THE SURVEY OF INCOME AND PROGRAM PARTICIPATION

JOB-EXITS AND JOB-TO-JOB TRANSITIONS IN THE UNITED STATES: AN EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS USING SIPP

No. 146

T. J. Devine
Pennsylvania State University

U. S. Department of Commerce BUREAU OF THE CENSUS

Job-Exits and Job-to-Job Transitions in the United States: An Empirical Analysis Using SIPP

Theresa J. Devine
Pennsylvania State University

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the potential of data on job exits and job-to-job transitions from a new source--the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). These data are more detailed than data from alternative sources, which means they allow analysis of more detailed research questions. However, this detail also means that using the data is more complicated. The labor market content of the data set and major measurement issues involved in its use are discussed here. Thereafter, first-round findings from an ongoing study of job exits-and job-to-job transitions using SIPP are presented. of particular interest are findings on sensitivity to measurement decisions. In short, seemingly minor changes in definition and measurement can produce very different pictures of the frequency and nature of turnover in the United States.

Support for this research from the National Science Foundation (SES 90-103-07) is gratefully acknowledged.

KEYWORDS

job exits, job-to-job transitions, labor market, self-employment, tenure, turnover, Survey of Income and Program Participation, SIPP.

1. INTRODUCTION

Variation in labor market turnover is generally regarded as an important source of variation in labor market earnings, unemployment rates, and other measures of economic status among major demographic and skill groups in the United States. Yet, at present, we actually know very little about demographic and skill variation in the frequency of job exits and job-to-job transitions, let alone variation in the causes and consequences of such turnover.

The limits of our knowledge in this area reflect the limits of data that have been available. Longitudinal data sets for large, representative samples for the United States have not been available. Thus, previous studies of turnover have been restricted almost exclusively to the experience of some groups in the population (youth and male household heads, in particular). And even for these groups, interpretation of empirical results has been complicated,.by potentially important problems in the measurement of key variables, such as tenures, employer-employee separations, and participation in various forms of self-employment.[1]

[1]For a review of the literature on labor market turnover, see Devine and Kiefer (1991), Chapter 8.

In light of this situation, this paper examines the potential of data on job exits and job-to-job transitions from a new source--the 1986 Panel of the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). SIPP samples are large and representative. SIPP interviews are four months apart, as opposed to annual or bi-annual. Due in part to this timing factor and also to the content of the SIPP questionnaires, data on labor market activity from the SIPP are more detailed than data from alternative sources. Thus, the data from SIPP allow analysis of questions precluded by-the constraints of alternative sources. By the same token, the additional detail in SIPP means that working with the data is more complicated. At the conceptual level, decisions about variable definitions--with potentially important consequences--must be made. At the practical level, care must be taken to avoid information loss and confusion, particularly when exploiting the longitudinal features of the survey.

The content of SIPP most relevant to the analysis of labor market turnover and the major measurement issues that arise when exploiting this content are Discussed in Section 2 below. In part, these measurement issues arise because of the basic structure of the survey and public-use Microdata Files, so a brief overview of this structure is included. Section 3 then presents first-round findings on job exits and job-to-job transitions based on data-for the 1986 Panel of SIPP. of primary interest here are findings on sensitivity to measurement decisions. In short, seemingly minor changes in definition and measurement can produce very different pictures of the magnitude and nature of turnover in the United States. In light of these findings, Section 4 closes . with a summary discussion of the potential of data for the 1986 and subsequent Panels of SIPP for more extensive analysis of labor market turnover.

2. MEASURING JOB EXITS AND JOB-TO-JOB TRANSITIONS

To understand and appreciate the issues that arise when using SIPP data to study job exits and job-to-job transitions, one must first consider some of the responses that we might provide if asked the question: What is a job?

We might define a job simply as

- an arrangement for regular work with an employer.

At first glance, this definition seems rather complete. We may be interested simply in the existence of an "arrangement," with the term "regular" interpreted broadly so as to include gaps in work schedules. Thus, we might count persons on temporary layoff (due, say, to weather or slack product demand) among those with jobs under this definition, as well as teachers during unpaid summer vacations, and workers such as substitute teachers and per them nurses during frequent gaps in their work schedules. only a permanent exit from an arrangement would be regarded as a "job exit" under this interpretation and, in turn, a "job-to-job transition" would require a change in employers.

Alternatively, we may want to interpret the term "regular" more narrowly and treat periods of

unpaid absence as being without a job. Toward this end, we might extend the above definition to

- an arrangement for regular work for pay with an employer.

Temporary layoffs and departures from temporary work might be counted as job exits in this case, regardless of any plans on the part of the workers and firms to resume work at a later date. Note, also, that the "for pay" restriction introduces additional considerations related to our definition of pay. For example, unpaid family workers would be excluded from those with jobs if we interpret "pay" strictly as monetary compensation.

Of course, all of the above deals with arrangements with employers. We may want to count persons who are self-employed among those with jobs. For example, we might define a job as

- an arrangement for regular work for pay with an employer or in one's own business.

On making this extension, defining "regular" and "for pay* becomes more complicated. Self-employed persons can have fixed hours and receive salaries. However, there are exceptions. Is a novelist working "for pay" when writing a novel if the novelist has no contract in hand? How about periods between books?

Going one step farther, when we say regular work, we may mean work that involves performance of the same or very similar tasks. That is, our definition of a job might be

- an arrangement for regular work for pay with an employer or in one's own business in a particular occupation.

Under this definition, arrangements before and after intra-firm transfers and promotions, arrangements before and after unpaid absences with the same employer or business, and old and new employer and business arrangements could all be distinguished.

Finally, suppose that an individual describes himself or herself an having no formal arrangement with an employer and no formal business established, but engages in some casual work for pay. Does this sort of "irregular" work constitute a job? How does it differ from a temporary job arrangement with an employer? Should it be categorized as self-employment?

A researcher interested in job exits and job-to-job transitions may approach the data at hand with a very tightly specified theoretical model or policy question that addresses all of the issues set out above. on the other hand, the researcher may not. When working with many data sets, it would not matter because only ambiguous measures are available--the questions raised above are essentially moot. If details such as the above are desired, compromises are required at the empirical stage under these circumstances. if the details have not been considered, measures that are available might be used without question. Either way, ambiguity in the data makes the results

from analysis difficult to interpret.

If the researcher chooses to work with SIPP, the situation is different. Details are reported. Choices such as those described above are not only possible, they are basically required. To see this, one must understand the structure and labor market activity content of the SIPP files, the subjects to which we now turn.

2.A. THE STRUCTURE OF SIPP AND THE MICRODATA FILES

There are three basic components of the SIPP sample design: the Panel, the Rotation Group, and the Wave. Understanding these is fundamental to understanding the structure of SIPP, which is essential for use of the SIPP Microdata Files.

A SIPP Panel is a multistage stratified random sample of the noninstitutionalized resident population of the U.S.; the first SIPP Panel was the 1984 and the survey design in such that a new Panel is added each February. In the design for each Panel, a living quarters (i.e., household dwelling) serves as the designated "ultimate sampling unit." The sample design for the 1986 Panel, in particular, designated 16,300 limits and initial interviews were successfully completed with about 11,500 of these units. (Most remaining units were found empty, vacant, or demolished.) Within each unit, the sample design calls for initial interviews with all persons aged fifteen years or more who reside in these units (younger persons are counted, but not interviewed until they reach age fifteen). Also according to the sample design, persons who join designated units after first round interviews are added to the Panel and subsequently followed, as are members of households formed by movers over the age of fifteen; children under age fifteen remain in the Panel as long as they continue to reside with a Panel adult.

A Rotation Group is a subsample of a Panel obtained simply by partitioning the Panel into four groups having nearly equal numbers of sampling units. Each month in the sampling period for a Panel, a different Rotation Group is interviewed and the four months preceding a particular interview month serve as the reference period.

A Wave is a set of interviews that use the same survey instrument (i.e., questionnaire). A set of Core questions that pertain to experience during the Wave's four month reference period is repeated in each interview. In some Waves, this Core is followed by additional sets of questions that are referred to as Topical Modules. As their title suggests, these are intended to gather information about special topics (e.g., employment history, fertility history, child care arrangements); in some cases, they are repeated for a given Panel (e.g., the child care module is administered twice for the 1986 Panel). Both the Core questions and Topical Modules vary across Panels. In particular, there are substantial differences between the 1984 Panel survey instruments and those used for subsequent Panels, and a key difference between the 1985 Panel survey instruments and those for the 1984 and post-1985 Panels is the lack of an employment history Topical Module for the 1985 Panel. Beyond 1985, however, the questionnaires are quite similar--particularly in terms of their labor market content. of course, this is useful because it

allows one to combine Panels and thus increase sample sizes and calendar periods covered.

For the 1986 Panel, there were seven Waves for Rotation Groups 2, 3 and 4 and six Waves for Rotation Group 1 (Wave 3 was not administered to Group 1). The reference periods for the Panel therefore span twenty-four to twenty-eight months continuously and the calendar reference period is October 1985 to March 1988.

The structure of the Microdata Files corresponds to the Wave structure of SIPP. Thus, there are seven files for the 1986 Panel and each contains Core and Topical Module data for a given Wave. The unit of observation in each file is an individual, but linking of data for individuals within households is possible by means of a multi-part SIPP identification number system. This identification system can also be used to link households and individuals across waves files.

2. B. LABOR MARKET CONTENT OF THE 1986 PANEL MICRODATA FILES

Data on Job exits and job-to-job transitions are generated by several sets of question-* in both the core and Topical Modules in the 1986 Panel questionnaire.[2] To some extent, these sets of questions are linked. To some extent, these sets of questions are independent.

CORE INFORMATION

There are three sets of questions in the Core that pertain to labor market activity and characteristics of work arrangements.

The "Labor Force and Recipiency" section (referred to as LFR below) provides information about activity during each week in a Wave reference period. Specifically, combined answers to the series of questions in this section allow one to determine whether a respondent:

(i) had at least one formal arrangement for regular work with an employer (including part-time, temporary, and nonpaying family-business arrangements) or business, and was not absent without pay for the whole week (i.e., the respondent may have been absent with pay for the whole week or absent part of the week without pay),

[2]As noted above, there are distinctions between questionnaires used for different SIPP Panels. In particular, there have been changes from one Panel to the next that improve the labor market activity content of the data insofar as measuring transitions is concerned. The reader is therefore cautioned against interpreting the description provided here as a description of data for other Panels. Also, a longitudinal file containing Core information at a monthly level is available for each panel of the SIPP--and these are useful for many purposes. Note, however, that the LFR information discussed below is aggregated to the monthly level in these files and details about employer and business arrangements from the EE are omitted. Also of importance, data from the Topical Modules are not included in these files. Thus, the discussion that follows should not be interpreted as a description of the content of 1986 longitudinal file.

(ii) had at least one arrangement, but was absent without pay from all such arrangements for the whole week,

(iii) had no arrangement during the week, but spent some time looking or on layoff, or

(iv) had no arrangement for regular work during the week and spent no time looking or on layoff.

Additional questions in this section further allow one to determine whether a respondent who was without an arrangement for at least one week during the reference period spent time looking or on layoff during each such week of absence without pay. (Conversely, weekly observations on looking or layoff during weeks of absence without pay are not available if a respondent had an arrangement in all weeks.)

Looking and layoff are aggregated throughout this section. However, the major reason for unpaid absence during all weeks absent is provided, and the possible responses include "layoff," as-well as labor dispute, own illness, vacation, new job not yet started, weather, and some other reason. one can also determine whether respondents who spent any weeks looking or on layoff were "available for work" during all such weeks and, if not, the major reason why. "Had a job" is included here, along with temporary illness, school, and some other reason. Together, these pieces of information allow some sorting of the .looking and layoff categories.

Finally, anyone who spent any full weeks without an arrangement for work was asked whether he or she did "any work at all that earned some money," which I will refer to as "irregular work," and the months in which this irregular work was done.

The second and third sources of labor market activity information are in the "Earnings and Employment" section of the Core (referred to as BE below). As compared to the LFR information described above, which pertains to a respondent's overall status during each week, the information reported here pertains to distinct employer-specific and business-specific arrangements that-may or may not overlap.

In the first part of this section, employer-specific information in reported separately for up to two employers--the two employers for whom the respondent worked the most hours during the entire Wave reference period. A flag indicating three or more employers is also provided, but no additional information is available for these additional arrangements.

Insofar as transitions within Wave reference periods are concerned, both first and last dates of employment during the Wave reference period are reported for each employer. Also, if a respondent reported that he or she stopped working for an employer before the last day of the reference period, the major reason for the exit is reported (laid off, retired, discharged, temporary job ended, quit to take another job, or quit for some other reason).

Two forms of employer-arrangement transitions between Waves are also identified in this section of the Core. First, there is an interviewer check flag for each employer that indicates whether or not the respondent reported employment with this particular employer during the previous Wave reference period. Second, if the respondent had been employed with an employer with the previous Wave reference period, changes in duties between Wave interviews are reported-based on a direct question about such changes.

Each employer discussed is also assigned a SIPP control card employer ID number. Specifically, a number is assigned to each employer name provided by a respondent and this number remains fixed for the duration of the survey.

In the second part of the EE section, business-specific self-employment information is provided separately for up to two businesses--the two businesses with highest gross earnings during the Wave reference period.

Starting and ending dates are not reported for business arrangements. However, as with employers, there are flags to indicate whether each business was reported in the previous Wave interview. Respondent-reported changes in duties between Wave interviews are also reported for continuing businesses.

A SIPP control card identification number is also assigned to each business. As with employers, the number assigned to a particular business is based on the reported name of the business and this number remains fixed across Waves.

Beyond data that allow transitions to be identified, additional Core questions generate information that can be used to study the characteristics of arrangements that workers exit and enter.

Additional Core employer-specific information consists of usual weekly hours, whether a worker was paid hourly and the most recent hourly wage if applicable, earnings by month, frequency of paychecks per month, union or employee association membership, collective bargaining contract coverage for nonmembers, industry, public/private-profit/private-nonprofit sector, and occupation.

Additional core business-specific information available for all business owners consists of occupation, industry, usual weekly hours, household or family business status, and a flag to indicate whether gross earnings over the next 12 months were expected to exceed $1000 at the time of each Wave interview. For those with expected gross earnings under $1000, total not earnings are also reported. For others, income received from the business is reported by month and there are flags indicating whether this in represented a regular salary drawn from the business or other income from the business used for personal purposes. Whether the business is incorporated, a sole-proprietorship, or a partnership, the number of employees (1, 2, 3-5, 6+ in the public use files), and profits for the reference period are also reported for these larger businesses, but only for one household when two or more household members were partners or

owners of the business; SIPP assigned ID numbers are provided for other household member owners and partners, however, which means that records can be linked to determine missing business characteristics.

Health plan coverage (government and private, employment related and personal), recipiency of various kinds of non-labor income, school enrollment status residence and marital status in each reference month and asset ownership, during the entire reference period are reported in the LFR section of the core questionnaire, along with other basic demographic and personal characteristics. Amounts of income received in each month from each nonlabor source and also from irregular work are then reported in the third section of the Core. Note, however, that there is no detail about the type of irregular work done or hours spent doing it.

TOPICAL MODULE INFORMATION

The Topical Modules generate an enormous amount of information. Most important for the study of labor market turnover is the Employment History Topical Module in Wave 2. For all respondents aged 18 to 64, the information reported here includes:

(i) the starting date for a respondent's "main" job during the Wave 1 reference period (or main job during the Wave 2 reference period if the respondent reported no regular work arrangement for Wave 1), the SIPP ID number for this employer or business, and the exit date for the most recent previous job,

(ii) the ending date of the most recent job that lasted two weeks or more, if no regular work was reported for the Wave 1 and Wave 2 reference periods (i.e., the last day of the last job held before the reference period), or

(iii) the reasons for no employment if a respondent reported that no job had ever been hold for two weeks or more.

If the most recent job exit year is 1975 or later, additional information is provided. This includes the starting date of the previous or most recent job (so that tenure can be determined), characteristics of this job (occupation, industry and a self-employment versus wage-and-salary flag), and the major reason for exiting the job (those described for reference period exits, plus quits due to dissatisfaction with working conditions, dissatisfaction with earnings, dissatisfaction with location, pregnancy/childbirth, school, health, or other personal). In terms of general labor market history, the first year of six or more months of employment and the total number of years of six or more months employment thereafter are reported--but only for the 1975+ exit year subsample. However, information about recent 6-month-plus nonwork spells is reported for all workers who-had held a job for at least two weeks by the end of the Wave 2 reference period.

Also of importance, data collected in a Topical Module in Waves 4 and 7 provide additional information about businesses discussed for each of these Wave reference periods. In particular, the existence of each business on the last day of the reference period is verified and, for those businesses still in existence, ownership share, debt, and asset information are reported.

2.C. DEFINING JOB EXITS AND JOB-TO-JOB TRANSITIONS IN SIPP

As noted at the start and hopefully confirmed by the above summaries, an enormous amount of detail is available in the SIPP Microdata Files about respondents' labor market activities.

In part, this detail is available because of the structure and content of the SIPP questionnaires. The multiplicity of questions about labor market status and arrangements allows relationships among simultaneous and overlapping labor market activities to be measured. Using the additional information available, one can study relationships between labor market transitions and policy variables, such as health insurance coverage and receipt of unemployment benefits. Relationships between labor market transitions and other transitions in a person's life, such as changes in marital status, living arrangements, and parenthood, can also be examined.

The detail available in SIPP data also reflects the timing of interviews. With interviews every four months, it seems reasonable to expect that events of brief duration are more likely to be observed. This timing is also likely to improve accuracy when measuring the timing of transitions in and out of employer and business arrangements, as well as changes in hours, wages, salaries, and occupations within arrangements.

On the downside, the above summaries should also suggest some of the complications faced when attempting to exploit the content of the SIPP Microdata Files.

At the most basic level, the collection of data at four month intervals means that following an individual for more than four months requires two major steps. Information within Waves must first be organized into Wave histories and these histories must then be merged sequentially. Thereafter, if one wishes to initialize activity at the start of the Wave 1 reference period, the Employment History information collected in the Wave 2 Topical module must be merged with the reference period histories.

Several complications are faced at each of these steps. In some cases, recognizing the complication is the hardest part--once recognized, the best method for dealing with it is obvious. In other cases, optimal solutions are less clearcut. Among the more important of such complications are the following.

First, employer arrangements are no: necessarily discussed in chronological order within Waves, but according to relative hours during the reference period instead. Moreover, employer ID numbers are assigned according to the order of employer discussions. Thus, although these ID numbers are of critical importance when merging information between Waves, they cannot be

used to determine the order of arrangements within or across Waves.

If a respondent has two employers in a given Wave, reported dates for the employer arrangements can be used to determine. the order of the two arrangements within a Wave. However, if a respondent has three or more employers in a given Wave, even this date check strategy has limited value because dates for a maximum of two employer arrangements are available. In such cases, one can turn to the weekly status information in the LFR section to determine the periods during which the additional jobs are held. That is, periods of arrangements reported in the EE can be checked against the weeks in which the respondent reported one or more arrangements in the LFR. Note, however, that this LFR check strategy will have limits because of possible overlaps between two or more employer and business arrangements. (Also, as noted above, the characteristics of these additional arrangements cannot be measured.)

Additional complications arise when studying employer arrangement transitions because only first and last dates of employment arrangements within each Wave reference period are reported in the EE section. That is, gaps are not identified in the EE section unless they fall at the beginning or end of a reference period. If a researcher wants to distinguish gaps within a Wave reference period, the weekly status information in the LFR can be used. However, this LFR check strategy will be of limited value if a respondent has multiple arrangements, as above, or if gaps during the Wave reference period do not include full calendar weeks.

Perhaps the most important complication faced when studying exits from employer arrangements is the omission of reasons for exits at the "seams" between reference periods. The major reason for an employer arrangement exit is available only if the last date of employment with an employer falls before the last day of a Wave reference period. In the event of a seem exit, one can check the weekly status data from the LFR to determine whether a respondent was of absent without pay or without any arrangement during the entire last week the reference period, and then check the-reason data to identify layoffs that, convert to permanent exits. Note, however, that this last weak check strategy provides no information about other reasons for seam exits (namely, quits, discharges, and temporary jobs endings). Furthermore, this check .strategy will not work if the respondent is absent for only part of the last week or if the respondent has multiple work arrangements during that week. Multiple gaps during the reference period will also introduce problems, as only one reason for absence or non-availability for work is reported. Another source of information is activity in the period directly following exits. For example, direct job-to-job transitions might be interpreted as evidence of a quit for a new job--but such interpretations will be loose, at best.

Turning to transitions that involve businesses, the most .important complication is the fact that dates for business arrangements within Wave reference periods are not reported directly. Thus, business entries and exits must be determinedly on the basis of related information. The most obvious source of information is change in business ID numbers between Waves, either in the form of a business being discuss in one Wave interview and then not being discussed in next, or vice-versa. If one takes this approach the continued business flags available in all Waves and

Topical Module flags for business endings in Waves 4 and 7 can be used for verification.

Of course, relative to the information available for employer arrangements, his change across wave information for business transitions is aggregated over time. To more closely match the time units available for employer arrangements, one might use the LFR weekly status information to determine first and last weeks of business arrangements. Note, however, that this matching will be straightforward only if there are clear spells of "no arrangement" status in the LFR data that can be matched with reported dates for employer arrangements (i.e., if a respondent has no employer arrangements, or if a "no arrangement" spell between identified employer arrangement periods and the business arrangement lasts at least one calendar week).

Depending on one's definition of "a job," information about monthly business income might also be used to measure transitions. Note, however, that this approach will be problematic if any income information is missing.

A second issue faced when studying business activity is the fact that expectations about "gross business earnings" can change. This is important because detailed business characteristics are reported in each Wave only if a business owner "expects" to gross $1000 over the twelve months following an interview date. If a business owner's expectations do change, "missing" information may be found, but only by tracking business characteristics across Waves.

Finally, only one employer or business arrangement is initialized for each respondent in the Employment History Topical Module--a respondent's "main" job. Thus, if a person has two or more employer or business arrangements at the start of the Wave 1 reference period, all but one must remain un-initialized. Complicating matters further, although both starting months and starting years for "main jobs" were requested, observations on starting months of older jobs are often missing. This means potentially important error in the measurement of initial tenure if time units of less than one year are used to measure tenure in such jobs.

In sum, the detail in the SIPP files allows a great deal of flexibility when defining "a job"--and, therewith, when measuring the occurrence and circumstances surrounding job exits. of course, the flip-side of this is that working with SIPP requires selection from the detailed information available in the separate sections of the files. This, in turn, means that a researcher must be prepared with a fairly precise definition of a job when SIPP is used, i.e., answers to the questions raised at the start of this section must be provided. In the case of nor complex definitions, linking details is required and this can be difficult. This holds both within and across Wave reference periods, and between the Employment History and the Panel reference period. A great deal of time and care are required. Moreover, whether a researcher's definition of a job is relatively simple or quite complex, some details are bound to be missing--even in SIPP. Decisions about what to do about these missing details must be made. As for the consequences of these decisions, they can be major--as shown in the findings below.

2. EVIDENCE ON JOB EXITS AND JOB-TO-JOB TRANSITIONS FROM SIPP

The findings presented here are from an ongoing study of job-exits and job-to-job transitions using the Micro Data files for the 1986 Panel of SIPP. As the construction of a data set that exploits the full detail in the files is not yet complete, these findings are first-round and should be interpreted accordingly. Nevertheless, they are informative insofar as the breadth of the labor market content of SIPP is concerned and, by providing information not available elsewhere, they point to some interesting economic questions. Most important, insofar as the primary purpose of this paper is concerned, they provide evidence on some of the major issues of definition and measurement discussed above.

3.A. SAMPLES

The particular sample examined here consists of all respondents in the 1986 Panel who:

- had interviews conducted with themselves or proxies for the first three waves,[3]
- had at least one regular employment arrangement during the Wave 1 reference period (wage-and-salary or self-employment),
- were aged 18 to 64 years at the Wave 2 Interview,
- provided sufficient information to determine the starting dates of main jobs held in Wave 1 (i.e, complete information or a starting year before 1985),
- did not move into another sample unit during the first 12 months of the Panel reference period,
- were not enrolled in school full-time during the first 12 months of the Panel reference period, and
- were not in the Armed Forces during the first 12 months of the Panel reference period.

The purpose of the first four of these sample restrictions is to produce a ample of persons who had an employer or business arrangement during the first four months of the reference period and no essential Core and Topical Module information missing; the fifth is minor in terms of numbers of respondents excluded, but serves to simplify the tracking of the sample across Waves. The last two restrictions are economic. Plans to enroll in school full-time or enter the military are made in advance and these plans should be reflected in behavior before entrance. For the present exercise,

[3]Approximately thirty percent of each Wave's interviews were proxies for this sample. Note that the first three Waves are Waves 1, 2 and 3 for Rotation Groups 2, 3, and 4, and Waves 1, 2, and 4 for Rotation Group 1.

these complications are at least partially avoided by the last two restrictions.

The discussion that follows focuses primarily on wave 1 "Main Jobs" and circumstances surrounding exits from these jobs. As discussed above, SIPP allows a lot of flexibility when defining "a job." The primary definition of a job used here is an arrangement for regular work for an employer or in a business, as reported in the EE section. "Main Job" status is based on responses in the Wave 2 Employment History Topical Module; as noted above, these may or may not be the first jobs held during the Wave 1 reference period.

Given this focus, most of the data described below are taken from the Wave 1 file for this sample; beyond checks on armed forces and student status, data from the next two Waves are used primarily to determine transitions. The demographic and personal characteristics of the sample as of the last date of main Job employment during the Wave 1 reference period are summarized in Table 1. Note that the calendar period corresponding to the first Wave reference period for all Rotation Groups is October 1985 through April 1986. This was a period of gradual improvement in the United States economy, which should be kept in mind when viewing the numbers that follow. For reference, the average state-level unemployment rate for 1986, as reported in Employment and Earnings, and the average percentage change in state unemployment rates between 1985 and 1986 are reported in Table 1 and comparable tables below.[4]

3.B. WAVE 1 LABOR MARKET ACTIVITY SUMMARY

Throughout Sections l and 2 above, much attention is paid to the amount of detail about labor market activity available in SIPP. Of course, the availability of such detail would be irrelevant if respondents' lives were uncomplicated. Part A of Table 2 presents a summary of all employer and business arrangement activity during the four month Wave 1 reference period based on EE data alone (i.e., information in the LPR and changes at the "seams" between Waves 1 and 2 are not included). Even a cursory glance over this distribution should convince the skeptical that respondents' lives can indeed be very complicated.

Most respondents do have one employer at the start of the reference period, remain with that employer for the entire four months, and report no self-employment. However, more than one-fourth of the sample does not fit into this category. One out of ten persons reports only self-employment activity. Dual-jobs, either for a second employer or in a business, are fairly common. There are a lot of transitions from one arrangement to another--and multiple exits before the last day of the reference period, while relatively rare, are observed. Overall, 8 percent of these with employer arrangements experiences at least one exit before the last day of the reference period, which amounts to 7 percent of the sample.

[4]States of residence are aggregated in the public use files for a small proportion of the sample living in sparsely populated states. Mean unemployment rates for states within groups have been used for observations in this category.

Also of interest is the frequency of job-to-no-job transitions in the LFR weekly status data reported in part B of Table 2. About.5.5 percent of the sample experiences this type of transition during the Wave 1 reference period.

There are several possible explanations for an observed difference between the EE and LFR transition measures. First, the LFR transition measure picks up a transition only if a full calendar week is spent without a job; thus, the LFR measure does not pick up direct job-to-job transitions, transitions that involve short spells of less than 7 days between arrangements, some transitions that involve longer spells that fall into two consecutive weeks, or any transitions for dual-job holders. On the other hand, the LFR measure should pick up transitions out of businesses that are not picked up in the EE data, as well as some temporary layoffs and comparable exits during the Wave reference period.[5] At this stage, the relative contributions of these factors have not been sorted out. Nonetheless, the magnitude of the difference in sample proportions for the short period of four months examined here strongly suggests that the LFR and EE data should not be regarded as substitute sources of information when analyzing labor market turnover, but complementary sources instead.

3.C. WAVE 1 MAIN JOBS

Tables 3 to 20 focus more narrowly on wave 1 Main Job arrangements, and exits from these single arrangements. Focusing first on Tables 3 and 4, alone, one can get some idea of the sensitivity of estimates of job exit frequency to the most basic of measurement decisions.

The first and most obvious factor is the inclusion versus exclusion of arrangement exits at the seams between Waves. Taken alone, the EE exit data for Wave 1 indicate that 4.9 percent of all Wave 1 Main Jobs end by the last day of the Wave 1 reference period. However, using this data together with Employer and Business ID data for Waves 1 and 2, one finds that a total of 8.4 percent of all Main Jobs end before the first day of the Wave 2 reference period--a number that is 71 percent higher.[6]

Insofar as definitions of a job are concerned, the decision to include versus exclude the self-employed from one's analysis appears important. While just over one out of ten Main Jobs is a business arrangement, the frequency of exits from these arrangements is sufficiently low to lower the sample relative frequency.

Going beyond the basic arrangement definition for a job, part F of Table 3 addresses changes in duties within arrangements. Just under 5 percent of all Wave 1 jobs do not end in the sense of an

---

[5]Note that additional within Wave transitions of this type may be picked up in the absence-without-pay LFR data, which are not reported here. The location will depend on how the respondent and interviewer jointly regard the respondent's situation.

[6]As indicated in Table 3, the EE flags for continued employer and business arrangements have been used jointly with ID number change information in measuring exits at the seams between Waves.

end of a permanent or temporary and of an arrangement, but major duties on the job do change; this represents over 5 percent of the arrangements that continue. If such changes were counted as job exits, the percentage of Wave 1 Main Jobs ended by the start of the Wave 2 reference period would be 56 percent higher. And, as discussed above, counting temporary exits from arrangements in the LFR data within Wave 1 employer arrangement periods would likely increase the overall total as well.

Finally, when making the above comparisons, note that aggregation of data for males and females masks some major gender differences in exit frequencies. As shown in the last two columns of Tables 3 and 4, relatively more females exit Main Jobs in each category by the start of the Wave 2 reference period. Moreover, while the percentage of male business arrangements that ends by the start of Wave 2 is less than half the percentage of male employer arrangements that ends, the percentage of female business arrangements that ends is actually slightly higher than the percentage of female employer arrangements. Thus, although the relative levels of the overall sample frequencies are qualitatively representative for males, they are not representative for females.

EXITS AND TENURE

The data summarized in Tables 3 and 4 are aggregated across jobs with different tenures. In particular, jobs that begin during the Wave 1 reference period are included. Tables 5 to 7 provide a summary of exit information by complete and incomplete Main Job tenures as of the last day of employment during the Wave 1 reference period. Not surprisingly, these suggest that the inclusion versus exclusion of jobs started in Wave 1 is important.

Focusing first on Table 5, we see that the average tenure in Wave 1 Main jobs (complete and incomplete combined) is about 7.5 years--but variation in the sample is substantial. In particular, one out of five jobs has a tenure of less than one year and one out of three jobs has a tenure of less than two years. The second column of Table 5 and Tables 6 and 7 together cast some light on this and other characteristics of the tenure distribution for the sample.

As shown in Table 6, while less than 8 percent all Main Jobs actually start during the Wave 1 reference period, exits from these jobs represent 35 percent of all exits by the start of the Wave 2 reference period. Conversely, over 40 percent of the Wave 1 starts fail to continue into the wave 2 reference period.

Insofar as exit frequencies conditioned on tenure are concerned, the last column of Table 5 gives Wave 2 4-month exit proportions for jobs that last until the start of Wave 2. Though aggregated, these suggest that the major hurdle is about 12 months. Exits decline sharply thereafter.

This 12-month hurdle is also apparent in Table 7, which gives tenure distributions by gender, type of arrangement, and exit status (i.e., complete versus incomplete job tenures). Focusing first on employer arrangements, arrangements that end are less than half the length of those that continue,

on average , and over half of-all exits are from jobs with tenures of one year or less. This pattern appears for both sales and females. Note, however, that gender differences in the upper ends of both the censored and completed tenure distributions are substantial. By any measure, the employer arrangements of sales in the sample last longer than those of females.

Turning to business arrangements, the, mall number of exits makes general statements impossible--but two aspects of the business tenure distributions are at least worth noting. First, male business arrangements appear to last longer than female business arrangements. Second, while male business arrangements appear to last for a year or more longer than male employer arrangements, on average, little difference in the average length of employer and business arrangements appears for females.[7]

Summing up, perhaps the most important message in the numbers in Tables 5 through 7 is the potential magnitude of bias hat can be introduced by a restriction of a SIPP sample to jobs in progress at the start of a Wave reference period (i.e., length-based sampling biases). However, these numbers can also be regarded as evidence of potentially important benefit associated with the frequency of SIPP interviews, as compared to annual interviews. To the extent that short jobs are more likely to appear in SIPP samples, such biases can be reduced.

REASONS FOR EMPLOYER ARRANGEMENT EXITS

Reasons for employer arrangement exits are available for exits within wave reference periods and Table 8 reports a summary of these data for Waves 1 and 2.

Focusing on part A of the table, the first thing to note is the frequency of temporary job endings. Almost one out of five exits in this sample is from a temporary job. Not surprising, this aggregate frequency is tied, in part, to the disproportionate representation of exits from jobs that start within the Wave 1 reference period. The frequency of temporary job endings among these exits is relatively high, as indicated in part B. As important, however, is the experience of females in the sample. The second and third columns of parts A and 8 suggest that females are more likely than males to take jobs with a definite and. Along with this, however, note that the proportion of male Wave 1 exits attributed to layoffs is almost twice the proportion of female exits-even when the sample in restricted to Wave 1 starts. Overall, these numbers suggest that respondents might regard their jobs as "main" jobs for the Wave 1 reference period, but this label should not be confused with "permanent" or "stable" jobs.

Additional comparisons among parts A, C, and D suggest the potential sensitivity of conclusions

[7]The number of business exits in this sample might lead one to believe that studying transitions in and out of self-employment with SIPP will be impossible. Note, however, that the number of business entries and exits observed will increase with the length of the sampling period. As noted in Section 2, sample sizes can also be increased by using data for the 1986 panel and subsequent Panels together. These comments also hold for sample of other minority groups in the population.

about reasons for job exits to sampling period restrictions. While the proportions of exits attributed to retirement and discharge exhibit little variation, others differ substantially. In particular, using data for Wave 1 exits alone, one might conclude that exits motivated primarily by the finding of a now job (and, therewith, on-the-job search) are rare. Shifting focus to the Wave 2 reference period, however, would alter such conclusions dramatically. For males, the proportion of exits attributed to the finding of new jobs more than triples from one Wave to the next; for females, it more than quadruples. On the other hand, the proportions of exits attributed to layoffs. for males and to temporary job endings for females both decrease substantially.

These contrasts between Waves likely reflect changes in the length of the sampling period and, thus, changes in the tenure composition or the groups at risk. They may also reflect seasonal change over the course of the calendar year, or more general changes in economic conditions during the 1985-1986 period. These and alternative explanations are worth investigating. In the meantime, the contrasts that appear here should be viewed as a warning. Conclusions about reasons for job exits are likely to be quite sensitive to sampling period restrictions.

Further complicating matters along this line, reasons for job exits at seams between Waves are not available--and such exits represent over one-third of all employer arrangement exits by the start of Wave 2. Given this representation, one might turn to the LFR data for the last week of the reference period to determine the circumstances surrounding these exits. As it turns out, the range of reasons for all but a few seas exits remains wide open after considering these LFR data for this sample. An shown in Table 9, the vast majority of workers with seam exits reportedly have a regular job or business during the last week of the Wave 1 reference period and only a small proportion of these workers reports an unpaid absence for the entire weak. Among those without jobs, less than 10 percent describe themselves as looking or on layoff. A second source of information on reasons for seam exits is activity directly allowing exits. The informational content of these data is discussed below.

ACTIVITY FOLLOWING EMPLOYER EXITS

Tables 10 and 11 report activity following employer Main Job exits within the Wave 1 reference period and at the seam between Waves 1 and 2, respectively. As these data cover activity only through the end of the Wave 2 reference period, they pertain to a relatively short period of time. Nevertheless, they do capture activity (and inactivity) directly following exits and, therewith, indicate some interesting and potentially important patterns.

Focusing first on part A of Table 10, we observe that 8 percent of all males who experience a within Wave exit either continues in an existing arrangement (i.e., one that overlaps in time with their Main Job) or enters a new employer arrangement as they leave their Main Job. These males therefore experience no time outside of an arrangement. Moreover, another 11 percent reports being in a new employer arrangement within one week of the Main Job exit. Thus, about one out of five males in this within Wave exit sample might be described as experiencing a direct job-to-job transition. In contrast, about one out of ten females experiences such a direct transition, and

short spells between arrangements of one to two weeks also appear to be more frequent for males than females. Only after the first two weeks following an exit do female new employer arrangement entry rates start to catch up with the entry rates for males in this sample.

Transitions into business arrangements are rare within the first few months following an exit for this within Wave exit sample--particularly among females. Nevertheless, among those that do appear in the sample, one aspect is worth noting--almost half of the business arrangements are in existence at the time of an employer exit.

Turning to Table 11, which summarizes comparable activity data for seam exits, one observes a very different picture from the picture in Table 10.

First, 28 percent of all males and (more striking) 26.1 percent of all females in the seam exit sample reportedly have existing or new arrangements as of the first day of Wave 2. Within a week, another 3 percent of the sample is in a new employer arrangement. Thus, almost one out of three persons in this sample experiences a direct job-to-job transition as defined above. On the other hand, entries into new employer arrangements after one week are slightly less frequent in this seam exit sample than in the within Wave exit sample.

Turning to business arrangement activity, comparable contrasts appear between the two samples. While the percentage of females in the seam exit sample with continuing and now business arrangements is low, it is 50 percent higher than that observed for within Wave exit females. Among males, almost one out of five in the seam exit sample is engaged in a business arrangement by the end of the Wave 2 reference period--and more than two-thirds of these arrangements are new.

Beyond activity in new or at least different arrangements following employer exits, returns to main Job arrangements are ' also observed. Data on such returns by the start of Wave 3 are summarized in Table 12.

While seem exits appear to be permanent, within Wave exits do not. About one out of four persons in the within Wave sample returns to his or bar Wave 1 Main Job employer arrangement by the start of Wave 3. Perhaps most interesting about these returns is the fact that just over half of the returns by males and one-fourth of the returns by females follow layoffs. Many of the remaining returns by females represent returns to former temporary jobs, which seems reasonable. Among the remaining returns, however, there are some that follow exits for new jobs and these are less easily understood. Also worth noting are observations on activity preceding the returns to the Main Jobs. One out of four workers in the within wave exit return sample holds one or more jobs before returning, as does one out of five of the seam exit workers who return. Finally, note that one out of twenty females and almost one out of ten males who returns by the end of Wave 2 reportedly has a change in major duties upon return to his or her former employer arrangement.

Overall, there is a negligible difference between the "regular" job activity levels of the within Wave exit and seam exit samples by the end of Wave 2--for the sample as a whole, and for males and females separately. However, there are clearly some important differences in the timing and nature of activities following exits between those who exit within the reference period and those who exit at the seam. These differences, in turn, say be tied to reasons for arrangement exits--and thus they may explain part of the large contrast in reported reasons for within reference period exits between waves 1 and 2. Unfortunately, this question cannot be examined directly. However, one implication of the contrast between Tables 10 and 11 is clear. Excluding either group from an analysis of turnover is likely to have a major effect on results and conclusions.

Along this line, the numbers that appear in the bottom rows of part A in Tables 10 and 11 are also worth noting. About one out of twenty persons reportedly engages in some form of irregular work within one month after a Main Job exit. Since interpretation of this activity is not entirely clear, one might be tempted to ignore it. However, although the average monthly amounts earned in such work are about $100 for females and $200 for males, incomes as high an $5000 do appear. Thus, ignoring the existence of this irregular work activity does not seen particularly wise.

ACTIVITY FOLLOWING BUSINESS EXITS

Given the small number of business exits by the start of Wave 2, a limited amount can be said about subsequent activity, but some differences between activities following business and employer exits are worth mention. First, relatively more of these exits are exits out of the labor force--particularly for females. Second, entry into a new business, after a gap, appears to be frequent--particularly for males. Third, relatively few of these workers have another arrangement when they exit, and the few that do are all males.

JOB AND WORKER CHARACTERISTICS

Aside from gender and type of arrangement, the data described above are aggregated over many worker and job characteristics that can be measured in SIPP. Tables 14 to 19 provide summary statistics for just some of these characteristics . Although these numbers do not allow marginal importance in exit decisions to be determined, they cast some light on patterns observed in the statistics reported above and provide additional evidence on the importance of measurement decisions.

Focusing first on Table 14, perhaps most interesting are the many differences. in personal characteristics between males and females who exit employer arrangements, given the many similarities that appear between males and females who do not. Males who exit are older, less educated, less likely to have been married, and more likely to have a work-limiting disability, on average, than females in the sample who exit. Among workers who stay, the primary gender difference appears in marital status--relatively more males are married with spouse present.

Turning to the job characteristics of employer arrangements in Table 15, one observes a very different picture. Exits from public sector and managerial and professional specialty jobs tend to be relatively rare for both-males and females, but differences in other job characteristics between males and females tend to dominate differences between those who exit versus stay. Among the most interesting of such gender differences is the relatively higher frequency of exits from union jobs by sales, as compared to females. This difference is likely related to gender differences that appear in the occupational and industrial distributions, and both cast some light on the gender differences in reasons for job exits discussed above. In particular, males are relatively more concentrated in construction and manufacturing and related occupations, while females are relatively more concentrated in trade and services and technical and administrative support occupations. Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the job characteristics of those who exit are the relatively large proportions of females in trade and males in construction.

As for earnings, the differences observed in Table 16 are consistent with most theoretical predictions. On average, workers who exit employer arrangements earn less than those who stay. Perhaps more interesting in this table are the data on full-time work. Full-time workers represent a smaller proportion of those who exit--and the difference is particularly large for females in this sample.

Tables 17 through 19 present comparable data for Wave 1 business arrangements. Focusing first on worker characteristics, several gender differences are more pronounced in these data than in the data for workers in employer arrangements. Males who continue in their business arrangements are older, more educated, and more likely to have been married, on average, than females who continue in business. Comparing Tables 14 and 17, one observes that these gender differences between males and females in business arrangements reflect both differences between males in employer versus business arrangements and differences between females in employer versus business arrangements. As above, the small sample of business exits limits comparisons between those who exit versus stay, but certain aspects of the data are again worth noting. Both males and females who exit are relatively young and relatively few are white. In terms of educational attainment and marital status, however, non-negligible differences appear for males, but not females. on average, the females who exit have education and marital status characteristics that are quite similar co their counterparts who continue in their business arrangements.

Turning to job characteristics in Table 18, we observe large proportions of both males and females in managerial and professional specialty and technical and administrative support occupations, a large proportion of males in craft occupations, and a large proportion of females in service occupations (personal services, in particular). Shifting to the industrial distributions of business arrangements, these occupational patterns translate into large proportions of both males in wholesale and retail trade combined and females in retail trade alone, a large proportion of females in personal services, and a large proportion of males in construction. Consistent with these occupation and industry characteristics are the relatively larger proportions of males in incorporated businesses and males receiving regular salaries. Turning to the job characteristics of those who exit, we observe that turnover for self-employed males in construction and related

occupations are relatively high, Just as we observe for male employees. Among females, there are also some similarities between the self-employed and employees. More striking, however, are the contrasts in relative turnover rates for females in retail trade and technical and administrative support occupations.

Insofar as measurement issues are concerned, perhaps most interesting in Table 18 are the data on "expected" gross earnings. Overall, about one out of twenty persons with a business arrangement expects to earn less than $1000 as of the Wave 1 interview. However, among sales who remain in business after the start of Wave 2, only 2 percent expect such low earnings--and over three-fourths of these sales have improved expectations by the Wave 2 interview. Among females, the proportion expecting low earnings among those who continue in business is relatively high at the first interview, but half of these females also have improved expectations by the Wave 2 interview. Although the proportions are smaller, a few business owners also have changes in the reverse directions.

These changes in expected gross earnings might be interpreted in several ways, but one implication seems clear. The expected gross earnings data do not serve simply to identify long-tom casual businesses, as one night reasonably assume. They also identify business starts and signal business downturns and, to some extent, business endings--although the data for those who exit suggest that this last-role is performed imperfectly.

Less than half of all females who leave their businesses by the start of Wave 2 reportedly expect their earnings to be less than $1000 (which seems like the appropriate response). More drastic, fewer than one out of six males who exit expect such low earnings. These exits among the reportedly more optimistic might be attributed to several factors. For example, some businesses are seasonal. In these cases, exits may be temporary and expectations may be valid. Alternatively, the optimistic expectations recorded in an interview may be those of a proxy respondent as opposed to an actual business owner. These and other explanations can be investigated using additional data. In the meantime, the inconsistencies in the expectations data for both those who continue in business and those who exit should serve as a warning. They suggest the potential volatility of expectations on the part of business owners and, thus, the importance of following business owners closely over extended periods of time--an approach that the structure of SIPP allows.

Finally, Table 19 presents a summary of earnings and hours data for workers in business arrangements. The earnings pattern that appears here is qualitatively similar to the pattern in Table 17, but quantitative differences between these tables are non-negligible. On average, the males in business arrangements in this sample work more hours and have higher earnings than their counterparts in employer arrangements. Among females, however, this pattern is reversed. Relatively few females in business arrangements work full-tine hours--and this difference is reflected in weekly earnings. In particular, although hourly earnings for females in continuing business and employer arrangements are similar, females in business arrangements ea--n less on a weekly basis, on average, than their counterparts in employer arrangements.

HEALTHCARE COVERAGE AND MAIN JOB EXITS

As suggested by the summaries in section 2, data on nonwage job characteristics available in the SIPP files are limited. However, one characteristic that can be observed in fair detail and at a monthly level is healthcare coverage. These data for the last month of employment in the Main Job during the Wave 1 reference period are summarized in Table 20.

The most interesting contrasts here are those between workers in employer versus business arrangements--overall, and for males and females separately. First, a smaller proportion of workers in business arrangements has coverage of any sort (i.e., government or private, through employment or otherwise). Second, relatively more workers in business arrangements have coverage under a policy in someone else's name. This second contrast is particularly strong for females, but it is also non-negligible for males who continue in business. The flip-side of this pattern is the pattern-for family health plans; relatively few -workers in business arrangements cover others under their policies. Of course, these coverage patterns have implications for potential losses of coverage with job exits. In this sample, one out of seven employer arrangement exits translates into a loss of private healthcare coverage in the month following an exit--versus one out twenty business arrangement exits.[8]

4. CONCLUSION

The objective here has not been a statement of the final word on the subject of job exits and job-to-job transitions--in general, or even based on data from SIPP. Instead, the objective has been to present a description and summary of what can be measured using data from SIPP and, therewith, to present evidence on the sensitivity of findings to definition and measurement decisions required when using these data.

At this point, it should be clear that using data from SIPP to study labor market turnover is less than straightforward. Different questions that pertain to the same or very closely related events and activities can generate responses that translate into very different pictures of a single respondent's circumstances. This holds when using data for a single Wave reference period, as well as when working with data for multiple waves. Given this situation, a researcher must be quite specific when defining what he or she would like to measure, and then make sure that all relevant data are used. Unfortunately, even with all of the information available in SIPP, details relevant to many research questions are likely to be missing--particularly as one moves from one Wave to the next. This means that measurement decisions will be necessary. As suggested by the first-round findings presented above, the consequences of such decisions for very basic conclusions can be major. Sensitivity checks on such decisions are therefore crucial--and when

[8]Loss with Exit is defined as the number of persons who have private coverage in the month of an exit and no private coverage in the next divided by the total number of exits. Note that data for the first month of the Wave 2 reference period have been used to determine such losses for all jobs ended in the last month of the Wave 1 reference period and jobs ended at the seam between Waves.

final decisions are made, they should be stated clearly.

Notwithstanding all of the above, the data from the Microdata files for the 1986 Panel of SIPP do seem to offer great potential for the study of job exits and job-to-job transitions. People's lives can be very complicated--and the wealth of information available in these files allows one to measure a great deal of this complexity.

REFERENCES

Devine, Theresa J., and Nicholas M. Kiefer (1991), Empirical Labor Economics: The Search Approach, Oxford University Press.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1988), Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP), Informational Booklet.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1989), SIPP 5010 Interviewer Manual.

U.S. Bureau of the Census (1989), Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPPI 1986 Panel, Rectangular Microdata File Technical Documentation.

TABLE 1. SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS SUMMARY

	Mean (Standard Deviation)	Proportion
Female		0.46
White		0.90
Black		0.07
Spanish origin		0.06
Married with spouse Present		0.68
Never Married		0.18
Part-Time Student		0.06
Veteran		0.19
Work Disabled		0.05
Age		
	38.66 (11.72)	
18-24		0.11
25-34		0.31
35-44		0.27
45-54		0.18
55-64		0.13
Years of Education		
	12.99 (2.82)	
Less than 11		0.16
12		0.41
13-15		0.20
16		0.12
17+		0.11
Unemployment Rate		
State Mean in 1986	-6.96	
85-86 Percent Change	-3.05	
Number of Observations:	9936	

*All characteristics are measured on the last day of the Wave 1 Main Job within the Wave 1 reference period.

TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF WAVE 1 EMPLOYER AND BUSINESS ARRANGEMENTS

A. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR ALL EMPLOYER AND BUSINESS ARRANGEMENTS

	No Business Arrangements	No Business Arrangements	No Business Arrangements
One Employer Arrangement:			
Entire Wave	7356	224	9
Enter/No Exit	253	27	0
Exit	343	27	0
Two Employer Arrangements:			
Both Entire wave	268	15	0
Exit one/Enter Other	217	6	0
One Entire Wave/Enter Other	52	1	0
One Entire Wave/Exit Other	59	0	0
Enter Both/Exit Neither	2	0	0
Two Exits	34	0	0
Three Employer Arrangements:			
Two Entire Wave	16	1	0
Exit One/Enter Other	16	0	0
One Entire Wave/Enter Second	9	0	0
One Entire Wave/Exit second	8	0	0
Enter Two/Exit Neither	1	0	0
Two Exits	8	1	0

TABLE 2. SUMMARY OF WAVE 1 EMPLOYER AND BUSINESS ARRANGEMENTS (Continued)

A. FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION FOR ALL EMPLOYER AND BUSINESS ARRANGEMENTS

	No Business Arrangements	No Business Arrangements	No Business Arrangements
No Employers:	0	923	60

B. WAVE 1 EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND EXITS

	Number of Observations	Sample Proportion
At Least One Employer Arrangement	8953	0.90
At Least One Business Arrangement	1294	0.13
At Least One EE Arrangement Exit during Wave 1 Reference Period	719	0.07
At Least one LAR weekly Status Job-to-No-Job Transition	546	0.06
Total Number of Observations	9936	

TABLE 3. WAVE 1 MAIN JOB EXITS

MAIN EMPLOYER ARRANGEMENT EXITS	Percentage of Sample	Males	Females
A. Within Wave 1 Exit Stopped Working for Employer Before Last Day in Reference Period	4.9	4.4	5.5
B. Exit at Seam Between Waves 1 and 2 Employer ID has No Match in Next Wave or Matching ID is Not Recorded Previously	2.9	2.5	3.4
MAIN BUSINESS ARRANGEMENT EXITS			
C. Within Wave 1 Exit Based on LAR Data for those with No Employers Job or Business in one Week (1+ Days) ⇒No Job or Business in Next Week During Wave 1 Reference Period	0.2	0.1	0.2
D. Exit at Seam Between Waves 1 and 2 Business ID has No Match in Next Wave or Matching ID is Not Recorded Previously	0.5	0.4	0.5
TOTAL MAIN EMPLOYER AND BUSINESS ARRANGEMENT EXITS BY THE START OF WAVE 2			
E. Main Employer and Business Arrangement Exits Within Wave 1 and at Seam Between Waves 1 and 2	8.4	7.4	9.6
MAIN JOB OCCUPATION CHANGE			
F. Change in Occupation Between Waves 1 and 2 in Continued Arrangement	4.7	4.5	4.9
Numbers of observations	9936	5373	4563

TABLE 4. WAVE 1 MAIN JOB EXITS BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT

		Sample	Males	Females
A.	EMPLOYER ARRANGEMENTS			
	Percent with Exit by Start of Wave 2	8.7	7.9	9.6
	Percent with Exit within Wave 2 or at Sean between Waves 2 and 3	8.9	8.0	9.9
	Number of Observations	8905	4680	4225
	Column Percentage	89.6	87.1	92.6
B.	BUSINESS ARRANGEMENTS			
	Percent with Exit by Start of Wave 2	5.8	3.6	10.4
	Percent with Exit within Wave 2 or at Seam between Waves 2 and 3	8.8	6.8	13.0
	Number of Observations	1031	693	338
	Column Percentage	10.4	12.9	7.4

TABLE 5. WAVE 1 MAIN JOB TENURES

Tenure in Months*

Mean	89.39
Standard Deviation	(99.27)

		Proportion	Proportion that Exits By Wave 2	Proportion of Continuing Main Jobs that Ends by Wave 3
1	Month Tenure or less	0.018	0.438	0.276
1	<Tenure ≤ 4 Months	0.058	0.392	0.267
4	<Tenure ≤ 8 Months	0.071	0.245	0.218
8	<Tenure ≤ 12 Months	0.060	0.122	0.173
12	<Tenure ≤ 24 Months	0.127	0.084	0.131
24	<Tenure ≤ 36 Months	0.084	0.060	0.102
36	<Tenure ≤ 48 Months	0.061	0.050	0.082
48	<Tenure ≤ 60 Months	0.052	0.046	0.089
60	<Tenure ≤ 120 Months	0.201	0.035	0.053
120	<Tenure ≤ 240 Months	0.179	0.029	0.043
240	<Tenure ≤ 360 Months	0.058	0.022	0.037
More than 360 Months Tenure		0.030	0.024	0.076
All Observations			0.084	0.097

Number of Observations: 9936

* Tenure is measured on the last day in an arrangement during the Wave 1 Reference Period in this table and those that follow. Note that Exits by wave 2 include exits during the Wave.1 reference period and exits at the seam between Waves 1 and 2, and Exits by Wave 3 include exits during the Wave 2 reference period and exits at the seam between Waves 2 and 3. Also, note that last column reports proportions of jobs in existence at the start of Wave 2.

TABLE 6. EXITS FROM JOBS STARTED IN THZ WAVE I REFERENCE PERIOD

A. EXITS BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT

	Total	Employer	Business
Exits within wave 1	31.7	33.5	7.9
Exits at Seam between Waves 1 and 2	7.6	7.5	7.8
Exits within Wave 2 and at Sean between Waves 2 and 3	16.3	15.9	21.6
Number of Observations	754	703	51
Percentage of Group	7.6	7.9	4.9

B. EXITS BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT AND GENDER

	Employer Main Job		Business Main Job	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
Exits within Wave 1	36.8	30.8	0	14.8
Exits at Sean between Waves 1 and 2	4.8	9.7	4.2	11.1
Exits within Wave 2 and at Seam between Waves 2 and 3	16.1	15.8	20.8	22.2
Number of Observations	310	393	24	27
Percentage of Group	6.6	9.3	3.5	8.0

TABLE 7. TENURE ON WAVE 1 MAIN JOBS: BY TYPE OF ARRANGEMENT AND GENDER

A. MALES	Employer Main Job		Business Main Job	
	No Exit	Exits	No Exit	Exits
Mean Tenure in Months*	108.02	42.38	120.77	66.66
Standard Deviation	(108.93)	(83.89)	(114.98)	(55.33)
Proportion with:				
1 Month Tenure or less	0.010	0.065	0.007	0.000
1 < Tenure ≤ 4 Months	0.032	0.284	0.027	0.040
4 < Tenure ≤ 8 Months	0.056	0.135	0.024	0.040
8 < Tenure ≤ 12 Months	0.049	0.097	0.051	0.040
12 < Tenure ≤ 24 Months	0.118	0.124	0.085	0.160
24 < Tenure ≤ 36 Months	0.086	0.054	0.075	0.160
36 < Tenure ≤ 48 Months	0.056	0.035	0.073	0.060
48 < Tenure ≤ 60 Months	0.052	0.024	0.054	0.120
60 < Tenure ≤ 120 Months	0.202	0.078	0.241	0.200
120 < Tenure ≤ 240 Months	0.211	0.054	0.210	0.240
240 < Tenure ≤ 360 Months	0.083	0.030	0.082	0.000
More than 360 Months Tenure	0.043	0.019	0.070	0.000

B. FEMALES	Employer Main Job		Business Main Job	
	No Exit	Exits	No Exit	Exits
Mean Tenure in Months	76.06	24.58	72.96	58.67
Standard Deviation	(83.21)	(43.11)	(89.48)	(76.07)
Proportion with:				
1 Month Tenure or less	0.014	0.118	0.020	0.086
1 < Tenure < 4 Months	0.048	0.273	0.046	0.114
4 < Tenure < 8 Months	0.082	0.140	0.076	0.086
8 < Tenure < 12 Months	0.065	0.091	0.083	0.057
12 < Tenure < 24 Months	0.142	0.128	0.149	0.114
24 < Tenure < 36 Months	0.088	0.054	0.106	0.114
36 < Tenure < 48 Months	0.070	0.037	0.059	0.057
48 < Tenure < 60 Months	0.057	0.027	0.056	0.029
60 < Tenure < 120 Months	0.217	0.079	0.231	0.143
120 < Tenure < 240 Months	0.169	0.049	0.109	0.171
240 < Tenure < 360 Months	0.036	0.002	0.050	0.029
More than 360 Months Tenure	0.013	0.000	0.017	0.000

* Tenure is calculated as of the last day in an arrangement during the Wave 1 Reference Period. Exits include exits within the Wave 1 reference period and at the seam between Waves 1 and 2.

TABLE 8. REPORTED REASONS FOR EMPLOYER WAVE 1 MAIN JOB EXITS

A. WITHIN WAVE 1 EXITS

	TOTAL	MALES	FEMALES
Percentage:			
Discharged	6.4	8.9	4.0
Retired	4.1	6.3	2.0
Quit: New Job	7.8	11.0	4.8
Quit: Other	33.7	21.1	45.8
Temporary job ended	17.1	12.2	21.7
Layoff	30.9	40.5	21.7
Number of observations	486	237	249

B. WAVE I EXITS FROM JOBS WITH TENURE LESS THAN 4 MONTHS (WAVE 1 STARTS)

	TOTAL	MALES	FEMALES
Percentage:			
Discharged	5.1	7.0	3.3
Retired	3.0	4.4	1.7
Quit: New job	6.8	11.4	2.5
Quit: Other	34.5	23.7	44.6
Temporary job ended	20.4	15.8	24.8
Layoff	30.2	37.7	23.1
Number of observations	235	114	121

C. WITHIN WAVE 2 EXITS

	TOTAL	MALES	FEMALES
Percentage:			
Discharged	5.6	6.8	4.5
Retired	4.5	7.2	2.1
Quit: Now Job	27.7	33.7	22.6
Quit: Other	31.1	20.5	40.3
Temporary job ended	6.8	4.4	12.5
Layoff	22.3	27.3	18.1
Number of observations	537	249	288

D. ALL EXITS WITHIN WAVE 1 AND WITHIN WAVE 2 REFERENCE PERIODS

	TOTAL	MALES	FEMALES
Percentage:			
Discharged	6.0	7.8	4.3
Retired	4.3	6.8	2.0
Quit: New Job	18.3	22.6	14.3
Quit: other	32.4	20.8	42.8
Temporary job ended	12.7	8.2	16.8
Layoff	26.4	33.7	19.7
Number of observations	1023	486	537

TABLE 9. ACTIVITY IN LAST WEEK OF WAVE 1 REFERENCE PERIOD: SEAN EXITS

	Percentage of		
	Total	Males	Females
No Job or Business	3.4	3.0	3.8
Absent Without Pay	6.9	7.5	6.4
No Job or Business and Looking or Layoff	0.3	0.8	0.0

TABLE 10. ACTIVITY FOLLOWING EMPLOYER EXIT: WITHIN WAVE 1 EXITS

		Percentage of		
		Total	Males	Females
A.	JOB ACTIVITY			
1.	Existing Jobs:			
	Continue in Second Employer Arrangement Held at Exit Date	3.3	3.4	3.2
	Continue at Business in Existence at the End of Wave 1 (into Wave 2)	1.6	2.1	1.2
2.	Now Jobs by the End of the Wave 2 Reference Period:			
	New Employer Arrangements	35.7	41.7	29.7
	Immediately Following	1.9	2.5	1.2
	2-8 Days after Exit	7.6	11.0	4.4
	9-15 Days after Exit	2.1	2.5	1.6
	16-22 Days after Exit	2.5	2.1	2.8
	23-29 Days after Exit	2.3	2.1	2.4
	30 or More Days after Exit	19.3	21.5	17.3
	New Business Arrangements	2.1	3.0	1.2
	Both Now Employer and Business Arrangements	0.2	0.4	0.0
3.	No Regular Arrangement by the End of Wave 2	38.1	30.4.	45.4
4.	Irregular Work in Month following Exit	6.0	7.2	4.8
B.	UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE			
	Receipt within 1 month of Exit Within Wave 1	16.3	23.6	9.2
	Number of observations	486	237	249

TABLE 11. ACTIVITY FOLLOWING EMPLOYER EXITS: WAVE 1 TO 2 SEAM EXITS

		Percentage of		
		Total	Males	Females
A.	JOB ACTIVITY			
1.	Existing Jobs:			
	Continue in Second Employer Arrangement Hold at Exit Date	5.5	3.8	7.0
	Continue at Business in Existence at the End of Wave 1 (into Wave 2)	2.8	5.3	0. 6
2.	Nov Jobs by the End of the Wave 2 Reference Period:			
	Nev Employer Arrangements	41.5	43.7	39.5
	Immediately Following	18.6	18.8	18.5
	Starts in 2 to 8 Days	2.8	3.0	2.5
	Starts in 9 to 15 Days	1.4	1.5	1.3
	Starts in 16 to 22 Days	2.8	2.3	3.2
	Starts in 23 to 29 Days	0.7	0.8	0.6
	Starts after 30 Days	15.2	17.3	13.4
	New Business Arrangements	7.9	13.5	3.2
	Both New Employer and Business Arrangements	0.7	1.5	0.0
3.	No Regular Arrangement by the End of Wave 2	38.6	31.6	44.6
4.	Irregular Work during Month following Exit	3.8	3.8	3.8
B.	LAR UNEMPLOYMENT AND NONPARTICIPATION FOR MONTH 1 OF WAVE 2			
1.	Some Weeks during Month Looking or On Layoff	26.2	31.6	21.7
2.	Month Out of Labor Force	26.9	16.5	35.7
Number of observations		290	133	157

TABLE 12. RETURNS TO WAVE 1 EMPLOYER MAIN JOBS

	Percentage of		
	Total	Males	Females
A. WITHIN WAVE 1 EXITS			
Timing of Return:			
During Wave 2 Reference Period	90.8	92.6	89.2
Between Waves 2 and 3 or During Wave 3	9.2	7.4	10.8
Reason for Exit Reported as:			
Layoff	37.8	53.7	24.6
Temporary Job Ending	24.4	9.3	35.4
Other Employer or Business Arrangement Hold Before Return	24.4	18.5	29.2
Change in Main Duties on Return (Percentage of Wave 2 Returns)	6.5	8.0	5.2
Number of Observations	119	54	65
Percentage of All Within Wave 1 Exits	24.5	22.8	26.1
B. SEAM EXITS RETURNING IN WAVE 3			
Other Employer or Business Arrangement Held Before Return	20.0	37.5	0.0
Number of observations	15	8	7
Percentage of All Wave 1 to 2 Seam Exits	5.2	6.0	4.5

TABLE 13. ACTIVITY FOLLOWING WAVE 1 BUSINESS EXITS

JOB ACTIVITY	Percentage of Total	Males	Females
1. Existing Jobs:			
Continue in Second Employer Arrangement Held at Exit Date	1.7	4.0	0.0
2. Nov Jobs by the End of the Wave 2 Reference Period:			
New Employer Arrangements	23.3	28.9	20.0
30 or More Days after Exit	8.3	4.0	11.4
Nev Business Arrangements	31.7	44.0	22.9
Both New Employer and Business Arrangements	0.0	0.0	0.0
3. No Regular Arrangement by the End of Wave 2	43.3	24.0	57.1
Number of observations	60	25	35

TABLE 14. WORKER CHARACTERISTICS: EMPLOYER WAVE 1 MAIN JOBS

	MALE		FEMALE	
	No Exit	Exit	No Exit	Exit
White	0.91	0.90	0.88	0.86
Black	0.07	0.07	0.09	0.11
Spanish Origin	0.06	0.10	0.06	0.08
Married with Spouse Present	0.72	0.59	0.62	0.62
Never Married	0.19	0.29	0.18	0.20
Part-Time Student	0.06	0.04	0.08	0.07
Veteran	0.35	0.29	0.01	0.01
Work Disabled	0.05	0.13	0.04	0.09
Age				
Mean	38.63	16.13	38.35	33.88
Standard Deviation	(11.51)	(13.32)	(11.65)	(11.44)
Proportion:				
18-24	0.10	0.23	0.12	0.26
25-34	0.31	0.34	0.31	0.35
35-44	0.28	0.14	0.28	0.20
45-54	0.18	0.16	0.17	0.11
55-64	0.12	0.14	0.13	0.07
Years of Education				
Mean	13.04	12.00	13.03	12.44
Standard Deviation	(2.95)	(2.99)	(2.61)	(2.65)
Proportion with:				
Less than 11	0.16	0.31	0.13	0.21
12	0.38	0.41	0.44	0.45
13-15	0.20	0.13	0.22	0.18
16	0.12	0.08	0.12	0.09
17+	0.13	0.07	0.10	0.07
Unemployment Rate				
State Mean in 1986	6.95	7.25	6.95	7.03
85-86 Percent Change	-3.47	-2.14	-2.90	-2.09
Number of Observations:	4310	370	3819	406

* Exit by start of Wave 2. Note that characteristics are measured on the last day of the Wave 1 Main Job arrangement within the Wave 1 reference period.

TABLE 15. JOB CHARACTERISTICS: WAVE 1 EMPLOYER MAIN JOBS

	MALES			FEMALES	
	Sample	No Exit	Wave 1 Exit	No Exit	Wave 1 Exit
Private Sector	0.820	0.832	0.951	0.786	0.894
Public Sector	0.178	0.167	0.049	0.211	0.106
Unpaid Family Business	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.002	0.000
Union Membership	0.196	0.259	0.186	0.140	0.069
Union Coverage	0.223	0.287	0.195	0.168	0.089
OCCUPATION:					
Managerial and Professional	0.259	0.272	0.127	0.269	0.153
Technical and Admin Support	0.315	0.196	0.165	0.451	0.438
Services					
Non-Personal	0.108	0.075	0.089	0.137	0.195
Personal	0.012	0.003	0.003	0.021	0.020
Crafts	0.123	0.210	0.268	0.021	0.022
Operators, Fabric, Labor	0.162	0.211	0.297	0.094	0.158
Agriculture, Farm, Fish	0.021	0.032	0.051	0.007	0.015
INDUSTRY:					
Agriculture, Farm, Fish	0.021	0.030	0.054	0.008	0.015
Wholesale Trade	0.043	0.057	0.032	0.027	0.057
Retail Trade	0.142	0.109	0.146	0.166	0.261
Services					
Business	0.049	0.052	0.070	0.041	0.081
Professional	0.224	0.116	0.070	0.365	0.197
Personal	0.032	0.014	0.019	0.047	0.091
Finance, Real Estate	0.065	0.043	0.035	0.093	0.064
Entertainment	0.008	0.009	0.024	0.006	0.007
Construction	0.053	0.081	0.205	0.010	0.022
Manufacturing	0.229	0.305	0.208	0.153	0.163
Mining	0.010	0.014	0.038	0.003	0.000
Transportation, Common, Util	0.073	0.107	0.078	0.040	0.020
Public Admin	0.049	0.062	0.019	0.040	0.022
Number of Observations:	8905	4310	370	3819	406

TABLE 16. HOURS AND EARNINGS: WAVE 1 EMPLOYER MAIN JOBS

	Variable	Observations	Mean	Standard Deviation	
A. MALES					
No Exit	Hours	4299	43.26	9.28	
	Full-Time	4299	0.95	0.22	
	Weekly Pay	4289	475.53		305.31
	Hourly Earnings	4287	11.00	6.88	
	Hourly Wage	2271	9.61	4.69	
Exit	Hours	368	42.48	13.46	
	Full-Time	368	0.85	0.35	
	Weekly Pay	362	359.80		339.26
	Hourly Earnings	362	8.48	7.42	
	Hourly Wage	238	8.26	4.99	
B. FEMALES					
No Exit	Hours	3805	36.60	10.11	
	Full-Time	3805	0.77	0.42	
	Weekly Pay	3791	273.47		190.24
	Hourly Earnings	3788	7.42	5.74	
	Hourly Wage	2197	6.51	3.26	
Exit	Hours	405	32.18	12.72	
	Full-Time	405	0.58	0.49	
	Weekly Pay	402	177.11		145.31
	Hourly Earnings	402	5.44	4.31	
	Hourly Wage	306	5.10	2.51	

* Note that imputed values and reported hours equal to zero have not been included in the calculations reported here. Also, Hours are usual weekly hours in the Main Job arrangement, Full-Time is the proportion reporting usual hours greater than or equal to 35, and wages and earnings are for the last month of the arrangement during the Wave 1 reference period.

TABLE 17. WORKER CHARACTERISTICS: WAVE I BUSINESS MAIN JOBS

	MALE		FEMALE	
	No Exit	Exit*	No Exit	Exit*
White	0.96	0.92	0.97	0.89
Black	0.01	0.04	0.01	0.09
Spanish Origin	0.04	0.08	0.03	0.11
Married with Spouse Present	0.81	0.76	0.75	0.77
Never Married	0.10	0.16	0.05	0.06
Part-Time Student	0.03	0.00	0.05	0.06
Veteran	0.38	0.32	0.01	0.00
Work Disabled	0.07	0.28	0.06	0.14
Age				
Mean	43.46	40.60	41.83	39.00
Standard Deviation	(11.09)	(9.73)	(11.03)	(12.12)
Proportion:				
18-24	0.03	0.00	0.04	0.14
25-34	0.23	0.32	0.25	0.29
35-44	0.29	0.24	0.34	0.23
45-54	0.24	0.40	0.20	0.17
55-64	0.22	0.04	0.18	0.17
Years of Education				
Mean	13.46	11.60	12.87	12.66
Standard Deviation	(3.01)	(2.89)	(2.52)	(2.73)
Proportion with:				
Less than 11	0.15	0.28	0.16	0.20
12	0.34	0.48	0.45	0.40
13-15	0.19	0.12	0.18	0.23
16	0.16	0.12	0.12	0.11
17+	0.16	0.00	0.09	0.06
Unemployment rate				
State Mean in 1986	6.93	7.22	6.95	7.00
85-86 Percent change	-2.58	1.20	-2.77	-1.33
Number of Observations:	668	25	303	35

* Exit by start of Wave 2. Note that characteristics are measured on the last day of the Wave 1 Main Job arrangement within the Wave 1 reference period

TABLE 18. JOB CHARACTERISTICS: WAVE 1 BUSINESS MAIN JOBS

		Males		Females	
	Sample	No Exit	Wave 1 Exit	No Exit	Wave 1 Exit
Family Business	0.170	0.157	0.160	0.208	0.143
Incorporated	0.200	0.249	0.240	0.112	0.057
Regular Salary	0.328	0.361	0.240	0.290	0.114
EXPECTED GROSS EARNINGS FOR NEXT YEAR:					
Less than $1000 at Wave 1 Interview	0.059	0.021	0.160	0.086	0.486
Less in Wave 1, and More in wave 2	0.025	0.016	NA	0.043	NA
OCCUPATION:					
Managerial and Professional	0.299	0.344	0.120	0.228	0.171
Technical and Admin Support	0.275	0.246	0.160	0.363	0.171
Services					
Non-Personal	0.055	0.021	0.040	0.119	0.171
Personal	0.076	0.012	0.000	0.191	0.343
Crafts	0.138	0.187	0.360	0.026	0.000
Operators, Fabric, Labor	0.057	0.069	0.120	0.026	0.057
Agriculture, Farm, Fish	0.100	0.121	0.200	0.046	0.086
INDUSTRY:					
Agriculture, Farm, Fish	0.102	0.123	0.160	0.053	0.086
Wholesale Trade	0.054	0.070	0.040	0.023	0.029
Retail Trade	0.196	0.168	0.160	0.264	0.171
Services					
Business	0.125	0.129	0.080	0.129	0.057
Professional	0.109	0.108	0.040	0.116	0.114
Personal	0.111	0.030	0.000	0.261	0.429
Finance, Real Estate	0.065	0.075	0.040	0.053	0.000
Entertainment	0.016	0.010	0.080	0.023	0.029
Construction	0.130	0.178	0.280	0.023	0.029
Manufacturing	0.048	0.052	0.000	0.043	0.029
Mining	0.005	0.007	0.000	0.000	0.000
Transportation, Common, Util	0.037	0.045	0.120	0.013	0.029
Public Admin	0.03	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000
Number of observations	1031	668	25	303	35

TABLE 19. HOURS AND EARNINGS: WAVE 1 BUSINESS MAIN JOBS

	Variable*	Observations	Mean	Standard Deviation	
A. MALES					
No Exit	Hours	665	49.32	17.19	
	Full-Time	665	0.88	0.32	
	Weekly Pay	486	575.40		511.96
	Hourly Earnings	486	13.56	20.66	
	Hourly Wage	na	na	na	
Exit	Hours	25	45.16	20.93	
	Full-Time	25	0.76	0.44	
	Weekly Pay	21	520.05		562.60
	Hourly Earnings	21	10.90	10.53	
	Hourly Wage	na	na	na	
B. FEMALES					
No Exit	Hours	303	35.52	19.19	
	Full-Time	303	0.56	0.50	
	Weekly Pay	215	225.10		293.09
	Hourly Earnings	215	7.61	11.99	
	Hourly Wage	na	na	na	
Exit	Hours	34	33.97	21.75	
	Full-Time	34	0.50	0.51	
	Weekly Pay	26	89.35	184.02	
	Hourly Earnings	26	2.48	3.43	
	Hourly Wage	na	na	na	

* Note that imputed values and reported hours equal to zero have not been included in the calculations reported here. Also,.Hours are usual weekly hours in the Main Job arrangement, Full-Time is the proportion reporting usual hours greater than or equal to 35, and earnings are averaged over the Wave 1 reference period.

TABLE 20. HEALTHCARE COVERAGE: WAVE 1 MAIN JOBS

	PROPORTION OF: EMPLOYER ARRANGEMENTS	BUSINESS ARRANGEMENTS
ALL WORKERS		
Any Health Coverage	0.880	0.803
Private: Other's Policy	0.150	0.309
Private: Own Name	0.720	0.488
Job Pays All or Part	0.676	0.200
Family Plan	0.438	0.326
Loss with Exit	0.140	0.050
MALES: NO EXIT		
Any Health Coverage	0.901	0.808
Private: Other's Policy	0.045	0.201
Private: own Name	0.853	0.608
Job Pays All or Part	0.807	0.257
Family Plan	0.604	0.452
MALES: EXIT		
Any Health Coverage	0.659	0.640
Private: other's Policy	0.105	0.120
Private: own Name	0.524	0.480
Job Pays All or Part	0.468	0.240
Family Plan	0.322	0.3210
Loss with Exit	0.141	0.040
FEMALES: NO EXIT		
Any Health Coverage	0.893	0.812
Private: Other's Policy	0.248	0.541
Private: Own Name	0.634	0.257
Job Pays All or Part	0.591	0.076
Family Plan	0.293	0.073
FEMALES: EXIT		
Any Health Coverage	0.732	0.743
Private: Other's Policy	0.379	0.514
Private: Own Name	0.303	0.200
Job Pays All or Part	0.278	0.143
Family Plan	0.153	0.114
Loss with Exit	0.140	0.057