A Survey of Claimants for Unemployment Compensation in February-March 1943

ARNOLD STEINBACH AND PHILIP BOOTH*

THE NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED WORKERS drawing benefits under State unemployment compensation laws, which had exceeded an average of 1.2 million per week during July 1940, declined to 600,000 in the middle of 1942 as employment levels rose under the impetus of war production; the number had fallen to 200,000 by February 1943 and to 60,000 in October. At the same time, the level of all unemployment, as estimated by the Bureau of the Census, dropped from 8.8 million in April 1940 to 1.4 million in February 1943 and 700,000 in October. The total volume of initial and continued claims had declined more than 70 percent between February 1942 and February 1943; in Michigan, New Mexico, and Wyoming, continued claims decreased during this period more than 90 percent.

This decline in unemployment and the growing manpower shortages focused attention upon the need for effective referral of claimants to available jobs. The public was increasingly interested in the question why workers were unemployed and receiving benefits in the face of increasing labor shortages. During pre-war days, the employment potentialities of claimants were not always closely scrutinized because the labor supply was relatively adequate. The growth of wartime labor stringencies, however, led to the need for determining the capability of each claimant to fill a necessary job and for getting him into such a job as quickly as possible

Scattered studies conducted during 1942 indicated that payment of benefits to unemployed workers was affected by three major types of factors: existing labor-market conditions, which were generally outside the claimant's control; the claimant's qualifications for work, physical condition, and initiative in seeking work; and the extent to which the U. S. Employment Service was able to and did offer work to applicants. These studies also indicated that the current claimant group was principally composed of workers out of work as a result of changes in war-production schedules, shifts in type of production, and material shortages; contraction of civilian goods and service industries; regular seasonal and frictional unemployment; and migration to centers of war production or, in the case of women, to areas adjacent to military establishments. While workers in the first group were usually out of work for only brief periods, the duration of unemployment of workers in the three other groups was greater.

This information was inadequate for any analysis of the importance of the claimant group as a source of labor supply, nor did it indicate the effectiveness of the job being done in referring claimants to job opportunities. The Employment Service was giving priority to employers in essential industries, in order to staff war industry and to assist essential employers to the utmost in meeting their manpower problems. It was felt that these priorities in service might result in limiting the employment opportunities of claimants normally attached to nonessential activities.

All the interested governmental agencies believed it necessary to obtain information which would throw light on the following questions: (1) Who were the claimants? were they principally men or women? old or young? skilled or unskilled? with or without physical disability? (2) Where were they located? in areas which contained labor shortages or in areas of labor surplus? (3) What had caused their unemployment and for how long had they been out of work? and (4) What had the Employment Service done to find work for them? had it full and complete information as to their past skills and experience? had it referred them to jobs? had it placed them in jobs?

Accordingly, a survey of the personal and

*Bureau of Employment Security, Program Division. The survey was made possible as the result of the cooperation of the War Manpower Commission and State employment security agencies. The Bureau of Employment Security wishes to express its appreciation to the State agencies for their cooperation in conducting the study and to the staff members of the War Manpower Commission, and to the members of the special subcommittee of the Interstate Conference of Employment Security Agencies for their assistance and suggestions during the course of the study and the preparation of the analysis.

occupational characteristics of claimants and the activities of the Employment Service with respect to such claimants was undertaken. Forty-seven States participated in the survey,[1] which covered 394 local offices and included 42,757 persons who had filed claims for total or part-total benefits during the week ending February 13, 1943.[2] Some 290,000 claimants had filed initial or continued claims throughout the country during that week. For each State, a few local offices, representative of the labor market in the given State, were selected for the sample, usually not more than 8; when there were both shortage and nonshortage areas within a State, both types of areas were represented.[3] In general, the sample was confined to 10 percent of the claim load of the State. However, since States with relatively small claim loads used a sample larger than 10 percent and in a few instances included all local offices and all claimants, the sample comprised about 15 percent of all claimants (table 1).[4]

[1] Alaska, District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Utah did not participate.

[2] Mail claimants were excluded; many States also excluded claims filed at itinerant points.

Table 1.—*Number of claims filed during survey week, and number of class A and B[1] claimants in sample, by State*[2]

State	Claims filed during survey week in—		Claimants in sample		
	All local offices	Sample local offices	Total	Class A[1]	Class B[1]
Total	293,787	173,027	[3] 43,151	22,896	20,255
Alabama	7,305	3,525	803	280	523
Arizona	522	522	519	320	199
Arkansas	2,317	695	695	407	288
California	22,590	12,505	3,893	2,311	1,582
Colorado	2,819	587	364	159	205
Connecticut	1,567	1,008	376	211	165
Delaware	569	569	462	271	191
Florida	4,464	3,350	418	239	179
Georgia	5,207	3,400	854	413	441
Idaho	1,248	1,248	724	495	229
Illinois	25,260	9,830	2,761	1,427	1,334
Indiana	9,200	3,656	783	314	469
Iowa	3,681	1,030	665	421	244
Kansas	2,915	2,329	1,907	1,226	681
Kentucky	4,055	2,984	856	415	441
Louisiana	6,871	6,477	1,019	660	359
Maine	2,030	619	246	105	141
Maryland	2,190	542	370	230	140
Massachusetts	7,111	3,617	654	457	197
Michigan	11,940	4,940	731	345	386
Minnesota	8,741	4,025	928	546	382
Mississippi	1,738	781	619	400	219
Missouri	12,043	7,978	759	383	376
Montana	721	300	300	126	174
Nebraska	1,463	1,181	531	303	228
Nevada	(4)	(4)	122	58	64
New Hampshire	905	707	514	306	208
New Jersey	14,183	7,820	1,489	1,007	482
New Mexico	317	317	207	65	142
New York	61,355	51,224	6,356	2,312	4,044
North Carolina	4,569	1,838	916	437	479
North Dakota	387	387	214	126	88
Ohio	9,317	4,272	3,402	1,769	1,633
Oklahoma	2,982	1,211	375	254	121
Oregon	3,193	3,193	1,397	1,011	386
Pennsylvania	12,992	4,330	747	381	366
Rhode Island	2,257	1,628	429	263	166
South Carolina	4,016	2,042	436	193	243
South Dakota	302	302	145	64	81
Tennessee	8,703	5,021	932	437	495
Texas	6,531	2,851	670	332	338
Vermont	482	482	319	130	189
Virginia	1,562	609	365	198	167
Washington	4,620	2,014	809	672	137
West Virginia	1,686	1,321	585	153	432
Wisconsin	4,262	2,605	430	224	206
Wyoming	99	99	55	40	15

[1] Class A claimants had been continuously unemployed for less than 5 weeks prior to the survey week; class B claimants for 5 weeks or more.

[2] Alaska, District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Utah did not participate in survey which was made during week ending Feb. 13, 1943. Sample included all local offices in Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wyoming.

[3] Includes 394 claimants whose records were incomplete. The text discussion and other tables do not include these claimants.

[4] Not available.

Schedules were filled out for each claimant in the sample by local-office claims takers and placement interviewers. Information on claims and benefit status and personal characteristics was recorded at the time of the filing or renewal of the claim during the survey week; the information on occupation and on referral and placement experience was supplied by Employment Service interviewers from the applicants' records in the Employment Service files.

The picture which emerged from the survey was that of a group of claimants which included disproportionately large numbers of older workers, women, and workers with permanent physical handicaps. In even this period of labor shortages, many of these claimants had experienced relatively prolonged unemployment. Almost half the group had been unemployed 5 weeks or longer at the time of the survey, one-tenth for at least 27 weeks. Only about one-seventh of the group drew no benefits—that is, presumably found a job before their waiting period had expired.

Both the duration of unemployment and the efforts of the Employment Service to place the claimants should be considered with regard for the characteristics of the group. Because of the stringency of the labor market, a group of persons out of work at the time of the survey was likely to be heavily weighted with seasonally unemployed workers, whose jobs customarily exist in only certain periods of a year; with individuals who, though laid off, retained an attachment to their

[3] Shortage areas are those with a current acute labor shortage or labor stringency and those anticipating a labor shortage within 6 months. All other areas are classified as nonshortage.

[4] Had it been possible for the sample to be drawn exactly in accordance with the instructions, it would have included approximately 30,000 claimants, or about 10 percent fewer claimants than were actually included.

former employer and expected to return to their old job; and with persons whose employability was more or less limited by their personal characteristics or lack of currently needed skills. The effect of all these factors is apparent in the findings of the study.

Occupational and Personal Characteristics

Occupation.—Twenty-eight percent of the claimants in the sample had been in skilled occupations, 40 percent in semiskilled and unskilled, 14 percent in clerical and sales, and the remainder in professional and managerial, service, and agricultural occupations (table 2). About 41 percent of the men, as compared with 7.5 percent of the women, were in skilled occupations, but relatively many more women than men were in the clerical and sales group. The skilled claimants were concentrated in three occupational groups—apparel, metalworking, and construction. The great majority of the semiskilled women claimants came from the textile and apparel industries. In the unskilled occupations, more than half of the men were construction workers and more than half of the women were cannery workers.

The seasonal slack in construction activity during the survey period, combined with the completion of construction projects in a number of States and the reluctance of construction workers to accept employment outside of their industry and from sources other than their unions, accounts for the fact that nearly one-fourth of the claimants were construction workers; almost three-fourths of these were in the skilled groups. Skilled construction workers accounted for 17 percent of all claimants and 28 percent of all men claimants.

Less than 6 percent of the claimants were found to be in nationally or locally critical occupations;[5] the States with the largest percentage of claimants in critical occupations were Idaho, with 20 percent, and Illinois, with 14 percent. In most instances these claimants were in locally, rather than nationally, critical occupations. The percentage of claimants in critical occupations did not differ greatly as between shortage and nonshortage areas, except in a few States.

Age and sex.—While men comprised 62 percent of the sample and women 38 percent, there was considerable variation among the States. California, Delaware, and North Carolina reported that at least 60 percent of their claimants were women, while Idaho and Connecticut reported only 11 and 17 percent, respectively. Men showed a greater concentration than women in the older age groups. Sixty-three percent of the men and 27 percent of the women were 45 years of age or older; in the employed labor force, on the other hand, only 41 percent of the men and 23 percent of the women were in this age group in

[5] See table 6, footnote 2.

Table 2.—*Distribution of men and women, and of white and nonwhite claimants, by occupation* [1]

Major and selected occupational group	All claimants				Men			Women		
	Number	Percentage distribution by occupation			Number	Percent of total	Percentage distribution	Number	Percent of total	Percentage distribution
		All claimants	White claimants	Nonwhite claimants						
All occupations	42,757	100.0	100.0	100.0	26,391	61.7	100.0	16,366	38.3	100.0
Professional and managerial	2,529	5.9	6.2	6.4	1,485	58.7	5.6	1,044	41.3	6.4
Clerical and sales	5,705	13.6	14.5	25.8	1,814	31.3	6.9	3,981	68.7	24.3
Service	3,078	7.2	6.5	8.8	1,444	46.9	5.5	1,634	53.1	10.0
Agriculture, fishery, forestry, and kindred	1,340	3.1	3.0	2.8	904	67.5	3.4	436	32.5	2.7
Skilled	12,122	28.3	29.7	7.9	10,893	89.9	41.3	1,229	10.1	7.5
Production of fabricated textile products	983	2.3	(2)	(2)	223	22.7	.8	760	77.3	4.6
Metalworking	689	1.6	(2)	(2)	654	94.9	2.5	35	5.1	.2
Construction	7,284	17.0	(2)	(2)	7,271	99.8	27.5	13	.2	.1
Semiskilled	8,378	19.6	19.9	24.5	4,425	52.8	16.8	3,953	47.2	24.2
Textile	915	2.1	(2)	(2)	113	12.3	.4	802	87.7	4.9
Production of fabricated textile products	2,002	4.7	(2)	(2)	231	11.5	.9	1,771	88.5	10.8
Metalworking	720	1.7	(2)	(2)	484	67.2	1.8	236	32.8	1.4
Construction	674	1.6	(2)	(2)	673	99.9	2.5	1	.1	(3)
Transportation	1,002	2.3	(2)	(2)	1,000	99.8	3.8	2	.2	(3)
Trade and service	542	1.3	(2)	(2)	229	42.3	.9	313	57.7	1.9
Unskilled	8,579	20.1	17.9	21.7	4,813	56.1	18.2	3,766	43.9	23.0
Production of food products	2,459	5.8	(2)	(2)	209	8.5	.8	2,250	91.5	13.7
Construction	2,513	5.9	(2)	(2)	2,503	99.6	9.5	10	.4	.1
Unassigned [4]	936	2.2	2.3	2.1	613	65.5	2.3	323	34.5	1.9

[1] See table 1, footnote 2.
[2] Information not available.
[3] Not computed; less than 40 claimants.
[4] Entry occupations and unknown.

Table 3.—*Percentage distribution of men and women claimants by age group, by occupation* [1]

Major and selected occupational group	Age group				
	Total	Under 22	22–44	45–64	65 and over
	Men				
All occupations	100.0	4.1	33.2	49.7	13.0
Professional and managerial	100.0	2.6	31.9	52.0	13.5
Clerical and sales	100.0	6.2	34.3	44.1	15.4
Service	100.0	3.7	21.6	45.5	29.2
Agriculture, fishery, forestry, and kindred	100.0	4.9	37.4	41.3	16.4
Skilled	100.0	1.1	26.9	59.2	12.8
Production of fabricated textile products	100.0	.4	13.5	66.5	20.0
Metalworking	100.0	5.7	31.5	50.3	12.5
Construction	100.0	.4	25.9	62.1	11.6
Semiskilled	100.0	6.6	45.7	37.8	9.9
Textile	100.0	8.0	49.5	30.1	12.4
Production of fabricated textile products	100.0	1.3	36.4	48.9	13.4
Metalworking	100.0	13.4	48.8	29.1	8.7
Construction	100.0	1.6	43.6	48.1	6.7
Transportation	100.0	6.9	66.0	23.8	3.3
Trade and service	100.0	10.9	30.1	43.7	15.3
Unskilled	100.0	6.3	38.1	45.2	10.4
Production of food products	100.0	10.0	39.3	31.6	19.1
Construction	100.0	4.7	36.6	51.0	7.7
Unassigned [2]	100.0	17.3	35.2	37.5	10.0
	Women				
All occupations	100.0	7.1	65.7	25.3	1.9
Professional and managerial	100.0	4.7	66.1	26.0	3.2
Clerical and sales	100.0	11.2	70.9	16.6	1.3
Service	100.0	4.4	54.7	37.3	3.6
Agriculture, fishery, forestry, and kindred	100.0	2.8	63.7	31.4	2.1
Skilled	100.0	2.6	50.9	41.9	4.6
Production of fabricated textile products	100.0	.9	42.9	50.7	5.5
Metalworking	100.0	20.0	68.6	11.4	0
Construction	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Semiskilled	100.0	6.4	71.1	21.5	1.0
Textile	100.0	6.7	76.1	16.5	.7
Production of fabricated textile products	100.0	6.0	64.9	27.8	1.3
Metalworking	100.0	8.9	78.4	12.3	.4
Construction	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Transportation	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Trade and service	100.0	2.9	71.2	24.9	1.0
Unskilled	100.0	7.1	64.3	27.0	1.6
Production of food products	100.0	5.8	59.4	33.0	1.8
Construction	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)	(3)
Unassigned [2]	100.0	11.2	64.4	22.6	1.8

[1] See table 1, footnote 2.
[2] Entry occupations and unknown.
[3] Not computed; less than 40 claimants.

February 1943, according to Bureau of the Census estimates.[6] There was no evidence that the older claimants were found principally in war-production areas, for the States in which more than 70 percent of the claimants were 45 years of age or older included Iowa, Montana, Nevada, and Wyoming, where there was little concentration of war production, as well as such war-production centers as California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Pennsylvania.

The age distribution of the claimants varied considerably among the several occupational groups (table 3). Thus, male claimants who had been in service occupations and the skilled male claimants in apparel industries and in construction showed a higher concentration at the older ages than did the semiskilled and unskilled groups. Skilled and service occupations had the highest proportions of women aged 45 and over.

Shortage areas reported a somewhat higher proportion of older claimants than nonshortage areas, probably because the reservoir of younger claimants had been depleted much faster. The proportion of men above age 45 was greater in noncritical than in critical occupations; this difference remained whether the claimants had one or more than one occupational classification. However, men claimants with additional classifications, especially those with critical skills, were a younger group than those with only primary classifications. It is likely that workers in the higher age groups are not at as great a handicap in obtaining work if they possess more than one skill, especially if such additional skills are in critical occupations.

Workers over age 65 apparently had considerable difficulty in obtaining jobs. Only 7 percent of the men who were recorded as employed at the completion of the survey were aged 65 or over, although claimants in this age group comprised 13 percent of the whole sample and 16 percent of those remaining unemployed. In contrast, while men aged 22–44 comprised 33 percent of the sample, 40 percent of those employed at the completion of the survey were in this group.

Race.—Only 9 percent of the claimants were nonwhite—10 percent of the men and 7 percent of the women. Colorado, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, and South Carolina had the highest percentage of nonwhite claimants.

The nonwhite claimants were a considerably younger group than the white claimants—among both the men and the women.

Age	All claimants				Labor force (1910)			
	Men		Women		Men		Women	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Under 22	4.1	3.8	7.3	4.8	65.3	71.3	78.6	79.0
22–44	31.3	49.0	65.0	74.9				
45–64	50.8	40.9	25.7	19.1	30.1	24.5	19.4	19.0
65 and over	13.8	6.3	2.0	1.2	4.6	4.2	2.0	2.0

[6] The estimates indicate that 57 percent of the persons unemployed in February 1943 were men and 43 percent women. Only 43 percent of the unemployed were 45 years of age or over as compared with 49 percent of all claimants who were in this age group at the time of the survey.

The comparatively greater proportion of white persons in the older groups among the claimants than in the labor force, shown in the tabulation, may be due to the fact that many of the younger nonwhite claimants were in occupations for which the demand was comparatively small, even in a period of labor stringency; they may therefore have remained unemployed longer than white workers in the same age groups. Relatively few nonwhite workers were in skilled occupations, or were qualified for jobs in critical occupations apart from their primary occupational classification.

Family responsibilities.—The claimant group was largely composed of individuals who might be regarded as under pressure to return to work at the earliest opportunity because of family responsibilities (table 4). Eighty-four percent were married, and 4 out of every 10 of that group had responsibilities for children under 12 or for an aged or invalid relative. About 2 of every 10 single claimants had such dependents. The proportion of men and women with dependents (38 and 31 percent, respectively) was fairly similar.

Nationality and citizenship.—Three of every 4 claimants were American born, 1 in 50 was born in Germany, and 1 in 20 in Italy. A negligible proportion of claimants came from China or Mexico. A high percentage of Germans was noted in Minnesota and South Dakota, and of Italians in Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Jersey, and New York. Less than half of the New York and Minnesota claimants were American born. Only 55 claimants, 41 of them in Colorado, were of Japanese nationality. Less than 1 claimant in 10 lacked American citizenship. Connecticut, New York, and Maryland reported the highest percentages of noncitizens.

Physical handicaps.—One claimant in 10 had a physical handicap. Proportionately twice as many men (13 percent) as women (6 percent) were reported as having disabilities. About 36 percent of the claimants in Maryland were reported as handicapped.[7] Of the 4,232 claimants with physical disabilities, 77 percent reported heart trouble, high blood pressure, loss of limbs, or some other permanent disability; 18 percent reported temporary disabilities, and the remaining 5 percent were pregnant women. Permanent disabilities were much more numerous among the men than among the women.

Draft status.—Draft status was recorded for 55 percent of the men in the sample. Many of the remainder were probably too old to have a selective service classification. Almost every third claimant with draft status had been classified as

[7] This high proportion may have been the result of intensive referral and placement activities, which reduced the number of fully employable claimants to a minimum.

Table 4.—*Distribution of men and women claimants by citizenship, nationality, marital and dependency status, and type of physical handicap* [1]

Selected characteristic	All claimants		Men		Women	
	Number	Percentage distribution	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Citizenship, total	42,757	100.0	26,391	61.7	16,366	38.3
Citizens	38,900	91.0	23,906	61.5	14,994	38.5
Noncitizens	3,857	9.0	2,485	64.4	1,372	35.6
Nationality, total	42,757	100.0	26,391	61.7	16,366	38.3
American	32,397	75.8	19,153	59.1	13,244	40.9
German	803	1.9	609	75.8	194	24.2
Italian	2,277	5.3	1,686	74.0	591	26.0
Other	7,280	17.0	4,943	67.9	2,337	32.1
Marital and dependency [2] status, total [3]	42,670	100.0	26,336	61.7	16,334	38.3
Single	6,779	15.9	4,411	65.1	2,368	34.9
With dependents	1,403	3.3	878	62.6	525	37.4
Without dependents	5,376	12.6	3,533	65.7	1,843	34.3
Married	35,891	84.1	21,925	61.1	13,966	38.9
With dependents	13,818	32.4	9,243	66.9	4,575	33.1
Without dependents	22,073	51.7	12,682	57.5	9,391	42.5
Physically handicapped, total	4,232	100.0	3,331	78.7	901	21.3
Permanent	3,269	77.3	2,797	85.6	472	14.4
Temporary	746	17.6	534	71.6	212	28.4
Pregnancy	217	5.1	----------	----------	217	100.0

[1] See table 1, footnote 2.

[2] Dependents include only children under 12 or an aged or invalid person in household. Married claimants with spouse only are classified as "without dependents."

[3] Data not available for 87 claimants.

3A, every tenth claimant as 4F, and 1 in 14 as 1A.[8] Less than 1 in 20 had been deferred on occupational grounds, and 1 in 200 because they were normally engaged in agricultural work.

Interstate claimants.—About 12 percent of the claimants had filed claims on the basis of wage credits accumulated in other States. Interstate claimants comprised 50 percent or more of all claimants in Arizona, Colorado, Nevada, and New Mexico, and more than 30 percent of those in Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and Wyoming. More women than men filed interstate claims, and women accounted for more than 85 percent of all interstate claimants in Florida, Georgia, and South Dakota. Though no information is available as to the reasons for migration, individual State analyses indicate that there were at least two large groups of interstate claimants: those returning to their former residence after employment in another State (primarily construction workers), and women who followed members of their family either to another job or to the vicinity of military establishments. The referability of the former group is obviously much greater than that of the latter.

[8] See classification in table 9 for definitions.

Duration of Unemployment and Benefits

At the time of the survey, more than half of the claimants had been unemployed from 2 to 3 months while one-third had drawn benefits continuously for 5–8 weeks, and about one-fourth for 3–4 weeks. About 30 percent of all claimants had been unemployed for more than 3 months at that time (February 1943). About 10 percent of the claimants had been unemployed for at least 6 months (table 5); relatively large numbers of such claimants were found in Alabama, Colorado, North Carolina, and Virginia. Unpublished estimates of the Bureau of the Census, by contrast, indicate that in January 1943 about 17 percent of all un-

Table 5.—*Cumulative percentage distribution*[1] *of claimants by number of weeks of unemployment and number of weeks compensated, by age, citizenship, nationality, marital and dependency status, and type of physical handicap*[2]

Selected characteristic	Cumulative percentage distribution of claimants by specified number of weeks of unemployment and weeks compensated															
	All claimants								Men				Women			
	Weeks of unemployment[3]				Weeks compensated[4]				Weeks compensated[4]				Weeks compensated[4]			
	Less than 5	Less than 14	Less than 27	All	None	Less than 5	Less than 14	All	None	Less than 5	Less than 14	All	None	Less than 5	Less than 14	All
Age, total	13.8	69.3	90.4	100.0	15.0	50.8	93.8	100.0	15.0	53.2	95.3	100.0	15.0	46.9	91.4	100.0
Under 22	16.6	70.1	88.4	100.0	24.8	62.8	96.3	100.0	24.8	64.2	96.7	100.0	24.8	61.5	95.9	100.0
22-44	14.4	66.6	87.8	100.0	16.9	51.5	93.4	100.0	18.9	58.8	96.5	100.0	15.3	45.6	90.9	100.0
45-64	14.3	74.0	93.0	100.0	12.9	51.0	95.4	100.0	13.0	52.0	96.4	100.0	12.4	47.6	92.3	100.0
65 and over	7.3	61.8	88.2	100.0	9.2	39.4	87.0	100.0	9.6	40.1	87.5	100.0	4.7	32.6	82.0	100.0
Citizenship, total	13.8	69.3	90.4	100.0	15.0	50.8	93.8	100.0	15.0	53.2	95.3	100.0	15.0	46.9	91.4	100.0
Citizens	13.8	69.0	90.1	100.0	15.4	51.5	93.9	100.0	15.3	53.9	95.4	100.0	15.4	47.7	91.5	100.0
Noncitizens	14.4	72.5	92.7	100.0	11.5	43.9	93.1	100.0	11.8	46.2	94.4	100.0	10.9	39.7	90.9	100.0
Nationality, total	13.8	69.3	90.4	100.0	15.0	50.8	93.8	100.0	15.0	53.2	95.3	100.0	15.0	46.9	91.4	100.0
American	13.6	67.7	89.3	100.0	16.2	52.3	93.9	100.0	16.6	55.6	95.5	100.0	15.8	47.9	91.7	100.0
German	11.6	70.1	95.0	100.0	10.3	51.1	94.0	100.0	9.9	52.6	95.1	100.0	12.4	47.5	91.2	100.0
Italian	11.6	77.6	95.2	100.0	7.2	38.5	95.0	100.0	6.0	38.3	95.3	100.0	10.5	38.8	94.4	100.0
Other	15.6	72.9	92.7	100.0	12.5	47.5	92.9	100.0	12.6	49.3	94.5	100.0	12.4	43.8	89.7	100.0
Marital and dependency status, total	13.8	69.3	90.4	100.0	15.0	50.8	93.8	100.0	15.0	53.2	95.3	100.0	15.0	46.9	91.4	100.0
Single	15.3	72.2	92.6	100.0	17.0	53.4	94.5	100.0	16.7	54.1	95.6	100.0	17.7	52.3	92.5	100.0
With dependents	13.0	72.2	92.7	100.0	14.6	48.6	93.4	100.0	14.5	49.6	94.4	100.0	14.9	47.1	91.9	100.0
Without dependents	15.9	72.3	92.6	100.0	17.7	54.7	94.8	100.0	17.2	55.2	95.8	100.0	18.4	53.7	92.7	100.0
Married	13.5	68.8	89.9	100.0	14.6	50.2	93.7	100.0	14.6	52.9	95.2	100.0	14.6	46.0	91.2	100.0
With dependents	14.9	69.7	89.0	100.0	15.8	51.6	94.6	100.0	16.9	56.3	96.1	100.0	13.8	42.2	91.4	100.0
Without dependents	12.7	68.2	90.5	100.0	13.8	49.4	93.2	100.0	13.0	50.5	94.6	100.0	14.9	47.9	91.2	100.0
Physically handicapped, total	11.0	65.1	88.7	100.0	14.9	49.5	92.7	100.0	13.4	49.8	93.2	100.0	20.1	48.3	90.8	100.0
Permanent	10.6	65.6	89.9	100.0	12.6	47.3	92.2	100.0	12.2	47.6	92.7	100.0	15.0	45.5	89.0	100.0
Temporary	13.3	65.2	86.8	100.0	21.6	58.6	94.8	100.0	20.2	61.4	95.7	100.0	25.0	51.4	92.5	100.0
Pregnancy	8.3	56.2	77.4	100.0	26.2	51.6	93.1	100.0	-----	-----	-----	-----	26.5	51.5	93.1	100.0

[1] Distribution based on number of claimants shown in table 9.
[2] See table 1, footnote 2, and table 4, footnote 2.
[3] Length of unemployment was measured from date of separation from last employment to week in which last claim in current claims series was made, or to cut-off date—whichever was earlier.
[4] Duration of benefit payments was measured from the beginning of the first compensated week to the end of the most recent compensated week within the current claims series prior to cut-off date.

employed persons had been seeking work for more than 3 months.

More than 80 percent of the claimants drew benefits for less than 9 weeks. Only 15 percent drew no benefits; in Colorado and Washington, however, more than half received no benefits. Six percent of all claimants drew benefits for 14 weeks or more; the proportion of beneficiaries with these long periods of benefits ranged among the States from 12 percent in Alabama and New York to less than 1 percent in Idaho and Washington and none in North Dakota. In Colorado, Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Oregon, and Washington, less than 5 percent of the claimants drew benefits for more than 8 weeks.

Duration of unemployment and additional occupational classification.—Claimants with additional occupational classifications tended to have a relatively short duration of unemployment; only 6 percent of the claimants with three or more additional classifications, compared with 10 percent of all claimants, were unemployed for more than 6 months. Only 3 percent of the claimants with three or more additional classifications drew benefits for as much as 14 weeks. Of the claimants in noncritical occupations who had additional classifications, 19 percent had drawn no benefits and 5 percent had drawn benefits for 14 weeks or more, as compared with 15 and 6 percent, respectively, for all claimants in noncritical occupations.

Duration of unemployment and critical occupation.—As might have been expected, claimants in nationally critical occupations reported the shortest period of unemployment; 20 percent of the claimants in such occupations, but 15 percent in noncritical occupations, drew no benefits. While 14 percent of all claimants were unemployed less than 5 weeks, 21 percent of those in nationally critical occupations in shortage areas, and 18 percent in nonshortage areas, had been unemployed for so brief a period.

Duration of unemployment and type of separation.—Half of the claimants were unemployed as the result of a lay-off expected to last 30 days or more, while only 8 percent had been laid off for less than 30 days. About 18 percent had left their former jobs voluntarily, and 9 percent were reported as discharged. As might have been expected, the cause of separation was directly related to duration of unemployment.

Fifty percent of the claimants whose lay-off was expected to last less than 30 days were unemployed less than 5 weeks, and 96 percent were unemployed for not more than 3 months. More than 22 percent received no benefits, and more than 97 percent drew benefits for less than 9 weeks.

Three-fourths of the claimants who were laid off for 30 days or more were unemployed for not more than 3 months. Their duration of benefit payments was similar to that of all claimants, though a much smaller percentage drew no benefits.

The longer duration of unemployment of those who quit their last jobs was marked; 20 percent of this group, as compared with 10 percent of all claimants, remained unemployed for more than 6 months. It is likely that some of these claimants had withdrawn from the labor market temporarily. The unemployment and benefit experience of discharged claimants did not differ greatly from that of all claimants.

Duration of unemployment and employment status.—Claimants who were reported to have found jobs through sources other than the Employment Service had considerably briefer unemployment than those placed by the Employment Service. Of the former group, 58–65 percent drew less than 3 weeks of benefits, but about 52 percent of those placed by the Employment Service and 28 percent of all claimants had such short duration.

Duration of unemployment and personal characteristics.—The percent of claimants who drew no benefits declined as age increased—further evidence of the greater referability of younger claimants (table 5).

Age	*Percent*
Under 22	24.8
22–44	16.9
45–64	12.9
65 and over	9.2

Women were unemployed longer and drew benefits for more weeks than men. Fifteen percent of the women as compared with 7 percent of the men were unemployed for 27 or more weeks, and 9 and 5 percent, respectively, drew benefits for at least 14 weeks. These differences may result from the fact that women were mostly in service, semiskilled, and unskilled occupations while a greater proportion of the men were in skilled occupations in which job opportunities were better. In a com-

parison of the group of claimants with physical handicaps, however, it was found that women returned to work sooner than men.

Single claimants had shorter periods of unemployment than married claimants. The greater mobility of single persons gave them a distinct advantage in accepting jobs in war-production areas which might be at a distance from their former work.

Married women with dependents experienced longer intervals of unemployment than those without dependents. About 20 percent of the former were unemployed for more than 26 weeks, in contrast to 13 percent of the latter. Family responsibilities undoubtedly interfered with placements, thus lengthening the period of unemployment. The presence of dependents made no such difference to male claimants.

Lack of citizenship did not materially influence the length of unemployment or duration of benefit payments, though what differences there were indicated that noncitizens required more time to find a job. Nationality, also, had little effect on these two variables.

While claimants with permanent physical handicaps drew benefits longer than those temporarily handicapped, the duration of unemployment and of benefit payments for all handicapped claimants was only slightly greater than for those without physical disabilities. Pregnant women had the longest duration of unemployment among all handicapped claimants; since they are frequently disqualified from benefits, however, their benefit duration is not an indicator of the length of their unemployment.

Men deferred for occupational reasons were unemployed for a shorter time than those with 1A status:

Draft status	All claimants		Percent of claimants—			
	Number	Percent	Unemployed less than 5 weeks	Unemployed less than 14 weeks	Drawing no benefit	Less than 9 weeks compensated
All claimants	14,721	100.0	17.7	77.1	17.7	88.1
1A	1,030	7.0	13.9	75.9	16.9	88.7
Deferred for:						
Essential activities	142	1.0	21.8	73.3	24.6	87.4
War production	451	3.1	25.1	84.3	26.3	93.5
Agriculture	68	.5	14.7	70.6	26.5	86.8
Family responsibility	4,508	30.5	21.2	80.6	27.3	86.4
4F	1,554	10.6	16.5	73.7	19.5	85.9
Others	6,968	47.3	15.8	75.3	16.0	87.7

Those classified 4F had relatively long benefit duration as did the 68 claimants who were deferred because of their agricultural attachment. In the absence of detailed information on the reasons for their unemployment, the deferred claimants appeared to have been unemployed for rather long periods, in view of the shortage of workers in essential or critical occupations.

Employment Status

While the data analyzed here concern the relationship of personal and occupational characteristics of claimants to referral and placement activities, it should be borne in mind that such factors as the industrial composition of the area, employment conditions, the specific period during which the study was conducted, and the provisions of the unemployment compensation laws themselves, all of which are not amenable to quantitative analysis, may affect the data. Heavy seasonal lay-offs, such as occur during the winter in Northern States, may release workers who cannot be referred satisfactorily to openings in other types of work. On the other hand, industrial expansion in a given area may increase sharply the number of referrals and placements and deplete the files of workers most readily referable to jobs.

A large number of referrals reported in a given area may mean, in one case, due consideration of employer specifications and the qualifications of the claimant, and, in another case, referrals without such consideration. The value of the former referrals is obviously much greater to both employers and workers. Since factors such as these could not be measured in the present study and, more important, since comparable information is not available for nonclaimants, conclusions regarding the relative efficiency of the Employment Service in given States or areas cannot be drawn.

The claimants were divided into two groups. For those (class B) who had been unemployed continuously for 5 or more weeks at the time of the survey (47 percent of the total), information on referral, placement, and employment status was filled out at once. But for those (class A) who had been unemployed less than 5 weeks (53 percent of all claimants) this information was not filled out until the week ending March 13, 1943. The purpose of the 4-week follow-up period for this group was to ensure that information on Employment Service activities would cover a period

roughly comparable to that for class B claimants.

The placement and referral activity of the Employment Service was somewhat understated. During a period of full employment such as prevailed at the time of the survey, the great majority of claimants tend to be reemployed rapidly, while many of those who, because of personal or occupational handicaps, fail to get jobs at once may remain unemployed for some weeks or months. Within the first quarter of 1943, only two-thirds of the 424,142 first determinations [9] were followed by payment of benefits, an indication that a considerable number of claimants who had filed initial claims were reemployed before benefits became payable to them. The claimants who had been unemployed for 5 or more weeks at the time of the survey, therefore, constituted the residue of the entire group of claimants who had become unemployed in January 1943 or before. The experience of the claimants who had been successfully placed or whose placements were pending at the time of the survey could not be studied. Consequently, virtually all recorded placements relate to the 23,000 claimants in class A, while only unsuccessful referrals for the most part were recorded for the 20,000 claimants in class B.

More useful information as to the referral and placement activity of the Employment Service with respect to claimants would have been yielded by a similar analysis confined to all claimants becoming unemployed during a given week. Since data were not tabulated separately for the two groups of claimants, it is not possible to state what proportion of the claimants unemployed less than 5 weeks at the time of the survey were placed or referred during the survey week. However, since this group comprised only slightly more than 50 percent of the entire sample, it would not be unreasonable to believe that, if the study had been related to a given week, the proportion of claimants reported as placed might have been about double the figure obtained from the current study.

Moreover, since data on referral and placement were drawn exclusively from local employment office records, any failure on the part of local office personnel to record referrals and placements resulted in an understatement of such activity. While exact information is not available, it was generally conceded by Employment Service and State agency personnel that, in many local offices, failure to follow normal procedures because of inadequate and inexperienced staff at a time of increased responsibilities resulted in an understatement of referral and placement activities.

Employment status and registration.—About 98 percent of the claimants were registered by the U. S. Employment Service.[10] Some of these had registered before their current spell of unemployment, but 87 percent were interviewed during their current unemployment. The Employment Service had complete registrations for four-fifths of the claimants, and self-applications had been prepared by most of the others (table 6). Skeleton registrations [11] were reported for not more than 3 percent of the claimants, and only 2 percent had no registration.[12] The reasons for nonregistration were given as follows:

Reasons for nonregistration	All claimants	
	Number	Percent
Total	1,011	100.0
Itinerant service	192	19.0
Temporary lay-off	185	18.3
Registration scheduled	73	7.2
Union hiring	46	4.5
Other [13]	515	51.0

About 34 percent of the claimants with complete registrations were referred to jobs, in contrast to 24 percent of those with skeleton registrations. Some 52 percent of all claimants refused to accept referrals. The relatively scanty information for claimants with skeleton registrations may have been responsible for the fact that refusals were reported for 57 percent of this group. Furthermore, only 11 percent of the referrals of such workers resulted in placements, as compared with an over-all percentage of 14. It is of interest that 11 percent of the claimants who had not registered were reported as reemployed at the close of the survey, most of them with their former employer. Since only 10 percent of all claimants were recorded

[9] The decision made by the initial authority of a State employment security agency with respect to a claim.

[10] Every claimant registers for work when he files a claim, although a complete registration based upon an interview may be deferred in certain circumstances. Had the survey not excluded mail claims, the proportion of claimants not registered would have been somewhat greater, since many mail claimants do not register at the time of filing.

[11] A skeleton registration which contains only the basic occupational information concerning the applicant is used in cases in which complete information is not needed for proper referral and placement.

[12] Includes 115 claimants for whom no information on type of registration was available.

as reemployed, the absence of registrations for these claimants did not appear to have handicapped their reemployment.[13]

[13] Almost 13 percent of the claimants with skeleton registrations were unemployed for more than 6 months as compared with 10 percent of all claimants, and 19 percent drew benefits for 14 weeks or more as compared with 6 percent of all claimants. Since many unregistered claimants were expecting reemployment very shortly, it is not surprising that 23 percent drew no benefits, almost double the proportion of all claimants who drew no benefits.

Employment status and additional occupational classification.—More than one occupational classification was assigned to 25 percent of the claimants, thus permitting them to be considered for a job in more than one type of work. The greater the number of additional classifications, the higher was the percentage of referrals which re-

Table 6.—*Claimants referred, placed, or reported employed, by type of registration, occupational and area classification, type of separation, and employment status* [1]

Type of registration, occupational [2] and area [3] classification, type of separation, and employment status [4]	Claimants referred [5]		Claimants refusing job or job offer		Claimants placed or reported employed [6]								
					Total		Placed					Reported employed	
										Percent placed with—			Percent employed with—
	Number	Percent of all claimants	Number	Percent of claimants referred	Number	Percent of all claimants	Number	Percent of all claimants	Percent of claimants referred	Former employer	Other employer	Number	Former employer	Other employer
All registrations	13,886	32.5	7,177	51.7	4,190	9.8	1,081	4.6	14.3	5.9	94.1	2,209	51.7	48.3
Complete	11,508	34.2	6,031	52.4	3,442	9.4	1,052	4.5	14.4	6.0	94.0	1,790	50.3	49.7
Skeleton	296	23.0	168	56.8	89	7.2	33	2.7	11.1	12.1	87.9	56	42.9	57.1
Self-application	2,033	29.8	950	46.7	555	8.1	289	4.2	14.2	4.5	95.5	266	51.9	48.1
No registration					95	11.1						95	83.2	16.8
Unknown	49	20.9	28	57.1	0	5.5	7	4.3	14.3	0	100.0	2	0	100.0
Assignment of additional occupational classification:														
All claimants	13,886	32.5	7,177	51.7	4,190	9.8	1,081	4.6	14.3	5.9	94.1	2,209	51.7	48.3
No additional classification	9,640	30.0	5,056	52.4	2,927	9.1	1,319	4.1	13.7	6.9	93.1	1,608	53.3	46.7
1 additional classification	3,322	38.3	1,672	50.3	1,004	11.6	503	5.8	15.1	3.8	96.2	501	48.9	51.1
2 additional classifications	696	47.3	339	48.7	192	13.1	118	8.0	17.0	3.4	96.6	74	36.5	63.5
3 or more additional classifications	189	49.4	91	48.2	56	14.6	37	9.7	19.6	5.4	94.6	19	42.1	57.9
Unknown	39	34.8	19	48.7	11	9.8	4	3.6	10.3	0	100.0	7	57.1	42.9
All separations, total	13,886	32.5	7,177	51.7	4,190	9.8	1,081	4.6	14.3	5.9	94.1	2,209	51.7	48.3
Lay-off of less than 30 days	807	24.5	468	58.0	690	21.3	134	4.1	16.6	7.5	92.5	555	79.8	20.2
Lay-off of 30 days or more	6,056	31.1	3,608	54.2	1,945	9.1	884	4.1	13.3	6.0	94.0	1,061	52.0	48.0
Discharge	1,432	35.6	732	51.1	307	7.6	193	4.8	13.5	4.7	95.3	114	16.7	83.3
Quit	2,899	37.3	1,301	44.9	705	9.1	460	5.9	15.9	5.4	94.6	245	15.9	84.1
Labor dispute	16	24.2	11	73.3	5	8.1	2	3.2	13.3	0	100.0	3	33.3	66.7
Other	2,077	33.5	1,057	50.9	529	8.5	308	5.0	14.8	6.2	93.8	221	35.7	64.3
Claimants in all occupations, total	13,886	32.5	7,177	51.7	4,190	9.8	1,981	4.6	14.3	5.9	94.1	2,209	51.7	48.3
Claimants in shortage areas, total	3,203	36.8	1,407	43.9	973	11.2	514	5.9	16.0	3.7	96.3	459	48.4	51.6
Nationally critical	195	48.0	75	38.5	85	20.9	40	9.9	20.5	7.5	92.5	45	48.9	51.1
Locally critical	120	47.1	39	32.5	41	16.1	28	11.0	23.3	3.6	96.4	13	76.9	23.1
Noncritical	2,888	35.9	1,293	44.8	847	10.5	446	5.5	15.4	3.4	96.6	401	47.4	52.6
Claimants in nonshortage areas, total	10,683	31.4	5,770	54.0	3,217	9.4	1,467	4.3	13.7	6.6	93.4	1,750	52.5	47.5
Nationally critical	393	44.7	200	50.9	135	15.4	60	7.5	16.8	4.5	95.5	69	39.1	60.9
Locally critical	380	43.4	241	63.4	135	15.4	53	6.1	13.9	13.2	86.8	82	59.8	40.2
Noncritical	9,910	30.7	5,329	53.8	2,047	9.1	1,348	4.2	13.6	6.5	93.5	1,599	52.7	47.3
Claimants employed at the completion of survey, total	3,037	51.9	895	29.5	4,190	71.6	1,981	33.9	65.2	5.9	94.1	2,209	51.7	48.3
Claimants in shortage areas, total	783	57.0	212	27.1	973	70.8	514	37.4	65.6	3.7	96.3	459	48.4	51.6
Nationally critical	65	65.0	14	21.5	85	85.0	40	40.0	61.5	7.5	92.5	45	48.9	51.1
Locally critical	33	68.8	5	15.2	41	85.4	28	58.3	84.8	3.6	96.4	13	76.9	23.1
Noncritical	685	55.9	193	28.2	847	69.1	446	36.4	65.1	3.4	96.6	401	47.4	52.6
Claimants in nonshortage areas, total	2,254	50.4	683	30.3	3,217	71.9	1,467	32.8	65.1	6.6	93.4	1,750	52.5	47.5
Nationally critical	107	60.5	36	33.6	135	76.3	66	37.3	61.7	4.5	95.5	69	39.1	60.9
Locally critical	92	52.9	38	41.3	135	77.6	53	30.5	57.6	13.2	86.8	82	59.8	40.2
Noncritical	2,055	49.8	609	29.6	2,947	71.4	1,348	32.7	65.6	6.5	93.5	1,599	52.7	47.3
Claimants not employed at the completion of survey, total	7,028	28.0	3,847	54.7										
Claimants in shortage areas, total	1,461	32.3	629	43.1										
Nationally critical	70	44.9	37	46.8										
Locally critical	51	37.8	13	25.5										
Noncritical	1,331	31.6	579	43.5										
Claimants in nonshortage areas, total	5,567	27.1	3,218	57.8										
Nationally critical	172	38.3	95	55.2										
Locally critical	168	39.3	117	69.6										
Noncritical	5,227	26.5	3,006	57.5										

[1] See table 1, footnote 2.

[2] A critical occupation is an essential occupation in which existing or anticipated demand exceeds available supply. A nationally critical occupation is one listed as such in releases of the War Manpower Commission. A locally critical occupation is a critical occupation not included in the national list.

[3] Shortage areas are those with a current acute labor shortage or labor stringency and those anticipating a labor shortage within 6 months. All other areas are classified as nonshortage.

[4] Employment status determined as of cut-off date, which was Feb. 13, 1943, for claimants who had filed claims for less than 5 weeks of unemployment during the present claims series, and was March 13 for all other claimants.

[5] Includes all referrals made prior to survey week.

[6] Includes only placements made or employment reported during or after survey week prior to cut-off date.

sulted in placements. This latter percentage was nearly half again as great for claimants with three or more additional classifications as for claimants with only one classification.

Employment status and type of separation.—The type of separation is directly related to duration of unemployment, as pointed out above, and also to opportunities for referral. More than one-third of the claimants who quit or were discharged from their last employment or were laid off for 30 days or more were offered referral, in contrast to one-fourth of those laid off for less than 30 days. The claimants in the latter group were relatively unsuitable for referral by the Employment Service because they retained an attachment to a former employer. Claimants who had quit or been discharged from their last jobs—the group with the highest percentage of referrals—had a relatively low percentage of refusals, possibly because their manner of separation disqualified many of them from benefits; they may therefore have been more willing to accept any offered work. Claimants who are laid off tend to return to their former employers more often than any other group. Four of every five reemployed claimants who were laid off for less than 30 days and every second claimant laid off for 30 days or more returned to their former employer, as compared with one out of six who were discharged or quit their former jobs.

Employment status and occupation.—Although 87 percent of the claimants were seen by an Employment Service interviewer during their current spell of unemployment, only 33 percent were referred to job openings. However, the proportion of referrals ranged from about 16 percent in Georgia, Idaho, and Louisiana to 60 percent in Oklahoma and 66 percent in Montana; it was considerably greater in shortage than in nonshortage areas and in critical than in noncritical occupations (table 6).

More than half of those referred to jobs refused one or more of the referrals offered them. Furthermore, 38 percent of the claimants referred were rejected by the employer.[14] The percentage of refusals to accept referral was smaller in shortage than in nonshortage areas (44 as against 54 percent), and was only about 30 percent for claimants employed at the end of the survey.

More than 20 percent of the claimants in critical occupations in shortage areas who were referred to jobs were placed, compared with the over-all figure of 14 percent. In connection with the latter figure, however, the understatement of the data on the volume of placements must be kept in mind; the automatic elimination of all successful referrals within the period preceding the survey resulted in an overrepresentation of unsuccessful referrals, which is shown in the unrealistic ratio of one placement for every seven referrals.

[14] A report by the Illinois Employment Security Agency as of August 20, 1943, on the results of the spot placement program for April 25–July 24 indicates that 34 percent of the 118,816 claimants were offered referral to jobs, and that half of these referrals were believed to have resulted in employment. Of those offered referrals, 33 percent refused to accept them; 73 percent of the refusals were found to have been for "good cause"; and in 5 percent of the cases the claimant was found to be unavailable for work, either temporarily or indefinitely. The remaining 22 percent of the cases resulted in contests to determine whether the claimant had good cause for refusal.

Table 7.—*Number and percent of claimants referred in usual or other than usual occupation, by occupational and area classification* [1]

Occupational and area classification	Number of claimants referred [2]	Number of claimants referred [3] in usual, other than usual, or either occupation	Referred in usual occupation		Referred in other than usual occupation	
			Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Claimants in all occupations, total	13,886	15,002	6,076	40.3	9,016	59.7
Claimants in shortage areas, total	3,203	3,651	1,603	42.3	2,048	57.7
Nationally critical	105	220	115	50.9	111	49.1
Locally critical	120	135	64	47.4	71	52.6
Noncritical	2,888	3,100	1,324	41.5	1,866	58.5
Claimants in nonshortage areas, total	10,683	11,541	4,573	39.6	6,968	60.4
Nationally critical	393	447	210	47.0	237	53.0
Locally critical	380	434	202	46.5	232	53.5
Noncritical	9,910	10,660	4,161	39.0	6,499	61.0

[1] See footnotes to tables 1 and 6 for definitions of terms used in this table.
[2] Includes all referrals made prior to survey week.
[3] This figure is greater than the number of claimants referred because claimants referred in both usual and other than usual occupation were counted twice.

Table 8.—*Frequency of referrals [1] and refusals, by occupational and area classification [2]*

Occupational and area classification	Percentage distribution of claimants by—												
	Number of referrals in usual occupation				Number of referrals in other than usual occupation				Number of refusals of jobs				
	All	1	2	3 or more	All	1	2	3 or more	Number	All	1	2	3 or more
Claimants in all occupations, total	100.0	76.1	16.5	7.4	100.0	72.5	18.1	9.4	7,177	100.0	72.6	18.5	8.9
Shortage areas, total	100.0	74.4	17.2	8.4	100.0	70.7	17.5	11.8	1,407	100.0	71.5	16.7	11.8
Nationally critical	100.0	67.9	19.1	13.0	100.0	70.3	18.0	11.7	75	100.0	61.3	24.0	14.7
Locally critical	100.0	73.4	21.9	4.7	100.0	70.4	15.5	14.1	30	100.0	76.9	12.8	10.3
Noncritical	100.0	75.0	16.8	8.2	100.0	70.8	17.5	11.7	1,293	100.0	71.9	16.4	11.7
Nonshortage areas, total	100.0	76.6	16.3	7.1	100.0	72.9	18.3	8.8	5,770	100.0	73.0	18.8	8.2
Nationally critical	100.0	71.9	20.5	7.6	100.0	74.6	16.5	8.9	200	100.0	75.5	15.5	9.0
Locally critical	100.0	71.3	22.3	6.4	100.0	68.6	19.8	11.6	241	100.0	63.9	22.8	13.3
Noncritical	100.0	77.1	15.8	7.1	100.0	73.0	18.3	8.7	5,329	100.0	73.4	18.6	8.0

[1] Includes all referrals made prior to survey week.

[2] See footnotes to tables 1 and 6 for definitions of terms used in this table.

Altogether, 10 percent of the claimant group were reported reemployed during the period studied. Of the 4,190 claimants reported placed or employed, 47 percent were placed by the Employment Service and 53 percent employed through their own efforts. In shortage areas the percentage of claimants placed exceeded the proportion employed through their own efforts, an indication of greater success or greater efforts of the Employment Service in those areas.

Only 6 percent of all claimants reported as placed went back to their former employers, but this figure varied with the type of occupation and area. The highest percentage (13) was found for claimants in locally critical occupations in nonshortage areas. It is reasonable to assume that most employers who reemploy their former workers would not normally do so through the Employment Service, and that they would use the Service most frequently in hiring workers in critical occupations.

Of the claimants reported as employed at the close of the survey, about half had gone back to their former employers. This fact clearly reflects the large representation of seasonal workers (in construction, apparel, canning) who tend to return to their former employers as soon as the busy season begins and for whom placement efforts by the Employment Service are of minor importance. In locally critical occupations, three of every four claimants returned to their former employers.

Of the 13,886 claimants referred, about 9 percent were referred in both their usual and in other than their usual occupations (table 7). The percent referred in both types of occupations was greatest for claimants whose primary classification was in a critical occupation.

Six of every 10 claimants and about half of those in critical occupations offered referral were referred to other than their usual occupations. About 1 of 4 claimants was referred more than once in his usual occupation and 7 of every 100 claimants had 3 or more referrals. Claimants in critical occupations, for whom the demand was greatest, had a much higher record of referrals; twice as many as the average were referred 3 times or more in their usual occupations.

Twenty-seven percent of the claimants who refused to accept referral refused more than once, 9 percent three times or more; a higher percentage of claimants in nationally critical occupations—15 percent in shortage areas—refused referrals 3 times or more.

Employment status and training.—Few of the claimants had been enrolled in vocational training courses. While many claimants may have found it necessary to change their occupations in order to find jobs, apparently few were ready to take the necessary training at the time they filed claims for unemployment compensation. Of the 42,757 claimants in the sample, 1,219 had refused referral to training courses, and only 1,335 had accepted such referrals. In the latter group, 455 had completed training, 554 were attending courses, and 326 were awaiting assignment to a class. The small use of the vocational training facilities by claimants may have been due not only to the larger concentration of seasonal and older workers among the claimant group but also to a preference for training on the job, with the expectation of continued employment, instead of noncompensated training in vocational courses with uncertain opportunities for employment.

Training courses had little effect on referral

and placement activities. While no detailed analysis of the available figures is presented in this article, it may be noted that the percent of claimants who completed training courses was far greater for those in nationally critical occupations than those in noncritical occupations, and greater in nonshortage than in shortage areas. Three-fifths of those who had completed training courses were assigned additional classifications. Most claimants who completed or were attending training courses had been laid off for 30 days or more or quit their jobs, and they probably felt the need for obtaining or improving occupational skills.

Employment status and personal characteristics of claimants.—Young workers were found to be more readily referable to jobs than those in the older age groups; about half as many claimants who were 65 and over returned to work as in the other age groups (table 9). Placement efforts were 50 percent more successful for claimants under age 22 than for the average claimant.

Proportionately more single than married claimants were reemployed. In general, single claimants without dependents showed a higher rate of reemployment than those with dependents; married claimants, on the other hand, were reemployed more rapidly if they had dependents.

Relatively, only half as many noncitizens as citizens were placed by the Employment Service; however, the chances of reemployment through other sources appeared to be almost equal for both groups. Claimants of American birth had a better placement and reemployment record than those of foreign birth.

Physical handicaps had little effect on reem-

Table 9.—*Distribution of claimants placed or reported employed, by age, citizenship, nationality, marital and dependency status, type of physical handicap, and draft status* [1]

Selected characteristic	Total claimants	Placed or reported employed						
		Total number	Percentage distribution	Percent of total claimants	Percent placed with—		Percent reported employed with—	
					Former employer	Other employer	Former employer	Other employer
Age, total [2]	42,753	4,190	100.0	9.9	0.3	4.4	2.7	2.5
Under 22	2,240	240	5.7	10.7	.3	6.1	1.8	2.5
22–44	19,501	2,072	49.4	10.7	.3	4.9	2.8	2.7
45–64	17,258	1,687	40.3	9.8	.3	4.1	2.9	2.5
65 and over	3,754	191	4.6	5.2	.2	2.0	1.6	1.4
Citizenship, total	42,757	4,190	100.0	9.9	.3	4.4	2.7	2.5
Citizens	38,900	3,927	93.7	10.1	.3	4.6	2.6	2.6
Noncitizens	3,857	263	6.3	7.3	.2	2.2	3.4	1.5
Nationality, total	42,757	4,190	100.0	9.9	.3	4.4	2.7	2.5
American	32,397	3,361	80.2	10.4	.3	4.8	2.6	2.7
German	803	77	1.8	9.6	.3	3.7	2.1	3.5
Italian	2,277	128	3.1	5.6	0	2.2	2.1	1.3
Other	7,280	624	14.9	8.6	.2	3.2	3.4	1.8
Marital and dependency status, total [3]	42,670	4,181	100.0	9.9	.3	4.4	2.7	2.5
Single	6,779	736	17.6	11.0	.3	5.3	2.8	2.6
With dependents	1,403	142	3.4	10.2	.1	5.5	2.2	2.4
Without dependents	5,376	594	14.2	11.2	.3	5.3	3.0	2.6
Married	35,891	3,445	82.4	9.7	.3	4.2	2.7	2.5
With dependents	13,818	1,441	34.5	10.5	.3	4.6	2.8	2.8
Without dependents	22,073	2,004	47.9	9.2	.3	4.0	2.6	2.3
Physical handicap, total	42,757	4,190	100.0	9.9	.3	4.4	2.7	2.5
No physical handicaps, total	38,525	3,843	91.7	10.1	.3	4.4	2.8	2.6
Physically handicapped, total	4,232	347	8.3	8.2	.2	4.5	1.3	2.2
Permanent	3,269	272	6.5	8.4	.2	4.7	1.5	2.0
Temporary	746	72	1.7	9.8	.3	4.9	1.1	3.5
Pregnancy	217	3	.1	1.5	0	.5	.5	.5
Draft status: [4]								
All claimants with draft status	14,721	1,821	100.0	12.4	.2	5.7	3.0	3.5
1A fit for general military service	1,030	94	5.2	9.2	.1	5.3	1.3	2.5
2A deferred (essential activities)	142	20	1.1	14.0	.7	5.6	4.2	3.5
2B and 3B deferred (war production)	451	94	5.2	21.0	.4	6.7	8.3	5.6
2C and 3C deferred (agricultural occupation)	68	4	.2	6.0	0	3.0	1.5	1.5
3A deferred (family responsibility)	4,508	626	34.3	14.0	.3	6.0	3.7	4.0
4F rejected	1,554	204	11.2	13.4	.5	8.1	1.8	3.0
Other	6,968	779	42.8	11.3	.2	5.0	2.7	3.4

[1] See footnotes to tables 1, 4, and 6 for definitions of terms used in this table.
[2] Excludes 4 claimants; data not available.
[3] Excludes 87 claimants; data not available.
[4] Status as of February 1943.

ployment. The percent of temporarily and permanently handicapped claimants who were reemployed was about the same as the average for all claimants.

Claimants classified as 1A encountered more difficulties in obtaining reemployment than those with other draft classifications who had any appreciable representation in the sample. Thus, 21 percent of those deferred because of their attachment to war production and 14 percent of those with family responsibilities were placed or found employment, as compared with 9 percent of those with 1A classifications. About 13 percent of claimants in 4F returned to employment.

Social Insurance and Public Assistance Payments

ELVA MARQUARD*

QUESTIONS ARE FREQUENTLY RAISED concerning the relative levels of payments under insurance and assistance programs established by the Social Security Act. How, for example, do benefits paid aged retired workers who are insured under old-age and survivors insurance compare with old-age assistance payments, or survivor benefits with payments for aid to dependent children? The differing character of social insurance and public assistance payments and some of the reasons for variations among States in average payments under old-age and survivors insurance and under public assistance are traced here in general terms.

In December 1942, payments were made to 2.2 million needy aged persons under the old-age assistance program and to 346,000 needy families in which one or more children were eligible for aid to dependent children. A much smaller group benefited under the relatively new Federal old-age and survivors insurance program, in which monthly payments on the basis of employment in commercial and industrial establishments were first made in 1940; 260,000 aged persons received primary benefits in December 1942, and about 57,000 families received both widow's current benefits and child's benefits.[1]

The average old-age assistance payment of $23.43 for December 1942 was 41 cents higher than the average primary insurance benefit paid to retired workers. On the other hand, the average family payment of $37.27 under the assistance program for dependent children was about $3 below the average insurance payment of $40 for this group.[2] It should be borne in mind that some individuals receive both insurance and assistance payments. Since the latter are based on need, they may be made if the insurance benefit is found to be inadequate.

Differences in the Programs

Differences in individual payments under the insurance and assistance programs result from various differences in the programs, the most important of which are concerned with administration, financing, coverage, and the basis of payments.

Administration.—The national character of old-age and survivors insurance results in policies and procedures which are uniform throughout the country. Although old-age assistance and aid to dependent children are administered under State plans approved by the Social Security Board, a wide variety of practices is possible within the standards required under the Social Security Act.

Financing.—Insurance benefits are paid from a trust fund to which the contributions of workers and employers have been appropriated, and this fund is maintained at a level adequate to meet current obligations in full. Assistance payments are financed through State and local funds and matching amounts from the Federal Government, except that amounts exceeding maximum individual payments established in the act are not matched. Low fiscal capacity of the State, as well as frugality of State appropriations, results in inadequate assistance payments in some States.

*Bureau of Research and Statistics, Division of Coordination Studies.

[1] In addition to these 3 types, with which this study is concerned, 3 other types of monthly benefits are also paid: wife's, widow's, and parent's. On December 31, 1940, some 245,000 persons were entitled to monthly benefits and on December 31, 1942, 692,000 persons. If an insured wage earner leaves no surviving widow, child, or parent entitled to monthly benefits at his death, a lump-sum benefit is payable to specified survivors.

[2] Estimated. Data on average benefits in force for families receiving both widow's current and child's benefits not available for December 1942. The assistance average of $37.27 relates to the 43 States (including District of Columbia and Hawaii) with approved plans in November 1940; 3 additional States had approved plans in December 1942.