

**THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION**

WORK EXPERIENCE DATA FROM SIPP

No. 25

**P. Ryscavage and A. Feldman-Harkins
Bureau of the Census**

Survey of Income and Program Participation

WORK EXPERIENCE DATA FROM SIPP

No. 8703-25

Paul Ryscavage
Angela Feldman-Harkins

April 1987

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
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 response 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 qualitative 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

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).

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.

	<u>SIPP</u>	<u>CPS</u>
Population, age 16 and over (thous.)	<u>175,862</u>	<u>176,771</u>
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

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, these 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/

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 withdrawal. 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 analysis.

RESPONSE ERROR IN SIPP WORK EXPERIENCE DATA

Problems of between wave response error have been observed in the SIPP program and reciprocity 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

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 matrices in "nonseam" months from the average of the 3 month-to-month transition matrices 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.

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 than 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/ In any event, the pattern of labor force status reporting as summarized by the ESR's makes the accuracy of a significant number of responses questionable.

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 suspicious 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

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 Reciprocity 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 Kasprzyk, "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.

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 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	<u>130,190</u>	<u>122,810</u>	<u>7,380</u>
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 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 ^{1/}	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:	746	333	58	10	175	48	504	276	9	1
1-2 weeks looked/layoff										
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 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 6. Characteristics of persons with "suspicious" employment status transitions occurring 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 AND RECEIPIENCY

Section 1 – LABOR FORCE AND RECEIPIENCY

(SHOW FLASHCARD)

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 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 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 x6 ALL

1008 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	1018 <input type="checkbox"/> 7	1030 <input type="checkbox"/> 13
1008 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	1020 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	1032 <input type="checkbox"/> 14
1010 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	1022 <input type="checkbox"/> 9	1034 <input type="checkbox"/> 15
1012 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	1024 <input type="checkbox"/> 10	1036 <input type="checkbox"/> 16
1014 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	1026 <input type="checkbox"/> 11	1038 <input type="checkbox"/> 17
1016 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	1028 <input type="checkbox"/> 12	1040 <input type="checkbox"/> 18

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

1042 Yes – SKIP to Check Item R1
 2 No

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

1058 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 x6 ALL

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

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

1088 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

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	37. Were the (entry in item 36) weeks ... was looking for work (or on layoff) all in one stretch?	46. What was ... 's longest job during 1981? (Compare with entry in CPS-1 item 23)	OFFICE USE ONLY	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION	
	CIV 14+		Male		Yes - 1 stretch No - 2 stretches No - 3+ stretches (Go to 38)	Same as item 23 (Skip to 48A or 48B) Different from item 23 blank (Specify in 47A-47E)		O O A I I B 2 2 C 3 3 D 4 4 E 5 5 F 6 6 G 7 7 H 8 8 J 9 9 K Ref. O M	O O O N I I I P 2 2 2 O 3 3 3 R 4 4 4 S 5 5 5 T 6 6 6 U 7 7 7 V 8 8 8 W 9 9 9 X Ref. O Z	
29A.					(If the entries in items 33 and 36, add to 52 weeks, ship to item 39. If not, ask 38)					
Did ... work at a job or business at any time during 1981?					Ill or disabled and unable to work Taking care of home or family Going to school In Armed Forces Retired Other (Specify)					51B. How much did ... receive in unemployment benefits during 1981?
Yes (Ship to 33) No										\$
29B.					39. For how many employers did ... work in 1981? If more than one at same time, only count it as one employer.					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)
Did ... do any temporary, part-time, or seasonal work even for a few days during 1981?					1 (Ship to 41) 2 3+ (Ask 40)					Yes No (Ship to 33)
Yes (Ship to 33) No					40. Did ... look for work between jobs in 1981?					State Workers Compensation Employer or employer's insurance Own insurance Other
Yes No (Ship to 32)					Yes No					52B. What was the source of these payments?
31.					41. In the weeks that ... worked, how many hours did ... usually work per week?					52C. How much compensation did ... receive during 1981?
looking for work or on layoff from a job?					(Mark hours)					\$
(Mark weeks)					42. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM Number of hours in item 41 is					53A. Was ... living in this house (Apt.) 1 year ago; that is, on March 1, 1981?
					1-34 (Ship to 44) 35+ (Ask 43)					Yes No (Ship to 54)
32.					43. Did ... work less than 36 hours for at least one week in 1981? Exclude time off with pay because of holidays, vacation, days off, or sickness.					53B. Was ... living here 5 years ago on March 1, 1977?
What was the main reason ... did not work in 1981?					Yes (Ask 44) No (Ship to 46)					Yes No (next person) No (Ship to 55A)
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					44. How many weeks did ... work less than 36 hours in 1981?					54. Where did ... live on March 1, 1981?
(Ship to 53A)					1 1 2 2 3 3 4 4 5 5 6 6 7 7 8 8 9 9					A. Name of State, foreign country, U.S. possession, etc.?
(Ship to 48A)					45. What was the main reason ... worked less than 36 hours per week?					B. Name of county?
33. During 1981 in how many weeks did ... work even for a few hours? Include paid vacation and sick leave as work.					Could not find a full time job Wanted to work part time or only able to work part time Lack work or material shortage Other (Ask 46)					C. Name of city, town, etc.?
(Mark weeks and Go to 34)					46. What was the main reason ... worked less than 36 hours per week?					D. Did ... live inside the limits of that city, town, village, etc.?
34. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM Number of weeks in item 33 is					1-49 (Ship to 36) 50-51 (Ask 35) 52 (Ship to 39)					Yes No
35. Did ... lose any full weeks of work in 1981 because he/she was on layoff from a job or lost a job?					47A. For whom did ... work?					E. Did ... live at that address 5 years ago, on March 1, 1977?
Yes No (Ship to 39)					47B. What kind of business or industry is this?					Yes No (next person) No
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?					47C. What kind of work was ... doing?					56A. Five years ago, on March 1, 1977 was ... living in this county?
(Mark weeks and ask 37)					47D. What were ... 's most important activities or duties?					Yes No (next person) No
None (Ship to 38)					47E. CLASS OF WORKER Private P Federal Gov't. F (Ask Inc. 48A) State Gov't. S Local Gov't. L Self-employment Yes I (Ask 48A) No (or farm) SE (Ask 48B) Without pay WP (Ship to 48A)					B. This state? Yes No (next person) No
					48A. How much did ... earn from this employer before deductions during 1981?					C. In which state was ... living?
					48B. What was ... net earnings from this business/farm after expenses during 1981?					(If another country, enter "outside U.S.")
					\$ Lost money					
					48C. Does this amount include all tips, bonuses, overtime pay or commissions ... may have received?					
					Yes No (Probe and make corrections to 48A)					
					48D. Did ... earn money from any other work he/she did during 1981?					
					Yes No (Ship to 50A)					
					48E. How much did ... earn from:					
					All other employers? His/her own business after expenses? His/her farm after expenses?					
					Yes No Yes No Yes No					
					\$ \$ \$					
					50A. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM Longest job (item 46) is farmer?					
					Yes No (Ship 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 (Ship to 52A)					
					Any Supplemental Unemployment Benefits (SUB)?					
					Yes No					
					Any Union unemployment or strike benefits?					
					Yes No					

**THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND
PROGRAM PARTICIPATION**

WORK EXPERIENCE DATA FROM SIPP

No. 25

**P. Ryscavage and A. Feldman-Harkins
Bureau of the Census**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
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 response 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 qualitative 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

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).

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.

	<u>SIPP</u>	<u>CPS</u>
Population, age 16 and over (thous.)	<u>175,862</u>	<u>176,771</u>
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

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, these 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/

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 withdrawal. 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 analysis.

RESPONSE ERROR IN SIPP WORK EXPERIENCE DATA

Problems of between wave response error have been observed in the SIPP program and reciprocity 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

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 matrices in "nonseam" months from the average of the 3 month-to-month transition matrices 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.

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 than 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/ In any event, the pattern of labor force status reporting as summarized by the ESR's makes the accuracy of a significant number of responses questionable.

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 suspicious 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

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 Reciprocity 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 Kasprzyk, "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.

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 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	<u>130,190</u>	<u>122,810</u>	<u>7,380</u>
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 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:	746	333	58	10	175	48	504	276	9	1
1-2 weeks looked/layoff										
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	1,941	5	12

1/ See footnote, 1, Table 1a.

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 6. Characteristics of persons with "suspicious" employment status transitions occurring 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

Section 1 – LABOR FORCE AND RECIPIENCY

LABOR FORCE AND RECIPIENCY

<p>(SHOW FLASHCARD J)</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>PGM 7</p> <p>1000 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – Mark "Worked" (code 170) on ISS and SKIP to 4 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>																		
<p>2a. Even though ... did not have a job during this period, did ... spend any time looking for work or on layoff from a job?</p>	<p>1002 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No – SKIP to 3a</p>																		
<p>b. Please look at the calendar. In which weeks was ... looking for work or on layoff from a job? Mark (X) all that apply.</p>	<p>1004 x5 <input type="checkbox"/> ALL</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1006 <input type="checkbox"/> 1</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1018 <input type="checkbox"/> 7</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1030 <input type="checkbox"/> 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1008 <input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1020 <input type="checkbox"/> 8</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1032 <input type="checkbox"/> 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1010 <input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1022 <input type="checkbox"/> 9</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1034 <input type="checkbox"/> 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1012 <input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1024 <input type="checkbox"/> 10</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1036 <input type="checkbox"/> 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1014 <input type="checkbox"/> 5</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1026 <input type="checkbox"/> 11</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1038 <input type="checkbox"/> 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1016 <input type="checkbox"/> 6</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1028 <input type="checkbox"/> 12</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1040 <input type="checkbox"/> 18</td> </tr> </table>	1006 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	1018 <input type="checkbox"/> 7	1030 <input type="checkbox"/> 13	1008 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	1020 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	1032 <input type="checkbox"/> 14	1010 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	1022 <input type="checkbox"/> 9	1034 <input type="checkbox"/> 15	1012 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	1024 <input type="checkbox"/> 10	1036 <input type="checkbox"/> 16	1014 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	1026 <input type="checkbox"/> 11	1038 <input type="checkbox"/> 17	1016 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	1028 <input type="checkbox"/> 12	1040 <input type="checkbox"/> 18
1006 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	1018 <input type="checkbox"/> 7	1030 <input type="checkbox"/> 13																	
1008 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	1020 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	1032 <input type="checkbox"/> 14																	
1010 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	1022 <input type="checkbox"/> 9	1034 <input type="checkbox"/> 15																	
1012 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	1024 <input type="checkbox"/> 10	1036 <input type="checkbox"/> 16																	
1014 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	1026 <input type="checkbox"/> 11	1038 <input type="checkbox"/> 17																	
1016 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	1028 <input type="checkbox"/> 12	1040 <input type="checkbox"/> 18																	
<p>c. Could ... have taken a job during any of these weeks if one had been offered?</p>	<p>1042 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – SKIP to Check Item R1 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>																		
<p>d. What was the main reason ... could not take a job during these weeks? Mark (X) only one.</p>	<p>1044 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Already had a job 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary illness 3 <input type="checkbox"/> School 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Specify _____</p>																		
<p>CHECK ITEM R1 Refer to item 2b. Is the "ALL" box marked in 2b?</p>	<p>1046 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – SKIP to 9a, page 4 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No – SKIP to 3b</p>																		
<p>3a. Were there any weeks in the 4-month period when ... wanted a job?</p>	<p>1048 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes – SKIP to 3c 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No – SKIP to Check Item R6, page 4</p>																		
<p>b. I have recorded that there were weeks that ... did not work or look for work. Did ... want a job in those weeks?</p>	<p>1050 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No – SKIP to 9a, page 4</p>																		
<p>c. Could ... have taken a job in those weeks if one had been offered?</p>	<p>1052 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No – SKIP to 9a, page 4</p>																		
<p>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.</p>	<p>1054 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Believes no work available in line of work or area 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Couldn't find any work 3 <input type="checkbox"/> Lacks necessary schooling, training, skills, or experience 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Employers think too young or too old 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Other personal handicap in finding job 6 <input type="checkbox"/> Can't arrange child care 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Family responsibilities 8 <input type="checkbox"/> In school or other training 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Ill health, physical disability 10 <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Specify _____ x1 <input type="checkbox"/> DK</p> <p style="text-align: right;">} SKIP to 9a, page 4</p>																		
<p>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.</p>	<p>1056 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No – SKIP to 6a</p>																		
<p>5a. Was ... absent without pay from ...'s job or business for any FULL weeks during the 4-month period?</p>	<p>1058 1 <input type="checkbox"/> Yes 2 <input type="checkbox"/> No – SKIP to 8a, page 4</p>																		
<p>b. Please look at the calendar. In which weeks was ... absent without pay? Mark (X) all that apply.</p>	<p>1060 x5 <input type="checkbox"/> ALL</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1062 <input type="checkbox"/> 1</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1074 <input type="checkbox"/> 7</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1086 <input type="checkbox"/> 13</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1064 <input type="checkbox"/> 2</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1076 <input type="checkbox"/> 8</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1088 <input type="checkbox"/> 14</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1066 <input type="checkbox"/> 3</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1078 <input type="checkbox"/> 9</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1090 <input type="checkbox"/> 15</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1068 <input type="checkbox"/> 4</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1080 <input type="checkbox"/> 10</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1092 <input type="checkbox"/> 16</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1070 <input type="checkbox"/> 5</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1082 <input type="checkbox"/> 11</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1094 <input type="checkbox"/> 17</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1072 <input type="checkbox"/> 6</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1084 <input type="checkbox"/> 12</td> <td style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">1096 <input type="checkbox"/> 18</td> </tr> </table>	1062 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	1074 <input type="checkbox"/> 7	1086 <input type="checkbox"/> 13	1064 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	1076 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	1088 <input type="checkbox"/> 14	1066 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	1078 <input type="checkbox"/> 9	1090 <input type="checkbox"/> 15	1068 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	1080 <input type="checkbox"/> 10	1092 <input type="checkbox"/> 16	1070 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	1082 <input type="checkbox"/> 11	1094 <input type="checkbox"/> 17	1072 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	1084 <input type="checkbox"/> 12	1096 <input type="checkbox"/> 18
1062 <input type="checkbox"/> 1	1074 <input type="checkbox"/> 7	1086 <input type="checkbox"/> 13																	
1064 <input type="checkbox"/> 2	1076 <input type="checkbox"/> 8	1088 <input type="checkbox"/> 14																	
1066 <input type="checkbox"/> 3	1078 <input type="checkbox"/> 9	1090 <input type="checkbox"/> 15																	
1068 <input type="checkbox"/> 4	1080 <input type="checkbox"/> 10	1092 <input type="checkbox"/> 16																	
1070 <input type="checkbox"/> 5	1082 <input type="checkbox"/> 11	1094 <input type="checkbox"/> 17																	
1072 <input type="checkbox"/> 6	1084 <input type="checkbox"/> 12	1096 <input type="checkbox"/> 18																	
<p>c. What was the main reason ... was absent from ...'s job or business during these weeks? Mark (X) only one.</p>	<p>1088 1 <input type="checkbox"/> On layoff 2 <input type="checkbox"/> Own illness 3 <input type="checkbox"/> On vacation 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Bad weather 5 <input type="checkbox"/> Labor dispute 6 <input type="checkbox"/> New job to begin within 30 days 7 <input type="checkbox"/> Other – Specify _____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">} SKIP to 8a, page 4</p>																		

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	37. Were the (entry in item 36) weeks ... was looking for work (or on layoff) all in one stretch?	46. What was ...'s longest job during 1981? (Compare with entry in CPS-1, item 23)	INDUSTRY	OCCUPATION
	CIV 14+		Male		Yes - 1 stretch No - 2 stretches No - 3+ stretches (Go to 38)	Same as item 23 (Ship to 48A or 48B) Different from item 23 or item 23 blank (Specify in 47A-47E)	A B C D E F G H J K L M	N O P Q R S T U V W X Y Z
	AF		Female		(If the entries in items 33 and 36, add to 52 weeks, ship to item 39. If not, ask 38)	47A. For whom did ... work?		
					38. What was the main reason ... was not working or looking for work in the remaining weeks of 1981?	47B. What kind of business or industry is this?		
					Ill or disabled and unable to work Taking care of home or family Going to school In Armed Forces Retired Other (Specify)	47C. What kind of work was ... doing?		
29A.					Did ... work at a job or business at any time during 1981?	47D. What were ...'s most important activities or duties?		
					Yes (Ship to 33) No	47E. CLASS OF WORKER		
29B.					Did ... do any temporary, part-time, or seasonal work even for a few days during 1981?	Private ... P Federal Gov't ... F State Gov't ... S Local Gov't ... L		
					Yes (Ship to 33) No	Self-employment (Ask Inc. 48A) Yes ... I No (or farm) SE ... (Ask 48B) Without pay ... WP ... (Ship to 49A)		
30.					Even though ... did not work in 1981, did he/she spend any time trying to find a job or on layoff?	48A. How much did ... earn from this employer before deductions during 1981?		
					Yes No (Ship to 32)	48B. What was ... net earnings from this business/farm after expenses during 1981?		
31.					How many different weeks was ... looking for work or on layoff from a job?	48C. Does this amount include all tips, bonuses, overtime pay or commissions ... may have received?		
					(Mark weeks)	Yes No (Probe and make corrections to 48A)		
32.					What was the main reason ... did not work in 1981?	49A. Did ... earn money from any other work he/she did during 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 (Ship to 48A)	Yes No (Ship to 50A)		
33.					During 1981 in how many weeks did ... work even for a few hours? Include paid vacation and sick leave as work.	49B. How much did ... earn from:		
					(Mark weeks and Go to 34)	All other employers? His/her own business after expenses? His/her farm after expenses?		
34.					INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM Number of weeks in item 33 is	Yes No Yes No Yes No		
					1-49 (Ship to 36) 50-51 (Ask 35) 52 (Ship to 39)	49C. Did ... work less than 36 hours for at least one week in 1981? Exclude time off with pay because of holidays, vacation, days off, or sickness.		
35.					Did ... lose any full weeks of work in 1981 because he/she was on layoff from a job or lost a job?	Yes (Ask 44) No (Ship to 46)		
					Yes No (Ship to 39)	49D. How many weeks did ... work less than 36 hours in 1981?		
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)		
					None (Ship to 38)	49E. What was the main reason ... worked less than 36 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)		
						50A. INTERVIEWER CHECK ITEM Longest job (item 46) is farmer?		
						Yes No (Ship 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 (Ship to 52A)		
						Any Supplemental Unemployment Benefits (SUB)?		
						Any Union unemployment or strike benefits?		
						51B. How much did ... receive in unemployment benefits during 1981?		
						51C. 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 (Ship to 53)		
						51D. What was the source of these payments?		
						State Workers Compensation Employer or employer's insurance Own insurance Other		
						51E. How much compensation did ... receive during 1981?		
						52A. Was ... living in this house (Apt.) 1 year ago; that is, on March 1, 1981?		
						Yes No (Ship to 54)		
						52B. Was ... living here 5 years ago on March 1, 1977?		
						Yes (next person) No (Ship to 55A)		
						52C. 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		
						52D. 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.")		