THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

Work Experience Data from SIPP

No. 25

Paul Ryscavage and Angela Feldman-Harkins

U.S. Census Bureau

April 1987

U.S. Department of Commerce U.S. CENSUS BUREAU

Survey of Income and Program Participation

WORK EXPERIENCE DATA FROM SIPP

No. 8703 25

Paul Ryscavage
Angela Feldman-Harkins

SIPP Working Paper #25

April 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE

INTRODUCTION..... 1

COLLECTING WORK EXPERIENCE DATA..... 2

COMPARING SIPP AND CPS WORK EXPERIENCE DATA..... 4
Data Results..... 4
Speculating About the Differences..... 7
Potential Application of SIPP Work Experience Data..... 8

RESPONSE ERROR IN SIPP WORK EXPERIENCE DATA..... 9
Average Month-to-Month Transitions in Labor Force Status..... 10
"Suspicious" Transitions in Labor Force Status..... 12
The Affect of Suspicious Transitions on Work Experience Data..... 13

CONCLUSION..... 14

References
Footnotes
Figure 1
Tables
Appendix

PREFACE

An important part of the data collected in SIPP is the information in labor force activity. From this data, it is possible to construct work experience data, or "panoramas" of individuals' experiences in the labor market. In this paper, work experience estimates derived from SIPP are compared to those obtained through the March Current Population Survey. In addition, potential uses of SIPP work experience data are discussed as well as the resopnse bias problem found in labor force transition categories.

INTRODUCTION

Work experience data generally relate to the experiences of individuals in the labor market over a period of time, typically a year. Labor force data, on the other hand, refer to the labor market statuses of individuals--employed, unemployed, not in the labor force--at a point in time, usually a week. The Current Population Survey (CPS), a household survey conducted by the Bureau of the Census for the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), is the chief source of both types of data.

Each month the BLS publishes the labor force data collected in the CPS which relate to the labor force statuses of persons age 16 and over in the previous month (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 1986). These data receive considerable attention in the media and in policy circles since the Nation's "official" unemployment rate is based on them. Each year the BLS also publishes work experience data, usually for the previous year, which summarize the labor market experiences of individuals during the year (Smith, 1986). These data receive less attention, but nevertheless are used by policy makers and especially labor market researchers.

The purpose of this paper is to compare the CPS work experience data with work experience data from the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP) and to discuss various questionable aspects of the SIPP data. Labor force estimates from both surveys have previously been compared (Ryscavage and Bregger, 1985), consequently this paper is a logical extension of the earlier effort. It is essential to compare these survey results so as to evaluate how well (or poorly) the same phenomena are being measured.

SIPP is a new household survey which began in October 1983. Its objective is to collect information on the economic well-being of persons and households

as reflected in their incomes, assets, and participation in Federal government programs. An important part of the survey is the information obtained on the labor force behavior of persons. Its principal use is as an aid in the interpretation of the income and participation data. Labor market researchers will also be interested in it as another "reading" of labor market behavior.

In this paper, we discuss the similarities and differences of the SIPP and CPS in obtaining work experience data from the population. Then we compare the estimates from both surveys for the 1983-84 period. We go on to show how the SIPP can be used also as a source of data on the length of completed spells of unemployment and their outcomes. A concluding section examines the response error problem detected in the SIPP work experience data and the implications of this for their use.

COLLECTING WORK EXPERIENCE DATA

The approaches used to collect work experience data in the CPS and SIPP are significantly different. These differences, in many respects, reflect the different goals of each survey--the CPS to collect labor force data and the SIPP to collect income and program participation data. 1/

CPS Questions

The CPS sample consists of approximately 60,000 interviewed households. Each March, as a supplement to the questions asked every month about labor force status, additional questions are asked concerning labor force activity in the previous calendar year. 2/ These questions are straightforward and are designed to find out: 1) if an individual worked, the characteristics of that employment (e.g., full-time, occupation, industry), how long one worked, and for how many employers; 2) if one looked for work or was on layoff, for how long, and how many times and 3) if one was neither working nor looking for work (or layoff), what one was doing. It is important to note that the

dating of events is not done so it is not known, for example, when a spell of unemployment occurred in the CPS.

Together, these questions yield a "panorama" of labor market activity in the previous year for all persons 16 years of age and over. The monthly CPS labor force questions, on the other hand, provide a "snapshot" of labor force activity 12 times a year. Given the dynamic nature of the labor force, that is, the movement of persons in and out of the labor market each month (and the movement of persons between employment and unemployment), the panoramic view identifies a much larger economically active population than the average of the 12 snapshots.

The SIPP is significantly different in design from the CPS. It is a longitudinal survey in which sample members are interviewed eight times for roughly a two and one-half year period. 3/ In each wave of interviewing, respondents are asked about their incomes, program participation activity, and labor force statuses in the previous four months-- or reference period (see Figure 1). With respect to labor force statuses, individuals are asked whether they had a job in the reference period and if so in which weeks. Any weeks in which a person did not have a job or was absent from one are identified and a series of questions then seeks to find out if the person had looked for work or the reason for the absence from the job.

SIPP is a rotating panel survey, with a new panel beginning each year. The 1984 panel (actually begun in October of 1983) is the focus of this paper and it consisted of approximately 20,000 interviewed households when it began. A panel consists of four rotation groups, one of which is in operation each month, and this results in a staggered sample design (see Figure 1).

Because sample members in SIPP are interviewed over a two and one-half year period, it is possible to develop work experience data not only on a calendar year basis, but for any period of time which does not exceed survey constraints. 4/ In short, SIPP's work experience data are built up from respondents' recollections of weekly labor force statuses in the previous four months, while the CPS data are based on respondents' memories of their labor force activities in a calendar year that took place between 3 to 15 months earlier.

Survey methodologists have generally believed that the quality of data collected through a survey with a short recall period would be superior to data obtained with a much longer recall period. It would be logical, therefore, to think that SIPP work experience data would be of a higher quality than that obtained in the CPS. In the next few pages we begin to examine this question.

COMPARING SIPP AND CPS WORK EXPERIENCE DATA

Our comparison of SIPP and CPS work experience data must be considered preliminary at this point for a number of reasons. The most important reason is that the SIPP and CPS data we are comparing relate to slightly different time periods. The SIPP estimates span the period from June 1983 to August 1984; this is because of the staggered sample design used in the survey. 5/ Nevertheless, for each rotation group the data relate to a 12 month period. Because the SIPP data bridge 1983 and 1984, it was decided to average the CPS work experience estimates for each calendar year.

Data Results. As the text table below indicates, SIPP showed a greater proportion of the population as being active in the labor market in the 1983-84 period than did the CPS--74.0 percent as compared to 69.5 percent. This would tend to support the notion that because the SIPP interviews occur every four

months as opposed to only once as in the CPS, a more comprehensive accounting of labor force experiences is obtained in the former than the latter.

	SIPP	CPS
Population, age 16 and over (thous.)	175,862	176,771
Total who worked or looked for work or were on layoff (thous.)	130,190	122,810
Percent of population	74.0	69.5
Total who worked during the year/12 month period* (thous.)	122,969	119,362
Percent of population	69.9	67.5
Total who looked for work or were on layoff* (thous.)	30,958	22,649
Percent of population	17.6	12.8

* Among those who worked during the year are individuals who also looked for work; among those who looked for work are individuals who did not work at all during the period.

The higher labor market activity rate is the result of more persons in SIPP indicating that they looked for work or were on layoff than was the case in the CPS. SIPP found approximately 8.3 million more persons looking for work or on layoff than the CPS. However, SIPP also discovered more persons as having worked--3.6 million more. Tables 1 and 2 take a closer look at these differences.

Table 1a shows the distribution of the weeks worked according to SIPP and CPS in the 1983-84 period. According to SIPP, persons who reported they had a job at some time in this period totaled 123.0 million, compared to 119.4 million in the CPS. This larger "worker count" was accounted for by greater

number of persons reporting they had worked part-time in 1983 and 1984. On the other hand, the SIPP showed about 2.0 million fewer full-time, year round workers than the CPS.

The weeks worked data are further broken down by age and sex in Table 1b and 1c. Among the men, full-time, year-round employment was reported to be quite similar in both surveys--slightly more than 42.5 million. But total part-time employment continued to be larger for the men in SIPP than in the CPS. Among the women, SIPP counted 2.2 million fewer full-time, year-round workers but significantly more part-time workers--close to 4.0 million more. Women in the central ages of 25 to 64 years appeared to be responsible for most of these differences.

Table 2a displays the differences in the SIPP and CPS estimates of looking for work or layoff in the 1983-84 period. The SIPP obtained a much higher estimate of persons looking for work or on layoff--31.0 million vs. 22.6 million. Not only did the SIPP find greater numbers of persons with some work experience in the year who looked for work or were on layoff, but the looking-layoff category was also higher among those with no work experience in 1983-1984. Among workers, looking for work or being on layoff for 1 to 10 weeks was particularly higher in SIPP than in the CPS.

Women accounted for most of the difference in the jobseeking/layoff estimates. According to SIPP, approximately 15.0 million women were looking for work or on layoff compared to 9.6 million as estimated in the CPS. The largest differences were found among teenage women and women age 25 to 64. Again, the estimate of those looking for jobs or on layoff for 1 to 10 weeks a year was much larger in the SIPP than in the CPS. (See Table 2c). Among

the men (Table 2b), the jobseeking/layoff estimates were similar in the 25 to 64 year age group, but quite different among teenage boys and young men.

Speculating About the Differences. In addition to the fact that the work experience data from both surveys relate to different periods of time, many other factors no doubt account for the different work experience estimates from SIPP and CPS. For example, questionnaires differ (as mentioned earlier), the surveys' sample designs differ, the training of interviewers differs, the degree to which information is obtained through telephone interviews differs, and so on.

One very obvious difference alluded to earlier concerns the length of the recall period used in both surveys. SIPP respondents are required to review their labor market experiences over the past four months, whereas in the March CPS respondents must look back over a 12 month period that ended nearly three months prior to the interview. It stands to reason that for even diligent respondents, the task of recollecting is much easier over a shorter period of time than a longer one, especially when the questionnaire for the longer period makes no special effort to help respondents recall the events.

An article by Morgenstern and Barrett (1974) addressed the issue of retrospective bias in unemployment reporting using the labor force data from the monthly CPS and the annual work experience data from the March CPS. They found that unemployment was understated in the work experience data for women and youths. They concluded that this occurred because:

> "...when asked to recollect their unemployment experience (most likely a distasteful task for anyone) of the previous year, those groups, whose part-time employment and movement into and out of the labor force is much greater than average, can and do more easily discount some of their unemployment experience." 6/

The basis for their conclusion was that these groups, while having a higher elasticity of labor force participation with respect to economic activity than middle-age men, may have less anxiety about spells of unemployment since they do not view labor force activity as their primary activity.

While one might quibble with how they perceived the economic roles of women and youth (it was 12 years earlier), there can be no doubt that the strength of labor market attachment will vary in a sample of individuals.

The diferences in the SIPP and CPS estimates of looking for work and layoff, of course, were greatest for the women and youth, but it is premature to say that the SIPP data corroborate the Morgenstern and Barrett finding. We need to know more about the SIPP work experience data in general. Moreover, we must explore the differences relating to employment and weeks worked; it could be that the shorter recall period in SIPP is also yielding a more accurate reflection of work activity. Indeed, in the concluding section of this paper possible response biases in the SIPP work experience estimates are discussed.

Potential Application of SIPP Work Experience Data. Because of SIPP's survey design and sequence of labor force questions, the data should be particularly useful in examining topical issues in labor market research. One of these involves estimating completed spells of unemployment and their outcomes. Researchers have delved into this issue using the CPS and other data sources (Clark and Summers, 1979).

The data contained in Table 3 are based on a special SIPP extract file which refers to the September 1983-August 1984 period. 7/ The data represent unweighted sample respondents who were neither unemployed in the first or

last week of the period, but who did experience at least one spell of unemployment in the intervening period. One of the problems that has been encountered by researchers in estimating completed spells of unemployment is the censoring or truncation problem, and for this reason we selected the above sample respondents. They totaled 2,866, or approximately one-half of those who were "ever" unemployed in the September 1983-August 1984 period.

For this group of persons the average completed spell of unemployment was 6.4 weeks and approximately 61 percent of the spells ended in employment. But, of course, these broad averages conceal some variation among subgroups, especially with respect to the outcomes of unemployment spells. For men age 25 to 54, 84 percent of their spells resulted in a job, but for teenage women only 44 percent of their spells ended in employment.

A very revealing contrast in the outcomes of unemployment spells is seen in the case of whites and blacks: While roughly 66 percent of the spells for whites turned into jobs only 37 percent of the spells for blacks did. Naturally, we would want to know more about the outcome of the unemployment spell than just whether it ended in a job or labor force withdrawl. We might want to know what kind of job was found, how long it lasted, what did it pay, and so forth. Nevertheless, these SIPP data do illustrate their potential for labor market analysts.

RESPONSE ERROR IN SIPP WORK EXPERIENCE DATA

Problems of between wave response error have been observed in the SIPP program and recipiency data, specifically with the responses between the last month of one reference period and the first month of the next (Burkehead and Coder, 1985). Similar problems have been found in the labor force data (Ryscavage and Short, 1986). Inconsistent reporting of labor force statuses

between waves of interviewing may affect the estimates of persons working and looking for work or on layoff and bias duration or spell estimates derived from respondents.

To further examine this issue in the context of the SIPP work experience data, we analyzed unweighted data from four waves of interviewing (see Figure 1). We also utilized the surveys' employment status recodes (ESR's) which summarize a respondent's labor force activities during a month. There are eight ESR's:

SIPP Employment Status Recode.

ESR	Description
1 -	With job entire month, worked all weeks.
2 -	With job entire month, missed 1 or more weeks, but not because of a layoff.
3 -	With job entire month, missed 1 or more weeks because of a layoff.
4 -	With job part of month, but not because of a layoff or looking for work.
5 -	With job part of month, some time spent on layoff or looking for work.
6 -	No job in month, spent entire month on layoff or looking for work.
7 -	No job in month, spent part of month on layoff or looking for work.
8 -	No job in month, no time spent on layoff or looking for work.

ESR's 3, 4, 5, and 7 contain more than one labor force status in the conventional sense of being employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force because activity is being measured across time and not at a point in time.

ESR's 1, 2, 6, and 8 contain only one labor force status for the month: 1 and 2, employment; 6, unemployment; and 8, not in the labor force.

Average Month-to-Month Transitions in Labor Force Status. As has been reported before, a greater amount of change, or transition, in the ESR's occurs between the reference periods than within the reference periods.

Ryscavage and Short (1986) found that the average month-to-month change in ESR's in the months at the "seams" of the reference periods was 13.1 percent compared to 7.2 percent in months not at the seams of reference periods. In other words, a greater amount of change in labor force status was taking place between two months when the information had been obtained from two interviews rather than just one. Moreover, the transition categories (i.e., the ESR's) responsible for much of the difference were identified.

Table 4 shows which transition categories appear to be accounting for the greatest amount of change in the seam months. It was constructed by subtracting the average of the 12 month-to-month transition matricies in "nonseam" months from the average of the 3 month-to-month transition matricies in "seam" months (see Figure 1). The largest numbers in the table (not including those on the diagonal) indicate where the greatest differences in labor force transitions between seam months and nonseam months were occurring. 8/ Six transition categories stand out:

ESR 1 to 6

ESR 1 to 8

ESR 6 to 1

ESR 6 to 8

ESR 8 to 1

ESR 8 to 6

Note that each of these ESR's contains only one labor force status for the whole month: 1, employed; 6, unemployed; and 8, not in the labor force. Consequently, the transition categories reflect two distinct labor force statuses in two adjacent months.

At this point, we can only suspect a problem exists with these transitions occurring in seam months. Indeed, distinct breaks in labor market activity do occur at month's end (e.g., "I'm through at the end of the month!"). But perhaps we can become legitimately more suspicious if the change in ESR, or labor force status, occurs after four months of the same status followed by four months of another status. For example, an individual may have reported in May that he had a job in the four preceding months, but then in the next interview taking place in September reported that he looked for work the entire subsequent reference period. In other words, his ESR pattern would appear as

ESR's 1 1 1 1 6 6 6 6

for the first eight months of the year. And in SIPP, there is the possibility for a respondent to report that they were in one particular status for the entire reference period, especially for those who find the survey burdensome or are not concerned with the accuracy of their responses.

"Suspicious" Transitions in Labor Force Status. With this possibility in mind, we examined ESR patterns for these suspicious transition categories. The data appear in Table 5. The data show that in the three month-to-month periods which occurred at the seams of reference periods there was an average of 1,930 persons with suspicious ESR changes, the largest groups being ESR's 1 to 8 and 8 to 1. Of the total, 1,287 persons, or 66 percent, had the same ESR for four consecutive months before the seam and a different ESR for four consecutive months after the seam. In ESR categories 6 to 8, 1 to 8, and 8 to 1, the percentages were nearly 70 percent or above. Can we believe that these transitions in labor force status were, in reality, as sharp and as distinct as they were reported? The Table also shows the other ESR wave

patterns among the suspicious transition categories and here too one could question responses.

Obviously, we can only conjecture about the accuracy of the responses from the individuals reporting labor force status changes at the seams and the stability of ESR patterns before and after the seams. For those familiar with the interview process, however, it is very possible that some respondents simply wish to get through the interview so find the easiest path. It is true that it takes much less time to report one status for the entire reference period then to report changes. And the fact that respondents reported a change in status may reflect "telescoping" or simply unconcern with regard to the timing of a labor force status change. 9/ [redacted]e.

The Affect of Suspicious Transitions on Work Experience Data. In Table 6 we present the age and sex characteristics of persons with suspicious labor force transitions. These data, unlike those just reported, show the number of individuals who had at least one suspcious employment transition, that is, they had one labor force status for four months before the seam and another status for four months after the seam. This Table is more consistent with a work experience concept than Table 5 in the previous discussion which dealt with month-to-month averages.

The Table shows there were 2,923 persons with at least one suspicious transition over the June 1983-December 1984 period. This represents about 12 percent of all the 24,709 sample members that reported some labor market activity in this period. Sample members with a suspicious transition that involved at least one period of looking for work or layoff (the sum of the 1

to 6, 6 to 1, 6 to 8, and 8 to 6 categories) totaled 1,440, or about 24 percent of all persons that reported at least one instance of looking for work or layoff.

How do suspicious transitions break down by income education, occupation?

Women comprised 57 percent of the total with suspicious transitions, and women in the central ages of 25 to 54 were the single largest age-sex group. When the age-sex categories are examined by specific transition, however, a different picture emerges. In the 1 to 6, 6 to 1 categories, that is, transitions involving employment and unemplyment and vice versa, men appeared to predominate. In most of the categories involving transitions between being in the labor force and not being in it (8 to 6, 1 to 8, and 8 to 1) women made up the majority. And, it is these latter categories that make up 66 percent of the total number of suspicious transition categories.

One might speculate that proxy vs. self-reporting of labor force activity could be responsible for the suspicious transitions. That is, a proxy respondent may be more inclined to misreport the labor force status of a sample member either because they are unsure of the individual's labor force status or are simply cavalier in their responses. The data, however, are not convincing on this point. Almost one-half of the suspicious respondents "self-reported" their statuses in both interviews, while only about one-fourth had proxy respondents account for their labor force activity in both interviews.

CONCLUSION

The SIPP work experience data offer researchers a new opportunity to examine the dynamic underpinnings of the labor force. Preliminary comparisons indicate that the SIPP data find more people economically active in the labor market than previously reported in the CPS. Considerably more part-time work activity was observed on the part of youth and women. In addition, signifi-

cantly more persons reported they had looked for work or were on layoff than was the case in the CPS.

The results of the comparison must be considered preliminary both on the grounds of the nature of the comparison and our investigation into the potential response error in the SIPP data. The comparison of the SIPP and CPS work experience data involved slightly different time periods and a number of survey differences were not controlled for which could also affect the comparisons. Moreover, response error in the SIPP data is evident and must be further investigated. Our exploration of this issue discovered that in a number of instances changes in labor force statuses between interviews are of dubious validity.

REFERENCES

Burkhead, Dan and Coder, John, "Gross Changes in Income Recipiency from the Survey of Income and Program Participation," Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Social Statistics Section, Washington, D.C., 1985, pp. 351-356.

Clark, Kim B. and Summers, Lawrence H., "Labor Market Dynamics and Unemployment: A Reconsideration," Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 1: 1979, pp. 13-60.

Mathiowetz, Nancy A., "The Problems of Omissions and Telescoping Error: New Evidence From a Study of Unemployment," Proceedings of the Section on Survey Research Methods, 1985, American Statistical Association Washington, D.C. pp. 482-487.

Morgenstern, Richard D. and Nancy S. Barrett, "The Retrospective Bias in Unemployment Reporting by Sex, Race, and Age," Journal of the American Statistical Association, June 1974, pp. 355-357.

Nelson, Dawn, McMillen, David B., and Kasprzyk, Daniel, "An Overview of the Survey of Income and Program Participation: Update 1," SIPP Working Paper No. 8401, U.S. Bureau of the Census, December 1985.

Ryscavage, Paul M. and Bregger, John E., "New Household Survey and the CPS: A Look at the Labor Force Difference," Monthly Labor Review, September 1985, pp. 3-12.

Ryscavage, Paul and Short, Kathleen, "SIPP Labor Force Transitions," SIPP Working Paper No. 8613, U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1986.

Smith, Shirley J. "Work Experience Profile, 1984: The Effects of Recovery Continue," Monthly Labor Review, February 1986, pp. 37-43.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, "Some Aspects of the Survey of Income and Participation," SIPP Working Paper No. 8601, 1986.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, Technical Paper No. 40, The Current Population Survey: Design and Methodology, 1978.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, October 1986 (and other monthly issues).

FOOTNOTES

1/ For information about the CPS see, Technical Paper No. 40, the Current Population Survey: Design and Methodology (1978), and for information concerning, SIPP, see Dawn Nelson, David B. McMillen, and Daniel Kaspryzk, "An Overview of the Survey of Income and Program Participation, Update 1," (1985).

2/ See Appendix for facsimilies of the CPS and SIPP questionnaires relating to work experience data.

3/ SIPP sample members that move to new addresses are followed and interviewed if possible. In the CPS, sample members are not followed.

4/ Work experience data for the 1984 SIPP panel could be developed for the full (all rotation groups) sample for the period beginning in September 1983 and ending in April 1986.

5/ The reference period for the first rotation was from June 1983 to May 1984; for the second, from July 1983 to June 1984; for the third, from August 1983, to July 1984, and for the fourth, from September 1983 to August 1984. Because of the staggered sample design, 22 of the 48 rotation group months fall in 1983 and the remaining 26 in 1984. No adjustment was made in the comparison, however, for the slightly greater weight of the 1984 data vis-a-vis the 1983 data.

6/ See Morgenstern and Barret (1974), p. 357.

7/ This file contained weekly data that enabled the estimation of durations of looking for work and layoff.

8/ The diagonal of the transition matrix contains individuals who have not changed their labor force status. Since we have observed a larger amount of change in seam months than in nonseam months (or smaller amount of nonchange in nonseam months than in seam months), when the nonseam matrix is subtracted from the seam matrix, negative numbers result in the diagonal.

9/ Mathiowetz (1985) recently reported on the problems of forgetting and telescoping error in unemployment reporting. Based on an analysis of an employer's records and the responses of persons who had been laid off from this employer, she found that over a 30-month reference period, both memory decay and forward and backward telescoping were present in respondents' answers concerning their unemployment experiences. Given the fact that SIPP has a relatively short reference period (relative to the March CPS), it may well be that telescoping is outweighing memory decay.

Figure 1. SIPP sample design and rotation group pattern (for part of the 1984 panel)

Rotation groups	J	J	1983 A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	1984 J	J	A	S	O	N	D	J	F	M	A	M	1985 J	J
R1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	.....									
R2		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	.....								
R3			3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	3	.....							
R4				4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	.....						

NOTE: SIPP began in October 1983 when the first rotation group (one-fourth of the sample) was interviewed. The second rotation group was interviewed in November and so on. The reference periods for the rotation groups are the four months to the left of each broken line. Seam months are those months which come at the end of one reference period and the beginning of another. For example, in rotation group one, the seam months are September-October, January-February, and May-June.

Table 1a. Extent of employment according to SIPP and CPS -- 1983-84 1/

(In thous.)

Extent of employment	(1) SIPP	(2) CPS	(3) = (1)-(2) Difference
Total who worked during period, age 16 and over	122,969	119,362	3,607
Full-Time	89,925	92,459	- 2,534
50-52 weeks	66,595	68,582	- 1,987
48-49 weeks	2,635	2,365	270
40-47 weeks	6,067	5,318	749
27-39 weeks	5,950	5,625	325
14-26 weeks	4,540	5,768	- 1,228
1-13 weeks	4,138	4,804	- 666
Part-Time	33,044	26,903	6,141
50-52 weeks	11,612	10,065	1,547
48-49 weeks	1,383	812	571
40-47 weeks	3,820	2,360	1,460
27-39 weeks	5,717	3,116	2,601
14-26 weeks	5,613	4,623	990
1-13 weeks	4,900	5,927	- 1,027

1/ The SIPP data cover the June 1983 to August 1984 period while the CPS data are averages of data for 1983 and 1984.

Table 1b. Extent of employment for men by age according to SIPP and CPS -- 1983-84 1/

(In thous.)

Extent of employment	Total		16 to 19		20 to 24		25 to 64		65 and over	
	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS
Total who worked during period, age 16 and over	67,403	65,236	5,400	4,568	9,255	8,655	50,181	49,611	2,567	2,403
Full-Time	55,859	56,030	1,688	1,658	6,788	6,635	46,289	46,539	1,095	1,200
50-52 weeks	42,857	42,651	377	418	3,880	3,638	37,966	37,793	633	803
48-49 weeks	1,544	1,385	27	24	340	239	1,141	1,105	37	16
40-47 weeks	3,287	3,023	111	104	598	545	2,540	2,320	38	53
27-39 weeks	3,394	3,190	186	153	718	643	2,314	2,310	176	86
14-26 weeks	2,512	3,186	311	319	659	777	1,423	1,983	120	108
1-13 weeks	2,264	2,596	676	641	593	793	904	1,028	91	135
Part-Time	11,544	9,206	3,712	2,910	2,468	2,022	3,891	3,072	1,472	1,203
50-52 weeks	3,673	3,155	804	690	764	697	1,507	1,251	597	517
48-49 weeks	465	252	113	62	128	61	167	84	58	45
40-47 weeks	1,267	766	397	156	340	215	419	302	110	93
27-39 weeks	2,095	1,025	585	321	504	235	753	358	254	111
14-26 weeks	2,163	1,732	812	639	403	364	699	543	251	185
1-13 weeks	1,879	2,279	1,001	1,043	329	450	346	535	203	253

1/ See footnote 1, Table 1a.

Table 1c. Extent of employment for women by age according to SIPP and CPS -- 1983-84 1/

(In thous.)

Extent of employment	Total		16 to 19		20 to 24		25 to 64		65 and over	
	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS
Total who worked during period, age 16 and over	55,566	54,126	4,685	4,196	8,372	8,068	40,786	40,231	1,724	1,633
Full-Time	34,066	36,429	1,009	1,150	4,972	5,284	27,539	29,402	545	595
50-52 weeks	23,737	25,930	233	323	2,953	3,021	20,273	22,227	278	360
48-49 weeks	1,091	980	16	25	148	183	912	754	14	21
40-47 weeks	2,780	2,295	73	60	440	424	2,212	1,777	56	36
27-39 weeks	2,556	2,436	100	109	595	519	1,801	1,758	60	50
14-26 weeks	2,028	2,583	244	212	385	590	1,341	1,707	59	75
1-13 weeks	1,874	2,207	343	424	450	548	1,002	1,179	79	55
Part-Time	21,501	17,696	3,675	3,046	3,400	2,784	13,247	10,828	1,179	1,038
50-52 weeks	7,938	6,911	799	688	1,065	932	5,531	4,827	543	465
48-49 weeks	918	560	81	56	169	97	637	350	32	58
40-47 weeks	2,553	1,595	343	180	453	270	1,643	1,045	114	99
27-39 weeks	3,621	2,092	682	385	540	330	2,241	1,292	158	85
14-26 weeks	3,449	2,892	809	692	638	510	1,778	1,576	225	115
1-13 weeks	3,020	3,648	962	1,045	535	646	1,417	1,739	106	218

1/ See footnote 1, Table 1a.

Table 2a. Extent of looking for work or layoff according to SIPP and CPS -- 1983-84 1/

(In. thous.)

Extent of looking for work/layoff	(1) SIPP	(2) CPS	(3)=(1)-(2) Difference
Total who worked or looked for work/layoff during period, age 16 and over	130,190	122,810	7,380
Total who looked for work/layoff	30,958	22,649	8,308
Percent who looked for work/layoff	23.8	18.4	NA
Did not work, but looked/layoff	7,220	3,449	3,771
1-14 weeks	2,563	-	-
15 weeks or more	4,657	-	-
Worked and also looked/layoff	23,738	19,199	4,539
Worked 50 or more weeks:			
1-2 weeks looked/layoff	1,464	908	556
Worked less than 50 weeks:			
1-4 weeks looked/layoff	4,895	3,529	1,366
5-10 weeks looked/layoff	5,032	3,611	1,421
11-14 weeks looked/layoff	2,629	2,448	181
15-26 weeks looked/layoff	5,855	4,671	1,184
27 or more weeks	3,863	4,034	- 171

1/ See footnote, Table 1a.

NA - Not applicable.

Table 2b. Extent of looking for work or layoff for men according to SIPP and CPS -- 1983-84 1/

(In thous.)

Extent of looking for Work/layoff	Total		16 to 19		20 to 24		25 to 64		65 and over	
	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS
Total who worked or looked for work/ layoff during period, age 16 and over	70,261	66,792	6,203	4,857	9,729	8,964	51,592	50,525	2,737	2,448
Total who looked for work/layoff	15,971	13,047	3,076	1,491	3,603	2,895	8,919	8,531	373	131
Percent who looked for work/layoff	22.7	19.5	49.6	30.7	37.0	32.3	17.3	16.9	13.6	5.3
Did not work, but looked/layoff	2,858	1,556	803	289	473	309	1,412	913	169	46
1-14 weeks	666	442	360	-	103	-	154	-	49	-
15 weeks or more	2,192	1,114	443	-	371	-	1,258	-	120	-
Worked and also looked/layoff	13,113	11,491	2,273	1,202	3,129	2,586	7,507	7,618	204	85
Worked 50 or more weeks:										
1-2 weeks looked/layoff	971	575	57	17	132	92	759	463	23	3
Worked less than 50 weeks:										
1-4 weeks looked/layoff	2,002	1,730	435	307	587	494	913	923	67	7
5-10 weeks looked/layoff	2,795	2,048	594	263	627	446	1,532	1,328	41	12
11-14 weeks looked/layoff	1,393	1,512	586	113	849	343	1,934	1,045	29	12
15-26 weeks looked/layoff	3,399	2,996	373	225	567	648	1,599	2,099	14	23
27 or more weeks	2,553	2,631	12	279	14	565	16	1,762	8	27

Table 2c. Extent of looking for work or layoff for women according to SIPP and CPS -- 1983-84 1/

(In thous.)

Extent of looking for Work/layoff	Total		16 to 19		20 to 24		25 to 64		65 and over	
	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS	SIPP	CPS
Total who worked or looked for work/layoff during period, age 16 and over	59,929	56,018	5,577	4,488	9,217	8,437	43,317	41,431	1,818	1,663
Total who looked for work/layoff	14,987	9,602	2,813	1,226	3,234	2,164	8,758	6,124	182	89
Percent who looked for work/layoff	25.0	17.1	50.4	27.3	35.1	25.6	20.2	14.8	10.0	3.4
Did not work, but looked/layoff	4,363	1,894	892	293	845	369	2,531	1,202	94	30
1-14 weeks	1,897	1,057	455	-	381	-	1,024	-	37	-
15 weeks or more	2,465	836	437	-	464	-	1,507	-	57	-
Worked and also looked/layoff	10,625	7,709	1,920	933	2,388	1,794	6,227	4,921	89	60
Worked 50 or more weeks:										
1-2 weeks looked/layoff	746	333	58	10	175	48	504	276	9	1
Worked less than 50 weeks:										
1-4 weeks looked/layoff	2,640	1,800	614	324	634	492	1,351	975	41	10
5-10 weeks looked/layoff	2,237	1,562	443	216	465	379	1,316	957	31	11
11-14 weeks looked/layoff	1,236	935	217	84	323	209	697	629	0	14
15-26 weeks looked/layoff	2,456	1,676	394	155	587	364	1,453	1,145	21	14
27 or more weeks	1,310	1,403	195	145	204	304	906	941	5	12

1/ See footnote, 1, Table 1a.

Table 3. Characteristics of unemployment spells for persons who were not unemployed in the first and last weeks of the Semptember 1983--August 1984 period by age, sex, and race

Age, sex, and race	Average number of weeks spent unemployed (weeks)	Average duration of completed spells (weeks)	Proportion of spells ending in employment (percent)
Total	9.9	6.4	61.2
Men	10.7	6.9	72.9
16 to 19	10.3	6.5	49.0
20 to 24	10.5	6.9	76.4
25 to 54	10.9	7.1	84.0
55 to 64	12.2	6.7	67.8
65 and over	8.5	6.3	49.0
Women	9.1	5.9	50.9
16 to 19	7.7	5.1	44.2
20 to 24	8.9	6.0	50.6
25 to 54	9.9	6.3	52.5
55 to 64	8.5	4.9	60.1
65 and over	6.5	4.2	32.3
Whites	9.7	6.4	65.7
Blacks	10.9	5.8	37.4

Table 4. Average monthly difference between employment status transitions occurring in "seam" months and "nonseam" months--June 1983 to December 1984

Employment status recodes (month T)	Total	Employment status recodes (month T + 1)							
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Total	0	194	- 93	- 4	-147	-133	83	- 58	160
1	- 4	-541	14	9	- 27	- 22	158	12	394
2	17	102	-169	5	5	3	17	1	54
3	1	17	4	-36	1	2	10	0	3
4	22	52	12	0	- 56	3	22	- 4	- 7
5	31	41	4	5	1	- 42	- 11	1	33
6	-67	152	7	9	10	- 91	-464	14	297
7	- 2	20	1	0	0	- 2	32	- 62	10
8	2	352	35	4	- 81	16	318	- 17	-624

Table 5. Persons with "suspicious" employment status transitions in average seam months by whether or not employment status was the same or mixed during four months before and after the seam--June 1983 to December 1989

ESR pattern in wave (Before - After)	Total	ESR Transition					
		1 - 6	6 - 1	6 - 8	8 - 6	1 - 8	8 - 1
Total	1,930	200	211	317	340	457	405
Same - Same	1,287	96	143	231	199	323	295
Same - Mixed	380	77	24	50	94	79	56
Mixed - Same	188	16	36	25	29	39	44
Mixed - Mixed	222	12	8	11	17	16	10

Table 6. Characteristics of persons with "suspicious" employment status transitions occuring at least once in seam months -- June 1983 to December 1984

Age and Sex	Total	ESR Transition					
		1 - 6	6 - 1	6 - 8	8 - 6	1 - 8	8 - 1
Total	2,923	233	306	441	460	797	686
Percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Men	42.5	61.8	63.7	43.3	37.1	38.0	34.8
16 to 19	11.3	9.0	6.9	12.7	15.2	10.7	11.1
20 to 24	7.2	14.2	15.0	5.7	5.4	4.5	6.7
25 to 54	14.6	34.3	39.2	17.2	10.2	7.4	6.7
55 to 64	4.9	2.6	2.0	5.0	3.9	7.3	5.0
65 and over	4.4	1.7	0.6	2.7	2.4	8.2	5.4
Women	57.4	38.2	36.3	56.7	62.8	62.0	65.2
16 to 19	10.2	6.4	4.6	11.8	14.8	8.4	12.1
20 to 24	9.2	6.9	7.2	10.2	10.2	10.8	7.9
25 to 54	29.5	23.2	22.2	29.5	31.3	29.0	34.4
55 to 64	5.4	1.3	2.0	3.9	5.2	8.5	5.8
65 and over	3.1	-	-	1.4	1.3	5.3	5.0

LABOR FORCE, ADDRESS, PARENT

Section 1 — LABOR FORCE AND RECIPIENCY

(SHOW FLASHCARD J)

1. **During the 4-month period outlined on this calendar, that is, from (4 months ago) thru (Last month), did . . . have a job or business, either full time or part time, even for only a few days?**
Mark "Yes" for active duty in the Armed Forces, any temporary or part-time work, and work without pay in a family business or farm.

PGM 7
1000
1 ☐ Yes — *Mark "Worked" (code 170) on ISS and SKIP to 4*
2 ☐ No

2a. **Even though . . . did not have a job during this period, did . . . spend any time looking for work or on layoff from a job?**

1002
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 3a*

b. **Please look at the calendar. In which weeks was . . . looking for work or on layoff from a job?**
Mark (X) all that apply.

1004 x8 ☐ ALL

1006	☐ 1	1018	☐ 7	1030	☐ 13
1008	☐ 2	1020	☐ 8	1032	☐ 14
1010	☐ 3	1022	☐ 9	1034	☐ 15
1012	☐ 4	1024	☐ 10	1036	☐ 16
1014	☐ 5	1026	☐ 11	1038	☐ 17
1016	☐ 6	1028	☐ 12	1040	☐ 18

c. **Could . . . have taken a job during any of these weeks if one had been offered?**

1042
1 ☐ Yes — *SKIP to Check Item R1*
2 ☐ No

d. **What was the main reason . . . could not take a job during these weeks?**
Mark (X) only one.

1044
1 ☐ Already had a job
2 ☐ Temporary illness
3 ☐ School
4 ☐ Other — *Specify* _____

CHECK ITEM R1 *Refer to item 2b.* Is the "ALL" box marked in 2b?

1046
1 ☐ Yes — *SKIP to 9a, page 4*
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 3b*

3a. **Were there any weeks in the 4-month period when . . . wanted a job?**

1048
1 ☐ Yes — *SKIP to 3c*
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to Check Item R6, page 4*

b. **I have recorded that there were weeks that . . . did not work or look for work. Did . . . want a job in these weeks?**

1050
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 9a, page 4*

c. **Could . . . have taken a job in those weeks if one had been offered?**

1052
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 9a, page 4*

d. **During the weeks that . . . wanted a job but was not looking for one, what was the main reason . . . was not looking?**
Mark (X) only one.

1054
1 ☐ Believes no work available in line of work or area
2 ☐ Couldn't find any work
3 ☐ Lacks necessary schooling, training, skills, or experience
4 ☐ Employers think too young or too old
5 ☐ Other personal handicap in finding job
6 ☐ Can't arrange child care
7 ☐ Family responsibilities
8 ☐ In school or other training
9 ☐ Ill health, physical disability
10 ☐ Other — *Specify* _____
x1 ☐ DK

SKIP to 9a, page 4

4. **Did . . . have a job or business, either full or part time, during EACH of the weeks in this period?**
Note that the person did not have to work each week.

1056
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 6a*

5a. **Was . . . absent without pay from . . .'s job or business for any FULL weeks during the 4-month period?**

1058
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 8a, page 4*

b. **Please look at the calendar. In which weeks was . . . absent without pay?**
Mark (X) all that apply.

1060 x8 ☐ ALL

1062	☐ 1	1074	☐ 7	1086	☐ 13
1064	☐ 2	1076	☐ 8	1088	☐ 14
1066	☐ 3	1078	☐ 9	1090	☐ 15
1068	☐ 4	1080	☐ 10	1092	☐ 16
1070	☐ 5	1082	☐ 11	1094	☐ 17
1072	☐ 6	1084	☐ 12	1096	☐ 18

c. **What was the main reason . . . was absent from . . .'s job or business during these weeks?**
Mark (X) only one.

1098
1 ☐ On layoff
2 ☐ Own illness
3 ☐ On vacation
4 ☐ Bad weather
5 ☐ Labor dispute
6 ☐ New job to begin within 30 days
7 ☐ Other — *Specify* _____

SKIP to 8a, page 4

Section 1 — LABOR FORCE AND RECIPIENCY (Continued)

LABOR FORCE AND RECIPIENCY

(SHOW FLASHCARD J)

6a. Please look at the calendar. In which weeks did . . . have a job or business?

Mark (X) calendar below, "With a job or business." AND then mark appropriate box(es). →

1100	☐ 1	1112	☐ 7	1124	☐ 13
1102	☐ 2	1114	☐ 8	1126	☐ 14
1104	☐ 3	1116	☐ 9	1128	☐ 15
1106	☐ 4	1118	☐ 10	1130	☐ 16
1108	☐ 5	1120	☐ 11	1132	☐ 17
1110	☐ 6	1122	☐ 12	1134	☐ 18

b. Of those weeks that . . . had a job or business, was . . . absent from work for any full weeks without pay?

1136
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 7a*

c. In which weeks was . . . absent without pay?

1138	☐ 1	1150	☐ 7	1162	☐ 13
1140	☐ 2	1152	☐ 8	1164	☐ 14
1142	☐ 3	1154	☐ 9	1166	☐ 15
1144	☐ 4	1156	☐ 10	1168	☐ 16
1146	☐ 5	1158	☐ 11	1170	☐ 17
1148	☐ 6	1160	☐ 12	1172	☐ 18

d. What was the main reason . . . was absent from . . .'s job or business during those weeks?

Mark (X) only one.

1174
1 ☐ On layoff
2 ☐ Own illness
3 ☐ On vacation
4 ☐ Bad weather
5 ☐ Labor dispute
6 ☐ New job to begin within 30 days
7 ☐ Other — *Specify*

7a. I have marked that there were some weeks in this period in which . . . did NOT have a job or business. During that week or weeks did . . . spend any time looking for work or on layoff?

1176
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 7e*

b. In which of these weeks was . . . looking for work or on layoff from a job?

Mark (X) calendar below, "Looking for work or on layoff" AND then mark appropriate box(es). →

1178
X5 ☐ All weeks without a job

1180	☐ 1	1192	☐ 7	1204	☐ 13
1182	☐ 2	1194	☐ 8	1206	☐ 14
1184	☐ 3	1196	☐ 9	1208	☐ 15
1186	☐ 4	1198	☐ 10	1210	☐ 16
1188	☐ 5	1200	☐ 11	1212	☐ 17
1190	☐ 6	1202	☐ 12	1214	☐ 18

c. Could . . . have taken a job during those weeks if one had been offered?

1216
1 ☐ Yes — *SKIP to Check Item R2*
2 ☐ No

d. What was the main reason . . . could not take a job during those weeks?

1218
1 ☐ Already had a job
2 ☐ Temporary illness
3 ☐ School
4 ☐ Other — *Specify*

CHECK ITEM R2

Refer to the Labor Force Calendar, below.
Is each week of the 4-month period marked as "With a job or business" or "Looking for work or on layoff"?

1220
1 ☐ Yes — *SKIP to 8a*
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 7f*

7e. Did . . . want a job in these weeks when . . . did not have one?

1222
1 ☐ Yes — *SKIP to 7g*
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 8a*

f. I have marked that there were weeks in this period when . . . did not have a job and was not looking for a job. Did . . . want a job in these weeks?
If necessary, refer to Labor Force calendar.

1224
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 8a*

g. Could . . . have taken a job during these weeks if one had been offered?

1226
1 ☐ Yes
2 ☐ No — *SKIP to 8a*

LABOR FORCE CALENDAR — *Use when item 4 is marked "No"*

WEEK →	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
With a job or business. *Mark for item 6a.*																		
Looking for work or on layoff (and without a job or business.) *Mark for item 7b.*																		

IF CIVILIAN 14+, BEGIN WITH ITEM 29A. IF CURRENT ARMED FORCES MEMBER, BEGIN WITH ITEM 48A.

18A. LINE NUMBER	POP. STATUS	18C. AGE	18E. Sex	OFFICE USE ONLY
	CIV 14+ / A F		Male / Female	

29A. Did . . . work at a job or business at any time during 1981?
Yes (Skip to 33) No

29B. Did . . . do any temporary, part-time, or seasonal work even for a few days during 1981?
Yes (Skip to 33) No

30. Even though . . . did not work in 1981, did he/she spend any time trying to find a job or on layoff?
Yes No (Skip to 32)

31. How many different weeks was . . . looking for work or on layoff from a job?
(Mark weeks)

32. What was the main reason . . . did not work in 1981?
- Ill or disabled and unable to work
- Taking care of home or family . . .
- Going to school . . . . . .
- Could not find work . . . . . .
- Retired . . . . . .
- Doing something else . . . . . .
- In Armed Forces . . . . . .

(Skip to 53A) / (Skip to 48A)

33. During 1981 in how many weeks did . . . work even for a few hours? Include paid vacation and sick leave as work.
(Mark weeks and Go to 34)

34. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM
Number of weeks in item 33 is
1–49 (Skip to 36)
50–51 (Ask 35)
52 (Skip to 39)

35. Did . . . lose any full weeks of work in 1981 because he/she was on layoff from a job or lost a job?
Yes / No (Skip to 39)

36. You said . . . worked about (entry in item 33) weeks in 1981. How many of the remaining (52 minus entry in item 33) weeks was . . . looking for work or on layoff from a job?
(Mark weeks and ask 37)
None (Skip to 38)

37. Were the (entry in item 36) weeks . . . was looking for work (or on layoff) all in one stretch?
Yes – 1 stretch
No – 2 stretches
No – 3+ stretches
(Go to 38)

(If the entries in items 33 and 36, add to 52 weeks, skip to item 39. If not, ask 38)

38. What was the main reason . . . was not working or looking for work in the remaining weeks of 1981?
- Ill or disabled and unable to work
- Taking care of home or family . . .
- Going to school . . . . . .
- In Armed Forces . . .
- Retired . . . . . .
- Other (Specify) . . . .

39. For how many employers did . . . work in 1981? If more than one at same time, only count it as one employer.
1 (Skip to 41)
2 / 3+ (Ask 40)

40. Did . . . look for work between jobs in 1981?
Yes No

41. In the weeks that . . . worked, how many hours did . . . usually work per week?
(Mark hours)
(Go to 42)

42. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM
Number of hours in item 41 is
1–34 (Skip to 44)
35+ (Ask 43)

43. Did . . . work less than 35 hours for at least one week in 1981? Exclude time off with pay because of holidays, vacation, days off, or sickness.
Yes (Ask 44)
No (Skip to 46)

44. How many weeks did . . . work less than 35 hours in 1981?
(Mark weeks)

45. What was the main reason . . . worked less than 35 hours per week?
- Could not find a full time job . .
- Wanted to work part time or only able to work part time . .
- Slack work or material shortage
- Other . . . . . .

(Ask 46)

46. What was . . . 's longest job during 1981? (Compare with entry in CPS-1 item 23)
Same as item 23 (Skip to 48A or 48B)
Different from item 23 or item 23 blank . . . . . (Specify in 47A–47E)

47A. For whom did . . . work?

47B. What kind of business or industry is this?

47C. What kind of work was . . . doing?

47D. What were . . . 's most important activities or duties?

47E. CLASS OF WORKER
Private . . . . . P
Federal Gov't. . F
State Gov't. . . . S
Local Gov't. . . . L
(Ask 48A)
Self-employment Inc. Yes . . . . . I (Ask 48A)
No (or farm) SE (Ask 48B)
Without pay . . . WP (Skip to 49A)

48A. How much did . . . earn from the employer before deductions during 1981?
48B. What was . . . net earnings from this business/farm after expenses during 1981?
$ Last money

48C. Does this amount include all tips, bonuses, overtime pay or commissions . . . may have received?
Yes No (Probe and make corrections to 48A)

49A. Did . . . earn money from any other work he/she did during 1981?
Yes No (Skip to 50A)

49B. How much did . . . earn from:
All other employers? Yes No $
He/her own business after expenses? Yes No $
He/her farm after expenses? Yes No $
Last money

50A. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM Longest job (item 46) is farmer?
Yes No (Skip to 51A)

50B. Other than the farm income we have already talked about, did . . . receive any income from agricultural work done for others, recreational services, or government farm programs other than loans?
Yes (Probe and make corrections to 48A or 49B) No (Ask 51A)

51A. During 1981 did . . . receive any unemployment compensation from the State or local government?
Yes No (Skip to 52A)
Any Supplemental Unemployment Benefits (SUB)? Yes / No
Any Union unemployment or strike benefits? Yes / No

OFFICE USE ONLY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION
	A B C D E F G H J K L M	N P Q R S T U V W X Y Z
Ref.		Ref.

51B. How much did . . . receive in unemployment benefits during 1981?
$

52A. During 1981 did . . . receive any Worker's Compensation payments or other payments as a result of a job related injury or illness? (Exclude sick pay and disability retirement)
Yes No (Skip to 53)

52B. What was the source of these payments?
- State Workers Compensation . . . . O
- Employer or employer's insurance O
- Own insurance . . . . . O
- Other . . . . . O

52C. How much compensation did . . . receive during 1981?
$

53A. Was . . . living in this house (Apt.) 1 year ago; that is, on March 1, 1981?
Yes No (Skip to 54)

53B. Was . . . living here 5 years ago on March 1, 1977?
Yes (next person) No (Skip to 55A)

54. Where did . . . live on March 1, 1981?
A. Name of State, foreign country, U.S. possession, etc.
B. Name of county
C. Name of city, town, etc.
D. Did . . . live inside the limits of that city, town, village, etc.
Yes No
E. Did . . . live at that address 5 years ago, on March 1, 1977?
Yes (next person) No

55A. Five years ago, on March 1, 1977 was . . . living in this county?
Yes (next person) No
B. This state?
Yes (next person) No
C. In which state was . . . living?
(If another country, enter "outside U.S.")