

Disabled-Worker Beneficiaries Under OASDI: Comparison With Severely Disabled PA Recipients

by MICHAEL HOOKER and AARON KRUTE*

The 1972 Survey of Disabled and Nondisabled Adults found that more than 1 million severely disabled persons aged 20-64 were receiving payments under Federal State public assistance programs To determine the reasons why most of these individuals did not qualify for disabled-worker benefits under the social security program, their characteristics were compared with those of the approximately 15 million disabled-worker beneficiaries The public assistance recipients were found to be younger and less well educated than their disabled-worker beneficiary counterparts A greater proportion of them were women and more were members of minority races Public assistance recipients became disabled at an earlier age and had been disabled longer Compared with disabled-worker beneficiaries, they had held less skilled jobs, had earned less money, and had had a weaker attachment to the labor force These characteristics greatly reduced their chances of qualifying for disabled-worker benefits Lack of knowledge about the program was also an important contributing factor

ACCORDING TO the Social Security Administration Survey of Disabled and Nondisabled Adults, approximately 15.5 million persons in the civilian noninstitutionalized population aged 20-64 considered themselves to be disabled because of a chronic health condition or impairment in 1972. Included among this number were 7.7 million persons who were severely disabled. About 1.5 million persons—19 percent of the severely disabled—were receiving disabled-worker benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance (OASDI) program. In addition, slightly more than 1 million severely disabled persons were receiving payments under some form of public assistance as a result of their disability.¹

This article compares the characteristics of the latter two groups and explores the apparent rea-

sons why the public assistance (PA) recipients did not qualify for disabled-worker benefits under the OASDI program. The analysis reveals that disability significantly weakens the labor-force attachment of certain individuals—particularly women and members of minority races—and thus reduces their chances of qualifying for disabled-worker benefits.

FACTORS LIMITING COVERAGE FOR DISABILITY BENEFITS

To qualify for benefits under the social security program, disabled workers must be so severely impaired that they are unable to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a medically determinable physical or mental condition that has lasted or is expected to last at least 12 months, or to result in death. In addition, disabled workers must also satisfy a technical requirement. Those disabled after age 30 must have worked in covered employment for at least 5 of the 10 years immediately preceding the onset of disability. Progressively fewer years of coverage are required for younger workers, but the minimum is a year and a half.

Ostensibly, all of the 7.7 million severely disabled persons should have been able to qualify for disabled-worker benefits. In the 1972 survey, disability was defined as a limitation in the kind or amount of work resulting from a chronic health condition or impairment lasting 3 months or longer. The severely disabled were defined as those persons who were unable to work at all or unable to work regularly as a result of their medical condition or impairment. Women who had never worked or customarily were not employed but whose condition precluded them from keeping house were also classified as severely disabled.²

* Division of Disability Studies, Office of Research and Statistics

¹ About 150,000 persons who were receiving both disabled-worker benefits and public assistance payments are included in the count of disabled-worker beneficiaries but excluded from the count of public assistance recipients.

² For more details on the survey definition of disability, see the technical note at the end of this article.

The disparity between the number of the severely disabled and the number receiving disabled-worker benefits is striking in view of the protection offered under the OASDI program against the risk of income loss due to disability. A number of factors can be identified, without exhaustive examination of the data, as contributing to this difference.

Most important, perhaps, is the fact that the survey figures are based on self-assessed capacity for work as reported in a set of work-qualification questions. An individual's self-assessment may have little to do with the medical severity of his condition or impairment. Instead, self-perception may reflect age, education, skills, and temperament, the ability to adapt to some functional limitation by compensating for capacity losses or by developing new capabilities, and awareness of the response of society to impairments and its ability and willingness to provide employment for impaired individuals.³

In contrast, allowance of disability benefits under the OASDI program is based primarily on the medical severity of an individual's impairment and functional limitations. Medical evaluation criteria describing impairments in terms of symptoms, signs, and laboratory findings are used specifically for this purpose. Only secondary consideration is given—and that only in some cases—to such factors as age, education, training, and work experience.⁴

Other factors also contribute to the difference. Many disabled adults, particularly women, may not have enough covered employment to satisfy the technical requirement. In addition, many persons do not know about disabled-worker protection and thus do not apply for benefits. Responses to the 1972 survey indicated that only about half of all Americans aged 20-64 were aware of these disability benefits.

Persons Receiving Public Assistance Payments

In 1972, prior to the establishment of the supplemental security income (SSI) program,

³ See Constantina Safflios-Rothschild, *The Sociology and Social Psychology of Disability and Rehabilitation*, Random House, 1970 (particularly chapters 2 and 3).

⁴ See Social Security Administration, *Disability Evaluation Under Social Security: A Handbook for Physicians*, July 1970.

severely disabled persons could receive money payments under one or more State PA programs: Aid to the permanently and totally disabled (APTD), aid to the blind (AB), aid to families with dependent children (AFDC), and general assistance. The following tabulation shows the estimated number of severely disabled PA recipients in the summer of 1972 and the programs under which they were receiving payments.

Type of public assistance program	Total	Men	Women
Total number (in thousands) . . .	1 002	286	717
APTD-AB	435	135	300
AFDC	308	59	249
Other ¹	217	79	138
APTD-AB and AFDC	29	8	21
APTD-AB and "other"	8	3	5
AFDC and "other"	7	2	4
APTD-AB, AFDC, and "other"	0	0	0

¹ Primarily general assistance.

About half of the 1 million severely disabled PA recipients were receiving APTD payments, and slightly more than a third were receiving AFDC payments. Before they were replaced by the SSI program, APTD provided payments to persons with permanent physical or mental impairments that precluded them from holding a job or making a home, and AB supplied similar aid to needy persons who were totally blind or who had so little sight that they could not earn a living. Under AFDC, the assistance program still in operation, aid is provided when a father or mother is disabled, absent from home, or dead. Disability is defined under AFDC to include persons who had an impairment that would cause incapacity for work for at least 3 months. Incapacity is defined as the inability to do previous work or, for a nonworker or a marginal worker, any available work that can be done by virtue of age, education, and aptitudes.

Severely disabled PA recipients are a particularly interesting group to examine within the context of coverage for disability benefits under the OASDI program. Many such persons apparently were sufficiently disabled to meet that program's severity definition. Although the definitions of disability under the State programs varied from State to State, many of them, particularly those relating to APTD, were similar.

to the social security definition.⁵ Thus, the characteristics of these recipients and the reasons they did not qualify for disabled-worker benefits are important factors to consider whenever changes in the program's technical requirements are contemplated.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF SEVERELY DISABLED PA RECIPIENTS

Severely disabled PA recipients were more likely than disabled-worker beneficiaries to be women, younger, less well-educated, and members of minority races. The median age for disabled-worker beneficiaries was 57, compared with 48 for PA recipients (table 1). More than four times as many PA recipients as disabled-worker beneficiaries were under age 35. In contrast, two-and-a-half times more disabled-worker beneficiaries than PA recipients were aged 60-64. These patterns held true for both men and women.

The most striking differences between the two disabled groups are their composition by race and sex, which is highlighted in the following tabulation. Men accounted for a far greater

Race	Disabled-worker beneficiaries			Severely disabled PA recipients		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Total number (in thousands)	1,489	1,071	418	1,002	286	717
Total percent	100.0	71.9	28.1	100.0	28.5	71.5
White	85.4	60.4	25.0	61.7	20.6	41.1
Black and other	14.2	11.2	3.0	38.2	7.9	30.3
Not reported	.4	.3	.1	.1		.1

proportion of the disabled-worker beneficiaries (72 percent) than did women (28 percent); for PA recipients, the proportions were almost exactly reversed. As discussed later, these imbalances probably reflect the rather extensive work-history requirement under the OASDI program and the historic lag in women's labor-force participation. Only 14 percent of the disabled workers were nonwhite, compared with 38 percent of

⁵ See Social and Rehabilitation Service, *Characteristics of State Public Assistance Plans Under the Social Security Act* (Public Assistance Report No. 50), Assistance Payments Administration, 1974.

TABLE 1.—General characteristics of disabled-worker beneficiaries and severely disabled PA recipients aged 20-64: Percentage distribution, by sex, summer 1972

General characteristics	Disabled-worker beneficiaries			Severely disabled PA recipients ¹		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Total number (in thousands)	1,489	1,071	418	1,002	286	717
<i>Age</i>						
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under 22				.6	.4	.7
22-34	5.3	6.0	3.3	23.3	23.3	23.2
35-49	21.0	21.3	20.1	28.8	35.8	26.1
50-59	37.3	35.3	42.5	32.7	22.5	36.6
60-64	36.4	37.3	34.1	14.7	18.1	13.4
Median age	57	57	57	48	46	49
<i>Race</i>						
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White	85.4	84.0	88.8	61.6	72.2	57.4
Black and other	14.2	15.6	10.7	38.2	27.8	42.4
Not reported	.4	.4	.5	.1		.2
<i>Education</i>						
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Less than 8 years	29.0	33.5	17.9	42.9	54.2	38.4
8 years	17.4	15.5	22.4	14.2	13.3	14.5
Some high school	21.4	20.8	23.0	25.2	11.2	30.8
4 years of high school	23.2	21.7	26.9	11.8	10.9	12.2
College	8.4	8.1	9.4	4.9	9.1	3.2
Not reported	.4	.4	.4	1.0	1.3	.9
<i>Marital status</i>						
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Married	73.4	79.4	58.1	30.0	50.2	21.9
Widowed	7.8	2.6	21.0	14.6	8.3	17.2
Divorced or separated	11.1	11.0	11.4	27.6	10.9	34.3
Never married	7.6	6.8	9.3	27.5	30.5	26.3
Not reported	.2	.2		.3		.4
<i>Labor-force status</i>						
Total percent	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Not in labor force	89.4	86.8	96.0	83.5	79.4	85.1
In labor force	9.7	12.6	2.4	14.8	15.8	14.4
Employed	6.3	8.1	1.8	8.0	12.8	6.0
Unemployed	3.4	4.5	.6	6.8	3.0	8.4
Not reported	.9	.7	1.6	1.7	4.8	.5

¹ Represents nonbeneficiaries receiving PA payments.

those receiving public assistance. This difference can be traced primarily to the racial distribution of women on the PA rolls.

The educational attainment of the disabled-worker beneficiaries was greater than that of the PA recipients despite the fact that younger people tend to be better educated. Among the men, about a third of the disabled workers but over half the PA recipients reported less than 8 years of schooling. Twice the proportion of men receiving disabled-worker benefits (22 percent) as that for men receiving public assistance (11 percent) had completed 4 years of high school. The educational experience of the women was similar to that of the men in that propor-

tionately half as many disabled-worker beneficiary women (18 percent) as PA recipients (38 percent) had less than 8 years of schooling, while twice as many disabled-worker beneficiary women (27 percent) as PA recipients (12 percent) had finished high school

The proportion of men not in the labor force at the time of the survey was similar for both disabled-worker beneficiaries and severely disabled PA recipients—87 percent and 79 percent, respectively. The difference in the proportion of women not in the labor force was significant even though both groups had a high level of non-participation at the time of the survey—96 percent for disabled-worker beneficiaries and 85 percent for PA recipients. Of those women receiving public assistance who were in the labor force (14 percent), about 58 percent were unemployed. Income levels from employment for those who did work must have been minimal—otherwise, they would not have been receiving payments under public assistance.

AMOUNT, SOURCES, AND ADEQUACY OF INCOME

The survey data on income were collected not for individuals, but for disability units, which included the respondent, the spouse, and any minor children living in the same household. If the respondent was not living with a spouse or with minor children, the unit consisted of one person only.

During 1971, the money income of the disabled-worker beneficiary units was much larger than that for severely disabled PA recipient units (table 2). Nearly 50 percent of the disabled-worker units had incomes of \$5,000 or more, but only 9 percent of the PA units reported incomes that high. Conversely, only 30 percent of the disabled-worker units and 74 percent of the PA units had incomes of less than \$3,000.

The income disparities were approximately of the same magnitude for men and women. Among the men, the median income for disabled-worker beneficiaries was \$5,071, compared with \$1,800 for those receiving public assistance. Comparable figures for women were \$4,637 and \$1,905, respectively. About twice as many disabled-worker units (53 percent) as PA units (24 per-

cent) reported earnings as a source of income during 1971. In three-fourths of the disabled-worker units with earnings, the earnings were those of the spouse, compared with only about one-fourth of the PA units. This finding is not particularly surprising since 71 percent of the PA recipients were women and only 22 percent of those women were married. Among the disabled workers, on the other hand, 72 percent were men and 79 percent of those men were married at the time of the survey.

Table 2 also presents a distribution of survey units according to income adequacy, a measure based on the poverty index developed by the Social Security Administration. The poverty index is made up of a series of minimum income levels based on family size, age of family mem-

TABLE 2—Money income of disability unit for disabled-worker beneficiaries and severely disabled PA recipients aged 20-64, 1971. Percentage distribution, by sex, summer 1972

Amount, source, and adequacy of disability unit income	Disabled worker beneficiaries			Severely disabled PA recipients ¹		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Total number (in thousands)....	1,489	1,071	418	1,002	286	717
<i>Money income</i>						
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
\$1-499.....	8	1 1	-	1 1	8	1 2
500-999.....	2 4	2 1	3 1	14 0	16 6	13 0
1,000-1,999.....	12 2	9 2	20 2	38 2	36 9	38 8
2,000-2,999.....	14 2	14 1	14 4	20 7	16 8	22 2
3,000-4,999.....	20 7	22 9	15 0	16 6	16 4	16 7
5,000-9,999.....	32 1	35 9	22 7	8 1	11 6	6 6
10,000-14,999.....	12 7	11 0	17 4	1 0	3	1 1
15,000 or more.....	4 7	3 8	7 2	1	4	2
Median income.....	\$4,969	\$5,071	\$4,637	\$1,882	\$1,800	\$1,905
<i>Source of income</i>						
Total percent ²	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Earnings of disability unit.....	53 0	54 0	50 5	24 0	33 1	20 3
Earnings of spouse.....	39 9	39 1	42 0	6 4	9 2	5 3
Asset income.....	24 8	20 9	34 7	9	7	1 0
Social insurance and related programs.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	14 3	18 3	12 7
Public assistance.....	14 7	15 8	11 8	100 0	100 0	100 0
Private employer union pensions.....	14 5	16 8	8 6	2 6	4	3 5
Other private sources.....	7 9	7 3	9 4	6 0	10 4	4 2
<i>Adequacy of income³</i>						
Total percent.....	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
0-50.....	5 6	5 5	5 9	20 2	27 9	17 2
51-75.....	9 8	9 1	11 7	31 1	32 4	30 6
76-90.....	5 6	6 2	4 1	15 7	22 2	17 3
91-100.....	3 7	3 5	4 2	3 9	4 6	3 6
101-125.....	9 0	9 9	6 7	11 9	5 1	14 7
126-150.....	9 0	9 3	8 3	4 3	4 5	4 3
151 or more.....	57 3	56 5	59 2	9 9	3 3	12 5

¹ Represents nonbeneficiaries receiving PA payments

² Percentages do not add to total because some units had income from more than one source

³ Unit income expressed as a percent of income limits used to represent poverty level

bers, sex of the household head, and place of residence⁶

A large difference in income adequacy existed between the disabled-worker units and the severely disabled PA units. Twenty-five percent of the disabled-worker units but 74 percent of the PA units, for example, reported incomes at or below the poverty level. More than half the disabled-worker units had incomes greater than 150 percent of the poverty level but only one-tenth of the PA units had incomes that high. The members of disabled-worker units were clearly in better financial shape than were members of the PA units.

KNOWLEDGE ABOUT DISABLED-WORKER BENEFITS

Lack of sufficient covered employment (insured status) and/or lack of knowledge about the disabled-worker program obviously were the underlying reasons why the overwhelming majority of the PA recipients did not receive disabled-worker benefits (table 3). Thirty-four percent of the men receiving public assistance but only 15 percent of the women had insured status at the onset of disability. Seventy-one percent of the men and 64 percent of the women said that they did not know about the disabled-worker program.

Even among those PA recipients who were insured, lack of program knowledge was a predominant characteristic. The reasons the members of this group gave for not applying for disabled-worker benefits are shown in the following tabulation.

Reason for not applying for benefits	Insured severely disabled PA recipients		
	Total	Men	Women
Number (in thousands)			
Total insured	206	96	110
Did not apply for benefits	168	79	89
Total percent not applying for benefits	100 0	100 0	100 0
Did not know about program	60 1	87 3	36 0
Not eligible	35 1	8 9	57 3
Not disabled enough	1 8	2 5	1 1
Did not want to apply or other	3 6	1 3	5 6

⁶ See Mollie Orshansky, "Counting the Poor: Another Look at the Poverty Profile," *Social Security Bulletin*, January 1965, and "Who's Who Among the Poor: A Demographic View of Poverty," *Social Security Bulletin*, July 1965.

TABLE 3—Severely disabled PA recipients aged 20-64. Percentage distribution, by selected characteristics and sex, summer 1972

Program characteristics	Severely disabled PA recipients ¹		
	Total	Men	Women
Total number (in thousands)	1 002	286	717
<i>Insured status at onset</i>			
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0
Insured	20 6	33 6	15 4
Not insured	79 4	66 4	84 6
<i>Knowledge of disabled worker benefits</i>			
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0
Did not know about program	66 0	71 0	63 9
Knew about program	33 0	28 6	35 6
Not reported	1 0	2 4	5 5
<i>Reason for not applying for benefits</i>			
Total number (in thousands)	212	26	186
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0
Not eligible	89 6	80 8	90 9
Not disabled enough	5 2	7 7	4 8
Did not want to apply or other	4 7	7 7	4 3
Not reported	5	3 8	---

¹ Represents nonbeneficiaries receiving PA payments.
² Represents persons who knew about disabled worker benefits.

Only about 1 percent of all the severely disabled PA recipients studied indicated that they had not applied for disabled-worker benefits because they were "not disabled enough." In addition, 19 percent said they had not applied because they were "not eligible." Although more specific information is not available, many of those in the latter group may have considered that they were not eligible because their disability was not severe enough.

Corroborating evidence that PA recipients were not as severely disabled as were the disabled-worker beneficiaries comes from a composite measure of the severity of functional limitation—the functional limitation index.⁷ Functional limitations, although not perfectly correlated, are related to the degree of disability and have been shown to increase significantly the likelihood of receiving disabled-worker benefits.⁸ As table 4 indicates, 35 percent of the PA recipients had either a minor loss of functional capacity or

⁷ For details on the index, see Lawrence D. Haber, *The Epidemiology of Disability II: The Measurement of Functional Capacity Limitations* (Survey of Disabled Adults 1966, Report No. 10), Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics, 1970.

⁸ See Iris Posner, *Functional Capacity Limitations and Disability, 1972* (1972 Survey of Disabled and Nondisabled Adults, Report No. 2), Social Security Administration, Office of Research and Statistics, 1977.

TABLE 4—Functional limitations of disabled-worker beneficiaries and severely disabled PA recipients aged 20-64. Percentage distribution, by sex, summer 1972

Functional limitations	Disabled worker beneficiaries			Severely disabled PA recipients ¹		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Total number (in thousands) ..	1,489	1,071	418	1,002	286	717
Total percent ...	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
No loss ..	7.2	6.8	8.4	14.3	12.4	15.1
Minor loss ..	13.0	13.6	11.5	20.3	23.8	18.9
Moderate loss ..	1.0	1.3	1.1	6	6	8
Moderate-severe loss ..	15.3	16.5	12.2	17.6	13.2	19.4
Severe loss ..	31.1	34.1	23.4	21.3	23.6	20.4
Dependency ..	31.3	26.6	43.4	21.9	23.7	21.2
Not reported ..	1.1	1.2	1.0	4.0	3.4	4.3

¹ Represents nonbeneficiaries receiving PA payments

none at all, compared with 20 percent of the disabled-worker beneficiaries. At the other extreme, 62 percent of the disabled-worker beneficiaries suffered severe losses or dependency, compared with 43 percent of the PA recipients. The patterns were similar for both men and women.

In addition, the two disabled groups exhibit significant differences in disability characteristics other than severity. Data on age at onset of disability, for example, provide further insight as to why fewer severely disabled PA recipients had insured status (table 5). Five times as many PA recipients (15 percent) as disabled workers (3 percent) were disabled before they reached age 22. Obviously, those in the former group had little opportunity to fulfill the work requirements for disabled-worker benefits. Much the same thing can be said for those disabled at ages 22-34, especially the women. In fact, 46 percent of the women receiving public assistance were disabled before reaching age 35, compared with about 13 percent of the women who were disabled workers.

Not only had PA recipients become disabled at an earlier age, they had also been disabled longer. Median duration of disability was 6 years for PA recipients, compared with 5 years for disabled-worker beneficiaries. The longer duration of disability for the PA recipients, of course, reflects the earlier age at which they became disabled. If it is assumed that the severely disabled have a higher mortality rate than those with lesser degrees of disability, then the difference in duration may also reflect and confirm

the lower degree of severity of disability among PA recipients discussed earlier.

LABOR-FORCE PARTICIPATION AT AND BEFORE ONSET

Examination of data about various aspects of labor-force participation at and before onset of disability helps explain how lack of insured status contributes to the failure of PA recipients to receive disabled-worker benefits despite severe disability. An individual with a relatively strong and recent employment history is much more likely to have acquired insured status. Thus, it is instructive to compare employment status at onset of disability for disabled-worker beneficiaries and PA recipients.

Table 6 shows that 87 percent of the disabled-worker beneficiaries but only 44 percent of the PA recipients were employed at onset. Among women, 79 percent of the disabled workers and only 37 percent of the PA recipients were employed at onset. Moreover, the proportion of PA recipients (27 percent) who had never been employed before they became disabled was about five times as high as that of disabled-worker beneficiaries (5 percent). This finding supports

TABLE 5—Selected characteristics of disabled-worker beneficiaries and severely disabled PA recipients aged 20-64. Percentage distribution, by sex, summer 1972

Selected characteristics related to disability	Disabled-worker beneficiaries			Severely disabled PA recipients ¹		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Total number (in thousands) ..	1,489	1,071	418	1,002	286	717
Age at onset	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Total percent ...	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Under 22 ..	2.9	3.1	1.9	15.4	26.7	10.9
22-34 ..	12.9	13.5	11.2	28.9	14.1	34.8
35-49 ..	32.8	30.6	38.2	31.7	37.1	29.6
50-59 ..	42.4	41.3	44.9	20.5	17.4	21.7
60-64 ..	8.6	10.8	3.0	6	3	7
Not reported ..	7	7	8	2.9	4.3	2.3
Median age ..	50	50	49	37	37	37
Duration of disability (in years)	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Total percent ..	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
1 or less ..	13.2	14.2	10.7	14.2	14.1	14.2
2-4 ..	41.8	42.4	40.3	31.7	32.4	31.5
5-9 ..	24.3	23.4	26.6	18.2	15.9	19.1
10 or more ..	20.0	19.3	21.6	33.1	33.6	32.9
Not reported ..	7	7	8	2.8	3.9	2.3
Median duration ..	6	5	5	6	6	6

¹ Represents nonbeneficiaries receiving PA payments.

TABLE 6—Labor-force participation of disabled-worker beneficiaries and severely disabled PA recipients aged 20-64
Percentage distribution, by sex, summer 1972

Labor force participation	Disabled worker beneficiaries			Severely disabled PA recipients ¹		
	Total	Men	Women	Total	Men	Women
Total number (in thousands)	1,489	1,071	418	1 002	286	717
<i>Employment status at onset</i>						
Total percent	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Employed at onset	87 3	90 6	78 7	43 6	59 6	37 2
Employed before onset	7 7	5 0	14 6	29 6	16 9	34 6
Not employed before or at onset or never employed	5 0	4 3	6 6	26 8	23 4	28 2
<i>Duration of employment before onset</i>						
Total percent ²	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Less than 6 months..	5 5	5 8	4 5	23 0	20 1	24 2
6-11 months	4 2	4 4	3 7	13 3	12 9	13 4
1 year	4 5	4 6	3 8	8 1	3 8	9 9
2-3 years	18 6	17 5	21 6	12 9	11 5	13 6
4-5 years	8 7	7 2	12 6	6 8	9 1	5 8
6-10 years	17 7	16 9	19 8	9 2	9 2	9 2
More than 10 years	39 8	42 4	33 2	15 1	31 1	8 4
Not reported.	1 0	1 1	8	11 7	2 3	15 7
Median years.	8	8	6	8	4	8
<i>Occupation before onset</i>						
Total percent ²	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0	100 0
Professional and technical	4 3	4 1	4 8	1 0	1 4	8
Managers	7 3	8 8	3 3	1 7	2 9	1 2
Sales	4 7	2 3	10 8	1 8	1 7	1 9
Clerical	9 8	3 3	27 1	6 7	9 4	5 5
Craftsmen	18 7	25 4	1 3	6 2	20 7	
Operatives, except transport	21 6	19 3	27 5	25 5	12 8	30 8
Transport operatives	3 8	5 2	2	3 1	10 3	
Laborers	11 8	15 9	9	5 2	16 9	3
Farmers.	3 7	5 1	2	5 8	13 2	2 7
Service	11 2	8 4	18 6	19 2	6 3	24 6
Private household.	1 3		4 7	13 0	4	18 3
Not reported	1 7	2 1	7	10 9	3 9	13 9

¹ Represents nonbeneficiaries receiving PA payments
² Excludes persons not employed before onset or never employed

data presented earlier on the relatively high percentage of PA recipients who became disabled at a young age and thus had reduced work opportunities

Differences between the two groups were also apparent in the duration of employment for those who had work experience. The PA recipients as a group had a much shorter duration of employment than did the disabled-worker beneficiaries. The disparity was particularly evident for women. Close to 25 percent of the women receiving public assistance but only about 5 percent of their disabled-worker counterparts had worked for less than 6 months. About 33 percent of the women who were disabled workers but only 8 percent of the women receiving public assistance reported employment durations of more than 10

years. This poorer employment history is most likely a consequence of the relatively younger age and earlier onset of disability among PA recipients.

Occupation before onset of disability for those who had work experience is also shown in table 6. Women receiving disabled-worker benefits were more likely to have been in higher-skilled occupations than were those receiving public assistance. About 27 percent of the disabled-worker beneficiary women but only 6 percent of those receiving public assistance, for example, had held clerical jobs. In contrast, the proportion of women reporting their occupation as "private household worker" was nearly four times as high for PA recipients (18 percent) as it was for disabled-worker beneficiaries (5 percent).

Technical Note*

STUDY DESIGN

The survey data were collected and processed by the Bureau of the Census. Survey estimates are based on a sample of 18,000 interviewed persons selected from the 5-percent Census. Of these 18,000 persons, 11,700 were selected from all who indicated that they were disabled before October 1969 on the 1970 Census questionnaire. These persons make up the disabled sample. A mail screening in 1971 of the remaining persons resulted in two other sample groups—5,100 non-disabled persons and 1,200 recent-onset cases. In addition to the sample of interviewed persons, there were 2,850 noninterviews. Thus the rate of "good responses" for the survey—based on 18,000 interviewed persons out of 20,850 eligible for interview—is 86 percent. The number and reason for noninterviews were as follows:

Noninterview reason	Number of persons
Total	2,850
Unable to contact	1,240
Temporarily absent	100
Refused	620
Moved outside 357 PSU's	650
Miscellaneous	240

* For a description of the reliability of the estimates, see the data in the technical note in Kathryn H. Allan, "First Findings of the 1972 Survey of the Disabled: General Characteristics," *Social Security Bulletin*, October 1976, pages 35-37.

In general, the sample was a stratified multi-stage cluster design comprised of 357 sampling areas including every county and some independent cities in the United States. The disabled persons were selected from all 357 strata, the non-disabled and recently disabled groups were chosen from a special subset of 105 strata. The sample was designed to represent the noninstitutionalized civilian population of the United States aged 18-64 as of April 1970.

DEFINITION OF DISABILITY

Disability is defined in this study as a limitation in the kind or amount of work (or housework) resulting from a chronic health condition or impairment lasting 3 months or longer. The disability classification is based on the extent of

the individual's capacity for work, as reported by the respondent in a set of work-qualification questions. Data on employment and on functional capacities—such as mobility, activities of daily living, personal care needs, and functional activity limitations—were also collected to evaluate further the nature and severity of disability.

The severity of disability was classified by the extent of work limitations as

Severely disabled—unable to work altogether or unable to work regularly

Occupationally disabled—able to work regularly but unable to do the same work as before the onset of disability or unable to work full time

Secondary work limitations—able to work full time, regularly, and at the same work but with limitations in the kind or amount of work they can perform, women with limitations in keeping house but not in paid work are included as having secondary work limitations

Notes and Brief Reports

Research Grants Studies

Sections 702 and 1110 of the Social Security Act authorize extramural research projects in the broad area of social security. The Social Security Administration provides funding through grants to nonprofit organizations and through contracts with both nonprofit and profitmaking organizations. From time to time, as projects are completed, the *BULLETIN* publishes summaries of research findings. The summaries that follow are based, in turn, on projects funded under Contract No. 73-242, Grant No. 57331, and Grant No. 57524.

☆ ☆ ☆

EFFECT OF HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT PRACTICES ON HOSPITAL PERFORMANCE

This study of hospital management practices and their effect on performance was conducted

by Selwyn W. Becker and Stephen M. Shortell, of the University of Chicago, and Duncan Neuhauser, of Harvard University. Forty-two of the 58 short-term, nonteaching, voluntary hospitals in Massachusetts participated in the project.

Data were collected on costs, utilization, quality of care, and organizational variables such as work specification, mechanisms of coordination, and visibility of consequences (the degree to which elites in the organization are aware of organization outcomes). Some of the secondary sources included the American Hospital Association, Aetna, the Joint Commission for the Accreditation of Hospitals, the Massachusetts Blue Cross Plan, the Massachusetts Department of Public Health, the Massachusetts Rate Setting Commission, and Medicare cost reports from the Social Security Administration. Other information was collected in the participating hospitals, either from their financial and medical records or from interviews with hospital board members, administrators, chiefs of staff, department heads, and employees.

The data were analyzed by means of multiple regression techniques. Casemix severity was used as a control variable in all equations and a quality-of-care variable was added as a control in the cost and utilization equations.