves directly to the regional question.

An important result is that education seems to have very little effect on incomes in the agricultural sector. This is worrying since it confirms what a number of critics have claimed, namely that the compulsory education in Thailand is irrelevant to the way of life of

most people. The majority of children leave school after four years. It is tragic if in those four years the educational system gives them little or nothing in terms of practical knowledge which would be helpful to their work, or an attitude which would make them more receptive to ideas which would increase their productivity.

On the whole the analysis leaves a large part of total income inequality unexplained. The explanation is better for the nonagricultural sector which is to be expected since the data here do not permit a more satisfactory inclusion of factors which affect agricultural incomes, such as agricultural landholding, type of crop, availability of water and use of machinery, fertilizers and insecticides.

5. Poverty and the Household

The analysis so far has indicated quite clearly that the household unit is central to any reasonable discussion of the distribution of income, if we are in any way concerned with the level of well-being of the population as a whole. In this section we make further explorations into the interrelationship between the household and the distribution of income.

5.1 Income on a Scale Adjusted for Family Composition

It is usual to define income distribution as referring to the incomes accruing to household units. Thus frequency distributions are typically given by household income class and measures of inequality, such as the Gini coefficient, are calculated on the basis of the shares of households and the shares of income by household income class.

As has been demonstrated in earlier sections, the household is a term which covers any number of people who happen to live together as a household unit. It may be a single person or it may be twelve people. Within any given household size, moreover, there are many possible age-sex combinations of household members. Households differ both in terms of their ability to earn income and the manner in which they dispose of their income in the consumption of goods and services. Thus on the earning side there is no reason why household incomes should be the same, and similarly on the spending side it is not possible to say from the distribution of household income how much

each person in fact has at his disposal. Income inequality is usually taken to be an undesirable thing, but in the context of the "usual" distribution of household income it is not clear why this should be the case. Given the different sizes and compositions which are possible in a household, it would be amazing if household incomes were equally distributed. In such a situation most people can probably agree that the equality which prevails is hardly desirable since households with a large number of members have exactly the same income as small households. Something seems to have gone wrong with the notion of equality.

The problem is not in the notion of equality itself. Rather it is in the choice of the unit whose income is to be considered. It is nonsensical to ask why incomes are not equally distributed among households, since by the very nature of the household one would not wish them to be equally distributed to start with.

Faced with the above argument, some may be inclined to point out that even though it may not be desirable to have complete equality of household incomes, nonetheless it is useful to compare the levels of inequality of different distributions in order to have an idea of relative inequality. But what makes household income unsuitable in a consideration of income inequality, namely the diverse nature of the household as an income unit, makes it even more unsuitable for a comparison of income inequality. Whereas it might be acceptable to use a measure of inequality to compare two distributions of income even when it is neither possible nor desirable to have complete equality, this

is so only if the measure is free from bias. That is, the existence of the barrier to total equality should be independent from any characteristics of the income units making up the income distribution.

But this condition does not hold when we consider the income distribution among households. Consider two different groups of households composed of different mixes of family sizes and compositions. Then the same Gini coefficient for both distributions actually means something different for each of them, and by the same token one could imagine that very different Gini coefficients might represent the same level of inequality if only one were able to take care of the different mixes of households in the two distributions in terms of size and composition.

The effect of comparing household income distributions differing in their underlying household structures is that the comparison is meaningless both in terms of the level of income itself and of income inequality. One type of comparison which is often made is between more- and less-developed countries. It has usually been observed that less-developed countries tend to be characterized by greater variation in the size and composition of households, with extended families being common. In more developed countries extended families are less often present and nuclear families are predominant, implying a clustering of households among fewer sizes and types. This difference alone leads one to expect a higher degree of inequality of household incomes in less-developed countries. It is unclear why it should be so important to compare these very different situations. Furthermore,

to the extent that average household sizes are very different in the two countries, even the simple comparison of the levels of household incomes is misleading.

Even comparisons within the same country suffer from the same objections, though possibly to a less extent. Household structures presumably differ from region to region, and in particular between urban and rural areas. Over time the overall household structure is also expected to undergo many changes.

If our concern with income inequality has to do with the ability of various members of the population to purchase goods and services, then household income is the appropriate concept to start with, but this must be adjusted to take into account the number of people the income has to serve as well as their relative needs. This is why we used household income per equivalent adult to separate poor and non-poor households. Furthermore, we advocate the use of household income per equivalent adult, or, in the event the data on family composition cannot be obtained, household income per person, in the discussion of income distribution. Thus the appropriate frequency distribution specifies the number of individuals who belong to households with household income per equivalent adult within certain ranges. The measures of inequality are similarly concerned with the shares of income on the income per equivalent adult scale going to various groups of the population. The significance of the hosuehold is in the pooling of the incomes of various earners to be distributed among its members, whether they earn income or not. The average income so adjusted and the

resulting level of inequality are then amenable to the various comparisons typically made.

Table 5.1.1 gives average income, defined in multiples of the cut-off income of ฿1,725 of household income per equivalent adult per year for 1968/9, by region and location. Various measures of inequality are also given. The frequency distributions of household income per equivalent adult, by region and location, are given in Tables A.3.1 to A.3.18 in the Appendix. The household income figures have been adjusted to take care of regional variations in the prices of consumer goods in order to make the regional distributions directly comparable with each other.

Household income per equivalent adult is more equally distributed than total household income. With the possible exception of the Centre & East and of Bangkok-Thonburi, income per equivalent adult is more equally distributed in villages than it is in towns.

5.2 The Shape of the Poverty Profile and the Household

Looking at the incidence of poor families by different characteristics of households, and comparing the distributions of poor and nonpoor households, we see that being poor is closely related with such factors as family size, the number of children and the number of income earners. In this section we take a closer look at the household and the way in which its composition affects its income position on the poverty scale.

Table 5.1.1

Distribution of Income of the Population on a Poverty Scale, 1968/9

(Poverty line is defined as household income per equivalent adult < ฿1,725 per year)

Region	Household Income per Equivalent Adult (in multiples of poverty income)	Gini Coefficient	Variance of Income Logarithms	Theil Index
North :	1.411	.3509	.3730	.2238
Towns	3.088	.3855	.4947	.2503
Villages	1.313	.3252	.3322	.1852
Centre & East :	2.166	.3737	.3947	.2673
Towns	3.479	.3623	.4099	.2275
Villages	2.053	.3635	.3714	.2581
Northeast :	1.115	.3502	.3156	.2636
Towns	3.037	.4149	.5175	.3066
Villages	1.043	.3212	.2750	.2179
South :	1.313	.3744	.3780	.2808
Towns	2.919	.3988	.4808	.2787
Villages	1.074	.2966	.2614	.1634
Bangkok-Thonburi:	3.626	.3770	.4516	.2463
Towns	3.854	.3610	.4296	.2227
Villages	2.901	.3993	.4344	.3169
Whole Kingdom :	1.619	.4128	.4724	.3247
Towns	3.481	.3794	.4689	.2460
Villages	1.381	.3686	.3803	.2623

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

Method : See text.

The thing which primarily characterizes a household is its size, the number of persons in it. An increase in the size of the family has two quite separate effects in terms of income. On the one hand, a larger number of persons would suggest that the number who are available to seek work and earn income is also larger. In general, the number of earners can be expected to increase with household size, although whether or not it increases as fast as the total number of family members is a different matter. On the other hand, a larger number of family members increases the demand for goods and services and means that a larger income is necessary to maintain the original level of consumption. So an increase in family size raises both the supply of income earners and also the demand for goods and services and hence income.

Large families tend also to have larger numbers of children. It is not obvious whether the number of children increases faster or more slowly than family size. It makes a difference whether the larger family size is due to the addition of children, who are dependents, or of adults. An adult member potentially can contribute towards total income, and if his contribution is larger than the average income already available to each member, then it raises the average potential consumption of the household. An increased family size due to the presence of children too young to work raises consumption needs, although these may be smaller than those for adults, but does not add to the number of workers. Thus average consumption must necessarily decline.

If we define the consumption needs of household members in terms of consumption expenditure per equivalent adult, then the result that the incidence of poor families rises with family size means that the increase in household income does not keep up with the increase in the number of equivalent adults. Defining the relationships in double-log form, we have, for example,

$$EA = \alpha_1 S^{\beta_1} \qquad \text{(i)}$$

$$W = \alpha_2 S^{\beta_2} \qquad \text{(ii)}$$

$$\text{and } Y = \alpha_3 W^{\beta_3} \qquad \text{(iii)}$$

where EA is the number of equivalent adults,

S is household size,

W is the number of workers,

Y is total household income,

and α's and β's are constants.

$$\text{Now } \frac{Y}{EA} = \frac{\alpha_3 W^{\beta_3}}{\alpha_1 S^{\beta_1}} = \frac{\alpha_3 \alpha_2^{\beta_3} S^{\beta_2\beta_3}}{\alpha_1 S^{\beta_1}} = \frac{\alpha_3 \alpha_2^{\beta_3}}{\alpha_1} . S^{(\beta_2\beta_3 - \beta_1)} \qquad \text{(iv)}$$

So $\frac{Y}{EA}$ decreases with S if $\beta_2\beta_3 < \beta_1$, that is if the product of the elasticities of number of workers with respect to family size and of family income with respect to number of workers is less than the elasticity of equivalent adults with respect to family size.

Tables 5.2.1a, 5.2.1b, 5.2.2, 5.2.3a and 5.2.3b present some results of estimating the relationships in equations (i), (ii) and (iv). The regressions used observations corresponding to family-size

Table 5.2.1a

Relationship Between the Number of Equivalent Adults[a] and Family Size

ln (number of equivalent adults) = a +b.ln (family size)

	a	b	R^2	Number of observations
Towns :	0.0110 (0.54)[b]	0.8883 (77.00)	0.9998	20
North	0.0302 (1.55)	0.8794 (70.99)	0.9990	14
Centre & East	0.0320 (1.85)	0.8730 (84.02)	0.9992	19
Northeast	0.0180 (0.81)	0.8803 (70.97)	0.9992	16
South	0.0098 (0.51)	0.8887 (76.79)	0.9985	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	-0.0374 (-1.79)	0.9191 (80.58)	0.9998	20
Villages :	0.0193 (0.98)	0.8659 (76.44)	0.9998	17
North	0.0536 (2.58)	0.8429 (69.61)	0.9998	15
Centre & East	0.0329 (1.83)	0.8668 (82.86)	0.9998	16
Northeast	-0.0383 (-1.34)	0.8942 (56.62)	0.9997	14
South	0.0325 (1.32)	0.8593 (57.72)	0.9997	14
Bangkok-Thonburi	0.0256 (0.65)	0.8734 (41.05)	0.9994	15
Total :	0.0172 (0.91)	0.8692 (80.65)	0.9998	20
North	0.0541 (2.62)	0.8436 (69.91)	0.9998	15
Centre & East	0.0335 (2.18)	0.8666 (96.60)	0.9999	20
Northeast	-0.0362 (-1.38)	0.8936 (61.24)	0.9998	16
South	0.0277 (1.21)	0.8639 (62.61)	0.9997	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	-0.0082 (-0.34)	0.9006 (69.43)	0.9997	20

[a] The scale used here assigned weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

[b] t-statistics are given in parentheses under the corresponding coefficients.

Table 5.2.1b

Relationship Between the Number of Equivalent Adults[a] and Family Size

ln (number of equivalent adults) = a + b.ln (family size)

	a	b	R^2	Number of observations
Towns :	0.0340 (0.99)[b]	0.8013 (41.08)	0.9992	20
North	0.0585 (1.73)	0.7897 (36.90)	0.9964	14
Centre & East	0.0684 (2.21)	0.7742 (41.59)	0.9969	19
Northeast	0.0396 (1.02)	0.7897 (36.90)	0.9972	16
South	0.0261 (0.79)	0.8052 (40.48)	0.9944	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	-0.0480 (-1.32)	0.8543 (43.00)	0.9993	20
Villages :	0.0544 (1.71)	0.7589 (41.53)	0.9995	17
North	0.1173 (3.56)	0.7164 (37.41)	0.9995	15
Centre & East	0.0741 (2.49)	0.7620 (43.79)	0.9994	16
Northeast	-0.0424 (-0.90)	0.8065 (30.86)	0.9991	14
South	0.0717 (1.70)	0.7516 (29.47)	0.9989	14
Bangkok-Thonburi	0.0652 (0.94)	0.7710 (20.54)	0.9976	15
Total :	0.0498 (1.62)	0.7650 (43.54)	0.9995	20
North	0.1170 (3.58)	0.7183 (37.67)	0.9994	15
Centre & East	0.0751 (2.95)	0.7617 (51.18)	0.9996	20
Northeast	-0.0390 (-0.90)	0.8056 (33.42)	0.9992	16
South	0.0631 (1.63)	0.7596 (32.57)	0.9990	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	0.0042 (0.10)	0.8211 (36.85)	0.9991	20

[a] The scale used here assigned weights of .13 and .39 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

[b] t-statistics are given in parentheses under the corresponding coefficients.

Table 5.2.2

Relationship Between the Number of Earners and Family Size

ln (number of earners) = a + b.ln (family size)

	a	b	R^2	Number of observations
Towns :	-0.0311 (-0.58)[a]	0.3919 (12.95)	0.9899	20
North	0.0836 (1.86)	0.2850 (10.00)	0.9613	14
Centre & East	0.0323 (0.68)	0.3072 (10.74)	0.9608	19
Northeast	0.0055 (0.04)	0.3664 (4.84)	0.8387	16
South	-0.0013 (-0.02)	0.3662 (8.60)	0.8507	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	-0.1005 (-1.48)	0.4619 (12.44)	0.9887	20
Villages :	0.0595 (1.03)	0.1932 (5.82)	0.9783	17
North	0.2152 (2.09)	0.1416 (2.36)	0.9551	15
Centre & East	0.0377 (0.36)	0.2390 (3.87)	0.9378	16
Northeast	-0.0487 (-0.67)	0.1935 (4.80)	0.9471	14
South	-0.0548 (-0.45)	0.2406 (3.29)	0.8731	14
Bangkok-Thonburi	0.0363 (0.25)	0.3212 (4.08)	0.9445	15
Total :	0.0305 (0.58)	0.2281 (7.64)	0.9832	20
North	0.2115 (2.15)	0.1469 (2.56)	0.9588	15
Centre & East	0.0352 (0.41)	0.2453 (4.86)	0.9572	20
Northeast	-0.0561 (-0.83)	0.2063 (5.53)	0.9603	16
South	-0.0786 (-0.80)	0.2765 (4.71)	0.9170	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	-0.0415 (-0.54)	0.4151 (9.85)	0.9848	20

[a] t-statistics are given in parentheses under the corresponding coefficients.

Table 5.2.3a

Relationship Between Household Income per Equivalent Adult[a] and Family Size

ln (household income per equivalent adult) = a + b.ln (family size)

	a	b	R^2	Number of observations
Towns :	9.3035 (120.99)[b]	-0.3298 (-7.55)	0.9999	20
North	9.0448 (111.91)	-0.2605 (-5.09)	0.9995	14
Centre & East	9.3515 (85.74)	-0.3971 (-6.05)	0.9992	19
Northeast	9.3011 (35.73)	-0.3648 (-2.53)	0.9955	16
South	9.2612 (61.69)	-0.3746 (-4.17)	0.9974	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	9.6196 (153.37)	-0.4504 (-13.16)	0.9999	20
Villages :	8.3658 (149.21)	-0.3254 (-10.11)	0.9999	17
North	8.4136 (74.12)	-0.3892 (-5.89)	0.9998	15
Centre & East	8.3925 (74.49)	-0.1472 (-2.24)	0.9998	16
Northeast	8.2201 (73.32)	-0.3785 (-6.09)	0.9998	14
South	8.2569 (72.49)	-0.3493 (-5.08)	0.9998	14
Bangkok-Thonburi	9.1618 (38.21)	-0.3887 (-3.00)	0.9991	15
Total :	8.5111 (173.47)	-0.3178 (-11.30)	0.9999	20
North	8.5175 (81.92)	-0.4070 (-6.70)	0.9998	15
Centre & East	8.5334 (106.01)	-0.1967 (-4.18)	0.9999	20
Northeast	8.2944 (81.78)	-0.3785 (-6.74)	0.9999	16
South	8.3562 (62.66)	-0.2944 (-3.67)	0.9997	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	9.4425 (124.64)	-0.3938 (-9.51)	0.9999	20

[a] The scale used here assigned weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

[b] t-statistics are given in parentheses under the corresponding coefficients.

Table 5.2.3b

Relationship Between Household Income per Equivalent Adult[a] and Family Size

ln (household income per equivalent adult) = a + b.ln (family size)

	a	b	R^2	Number of observations
Towns :	9.2806 (121.30)[b]	-0.2428 (-5.59)	0.9999	20
North	9.0166 (114.32)	-0.1708 (-3.42)	0.9995	14
Centre & East	9.3151 (81.62)	-0.2983 (-4.34)	0.9991	19
Northeast	9.2796 (36.18)	-0.2742 (-1.93)	0.9958	16
South	9.2449 (62.82)	-0.2912 (-3.30)	0.9975	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	9.6301 (172.53)	-0.3856 (-12.66)	0.9999	20
Villages :	8.3307 (143.15)	-0.2183 (-6.53)	0.9999	17
North	8.3499 (69.84)	-0.2627 (-3.78)	0.9998	15
Centre & East	8.3513 (71.66)	-0.0424 (-0.62)	0.9998	16
Northeast	8.2242 (80.46)	-0.2908 (-5.13)	0.9999	14
South	8.2177 (67.80)	-0.2415 (-3.30)	0.9998	14
Bangkok-Thonburi	9.1222 (38.22)	-0.2863 (-2.22)	0.9992	15
Total :	8.4786 (190.17)	-0.2137 (-8.36)	0.9999	20
North	8.4547 (78.23)	-0.2817 (-4.46)	0.9998	15
Centre & East	8.4918 (100.88)	-0.0919 (-1.87)	0.9999	20
Northeast	8.2973 (88.48)	-0.2904 (-5.59)	0.9999	16
South	8.3207 (63.76)	-0.1901 (-2.42)	0.9997	16
Bangkok-Thonburi	9.4301 (119.98)	-0.3142 (-7.31)	0.9999	20

[a] The scale used here assigned weights of .13 and .39 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

[b] t-statistics are given in parentheses under the corresponding coefficients.

cells of each region and urban/rural location under consideration. It can be seen that the order of magnitude of the β_1 coefficient is close to .9 using scale A, and close to or around .8 on scale B which assigns very low consumption requirements to children.[26/] The range of the β_2 coefficient is from .14 in Northern villages to .46 in Bangkok-Thonburi towns.[27/]

Table 5.2.3 gives the results of regressing income per equivalent adult on family size. The coefficient of family size gives an estimate for $\beta_2\beta_3 - \beta_1$, so that having already estimated β_1 and β_2, estimates for β_3 can be obtained. These are quite independent of which set of equivalent scales is used. The various coefficients are presented together in Table 5.2.4. Thus it can be seen that although the variation among various regions of β_1 is very small, there is a great deal of difference in the β_2 and β_3 coefficients. The number of income earners increases less rapidly with family size for villages than for towns within any given region. However, household income increases with the number of earners faster for villages than for towns. Taken together, the product of β_2 and β_3 represents the elasticity of family income with respect to family size. Since this is, in all cases, smaller than the elasticity of number of equivalent adults with respect to family size, we find that income per equivalent adult does

---

26/ Scale A assigns weights of .42 and .63 while scale B assigns .13 and .39 of adults to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

27/ The regressions presented here used income earners as opposed to workers since this was the variable more readily available from the data tapes.

Table 5.2.4

Elasticities of number of earners with respect to family size (β_2), of family income with respect to number of earners (β_3), of equivalent adults with respect to family size (β_1), and of income per equivalent adult with respect to family size ($\beta_2\beta_3 - \beta_1$)

	β_2	β_1^A	β_1^B	$\beta_2\beta_3-\beta_1^A$	$\beta_2\beta_3-\beta_1^B$	β_3	$\beta_2\beta_3$
Towns :	.3919	.8883	.8013	-.3298	-.2429	1.4251	.5585
North	.2850	.8794	.7897	-.2605	-.1708	2.1717	.6189
Centre & East	.3072	.8730	.7742	-.3971	-.2983	1.5492	.4759
Northeast	.3664	.8803	.7897	-.3648	-.2742	1.4071	.5156
South	.3662	.8887	.8052	-.3746	-.2912	1.4040	.5151
Bangkok-Thonburi	.4619	.9191	.8543	-.4504	-.3856	1.0147	.4687
Villages :	.1932	.8659	.7589	-.3254	-.2183	2.7986	.5407
North	.1416	.8429	.7164	-.3892	-.2627	3.2036	.4536
Centre & East	.2390	.8668	.7620	-.1472	-.0424	3.0114	.7197
Northeast	.1935	.8942	.8065	-.3785	-.2908	2.6655	.5158
South	.2406	.8593	.7516	-.3493	-.2415	2.1198	.5100
Bangkok-Thonburi	.3212	.8734	.7710	-.3887	-.2863	1.5089	.4847
Total :	.2281	.8691	.7650	-.3178	-.2137	2.4169	.5513
North	.1469	.8435	.7183	-.4070	-.2817	2.9728	.4367
Centre & East	.2453	.8666	.7617	-.1967	-.0919	2.7306	.6698
Northeast	.2063	.8936	.8056	-.3785	-.2904	2.4970	.5151
South	.2765	.8639	.7596	-.2944	-.1901	2.0598	.5695
Bangkok-Thonburi	.4151	.8691	.8211	-.3178	-.3142	1.2212	.5069

not keep up with family size. Considering towns and villages as a whole, an increase of 1% in the size of the family leads to an increase in the number of earners of .4% in towns compared with only .2% in villages. For every 1% increase in the number of earners, family income rises by 1.4% in towns and 2.8% in villages. The net effect is that a 1% increase in family size leads to an increase of just over .5% in family income for both. Since the number of equivalent adults has, however, increased by approximately .9% or .8%, depending on the scale used, income per equivalent adult falls by .4% or .3% respectively.

The increasing incidence of poor households by family size is related to the inability, for whatever reason, on the part of households to increase the number of earners fast enough to keep up with the increased consumption requirements made necessary by the increased family size. Given the elasticities of household income by number of earners, and using scale A to calculate the number of equivalent adults, the elasticity of number of earners with respect to family size would have to increase from .39 to .62 for towns and from .19 to .31 for villages in order for income per equivalent adult to keep pace with family size, assuming that this increase does not affect the size of the elasticity of family income with respect to the number of earners.

The elasticity β_2 of number of earners with respect to family size depends on the supply of potential workers on the one hand, and the demand for them in the labour market on the other. The supply of

workers depends on the number of adults, so that the more the increase in family size is due to the presence of children, the lower the elasticity. It may also be influenced by how well-off the household is without the additional workers. A really poor family has more incentive to send more of its available members out to work. On the demand side many factors are involved which affect the size of β_2 such as the personal characteristics of the potential workers, age, sex, level of schooling, work experience and so on, as well as the general market situation.

The β_2 elasticity is found to be lower for villages than for towns, for any given region. This suggests that large village households have more children than town households of comparable size and, moreover, that work opportunities are not so readily available in rural as in urban areas, if we assume that there is in the two areas the same incentive to work for any given level of household income per equivalent adult. If this is true, it points to the desirability of providing more work opportunities in rural areas as a way of reducing poverty. However, it would first be necessary to find out more about household decisions concerning work.

5.3 Identifying the Poor

It has been shown that there are many factors which are related to the incidence of poor families in different population groups. Some involve the characteristics of the household head, such as his age, sex, level of educational attainment and economic sector, while

others involve those of the household itself, its size, number of children and number of earners. In this section we look at income per equivalent adult directly and attempt to see how it can be linked with these characteristics when they are taken into account simultaneously, since many of them tend to be correlated. The usefulness of the approach lies in the possibility of being able to work back to the position of the family in relation to the poverty line, when only certain household characteristics are given but not income itself, or when the income information needs corroboration.

Formally a simple model of household income determination is given by the following relationships :

$$Y_H : ED, AGE, SECT, \ldots\ldots \quad \text{(i)}$$

$$W : A, X \quad \text{(ii)}$$

$$Y_R : W \quad \text{(iii)}$$

and the identity $Y_F = Y_H + Y_R$ (iv)

The first equation postulates that the income of the head of household is determined by a number of personal characteristics, such as his level of educational attainment and his age, as well as the economic environment in which he finds himself, such as his sector of occupation and his region of residence. The second relates the number of extra workers in the household besides the head to the number of adults and to exogenous factors X beyond the control of the household unit which represent the demand situation. The number of adults can be taken to represent the supply of labour which can potentially

be offered by the household. The third equation postulates that the income earned by extra workers is a function of the number of extra workers, while the fourth simply states that total household income is the sum of the head's income and the combined income of additional workers. From these equations we easily see that household income will be related to the socio-economic characteristics of the household head and the number of workers, where it is understood that the latter is itself determined by the forces of demand and supply of labour services.

Since we have consistently found differences between towns and villages, and also across regions, the analysis from this point on is carried out separately for each region and location. Regressions were run of household total income on some characteristics of the household head and the number of earners.[28/] Household total income included own consumption and imputed rent and was adjusted for regional price variations in order for the equations for different regions and locations to be directly comparable.

The independent variables representing characteristics of the household head were included as dummy variables. These were education (no schooling, 1-9 years, 10 years or more), age (under 30, 30-39, 40-49, and 50 and over) and economic sector (agriculture, nonagriculture). The base was taken to be no schooling, age 30-39 and agriculture.

28/ For convenience this was used instead of the number of extra earners besides the household head. The two are highly correlated since practically all household heads earn incomes.

The number of workers was included as a continuous variable.

The sample consisted of all the households on the data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, with the exception of Bangkok-Thonburi towns and Northeastern villages where the sample size was too large and we were limited to 1,800 observations.

The estimated regression equations are presented in Table 5.3.1. The results are on the whole as would be expected. The coefficients for education show incomes as increasing steadily with the level of schooling of the head, the exception being in Northeastern towns where the coefficient for 1-9 years of education is negative, but it is also not statistically significant. The coefficients for the nonagriculture dummy variable are of the right sign and generally statistically significant, with the exception of towns in the Centre & East where the sign is different from what would be expected. The percentage of town households in the agricultural sector is small, but evidently in the Centre & East they belong to the wealthier class, and one can only conjecture that they may be landowners and absentee landlords. The age dummy variable shows a more varied pattern across different regions and locations, with many of the coefficients statistically insignificant.

Household income is definitely correlated with the number of earners, the coefficient of the number of earners being positive in every case and statistically significant in all but one. For cross-sectional data such as these, the multiple correlation coefficients are quite high.

Table 5.3.1

Relationship between Household Income and Various Household Characteristics, by Region and Location, 1968/9
(Dependent variable is total household income adjusted for own consumption and imputed rent, and for regional price variations.)

Region and Location	Constant	Education of head : P1-MS2	Education of head : MS3 +	Nonagri-culture	Age of head : < 30	Age of head : 40-49	Age of head : 50 +	No. of earners	R^2	No. of obser-vations
Towns :										
North	-5425.55 (-1 19)	11225.60 (3.86)	24275.20 (6.98)	6753.05 (2.35)	-11647.1 (-3.51)	-5843.33 (-2.29)	4302.45 (1.60)	5442.41 (4.70)	.2012	873
Centre & East	9810.09 (2.54)	3045.96 (1.35)	8969.38 (2.95)	-5483.45 (-2.24)	-4263.73 (-1.54)	2120.49 (.96)	-245.55 (-.10)	9088.80 (9.19)	.2683	794
Northeast	-6753.37 (-.96)	-1240.66 (-.23)	16035.00 (2.63)	13883.20 (3.63)	-7965.49 (-1.49)	-6689.39 (-1.77)	3709.54 (.97)	9375.29 (6.82)	.2301	479
South	-4615.45 (-.87)	3846.49 (1.31)	20426.00 (5.99)	6306.96 (1.46)	-12304.20 (-3.98)	-263.46 (-.10)	959.04 (.33)	7288.18 (7.78)	.1711	1027
Bangkok-Thonburi	-4667.96 (-.63)	5793.35 (2.97)	23136.10 (10.24)	2565.37 (.35)	-4044.41 (-1.78)	3631.36 (1.94)	11277.9 (5.59)	8924.19 (14.54)	.2045	1800
Villages :										
North	5310.32 (8.42)	2237.59 (4.95)	14943.10 (12.56)	1062.07 (2.60)	-1712.31 (-2.77)	1238.11 (2.46)	1804.97 (3.55)	481.48 (2.06)	.4080	1236
Centre & East	6030.58 (4.31)	4989.88 (5.18)	9898.67 (3.99)	3214.42 (3.96)	-2023.03 (-1.14)	4429.41 (4.02)	2572.08 (2.37)	291.99 (.66)	.1888	1625
Northeast	1993.13 (3.68)	1443.59 (3.54)	13131.30 (13.30)	2236.84 (5.62)	-1190.26 (-2.35)	1405.63 (3.66)	2278.15 (5.75)	1930.36 (8.51)	.2455	1800
South	2464.81 (5.19)	2295.59 (7.06)	7728.12 (8.88)	2512.45 (5.88)	-731.42 (-1.35)	1706.15 (4.02)	832.27 (2.14)	1164.53 (5.45)	.2647	910
Bangkok-Thonburi	2672.19 (.70)	4344.78 (1.63)	26517.1 (7.52)	2547.91 (1.18)	-2736.97 (-.78)	-15.34 (-.01)	7306.96 (2.59)	3878.52 (4.48)	.3137	477

Source : Data from the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Bangkok.

The point of the whole exercise, and the reason for picking the simplest possible functional form in estimating the equation is to illustrate how simple it would be to use the type of information obtained in this paper to help locate the poor. Suppose that the government sets out to assist the poor, as defined by some level of income per equivalent adult. In fact there is no way out of putting in some hard work in order to find out what the income position of each household is. But we can reduce the work which has to be done by way of detailed investigation. By asking a few questions to obtain information on the household's total income, the number of children and family size, we can first of all calculate the income per equivalent adult. If by the household's own statement it is above the specified cut-off level of income, we can safely pass it by. If, however, it is below the cut-off income, then by obtaining further information on the education, age and sector of occupation of the household head, and the number of workers, the appropriate regression coefficients can be used to calculate the expected income of a household with such characteristics, and hence the expected income per equivalent adult. If this is well below the cut-off level of income, we may well accept that this family be classified as poor. It is then necessary only to investigate those families whose reported incomes put them in the poor group but whose estimated incomes do not confirm this. The actual details would have to be worked out and the equation estimated may be different in terms of the choice of characteristics included from that presented here. In terms of having field workers working out the estimated household income as they go along, a simple equation is

warranted, however.

Such an approach utilizes what we know about the characteristics of poor households to assist us in confirming whether or not a household is below a particular cut-off standard of income, thus qualifying for government assistance.

5.4 Conclusion

The Thai government has recently shown increasing interest in instituting various welfare measures. Our work demonstrates the importance of household characteristics such as its size, number of children and number of earners, as well as characteristics of the household head, in linking the distribution of income of economically active individuals with that of the entire population. It is inappropriate to use total household income to measure the economic well-being of households, but in the same way it would also be inappropriate to use the income of earning members.

Government measures to improve the level of material well-being of the poor must take into account not only the income taken in by household members, but also the number and the composition of the people among whom the income has to be shared. Only in this way will government assistance reach the intended group of the population, namely the poor. Thus the government must attempt to find an appropriate measure of the level of well-being of households. We have suggested household income per equivalent adult, or, if necessary, simply household income per person. Obtaining this information

directly by asking the household is not difficult. The problem is when it is suspected that the household is understating its income in order to qualify for government assistance. In such cases it is possible to use the regression estimate for household income based on some characteristics of the head and the number of workers, from which household income per equivalent adult can be obtained. This helps to narrow the group on which further investigation has to be done in order to determine the real income position of the household.

The concept of household income per equivalent adult is therefore seen not to be merely a theoretical concept, but one which could be applied in practice in order to identify those households among the population which should receive government attention.

6. Conclusion

This paper uses data from the Household Expenditure Survey, 1962/3, and the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, to examine the income distribution in Thailand. The money income data normally used in official tabulations are adjusted to take into account own consumption or nonmoney income and imputed rent to owner-occupied dwellings. Ignoring these would mean that we exaggerate the overall degree of income inequality as well as the disparity between towns and villages, since the adjustments are more important for lower income groups and for villages.

A poverty profile has been constructed for Thailand, based on the 1968/9 survey, and the characteristics of poor and nonpoor households are compared. Being poor in Thailand is closely associated with living in villages and being in a household whose head is in the agricultural sector and has little or no schooling. Poor households tend to be large in size, have many children and few earners. The Northeast, North and South are the poor regions of Thailand, while the Centre & East and Bangkok-Thonburi are considerably better off.

The definition of poor households is based on a cut-off level of household income per equivalent adult, with account being taken of variations in the price level by region. The qualitative results are not sensitive to the exact cut-off standard, although the actual composition of poor households changes as the cut-off level is shifted up and down.

Using published tabulations from both surveys, and a scale elasticity of .9 to allow for different consumption needs of households of different sizes, and allowing for increases in the consumer price level over time, a comparison is made between 1962/3 and 1968/9. It is found that rapid income growth does not guarantee an improvement in the income situation of the poor relative to other groups. The Northeast which experienced very rapid income growth between 1962/3 and 1968/9 had a higher share of the poor in 1968/9 than at the earlier date. The study raises the question of whether it is in fact easier to bring about improvements in the distribution of income in the context of rapid growth, or whether it is simply that income growth makes it more acceptable that there is still a great deal of inequality in incomes.

Using the sample of economically active individuals from the 1968/9 Socio-economic Survey, the study attempts to assess the contribution of various socio-economic characteristics of individuals to income inequality among the working population. An analysis-of-variance technique is applied in which the measure of income inequality used is the variance of income logarithms. Five characteristics of individuals are used in the analysis : the level of educational attainment, age, economic sector, major type of income and region of residence. Economic sector is the single most important explanatory characteristic of income disparities. Within the nonagricultural sector, human capital variables, namely education and age which represents work experience, offer some explanation for income inequality. This is, however, not

the case in the agricultural sector, where education, in particular, fails to account for income dispersion among individuals. Age, however, is an important factor in this sector. In both economic sectors the study concludes that there is a definite regional effect, so that regional disparities in income cannot be attributed to factors such as education, age or economic sector, and are presumably due to omitted factors such as the resource endowments of different regions.

Some preliminary findings are offered in this paper of our attempt to link the distribution of household income per equivalent adult with the distribution of income of economically active individuals. It has been argued that the latter is the appropriate distribution to use when trying to identify sources of inequality in incomes as they are generated. However, incomes are subsequently pooled and redistributed within household units so that for welfare implications of income inequality one must look at household incomes. But, since households vary greatly in terms of their size and composition, it becomes necessary to look at a concept of income which takes into account these things. It is suggested that household income per equivalent adult be used instead of the usual total household income when examining income inequality among the total population.

Since the income distribution analysed from the point of view of the material well-being of the total population has a great deal to do with the household, this paper examines some aggregate relationships between family size, the number of equivalent adults and the number of income earners. It is found that the increasing incidence of poor

households by household size is due to the slow rate of increase in the number of earners by family size which prevents income per equivalent adult from remaining at the same level.

Some tentative policy implications of the study are offered here. It comes as no surprise that the sectoral disparity in incomes explains a great deal of total income inequality. The surveys used do not include the type of information necessary for a detailed analysis of the agricultural sector sepcifically.[29/] More work is clearly needed in this area. However, the study raises the question of why those with some schooling do not earn substantially higher incomes in the agricultural sector than people with no schooling. Even if people spend only a few years having their formal education, and even if they do not remain functionally literate after leaving school, one would expect a reasonable system of education to leave people more receptive to the introduction of new technology, so that they would be more likely to use new techniques and equipment consistent with an improved ability to earn income. More research should be done to determine the effects on income of compulsory education as well as the improvements in the school curriculum in rural areas which would make education more beneficial to the rural population in terms of their material well-being.

29/ A Thammasat student is writing his M.A. thesis on the sources of inequality in the agricultural sector, using data from the Village Studies conducted by the Chulalongkorn University Social Science Research Institute, which should be completed by September, 1975.

This study has stressed the role of the household in the determination of the distribution of material welfare of the population, although it leaves many questions unanswered. Government policies aimed at improving the overall distribution of income must necessarily take into account the household sector. On the one hand, attempts to increase the incomes of the economically active population, both by way of raising the incomes of those already working and of expanding work opportunities, as well as efforts to supplement the incomes of poor households in various ways, must take into account the fact that labour force participation is a household decision which is related with many other factors internal to the household, such as the existing level of material well-being of the household, family size and its composition. The impact of government programmes such as the present one of channeling 2,500 million baht through the district councils in rural areas on the income distribution cannot be predicted unless we have a better understanding of how households function and make decisions.

On the other hand, once we are able to translate a government policy instrument into its effects on individuals' and hence household incomes, the manner in which the increment in income gets spent must be understood. This means a detailed study of the consumption pattern of various goods and services of households in general, and of those at different parts of the income distribution in particular. The compositions of total consumption of different income groups are quite dissimilar, and the income elasticities of demand for different goods

and services are expected to be different for poor and nonpoor households.[30/] Thus the composition of final demand depends on which population group experiences an improvement in its relative income position.

The study has demonstrated how the level of material welfare of the population cannot be assessed on the basis of the incomes earned by individuals. Thus welfare schemes such as the one newly introduced supposedly to help the poor in Bangkok, where the criterion for being poor is based on the income earned by the major earner or the couple, without regard for either additional earners or the size and composition of the household, will not necessarily reach the intended target group, namely the poorest people in Bangkok-Thonburi. The scheme is badly formulated because it had not been clearly thought out before hand what was meant by being poor. The objectives of the programme are also seen to be hazy since a person loses his privileges of free bus rides if his income exceeds ฿1,000 per month, when in fact he could conceivably be supporting a very large family all by himself so that the household may be right at the bottom of the income-per-equivalent-adult distribution. Similarly, a couple losing free-schooling and free-medical-services privileges, on account of earning more than ฿2,000 per month together, may be considerably worse off than another household qualifying for these privileges, if we took into account

---

30/ This writer has started to work on this problem. Preliminary results show very different income elasticities of demand for major commodity groups when poor and nonpoor households are considered separately.

their household size and composition.

There is thus no easy way out and one simply must take into account the household when considering poverty. The study suggests that by estimating the relationship between household income and certain characteristics of the household as well as the household head, it will be possible to use this as a rough check on the order of magnitude of reported income, thereby reducing the amount of further investigation which must be carried out in order to find the position of each household in the income distribution.

Table A.1.1

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

North, Towns

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.03	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000 - 1,499	0.01	0.00	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,500 - 1,999	0.20	0.02	0.12	0.01	0.0	0.0
2,000 - 2,499	0.48	0.05	0.13	0.01	0.12	0.01
2,500 - 2,999	0.77	0.10	0.32	0.04	0.10	0.01
3,000 - 3,749	3.63	0.55	1.03	0.16	0.41	0.06
3,750 - 4,499	1.39	0.28	2.45	0.46	1.33	0.23
4,500 - 5,249	3.70	0.86	1.38	0.31	1.67	0.35
5,250 - 5,999	3.82	1.00	3.72	0.98	1.61	0.39
6,000 - 6,749	2.50	0.76	2.85	0.84	1.58	0.44
6,750 - 7,499	2.71	0.92	3.84	1.26	3.82	1.16
7,500 - 8,249	5.18	1.95	3.93	1.44	4.23	1.44
8,250 - 8,999	2.16	0.88	2.41	0.97	3.25	1.21
9,000 - 9,749	5.98	2.65	7.52	3.20	5.47	2.21
9,750 - 10,499	3.61	1.74	3.81	1.76	4.76	2.09
10,500 - 11,249	5.14	2.64	3.68	1.84	3.46	1.62
11,250 - 11,999	1.42	0.78	2.27	1.21	3.74	1.86
12,000 - 13,499	7.04	4.20	8.28	4.80	7.77	4.22
13,500 - 14,999	3.55	2.43	2.72	1.77	5.64	3.47
15,000 - 16,499	4.85	3.58	4.15	2.97	1.98	1.34
16,500 - 17,999	3.35	2.75	4.26	3.36	4.32	3.21
18,000 - 19,499	3.54	3.10	4.17	3.54	4.24	3.40
19,500 - 20,999	8.05	7.72	7.49	6.90	6.30	5.49
21,000 - 22,499	1.56	1.62	2.78	2.76	5.50	5.17
22,500 - 23,999	1.66	1.83	2.55	2.71	1.97	2.00
24,000 - 26,999	4.32	5.21	3.61	4.22	4.05	4.40
27,000 - 29,999	1.12	1.50	1.54	1.99	2.70	3.29
30,000 - 32,999	3.04	4.49	3.75	5.33	3.09	4.18
33,000 - 35,999	2.26	3.68	2.16	3.41	2.40	3.50
36,000 - 39,999	4.06	7.33	3.78	6.57	3.36	5.46
40,000 - 47,999	3.03	6.30	2.76	5.56	3.83	7.15
48,000 - 59,999	1.08	2.78	1.65	3.95	2.26	5.15
60,000 - 99,999	2.92	10.68	3.03	10.65	2.90	9.61
100,000 - 149,999	1.00	5.05	1.00	4.86	1.25	5.79
150,000 +	0.86	10.57	0.86	10.15	0.90	10.08
Average Income	20954.95		21822.66		23181.89	
Gini Coefficient	0.4726		0.4524		0.4404	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.6699		0.5770		0.5327	
Theil Index	0.4515		0.4165		0.3955	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.2

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Centre & East, Towns

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.26	0.01	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000 - 1,499	0.30	0.02	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,500 - 1,999	0.32	0.02	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,000 - 2,499	0.10	0.01	0.25	0.02	0.0	0.0
2,500 - 2,999	0.22	0.02	0.08	0.01	0.25	0.03
3,000 - 3,749	1.51	0.20	1.40	0.18	0.29	0.04
3,750 - 4,499	1.60	0.27	1.19	0.19	1.79	0.28
4,500 - 5,249	1.38	0.28	1.96	0.39	0.96	0.18
5,250 - 5,999	0.46	0.10	0.46	0.10	1.20	0.26
6,000 - 6,749	1.60	0.41	1.42	0.35	1.29	0.30
6,750 - 7,499	1.71	0.51	1.30	0.37	1.53	0.41
7,500 - 8,249	2.15	0.71	1.99	0.62	0.59	0.18
8,250 - 8,999	1.90	0.66	2.31	0.77	2.92	0.96
9,000 - 9,749	2.95	1.15	2.43	0.90	2.38	0.85
9,750 - 10,499	2.90	1.21	2.80	1.11	1.40	0.54
10,500 - 11,249	2.65	1.19	2.72	1.16	3.57	1.48
11,250 - 11,999	2.04	0.98	2.18	0.99	2.37	1.05
12,000 - 13,499	8.41	4.38	6.82	3.38	5.96	2.91
13,500 - 14,999	6.13	3.59	5.23	2.93	5.37	2.90
15,000 - 16,499	7.60	4.90	5.99	3.67	6.50	3.90
16,500 - 17,999	3.47	2.45	4.72	3.16	4.40	2.89
18,000 - 19,499	6.30	4.78	6.60	4.85	6.06	4.32
19,500 - 20,999	5.60	4.65	5.94	4.70	6.88	5.30
21,000 - 22,499	4.02	3.60	4.18	3.56	4.62	3.79
22,500 - 23,999	2.31	2.20	2.81	2.56	3.16	2.82
24,000 - 26,999	8.50	8.67	8.50	8.34	8.06	7.72
27,000 - 29,999	3.85	4.42	5.78	6.40	6.52	6.98
30,000 - 32,999	3.12	3.98	2.65	3.25	2.86	3.41
33,000 - 35,999	2.20	3.13	3.20	4.33	2.55	3.37
36,000 - 39,999	2.34	3.58	2.31	3.43	2.49	3.50
40,000 - 47,999	2.50	4.54	2.33	3.92	3.57	5.82
48,000 - 59,999	3.37	7.25	3.98	8.39	3.77	7.80
60,000 - 99,999	3.84	12.25	3.95	12.14	4.02	11.84
100,000 - 149,999	1.71	8.47	1.81	8.63	1.94	8.92
150,000 +	0.70	5.42	0.70	5.19	0.73	5.27
Average Income	24187.61		25439.50		26216.11	
Gini Coefficient	0.4160		0.4081		0.3996	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.5894		0.5259		0.4938	
Theil Index	0.3290		0.3131		0.3006	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.3

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}), and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Northeast, Towns

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000 - 1,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,500 - 1,999	1.26	0.07	1.26	0.08	0.0	0.0
2,000 - 2,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.26	0.09
2,500 - 2,999	0.14	0.01	0.14	0.01	0.14	0.01
3,000 - 3,749	1.36	0.17	0.76	0.09	0.62	0.07
3,750 - 4,499	0.80	0.12	0.27	0.04	0.14	0.02
4,500 - 5,249	0.73	0.14	0.46	0.08	0.39	0.06
5,250 - 5,999	0.76	0.16	0.53	0.11	0.64	0.13
6,000 - 6,749	4.00	0.92	4.27	0.98	0.78	0.17
6,750 - 7,499	1.86	0.51	0.97	0.25	2.72	0.67
7,500 - 8,249	1.59	0.48	1.38	0.40	2.04	0.55
8,250 - 8,999	2.14	0.70	2.70	0.84	1.95	0.58
9,000 - 9,749	3.84	1.38	2.70	0.93	1.90	0.61
9,750 - 10,499	3.05	1.17	3.04	1.11	1.59	0.55
10,500 - 11,249	5.24	2.16	4.90	1.92	3.19	1.19
11,250 - 11,999	1.02	0.46	1.49	0.62	2.37	0.93
12,000 - 13,499	8.20	3.88	8.12	3.69	8.28	3.56
13,500 - 14,999	3.30	1.78	4.03	2.09	6.16	2.98
15,000 - 16,499	6.39	3.78	5.56	3.14	4.28	2.33
16,500 - 17,999	3.03	2.00	3.74	2.33	5.15	3.03
18,000 - 19,499	9.39	6.67	3.60	2.42	3.55	2.30
19,500 - 20,999	3.97	3.04	7.12	5.21	4.48	3.12
21,000 - 22,499	2.87	2.37	4.60	3.56	6.65	5.00
22,500 - 23,999	3.30	2.90	4.31	3.63	4.33	3.46
24,000 - 26,999	7.52	7.10	7.54	6.76	8.86	7.63
27,000 - 29,999	2.82	3.00	3.71	3.75	4.75	4.62
30,000 - 32,999	2.86	3.40	3.46	3.91	2.81	3.01
33,000 - 35,999	3.19	4.17	2.64	3.23	3.54	4.26
36,000 - 39,999	1.67	2.44	2.17	2.96	2.01	2.64
40,000 - 47,999	2.50	4.02	2.62	4.04	3.45	5.22
48,000 - 59,999	4.98	10.03	4.82	9.26	3.97	7.42
60,000 - 99,999	3.34	9.28	3.77	10.31	4.52	11.51
100,000 - 149,999	1.38	6.17	1.81	7.62	1.96	7.94
150,000 +	1.51	15.50	1.51	14.66	1.51	14.37
Average Income	26213.25		27722.34		29161.00	
Gini Coefficient	0.4667		0.4590		0.4495	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.6535		0.6242		0.5895	
Theil Index	0.4600		0.4397		0.4224	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.4

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

South, Towns

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.60	0.01	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000 - 1,499	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.00
1,500 - 1,999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,000 - 2,499	0.24	0.02	0.17	0.02	0.0	0.0
2,500 - 2,999	0.28	0.03	0.0	0.0	0.02	0.00
3,000 - 3,749	1.29	0.19	1.32	0.18	0.20	0.03
3,750 - 4,499	1.82	0.32	1.35	0.22	0.96	0.15
4,500 - 5,249	1.66	0.34	1.02	0.20	1.57	0.29
5,250 - 5,999	1.59	0.39	2.26	0.51	1.29	0.28
6,000 - 6,749	4.42	1.19	3.38	0.86	2.97	0.72
6,750 - 7,499	4.48	1.37	3.79	1.11	2.85	0.78
7,500 - 8,249	3.26	1.10	2.64	0.84	2.33	0.70
8,250 - 8,999	1.73	0.64	2.75	0.97	2.94	0.97
9,000 - 9,749	4.97	2.00	4.11	1.56	3.87	1.39
9,750 - 10,499	3.31	1.44	3.62	1.48	3.24	1.26
10,500 - 11,249	3.51	1.64	3.16	1.40	3.02	1.25
11,250 - 11,999	2.75	1.37	1.80	0.84	2.32	1.03
12,000 - 13,499	7.59	4.10	7.20	3.66	6.96	3.38
13,500 - 14,999	4.31	2.64	5.37	3.11	6.32	3.45
15,000 - 16,499	5.63	3.80	5.29	3.37	4.86	2.90
16,500 - 17,999	4.45	3.29	4.74	3.32	4.12	2.70
18,000 - 19,499	6.18	4.93	7.19	5.45	6.34	4.52
19,500 - 20,999	2.00	1.73	3.01	2.46	4.14	3.21
21,000 - 22,499	3.35	3.12	3.21	2.84	3.86	3.20
22,500 - 23,999	2.43	2.42	2.38	2.25	2.36	2.07
24,000 - 26,999	6.12	6.52	6.82	6.97	6.87	6.64
27,000 - 29,999	2.70	3.34	3.00	3.53	3.95	4.30
30,000 - 32,999	4.13	5.54	3.19	4.06	3.04	3.64
33,000 - 35,999	1.30	1.92	2.02	2.80	2.93	3.81
36,000 - 39,999	2.67	4.28	2.79	4.26	2.54	3.68
40,000 - 47,999	2.47	4.58	2.91	5.16	3.55	5.76
48,000 - 59,999	3.76	8.69	3.98	8.68	3.92	7.91
60,000 - 99,999	3.20	10.00	3.57	10.54	4.54	12.43
100,000 - 149,999	1.03	4.76	1.22	5.64	1.35	5.87
150,000 +	0.73	12.29	0.73	11.69	0.76	11.68
Average Income	23233.42		24539.00		26172.32	
Gini Coefficient	0.4692		0.4591		0.4501	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.6722		0.5799		0.5471	
Theil Index	0.4871		0.4625		0.4454	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.5

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Bangkok-Thonburi, Towns

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.06	0.00
1,000 - 1,499	0.26	0.01	0.15	0.01	0.0	0.0
1,500 - 1,999	0.0	0.0	0.08	0.00	0.15	0.01
2,000 - 2,499	0.03	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.10	0.01
2,500 - 2,999	0.18	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.08	0.01
3,000 - 3,749	0.29	0.03	0.19	0.02	0.09	0.01
3,750 - 4,499	0.18	0.02	0.16	0.02	0.12	0.02
4,500 - 5,249	0.48	0.07	0.38	0.06	0.34	0.05
5,250 - 5,999	0.29	0.05	0.34	0.06	0.42	0.07
6,000 - 6,749	0.96	0.19	0.90	0.17	0.61	0.12
6,750 - 7,499	1.27	0.29	0.72	0.16	0.62	0.13
7,500 - 8,249	1.11	0.27	1.02	0.24	0.63	0.14
8,250 - 8,999	1.03	0.28	0.95	0.25	1.12	0.28
9,000 - 9,749	2.90	0.86	2.20	0.63	1.49	0.41
9,750 - 10,499	1.84	0.59	1.40	0.44	1.51	0.46
10,500 - 11,249	2.85	0.98	2.75	0.91	2.61	0.84
11,250 - 11,999	1.30	0.48	1.43	0.51	1.57	0.54
12,000 - 13,499	5.85	2.31	5.71	2.18	5.41	2.03
13,500 - 14,999	4.36	1.97	4.34	1.89	3.84	1.61
15,000 - 16,499	5.49	2.70	5.67	2.71	4.87	2.26
16,500 - 17,999	4.28	2.31	3.76	1.97	5.06	2.56
18,000 - 19,499	7.49	4.40	6.83	3.88	5.17	2.85
19,500 - 20,999	5.20	3.33	5.05	3.13	5.12	3.07
21,000 - 22,499	4.46	3.06	4.64	3.08	5.13	3.30
22,500 - 23,999	2.61	1.91	3.39	2.40	4.08	2.80
24,000 - 26,999	7.66	6.11	7.38	5.71	7.26	5.44
27,000 - 29,999	4.70	4.20	5.64	4.84	6.35	5.36
30,000 - 32,999	4.86	4.76	5.17	4.93	5.23	4.84
33,000 - 35,999	2.99	3.26	3.35	3.52	3.79	3.86
36,000 - 39,999	4.07	4.83	4.08	4.69	4.19	4.68
40,000 - 47,999	4.98	6.84	5.27	7.00	5.34	6.89
48,000 - 59,999	5.56	9.29	5.89	9.55	6.16	9.73
60,000 - 99,999	6.97	16.50	7.33	16.75	7.64	16.96
100,000 - 149,999	2.18	8.22	2.39	8.69	2.52	8.94
150,000 +	1.27	9.88	1.27	9.60	1.33	9.74
Average Income	31532.90		32670.81		33799.66	
Gini Coefficient	0.4210		0.4134		0.4085	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.5406		0.5181		0.5019	
Theil Index	0.3371		0.3237		0.3157	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.6

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Whole Kingdom, Towns

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.16	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02	0.00
1,000 - 1,499	0.17	0.01	0.07	0.00	0.00	0.00
1,500 - 1,999	0.21	0.01	0.18	0.01	0.06	0.00
2,000 - 2,499	0.14	0.01	0.09	0.01	0.19	0.01
2,500 - 2,999	0.29	0.03	0.12	0.01	0.11	0.01
3,000 - 3,749	1.25	0.15	0.73	0.09	0.24	0.03
3,750 - 4,499	0.89	0.14	0.86	0.12	0.69	0.10
4,500 - 5,249	1.32	0.24	0.89	0.16	0.82	0.14
5,250 - 5,999	1.10	0.22	1.17	0.24	0.87	0.17
6,000 - 6,749	2.09	0.48	1.97	0.44	1.21	0.26
6,750 - 7,499	2.07	0.55	1.75	0.44	1.79	0.43
7,500 - 8,249	2.26	0.66	1.89	0.53	1.56	0.42
8,250 - 8,999	1.56	0.49	1.82	0.56	2.08	0.61
9,000 - 9,749	3.77	1.30	3.38	1.12	2.62	0.84
9,750 - 10,499	2.61	0.98	2.47	0.89	2.25	0.78
10,500 - 11,249	3.51	1.41	3.17	1.22	3.01	1.11
11,250 - 11,999	1.61	0.69	1.74	0.71	2.22	0.88
12,000 - 13,499	6.92	3.20	6.74	3.00	6.37	2.75
13,500 - 14,999	4.40	2.32	4.34	2.19	4.94	2.39
15,000 - 16,499	5.84	3.36	5.42	3.00	4.62	2.47
16,500 - 17,999	3.90	2.47	4.13	2.51	4.72	2.75
18,000 - 19,499	6.69	4.58	6.10	4.02	5.16	3.28
19,500 - 20,999	5.14	3.83	5.50	3.94	5.39	3.71
21,000 - 22,499	3.62	2.90	4.07	3.13	5.08	3.76
22,500 - 23,999	2.46	2.10	3.12	2.57	3.39	2.68
24,000 - 26,999	7.04	6.51	6.91	6.16	7.00	6.00
27,000 - 29,999	3.54	3.68	4.46	4.46	5.31	5.13
30,000 - 32,999	4.00	4.57	4.10	4.53	3.97	4.22
33,000 - 35,999	2.54	3.22	2.88	3.51	3.23	3.78
36,000 - 39,999	3.35	4.65	3.38	4.51	3.34	4.28
40,000 - 47,999	3.68	5.90	3.81	5.87	4.38	6.46
48,000 - 59,999	4.20	8.21	4.55	8.57	4.64	8.43
60,000 - 99,999	4.94	13.70	5.24	13.96	5.58	14.22
100,000 - 149,999	1.68	7.26	1.86	7.75	2.01	8.07
150,000 +	1.06	10.16	1.06	9.79	1.11	9.85
Average Income	27018.16		28192.95		29402.99	
Gini Coefficient	0.4468		0.4370		0.4290	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.6360		0.5807		0.5480	
Theil Index	0.3906		0.3717		0.3586	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.7

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

North, Villages

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.92	0.09	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000 - 1,499	2.90	0.49	0.59	0.08	0.45	0.06
1,500 - 1,999	2.76	0.65	0.84	0.16	0.51	0.09
2,000 - 2,499	5.92	1.72	1.78	0.42	1.36	0.30
2,500 - 2,999	5.91	2.15	2.35	0.69	1.58	0.42
3,000 - 3,749	11.36	5.04	7.31	2.61	5.64	1.89
3,750 - 4,499	8.01	4.37	6.39	2.79	5.57	2.21
4,500 - 5,249	9.53	6.18	6.93	3.58	6.61	3.10
5,250 - 5,999	5.35	4.00	8.28	4.91	7.12	3.91
6,000 - 6,749	8.76	7.32	8.35	5.58	8.05	5.00
6,750 - 7,499	3.51	3.31	6.11	4.58	6.50	4.48
7,500 - 8,249	5.99	6.22	6.27	5.18	6.23	4.73
8,250 - 8,999	2.89	3.29	5.27	4.81	5.45	4.53
9,000 - 9,749	2.33	2.90	4.54	4.49	4.52	4.11
9,750 - 10,499	2.57	3.45	3.54	3.77	4.18	4.07
10,500 - 11,249	2.22	3.24	3.11	3.55	3.86	4.04
11,250 - 11,999	1.80	2.81	4.39	5.41	3.19	3.59
12,000 - 13,499	4.72	7.93	6.37	8.55	7.22	8.95
13,500 - 14,999	2.47	4.68	3.58	5.33	5.66	7.85
15,000 - 16,499	2.63	5.49	3.27	5.36	2.37	3.59
16,500 - 17,999	1.21	2.76	1.30	2.37	3.42	5.61
18,000 - 19,499	0.41	0.98	2.01	3.95	1.06	1.92
19,500 - 20,999	1.41	3.84	1.18	2.53	1.90	3.69
21,000 - 22,499	0.87	2.51	1.29	2.97	1.06	2.24
22,500 - 23,999	0.05	0.16	0.78	1.89	1.54	3.50
24,000 - 26,999	1.66	5.57	1.62	4.34	1.54	3.83
27,000 - 29,999	0.78	2.87	1.14	3.47	0.95	2.59
30,000 - 32,999	0.28	1.15	0.47	1.55	1.30	4.00
33,000 - 35,999	0.12	0.57	0.15	0.54	0.31	1.03
36,000 - 39,999	0.13	0.69	0.16	0.63	0.22	0.85
40,000 - 47,999	0.10	0.54	0.21	0.94	0.13	0.55
48,000 - 59,999	0.41	2.80	0.32	1.76	0.40	2.12
60,000 - 99,999	0.02	0.21	0.02	0.17	0.02	0.17
100,000 - 149,999	0.0	0.0	0.09	1.02	0.09	1.00
150,000 +	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average Income	7488.09		9466.22		10330.55	
Gini Coefficient	0.4052		0.3488		0.3450	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.5514		0.3937		0.3844	
Theil Index	0.2827		0.2129		0.2081	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.8

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Centre & East, Villages

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.88	0.04	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.01
1,000 - 1,499	0.84	0.08	0.18	0.02	0.10	0.01
1,500 - 1,999	2.13	0.27	0.42	0.05	0.41	0.05
2,000 - 2,499	1.63	0.28	1.16	0.18	0.44	0.07
2,500 - 2,999	1.52	0.31	0.60	0.11	1.12	0.20
3,000 - 3,749	5.37	1.38	2.57	0.58	1.58	0.35
3,750 - 4,499	4.34	1.36	2.76	0.75	3.07	0.82
4,500 - 5,249	5.83	2.19	4.78	1.56	2.90	0.91
5,250 - 5,999	3.54	1.52	3.11	1.15	4.41	1.58
6,000 - 6,749	5.79	2.79	4.48	1.88	3.82	1.56
6,750 - 7,499	5.38	2.94	4.42	2.09	3.78	1.72
7,500 - 8,249	5.49	3.33	5.54	2.90	4.61	2.31
8,250 - 8,999	5.15	3.37	4.99	2.83	5.78	3.18
9,000 - 9,749	6.25	4.46	5.30	3.28	4.99	2.97
9,750 - 10,499	4.03	3.14	4.85	3.27	4.14	2.66
10,500 - 11,249	4.03	3.36	4.46	3.21	5.09	3.52
11,250 - 11,999	2.05	1.82	3.15	2.40	4.31	3.19
12,000 - 13,499	6.60	6.37	8.42	7.10	7.07	5.73
13,500 - 14,999	3.58	3.88	7.14	6.69	8.64	7.85
15,000 - 16,499	5.25	6.21	5.58	5.85	4.62	4.63
16,500 - 17,999	2.13	2.79	3.39	3.87	5.30	5.80
18,000 - 19,499	3.34	4.76	3.32	4.12	2.80	3.35
19,500 - 20,999	2.32	3.55	3.02	4.03	3.15	4.06
21,000 - 22,499	1.49	2.45	2.90	4.17	2.76	3.80
22,500 - 23,999	0.87	1.56	1.14	1.78	2.00	2.93
24,000 - 26,999	2.16	4.19	2.45	4.14	2.28	3.66
27,000 - 29,999	0.94	2.03	1.76	3.26	2.55	4.58
30,000 - 32,999	1.47	3.58	1.12	2.35	1.00	2.03
33,000 - 35,999	1.06	2.80	1.58	3.64	1.19	2.62
36,000 - 39,999	1.13	3.26	1.50	3.82	1.56	3.72
40,000 - 47,999	0.63	2.11	0.88	2.51	1.46	3.94
48,000 - 59,999	0.56	2.30	0.67	2.41	0.73	2.56
60,000 - 99,999	1.61	8.14	1.65	7.44	1.64	7.24
100,000 - 149,999	0.42	3.75	0.43	3.38	0.44	3.36
150,000 +	0.18	3.64	0.18	3.16	0.18	3.07
Average Income	13009.44		15064.80		15699.47	
Gini Coefficient	0.4463		0.4002		0.3917	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.6726		0.4890		0.4641	
Theil Index	0.4012		0.3226		0.3090	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.9

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Northeast, Villages

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	11.38	1.44	0.16	0.01	0.16	0.01
1,000 - 1,499	13.71	3.07	0.12	0.02	0.03	0.00
1,500 - 1,999	9.11	2.99	0.75	0.16	0.29	0.06
2,000 - 2,499	10.62	4.48	1.52	0.42	1.15	0.29
2,500 - 2,999	7.24	3.79	3.37	1.12	1.99	0.61
3,000 - 3,749	8.99	5.79	7.52	3.10	5.06	1.87
3,750 - 4,499	6.64	5.30	11.00	5.48	9.32	4.26
4,500 - 5,249	4.64	4.44	10.82	6.31	10.74	5.78
5,250 - 5,999	2.62	2.90	9.47	6.38	8.68	5.37
6,000 - 6,749	3.50	4.27	9.56	7.33	8.90	6.21
6,750 - 7,499	2.32	3.21	7.78	6.63	8.58	6.73
7,500 - 8,249	2.50	3.88	4.95	4.69	7.24	6.25
8,250 - 8,999	1.70	2.84	4.94	5.14	4.45	4.22
9,000 - 9,749	3.16	5.73	4.66	5.24	4.47	4.62
9,750 - 10,499	1.57	3.10	3.30	4.00	4.65	5.17
10,500 - 11,249	0.73	1.54	3.91	5.11	3.45	4.12
11,250 - 11,999	0.41	0.93	2.10	2.93	3.57	4.61
12,000 - 13,499	2.27	5.66	2.90	4.49	3.75	5.20
13,500 - 14,999	0.84	2.34	1.87	3.17	2.98	4.72
15,000 - 16,499	0.98	2.99	1.73	3.22	1.44	2.47
16,500 - 17,999	0.58	1.94	1.54	3.16	1.66	3.11
18,000 - 19,499	0.90	3.27	0.91	2.06	1.46	3.00
19,500 - 20,999	0.46	1.80	0.85	2.08	0.69	1.56
21,000 - 22,499	0.42	1.78	0.41	1.08	0.76	1.80
22,500 - 23,999	0.24	1.08	0.51	1.42	0.54	1.36
24,000 - 26,999	0.60	2.94	1.11	3.35	1.08	3.02
27,000 - 29,999	0.35	1.93	0.69	2.34	0.95	2.93
30,000 - 32,999	0.42	2.50	0.39	1.42	0.50	1.73
33,000 - 35,999	0.15	0.96	0.06	0.23	0.30	1.10
36,000 - 39,999	0.38	2.83	0.39	1.80	0.16	0.65
40,000 - 47,999	0.15	1.28	0.26	1.38	0.50	2.40
48,000 - 59,999	0.13	1.36	0.18	1.15	0.17	1.02
60,000 - 99,999	0.20	2.78	0.20	1.75	0.24	2.02
100,000 - 149,999	0.07	1.69	0.07	1.07	0.07	1.04
150,000 +	0.03	1.19	0.03	0.73	0.03	0.69
Average Income	5102.57		8314.86		9078.65	
Gini Coefficient	0.5480		0.3525		0.3473	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.9712		0.3479		0.3392	
Theil Index	0.5858		0.2500		0.2411	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.10

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

South, Villages

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.49	0.05	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.00
1,000 - 1,499	1.84	0.32	0.14	0.02	0.08	0.01
1,500 - 1,999	2.70	0.70	1.17	0.24	0.81	0.15
2,000 - 2,499	6.93	2.24	1.23	0.34	0.83	0.20
2,500 - 2,999	5.20	2.04	3.84	1.26	2.07	0.64
3,000 - 3,749	11.80	5.67	7.25	2.86	6.61	2.40
3,750 - 4,499	7.72	4.58	7.76	3.75	6.44	2.88
4,500 - 5,249	12.26	8.66	8.68	4.94	7.87	4.12
5,250 - 5,999	6.95	5.63	10.38	6.94	7.15	4.31
6,000 - 6,749	7.49	6.90	6.60	4.96	9.84	6.75
6,750 - 7,499	6.70	6.99	7.43	6.24	6.19	4.76
7,500 - 8,249	4.51	5.21	6.17	5.70	6.79	5.78
8,250 - 8,999	4.20	5.28	7.98	8.13	5.77	5.35
9,000 - 9,749	3.14	4.29	3.76	4.16	7.73	7.88
9,750 - 10,499	3.09	4.55	3.86	4.60	3.52	3.85
10,500 - 11,249	2.60	4.15	3.83	4.94	3.41	3.99
11,250 - 11,999	0.96	1.62	2.46	3.39	3.41	4.29
12,000 - 13,499	2.34	4.28	3.73	5.56	4.92	6.73
13,500 - 14,999	1.47	3.02	3.10	5.14	3.79	5.79
15,000 - 16,499	2.11	4.80	2.39	4.38	2.25	3.77
16,500 - 17,999	0.91	2.32	2.23	4.56	2.27	4.16
18,000 - 19,499	0.69	1.85	1.06	2.34	2.25	4.60
19,500 - 20,999	0.88	2.60	0.88	2.09	1.08	2.36
21,000 - 22,499	1.01	3.21	0.89	2.28	0.88	2.03
22,500 - 23,999	0.46	1.54	0.50	1.37	0.79	1.99
24,000 - 26,999	0.74	2.77	1.24	3.66	1.10	3.02
27,000 - 29,999	0.17	0.70	0.41	1.41	0.81	2.45
30,000 - 32,999	0.21	0.98	0.55	2.07	0.38	1.28
33,000 - 35,999	0.16	0.82	0.20	0.82	0.48	1.79
36,000 - 39,999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.20	0.82
40,000 - 47,999	0.10	0.64	0.04	0.22	0.04	0.22
48,000 - 59,999	0.04	0.30	0.09	0.59	0.09	0.59
60,000 - 99,999	0.05	0.44	0.05	0.36	0.05	0.36
100,000 - 149,999	0.06	0.86	0.06	0.70	0.06	0.69
150,000 +	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Average Income	6831.01		8456.33		9243.82	
Gini Coefficient	0.3706		0.3290		0.3249	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.4476		0.3414		0.3330	
Theil Index	0.2443		0.1893		0.1843	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.11

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Bangkok-Thonburi, Villages

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.37	0.02	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000 - 1,499	0.0	0.0	0.37	0.02	0.0	0.0
1,500 - 1,999	0.24	0.02	0.24	0.02	0.0	0.0
2,000 - 2,499	0.46	0.05	0.0	0.0	0.37	0.04
2,500 - 2,999	0.03	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.21	0.02
3,000 - 3,749	2.18	0.36	1.20	0.19	0.03	0.00
3,750 - 4,499	0.92	0.18	1.50	0.28	0.25	0.04
4,500 - 5,249	3.57	0.82	1.69	0.36	1.16	0.24
5,250 - 5,999	2.22	0.60	1.23	0.31	1.88	0.43
6,000 - 6,749	2.32	0.66	1.92	0.53	1.19	0.31
6,750 - 7,499	3.64	1.21	3.74	1.17	2.26	0.67
7,500 - 8,249	1.92	0.69	2.62	0.91	1.48	0.49
8,250 - 8,999	1.26	0.50	1.30	0.50	3.67	1.30
9,000 - 9,749	4.24	1.87	3.35	1.38	2.92	1.12
9,750 - 10,499	3.07	1.44	2.04	0.90	1.62	0.68
10,500 - 11,249	3.87	1.95	3.41	1.63	3.10	1.40
11,250 - 11,999	2.71	1.45	3.22	1.65	2.06	1.00
12,000 - 13,499	7.92	4.66	6.78	3.78	7.15	3.79
13,500 - 14,999	7.36	4.87	8.90	5.56	5.58	3.31
15,000 - 16,499	6.53	4.70	7.15	4.91	9.06	5.87
16,500 - 17,999	4.75	3.81	6.58	4.94	6.90	4.89
18,000 - 19,499	7.75	6.66	7.01	5.69	8.11	6.22
19,500 - 20,999	2.73	2.58	2.40	2.14	5.66	4.72
21,000 - 22,499	1.37	1.38	2.66	2.52	1.62	1.44
22,500 - 23,999	2.17	2.33	2.76	2.82	3.06	2.91
24,000 - 26,999	4.88	5.62	5.41	5.92	6.34	6.69
27,000 - 29,999	2.48	3.29	2.30	2.90	2.49	2.89
30,000 - 32,999	3.45	4.90	2.99	4.06	4.24	5.53
33,000 - 35,999	1.32	2.11	2.49	3.77	1.84	2.66
36,000 - 39,999	3.64	6.38	3.84	6.51	2.94	4.65
40,000 - 47,999	5.46	10.94	4.91	9.30	5.76	10.20
48,000 - 59,999	1.48	3.48	2.05	4.70	3.16	6.72
60,000 - 99,999	1.76	6.44	1.42	4.68	1.26	3.86
100,000 - 149,999	1.74	11.02	2.26	13.09	2.11	11.29
150,000 +	0.20	3.04	0.20	2.87	0.50	4.63
Average Income	21487.62		22832.38		24289.55	
Gini Coefficient	0.4284		0.4140		0.3928	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.5816		0.5233		0.4489	
Theil Index	0.3643		0.3427		0.3070	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.12

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Whole Kingdom, Villages

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	4.40	0.35	0.08	0.01	0.08	0.01
1,000 - 1,499	5.93	0.86	0.28	0.04	0.17	0.02
1,500 - 1,999	4.72	0.99	0.74	0.13	0.44	0.07
2,000 - 2,499	6.58	1.77	1.46	0.32	1.00	0.20
2,500 - 2,999	5.19	1.73	2.44	0.65	1.65	0.41
3,000 - 3,749	9.12	3.73	6.21	2.02	4.56	1.38
3,750 - 4,499	6.57	3.32	7.22	2.86	6.30	2.32
4,500 - 5,249	7.27	4.38	7.89	3.68	7.24	3.15
5,250 - 5,999	4.16	2.88	7.66	4.12	6.96	3.49
6,000 - 6,749	6.05	4.69	7.58	4.61	7.49	4.26
6,750 - 7,499	3.91	3.43	6.41	4.37	6.49	4.12
7,500 - 8,249	4.45	4.32	5.58	4.20	6.20	4.34
8,250 - 8,999	3.12	3.30	5.36	4.42	5.19	3.98
9,000 - 9,749	3.62	4.16	4.64	4.15	4.97	4.16
9,750 - 10,499	2.63	3.28	3.76	3.64	4.21	3.78
10,500 - 11,249	2.19	2.95	3.77	3.93	3.93	3.80
11,250 - 11,999	1.30	1.87	3.08	3.43	3.58	3.72
12,000 - 13,499	4.08	6.36	5.34	6.51	5.73	6.50
13,500 - 14,999	2.13	3.73	3.83	5.17	5.19	6.61
15,000 - 16,499	2.66	5.11	3.22	4.83	2.66	3.71
16,500 - 17,999	1.23	2.60	2.05	3.38	3.16	4.81
18,000 - 19,499	1.39	3.18	1.90	3.40	1.85	3.09
19,500 - 20,999	1.25	3.11	1.46	2.84	1.73	3.13
21,000 - 22,499	0.88	2.35	1.33	2.76	1.32	2.55
22,500 - 23,999	0.38	1.10	0.77	1.72	1.24	2.56
24,000 - 26,999	1.36	4.22	1.65	4.00	1.58	3.58
27,000 - 29,999	0.62	2.16	1.06	2.87	1.31	3.30
30,000 - 32,999	0.64	2.47	0.64	1.92	0.90	2.55
33,000 - 35,999	0.37	1.55	0.48	1.61	0.55	1.68
36,000 - 39,999	0.48	2.26	0.58	2.13	0.54	1.83
40,000 - 47,999	0.33	1.75	0.44	1.81	0.64	2.44
48,000 - 59,999	0.32	2.09	0.35	1.80	0.41	1.98
60,000 - 99,999	0.47	3.92	0.47	3.12	0.48	3.04
100,000 - 149,999	0.16	2.30	0.19	2.22	0.19	2.10
150,000 +	0.06	1.70	0.06	1.32	0.06	1.32
Average Income	8073.19		10433.50		11213.56	
Gini Coefficient	0.4957		0.3906		0.3813	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.9073		0.4459		0.4263	
Theil Index	0.4700		0.3002		0.2840	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.13

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

North, Total

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.87	0.08	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000 - 1,499	2.73	0.42	0.55	0.07	0.42	0.05
1,500 - 1,999	2.60	0.55	0.79	0.14	0.48	0.08
2,000 - 2,499	5.59	1.47	1.68	0.37	1.28	0.26
2,500 - 2,999	5.60	1.84	2.23	0.61	1.50	0.37
3,000 - 3,749	10.90	4.36	6.93	2.30	5.33	1.66
3,750 - 4,499	7.62	3.75	6.15	2.49	5.32	1.96
4,500 - 5,249	9.18	5.38	6.60	3.16	6.31	2.76
5,250 - 5,999	5.26	3.54	8.01	4.40	6.79	3.47
6,000 - 6,749	8.38	6.33	8.02	4.98	7.66	4.43
6,750 - 7,499	3.46	2.95	5.97	4.16	6.34	4.06
7,500 - 8,249	5.94	5.57	6.13	4.70	6.11	4.32
8,250 - 8,999	2.84	2.93	5.10	4.32	5.31	4.12
9,000 - 9,749	2.55	2.86	4.72	4.32	4.58	3.87
9,750 - 10,499	2.63	3.19	3.56	3.51	4.21	3.82
10,500 - 11,249	2.40	3.15	3.14	3.33	3.84	3.74
11,250 - 11,999	1.78	2.50	4.26	4.88	3.23	3.38
12,000 - 13,499	4.86	7.37	6.48	8.07	7.26	8.36
13,500 - 14,999	2.54	4.34	3.53	4.87	5.66	7.30
15,000 - 16,499	2.76	5.20	3.32	5.06	2.34	3.30
16,500 - 17,999	1.34	2.76	1.48	2.50	3.47	5.31
18,000 - 19,499	0.59	1.30	2.14	3.90	1.25	2.10
19,500 - 20,999	1.81	4.42	1.56	3.09	2.16	3.92
21,000 - 22,499	0.91	2.38	1.38	2.95	1.33	2.60
22,500 - 23,999	0.15	0.41	0.89	2.00	1.56	3.31
24,000 - 26,999	1.82	5.51	1.74	4.32	1.68	3.90
27,000 - 29,999	0.80	2.66	1.16	3.28	1.05	2.68
30,000 - 32,999	0.45	1.66	0.66	2.03	1.41	4.02
33,000 - 35,999	0.25	1.04	0.27	0.91	0.43	1.34
36,000 - 39,999	0.37	1.69	0.38	1.39	0.41	1.43
40,000 - 47,999	0.27	1.42	0.36	1.54	0.35	1.37
48,000 - 59,999	0.45	2.80	0.43	2.04	0.52	2.50
60,000 - 99,999	0.20	1.80	0.20	1.51	0.20	1.35
100,000 - 149,999	0.06	0.76	0.14	1.51	0.16	1.60
150,000 +	0.05	1.60	0.05	1.30	0.05	1.26
Average Income	8294.21		10205.86		11099.83	
Gini Coefficient	0.4364		0.3753		0.3697	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.6064		0.4317		0.4196	
Theil Index	0.3616		0.2706		0.2607	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.14

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Centre & East, Total

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.83	0.04	0.10	0.00	0.10	0.00
1,000 - 1,499	0.80	0.07	0.17	0.01	0.09	0.01
1,500 - 1,999	1.98	0.24	0.38	0.04	0.38	0.04
2,000 - 2,499	1.50	0.24	1.09	0.16	0.40	0.06
2,500 - 2,999	1.41	0.27	0.56	0.10	1.05	0.17
3,000 - 3,749	5.06	1.21	2.48	0.53	1.48	0.31
3,750 - 4,499	4.12	1.21	2.64	0.68	2.97	0.75
4,500 - 5,249	5.48	1.92	4.55	1.41	2.74	0.82
5,250 - 5,999	3.29	1.32	2.90	1.02	4.15	1.41
6,000 - 6,749	5.46	2.45	4.24	1.68	3.62	1.40
6,750 - 7,499	5.08	2.60	4.16	1.86	3.60	1.55
7,500 - 8,249	5.22	2.96	5.25	2.61	4.29	2.04
8,250 - 8,999	4.88	2.99	4.78	2.56	5.55	2.89
9,000 - 9,749	5.98	4.00	5.07	2.98	4.78	2.70
9,750 - 10,499	3.94	2.87	4.68	2.99	3.92	2.39
10,500 - 11,249	3.92	3.06	4.32	2.95	4.97	3.26
11,250 - 11,999	2.05	1.71	3.07	2.22	4.16	2.92
12,000 - 13,499	6.74	6.09	8.29	6.62	6.98	5.37
13,500 - 14,999	3.79	3.84	6.99	6.20	8.37	7.21
15,000 - 16,499	5.44	6.02	5.61	5.57	4.77	4.53
16,500 - 17,999	2.23	2.75	3.50	3.78	5.22	5.43
18,000 - 19,499	3.58	4.77	3.58	4.21	3.07	3.47
19,500 - 20,999	2.58	3.71	3.25	4.12	3.45	4.22
21,000 - 22,499	1.69	2.61	3.00	4.09	2.91	3.80
22,500 - 23,999	0.99	1.65	1.28	1.88	2.09	2.92
24,000 - 26,999	2.67	4.82	2.94	4.69	2.74	4.18
27,000 - 29,999	1.17	2.36	2.08	3.67	2.87	4.89
30,000 - 32,999	1.60	3.64	1.24	2.47	1.15	2.20
33,000 - 35,999	1.16	2.84	1.71	3.73	1.30	2.72
36,000 - 39,999	1.23	3.30	1.57	3.77	1.63	3.69
40,000 - 47,999	0.78	2.45	0.99	2.69	1.63	4.18
48,000 - 59,999	0.79	2.99	0.94	3.18	0.98	3.23
60,000 - 99,999	1.79	8.72	1.84	8.04	1.83	7.83
100,000 - 149,999	0.52	4.41	0.54	4.06	0.56	4.07
150,000 +	0.23	3.89	0.23	3.42	0.23	3.35
Average Income	13910.61		15901.21		16547.31	
Gini Coefficient	0.4544		0.4096		0.4010	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.6995		0.5116		0.4855	
Theil Index	0.4106		0.3346		0.3205	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.15

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Northeast, Total

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	10.98	1.21	0.15	0.01	0.15	0.01
1,000 - 1,499	13.23	2.58	0.12	0.02	0.03	0.00
1,500 - 1,999	8.84	2.53	0.77	0.16	0.28	0.05
2,000 - 2,499	10.25	3.77	1.46	0.38	1.16	0.27
2,500 - 2,999	6.99	3.20	3.25	1.00	1.93	0.55
3,000 - 3,749	8.72	4.90	7.28	2.77	4.90	1.68
3,750 - 4,499	6.44	4.49	10.62	4.89	9.00	3.81
4,500 - 5,249	4.50	3.76	10.45	5.63	10.38	5.18
5,250 - 5,999	2.55	2.46	9.15	5.70	8.39	4.82
6,000 - 6,749	3.52	3.74	9.37	6.64	8.61	5.58
6,750 - 7,499	2.31	2.78	7.54	5.94	8.38	6.09
7,500 - 8,249	2.47	3.34	4.82	4.22	7.06	5.65
8,250 - 8,999	1.72	2.51	4.87	4.68	4.36	3.84
9,000 - 9,749	3.18	5.04	4.59	4.77	4.38	4.20
9,750 - 10,499	1.62	2.80	3.29	3.69	4.54	4.68
10,500 - 11,249	0.88	1.63	3.94	4.76	3.44	3.81
11,250 - 11,999	0.43	0.86	2.08	2.68	3.53	4.23
12,000 - 13,499	2.48	5.38	3.08	4.40	3.91	5.03
13,500 - 14,999	0.93	2.25	1.95	3.06	3.10	4.54
15,000 - 16,499	1.17	3.11	1.86	3.22	1.54	2.46
16,500 - 17,999	0.66	1.95	1.62	3.07	1.78	3.10
18,000 - 19,499	1.20	3.81	1.00	2.10	1.54	2.93
19,500 - 20,999	0.58	2.00	1.07	2.42	0.82	1.72
21,000 - 22,499	0.50	1.87	0.56	1.35	0.97	2.13
22,500 - 23,999	0.34	1.37	0.64	1.66	0.67	1.58
24,000 - 26,999	0.85	3.60	1.34	3.72	1.36	3.50
27,000 - 29,999	0.44	2.10	0.80	2.49	1.08	3.11
30,000 - 32,999	0.51	2.65	0.49	1.69	0.58	1.86
33,000 - 35,999	0.25	1.47	0.15	0.56	0.41	1.43
36,000 - 39,999	0.42	2.76	0.45	1.93	0.22	0.86
40,000 - 47,999	0.24	1.71	0.35	1.66	0.60	2.70
48,000 - 59,999	0.30	2.73	0.34	2.03	0.30	1.70
60,000 - 99,999	0.31	3.81	0.32	2.68	0.40	3.02
100,000 - 149,999	0.12	2.40	0.13	1.78	0.14	1.76
150,000 +	0.08	3.45	0.08	2.24	0.08	2.12
Average Income	5846.20		8998.50		9786.06	
Gini Coefficient	0.5795		0.3859		0.3788	
Variance of Income Logarithms	1.0694		0.3948		0.3833	
Theil Index	0.6880		0.3220		0.3073	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.16

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

South, Total

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.51	0.04	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.00
1,000 - 1,499	1.62	0.22	0.13	0.01	0.07	0.01
1,500 - 1,999	2.37	0.47	1.03	0.17	0.71	0.11
2,000 - 2,499	6.10	1.52	1.10	0.25	0.73	0.14
2,500 - 2,999	4.59	1.39	3.36	0.90	1.81	0.46
3,000 - 3,749	10.50	3.90	6.52	2.08	5.82	1.72
3,750 - 4,499	6.99	3.20	6.96	2.72	5.76	2.10
4,500 - 5,249	10.95	5.96	7.73	3.56	7.09	3.03
5,250 - 5,999	6.29	3.93	9.37	5.07	6.42	3.16
6,000 - 6,749	7.11	5.05	6.20	3.77	8.99	5.03
6,750 - 7,499	6.43	5.17	6.98	4.75	5.78	3.62
7,500 - 8,249	4.35	3.88	5.73	4.29	6.24	4.33
8,250 - 8,999	3.90	3.77	7.34	6.05	5.42	4.10
9,000 - 9,749	3.36	3.54	3.81	3.41	7.25	6.03
9,750 - 10,499	3.12	3.54	3.83	3.69	3.49	3.11
10,500 - 11,249	2.72	3.34	3.74	3.91	3.36	3.21
11,250 - 11,999	1.18	1.54	2.38	2.65	3.27	3.36
12,000 - 13,499	2.99	4.22	4.16	5.01	5.17	5.77
13,500 - 14,999	1.82	2.90	3.38	4.55	4.10	5.12
15,000 - 16,499	2.54	4.47	2.74	4.09	2.57	3.52
16,500 - 17,999	1.35	2.63	2.54	4.20	2.50	3.75
18,000 - 19,499	1.37	2.85	1.82	3.24	2.76	4.58
19,500 - 20,999	1.02	2.32	1.15	2.20	1.46	2.60
21,000 - 22,499	1.30	3.18	1.18	2.45	1.24	2.37
22,500 - 23,999	0.70	1.82	0.73	1.63	0.98	2.01
24,000 - 26,999	1.40	3.99	1.93	4.62	1.82	4.05
27,000 - 29,999	0.48	1.55	0.73	2.02	1.20	2.97
30,000 - 32,999	0.70	2.45	0.88	2.64	0.70	1.95
33,000 - 35,999	0.30	1.18	0.42	1.40	0.78	2.37
36,000 - 39,999	0.33	1.39	0.34	1.24	0.49	1.63
40,000 - 47,999	0.39	1.92	0.40	1.65	0.48	1.80
48,000 - 59,999	0.50	3.02	0.57	2.94	0.57	2.68
60,000 - 99,999	0.44	3.54	0.48	3.32	0.60	3.80
100,000 - 149,000	0.18	2.13	0.20	2.13	0.22	2.17
150,000 +	0.09	3.98	0.09	3.40	0.09	3.33
Average Income	8858.72		10444.50		11336.56	
Gini Coefficient	0.4585		0.4086		0.4014	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.5984		0.4554		0.4420	
Theil Index	0.4599		0.3669		0.3518	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.17

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Bangkok-Thonburi, Total

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	0.13	0.00	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.00
1,000 - 1,499	0.19	0.01	0.20	0.01	0.0	0.0
1,500 - 1,999	0.06	0.00	0.12	0.01	0.11	0.01
2,000 - 2,499	0.14	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.16	0.01
2,500 - 2,999	0.14	0.01	0.08	0.01	0.12	0.01
3,000 - 3,749	0.74	0.09	0.44	0.05	0.07	0.01
3,750 - 4,499	0.36	0.05	0.49	0.07	0.15	0.02
4,500 - 5,249	1.22	0.21	0.70	0.11	0.54	0.08
5,250 - 5,999	0.76	0.15	0.56	0.10	0.77	0.14
6,000 - 6,749	1.29	0.28	1.15	0.24	0.75	0.15
6,750 - 7,499	1.84	0.45	1.45	0.34	1.01	0.23
7,500 - 8,249	1.30	0.35	1.40	0.36	0.84	0.21
8,250 - 8,999	1.09	0.32	1.03	0.29	1.74	0.47
9,000 - 9,749	3.23	1.04	2.48	0.76	1.84	0.54
9,750 - 10,499	2.14	0.74	1.56	0.52	1.54	0.50
10,500 - 11,249	3.10	1.15	2.91	1.04	2.73	0.94
11,250 - 11,999	1.64	0.65	1.86	0.72	1.69	0.62
12,000 - 13,499	6.35	2.72	5.97	2.47	5.83	2.36
13,500 - 14,999	5.08	2.49	5.44	2.56	4.26	1.93
15,000 - 16,499	5.74	3.06	6.03	3.11	5.88	2.94
16,500 - 17,999	4.39	2.58	4.44	2.51	5.50	2.99
18,000 - 19,499	7.55	4.80	6.87	4.21	5.88	3.47
19,500 - 20,999	4.61	3.20	4.41	2.95	5.26	3.38
21,000 - 22,499	3.71	2.76	4.16	2.98	4.28	2.95
22,500 - 23,999	2.50	1.99	3.24	2.48	3.83	2.82
24,000 - 26,999	6.99	6.02	6.90	5.75	7.04	5.67
27,000 - 29,999	4.17	4.04	4.83	4.49	5.42	4.90
30,000 - 32,999	4.52	4.78	4.64	4.77	4.99	4.97
33,000 - 35,999	2.59	3.05	3.14	3.56	3.32	3.64
36,000 - 39,999	3.96	5.10	4.02	5.02	3.89	4.68
40,000 - 47,999	5.09	7.57	5.19	7.42	5.44	7.51
48,000 - 59,999	4.58	8.26	4.96	8.67	5.43	9.17
60,000 - 99,999	5.71	14.70	5.90	14.55	6.10	14.52
100,000 - 149,999	2.08	8.72	2.36	9.49	2.42	9.37
150,000 +	1.01	8.66	1.01	8.38	1.13	8.79
Average Income	29106.17		30294.04		31502.22	
Gini Coefficient	0.4302		0.4208		0.4119	
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.5806		0.5441		0.5072	
Theil Index	0.3533		0.3371		0.3228	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.1.18

Size Distribution of Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income (Y_{M+K}) and Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), by Region and Location, 1968/9

Whole Kingdom, Total

Income Class (Baht/year)	Y_M		Y_{M+K}		Y_{M+K+R}	
	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income	% Households	% Income
0 - 999	3.94	0.25	0.08	0.00	0.08	0.00
1,000 - 1,499	5.30	0.61	0.26	0.03	0.16	0.02
1,500 - 1,999	4.23	0.71	0.68	0.10	0.40	0.05
2,000 - 2,499	5.88	1.26	1.31	0.24	0.91	0.16
2,500 - 2,999	4.66	1.24	2.19	0.49	1.48	0.31
3,000 - 3,749	8.26	2.69	5.61	1.54	4.09	1.06
3,750 - 4,499	5.95	2.39	6.53	2.18	5.69	1.78
4,500 - 5,249	6.62	3.18	7.12	2.80	6.54	2.42
5,250 - 5,999	3.82	2.11	6.95	3.16	6.29	2.68
6,000 - 6,749	5.62	3.47	6.96	3.58	6.80	3.29
6,750 - 7,499	3.71	2.59	5.90	3.39	5.98	3.22
7,500 - 8,249	4.21	3.26	5.18	3.29	5.69	3.38
8,250 - 8,999	2.95	2.48	4.97	3.46	4.85	3.16
9,000 - 9,749	3.63	3.33	4.50	3.40	4.71	3.35
9,750 - 10,499	2.62	2.61	3.62	2.96	3.99	3.05
10,500 - 11,249	2.34	2.50	3.71	3.25	3.83	3.14
11,250 - 11,999	1.33	1.52	2.94	2.76	3.43	3.03
12,000 - 13,499	4.39	5.44	5.49	5.64	5.80	5.59
13,500 - 14,999	2.38	3.32	3.89	4.43	5.16	5.59
15,000 - 16,499	3.00	4.60	3.46	4.38	2.87	3.41
16,500 - 17,999	1.52	2.56	2.28	3.16	3.33	4.31
18,000 - 19,499	1.97	3.59	2.36	3.56	2.21	3.14
19,500 - 20,999	1.67	3.32	1.90	3.11	2.13	3.27
21,000 - 22,499	1.18	2.51	1.63	2.85	1.74	2.84
22,500 - 23,999	0.61	1.39	1.03	1.93	1.47	2.59
24,000 - 26,999	1.98	4.89	2.22	4.54	2.17	4.17
27,000 - 29,999	0.94	2.60	1.43	3.27	1.75	3.75
30,000 - 32,999	1.01	3.08	1.02	2.57	1.24	2.95
33,000 - 35,999	0.60	2.04	0.75	2.08	0.84	2.19
36,000 - 39,999	0.80	2.96	0.89	2.72	0.85	2.42
40,000 - 47,999	0.69	2.96	0.80	2.82	1.04	3.42
48,000 - 59,999	0.74	3.87	0.81	3.49	0.87	3.55
60,000 - 99,999	0.96	6.76	0.99	5.82	1.04	5.76
100,000 - 149,999	0.32	3.74	0.37	3.59	0.39	3.55
150,000 +	0.16	4.16	0.16	3.43	0.17	3.39
Average Income	10139.73		12370.72		13197.69	
Gini Coefficient	0.5370		0.4399		0.4289	
Variance of Income Logarithms	1.0459		0.5434		0.5175	
Theil Index	0.5700		0.3947		0.3734	

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok, Thailand.

Table A.2.1

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

North, Towns

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,000-2,499	0.12	1790.47	2346.47	0.12	1.95	1.00	0.0	0.0
2,500-2,999	0.10	1807.26	2816.02	14.03	2.27	1.00	0.0	0.0
3,000-3,749	0.41	2478.72	3220.39	4.74	1.08	1.00	0.0	0.0
3,750-4,499	1.33	2824.89	4070.43	16.98	1.63	1.02	0.0	0.04
4,500-5,249	1.67	3233.55	4926.81	19.82	3.76	1.18	0.99	0.74
5,250-5,999	1.61	4540.38	5571.11	2.24	2.20	1.10	0.33	0.24
6,000-6,749	1.58	4229.76	6459.38	20.01	5.50	1.86	0.08	0.31
6,750-7,499	3.82	5385.88	7018.87	10.18	3.97	1.50	0.45	1.14
7,500-8,249	4.23	5839.27	7885.68	14.80	5.08	1.05	1.16	1.69
8,250-8,999	3.25	6794.21	8638.48	8.76	4.66	1.56	0.70	1.70
9,000-9,749	5.47	8271.74	9378.84	6.50	3.23	1.12	0.21	1.05
9,750-10,499	4.76	7843.14	10187.98	12.16	5.56	1.86	0.54	2.13
10,500-11,249	3.46	9464.45	10827.02	4.66	4.04	1.30	0.47	1.15
11,250-11,999	3.74	9614.45	11535.26	7.37	4.54	1.34	0.67	1.40
12,000-13,499	7.77	10988.23	12598.69	7.00	4.35	1.50	0.43	1.49
13,500-14,999	5.64	12321.12	14256.29	5.16	4.97	1.57	0.50	1.93
15,000-16,499	1.98	13392.01	15653.15	7.08	4.37	1.78	0.38	1.03
16,500-17,999	4.32	15461.33	17242.83	3.64	5.60	2.06	0.33	1.70
18,000-19,499	4.24	15986.70	18569.56	6.13	5.74	1.77	0.24	2.04
19,500-20,999	6.30	19175.64	20210.74	1.34	5.09	1.63	0.43	1.40
21,000-22,499	5.50	18833.61	21806.62	5.83	6.63	1.79	0.55	2.78
22,500-23,999	1.97	19287.28	23560.64	12.22	5.02	1.97	0.46	2.01
24,000-26,999	4.05	22866.49	25197.41	2.86	5.25	1.73	0.45	1.40
27,000-29,999	2.70	26116.63	28292.98	0.82	4.95	2.08	0.15	1.33
30,000-32,999	3.09	27861.77	31353.27	6.80	5.06	1.61	0.23	1.12
33,000-35,999	2.40	32026.62	33865.35	0.24	6.54	2.93	0.29	1.40
36,000-39,999	3.36	35710.57	37691.83	1.09	5.29	1.76	0.49	1.28
40,000-47,999	3.83	40290.16	43235.44	1.44	5.55	2.16	0.08	0.94
48,000-59,999	2.26	47197.61	52786.86	5.29	6.83	2.40	0.13	1.71
60,000-99,999	2.90	73059.88	76756.31	0.78	6.54	2.32	0.06	2.06
100,000-149,999	1.25	102591.56	107416.13	0.18	6.46	2.04	0.13	2.32
150,000 +	0.90	252112.75	259756.63	0.05	8.16	1.59	1.93	1.15
All Classes	100.00	20954.96	23181.89	3.74	5.01	1.68	0.43	1.51

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.2

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Centre & East, Towns

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,000-2,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,500-2,999	0.25	1900.00	2705.93	6.96	1.63	1.00	0.0	0.40
3,000-3,749	0.29	2896.65	3385.26	8.75	2.57	1.00	0.75	0.82
3,750-4,499	1.79	3093.04	4020.74	11.14	2.26	1.36	0.0	0.29
4,500-5,249	0.96	3621.26	4878.61	16.70	3.31	1.20	0.04	1.40
5,250-5,999	1.19	4314.23	5778.32	12.02	2.88	1.05	0.21	0.79
6,000-6,749	1.29	5451.13	6097.88	3.80	3.25	1.67	0.40	0.53
6,750-7,499	1.53	4956.85	7082.44	22.38	3.34	1.33	0.88	0.81
7,500-8,249	0.59	7339.27	7838.26	0.56	4.15	1.35	0.72	1.28
8,250-8,999	2.93	7383.85	8555.86	7.63	2.88	1.04	0.40	0.53
9,000-9,749	2.38	8719.61	9416.79	1.60	4.95	1.12	0.33	1.83
9,750-10,499	1.40	9165.99	10134.61	5.22	5.01	1.06	0.95	1.40
10,500-11,249	3.57	9614.89	10865.43	4.49	3.65	1.31	0.82	0.77
11,250-11,999	2.37	10589.13	11655.29	5.23	3.83	1.61	0.52	1.16
12,000-13,499	5.97	11755.60	12780.05	2.24	5.08	1.54	0.51	1.72
13,500-14,999	5.37	12954.89	14166.45	3.22	4.30	1.48	0.49	1.04
15,000-16,499	6.50	14528.25	15705.80	2.98	6.32	1.60	0.76	2.61
16,500-17,999	4.40	14947.44	17200.45	8.18	5.65	1.94	0.67	1.81
18,000-19,499	6.06	17290.11	18655.19	3.26	4.94	1.67	0.55	1.64
19,500-20,999	6.88	17707.77	20203.56	9.22	5.62	1.54	0.65	1.82
21,000-22,499	4.62	19599.94	21515.95	6.02	6.12	1.92	0.48	2.43
22,500-23,999	3.16	20615.38	23396.04	8.22	6.08	1.69	0.66	2.76
24,000-26,999	8.07	23794.01	25084.23	2.56	5.99	1.50	0.52	2.09
27,000-29,999	6.52	24819.11	28087.80	9.42	6.96	1.87	0.71	2.18
30,000-32,999	2.86	27979.88	31312.80	7.32	5.81	1.68	0.43	2.05
33,000-35,999	2.55	32061.82	34694.44	4.24	5.64	1.91	0.50	1.64
36,000-39,999	2.49	34239.37	36786.88	3.61	8.00	2.72	1.22	2.50
40,000-47,999	3.57	39268.17	42750.45	5.09	7.79	2.74	1.13	1.72
48,000-59,999	3.77	50802.54	54243.26	4.74	7.59	2.03	0.61	2.35
60,000-99,999	4.02	74814.81	77262.06	1.87	5.98	2.23	0.53	1.58
100,000-149,999	1.93	113227.94	120846.38	4.70	7.29	2.14	0.29	1.54
150,000 +	0.73	185181.44	188658.31	1.02	5.74	2.14	0.06	0.33
All Classes	100.00	24187.61	26216.11	4.78	5.52	1.70	0.59	1.74

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.3

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Northeast, Towns

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,000-2,499	1.26	1500.00	2115.26	8.51	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
2,500-2,999	0.14	2654.00	2654.00	0.0	4.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
3,000-3,749	0.62	3155.97	3405.57	1.16	1.89	1.00	0.44	0.22
3,750-4,499	0.14	3600.00	4334.86	1.38	7.00	1.00	1.00	4.00
4,500-5,249	0.39	3800.00	4736.34	9.39	3.90	1.38	0.76	1.38
5,250-5,999	0.64	4775.23	5818.27	10.57	3.31	1.34	0.63	0.68
6,000-6,749	0.78	5552.92	6253.15	7.27	2.07	1.19	0.48	0.40
6,750-7,499	2.73	6047.41	7143.43	3.20	8.15	1.87	0.91	3.49
7,500-8,249	2.04	5843.14	7838.11	15.22	2.38	1.00	0.37	0.24
8,250-8,999	1.95	7387.49	8633.79	10.48	4.08	1.30	0.45	1.58
9,000-9,749	1.90	7734.95	9414.19	8.13	4.94	1.43	0.96	1.60
9,750-10,499	1.59	9141.39	10030.07	4.52	5.24	1.41	0.72	1.84
10,500-11,249	3.19	9322.33	10832.25	5.86	5.85	1.59	0.71	2.41
11,250-11,999	2.37	9257.82	11492.14	9.43	6.04	1.25	0.80	2.37
12,000-13,499	8.28	11150.44	12547.55	3.55	6.37	2.24	0.72	2.22
13,500-14,999	6.16	11949.13	14109.45	6.72	4.32	1.30	0.52	1.35
15,000-16,499	4.28	13627.86	15873.91	7.87	5.90	1.67	1.07	1.99
16,500-17,999	5.15	14918.76	17150.58	6.18	7.09	1.55	1.09	2.52
18,000-19,499	3.55	16718.89	18898.01	4.83	6.15	1.85	1.30	1.63
19,500-20,999	4.48	18124.02	20279.69	6.04	5.70	1.89	0.60	1.94
21,000-22,499	6.65	19509.82	21924.73	4.35	7.79	1.87	0.62	3.11
22,500-23,999	4.33	19900.43	23259.29	8.42	8.33	2.82	0.39	2.79
24,000-26,999	8.86	23028.01	25097.29	3.88	7.58	1.83	0.88	2.72
27,000-29,999	4.75	26394.97	28349.79	2.01	6.13	1.92	0.61	2.28
30,000-32,999	2.81	26589.79	31232.20	10.69	6.06	1.70	1.08	1.60
33,000-35,999	3.54	31922.70	35014.56	2.94	6.30	2.68	0.39	1.43
36,000-39,999	2.01	35296.36	38314.48	2.52	5.36	2.04	0.36	1.47
40,000-47,999	3.45	40644.63	44041.55	2.21	8.13	3.03	1.62	1.80
48,000-59,999	3.97	48143.12	54448.68	7.27	6.55	2.20	0.87	1.90
60,000-99,999	4.53	64880.87	74183.88	8.91	7.40	2.96	0.55	2.26
100,000-149,999	1.96	105748.13	118249.31	8.11	7.03	3.09	0.86	1.20
150,000 +	1.51	269727.13	278330.50	0.05	6.21	2.68	0.59	1.09
All Classes	100.00	26213.22	29161.02	5.18	6.28	1.95	0.75	2.05

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.4

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

South, Towns

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.03	1200.00	1200.00	0.0	6.00	1.00	1.00	2.00
1,500-1,999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,000-2,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,500-2,999	0.02	2000.00	2608.59	0.0	2.00	1.00	1.00	0.0
3,000-3,749	0.20	2475.65	3299.24	9.50	4.18	1.27	0.0	2.18
3,750-4,499	0.96	2370.49	3993.40	25.28	2.36	1.04	0.27	0.49
4,500-5,249	1.57	3656.07	4858.30	9.00	3.08	1.28	0.37	0.97
5,250-5,999	1.29	3630.36	5625.14	25.18	2.65	1.34	0.28	0.30
6,000-6,749	2.97	5302.25	6331.26	6.82	2.53	1.07	0.30	0.52
6,750-7,499	2.85	6193.34	7173.21	5.53	4.18	1.12	0.72	1.12
7,500-8,249	2.33	6746.40	7815.77	3.82	4.46	1.35	0.60	1.24
8,250-8,999	2.94	6991.18	8653.80	7.36	4.59	1.26	0.55	1.81
9,000-9,749	3.87	8036.74	9396.04	7.65	4.94	1.53	0.52	1.59
9,750-10,499	3.24	8770.43	10145.54	5.28	4.52	1.54	0.42	1.34
10,500-11,249	3.03	9339.59	10817.01	4.73	5.09	1.82	0.63	1.79
11,250-11,999	2.32	9813.63	11662.30	2.17	4.90	1.38	0.34	1.97
12,000-13,499	6.96	10750.18	12714.33	8.31	4.28	1.50	0.62	1.12
13,500-14,999	6.31	12419.48	14294.90	5.18	4.91	2.00	0.59	1.13
15,000-16,499	4.86	13399.82	15651.14	8.00	5.98	1.91	0.54	2.00
16,500-17,999	4.12	15131.11	17179.66	6.47	4.81	1.65	0.38	1.54
18,000-19,499	6.34	16553.77	18658.81	5.97	6.09	1.71	0.89	1.92
19,500-20,999	4.14	17754.84	20298.84	3.93	5.93	1.88	0.65	1.74
21,000-22,499	3.86	18779.52	21698.50	5.68	5.80	1.69	1.09	1.48
22,500-23,999	2.36	19847.86	22990.08	5.29	6.83	2.28	0.94	2.36
24,000-26,999	6.87	23097.50	25287.49	3.15	6.01	1.85	0.77	1.75
27,000-29,999	3.95	25195.23	28441.00	3.28	5.92	1.77	0.72	1.54
30,000-32,999	3.04	28496.10	31314.64	3.59	7.24	2.11	0.77	2.21
33,000-35,999	2.93	28453.04	34056.15	8.45	6.89	2.43	0.63	1.89
36,000-39,999	2.54	32739.18	37969.23	7.84	8.86	2.33	0.91	2.77
40,000-47,999	3.55	38608.25	42529.19	2.82	6.28	2.25	0.81	1.48
48,000-59,999	3.91	46384.06	52929.08	7.10	7.07	2.45	0.49	1.96
60,000-99,999	4.54	64216.53	71652.19	5.18	7.42	2.46	0.94	1.82
100,000-149,999	1.35	104343.75	113662.13	5.93	7.04	3.11	0.54	1.59
150,000 +	0.75	383127.00	405056.38	0.40	10.38	3.39	1.10	3.27
All Classes	100.00	23233.42	26172.32	4.99	5.57	1.82	0.66	1.61

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.5

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Bangkok-Thonburi, Towns

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.06	960.00	960.00	0.0	6.00	1.00	3.00	1.00
1,000-1,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.15	1399.12	1906.01	0.0	3.51	1.00	0.83	0.85
2,000-2,499	0.10	1367.66	2037.26	11.98	1.37	1.00	0.0	0.19
2,500-2,999	0.08	2535.52	2581.45	1.78	6.22	1.33	0.29	1.48
3,000-3,749	0.09	3092.69	3323.00	0.65	3.23	1.09	0.95	0.49
3,750-4,499	0.12	3594.95	4295.44	3.65	2.04	1.00	0.07	0.37
4,500-5,249	0.34	3482.21	4882.68	20.95	1.89	1.11	0.0	0.33
5,250-5,999	0.42	4666.77	5586.21	9.03	2.58	1.24	0.17	0.56
6,000-6,749	0.61	5904.73	6405.41	4.99	2.92	1.27	0.35	0.66
6,750-7,499	0.62	6584.25	7130.74	0.56	3.36	1.23	0.56	0.63
7,500-8,249	0.63	7314.90	7735.54	1.92	5.11	1.63	0.63	1.78
8,250-8,999	1.13	7738.70	8564.18	1.96	3.64	1.35	0.42	0.89
9,000-9,749	1.49	8475.51	9327.63	4.12	3.80	1.18	0.69	1.06
9,750-10,499	1.51	9161.18	10180.63	4.52	4.58	1.47	0.94	1.26
10,500-11,249	2.61	9946.95	10837.62	4.26	4.58	1.30	1.03	1.36
11,250-11,999	1.57	10318.93	11583.88	6.81	4.92	1.68	0.89	1.10
12,000-13,499	5.41	11569.11	12693.10	3.90	4.92	1.31	0.91	1.53
13,500-14,999	8.84	12905.31	14210.38	4.84	4.93	1.63	0.71	1.67
15,000-16,499	4.87	14333.20	15727.79	4.69	5.53	1.67	0.84	1.64
16,500-17,999	5.06	15502.30	17094.36	3.96	5.59	1.73	0.93	1.75
18,000-19,499	5.17	17380.73	18620.23	3.92	5.78	1.81	0.70	1.87
19,500-20,999	5.13	18588.19	20230.45	3.10	5.94	1.82	0.62	2.05
21,000-22,499	5.13	20066.32	21709.68	3.12	5.96	2.14	0.51	2.05
22,500-23,999	4.08	20907.04	23228.13	5.77	6.77	2.07	0.79	2.30
24,000-26,999	7.26	23293.79	25303.07	4.32	6.57	2.09	0.64	1.96
27,000-29,999	6.35	25738.31	28534.13	5.13	6.55	2.28	0.62	1.96
30,000-32,999	5.23	29195.48	31276.02	3.41	6.76	2.08	0.68	2.21
33,000-35,999	3.79	31482.08	34424.48	5.28	7.03	2.44	0.70	1.95
36,000-39,999	4.19	35480.13	37759.00	3.26	7.63	2.34	0.72	2.44
40,000-47,999	5.34	40391.79	43630.91	4.07	7.33	2.61	0.61	2.05
48,000-59,999	6.16	49949.89	53390.06	3.35	7.58	2.68	0.56	1.85
60,000-99,999	7.64	70659.88	75025.06	3.12	7.80	2.90	0.62	1.91
100,000-149,999	2.52	114425.88	119637.31	1.52	7.77	3.00	0.57	1.43
150,000 +	1.33	240557.25	247351.56	0.86	8.20	4.07	0.28	1.56
All Classes	100.00	31532.87	33799.68	3.37	6.26	2.09	0.68	1.82

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.6

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Whole Kingdom, Towns

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.03	960.00	960.00	0.0	6.00	1.00	3.00	1.00
1,000-1,499	0.00	1200.00	1200.00	0.0	6.00	1.00	1.00	2.00
1,500-1,999	0.07	1399.12	1906.01	0.0	3.51	1.00	0.83	0.85
2,000-2,499	0.19	1498.29	2120.04	8.36	1.18	1.00	0.0	0.04
2,500-2,999	0.11	2202.80	2670.25	5.26	3.60	1.11	0.25	0.78
3,000-3,749	0.24	2834.23	3326.15	4.46	2.29	1.05	0.41	0.55
3,750-4,499	0.69	2921.80	4057.41	14.76	2.17	1.16	0.08	0.34
4,500-5,249	0.82	3490.73	4882.43	16.11	3.15	1.21	0.46	0.88
5,250-5,999	0.87	4348.63	5649.16	11.20	2.61	1.18	0.28	0.48
6,000-6,749	1.21	5259.92	6328.96	8.67	3.31	1.38	0.30	0.50
6,750-7,499	1.79	5791.94	7098.16	8.24	4.48	1.41	0.66	1.38
7,500-8,249	1.56	6381.83	7835.25	9.45	4.55	1.22	0.82	1.40
8,250-8,999	2.08	7248.44	8604.64	6.77	3.94	1.31	0.51	1.25
9,000-9,749	2.62	8300.36	9377.52	5.55	4.10	1.24	0.47	1.32
9,750-10,499	2.25	8646.70	10160.72	7.27	4.98	1.57	0.69	1.62
10,500-11,249	3.01	9645.75	10837.52	4.61	4.51	1.41	0.80	1.38
11,250-11,999	2.22	9991.60	11584.73	6.29	4.75	1.49	0.68	1.45
12,000-13,499	6.37	11307.21	12672.24	4.86	4.93	1.53	0.69	1.58
13,500-14,999	4.94	12603.11	14213.22	4.91	4.75	1.62	0.59	1.47
15,000-16,499	4.62	14111.48	15720.32	5.25	5.73	1.70	0.77	1.90
16,500-17,999	4.72	15304.37	17147.93	5.10	5.67	1.78	0.76	1.81
18,000-19,499	5.16	16998.11	18646.19	4.49	5.70	1.77	0.69	1.84
19,500-20,999	5.39	18387.91	20232.82	4.36	5.70	1.74	0.59	1.84
21,000-22,499	5.08	19581.24	21725.20	4.43	6.32	1.97	0.59	2.31
22,500-23,999	3.39	20483.93	23264.33	7.03	6.72	2.12	0.70	2.41
24,000-26,999	7.00	23286.44	25224.76	3.65	6.40	1.88	0.65	2.00
27,000-29,999	5.31	25591.43	28401.28	5.15	6.40	2.10	0.61	1.94
30,000-32,999	3.97	28632.66	31290.61	4.82	6.45	1.95	0.63	2.01
33,000-35,999	3.23	31285.07	34412.69	4.70	6.70	2.45	0.58	1.78
36,000-39,999	3.34	35067.95	37688.63	3.40	7.30	2.28	0.74	2.24
40,000-47,999	4.38	40051.32	43371.25	3.56	7.09	2.56	0.71	1.77
48,000-59,999	4.64	49276.08	53492.52	4.46	7.38	2.50	0.55	1.92
60,000-99,999	5.58	70129.00	74972.00	3.47	7.41	2.73	0.59	1.91
100,000-149,999	2.01	111298.31	117942.94	2.95	7.43	2.79	0.51	1.53
150,000 +	1.11	253710.88	261947.25	0.59	7.87	3.30	0.59	1.48
All Classes	100.00	27018.17	29403.00	4.00	5.85	1.91	0.63	1.76

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.7

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

North, Villages.

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.45	892.77	1348.26	22.80	2.28	2.28	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.51	1181.47	1819.64	24.46	2.94	1.86	0.53	0.48
2,000-2,499	1.36	1449.83	2247.66	25.14	4.50	1.21	0.50	1.16
2,500-2,999	1.58	1795.28	2743.02	24.43	4.50	1.45	0.69	1.62
3,000-3,749	5.64	2081.24	3459.83	30.14	4.29	1.41	0.77	1.24
3,750-4,499	5.57	2671.58	4096.09	25.10	4.45	1.51	0.65	1.35
4,500-5,249	6.61	3140.99	4854.11	25.87	4.78	1.35	0.93	1.17
5,250-5,999	7.12	3646.77	5673.13	26.47	5.39	1.66	0.82	1.74
6,000-6,749	8.05	4279.75	6417.13	24.14	5.15	1.64	1.06	1.55
6,750-7,499	6.50	4763.92	7119.40	24.00	5.27	1.53	0.96	1.43
7,500-8,249	6.23	5122.82	7833.66	26.45	5.87	1.50	0.98	1.80
8,250-8,999	5.45	5727.37	8597.65	24.50	5.79	1.50	0.94	1.84
9,000-9,749	4.52	6430.67	9393.92	22.88	6.46	1.47	1.10	2.28
9,750-10,499	4.18	6647.64	10054.43	25.17	5.99	1.68	0.60	2.11
10,500-11,249	3.86	7415.84	10810.75	22.90	5.87	1.56	1.17	1.91
11,250-11,999	3.19	8175.11	11621.88	21.07	6.50	1.79	0.62	2.30
12,000-13,499	7.22	9599.18	12805.15	16.70	6.10	1.65	0.77	1.54
13,500-14,999	5.66	10651.79	14310.79	17.27	6.39	1.47	0.75	2.33
15,000-16,499	2.37	10986.18	15648.14	21.52	5.55	1.84	0.78	1.69
16,500-17,999	3.42	12768.48	16958.77	17.06	6.71	1.99	0.83	2.53
18,000-19,499	1.06	15098.10	18704.55	11.45	6.92	1.77	0.99	2.33
19,500-20,999	1.89	15368.27	20139.70	15.62	6.04	1.57	0.32	2.23
21,000-22,499	1.06	16916.20	21782.20	14.42	5.26	1.40	0.35	0.78
22,500-23,999	1.54	19704.14	23453.86	8.06	7.20	2.03	0.24	2.32
24,000-26,999	1.54	20563.64	25769.59	12.59	7.05	1.58	0.70	1.78
27,000-29,999	0.95	24464.55	28267.32	5.69	7.56	2.17	0.71	2.31
30,000-32,999	1.30	27165.86	31636.09	6.86	6.38	1.07	0.76	2.26
33,000-35,999	0.31	28102.34	34854.02	12.83	6.61	1.34	0.73	2.56
36,000-39,999	0.23	31542.99	39112.92	11.88	9.94	1.00	2.37	3.67
40,000-47,999	0.13	39200.31	44884.69	5.42	8.78	1.97	1.05	2.02
48,000-59,999	0.40	49087.72	54348.80	2.48	6.07	2.23	0.31	1.09
60,000-99,999	0.02	69999.94	76001.88	0.96	5.00	1.00	2.00	0.0
100,000-149,999	0.09	53904.98	120258.75	48.60	5.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
150,000 +	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Classes	100.00	7488.10	10330.56	19.15	5.63	1.58	0.83	1.74

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.8

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Centre & East, Villages

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.10	100.00	916.68	72.00	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.10	1161.72	1394.97	2.73	1.01	1.00	0.0	0.00
1,500-1,999	0.41	1155.22	1804.74	23.62	1.48	1.00	0.31	0.0
2,000-2,499	0.44	1442.87	2378.29	28.47	2.79	1.08	0.0	0.35
2,500-2,999	1.12	1670.89	2746.80	29.14	2.47	1.16	0.37	0.26
3,000-3,749	1.58	2167.57	3490.74	28.86	3.47	1.28	0.58	1.03
3,750-4,499	3.07	2852.33	4166.23	23.21	3.61	1.31	0.48	1.04
4,500-5,249	2.90	3110.25	4922.43	29.33	3.33	1.31	0.29	0.74
5,250-5,999	4,41	3893.43	5613.35	23.42	3.83	1.35	0.43	1.25
6,000-6,749	3,82	4224.74	6413.07	27.35	4.80	1.36	0.67	1.44
6,750-7,499	3.78	5036.51	7148.19	23.10	5.04	1.53	0.58	1.45
7,500-8,249	4.61	6254.81	7876.81	14.43	4.77	1.55	0.79	1.34
8,250-8,999	5.78	6435.48	8634.18	19.60	4.77	1.43	0.50	1.47
9,000-9,749	4.99	7083.66	9350.32	18.56	4.76	1.39	0.54	1.52
9,750-10,499	4.14	7314.76	10107.50	22.19	6.20	1.81	0.73	2.59
10,500-11,249	5.09	8684.07	10872.71	14.84	5.25	1.56	0.61	1.75
11,250-11,999	4.31	9017.33	11612.14	17.22	5.40	1.60	0.69	1.75
12,000-13,499	7.07	9821.04	12720.44	17.98	6.09	1.69	0.76	2.03
13,500-14,999	8.63	11019.80	14265.38	18.12	6.51	1.52	0.82	1.94
15,000-16,499	4.62	13336.01	15726.87	10.94	6.15	1.74	0.88	1.62
16,500-17,999	5.30	13714.31	17189.60	16.03	5.86	1.54	0.59	1.84
18,000-19,499	2.80	14899.89	18758.39	16.74	6.48	2.13	0.33	2.31
19,500-20,999	3.15	17661.54	20222.61	8.80	6.38	1.62	0.40	1.90
21,000-22,499	2.76	17760.25	21577.17	13.97	6.88	1.42	0.52	1.96
22,500-23,999	2.00	19877.44	23046.05	10.15	5.79	1.89	0.35	1.90
24,000-26,999	2.27	21355.34	25268.84	12.08	6.21	1.79	0.74	1.79
27,000-29,999	2.55	24052.42	28239.80	11.46	7.71	1.84	0.92	2.67
30,000-32,999	1.00	28474.45	31985.38	8.03	7.70	2.08	1.26	1.55
33,000-35,999	1.19	30319.66	34672.18	9.69	8.53	1.47	0.75	2.84
36,000-39,999	1.56	33774.19	37499.00	7.32	7.26	1.75	0.61	2.47
40,000-47,999	1.46	38646.06	42243.22	6.19	7.73	1.62	0.60	3.06
48,000-59,999	0.73	50240 91	54756.14	6.20	6.11	1.61	1.08	1.58
60,000-99,999	1.64	65006.68	69316.44	4.02	8 89	1.14	1.76	2.83
100,000-149,999	0.44	115253.25	120158.56	2.39	7.46	1.68	1.68	1.01
150,000 +	0.18	256415.19	260706.50	0.49	5.73	1.35	0.47	1.82
All Classes	100.00	13009.43	15699.47	13.09	5.59	1.56	0.65	1.74

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.9

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Northeast, Villages

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.16	550.00	786.37	19.08	3.00	1.00	0.50	1.00
1,000-1,499	0.03	1000.00	1345.79	15.16	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.29	749.32	1747.59	46.80	2.84	1.37	0.66	0.50
2,000-2,499	1.15	1016.71	2254.32	45.89	3.89	1.17	0.91	0.96
2,500-2,999	1.99	944.85	2773.33	55.98	4.21	1.00	0.67	0.96
3,000-3,749	5.05	1266.61	3363.34	52.53	4.53	1.06	1.24	1.06
3,750-4,499	9.32	1389.50	4145.26	56.90	4.57	1.09	0.88	1.22
4,500-5,249	10.74	1907.33	4882.68	51.43	5.13	1.16	0.92	1.55
5,250-5,999	8.68	2058.79	5622.14	53.98	5.67	1.32	0.99	1.74
6,000-6,749	8.90	2443.61	6340.31	52.23	5.98	1.28	1.00	1.80
6,750-7,499	8.58	2889.34	7118.29	50.27	6.21	1.36	1.02	1.87
7,500-8,249	7.24	3180.21	7838.58	50.37	6.71	1.28	1.09	2.12
8,250-8,999	4.45	3971.30	8618.68	45.05	6.47	1.43	1.05	2.01
9,000-9,749	4.47	4739.51	9369.30	40.73	7.01	1.38	1.19	1.85
9,750-10,499	4.65	5580.17	10083.86	35.97	7.63	1.52	0.88	2.61
10,500-11,249	3.45	6549.86	10846.14	30.99	6.79	1.39	1.26	2.16
11,250-11,999	3.57	6447.28	11724.86	36.28	7.25	1.36	0.94	2.31
12,000-13,499	3.75	7310.75	12589.39	33.86	7.66	1.70	1.13	2.65
13,500-14,999	2.98	8731.21	14364.35	30.85	7.36	1.57	1.06	2.24
15,000-16,499	1.44	12061.28	15623.95	15.10	7.86	1.67	1.12	2.89
16,500-17,999	1.66	11874.31	17023.85	22.39	6.59	1.52	0.70	2.50
18,000-19,499	1.46	12947.16	18641.62	22.65	7.90	1.64	1.30	2.62
19,500-20,999	0.69	15104.23	20474.30	18.39	6.95	2.12	0.86	1.98
21,000-22,499	0.76	15319.95	21478.61	21.75	6.26	1.25	0.67	1.87
22,500-23,999	0.54	18407.50	22995.66	12.26	8.14	2.14	1.27	1.84
24,000-26,999	1.08	19101.40	25363.08	17.95	7.64	1.81	0.96	2.44
27,000-29,999	0.95	22816.03	28116.17	11.14	7.53	1.78	0.69	2.80
30,000-32,999	0.50	26122.72	31605.38	9.97	6.92	2.18	0.63	1.29
33,000-35,999	0.30	30353.18	33408.61	1.39	6.93	1.97	0.56	1.35
36,000-39,999	0.16	33623.37	37525.93	7.78	6.66	1.50	0.56	2.75
40,000-47,999	0.49	37329.69	44087.48	8.00	8.57	1.98	1.45	3.31
48,000-59,999	0.17	47891.73	54310.21	6.41	6.37	1.12	1.29	2.26
60,000-99,999	0.25	68822.50	74862.06	1.80	6.46	2.61	0.38	1.43
100,000-149,999	0.07	119973.75	130792.69	2.58	3.65	2.65	0.0	0.57
150,000 +	0.03	194999.88	201132.38	0.03	7.50	1.50	0.50	3.00
All Classes	100.00	5102.55	9078.66	35.38	6.12	1.34	1.00	1.86

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.10

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

South, Villages

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.04	840.00	971.38	2.47	2.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.08	1000.00	1122.42	0.0	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.81	980.42	1757.02	33.74	2.08	1.00	0.12	0.70
2,000-2,499	0.83	1326.18	2233.01	30.38	2.09	1.00	0.29	0.45
2,500-2,999	2.07	2145.74	2843.62	14.54	3.56	1.00	0.54	0.87
3,000-3,749	6.61	2260.09	3352.21	22.73	3.58	1.07	0.54	0.87
3,750-4,499	6.44	2936.84	4138.16	19.37	4.09	1.18	0.72	0.98
4,500-5,249	7.87	3339.93	4834.47	21.39	4.56	1.31	0.85	1.09
5,250-5,999	7.15	3672.81	5577.91	24.76	4.48	1.16	0.63	1.01
6,000-6,749	9.84	4416.35	6343.75	21.42	5.43	1.76	0.74	1.50
6,750-7,499	6.19	4871.09	7107.93	22.28	5.31	1.32	0.51	1.66
7,500-8,249	6.79	5561.32	7860.94	20.27	5.23	1.35	1.01	1.42
8,250-8,999	5.77	6253.41	8571.75	18.08	5.29	1.43	0.53	1.58
9,000-9,749	7.73	6796.26	9425.14	19.04	5.68	1.38	0.96	1.44
9,750-10,499	3.52	7095.62	10112.98	21.29	6.01	1.32	0.87	1.69
10,500-11,249	3.41	7430.02	10817.67	22.59	6.03	1.56	0.60	2.08
11,250-11,999	3.41	8548.54	11630.04	18.12	5.70	1.42	0.91	1.26
12,000-13,499	4.92	9587.44	12632.04	15.74	6.30	1.70	1.03	1.49
13,500-14,999	3.79	10242.10	14127.91	19.24	6.23	1.53	0.87	1.56
15,000-16,499	2.25	11432.40	15496.86	18.13	6.72	1.42	0.83	2.32
16,500-17,999	2.27	13327.34	16949.98	12.90	8.02	1.43	1.17	2.93
18,000-19,499	2.25	14949.37	18901.88	12.90	6.57	1.88	0.56	2.31
19,500-20,999	1.08	15740.35	20078.84	14.50	7.28	1.47	1.71	1.73
21,000-22,499	0.88	17253.25	21438.95	12.99	4.78	1.91	0.76	0.59
22,500-23,999	0.79	19610.21	23349.02	8.70	6.47	1.97	0.54	2.93
24,000-26,999	1.10	21409.89	25302.64	9.01	6.85	1.90	0.90	2.44
27,000-29,999	0.81	23634.07	27851.37	7.83	6.27	1.70	0.69	1.71
30,000-32,999	0.37	25256.09	31580.04	12.03	8.94	2.22	1.65	3.60
33,000-35,999	0.48	27392.07	34530.50	12.74	9.08	1.54	1.28	3.52
36,000-39,999	0.20	34420.36	38199.32	2.03	3.59	1.41	0.59	0.41
40,000-47,999	0.04	42899.99	47390.77	1.77	4.00	1.00	0.0	2.00
48,000-59,999	0.09	49569.29	57786.63	6.66	5.18	1.00	0.59	1.41
60,000-99,999	0.05	60599.99	67491.19	2.76	9.00	1.00	2.00	5.00
100,000-149,999	0.06	100999.94	108756.06	0.0	3.00	1.00	1.00	0.0
150,000 +	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Classes	100.00	6831.02	9243.82	17.58	5.28	1.41	0.77	1.45

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.11

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Bangkok-Thonburi, Villages

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
2,000-2,499	0.37	900.00	2432.94	19.73	5.00	1.00	1.00	2.00
2,500-2,999	0.21	1800.00	2881.26	0.0	9.00	1.00	2.00	4.00
3,000-3,749	0.03	1920.00	3009.37	0.0	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
3,750-4,499	0.25	2840.17	4226.06	5.33	2.15	1.00	0.0	0.12
4,500-5,249	1.16	3589.25	4935.82	3.03	2.24	1.69	0.0	0.04
5,250-5,999	1.88	3672.77	5595.98	12.43	2.76	1.12	0.22	0.87
6,000-6,749	1.19	4866.21	6317.68	3.05	2.72	1.64	0.08	0.55
6,750-7,499	2.26	5341.45	7213.17	8.01	4.47	1.61	0.84	1.63
7,500-8,249	1.48	5506.77	7956.88	14.20	5.19	1.14	1.11	2.01
8,250-8,999	3.67	6251.13	8604.71	11.75	5.88	1.25	0.74	1.46
9,000-9,749	2.92	7496.88	9340.35	9.44	5.75	1.37	0.99	2.53
9,750-10,499	1.62	8234.99	10141.63	5.10	4.31	1.36	0.32	1.64
10,500-11,249	3.10	8502.45	10935.79	10.44	5.65	1.68	0.89	2.02
11,250-11,999	2.06	9844.56	11736.30	7.85	5.89	1.95	1.50	1.95
12,000-13,499	7.15	10385.38	12859.95	7.88	4.81	1.58	0.43	1.64
13,500-14,999	5.58	11918.37	14405.13	7.39	6.74	1.86	0.89	2.28
15,000-16,499	9.06	12918.63	15737.92	8.84	7.67	1.93	1.21	3.29
16,500-17,999	6.90	14752.74	17222.69	5.80	5.72	1.79	0.89	1.39
18,000-19,499	8.11	16330.44	18609.71	5.54	6.73	1.63	0.54	2.80
19,500-20,999	5.66	17879.23	20252.88	4.52	5.71	2.30	0.64	1.54
21,000-22,499	1.62	19351.96	21632.05	3.00	6.75	1.61	1.51	1.80
22,500-23,999	3.06	19585.41	23098.06	8.35	7.20	2.07	0.41	2.09
24,000-26,999	6.34	22562.68	25634.25	5.38	7.24	2.19	0.70	2.56
27,000-29,999	2.49	25512.17	28203.89	3.84	8.42	2.41	0.79	2.87
30,000-32,999	4.23	28783.37	31719.57	4.29	6.27	2.15	0.81	1.96
33,000-35,999	1.84	31000.00	35030.07	7.13	10.53	1.88	0.54	2.63
36,000-39,999	2.94	35381.06	38434.39	4.43	8.39	1.74	0.97	2.72
40,000-47,999	5.76	40400.03	42969.75	1.69	7.45	1.72	0.77	2.56
48,000-59,999	3.16	46979.80	51626.65	6.86	8.19	2.84	0.65	2.69
60,000-99,999	1.26	67148.19	74104.94	6.53	8.53	3.46	1.21	1.94
100,000-149,999	2.11	120466.69	129740.81	5.31	7.55	3.32	0.43	1.44
150,000 +	0.50	218618.38	223111.88	0.83	2.96	1.32	0.61	0.06
All Classes	100.00	21487.62	24289.55	5.54	6.44	1.87	0.77	2.14

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.12

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Whole Kingdom, Villages

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.08	441.19	834.70	34.26	2.37	1.00	0.33	0.66
1,000-1,499	0.17	937.19	1341.46	18.80	1.99	1.99	0.0	0.00
1,500-1,999	0.44	1034.97	1786.60	31.19	2.42	1.38	0.42	0.43
2,000-2,499	1.00	1264.46	2262.75	34.02	3.86	1.16	0.59	0.94
2,500-2,999	1.65	1481.75	2771.45	36.45	3.94	1.15	0.61	1.04
3,000-3,749	4.56	1812.86	3407.04	37.07	4.19	1.21	0.89	1.09
3,750-4,499	6.30	2080.52	4133.68	40.18	4.37	1.24	0.76	1.21
4,500-5,249	7.24	2545.05	4872.23	38.42	4.79	1.25	0.86	1.31
5,250-5,999	6.96	3013.41	5630.95	37.38	5.16	1.41	0.81	1.58
6,000-6,749	7.49	3557.36	6373.84	35.27	5.48	1.48	0.94	1.63
6,750-7,499	6.49	3974.25	7121.89	35.37	5.66	1.43	0.88	1.66
7,500-8,249	6.20	4600.86	7846.88	33.04	5.93	1.40	1.00	1.80
8,250-8,999	5.19	5469.75	8609.45	28.24	5.67	1.45	0.80	1.76
9,000-9,749	4.97	6140.14	9381.96	26.50	6.09	1.40	0.98	1.82
9,750-10,499	4.21	6449.43	10083.59	28.04	6.64	1.61	0.76	2.36
10,500-11,249	3.93	7540.77	10841.63	22.77	5.98	1.51	0.97	1.96
11,250-11,999	3.58	7875.96	11656.22	24.75	6.36	1.55	0.79	2.03
12,000-13,499	5.73	9168.33	12717.27	20.53	6.44	1.68	0.87	1.92
13,500-14,999	5.19	10401.44	14290.05	20.23	6.62	1.52	0.85	2.10
15,000-16,499	2.66	12254.24	15664.05	15.13	6.45	1.73	0.91	2.04
16,500-17,999	3.16	13085.78	17065.74	16.83	6.45	1.68	0.75	2.26
18,000-19,499	1.85	14526.61	18727.60	15.99	6.97	1.86	0.75	2.44
19,500-20,999	1.73	16431.68	20220.29	12.52	6.38	1.70	0.55	1.99
21,000-22,499	1.32	17076.81	21597.39	15.27	6.20	1.43	0.55	1.54
22,500-23,999	1.24	19563.40	23216.41	9.48	6.78	1.99	0.46	2.14
24,000-26,999	1.58	20688.98	25465.26	12.86	6.91	1.77	0.79	2.04
27,000-29,999	1.31	23856.13	28185.40	9.62	7.55	1.91	0.80	2.56
30,000-32,999	0.90	27329.60	31720.45	7.78	6.93	1.67	0.91	1.95
33,000-35,999	0.55	29684.97	34473.92	8.90	8.09	1.57	0.76	2.58
36,000-39,999	0.54	33660.64	37821.30	7.44	7.48	1.61	0.86	2.58
40,000-47,999	0.64	38641.21	43041.04	5.89	7.94	1.75	0.88	2.98
48,000-59,999	0.41	49109.58	54236.46	5.22	6.39	1.87	0.81	1.68
60,000-99,999	0.48	65775.75	70558.31	3.68	8.40	1.50	1.50	2.53
100,000-149,999	0.19	108088.56	122937.38	9.00	6.50	2.00	0.98	0.87
150,000 +	0.06	240257.13	244898.19	0.47	5.64	1.37	0.50	1.77
All Classes	100.00	8073.16	11213.50	21.05	5.76	1.48	0.84	1.75

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.13

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

North, Total

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.42	892.77	1348.26	22.80	2.28	2.28	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.48	1181.47	1819.64	24.46	2.94	1.86	0.53	0.48
2,000-2,499	1.28	1451.68	2248.19	25.00	4.49	1.21	0.50	1.15
2,500-2,999	1.50	1795.33	2743.32	24.38	4.49	1.45	0.69	1.62
3,000-3,749	5.33	2083.08	3458.73	30.03	4.27	1.41	0.76	1.23
3,750-4,499	5.32	2673.89	4095.71	24.98	4.41	1.50	0.64	1.33
4,500-5,249	6.31	3142.45	4855.26	25.77	4.77	1.35	0.93	1.16
5,250-5,999	6.79	3659.43	5671.68	26.13	5.35	1.65	0.81	1.71
6,000-6,749	7.66	4279.14	6417.65	24.08	5.15	1.65	1.05	1.53
6,750-7,499	6.34	4786.37	7115.77	23.51	5.23	1.53	0.94	1.42
7,500-8,249	6.11	5152.50	7835.81	25.97	5.84	1.49	0.99	1.79
8,250-8,999	5.31	5766.44	8599.14	23.92	5.75	1.50	0.93	1.84
9,000-9,749	4.58	6562.30	9392.84	21.71	6.23	1.44	1.04	2.19
9,750-10,499	4.21	6728.48	10063.45	24.28	5.96	1.69	0.59	2.11
10,500-11,249	3.84	7526.38	10811.63	21.91	5.77	1.55	1.13	1.87
11,250-11,999	3.23	8275.08	11615.87	20.12	6.36	1.76	0.62	2.23
12,000-13,499	7.26	9688.21	12791.92	16.09	5.99	1.64	0.75	1.54
13,500-14,999	5.66	10751.27	14307.54	16.55	6.31	1.47	0.74	2.30
15,000-16,499	2.34	11107.94	15648.39	20.79	5.49	1.84	0.76	1.65
16,500-17,999	3.47	12969.06	16979.92	16.04	6.63	2.00	0.79	2.47
18,000-19,499	1.25	15278.33	18677.18	10.38	6.68	1.77	0.84	2.27
19,500-20,999	2.16	16033.54	20152.10	13.12	5.87	1.58	0.34	2.08
21,000-22,499	1.33	17391.86	21788.26	12.29	5.60	1.50	0.40	1.28
22,500-23,999	1.57	19672.72	23461.91	8.38	7.04	2.02	0.26	2.30
24,000-26,999	1.69	20894.64	25687.34	11.22	6.79	1.60	0.66	1.72
27,000-29,999	1.05	24718.38	28271.27	4.94	7.16	2.16	0.62	2.16
30,000-32,999	1.41	27257.04	31599.04	6.85	6.21	1.14	0.69	2.11
33,000-35,999	0.43	29410.23	34524.51	8.71	6.59	1.87	0.58	2.18
36,000-39,999	0.41	33573.14	38420.66	6.72	7.67	1.37	1.45	2.51
40,000-47,999	0.35	39919.14	43796.89	2.83	6.65	2.09	0.41	1.31
48,000-59,999	0.52	48590.82	53938.18	3.20	6.27	2.27	0.26	1.26
60,000-99,999	0.19	72726.69	76674.13	0.80	6.37	2.18	0.27	1.84
100,000-149,999	0.16	77352.50	114073.75	26.64	5.70	1.50	0.06	1.12
150,000 +	0.05	252112.75	259756.63	0.05	8.16	1.59	1.93	1.15
All Classes	100.00	8294.21	11099.83	17.22	5.59	1.58	0.80	1.73

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.14

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Centre & East, Total

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.10	100.00	916.68	72.00	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.09	1161.72	1394.97	2.73	1.01	1.00	0.0	0.00
1,500-1,999	0.38	1155.22	1804.74	23.62	1.48	1.00	0.31	0.0
2,000-2,499	0.40	1442.87	2378.29	28.47	2.79	1.08	0.0	0.35
2,500-2,999	1.05	1675.32	2746.01	28.72	2.45	1.15	0.37	0.26
3,000-3,749	1.48	2178.94	3489.09	28.55	3.46	1.28	0.59	1.03
3,750-4,499	2.97	2864.06	4159.14	22.64	3.54	1.31	0.45	1.01
4,500-5,249	2.74	3124.64	4921.20	28.98	3.33	1.31	0.29	0.76
5,250-5,999	4.15	3903.20	5617.17	23.15	3.80	1.34	0.42	1.24
6,000-6,749	3.62	4260.06	6404.00	26.70	4.76	1.36	0.66	1.41
6,750-7,499	3.60	5033.77	7145.94	23.08	4.98	1.53	0.58	1.43
7,500-8,249	4.29	6266.89	7876.38	14.28	4.76	1.55	0.79	1.34
8,250-8,999	5.55	6475.79	8630.86	19.09	4.69	1.42	0.50	1.43
9,000-9,749	4.78	7149.23	9352.98	17.88	4.76	1.38	0.53	1.53
9,750-10,499	3.92	7368.13	10108.27	21.70	6.17	1.79	0.74	2.56
10,500-11,249	4.97	8737.98	10872.28	14.24	5.16	1.55	0.62	1.70
11,250-11,999	4.16	9089.50	11614.13	16.67	5.32	1.60	0.68	1.72
12,000-13,499	6.98	9954.36	12724.54	16.90	6.02	1.68	0.74	2.01
13,500-14,999	8.37	11119.82	14260.27	17.36	6.39	1.52	0.81	1.89
15,000-16,499	4.77	13467.04	15724.55	10.06	6.17	1.72	0.87	1.73
16,500-17,999	5.22	13798.11	17190.32	15.50	5.85	1.56	0.60	1.84
18,000-19,499	3.07	15281.04	18741.93	14.60	6.23	2.06	0.36	2.21
19,500-20,999	3.45	17668.95	20219.54	8.87	6.26	1.60	0.44	1.89
21,000-22,499	2.91	17995.61	21569.32	12.96	6.78	1.48	0.51	2.02
22,500-23,999	2.09	19967.44	23088.75	9.91	5.83	1.86	0.39	2.01
24,000-26,999	2.74	21933.70	25225.05	9.83	6.16	1.72	0.69	1.86
27,000-29,999	2.87	24192.88	28211.94	11.09	7.57	1.85	0.88	2.58
30,000-32,999	1.15	28375.02	31850.15	7.89	7.32	2.00	1.09	1.65
33,000-35,999	1.30	30595.77	34675.72	8.82	8.08	1.54	0.71	2.65
36,000-39,999	1.63	33831.49	37411.30	6.87	7.35	1.87	0.69	2.48
40,000-47,999	1.63	38755.56	42332.50	6.00	7.75	1.82	0.70	2.82
48,000-59,999	0.98	50415.55	54596.66	5.75	6.57	1.74	0.94	1.82
60,000-99,999	1.83	66740.88	70721.38	3.61	8.37	1.34	1.54	2.61
100,000-149,999	0.56	114688.19	120350.50	3.04	7.42	1.80	1.29	1.16
150,000 +	0.23	238038.19	242119.31	0.59	5.74	1.55	0.36	1.43
All Classes	100.00	13910.62	16547.32	12.03	5.59	1.57	0.65	1.74

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.15

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Northeast, Total

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.15	550.00	786.37	19.08	3.00	1.00	0.50	1.00
1,000-1,499	0.03	1000.00	1345.79	15.16	1.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.28	749.32	1747.59	46.80	2.84	1.37	0.66	0.50
2,000-2,499	1.16	1035.26	2248.98	44.54	3.78	1.16	0.87	0.92
2,500-2,999	1.93	949.29	2773.02	55.84	4.20	1.00	0.67	0.96
3,000-3,749	4.90	1275.02	3363.53	52.30	4.51	1.06	1.23	1.05
3,750-4,499	9.00	1390.73	4145.37	56.87	4.58	1.09	0.88	1.22
4,500-5,249	10.38	1909.82	4882.49	51.37	5.13	1.16	0.92	1.55
5,250-5,999	8.39	2066.13	5622.67	53.86	5.67	1.32	0.99	1.74
6,000-6,749	8.61	2453.47	6340.04	52.09	5.97	1.28	1.00	1.80
6,750-7,499	8.38	2925.53	7118.57	49.73	6.23	1.37	1.02	1.89
7,500-8,249	7.06	3207.36	7838.57	50.01	6.67	1.28	1.08	2.10
8,250-8,999	4.36	4025.05	8618.91	44.51	6.43	1.43	1.04	2.00
9,000-9,749	4.38	4785.30	9369.98	40.23	6.98	1.38	1.19	1.85
9,750-10,499	4.54	5623.96	10083.19	35.58	7.60	1.52	0.88	2.60
10,500-11,249	3.44	6640.54	10845.68	30.17	6.76	1.39	1.25	2.16
11,250-11,999	3.53	6513.72	11719.36	35.66	7.22	1.36	0.94	2.31
12,000-13,499	3.91	7597.20	12586.27	31.60	7.57	1.74	1.10	2.62
13,500-14,999	3.10	8956.95	14346.46	29.18	7.15	1.55	1.02	2.18
15,000-16,499	1.54	12214.80	15648.45	14.38	7.67	1.67	1.11	2.80
16,500-17,999	1.78	12184.05	17036.74	20.73	6.65	1.53	0.74	2.50
18,000-19,499	1.54	13254.09	18662.49	21.18	7.76	1.65	1.30	2.54
19,500-20,999	0.82	15682.05	20437.07	16.05	6.71	2.08	0.81	1.98
21,000-22,499	0.97	16335.77	21586.77	17.46	6.63	1.40	0.66	2.17
22,500-23,999	0.67	18747.32	23055.68	11.37	8.18	2.29	1.07	2.06
24,000-26,999	1.36	20006.02	25301.85	14.74	7.63	1.82	0.94	2.50
27,000-29,999	1.08	23369.75	28152.32	9.72	7.32	1.80	0.68	2.71
30,000-32,999	0.58	26202.80	31541.41	10.09	6.77	2.10	0.70	1.34
33,000-35,999	0.41	30826.25	33892.67	1.87	6.74	2.18	0.50	1.37
36,000-39,999	0.22	34156.32	37777.13	6.08	6.25	1.67	0.49	2.34
40,000-47,999	0.60	38002.89	44078.18	6.82	8.48	2.19	1.49	3.00
48,000-59,999	0.31	48007.02	54373.72	6.80	6.45	1.61	1.10	2.10
60,000-99,999	0.40	67235.06	74588.94	4.65	6.84	2.75	0.45	1.76
100,000-149,999	0.14	112879.44	124537.31	5.20	5.34	2.87	0.43	0.88
150,000 +	0.08	242764.13	250475.94	0.04	6.68	2.25	0.56	1.78
All Classes	100.00	5846.17	9786.06	32.21	6.12	1.37	0.99	1.87

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.16

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

South, Total

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.04	840.00	971.38	2.47	2.00	1.00	0.0	0.0
1,000-1,499	0.07	1010.93	1126.66	0.0	1.27	1.00	0.06	0.11
1,500-1,999	0.71	980.42	1757.02	33.74	2.08	1.00	0.12	0.70
2,000-2,499	0.73	1326.18	2233.01	30.38	2.09	1.00	0.29	0.45
2,500-2,999	1.81	2145.55	2843.31	14.52	3.55	1.00	0.54	0.87
3,000-3,749	5.82	2261.03	3351.98	22.67	3.59	1.07	0.54	0.87
3,750-4,499	5.76	2925.19	4135.18	19.49	4.05	1.18	0.71	0.97
4,500-5,249	7.09	3348.58	4835.13	21.05	4.52	1.31	0.83	1.09
5,250-5,999	6.42	3671.75	5579.07	24.77	4.44	1.16	0.62	0.99
6,000-6,749	8.99	4452.50	6343.25	20.83	5.31	1.73	0.72	1.46
6,750-7,499	5.78	4951.71	7111.91	21.25	5.24	1.31	0.53	1.62
7,500-8,249	6.24	5616.11	7858.86	19.51	5.19	1.35	0.99	1.41
8,250-8,999	5.42	6302.93	8577.26	17.35	5.24	1.42	0.53	1.60
9,000-9,749	7.25	6878.14	9423.22	18.29	5.63	1.39	0.93	1.45
9,750-10,499	3.49	7287.91	10116.72	19.44	5.84	1.35	0.82	1.65
10,500-11,249	3.36	7642.41	10817.60	20.60	5.93	1.59	0.60	2.04
11,250-11,999	3.27	8659.41	11632.86	16.72	5.63	1.42	0.86	1.32
12,000-13,499	5.17	9780.72	12645.71	14.50	5.97	1.67	0.96	1.43
13,500-14,999	4.10	10656.65	14159.70	16.54	5.98	1.62	0.82	1.48
15,000-16,499	2.57	11891.68	15532.88	15.74	6.55	1.54	0.76	2.24
16,500-17,999	2.50	13694.71	16996.76	11.57	7.36	1.47	1.01	2.64
18,000-19,499	2.76	15405.36	18832.80	10.95	6.43	1.83	0.65	2.20
19,500-20,999	1.46	16445.30	20155.83	10.78	6.81	1.61	1.34	1.73
21,000-22,499	1.25	17838.31	21538.45	10.16	5.17	1.83	0.89	0.93
22,500-23,999	0.98	19680.84	23242.34	7.70	6.57	2.06	0.66	2.76
24,000-26,999	1.82	22198.63	25295.57	6.27	6.46	1.88	0.84	2.12
27,000-29,999	1.20	24269.69	28091.44	5.96	6.12	1.73	0.71	1.64
30,000-32,999	0.70	26984.82	31438.44	7.54	8.03	2.16	1.18	2.86
33,000-35,999	0.78	27883.22	34310.92	10.77	8.07	1.95	0.98	2.77
36,000-39,999	0.49	33337.25	38051.08	5.77	6.98	2.00	0.79	1.93
40,000-47,999	0.48	38943.25	42908.66	2.73	6.10	2.15	0.75	1.52
48,000-59,999	0.57	46846.75	53634.70	7.03	6.80	2.24	0.50	1.88
60,000-99,999	0.60	63959.02	71355.94	5.01	7.53	2.35	1.02	2.05
100,000-149,999	0.22	103558.81	112510.44	4.58	6.09	2.61	0.64	1.22
150,000 +	0.09	383127.00	405056.38	0.40	10.38	3.39	1.10	3.27
All Classes	100.00	8858.71	11336.56	13.99	5.32	1.46	0.76	1.47

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.17

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location, 1968/9.

Bangkok-Thonburi, Total

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.04	960.00	960.00	0.0	6.00	1.00	3.00	1.00
1,000-1,499	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
1,500-1,999	0.11	1399.12	1906.01	0.0	3.51	1.00	0.83	0.85
2,000-2,499	0.16	1108.34	2256.67	16.61	3.38	1.00	0.55	1.19
2,500-2,999	0.12	2208.22	2714.86	0.94	7.46	1.18	1.05	2.60
3,000-3,749	0.07	2980.92	3293.11	0.59	3.02	1.08	0.86	0.45
3,750-4,499	0.15	3290.67	4267.47	4.32	2.09	1.00	0.04	0.27
4,500-5,249	0.54	3537.62	4910.19	11.62	2.07	1.41	0.0	0.18
5,250-5,999	0.77	4082.78	5591.95	11.02	2.69	1.17	0.20	0.74
6,000-6,749	0.75	5504.72	6371.62	4.25	2.84	1.41	0.24	0.62
6,750-7,499	1.01	5915.20	7175.11	4.59	3.96	1.44	0.71	1.17
7,500-8,249	0.83	6539.20	7830.50	7.28	5.14	1.42	0.84	1.88
8,250-8,999	1.74	6981.04	8584.81	6.96	4.78	1.30	0.58	1.18
9,000-9,749	1.84	8099.32	9332.51	6.17	4.55	1.25	0.80	1.62
9,750-10,499	1.54	8925.96	10170.71	4.66	4.51	1.44	0.78	1.35
10,500-11,249	2.73	9549.57	10864.63	5.97	4.87	1.41	0.99	1.54
11,250-11,999	1.69	10178.66	11628.94	7.12	5.20	1.76	1.07	1.35
12,000-13,499	5.83	11218.49	12742.52	5.09	4.89	1.39	0.77	1.56
13,500-14,999	4.26	12593.08	14272.00	5.65	5.50	1.70	0.77	1.87
15,000-16,499	5.88	13806.93	15731.56	6.23	6.32	1.77	0.98	2.26
16,500-17,999	5.50	15275.48	17133.19	4.52	5.63	1.75	0.92	1.64
18,000-19,499	5.88	17030.53	18616.73	4.46	6.10	1.75	0.64	2.18
19,500-20,999	5.26	18403.63	20236.29	3.47	5.88	1.94	0.62	1.92
21,000-22,499	4.28	20001.03	21702.58	3.11	6.03	2.10	0.60	2.02
22,500-23,999	3.83	20651.84	23203.02	6.27	6.85	2.07	0.72	2.26
24,000-26,999	7.04	23134.64	25375.16	4.55	6.71	2.11	0.65	2.09
27,000-29,999	5.42	25713.22	28497.48	4.99	6.76	2.29	0.64	2.06
30,000-32,999	4.99	29110.98	31366.99	3.60	6.66	2.10	0.70	2.16
33,000-35,999	3.32	31417.42	34505.72	5.53	7.50	2.36	0.68	2.04
36,000-39,999	3.89	35462.06	37882.23	3.48	7.77	2.23	0.76	2.49
40,000-47,999	5.44	40393.88	43461.69	3.47	7.36	2.38	0.65	2.18
48,000-59,999	5.43	49532.36	53142.16	3.83	7.67	2.70	0.57	1.97
60,000-99,999	6.10	70484.13	74979.00	3.29	7.83	2.93	0.65	1.92
100,000-149,999	2.43	115697.88	121764.81	2.37	7.73	3.06	0.54	1.44
150,000 +	1.13	238195.69	244742.25	0.86	7.64	3.77	0.32	1.40
All Classes	100.00	29106.13	31502.22	3.77	6.30	2.04	0.70	1.90

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.2.18

Percentage of Households, Household Money Income (Y_M), Household Income Adjusted for Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent (Y_{M+K+R}), Percentage of Nonmoney Income and Imputed Rent in Total Income, Family Size, Number of Earners, Number of Children 0-4 and 5-14, by Total Income Class, Region and Location 1968/9.

Whole Kingdom, Total

Total Income Class (Baht/Year)	% of Households	Y_M	Y_{M+K+R}	$\%\frac{Y_{K+R}}{Y_{M+K+R}}$	Family size	Number of Earners	Number of Children 0-4	Number of Children 5-14
0-999	0.08	460.06	839.26	32.84	2.51	1.00	0.42	0.67
1,000-1,499	0.16	938.02	1341.01	18.75	2.00	1.98	0.00	0.01
1,500-1,999	0.40	1041.45	1788.72	30.60	2.44	1.37	0.43	0.44
2,000-2,499	0.91	1269.70	2259.55	33.48	3.80	1.16	0.58	0.92
2,500-2,999	1.49	1487.61	2770.63	36.21	3.94	1.15	0.61	1.04
3,000-3,749	4.09	1819.39	3406.52	36.87	4.18	1.21	0.89	1.08
3,750-4,499	5.69	2091.72	4132.66	39.85	4.35	1.23	0.75	1.19
4,500-5,249	6.54	2558.04	4872.37	38.11	4.77	1.25	0.85	1.31
5,250-5,999	6.29	3033.62	5631.23	36.98	5.13	1.40	0.80	1.56
6,000-6,749	6.81	3590.45	6372.97	34.76	5.44	1.48	0.92	1.61
6,750-7,499	5.98	4033.51	7121.12	34.48	5.62	1.43	0.88	1.65
7,500-8,249	5.69	4654.26	7846.54	32.34	5.89	1.40	0.99	1.79
8,250-8,999	4.85	5552.95	8609.22	27.24	5.59	1.44	0.79	1.74
9,000-9,749	4.71	6271.38	9381.69	25.23	5.97	1.39	0.94	1.79
9,750-10,499	3.99	6584.41	10088.33	26.75	6.54	1.61	0.76	2.31
10,500-11,249	3.83	7721.35	10841.27	21.21	5.85	1.50	0.96	1.91
11,250-11,999	3.43	8025.34	11651.18	23.45	6.24	1.55	0.78	1.99
12,000-13,499	5.80	9424.61	12711.88	18.66	6.26	1.66	0.85	1.88
13,500-14,999	5.16	10631.38	14282.02	18.64	6.42	1.53	0.82	2.03
15,000-16,499	2.87	12580.26	15673.93	13.39	6.32	1.73	0.89	2.02
16,500-17,999	3.33	13428.52	17078.44	15.01	6.33	1.70	0.75	2.19
18,000-19,499	2.21	15155.78	18706.88	13.07	6.65	1.84	0.73	2.28
19,500-20,999	2.13	16970.57	20223.75	10.28	6.19	1.71	0.56	1.95
21,000-22,499	1.74	17877.31	21638.25	11.79	6.24	1.60	0.56	1.79
22,500-23,999	1.47	19794.63	23228.44	8.86	6.76	2.02	0.52	2.21
24,000-26,999	2.17	21603.04	25380.63	9.64	6.73	1.81	0.74	2.03
27,000-29,999	1.75	24430.63	28256.87	8.13	7.17	1.97	0.74	2.35
30,000-32,999	1.23	27786.37	31569.77	6.75	6.76	1.77	0.81	1.97
33,000-35,999	0.84	30356.11	34448.24	7.14	7.50	1.94	0.68	2.24
36,000-39,999	0.85	34265.73	37764.25	5.71	7.40	1.90	0.80	2.43
40,000-47,999	1.05	39285.82	43191.99	4.82	7.55	2.12	0.80	2.43
48,000-59,999	0.87	49206.38	53803.94	4.78	6.96	2.24	0.66	1.82
60,000-99,999	1.04	68325.00	73143.00	3.55	7.82	2.22	0.97	2.17
100,000-149,999	0.39	109894.19	120127.75	5.66	7.02	2.44	0.71	1.24
150,000 +	0.17	249559.19	256686.06	0.55	7.18	2.70	0.56	1.57
All Classes	100.00	10139.69	13197.63	16.90	5.77	1.53	0.82	1.75

Source : Data tapes of the Socio-economic Survey, 1968/9, National Statistical Office, Office of the Prime Minister, Bangkok.

Table A.3.1

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

North, Towns

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.250 - 0.375	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.375 - 0.500	0.4408	2.13	0.30	1.90
0.500 - 0.625	0.5546	0.17	0.03	0.17
0.625 - 0.750	0.7261	0.65	0.15	0.68
0.750 - 0.875	0.8092	2.57	0.67	2.84
0.875 - 1.000	0.9645	2.36	0.74	2.71
1.000 - 1.125	1.0580	5.43	1.86	6.07
1.125 - 1.250	1.1912	3.25	1.26	3.44
1.250 - 1.375	1.3158	4.46	1.90	4.67
1.375 - 1.500	1.4508	3.96	1.86	4.22
1.500 - 1.750	1.6180	10.46	5.48	10.40
1.750 - 2.000	1.8887	7.92	4.84	7.95
2.000 - 2.500	2.2532	15.67	11.43	15.65
2.500 - 3.000	2.7302	7.18	6.35	7.30
3.000 - 3.500	3.2126	6.63	6.89	6.53
3.500 - 4.000	3.7251	5.80	7.00	5.40
4.000 - 5.000	4.5304	6.38	9.36	5.94
5.000 +	8.2107	14.99	39.87	14.19

Average Income	3.09
Gini Coefficient	0.3855
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.4947
Theil Index	0.2503

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.2

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (₱ 1,725 per year)

Centre & East, Towns

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.250 - 0.375	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.375 - 0.500	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.500 - 0.625	0.5683	0.14	0.02	0.14
0.625 - 0.750	0.7122	0.42	0.08	0.44
0.750 - 0.875	0.8072	0.73	0.17	0.79
0.875 - 1.000	0.9592	3.04	0.84	3.07
1.000 - 1.125	1.0626	3.26	1.00	3.52
1.125 - 1.250	1.1991	2.78	0.96	2.75
1.250 - 1.375	1.3028	1.44	0.54	1.52
1.375 - 1.500	1.4405	2.72	1.12	2.86
1.500 - 1.750	1.6160	8.41	3.90	8.67
1.750 - 2.000	1.8606	8.96	4.79	9.22
2.000 - 2.500	2.2286	12.84	8.22	13.32
2.500 - 3.000	2.7849	16.22	12.99	16.06
3.000 - 3.500	3.2016	10.12	9.32	10.10
3.500 - 4.000	3.7522	6.27	6.76	6.15
4.000 - 5.000	4.4797	8.11	10.45	7.79
5.000 +	9.2888	14.54	38.83	13.60

Average Income	3.48
Gini Coefficient	0.3624
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.4099
Theil Index	0.2275

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.3

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

Northeast, Towns

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.250 - 0.375	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.375 - 0.500	0.4749	0.46	0.07	0.52
0.500 - 0.625	0.5601	3.40	0.63	3.56
0.625 - 0.750	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.750 - 0.875	0.8102	0.95	0.25	0.98
0.875 - 1.000	0.9266	2.30	0.70	2.30
1.000 - 1.125	1.0689	5.04	1.78	5.49
1.125 - 1.250	1.2036	5.22	2.07	5.17
1.250 - 1.375	1.3328	4.29	1.88	4.30
1.375 - 1.500	1.4522	7.66	3.66	7.69
1.500 - 1.750	1.6269	13.88	7.44	14.19
1.750 - 2.000	1.8578	8.78	5.37	8.94
2.000 - 2.500	2.2243	11.37	8.32	11.36
2.500 - 3.000	2.7030	7.63	6.79	7.43
3.000 - 3.500	3.2846	5.78	6.26	5.59
3.500 - 4.000	3.7047	3.79	4.63	4.02
4.000 - 5.000	4.5268	7.04	10.50	6.79
5.000 +	9.7137	12.40	39.65	11.67

Average Income	3.04
Gini Coefficient	0.4149
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.5174
Theil Index	0.3066

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.4

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

South, Towns

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.1351	0.03	0.00	0.04
0.250 - 0.375	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.375 - 0.500	0.4315	0.12	0.02	0.13
0.500 - 0.625	0.5824	1.36	0.27	1.48
0.625 - 0.750	0.7062	1.98	0.48	2.09
0.750 - 0.875	0.8172	3.30	0.92	3.35
0.875 - 1.000	0.9402	3.15	1.01	3.30
1.000 - 1.125	1.0580	4.06	1.47	4.18
1.125 - 1.250	1.2060	6.23	2.57	6.44
1.250 - 1.375	1.3102	6.18	2.77	6.38
1.375 - 1.500	1.4234	6.23	3.04	6.43
1.500 - 1.750	1.6181	7.38	4.09	7.35
1.750 - 2.000	1.8797	6.88	4.43	6.71
2.000 - 2.500	2.2522	14.03	10.82	13.81
2.500 - 3.000	2.7435	9.08	8.53	8.98
3.000 - 3.500	3.2603	8.07	9.02	8.12
3.500 - 4.000	3.7415	4.18	5.36	4.14
4.000 - 5.000	4.4242	7.12	10.79	6.90
5.000 +	9.4512	10.62	34.40	10.19

Average Income	2.92
Gini Coefficient	0.3988
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.4808
Theil Index	0.2787

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.5

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

Bangkok-Thonburi, Towns

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.1918	0.14	0.01	0.15
0.250 - 0.375	0.3249	0.03	0.00	0.03
0.375 - 0.500	0.4673	0.07	0.01	0.07
0.500 - 0.625	0.5898	0.17	0.02	0.17
0.625 - 0.750	0.6834	0.42	0.07	0.43
0.750 - 0.875	0.8173	0.09	0.02	0.10
0.875 - 1.000	0.9394	1.08	0.26	1.12
1.000 - 1.125	1.0698	1.65	0.46	1.72
1.125 - 1.250	1.1826	2.56	0.78	2.67
1.250 - 1.375	1.3137	2.49	0.85	2.61
1.375 - 1.500	1.4421	2.93	1.10	3.16
1.500 - 1.750	1.6328	6.29	2.66	6.48
1.750 - 2.000	1.8847	8.01	3.92	8.22
2.000 - 2.500	2.2391	15.70	9.12	16.05
2.500 - 3.000	2.7422	13.37	9.51	13.47
3.000 - 3.500	3.2325	9.61	8.06	9.66
3.500 - 4.000	3.7396	7.54	7.32	7.39
4.000 - 5.000	4.4145	8.56	9.81	8.25
5.000 +	9.1907	19.29	46.01	18.24

Average Income	3.85
Gini Coefficient	0.3610
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.4296
Theil Index	0.2227

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.6

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (₱ 1,725 per year)

Whole Kingdom, Towns

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.1880	0.07	0.00	0.08
0.250 - 0.375	0.3249	0.01	0.00	0.02
0.375 - 0.500	0.4522	0.39	0.05	0.36
0.500 - 0.625	0.5704	0.66	0.11	0.71
0.625 - 0.750	0.7037	0.61	0.12	0.64
0.750 - 0.875	0.8124	1.04	0.24	1.09
0.875 - 1.000	0.9477	1.95	0.53	2.04
1.000 - 1.125	1.0633	3.08	0.94	3.31
1.125 - 1.250	1.1953	3.45	1.19	3.56
1.250 - 1.375	1.3153	3.28	1.24	3.40
1.375 - 1.500	1.4416	3.98	1.65	4.18
1.500 - 1.750	1.6241	8.12	3.79	8.29
1.750 - 2.000	1.8779	8.07	4.35	8.21
2.000 - 2.500	2.2403	14.58	9.39	14.78
2.500 - 3.000	2.7483	11.78	9.30	11.78
3.000 - 3.500	3.2323	8.67	8.05	8.65
3.500 - 4.000	3.7373	6.27	6.73	6.14
4.000 - 5.000	4.4520	7.85	10.04	7.53
5.000 +	9.1303	16.12	42.28	15.22

Average Income	3.48
Gini Coefficient	0.3794
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.4689
Theil Index	0.2460

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.7

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (₱ 1,725 per year)

North, Villages

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.2205	0.83	0.14	0.84
0.250 - 0.375	0.3296	2.06	0.52	2.12
0.375 - 0.500	0.4541	4.79	1.66	4.94
0.500 - 0.625	0.5670	7.44	3.21	7.52
0.625 - 0.750	0.6902	9.77	5.14	10.07
0.750 - 0.875	0.8172	11.55	7.19	11.84
0.875 - 1.000	0.9431	7.89	5.67	7.98
1.000 - 1.125	1.0629	9.48	7.68	9.72
1.125 - 1.250	1.1809	7.47	6.72	7.36
1.250 - 1.375	1.3138	5.47	5.48	5.53
1.375 - 1.500	1.4448	5.22	5.74	5.07
1.500 - 1.750	1.6295	9.00	11.17	8.66
1.750 - 2.000	1.8902	4.47	6.44	4.32
2.000 - 2.500	2.2525	6.71	11.52	6.46
2.500 - 3.000	2.6850	3.48	7.11	3.31
3.000 - 3.500	3.2150	1.44	3.51	1.43
3.500 - 4.000	3.8438	1.08	3.17	1.13
4.000 - 5.000	4.5594	0.97	3.37	0.92
5.000 +	6.7748	0.88	4.55	0.80

Average Income	1.31
Gini Coefficient	0.3252
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.3322
Theil Index	0.1852

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.8

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (₱ 1,725 per year)

Centre & East, Villages

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.2375	0.13	0.02	0.11
0.250 - 0.375	0.3631	0.31	0.06	0.33
0.375 - 0.500	0.4596	1.02	0.23	1.05
0.500 - 0.625	0.5590	2.28	0.62	2.38
0.625 - 0.750	0.6965	2.04	0.69	1.97
0.750 - 0.875	0.8156	5.97	2.37	6.15
0.875 - 1.000	0.9459	8.43	3.88	8.58
1.000 - 1.125	1.0690	7.09	3.69	7.24
1.125 - 1.250	1.1900	6.49	3.76	6.70
1.250 - 1.375	1.3122	7.59	4.85	7.84
1.375 - 1.500	1.4288	6.54	4.55	6.60
1.500 - 1.750	1.6254	10.71	8.48	10.49
1.750 - 2.000	1.8932	8.78	8.10	8.70
2.000 - 2.500	2.2238	11.57	12.54	11.22
2.500 - 3.000	2.7210	8.00	10.60	7.68
3.000 - 3.500	3.2173	4.03	6.31	3.86
3.500 - 4.000	3.7376	2.20	4.00	2.15
4.000 - 5.000	4.4405	2.92	6.32	2.89
5.000 +	9.9278	3.92	18.94	4.04

Average Income	2.05
Gini Coefficient	0.3635
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.3714
Theil Index	0.2581

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.9

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

Northeast, Villages

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.1789	0.17	0.03	0.17
0.250 - 0.375	0.3267	2.46	0.77	2.46
0.375 - 0.500	0.4466	7.22	3.09	7.17
0.500 - 0.625	0.5645	15.05	8.15	15.30
0.625 - 0.750	0.6885	16.84	11.12	16.83
0.750 - 0.875	0.8099	15.77	12.24	16.05
0.875 - 1.000	0.9400	10.43	9.40	10.50
1.000 - 1.125	1.0656	7.92	8.09	7.83
1.125 - 1.250	1.1862	4.40	5.00	4.38
1.250 - 1.375	1.3035	3.14	3.92	3.08
1.375 - 1.500	1.4289	2.49	3.41	2.50
1.500 - 1.750	1.6102	4.40	6.79	4.28
1.750 - 2.000	1.8529	2.32	4.12	2.34
2.000 - 2.500	2.2433	3.25	7.00	3.08
2.500 - 3.000	2.7090	1.51	3.92	1.45
3.000 - 3.500	3.2122	0.79	2.44	0.79
3.500 - 4.000	3.6959	0.75	2.66	0.75
4.000 - 5.000	4.6678	0.31	1.39	0.30
5.000 +	8.6782	0.78	6.46	0.72

Average Income	1.04
Gini Coefficient	0.3212
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.2750
Theil Index	0.2179

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.10

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

South, Villages

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.2392	0.17	0.04	0.19
0.250 - 0.375	0 3109	3.28	0.95	3.32
0.375 - 0.500	0.4498	4.99	2.09	5.00
0.500 - 0.625	0.5704	12.34	6.56	12.59
0.625 - 0.750	0.6867	15.32	9.80	15.24
0.750 - 0.875	0.8040	12.64	9.46	12.64
0.875 - 1.000	0.9471	9.40	8.28	9.44
1.000 - 1.125	1.0595	10.03	9.89	10.16
1.125 - 1.250	1.1937	7.79	8.65	7.74
1.250 - 1.375	1.3140	4.06	4.96	3.89
1.375 - 1.500	1.4344	3.81	5.09	3.73
1.500 - 1.750	1.6215	4.97	7.50	4.85
1.750 - 2.000	1.8658	4.20	7.29	4.30
2.000 - 2.500	2.2262	3.42	7.08	3.43
2.500 - 3.000	2.7207	2.02	5.10	2.00
3.000 - 3.500	3.1342	0.38	1.12	0.35
3.500 - 4.000	3.7961	0.38	1.34	0.36
4.000 - 5.000	4.6088	0.23	0.98	0.19
5.000 +	6.9715	0.58	3.80	0.57

Average Income	1.07
Gini Coefficient	0.2966
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.2614
Theil Index	0.1634

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.11

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

Bangkok-Thonburi, Villages

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.250 - 0.375	0.2653	0.31	0.03	0.34
0.375 - 0.500	0.3833	0.26	0.04	0.29
0.500 - 0.625	0.5596	0.38	0.07	0.41
0.625 - 0.750	0.6871	1.19	0.28	1.16
0.750 - 0.875	0.7984	0.58	0.16	0.60
0.875 - 1.000	0.9392	3.46	1.12	3.70
1.000 - 1.125	1.0601	2.41	0.88	2.61
1.125 - 1.250	1.1947	5.14	2.12	5.47
1.250 - 1.375	1.3256	6.65	3.04	6.89
1.375 - 1.500	1.4302	6.70	3.30	6.66
1.500 - 1.750	1.6183	12.62	7.04	12.74
1.750 - 2.000	1.8806	13.02	8.44	13.05
2.000 - 2.500	2.2168	13.76	10.51	13.70
2.500 - 3.000	2.7366	8.03	7.57	7.65
3.000 - 3.500	3.2274	6.63	7.37	6.39
3.500 - 4.000	3.7477	4.09	5.29	3.92
4.000 - 5.000	4.4243	7.23	11.03	7.18
5.000 +	12.1986	7.54	31.72	7.24

Average Income	2.90
Gini Coefficient	0.3993
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.4344
Theil Index	0.3169

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.12

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

Whole Kingdom, Villages

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.2148	0.35	0.06	0.35
0.250 - 0.375	0.3268	1.92	0.45	1.95
0.375 - 0.500	0.4499	4.76	1.55	4.82
0.500 - 0.625	0.5658	9.42	3.86	9.64
0.625 - 0.750	0.6889	11.04	5.51	11.15
0.750 - 0.875	0.8118	11.73	6.90	11.99
0.875 - 1.000	0.9428	8.99	6.14	9.10
1.000 - 1.125	1.0644	8.32	6.42	8.41
1.125 - 1.250	1.1863	6.15	5.29	6.15
1.250 - 1.375	1.3113	4.97	4.72	4.99
1.375 - 1.500	1.4353	4.41	4.58	4.36
1.500 - 1.750	1.6232	7.36	8.65	7.14
1.750 - 2.000	1.8821	4.79	6.53	4.72
2.000 - 2.500	2.2362	6.32	10.24	6.08
2.500 - 3.000	2.7101	3.70	7.26	3.52
3.000 - 3.500	3.2138	1.76	4.10	1.70
3.500 - 4.000	3.7676	1.19	3.25	1.18
4.000 - 5.000	4.5079	1.20	3.93	1.16
5.000 +	9.0766	1.61	10.58	1.57

Average Income	1.38
Gini Coefficient	0.3687
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.3802
Theil Index	0.2623

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.13

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

North, Total

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.2205	0.78	0.12	0.80
0.250 - 0.375	0.3296	1.94	0.45	2.00
0.375 - 0.500	0.4539	4.64	1.49	4.78
0.500 - 0.625	0.5670	7.03	2.82	7.12
0.625 - 0.750	0.6904	9.26	4,53	9.57
0.750 - 0.875	0.8171	11.05	6.40	11.36
0.875 - 1.000	0.9434	7.58	5.06	7.70
1.000 - 1.125	1.0627	9.25	6.97	9.53
1.125 - 1.250	1.1812	7.24	6.06	7.15
1.250 - 1.375	1.3139	5.41	5.04	5.48
1.375 - 1.500	1.4450	5.15	5.27	5.02
1.500 - 1.750	1.6288	9.08	10.48	8.75
1.750 - 2.000	1.8900	4.67	6.25	4.51
2.000 - 2.500	2.2526	7.22	11.52	6.95
2.500 - 3.000	2.6899	3.68	7.02	3.52
3.000 - 3.500	3.2145	1.73	3.93	1.70
3.500 - 4.000	3.8192	1.35	3.65	1.36
4.000 - 5.000	4.5519	1.27	4.11	1.19
5.000 +	7.4458	1.67	8.83	1.52

Average Income	1.41
Gini Coefficient	0.3509
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.3730
Theil Index	0.2238

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.14

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

Centre & East, Total

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.2375	0.12	0.01	0.10
0.250 - 0.375	0.3631	0.28	0.05	0.30
0.375 - 0.500	0.4596	0.94	0.20	0.97
0.500 - 0.625	0.5591	2.11	0.54	2.21
0.625 - 0.750	0.6968	1.91	0.61	1.85
0.750 - 0.875	0.8155	5.55	2.09	5.72
0.875 - 1.000	0.9463	8.00	3.49	8.14
1.000 - 1.125	1.0689	6.79	3.35	6.95
1.125 - 1.250	1.1904	6.20	3.40	6.39
1.250 - 1.375	1.3120	7.10	4.30	7.34
1.375 - 1.500	1.4291	6.23	4.11	6.30
1.500 - 1.750	1.6249	10.52	7.89	10.35
1.750 - 2.000	1.8910	8.79	7.68	8.74
2.000 - 2.500	2.2242	11.67	11.99	11.39
2.500 - 3.000	2.7296	8.66	10.91	8.35
3.000 - 3.500	3.2146	4.51	6.70	4.36
3.500 - 4.000	3.7407	2.52	4.35	2.47
4.000 - 5.000	4.4491	3.34	6.86	3.28
5.000 +	9.7574	4.76	21.47	4.80

Average Income	2.17
Gini Coefficient	0.3737
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.3947
Theil Index	0.2673

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.15

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (₱ 1,725 per year)

Northeast, Total

Income Class (Mulitples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.1789	0.16	0.03	0.16
0.250 - 0.375	0.3267	2.37	0.70	2.38
0.375 - 0.500	0.4467	6.97	2.79	6.93
0.500 - 0.625	0.5645	14.62	7.40	14.88
0.625 - 0.750	0.6885	16.22	10.01	16.22
0.750 - 0.875	0.8099	15.22	11.05	15.50
0.875 - 1.000	0.9399	10.13	8.54	10.20
1.000 - 1.125	1.0656	7.82	7.47	7.74
1.125 - 1.250	1.1868	4.43	4.72	4.40
1.250 - 1.375	1.3049	3.18	3.72	3.13
1.375 - 1.500	1.4305	2.68	3.44	2.69
1.500 - 1.750	1.6117	4.75	6.86	4.64
1.750 - 2.000	1.8534	2.56	4.25	2.58
2.000 - 2.500	2.2411	3.55	7.14	3.38
2.500 - 3.000	2.7081	1.74	4.22	1.67
3.000 - 3.500	3.2259	0.98	2.82	0.96
3.500 - 4.000	3.6973	0.86	2.86	0.87
4.000 - 5.000	4.6157	0.56	2.32	0.54
5.000 +	8.9586	1.20	9.68	1.12

Average Income	1.12
Gini Coefficient	0.3502
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.3156
Theil Index	0.2636

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.16

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (₱ 1,725 per year)

South, Total

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.2360	0.15	0.03	0.17
0.250 - 0.375	0.3109	2.85	0.67	2.89
0.375 - 0.500	0.4498	4.36	1.49	4.37
0.500 - 0.625	0.5706	10.90	4.74	11.15
0.625 - 0.750	0.6871	13.58	7.10	13.54
0.750 - 0.875	0.8043	11.42	6.99	11.43
0.875 - 1.000	0.9468	8.58	6.18	8.64
1.000 - 1.125	1.0594	9.25	7.46	9.39
1.125 - 1.250	1.1946	7.58	6.90	7.57
1.250 - 1.375	1.3134	4.33	4.33	4.22
1.375 - 1.500	1.4326	4.13	4.50	4.08
1.500 - 1.750	1.6210	5.28	6.52	5.17
1.750 - 2.000	1.8682	4.55	6.47	4.61
2.000 - 2.500	2.2363	4.81	8.18	4.77
2.500 - 3.000	2.7290	2.94	6.11	2.91
3.000 - 3.500	3.2240	1.39	3.41	1.36
3.500 - 4.000	3.7678	0.88	2.52	0.85
4.000 - 5.000	4.4888	1.13	3.87	1.06
5.000 +	8.6615	1.90	12.53	1.82

Average Income	1.31
Gini Coefficient	0.3744
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.3780
Theil Index	0.2808

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.17

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

Bangkok-Thonburi, Total

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.1918	0.11	0.01	0.11
0.250 - 0.375	0.2793	0.10	0.01	0.11
0.375 - 0.500	0.4288	0.11	0.01	0.12
0.500 - 0.625	0.5772	0.22	0.04	0.23
0.625 - 0.750	0.6851	0.61	0.11	0.61
0.750 - 0.875	0.8069	0.21	0.05	0.22
0.875 - 1.000	0.9393	1.66	0.43	1.76
1.000 - 1.125	1.0664	1.83	0.54	1.94
1.125 - 1.250	1.1873	3.18	1.04	3.36
1.250 - 1.375	1.3192	3.50	1.27	3.67
1.375 - 1.500	1.4374	3.84	1.52	4.02
1.500 - 1.750	1.6265	7.82	3.51	8.03
1.750 - 2.000	1.8832	9.22	4.79	9.42
2.000 - 2.500	2.2337	15.23	9.38	15.47
2.500 - 3.000	2.7413	12.08	9.13	12.03
3.000 - 3.500	3.2316	8.89	7.92	8.85
3.500 - 4.000	3.7409	6.71	6.92	6.53
4.000 - 5.000	4.4166	8.24	10.04	7.98
5.000 +	9.5428	16.45	43.28	15.52

Average Income	3.63
Gini Coefficient	0.3770
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.4516
Theil Index	0.2463

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.

Table A.3.18

Size Distribution of Household Total Income per Equivalent Adult[a], by Region and Location, 1968/9, in Multiples of the Cut-off Income (฿ 1,725 per year)

Whole Kingdom, Total

Income Class (Multiples of Cut-off Income)	Average Income	% Equivalent Adults	% Income	% Persons
0.00 - 0.125	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
0.125 - 0.250	0.2140	0.32	0.04	0.32
0.250 - 0.375	0.3268	1.70	0.34	1.74
0.375 - 0.500	0.4499	4.26	1.18	4.33
0.500 - 0.625	0.5659	8.43	2.95	8.65
0.625 - 0.750	0.6890	9.86	4.20	9.99
0.750 - 0.875	0.8118	10.52	5.27	10.79
0.875 - 1.000	0.9429	8.19	4.77	8.32
1.000 - 1.125	1.0644	7.73	5.08	7.97
1.125 - 1.250	1.1868	5.85	4.29	5.86
1.250 - 1.375	1.3116	4.78	3.87	4.82
1.375 - 1.500	1.4358	4.36	3.87	4.34
1.500 - 1.750	1.6233	7.44	7.46	7.26
1.750 - 2.000	1.8814	5.16	6.00	5.11
2.000 - 2.500	2.2371	7.26	10.03	7.04
2.500 - 3.000	2.7198	4.61	7.75	4.44
3.000 - 3.500	3.2205	2.54	5.06	2.47
3.500 - 4.000	3.7563	1.77	4.10	1.73
4.000 - 5.000	4.4838	1.96	5.42	1.87
5.000 +	9.1044	3.26	18.31	3.08

Average Income	1.62
Gini Coefficient	0.4128
Variance of Income Logarithms	0.4724
Theil Index	0.3247

[a] The scale used here assigns weights of .42 and .63 to children under five and between five and fifteen respectively.