Why Unions Matter
The Labor Movement!
The folks that brought you...

Over-time pay
Living wage laws
Parental leave
Sick leave
Civil rights
OSHA
Grievance procedures
Workers' comp.
Minimum wage
Unemployment insurance
Health benefits
Pension benefits
Domestic partner benefits
Social security
Child labor laws
Paid vacations
Workplace power
Farm labor rights
Equal pay for equal work
The weekend

Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will. —Frederick Douglass
Incomes rise fastest at the top
Percentage growth in household income, by rank on income scale, 1979–2007
Figure 2 Households’ Share of Average Income Growth: 1949–2015 Expansions (including capital gains)

- **Bottom 90 percent**
- **Top 10 percent**
Figure 4: Households’ Share of Average Income Growth: 1949–2015 Expansions (including capital gains)

- **Bottom 99 percent**
- **Top 1 percent**
Top 1 percent’s share of average income growth during expansions, by region
Boosting productivity is necessary but not sufficient for wage growth

Disconnect between productivity and a typical worker’s compensation, 1948–2015

1948–1973:
Productivity: 96.7%
Hourly compensation: 91.3%

1973–2015:
Productivity: 73.4%
Hourly compensation: 11.1%

Cumulative percent change since 1948

Chart Data

Note: Data are for average hourly compensation of production/nonsupervisory workers in the private sector and net productivity of the total economy. “Net productivity” is the growth of output of goods and services minus depreciation per hour worked.
Though all workers’ wages have failed to rise in tandem with productivity, black men have suffered most

Hourly median wage growth by gender, race, and ethnicity, compared with economy-wide productivity growth, 1979–2014

Chart Data

Note: Race/ethnicity categories are mutually exclusive (i.e., white non-Hispanic, black non-Hispanic, and Hispanic any race).
Income growth by income group, 1946-2014

- Full Population: 95% (1946-1980), 61% (1980-2014)
- Bottom 50%: 102% (1946-1980), 1% (1980-2014)
- Middle 40%: 105% (1946-1980), 42% (1980-2014)
- Top 10%: 79% (1946-1980), 121% (1980-2014)
- Top 1%: 205% (1946-1980), 47% (1980-2014)
- Top 0.1%: 321% (1980-2014)
Bottom half income growth, actual and two scenarios

2014 $'s


Actual bottom half  Avg grth rate, 1946-80  Avg grth rate, 1980-2014
For Americans born in 1980 – today’s 36-year-olds – that figure dropped to 50 percent.
The American dream, new research shows, is fading faster than previously thought. The prime driver behind the fade: the increasingly "unequal distribution" of the rewards from America’s economic growth.

Over 90% of kids born in 1940 earned more than their parents.

Only 50% of kids born in 1980 are earning more.

Increasing share of income from wealth claimed by top 1 percent

Concentration of capital incomes, by income group, 1979–2010
Middle-Class Incomes Have Fallen Since 1999

A middle-income American family makes less than at the turn of the century.

**Median household income, in 2014 dollars**

Shaded areas indicate recessions.

Source: Census Bureau
Figure 1. The Decline in Occupational Real Wages, 2009 to 2014

Note: Ranges shown represent the median hourly wage of the lowest- and highest-paid occupations within each quintile.
Top 1 percent's income soars while typical Oregonian's remains stagnant

Average income of Oregon's top 1 percent compared to Oregon's median income. All figures adjusted for inflation using CPI-U-RS. Gray bars indicate official periods of recession.

Source: OCPP analysis of Oregon Department of Revenue data.
Top one-tenth of 1 percent's income nears record level

Average income of Oregon's top 1/10th of 1 percent compared to the average income of the rest of Oregon's top 1 percent. Full-year resident income tax filers. Adjusted for inflation using CPI-U-RS. Source: OCPP analysis of Oregon Department of Revenue data.
Oregon’s top 1 percent now earns more than twice that of the bottom 40 percent

1980

10.1% Bottom 40%

7.4% Top 1%

7.4% Bottom 40%

2014

15.5% Top 1%
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Capital gains income flows mainly to the top

- Bottom 99 percent: 45%
- Top 1/10th of 1 percent: 34%
- Rest of top 1 percent: 21%

2014 share of Oregon capital gains income. Full-year resident income tax filers. Source: OCPP analysis of Oregon Department of Revenue data.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Pro-Union Voters</th>
<th>Pro-Union Voters per Fired Union Supporter</th>
<th>Probability of Pro-Union Worker Firing in Campaign (percent)</th>
<th>Elections with Illegal Firing by Unions (percent)</th>
<th>Elections Won by Unions (percent)</th>
<th>Elections Held by NLRB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) LaLonde &amp; Melitz (1991) results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964-69</td>
<td>1,371</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970-74</td>
<td>1,342</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>8,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>7,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-84</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-88</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) LaLonde &amp; Melitz (1991) time periods, authors' data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975-79</td>
<td>1,942</td>
<td>212,708</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980-84</td>
<td>2,812</td>
<td>129,082</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985-88</td>
<td>2,483</td>
<td>90,023</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Dunlop Commission (1994)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-55</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956-60</td>
<td>429</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>584</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961-65</td>
<td>1,019</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966-70</td>
<td>1,346</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-75</td>
<td>1,473</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976-80</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-85</td>
<td>2,855</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-90</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Authors' time periods, authors' data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974-80</td>
<td>2,099</td>
<td>212,478</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981-85</td>
<td>2,756</td>
<td>107,041</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986-90</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>94,552</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-95</td>
<td>1,606</td>
<td>81,751</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-00</td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>93,365</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-05</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>73,977</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Authors time periods, authors' data, adjusted for rise in card-check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996-00</td>
<td>1,429</td>
<td>116,356</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-05</td>
<td>1,169</td>
<td>96,170</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Authors' analysis of NLRB data, following LaLonde and Melitz (1991), Table 7; Dunlop (1994), Exhibit III-1, following Table 7. See notes to Appendix Table 1. For adjustments in (e), see Appendix Table 2 and text.
ECONOMIC SNAPSHOT

As union membership has fallen, the top 10 percent have been getting a larger share of income

Union membership and share of income going to the top 10%, 1917–2014


Economic Policy Institute
The long-term decline in union representation in Oregon has contributed to the rise in income inequality, which now stands near record highs. Greater levels of union representation could not only help narrow income inequality, but could support economic growth.

**Unionization declines; inequality widens**

Percent change in share of Oregon income going to top 20 percent and bottom 60 percent of earners: percent change in Oregon unionization rates.

Source: OCPP analysis of Oregon Department of Revenue and unionstats.com data.
Pay for most nonunion workers has stagnated
Cumulative change in annual median wages of nonunion workers in the private sector, by gender, 1979–2013

Notes: Sample restricted to nonunion full-time workers in the private sector ages 16 to 64. Wages are measured in 2013 dollars. See the text and Methodological Appendix for details on the analysis.
Drop in union membership has taken $14 to $52 out of nonunion workers’ weekly wages

Additional weekly wages that nonunion private-sector workers would earn had the share of workers in a union (union density) remained the same as in 1979, 1979–2013 (2013 dollars)

Notes: Sample restricted to nonunion full-time workers in the private sector ages 16 to 64. See the text and Methodological Appendix for details on the analysis.
Women’s hourly pay as a share of men’s hourly pay, by union status, overall, by race and ethnicity, and regression adjusted, 2016

Notes: Economic Policy Institute (EPI) analysis of CPS ORG hourly wage data for workers age 18 to 64. The union coverage are workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement. The regression-based gap controls for gender, race and ethnicity, education, experience, and geographic division. The log of the hourly wage is the dependent variable.

Source: EPI analysis of Current Population Survey Outgoing Rotation Group data
Taking It Offline

Alternative work arrangement jobs, often known as gigs, have climbed rapidly since 2005, but contrary to popular belief, most of that growth has happened offline, not through apps such as Taskrabbit and Lyft.

Share of workers in each type of alternate work arrangement

![Bar chart showing the share of workers in different types of alternate work arrangements from 1995 to 2015.]

- **Independent contractors:** The highest share is seen in 2015, with a decrease in subsequent years.
- **Workers provided by contract firms:** Show a steady increase from 1995 to 2015.
- **On-call workers (excluding day laborers):** Show a slight increase over the years.
- **Temporary help agency workers:** Have a consistent share over the years.


THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.
Gigging Is Up
Economists have found massive growth in alternative work arrangements since 2005, but despite stereotypes about working-class Uber drivers, those gains have mostly come offline, and among professional classes.

SHARE OF WORKERS IN ALTERNATIVE/GIG WORK ARRANGEMENTS

BY OCCUPATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>25</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment, media</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and social service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer/math</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education training</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-care support</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and related</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protective service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and grounds</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Financial</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health-care practitioners</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food service</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture and engineering</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life physical and social science</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and administration</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes: The underemployment rate is defined as the share of graduates working in jobs that typically do not require a college degree. A job is classified as a college job if 50 percent or more of the people working in that job indicate that at least a bachelor’s degree is necessary; otherwise, the job is classified as a non-college job. Rates are calculated as a twelve-month moving average. College graduates are those aged 22 to 65 with a bachelor’s degree or higher; recent college graduates are those aged 22 to 27 with a bachelor’s degree or higher. All figures exclude those currently enrolled in school. Shaded areas indicate periods designated recessions by the National Bureau of Economic Research.
### Share of Underemployed Graduates in Good Non-College and Low-Wage Jobs

[Graph showing trends in the share of underemployed graduates in good non-college and low-wage jobs from 1990 to 2015.]

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Population Survey (IPUMS); U.S. Department of Labor, O*NET.

**Notes:** Good non-college jobs are those with a full-time average annual wage of roughly $45,000 or more, while low-wage jobs are those that tend to pay around $25,000 or less. Rates are calculated as a twelve-month moving average. College graduates are those aged 22 to 65 with a bachelor’s degree or higher; recent college graduates are those aged 22 to 27 with a bachelor’s degree or higher. All figures exclude those currently enrolled in school. Shaded areas indicate periods designated recessions by the National Bureau of Economic Research.
Estimates suggest a sharp increase in the percentage of the U.S. workforce that isn’t employed directly by the company where they work.

- Independent contractors
- On-call workers
- Temporary help agency workers
- Contract-firm workers with one client
- Contract-firm workers with more than one client

Note: A janitor who is employed by a contract firm and cleans five unrelated offices a week is counted as working for more than one client. Data for 1995 and 2005 don’t include exact comparisons for that group.

Source: Lawrence Katz (Harvard University) and Alan Krueger (Princeton University)
Average annual growth rate of labor productivity, capital, information equipment, and software, 1973–2016

Growth in labor productivity and the capital stock have decreased in recent periods

Labor productivity
- 1947–1973
- 1973–1995
- 1995–2002
- 2002–2007
- 2007–2016

Capital Investment
- 1947–1973
- 1973–1995
- 1995–2002
- 2002–2007
- 2007–2016

Capital Investment in Information technology has also slowed

Hardware
- (No data 1947–1973)

Software
- (No data 1947–1973)

Note: Using latest available data, 2016 measure includes data from 2015Q4–2016Q3.

Source: EPI analysis of data (xls) compiled by John Fernald of the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total, all occupations</td>
<td>150,539.9</td>
<td>9,788.9</td>
<td>$35,540</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal care aides</td>
<td>1,768.4</td>
<td>458.1</td>
<td>20,440</td>
<td>No formal educational credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered nurses</td>
<td>2,751.0</td>
<td>439.3</td>
<td>66,640</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home health aides</td>
<td>913.5</td>
<td>348.4</td>
<td>21,380</td>
<td>No formal educational credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined food preparation and serving workers, including fast food</td>
<td>3,159.7</td>
<td>343.5</td>
<td>18,410</td>
<td>No formal educational credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail salespersons</td>
<td>4,624.9</td>
<td>314.2</td>
<td>21,390</td>
<td>No formal educational credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing assistants</td>
<td>1,492.1</td>
<td>262.0</td>
<td>25,100</td>
<td>Postsecondary nondegree award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service representatives</td>
<td>2,581.8</td>
<td>252.9</td>
<td>31,200</td>
<td>High school diploma or equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooks, restaurant</td>
<td>1,109.7</td>
<td>158.9</td>
<td>22,490</td>
<td>No formal educational credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and operations managers</td>
<td>2,124.1</td>
<td>151.1</td>
<td>97,270</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction laborers</td>
<td>1,159.1</td>
<td>147.4</td>
<td>31,090</td>
<td>No formal educational credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants and auditors</td>
<td>1,332.7</td>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>65,940</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical assistants</td>
<td>591.3</td>
<td>138.9</td>
<td>29,960</td>
<td>Postsecondary nondegree award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janitors and cleaners, except maids and housekeeping cleaners</td>
<td>2,360.0</td>
<td>136.3</td>
<td>22,840</td>
<td>No formal educational credential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software developers, applications</td>
<td>718.4</td>
<td>135.3</td>
<td>95,510</td>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers and freight, stock, and material movers, hand</td>
<td>2,441.3</td>
<td>125.1</td>
<td>24,430</td>
<td>No formal educational credential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:


Note: SOC = Standard Occupational Classification.

## Top 15 Job Openings, 2014-2024

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Employed, 2014</th>
<th>Avg. annual job openings*</th>
<th>Median hourly wage, 2016</th>
<th>Education required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retail salespeople</td>
<td>63,827</td>
<td>3,192</td>
<td>$11.54</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Waiters and Waitresses</td>
<td>28,303</td>
<td>1,967</td>
<td>$9.73</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Cashiers</td>
<td>38,188</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>$10.74</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Food prep and serving</td>
<td>32,775</td>
<td>1,787</td>
<td>$9.81</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Registered nurses</td>
<td>33,421</td>
<td>1,284</td>
<td>$41.55</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Restaurant cooks</td>
<td>22,006</td>
<td>1,162</td>
<td>$11.50</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>General and operations managers</td>
<td>27,869</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>$39.52</td>
<td>Bachelor’s degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Customer service representatives</td>
<td>26,451</td>
<td>1,112</td>
<td>$16.15</td>
<td>High school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hand laborers and stock movers</td>
<td>23,972</td>
<td>1,049</td>
<td>$13.05</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Personal care aides</td>
<td>19,347</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>$11.19</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Office clerks</td>
<td>33,978</td>
<td>1,005</td>
<td>$15.76</td>
<td>High school diploma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Farmworkers</td>
<td>22,343</td>
<td>850</td>
<td>$10.47</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Janitors</td>
<td>26,152</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>$12.40</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Stock clerks and order fillers</td>
<td>17,071</td>
<td>723</td>
<td>$13.76</td>
<td>Less than high school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Truck drivers</td>
<td>23,686</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>$19.96</td>
<td>Postsecondary training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The number of openings exclude people who left one position for another within the same organization, and those who leave an organization for the same position in another organization.
share of occupational employment growth by educational requirement for entry, 2014–2024
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THE WEALTHIEST 20 PEOPLE IN THE U.S.
THE NUMBER THAT COULD FIT INTO ONE GULFSTREAM G650 LUXURY JET

NOW OWN MORE WEALTH THAN
HALF OF THE ENTIRE POPULATION IN THE UNITED STATES.

READ THE REPORT: IPS-DC.ORG/BILLIONAIRE-BONANZA
The Great Wage Slowdown

Since 2000, weekly earnings for low- and middle-income workers are nearly unchanged, after adjusting for inflation. Earnings for workers at the 90th percentile have risen.

**Cumulative percent change since 2000.**

Usual weekly earnings, full-time wage and salary workers

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics
It’s time to raise, not lower, corporate income taxes

Corporate income tax as a percentage of GDP

Source: EPI analysis of Office of Management and Budget data.

Economic Policy Institute
Corporate income tax drops as share of economy

1975-77 to 2013-15

Oregon corporate income taxes as share of gross state product by biennium.
Source: OCPP analysis of Bureau of Economic Analysis and Oregon Office of Economic Analysis data.
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Corporate share of income taxes has shrunk and will continue to shrink

- **Mid 1970s**: 18.5% corporate, 81.5% personal
- **Current**: 6.7% corporate, 93.3% personal
- **Mid 2020s**: 4.6% corporate, 95.4% personal

Corporate and personal share of Oregon income taxes.

Source: OCPP analysis of Legislative Revenue Office and Office of Economic Analysis data.
Business share of property taxes has declined

Share of property taxes paid by fiscal year. Figures shown do not include farm or forest property.
Source: OCPP analysis of Oregon Department of Revenue data.
In a study funded by many of the nation’s largest corporations, Oregon tied Connecticut in having the lowest “total effective business tax rate” in the country.

Fiscal year 2014 state and local business taxes as a share of private sector GSP by state. Source: OCPP presentation of Council on State Taxation data.