IMPACT OF INCLUDING MONETARILY INELIGIBLE CLAIMANTS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IN THE LAUS ESTIMATING SYSTEM

THE IMPACT OF INCLUDING MONETARILY INELIGIBLE CLAIMANTS FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE IN THE LAUS ESTIMATING SYSTEM

by

THE RESEARCH AND REPORTS SECTION
OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ADMINISTRATION
ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY

PREFACE

The Bureau of Labor Statistics does not specifically include monetarily ineligible claimants for unemployment insurance in its LAUS (Local Area Unemployment Statistics) estimating system. For purposes of improving estimates of unemployment at the substate level, we obtained characteristics of unemployment insurance claimants from the Arizona UI database and conducted a survey of monetarily ineligible claimants with regards to their labor force status. The Bureau of Labor Statistics provided funding for the project. We found that the chance of a claimant being determined monetarily ineligible for UI benefits is affected by that person's sex, ethnic background, age, and other characteristics. Unemployment rates for monetarily ineligible claimants after the date of their filing were computed from our survey data. Methods of integrating those survey results into the LAUS estimating are explored in this paper.

This report was written by Mr. Robert Furgerson. Several other individuals within the Research and Reports Section of the Unemployment Insurance Administration of the Arizona Department of Economic Security contributed to the overall development of the report. Mr. Richard Porterfield initially supervised the study; his planning of project tasks had much to do with its successful completion. The jobs of maintaining records of survey responses, phoning members of the survey group, and typing this report were carefully performed by Ms. Agnes Toombs, Ms. Rosemary Gutierrez, Mr. Gilbert Mendoza, and Ms. Judith Vaughn. The coding of the questionnaire responses was accomplished by Ms. Karen Marsh. Mr. Joseph T. Sloane and Dr. Robert St. Louis carefully read a rough draft of this report and provided several useful comments. Dr. St. Louis also devised the sample design

used.

Several individuals from other organizations also lended assistance to this project. Mr. Vic Conti, who works for the Labor Market Information Section within the Arizona Department of Economic Security, provided useful technical advice and data. Valuable assistance was also given by Anne Christy and Ed Gray, who are computer programmers for the Office of Data Administration of the Arizona Department of Economic Security. Ms. Sharon Brown of the B.L.S. National Office and Ms. Mitzie Slater of the B.L.S. San Francisco Regional Office made several constructive suggestions regarding the content of this report. Ms. Slater, who acted as the Government Authorized Representative, deserves a special thanks for her help in the administration of this contract.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Currently, persons declared monetarily ineligible for Unemployment Insurance benefits are not specifically included in the LAUS estimating system. Failure to take monetarily ineligible claimants into account will produce biased estimates of unemployment at the substate level unless either of the following conditions is met:

(1) The number of monetarily ineligible claimants is an insignificant proportion of the labor force, or

(2) Monetarily ineligible claimants are distributed evenly throughout the state, and the labor force experience of those claimants does not vary significantly from area to area during the weeks following the ineligible claim.

In Arizona, the first condition is not satisfied. For calendar year 1979, 12,210 people filed for Unemployment Insurance benefits in Arizona and were determined to be monetarily ineligible (63,320 filed monetarily eligible claims). A contract with the Bureau of Labor Statistics enabled us to study a group of monetarily ineligible claimants to see if the second condition is met. Characteristics of persons filing for UI benefits in Arizona in 1979 were obtained from the UI data base. A sample of those persons determined to be ineligible due to monetary reasons was sent a mail questionnaire in order to ascertain their labor force status during the 26-week period immediately following the filing of their claim.

We found that the incidence of monetary ineligibility differs among Arizona counties. The labor force experiences of the survey respondents also vary among substate areas. In general, persons living in urban areas are likely to return to work or establish an eligible UI claim sooner than are persons residing in rural areas. Therefore, the second condition also is not met, and the LAUS estimating system may be improved by the specific inclusion of monetarily ineligible claimants.

The remainder of this paper is organized into eight sections:

(II) Comparison of the characteristics of monetarily eligible and monetarily ineligible claimants.

(III) Analysis of the reasons for monetary ineligibility in terms of personal characteristics.

(IV) Examination of the rate of ineligibility among various Arizona counties.

(V) Description of the design of the survey.

(VI) Results of the survey.

(VII) Proposed methods of utilizing the survey results in the LAUS estimating system.

(VIII) Impact on the estimate of new entrants and reentrants to the labor force.

(IX) Summary and conclusions.

II. COMPARISON BETWEEN MONETARILY ELIGIBLE AND MONETARILY INELIGIBLE CLAIMANTS

An individual filing for UI benefits in Arizona can be declared to be monetarily ineligible for benefits for any of the following reasons:

(1) Failure to earn a certain minimum amount of money while engaged in covered employment during the "high quarter", which is the quarter in a person's "base period" with the highest covered earnings. A "base period" is the first four of the last five quarters completed before a person's application for benefits. The minimum was $375 until August, 1979, at which time it was raised to $625. In August, 1980, the minimum was raised to $725.

(2) Having base period earnings which are less than one-and-one-half times those of the high quarter.

(3) Trying to establish a new benefit year within eighteen months of the prior benefit year beginning date without having earned since that date at least eight times the weekly benefit amount to which the claimant would be entitled.

Table 1, Appendix 1 shows that 63,320 people filed for UI benefits in 1979, and were determined to be monetarily eligible for benefits. Those declared ineligible numbered 12,210, or 16.2 percent of the total number of applicants. Monetarily ineligible claimants are typically just moving into the labor force (new entrants and reentrants) have difficulty staying attached to it (marginal workers), or work in non-covered employment.

A slightly larger percentage of female claimants were monetarily ineligible than were male claimants: 17.6 percent of females as compared to 15.3 percent of males. This is accounted for by the relatively higher unemployment that females have had (which indicates a less stable work history), and their increasing rate of entry into the labor force. Adult female participation in the labor force went from 49.3 percent in 1978 to 50.6 percent in 1979.*

The data shows that the very young and the elderly were more likely than persons in other age groups to be monetarily ineligible. 34.0 percent of the claimants under the age of 20 and 20.5 percent of claimants in the 20-21 age group were ineligible. People in those age groups are just moving into the labor force and are still acquiring needed job skills. The percentage of ineligibles in the 22-24 years category was about the same as the average, while in the age groups from 25-64, there were below-average rates of monetary ineligibility. 29.8 percent of persons 65 years and over failed to meet the monetary eligibility criterion.

Examination of the effect of ethnic background indicated that white claimants had a below-average incidence of monetary ineligibility: 15.1 percent as compared to 16.2 percent for the total group. Hispanics and Indians had rates of 17.4 and 19.1 percent, respectively, while blacks had the highest rate of monetary ineligibility (21.9 percent) of any of the ethnic groups. The difference between the Asians' incidence of monetary ineligibility and the total group's rate was not statistically significant at the five percent level.

---

*Monthly Labor Review, U.S. Dept. of Labor, December, 1979, page 68. Figures used are for women twenty years of age and above.

Among occupations, the "professional/technical/managerial" group had the lowest rate of monetary ineligibility - 13.1 percent. This is probably due to the above average wages and the relatively stable employment enjoyed by those workers. The farming/fishing/forestry classification had the highest incidence of monetary ineligibility at 27.0 percent. This can be explained by the relatively low wages of these occupational groups, and the fact that many agricultural workers are still not covered by the UI system.

A sizable percent of workers with no information available on industrial attachment were determined to be monetarily ineligible - 36.9 percent. This result is not surprising given that often no information is available on industrial attachment because an employee had no base period employer, and hence no base period wages. The industry with the greatest percentage of monetary ineligibles was the services industry (with 15.8 percent). This can be ascribed to that industry's lower than average wages, the non-coverage of many of its workers, and the fact that a sizable part of some service workers' wages come in the form of tips, which are not covered by the UI system.

A comparison of the claimants' high quarter and base period earnings showed the expected pattern of the group not monetarily eligible for benefits having much lower earnings than the group that met the monetary eligibility requirements. For example, 86.2 percent of the claimants with high quarter earnings of less than $700 were in the ineligible group, while only 3.6 percent of those with high quarter earnings of at least $5,000 failed to meet the monetary eligibility criteria. The two base-period wage distributions showed a similar pattern. People with annual earnings of less than $2,000 had an ineligibility rate of

77.8 percent, while only 1.2 percent of those with annual earnings of at least $5,000 failed to meet monetary eligibility. All of the base period wage categories in the range from $0 to $2,999 showed substantially more monetary ineligibles than the overall percentage (16.2 percent), and all of the categories above $3,000 showed substantially fewer. Obviously, the group not eligible for benefits is dominated by persons with extremely low earnings, consistent with the unemployment insurance principle of replacing lost earnings only for those who have demonstrated a strong labor force attachment.

III. REASONS FOR MONETARY INELIGIBILITY

This section is devoted to a fairly detailed explanation of the reasons for monetary ineligibility for the group that failed to meet Arizona's monetary requirements for benefit eligibility. As was just noted, this group is dominated by persons with extremely low earnings. As previously stated, reasons for monetary ineligibility include insufficient high quarter earnings (including no wages reported for the entire base period), a base-period-to-high-quarter-earnings ratio that is too low, and failure to meet the requirements for requalifying wages. The distribution of the total group (which was obtained by using a weighted sample) is summarized in the table below:

Reason for Monetary Ineligibility	Percent
No Base Period Wages	27.2%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	17.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Ratio Too Low	55.5%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.4%

Over one-fourth of these claimants had not received any wages from covered employment during the entire one-year base period, and an additional 17.2 percent had earned less than $625 (less than $375 before August, 1979) during their high quarters. The largest group, however, consisted of those who had sufficient high quarter earnings but failed to earn at least half as much as those earnings during the remaining three quarters of their base period. This group accounted for 55.5 percent of those declared ineligible.

Only 0.4 percent of the ineligible claimants were determined ineligible due to insufficient requalifying wages. It is interesting to compare that result to fiscal year 1976 data, which showed 16.7 percent of all ineligible claimants during that period being ruled ineligible due to insufficient requalifying wages. That workers in fiscal year 1976 were apparently more subject to periods of prolonged unemployment than workers in calendar year 1979 is not surprising. The country was just coming out of a recession in 1976, with the economic expansion continuing through most of 1979.

The distribution of men and women by reasons for monetary ineligibility reveals some interesting differences between the two groups, as shown in the summary table below:

Reason for Monetary Ineligibility	Male Percentage	Female Percentage
No Base Period Wages	28.6%	24.9%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	14.4%	20.8%
Base Period/High Quarter Ratio Too Low	56.5%	53.9%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.5%	0.3%

Men differed somewhat from women in terms of their reasons for monetary ineligibility. A larger percentage of the men had no base period earnings (28.6 vs. 24.9 percent) or were ineligible due to their base period earnings being less than one-and-one-half times their high quarter wages (56.5 percent as compared to 53.9 percent). 20.8 percent of the women were ineligible due to insufficient high quarter earnings, while relatively fewer men were ineligible due to that reason - 14.4 percent. The numbers of persons declared ineligible because of failure to earn sufficient requalifying wages were approximately equal between the two sexes.

In the remainder of this section, these reasons for monetary ineligibility in comparison to various other claimant characteristics are discussed. In each case, the emphasis is on marked departures from any particular characteristic, relative to the distribution recorded for the total sample.

Occupational Category. As shown above, a total of 44.2 percent of those ineligible for benefits had no base period earnings or insufficient high quarter earnings. The occupational category (see Appendix 1, Table 2) with the greatest percentage of its members ruled ineligible due to this reason was the service group (51.7%), followed by the farming/fishing/forestry category (51.0%). The high incidence of insufficient earnings in these cases may be explained partly by employment in noncovered establishments, the generally low wage levels in these industries, and for the service occupations, the fact that a large part of many workers' income is received through tips, which are usually not covered by the UI system.

A surprising result was that an above average percentage of professional/technical/managerial workers were ineligible due to low or no earnings (48.0%). Looking more closely at these workers, we find that only 7.1 percent (as compared to an average of 17.0 percent) had insufficient high quarter earnings. In contrast, 35.6 percent of them had no base period earnings, which was more than the average (27.2 percent) and also the highest of all the occupational groups. This may be due to a high number of these workers being self-employed during their base period.

For the total group, 55.5 percent failed to meet monetary eligibility requirements because the base period/high quarter earnings ratio was too low. Three occupations had a considerably larger proportion of their members failing to qualify for this reason: processing (64.9%), benchwork

(62.3%), and structural work (59.0%). That pattern is due, in part, to the seasonal nature of construction work and some of the processing and benchwork occupations (e.g., food and wood product processing).

Industrial Attachment. For the total group, 27.2 percent were ineligible for benefits because of no base period wages. A higher percentage (86.7%) of those in the information not available category failed to meet eligibility requirements because of no earnings (see Appendix 1, Table 3); those with no earnings in the base period are in the nonclassifiable category because they had no covered base period employment.

33.6 percent of the ineligibles from the wholesale and retail industries were ineligible due to insufficient high-quarter earnings, while 29.8 percent of those in the service industry were ineligible for the same reason. A contributing factor is the lower than average wage level of these industries. Another possible cause is the high number of young people in these industries - 25.7 percent of the ineligibles under 20 were in the wholesale or retail industry, while 15.2 percent were in the services industry. These workers are just entering the labor force and thus find it difficult to secure high-paying employment.

Overall, 55.5 percent of the ineligibles were determined to be ineligible because of their base-period-to-high-quarter-earnings ratio. However, if those with no information available on industrial classification are not considered, then the industry average of being ineligible for that reason is 75.2 percent. Taking that figure into account, the wholesale/retail industry had a below average percentage (65.6) of workers ineligible due to their base-period-to-high-quarter-earnings ratio; the transportation/communication/utilities category had the highest

percentage (87.3) of its workers ineligible because of that. Apparently, ineligibility due to a low base-period-to-high-quarter-earnings ratio is more likely in the higher paying industries.

Age. The distributions of reasons for ineligibility by age for the total sample and separately for males and females are provided in Tables 4, 5 and 6, respectively, of Appendix 1. About 44.2 percent of the total group of ineligibles had either no base period earnings or insufficient earnings; for workers under 20 years of age, however, the comparable percentage was much higher, as would be expected. 53.2 percent of male workers less than 20 years old and 54.6 percent of female workers in that age group failed to meet the minimum earnings requirement. The over 65 age group also showed high numbers of workers ineligible due to no or low earnings: 61.3 percent of the males and 53.6 percent of the females.

Overall, 55.5 percent of the total group was denied benefits because the requirement that base period earnings be at least one-and-one-half times high quarter earnings was not met. The 35-44 age group had the highest relative number of ineligibles disqualified for this reason (61.3 percent). This figure is broken down by sex into 61.2 percent for males and 60.2 percent for females.

Ethnic. The distribution by reason for ineligibility are quite similar for each of the ethnic groups with the exception of Indians (see Appendix 1, Table 7). 35.7 percent of them had no base period earnings, while this was true for only 27.2 percent of the total group. This can be explained by the fact that employers on Indian reservations are not required to pay into the unemployment insurance system.

IV. RATE OF INELIGIBILITY BY COUNTY

An important question with respect to LAUS estimating procedures is whether or not monetarily ineligible claimants are distributed equally throughout the state. In order to measure their distribution, two types of ratios were computed: the number of monetary ineligibles in a county divided by that county's labor force, and the percentage of new initial claims filed by a county's residents classified as monetarily ineligible. These ratios can be seen in the table below:

County	Number of Monetarily Ineligible Claims	Civilian Labor Force in 1979*	Ratio of Monetarily Ineligible Claims To Number in Labor Force	Percentage of New Initial Claims Determined to be Monetarily Ineligible
Apache	343	14,203	.024	20.5%
Cochise	711	25,072	.028	26.6%
Coconino	465	30,013	.015	18.6%
Gila	369	12,835	.029	26.6%
Graham	229	6,603	.035	24.6%
Greenlee	64	3,957	.016	33.0%
Maricopa	5,215	631,160	.008	13.4%
Mohave	325	17,357	.019	20.7%
Navajo	473	21,965	.022	21.7%
Pima	1,879	184,159	.010	15.1%
Pinal	791	26,064	.030	25.2%
Santa Cruz	201	7,349	.027	21.7%
Yavapai	319	24,075	.013	16.3%
Yuma	713	30,680	.023	17.9%
I.N.A.	113			20.5%
Total	12,210	1,080,094	.011	16.2%

*These are June, 1979 figures taken from Arizona Labor Market Newsletter, Arizona Department of Economic Security, July, 1979, page 14.

Maricopa had the most monetarily ineligible claims of any county; however, if the number of persons in each county's labor force is taken into account, it had relatively fewer ineligibles than the other counties (see preceding table). Pima County had a similar ratio of ineligible claims to labor force size. All of the rural counties had proportionately more monetarily ineligible claims than did Maricopa or Pima, with the ratio for Graham County being more than four times that of Maricopa.

If the number of monetarily ineligible claimants in comparison to all new initial claims is fairly constant across the substate areas, then they could be estimated from the total number of claims. Obviously, however, this ratio varies widely among the counties (see preceding table). Maricopa County had the lowest percentage (13.4) of claims being declared monetarily ineligible, while Pima County had the second lowest (15.1). The percentage of ineligible claims in Greenlee County, 33.0, was more than twice the percentage for two urban counties. Clearly, monetarily ineligible claimants are not distributed evenly throughout the state, either as a percentage of a county's labor force or as a percentage of its total claims.

V. DESIGN OF THE SURVEY

A major part of the Arizona LAUS contract was the survey of monetary ineligibles in regard to their labor force status after filing for UI benefits. In order to reduce costs, yet still obtain a reliable estimate of the monetary ineligibles' survival rate, a random sampling scheme was devised. Stratification was done by county since reliable estimates are desired for the survival rate by county.

The sample percentage used for each county was determined by computing the sampling size required to estimate 6-month survival rates within a .85% absolute error. An expected response rate of 78% was used. Based on these assumptions, the most populous counties, Maricopa and Pima, had sampling percentages of 32% and 66%, respectively. Cochise and Pinal counties had sampling percentages of 98 percent and 99 percent, respectively. For the rest of the counties, the entire population was surveyed.

The existence or nonexistence of sampling bias is critical whenever a survey uses sampling. To test for sampling bias in the LAUS survey, characteristics of the sample in a particular county were compared with those of the county's population. Two-tailed T-tests were used to compute statistical significance of any differences. The results for Maricopa and Pima counties, which had the lowest sampling percentage, are given in Appendix 1 as Tables 8 and 9. As can be seen in the tables, none of the differences between the sample and population characteristics give rise to a T-value that would generally be considered significant. It can therefore be concluded that sample bias is not a problem for the study.

Persons selected for the survey were mailed a questionnaire (see Appendix 2) along with an accompanying cover letter which explained the purpose of the project. The front page of the questionnaire asked when was the last day worked before coming in to file for Unemployment Insurance benefits, and if they had looked for work during the four weeks preceding the effective date of the claim. The back page asked, for each week in a 13-week period beginning when the monetarily ineligible claimant filed for benefits, questions regarding that person's labor force status.

If a selectee for the survey did not respond within ten days after the initial mailout, then a reminder postcard was sent. We attempted to contact by phone those who still had not responded, and for whom we had a phone number. Four attempts at phone contact were made for each such person - one morning (7:00 a.m. to 11:00 a.m.) weekday call, an early-afternoon (11:00 a.m. - 3:30 p.m.) weekday call, a late afternoon (3:30 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.) weekday call, and a call on Saturday. A certified letter was mailed to those people for whom contact had yet to be made. If there was no response after all of these attempts at contact had been made, then a person was classified as a non-respondent.

Survey respondents who had not established an eligible claim within the thirteen weeks after their initial ineligible claim were mailed an additional survey questionnaire. This second questionnaire was similar to the first, except that its questions pertained to the thirteen-week period starting with the fourteenth week after the person's initial claim. The same follow-up procedures were used.

VI. RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

Only 21.3 percent of the claimants selected for the survey responded to the initial mailout of the first thirteen-week questionnaire. This is not surprising because we would expect the survey group to be antagonistic towards our agency, given that they were denied UI benefits. Clearly, other methods of contact were necessary in order to get an adequate rate of response. The most frequent method of contact was by telephone, as can be seen in the table below:

Method of Contact*	1st 13-week Number	Questionnaire Percentage	2nd 13-week Number	Questionnaire Percentage
Initial Mailout	1,618	21.3	1,087	27.0
Postcard	660	8.7	455	11.3
Certified Letter	589	7.8	182	4.5
Phone	1,848	24.3	1,320	32.8
Never Contacted	2,877	37.9	982	24.4
TOTAL	7,592	100.0	4,026	100.0

The first question of the survey was "Our records indicate that you filed for Unemployment Insurance Benefits during the week of (effective date of claim). Before (effective date of claim) when was the last day you 'worked for pay or profit?' If you cannot remember exactly what day you last worked, please give us your best guess". It was answered by 4,610 persons. Our coders put the answers into six categories: never worked, less than two weeks, two and up to four weeks, four and up to thirteen weeks, thirteen and up to twenty-six weeks, and twenty-six weeks or more. The results, broken down by age groups, are shown in Appendix 1, Table 10.

---

*Not all persons contacted provided a full response. Data on the number of people partially responding is presented later in the report.

A surprising result was that very few people (6) indicated that they had never worked. An obvious pattern among the age groups was that older individuals experienced, on the average, a longer period of time between their last job and filing for UI benefits.

The next question asked was "...did you'look for work' at any time during the four weeks before (effective date of claim)?" Out of 4,653 people answering that question, 3,474 responded "yes" while 1,179 answered "no".

The second page of the questionnaire had two sections for each week of the survey period starting with the week in which the monetarily ineligible claimants filed. Survey respondents were asked to check one of the boxes in each of the sections. Section 1 asked if the person had worked either 1-34 hours or hours in excess of that; or did not work because of an absence due to illness or vacation, had no job, had a job to start within 30 days, or was on layoff for less than 30 days. Several people indicated that they had been on strike, or that they had moved out of state. We therefore decided to put those categories on our coding sheets. The second section asked whether the respondent had looked for work in a particular week, or did not look for work because he already had a job that satisfied his needs, was temporarily ill, or for other reasons.

A tabulation of responses to this part of the questionnaire is presented in Appendix 1 as Tables 11 and 12. It should be mentioned that it was often the case that a survey respondent would write in answers for only a few of the weeks, or would check off boxes in only one section. We attempted to contact again those people who gave partial responses in order to get their questionnaire completely filled out. The seriousness of a partial

response varied, depending on how the person responded. If that respondent indicated having a job in a particular week, and did not check a box in the section asking about looking for work, then we still had enough information to determine his or her labor force status. In fact, for surveys done over the phone, a person who said that he or she had a job for the relevant time period was not asked about looking for work, as the information was not necessary. However, we were unable to determine the labor force status of an individual who indicated having no job and gave no information about looking for work.

From these raw answers a person's labor force status can be computed. Individuals indicating that they worked 1-34 hours, worked 35 hours or more, were absent from work due to illness or vacation, or were on strike during a particular week, were classified as employed for that week. Those who checked the "Accepted a job to start within 30 days" or "On layoff for less than 30 days" boxes were put into the "unemployed" category. A person indicating that he or she did not have a job, but looked for work during that particular week was classified as unemployed. A person who had no job and was not currently looking for work, but had looked for work during the previous four weeks, would be classified as unemployed according to the C.P.S. definition, and out-of-the-labor force according to the UI definition*. An individual with no job who was not currently looking for work and had not looked for work at any time during the previous four weeks would be classified as out of the labor force by both the C.P.S. and UI definitions.

We calculated the labor force status for each survey respondent for whom we had sufficient information with both C.P.S. and UI definitions.

*Ui does not explicitly classify individuals this way. Claimants are classified as either ineligible, eligible unemployed, or eligible employed.

The results for each survey week, broken down by sex, are presented in Appendix 1 as Tables 13-18. The greatest difference between the sexes was that females were more likely to drop out of the labor force. With the C.P.S. definitions of labor force categories, 14.3 percent of the females were out of the labor force at the end of the survey, compared to only 8.9 percent of the males. The figures for females and males using the UI definitions are 15.7 percent and 9.5 percent, respectively. This result is not surprising since relatively fewer women than men participate in the U.S. labor force.

Survival. An important concept used in the LAUS estimating system is that of survival. For our study, a person who is unemployed (C.P.S. definition) and monetarily ineligible for UI benefits is considered to be a "survivor". Becoming employed, dropping out of the labor force, or establishing monetary eligibility for UI benefits would all cause a person to be removed from the survival group. We define the"survival rate" as the number of persons from a group surviving in a time period divided by the number of group members who were survivors in a preceding time period.

Tables 19 through 22 in Appendix 1 show the proportion of survey respondents surviving in each survey week, broken down by sex, ethnic group planning district (groups of supposedly similiar counties used for planning purposes), and county, respectively. The proportions shown in Tables 19 through 21 are weighted by county to reflect the stratified random sampling scheme that we used.

Weekly survival rates can be computed from these tables by taking the proportion of survivors in the desired week, and dividing that number by the proportion of survivors in the preceding week. The number of people for whom we were able to determine survival status varied from week to week; values for the first and final weeks are presented at the bottom of those tables (19-22). People who responded to the first survey but were not mailed a second survey due to the establishment of a monetarily eligible claim are included in those figures even for weeks 14-26. They were classified as "non-survivors" beginning with the week in which they were monetarily eligible for benefits.

Surprisingly, the survival rate of males as a group was similar to that for females. In the final survey week, the percentage of males still surviving was the same as that for females - 22.8 percent.

Our data showed that members of minority groups had higher survival rates than did whites. 28.6 percent of the blacks, 26.6 percent of the Hispanics, and 28.9 percent of the Indians were survivors at the end of the survey period; only 20.5 percent of the whites were still surviving at that time. These figures were used in two-tailed T-tests in order to see if the differences in proportions of survivors between whites and minority groups were statistically significant. The differences in proportions for Hispanics, blacks, and Indians were each found to be different from whites at the 1% level of significance. Differences among blacks, Hispanics, and Indians were not statistically significant. Survival figures for survey respondents classified as Asians or of unknown ethnic background are also presented in Table 20, but there was no statistically significant difference between these and other ethnic groups. However, this may be due to there

being so few people in those two classifications.

Survival status by planning district can be seen in Appendix 1, Table 21. Appendix 3 is a map depicting the counties and planning districts of Arizona. The urban area planning districts 1 and 2 had lower survival rates than the other planning districts. However, two-tailed T-tests showed that only District 5 and District 6 were different from each urban district at the 1 percent level of significance.

Table 22 of Appendix 1 shows survival rates by county. One of the smaller counties in the state, Graham, had the lowest proportion of survivors (15.9 percent) at the conclusion of the survey. The urban counties, Maricopa and Pima, had the second and third lowest survival rates, respectively. Greenlee County, the county with the highest average annual wage in the state, had the highest proportion of survivors (37.0 percent) in the final survey week.

The reliability of these estimates is of great interest. In order to evaluate this, an estimated standard error of proportion (σ_p) was calculated for each county's percentage of survivors at the survey end. A confidence coefficient of 95% was selected, so the estimated standard errors were multiplied by 1.96 in order to compute confidence intervals. The last column in the table on the following page shows 95% confidence limits for each of the counties.

At the time the survey was originally designed, required sample sizes were calculated so as to achieve a .85% absolute or 17% relative error (the absolute error divided by the point estimate). The desired standard for the absolute error was not achieved for any of the counties (see column 2 of the following table). Sample sizes were insufficient (due to a lower

than necessary response rate) and a higher than expected proportion of survey respondents were survivors at the end of the survey period. Three of the counties did have a lower than 17 percent relative error, while Pinal County had only a 17.1 percent relative error. Calculations made during the survey design period assumed that only 5% of the survey respondents would still be surviving at the end of the 26-week period; a much larger percentage actually survived, so that results in some counties met our criterion for relative error, even though none did in terms of absolute error.

County	Percent of Respondents Surviving in Final Survey Week	Upper Bound on Absolute Error (95% Confidence)	Upper Bound on Relative Error (95% Confidence)	Lower 95% Confidence Limit	Upper 95% Confidence Limit
Apache	30.4	6.4	21.1	24.0	36.8
Cochise	33.2	3.4	10.2	29.8	36.6
Coconino	23.1	5.3	22.9	17.8	28.4
Gila	25.0	5.5	22.0	19.5	30.5
Graham	15.9	6.0	37.7	9.9	21.9
Greenlee	37.0	13.8	37.3	23.2	50.8
Maricopa	20.2	2.7	13.4	17.5	22.9
Mohave	21.8	4.9	22.5	16.9	26.7
Navajo	24.9	4.7	18.9	20.2	29.6
Pima	20.9	2.8	13.4	18.1	23.7
Pinal	28.7	3.6	12.5	25.1	32.3
Santa Cruz	23.4	5.3	22.6	18.1	28.7
Yavapai	21.8	4.9	22.5	16.9	26.7
Yuma	24.7	3.7	15.0	21.0	28.4

An interesting result from these calculations is that Graham County had a much different survival rate than the other counties (Cochise, Greenlee, and Santa Cruz) within its planning district (number 6). The confidence interval for Graham County was 9.9-21.9%, while Cochise County's confidence interval was 29.8-36.6%; it is highly unlikely that these two samples came from the same population. At least for purposes of surviving monetary ineligibles, Planning District 6 is a poor grouping of counties.

Another measure of survival for monetary ineligibles within a county would be the average number of weeks the person was a survivor. Those means, and their standard errors, can be seen in the following table.

County	Mean Number of Weeks Surviving	Standard Error (With Finite Correction Factor)	Number of Full Respondents	Number* Sampled
Apache	12.736	0.747	110	349
Cochise	12.962	0.356	338	648
Coconino	11.887	0.591	141	445
Gila	10.872	0.656	125	343
Graham	10.162	0.713	80	209
Greenlee	12.652	0.727	23	56
Mariocpa	9.826	0.293	688	1,707
Mohave	10.191	0.571	131	308
Navajo	10.843	0.538	166	455
Pima	9.514	0.314	514	1,190
Pinal	11.531	0.404	311	728
Santa Cruz	11.152	0.581	105	181
Yavapai	10.135	0.547	133	308
Yuma	12.102	0.413	265	665
Statewide	10.868	0.119	3,130	7,592

*Ineligibles for whom information on county of residence was not initially available and who were selected for the sample, were later classified by county as more information became available. Therefore, it is possible that more people were sampled in a county than the number of ineligibles in a county listed on page 12, since the latter figures are based on initial computer runs.

These figures include the total number of weeks that a respondent was a survivor; they are not necessarily continuous spells. It was often the case that a monetary ineligible dropped out of the survival group and then went back into it. Approximately 1,300 of our survey respondents changed their survival status more than once; therefore, means for continuous spells of survival would be much lower than these figures. Only individuals for whom we could determine survival status in each of the twenty-six survey weeks (3,130) were included. The rankings among counties are roughly similar to those obtained from the proportions of survivors in the final survey week. Exact relative rankings are not important, given the size of the standard errors.

Response Bias. An important aspect of any survey is response bias. For purposes of testing for response bias, we divided the persons selected for the survey into three response types - full, partial, or none. These categories, crosstabulated by sex, look like this:

Response Type		SEX		
		Male	Female	Total
Full:	Number	1673	1458	3130
	Percent	36.7%	48.1%	41.2%
Partial:	Number	1024	677	1701
	Percent	22.4%	22.4%	22.4%
None:	Number	1867	894	2761
	Percnet	40.9%	29.5%	36.4%
				7592

Men were much more likely than women to not answer the survey at all; they were significantly less likely to give full response. However, it should be recalled that the women in our survey had roughly the same survival rate as the men did. Therefore, weighting would not be useful for purposes of correcting this response bias.

It should be recalled that members of minority groups, in general, had higher survival rates than whites did. Different response rates among ethnic groups could therefore cause problems. Unfortunately, this was the case, as shown in the following table:

		ETHNIC GROUP						
		White	Black	Hispanic	India	Asian	Other	Total
Full:	Number	1919	140	809	240	11	11	3130
	Percent	42.7%	34.2%	45.6%	28.4%	44.0%	28.9%	41.2
Partial:	Number	975	92	392	220	8	14	1701
	Percent	21.7%	22.5%	22.1%	26.0%	32.0%	32.8%	22.4
None:	Number	1605	177	574	386	6	13	2761
	Percent	35.7%	43.3%	32.3%	45.6%	24.0%	34.2%	36.4
								7592

Hispanics were more likely to fully respond to the questionnaires than were whites; Indians and blacks were less likely to fully respond than were whites. For purposes of calculating a statewide survival rate, weighting by ethnic group would probably be worthwhile.

Since estimates of county survival rates are desired for our study, response bias should be checked at the county level. Crosstabulations of ethnic group and response type were done for each county; chi-square tests were used to test the hypothesis of independence between the two types of classifications. Using a 1% level of significance, independence had to be rejected for Cochise and Maricopa counties.

For weighting of Maricopa and Cochise survival rates to be useful it would have to be shown that their ethnic groups had significantly different survival rates. To test for this, survey respondents were classified as either "survivors" or "non-survivors" according to their survival status.

Following are the results for Maricopa County:

Survival Status in Final Survey Week	ETHNIC CATEGORY						
	White	Black	Hispanic	Indian	Asian	Other	Total
Survived:							
Number	109	13	25	2	1	0	150
Percent	18.5%	29.5%	25.5%	22.2%	50.0%	0.0%	20.2%
Did Not Survive:							
Number	479	31	73	7	1	2	593
Percent	81.5%	70.5%	74.5%	77.8%	50.0%	100%	79.8%
							743

The chi-square for this table has a value of 6.74032, with 5 degrees of freedom. The significance level for this chi-square is 0.2407, so we would not reject the hypothesis that survival status and ethnic background are independent for monetary ineligibles in Maricopa County. A similar result was obtained for Cochise County. We therefore conclude that although there does appear to be significant response bias among ethnic groups in these counties, weighting would not be useful for our estimations of county survival rates.

There were similar problems of response bias among age, earnings, industry, and occupational groups for purposes of estimating state-wide survival rates. For example older people were more likely to respond than

were young people. There were no characteristics, however, for which both response rates and survival rates were significantly different at the county level.

VII. INTEGRATION OF RESULTS INTO THE LAUS ESTIMATING SYSTEM

The ultimate purpose of this project is to improve the LAUS estimating system. We have established that there are a significant number of monetary ineligibles in the state, that they are not evenly distributed throughout the state, and that the survival rate varies among the substate areas. Therefore, monetary ineligibles should be specifically included.

In order to best estimate true survival rates for an area, we fitted equations to the data using linear regression techniques. It should be noted that the later a week was in the survey period, the higher the weekly survival rate. Here are the weekly survival rates (weighted by county) for all survey respondents:

Week No.	Weekly Survival Rate	Week No.	Weekly Survival Rate
1	.842	14	.942
2	.927	15	.943
3	.910	16	.948
4	.904	17	.900
5	.910	18	.978
6	.921	19	.979
7	.931	20	.959
8	.949	21	.985
9	.959	22	.979
10	.938	23	.974
11	.962	24	.986
12	.941	25	.968
13	.952	26	.991

In computing the first weekly survival rate, it is assumed that all the survey respondents were initially survivors. The first week's rate is much lower than the others, which we might expect for a variety of reasons. One possible cause is that a person might still have a full-time job during the week that he files a claim. Suppose someone loses his job on Wednesday, and files for benefits on Friday. The effective date of his claim will be on the Sunday of that week, and thus he would actually be employed (a non-survivor) during that initial week of ineligibility. It is also possible that a person filed for benefits due to losing a full-time job, but still maintained a part-time job; or that someone was actually out of the labor force at the time of filing for benefits. Persons for whom these conditions were true would not be classified as survivors during the initial part of the survey period.

In general, weekly survival rates were higher during the latter part of the survey period. This was anticipated at the beginning of this project. Monetary ineligibles with good job skills, for whom unemployment is a temporary aberration in their job history, should have quickly found employment. During the final weeks of the survey period, the group of survivors would be mainly made up of the hard-core unemployed; their chance of finding employment would be low.

With survival rates rising over time, the most appropriate equations might be geometric or logarithmic, rather than linear. We found that the single equation which best fit the data was of the formula $Y_x = \frac{1}{a+bx}$ where x is the week number, Y_x is the estimated number of survivors in week x, a is a constant term, and b is a linear coefficient.

In order to compensate for the varying number of respondents within each survey week and to maximize the use of our information, the proportion

of respondents surviving in each survey week was multiplied by the number of respondents in the first week to obtain the "true" number of survivors in each week. The equation derived for Maricopa County is shown below (equations estimated for all counties are shown in Appendix 1, Table 23).

$$\text{Survivors}_{\text{week } x} = \frac{1}{.0010076 + .0001579\ (\text{week number})}$$

For example, the estimated number of survivors in week 5 would be

$$\frac{1}{.0010076 + .0001579(5)} = 557$$

Using the estimated Number of survivors in each week, the following weekly survival rates were derived:

Week No.	Survival Rate	Week No.	Survival Rate
1	.865	14	.951
2	.881	15	.953
3	.894	16	.955
4	.909	17	.957
5	.912	18	.959
6	.919	19	.961
7	.925	20	.962
8	.931	21	.964
9	.935	22	.965
10	.939	23	.966
11	.943	24	.967
12	.946	25	.968
13	.948	26	.969

Survival rates for later weeks could also be derived from the equation. The number of survivors in any particular calendar week could be estimated by applying the proper weekly survival rate to the monetarily ineligible claims of the current week and each of an appropriate number of previous weeks. Thus, the total number of monetarily ineligible claimants in Maricopa County surrently "surviving" would be the summation of the monetarily ineligible claims in the present week multiplied by .865, the claims from the previous week multiplied by .762 (the product of .865 x .881), the number of claims from two weeks ago multiplied by .681 (the product of .865 x .881 x .984), etc.

One problem with using the equation is selecting the number of weeks needed to build up to a total estimate of unemployed monetary ineligibles. The equation implies that some monetary ineligible claimants would still be unemployed even years after the date of filing. For example, about four percent of monetary ineligibles would still be unemployed three years after filing.*

We found a simpler method of calculating the number of survivors by estimating the equation $Survivors_t = f(Survivors_{t-1})$ where $Survivors_t$ is the number of survivors in week t, and $Survivors_{t-1}$ is the number of survivors in the week previous to t. For all counties, the first week's survival rate was much lower than the other weeks' survival rates; therefore dropping $Survivors_{t=1} = f(Survivors_{t=0})$ increased greatly the equation's goodness of fit. The y-intercept term was not included in the computation of the linear regression line; so instead of our equation being of the usual form $y = a + bx$, it is $y = bx$. The weekly survival rate is then simply the regression coefficient "b".

*$\dfrac{1 \div (.0010076 + .0001579(200))}{1 \div .0010076} = .039$

The least squares estimate of the weekly survival rate for Maricopa County was .926 (for all of the counties and planning districts, see Appendix 1, Table 24). The percentage of monetary ineligibles in Maricopa County who were survivors in the initial week of the survey period was 82.9%. In order to estimate the number of monetarily ineligible claims in that week multiplied by .829 would be added to the number of survivors from previous weeks multiplied by .926. A representative worksheet for this method is presented on the next page.

In order to begin this procedure, a total estimate of unemployed monetary ineligibles would have to be built up over a period of several weeks. For Maricopa County, a period of seventy-two weeks would probably be sufficient. In other words, the proportion of persons still unemployed seventy-two weeks after filing a monetarily ineligible claim in Maricopa County would be sufficiently close to zero so as to be ignored.* A shorter "build-up" period would be necessary for the smaller counties, since they have fewer monetarily ineligible claimants.

For purposes of testing the impact of including these claimants in unemployment estimates, the number of surviving monetary ineligibles for the week including July 12, 1979, was calculated for each county using the method just given. These values were then added to the Handbook estimate of unemployment for each county, in order to get a revised Handbook estimate. Using the revised figures, the percentage of state-

---

*The average number of monetary ineligibles per week in Maricopa County for calendar year 1979 was 100. Multiplying 100 by $[.829(.926^{71})]$ gives .35, which is less than a 'whole' person.

WORKSHEET FOR ESTIMATING MONETARY INELIGIBLES*

Week Beginning	Number of Monetarily Ineligible Claims	Estimated Number Surviving: Col. I x Survival Rate of .829	Number of Surviving Monetary Ineligibles From Previous Weeks	Number of Survivors from Previous Weeks Still Surviving: Col. III x Survival Rate of .926	Total Number of Surviving Monetary Ineligibles for Current Week (Column II + Column IV)
	Column I	Column II	Column III	Column IV	Column V
1981					
1/4	150	124	1210	1120	1244
1/11	140	116	1244	1152	1268
1/18	120	99	1268	1174	1273
1/25	100	83	1273	1179	1262
2/1	100	83	1262	1169	1252

* Figures for Column I and the first entry in Column III are made up for purposes of the worksheet. Survival rates used are those estimated for Maricopa County using the survey data.

wide unemployment that could be attributed to each county was computed. These percentages were then multiplied by the C.P.S. estimate of unemployment for the state (55,092), so as to derive a new estimate of unemployment for each county. These county figures were then divided by the respective C.P.S. labor force estimate for each county, in order to obtain revised county unemployment rates.

The results of these computations are shown in Table 25 of Appendix 1. The inclusion of monetarily ineligible claimants would lower Maricopa County's published unemployment rate from 4.6 percent to 4.5 percent. Cochise County's rate would increase from 7.4 percent to 8.2 percent. Five other counties (Gila, Graham, Greenlee, Pinal, and Yuma) showed an increase of at least three-tenths of a percent in their respective unemployment rates. The estimated rate for Santa Cruz increased from 12.8 percent to 13.0 percent, while the estimate for Mohave County changed by only one-tenth of a percent. The change in the estimated unemployment rates for each of the other counties was less than one-tenth of a percent.

The inclusion of monetarily ineligible claimants produced similar changes in the estimated county unemployment rates for other periods. The estimated unemployment rate for Maricopa County during November, 1979, would decrease by one-tenth of a percent. Cochise County's unemployment rate would increase from 7.2 percent to 7.9 percent, while the rate for Graham County would be 7.2 percent instead of 6.6 percent. The revised unemployment rates for each of the remaining counties were either higher or not significantly different from the previous estimates.

VIII. IMPACT ON THE ESTIMATE OF NEW ENTRANTS AND REENTRANTS TO THE LABOR FORCE

In general, monetary ineligibles are disqualified from UI benefits due to insufficient participation in the labor force. Therefore, we would expect some of them to be unemployed entrants into the labor force, which are already part of the LAUS estimating system. Unemployed entrants are divided by BLS into two categories: new entrants, who are persons entering the labor force for the first time and have not found a job, and reentrants, who have previously worked full-time for at least two weeks and were out of the labor force before beginning their work search. Putting monetary ineligibles into the system and keeping the present method of estimating the number of unemployed new entrants and reentrants might lead to duplication in the counts of the unemployed.

It appears to be doubtful that many new entrants to the labor force file for UI benefits. Only six of our survey respondents indicated that they had never worked, while a "last day worked" was recorded on the initial claim for all persons initially selected for the survey. This is very close agreement given that almost five thousand persons responded to that question on their survey form.

The estimate of unemployed reeentrants to the labor force would be affected by the inclusion of monetary ineligibles, however. Given the questions asked on our questionnaire, survey respondents could be classified as just becoming unemployed reentrants at the beginning of the survey period if they indicated that they had not looked for work during the previous four weeks, had no job for at least the previous two weeks, and were unemployed at the beginning of the survey period. Out of the 4,610 people for whom we had sufficient information, 159

could be classified as unemployed reentrants at the time they filed a monetarily ineligible claim. However, it is possible that none of these people were unemployed reentrants in the first survey week, since we asked for the last day worked, rather than the last day that one had a full-time job for at least two weeks. The total number of potential unemployed reentrants at the beginning of the survey period would be all respondents unemployed during the first survey week who had no job during the previous two-week period. This was true for 1952 survey respondents. Therefore, given the information available from our survey, the percentage of survey respondents who were reentrants at the time of filing might be zero, or as high as 42 percent. In all likelihood, however, at least some monetarily ineligible claimants are also unemployed reentrants to the labor force at the time they filed a claim. Therefore, formulas used to estimate new entrants and reentrants to the labor force should be revised so as to exclude persons recently filing a monetarily ineligible UI claim.

IX. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Statistics indicate that there is a significant number of monetarily ineligible claimants for unemployment insurance benefits. We used two ways to measure the dispersion of such persons among the sub-state areas. With each criterion, we found that Arizona's rural counties have proportionately more monetarily ineligible claimants than do its two urban counties.

Female claimants are more likely to be declared monetarily ineligible for benefits than are male claimants. There is a greater incidence of monetary ineligibility among black, Hispanic, and Indian claimants than there is for white claimants. However, the distribution of reasons for monetary ineligibility do not vary much among ethnic groups, with the exception of Indians.

We surveyed monetarily ineligible claimants with regards to their labor force status during a twenty-six week period, beginning with the week in which they filed their claim. Respondents were classified as "survivors" during a particular survey week if they were both unemployed (C.P.S. definition) and still monetarily ineligible for benefits. The proportion of survivors at the end of the survey period was about the same for men respondents as it was for women respondents. The percentage of minority group respondents surviving in the final survey week was higher than the percentage for whites.

In general, survival rates for rural counties were higher than those of urban counties. Response bias was not statistically significant at the county level, but it was for state-wide figures due to different response and survival rates among ethnic groups. Therefore, computations of results at the state-wide level would have to be weighted both due

to response bias and the fact that a stratified random sample was used.

Since data from the Arizona UI database indicates that monetarily ineligible claimants are not distributed evenly throughout the state, and our survey results showed that their survival rates differ among the counties, we recommend that they be specifically included in the LAUS estimating system. Estimates of unemployed monetary ineligibles should be made at the county level. The most practical way to survive monetary ineligibles would be to apply a survival rate to the current week's monetary ineligibles, and apply another rate to survivors carried over from previous weeks (recommended rates are shown in Appendix 1, Table 22). This method was used to compute revised county unemployment rates for some time periods in 1979. Maricopa County's estimated unemployment rate decreased by one-tenth of a percent, while the rates for other counties either increased or else showed no significant change. Our survey results give some indication that inclusion of monetarily ineligible claimants will require slight revisions to the equations used to estimate unemployed new entrants and unemployed reentrants to the labor force so that double-counting is avoided.

Appendix 1 - Statistical Tables

Appendix 1 - Statistical Tables
(Continued)

TABLE 1

CLAIMANT CHARACTERISTICS: A COMPARISON OF MONETARILY ELIGIBLE AND INELIGIBLE CLAIMANTS WHO FILED DURING CY 1979 (ARIZONA INTRASTATE UI CLAIMANTS ONLY)

Characteristic	Number Eligible	Number Ineligible	Total	Percent Ineligible
Sex:				
Male	40,560	7,351	47,911	15.3
Female	22,760	4,859	27,619	17.6
Total	63,320	12,210	75,530	16.2
Age:				
Less than 20	2,404	1,238	3,642	34.0
20-21	5,130	1,325	6,455	20.5
22-24	9,366	1,761	11,127	15.8
25-34	21,777	3,818	25,595	14.9
35-44	11,293	1,747	13,040	13.4
45-54	7,868	1,269	9,137	13.9
55-64	4,828	775	5,603	13.8
65 or more	654	277	931	29.8
Total	63,320	12,210	75,530	16.2
Ethnicity:				
White	43,580	7,769	51,349	15.1
Black	2,804	787	3,591	21.9
Hispanic	12,281	2,594	14,875	17.4
Indian	4,132	974	5,106	19.1
Asian	188	38	226	16.8
I.N.A.	335	48	383	12.5
Total	63,320	12,210	75,530	16.2
Occupation, Last Base Period Employer:				
Prof./Tech./Mgrl.	7,662	1,153	8,815	13.1
Clerical/Sales	12,471	2,340	14,811	15.8
Service	5,803	1,521	7,324	20.8
Farm/Fish/Forestry	1,606	594	2,200	27.0
Processing	799	194	993	19.5
Machine	2,941	471	3,412	13.8
Bench Work	2,977	621	3,598	17.3
Structural	12,623	2,356	14,979	15.7
Miscellaneous	6,169	1,249	7,418	16.8
I.N.A.	10,269	1,711	11,980	14.3
Total	63,320	12,210	75,530	16.2

Continued

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Characteristic	Number Eligible	Number Ineligible	Total	Percent Ineligible
Industry, Last Base Period Employer:				
Ag./Forest/Fish	4,011	701	4,712	14.9
Mining	2,520	288	2,808	10.3
Construction	6,329	1,015	7,344	13.8
Manufacturing	11,037	1,410	12,447	11.3
Trans./Commun./Util.	3,467	369	3,836	9.6
Wholesale/Retail	10,915	1,949	12,864	15.2
F.I.R.E.	4,435	501	4,936	10.1
Services	9,263	1,740	11,003	15.8
Pub. Admin.	2,578	377	2,955	12.8
Nonclassified	2,401	138	2,539	5.4
I.N.A.	6,364	3,722	10,086	36.9
TOTAL	63,320	12,210	75,530	16.2
UI High Quarter Earnings:				
$ 0-374	30	4,716	4,746	99.4
$ 375-499	219	494	713	69.3
$ 500-699	709	758	1,467	51.7
$ 700-899	1,346	634	1,980	32.0
$ 900-1099	1,899	707	2,606	27.1
$ 1100-1499	6,654	1,364	8,018	17.0
$ 1500-1999	11,242	1,283	12,525	10.2
$ 2000-2999	18,965	1,200	20,165	6.0
$ 3000-3999	9,040	520	9,560	5.4
$ 4000-4999	5,527	248	5,775	4.3
$ 5000 or over	7,689	286	7,975	3.6
TOTAL	63,320	12,210	75,530	16.2
UI Base Period Wages:				
$ 0-562	35	5,015	5,050	99.3
$ 563-999	245	1,370	1,615	82.3
$ 1000-1999	2,322	2,720	5,042	53.9
$ 2000-2999	4,669	1,492	6,161	24.2
$ 3000-3999	5,750	697	6,447	10.8
$ 4000-4999	6,081	357	6,438	5.5
$ 5000-7499	14,672	380	15,052	2.5
$ 7500-9999	10,447	101	10,548	1.0
$ 10,000-14,999	11,235	47	11,282	0.4
$ 15,000 or over	7,864	31	7,895	0.4
TOTAL	63,320	12,210	75,530	16.2

TABLE 2

CROSS TABULATION OF OCCUPATION BY REASON FOR MONETARY INELIGIBILITY*
CY 1979

Reason for Ineligibility	Occupational Category: Prof. Tech. Mgrl.	Clerical & Sales	Service	Farming Fishery Forestry	Processing	Machine Trade	Bench-Work	Structrual	Misc.	None or Non-Classifiable	Total
	A. Percent Distribution of Reason for Ineligibility by Occupation										
No Base Period Wages	12.8%	18.7%	13.4%	5.1%	1.1%	4.0%	3.6%	17.7%	9.2%	14.4%	100.0%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	7.1%	23.1%	17.3%	5.2%	1.0%	3.9%	5.4%	16.8%	10.4%	9.6%	100.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	9.1%	18.7%	11.0%	3.9%	1.7%	3.9%	5.8%	19.9%	11.7%	14.3%	100.0%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	13.3%	14.2%	12.2%	0.0%	7.1%	6.3%	12.5%	4.0%	18.4%	12.1%	100.0%
All Reasons	9.8%	19.4%	12.7%	4.4%	1.5%	3.9%	5.2%	18.7%	10.8%	13.5%	100.0%
	B. Percent Distribution of Occupation by Reason for Ineligibility										All Occu.
No Base Period Wages	35.6%	26.1%	28.6%	31.1%	21.0%	27.7%	18.8%	25.6%	23.1%	29.0%	27.2%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	12.4%	20.2%	23.1%	19.9%	12.0%	16.9%	17.8%	15.3%	16.3%	12.0%	17.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	51.5%	53.4%	47.9%	49.1%	64.9%	54.7%	62.3%	59.0%	59.8%	58.6%	55.5%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.0%	2.0%	0.7%	1.0%	0.1%	0.7%	0.4%	0.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100.0%

Based on all who filed for benefits at any time during calendar year 1979 and were denied benefits because of a failure to meet the monetary eligibility criteria. (It should be noted that a particular claimant can file for a monetary determination each calendar quarter; these data include persons in the characteristics count each time they had a monetary determination.)

TABLE 3

CROSS TABULATION OF INDUSTRY BY REASON FOR MONETARY INELIGIBILITY*
CY 1979

Reason for Ineligibility	Industry										
	Agr. Forestry Fishing	Mining	Const.	Mfg.	TCPU	Wholesale Retail	F.I.R.E.	Services	Government	None or Non-Classifiable	Total
	A. Percent Distribution of Reason for Ineligibility by Industry										
No Base Period Wages	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	98.6%	100.0%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	7.6%	2.9%	8.8%	10.5%	2.2%	31.6%	3.1%	25.5%	3.9%	3.2%	100.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	7.7%	3.1%	12.0%	17.3%	4.7%	18.8%	5.9%	18.2%	4.1%	6.3%	100.0%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	27.3%	0.0%	4.0%	14.4%	0.0%	12.3%	14.6%	4.0%	4.0%	11.3%	100.0%
All Reasons	5.8%	2.3%	8.2%	11.5%	3.0%	15.9%	3.9%	14.5%	3.0%	30.9%	100.0%
	B. Percent Distribution of Industry by Reason for Ineligibility										All Indus.
No Base Period Wages	1.2%	1.9%	0.2%	1.0%	0.3%	0.4%	0.4%	0.2%	0.3%	86.7%	27.2%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	22.4%	21.8%	18.3%	15.4%	12.4%	33.6%	13.5%	29.8%	22.4%	1.8%	17.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	74.5%	76.3%	81.3%	83.0%	87.3%	65.6%	84.5%	69.9%	76.8%	11.33%	55.5%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	2.0%	0.0%	0.2%	0.5%	0.0%	0.3%	1.6%	0.1%	0.6%	0.2%	0.4%
Total	100.00%	100.0%	100.00%	100.0%	100 %	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Based on all who filed for benefits at any time during calendar year 1979 and were denied benefits because of a failure to meet the monetary eligibility criteria. (It should be noted that a particular claimant can file for a monetary determination each calendar quarter; these data include persons in the characteristics count each time they had a monetary determination.)

TABLE 4

CROSS TABULATION OF AGE BY REASON FOR MONETARY INELIGIBILITY: TOTAL SAMPLE*
CY 1979

Reason for Ineligibility	Age less than 20	20-21	22-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65 or over	Total
A. Percent Distribution of Reason for Ineligibility by Age									
No Base Period Wages	8.3%	11.1%	13.4%	29.7%	13.7%	11.5%	7.9%	4.3%	100.0%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	18.4%	13.4%	15.3%	30.9%	10.1%	6.9%	4.0%	0.9%	100.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	8.3%	11.3%	14.4%	32.3%	15.7%	10.7%	6.0%	1.4%	100.0%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.0%	8.0%	6.1%	21.4%	14.4%	12.1%	6.0%	32.0%	100.0%
All Reasons	10.0%	11.6%	14.2%	31.3%	14.2%	10.3%	6.2%	2.2%	100.0%
B. Percent Distribution of Age by Reason for Ineligibility									All Ages
No Base Period Wages	22.6%	25.9%	25.6%	25.8%	26.2%	30.5%	34.4%	52.4%	27.2%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	31.2%	19.7%	18.2%	16.7%	12.1%	11.3%	11.1%	7.1%	17.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	46.2%	54.1%	56.0%	57.2%	61.3%	57.7%	53.5%	34.5%	55.5%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.0%	0.3%	0.2%	0.3%	0.4%	0.5%	0.4%	6.0%	0.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Based on all who filed for benefits at any time during calendar year 1979 and were denied benefits because of a failure to meet the monetary eligibility criteria. It should be noted that a particular claimant can file for a monetary determination each calendar quarter; these data include persons in the characteristics count each time they had a monetary determination.)

TABLE 5

CROSS TABULATION OF AGE BY REASON FOR MONETARY INELIGIBILITY: MALES*
CY 1979

Reason for Ineligibility	Age								
	less than 20	20-21	22-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65 or over	Total
	A. Percent Distribution of Reason for Ineligibility by Age								
No Base Period Wages	8.6%	11.7%	12.3%	29.9%	12.2%	11.2%	8.8%	5.4%	100.0%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	19.3%	13.4%	16.8%	29.8%	10.4%	5.6%	3.4%	1.3%	100.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	8.2%	11.5%	13.4%	33.1%	14.7%	10.6%	6.7%	1.7%	100.0%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.0%	11.8%	2.9%	19.3%	16.6%	17.8%	5.9%	25.8%	100.0%
All Reasons	9.9%	11.8%	13.5%	31.7%	13.4%	10.1%	6.8%	2.8%	100.0%
	B. Percent Distribution of Age by Reason for Ineligibility								All Ages
No Base Period Wages	25.0%	28.2%	25.9%	27.0%	26.1%	31.7%	36.8%	54.8%	28.6%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	28.2%	16.3%	17.9%	13.6%	11.2%	8.0%	7.1%	6.5%	14.4%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	46.7%	55.0%	56.1%	59.1%	62.1%	59.4%	55.6%	34.3%	56.5%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.0%	0.5%	0.1%	0.3%	0.6%	0.8%	0.4%	4.3%	0.5%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Based on all males who filed for benefits at any time during calendar year 1979 and were denied benefits because of a failure to meet the monetary eligibility criteria. (It should be noted that a particular claimant can file for a monetary determination each calendar quarter; these data include persons in the characteristics count each time they had a monetary determination.)

TABLE 6

CROSS TABULATION OF AGE BY REASON FOR MONETARY INELIGIBILITY: FEMALES*
CY 1979

Reason for Ineligibility	AGE								
	less than 20	20-21	22-24	25-34	35-44	45-54	55-64	65 or over	Total
	A. Percent Distribution of Reason for Ineligibility by Age								
No Base Period Wages	7.8%	10.0%	15.5%	29.3%	16.3%	12.2%	6.4%	2.4%	100.0%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	17.5%	13.5%	13.8%	32.0%	9.8%	8.2%	4.8%	0.6%	100.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	8.6%	11.0%	15.9%	30.9%	17.2%	10.8%	4.7%	0.9%	100.0%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.0%	0.0%	12.7%	26.1%	9.5%	0.0%	6.4%	45.2%	100.0%
All Reasons	10.3%	11.2%	15.3%	30.7%	15.4%	10.6%	5.1%	1.3%	100.0%
	B. Percent Distribution of Age by Reason for Ineligibility								All Ages
No Base Period Wages	19.1%	22.3%	25.3%	23.8%	26.4%	28.8%	31.0%	44.8%	24.9%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	35.5%	25.0%	18.7%	21.7%	13.2%	16.1%	19.2%	8.8%	20.8%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	45.4%	52.7%	55.8%	54.2%	60.2%	55.1%	49.3%	35.1%	53.9%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%	0.3%	0.2%	0.0%	0.4%	11.4%	0.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Based on all females who filed for benefits at any time during calendar year 1979 and were denied benefits because of a failure to meet the monetary eligibility criteria. (It should be noted that a particular claimant can file for a monetary determination each calendar quarter; these data include persons in the characteristics count each time they had a monetary determination.)

TABLE 7

CROSS TABULATION OF ETHNIC GROUP BY REASON FOR MONETARY INELIGIBILITY*
CY 1979

Reason for Ineligibility	Ethnic Group						
	White	White Spanish	Black	Indian	Asian	Other	Total
A. Percent Distribution of Reason for Ineligibility by Ethnic Group							
No Base Period Wages	63.2%	18.5%	6.8%	10.4%	0.3%	0.7%	100.0%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	66.5%	20.5%	6.3%	6.3%	0.2%	0.2%	100.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	64.5%	20.9%	6.7%	7.2%	0.3%	0.4%	100.0%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	65.5%	27.4%	3.0%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
All reasons	64.5%	20.2%	6.6%	7.9%	0.3%	0.5%	100.0%
B. Percent Distribution of Ethnic Groups by Reason for Ineligibility							All Ethnic Groups
No Base Period Wages	26.6%	24.8%	28.0%	35.7%	30.0%	43.3%	27.2%
Insufficient High Quarter Earnings	17.5%	17.2%	16.2%	13.6%	11.3%	7.5%	17.0%
Base Period/High Quarter Earnings Ratio Too Low	55.5%	57.4%	55.7%	50.4%	58.7%	49.2%	55.5%
Insufficient Requalifying Wages	0.4%	0.6%	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.4%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

*Based on all who filed for benefits at any time during calendar year 1979 and were denied benefits because of a failure to meet the monetary eligibility criteria. (It should be noted that a particular claimant can file for a monetary determination each calendar quarter; these data include persons in the characteristics count each time they had a monetary determination.)

TABLE 8

"COMPARISON BETWEEN THE POPULATION AND THE SAMPLE USED IN THE ARIZONA LAUS CONTRACT-MARICOPA COUNTY"

Characteristic	Percentage of Sample	Percentage of Population	Probability of Difference This Large Occuring Due To Chance
Sex:			
Male	68.4%	65.7%	.4180
Female	31.6	34.3	.4180
Age:			
Less than 20	14.5	14.2	.9044
20-21	11.8	11.1	.7490
22-24	14.7	15.6	.7264
25-34	32.3	31.1	.7114
35-44	13.4	13.2	.9362
45-54	8.5	8.8	.8808
55-64	3.8	4.9	.4654
65 or more	1.1	1.1	1.0000
Ethnicity:			
White	72.4	75.2	.3524
Black	9.6	8.4	.5352
Hispanic	15.6	14.2	.5686
Indian	2.2	1.7	.5824
Asian	-	0.4	.6528
Unknown	0.2	0.1	.3682
Occupation, Last Base Period Employer:			
Prof./Tech./Mgrl.	9.4	11.3	.3898
Clerical/Sales	17.6	18.9	.6384
Service	11.4	10.1	.5352
Farm/Fish/Forest/ Related	3.1	2.7	.7264
Processing	1.6	0.9	.2892
Machine Trades	4.7	4.9	.8966
Bench Work	5.8	5.5	.8494
Structural Work	27.6	28.8	.7184
Miscellaneous	12.2	10.4	.4010
Not Given/Classified	6.7	6.4	.8572

Continued

TABLE 8 (continued)

Characteristic	Percentage of Sample	Percentage of Population	Probability of Difference This Large Occuring Due to Chance
Industry, Last Base Period Employer:			
Ag./Forest./Fish.	5.8 %	4.4%	.3720
Mining	1.1	1.2	.8466
Construction	10.0	11.1	.6170
Manufacuring	11.4	10.0	.5028
Trans./Comm./Util.	2.4	2.8	.7264
Wholesale/Retail Trade	17.4	18.5	.6892
Finance/Insurance/ Real Estate	3.8	3.9	.9442
Services	15.6	14.5	.6528
Government	2.0	2.4	.7114
Not Given/Classified	0.4	0.4	1.0000
Information Not Available	30.1	30.6	.8808
UI High Quarter Earnings:			
$0	27.8	27.5	.9204
1 - 499	16.5	16.6	.9680
500 - 699	9.1	8.6	.8026
700 - 899	5.3	5.6	.8494
900 - 1099	4.7	4.7	1.0000
1000 - 1499	7.8	8.1	.8728
1500 - 1999	9.1	9.2	.9602
2000 - 2999	10.2	10.1	.9602
3000 - 3999	5.3	4.3	.4840
4000 - 4999	1.8	2.0	.8414
5000 or over	2.2	3.3	.3788
UI Base Period Wages:			
$0	27.8	27.5	.9204
1 - 999	26.7	26.4	.9204
1000 - 1999	20.5	20.4	.9680
2000 - 2999	11.6	11.6	1.0000
3000 - 3999	6.2	6.3	.9522
4000 - 4999	2.2	2.3	.9204
5000 - 7499	3.3	3.5	.8728
7500 - 9999	1.3	1.1	.7872
10000 - 14999	0.2	0.6	.4592
15000 or over	-	0.4	.3628

TABLE 9

"COMPARISON BETWEEN THE POPULATION AND THE SAMPLE USED IN THE ARIZONA LAUS CONTRACT-PIMA COUNTY"

Characteristic	Percentage of Sample	Percentage of Population	Probability of Error This Large Occuring Due to Chance
Sex:			
Male	65.8%	63.9%	.8104
Female	34.2	36.1	.8104
Age:			
Less than 20	11.2	10.2	.8414
20-21	9.5	9.7	.9680
22-24	14.9	14.6	.9602
25-34	35.6	35.2	.9602
35-44	13.6	15.3	.7794
45-54	10.2	9.7	.9204
55-64	4.7	4.9	.9522
65 or more	0.3	0.4	.9282
Ethnicity:			
White	74.9	72.6	.7566
Black	6.1	5.5	.8728
Hispanic	15.9	18.8	.66
Indian	2.4	2.7	.9124
Asian	0.7	0.4	.7794
Unknown	-	-	-
Occupation, Last Base Period Employer:			
Prof./Tech./Mgrl.	12.2	13.5	.8180
Clerical/Sales	18.6	17.7	.8886
Service	14.2	15.5	.8336
Farm./Fish./Forest./ Related	2.4	1.8	.7872
Processing	-	0.2	.7872
Machine Trades	6.4	5.8	.8808
Bench Work	2.7	3.3	.8414
Structural Work	20.3	20.6	.9680
Miscellaneous	6.1	7.1	.8180
Not Given/Classified	16.9	14.6	.6966

continued

TABLE 9 (Continued)

"COMPARISON BETWEEN THE POPULATION AND THE SAMPLE USED IN THE ARIZONA LAUS CONTRACT-PIMA COUNTY"

Characteristic	Percentage of Sample	Percentage of Population	Probability of Error This Large Occurring Due to Chance
Industry, Last Base Period Employer:			
Ag./Forest./Fish.	2.4	2.7	.9124
Mining	1.7	2.0	.8966
Construction	9.5	9.7	.9680
Manufacturing	7.5	8.4	.8494
Trans./Comm./Util.	1.7	2.0	.8966
Wholesale/ Retail Trade	19.7	18.6	.8650
Finance/Insurance/ Real Estate	3.4	3.8	.8966
Services	18.0	16.6	.8258
Government	2.0	2.7	.7948
Not Given/Classifed	2.0	2.7	.7948
Information Not Available	32.2	31.0	.8728
UI High Quarter Earnings:			
$0	26.8	26.8	1.0000
1 - 499	16.6	16.2	.9204
500 - 699	7.8	7.1	.8728
700 - 899	5.1	4.9	.9522
900 - 1099	4.7	6.4	.6744
1100 - 1499	10.2	9.7	.9204
1500 - 1999	9.8	9.3	.9204
2000 - 2999	11.2	11.9	.8966
3000 - 3999	3.7	3.5	.9442
4000 - 4999	2.0	1.5	.8026
5000 or over	2.0	2.6	.8180
UI Base Period Wages:			
$0	26.8	26.8	1.0000
1 - 999	25.4	25.4	1.0000
1000 - 1999	22.4	22.1	.9680
2000 - 2999	11.5	11.7	.9680
3000 - 3999	6.1	6.0	.9760
4000 - 4999	3.4	3.3	.9760
5000 - 7499	3.1	2.9	.9442
7500 - 9999	1.4	1.1	.8650
10000 - 14999	-	0.2	.7872
15000 or over	-	0.4	.7184

TABLE 10

CROSS TABULATION OF AGE GROUP BY TIME PERIOD BETWEEN LAST DAY WORKED AND FILING FOR UI BENEFITS

	AGE GROUPS															
	Less Than 20		20-21		22-24		25-34		35-44		45-54		55-64		65 or Over		Total	
Time Period	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Never Worked	0	0.0	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.1	0	0.0	3	0.5	0	0.0	0	0.06	6	0.1
Less Than 2 Weeks	242	53.2	232	50.9	296	50.8	671	51.6	408	55.2	293	50.3	172	46.1	50	41.3	2364	51.3
2-4 Weeks	101	22.2	90	19.7	98	16.8	227	17.5	108	14.6	79	13.6	52	13.9	16	13.9	771	16.7
4-13 Weeks	88	19.3	96	21.1	124	21.3	263	20.2	158	21.4	125	21.4	81	21.7	26	21.5	961	20.8
13-26 Weeks	12	2.6	20	4.4	39	6.7	74	5.7	34	4.6	42	7.2	35	9.4	14	11.6	270	5.9
Greater Than 26 Weeks	12	2.6	17	3.7	25	4.3	64	4.9	31	4.2	41	7.0	33	8.8	15	12.4	238	5.2
TOTAL	455	9.9	456	9.9	583	12.6	1300	28.2	739	16.0	583	12.6	373	8.1	121	2.6	4610	100.0

TABLE 11: RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE, PAGE TWO, SECTION I (UNWEIGHTED)

	SECTION I.																
	Worked		Did not work because:														
	1-34 hrs:		35 hrs. or more:		Absent due to illness or vacation:		Did not have a job:		Accepted a job to start within 30 days:		On layoff for less than 30 days:		On Strike		Left Arizona or joined the military:		Total Number of Responses
EEK #	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
1	272	5.9	234	5.1	17	0.4	3867	84.1	14	0.3	191	4.2	3	0.1	0	0.0	4598
2	300	6.5	412	8.9	19	0.4	3701	80.3	24	0.5	149	3.2	3	0.1	1	0.0	4609
3	358	7.8	629	13.6	19	0.4	3479	75.5	18	0.4	101	2.2	3	0.1	2	0.0	4609
4	393	8.5	814	17.7	21	0.5	3287	71.3	24	0.5	66	1.4	2	0.0	3	0.1	4610
5	429	9.3	983	21.3	23	0.5	3122	67.7	22	0.5	24	0.5	2	0.0	4	0.1	4609
6	458	9.9	1107	24.0	29	0.6	2959	64.3	22	0.5	22	0.5	2	0.0	6	0.1	4605
7	476	10.3	1187	25.8	29	0.6	2865	62.3	15	0.3	18	0.4	2	0.0	8	0.2	4600
8	492	10.7	1254	27.3	31	0.7	2767	60.3	20	0.4	17	0.4	2	0.0	9	0.2	4592
9	490	10.7	1315	28.6	34	0.7	2704	58.9	27	0.6	12	0.3	0	0.0	11	0.2	4593
10	517	11.3	1374	29.9	31	0.7	2613	56.9	29	0.5	19	0.4	0	0.0	11	0.2	4594
11	511	11.1	1450	1.6	25	0.5	2547	55.4	30	0.7	20	0.4	0	0.0	12	0.3	4595
12	518	11.3	1524	33.2	26	0.6	2475	53.4	20	0.4	16	0.3	0	0.0	13	0.3	4592
13	510	11.2	1565	34.2	33	0.7	2404	52.6	31	0.7	16	0.4	1	0.0	11	0.2	4571
14	377	12.6	1060	35.3	22	0.7	1517	50.6	10	0.3	7	0.2	2	0.1	4	0.1	2999
15	377	12.6	1113	37.2	22	0.7	1464	48.9	10	0.3	4	0.1	1	0.0	4	0.1	2995
16	382	12.8	1142	38.1	19	0.6	1432	47.8	11	0.4	4	0.1	1	0.0	4	0.1	2995
17	384	12.8	1154	38.5	13	0.4	1423	47.5	11	0.4	5	0.2	0	0.0	4	0.1	2994
18	386	12.9	1170	39.1	17	0.6	1402	46.8	11	0.4	4	0.1	0	0.0	4	0.1	2994
19	378	12.6	1176	39.3	22	0.7	1395	46.6	11	0.4	5	0.2	0	0.0	6	0.2	2993
20	388	13.0	1199	40.2	21	0.7	1357	45.4	11	0.4	5	0.2	0	0.0	5	0.2	2986
21	361	12.1	1223	40.9	26	0.9	1357	45.4	8	0.3	7	0.2	0	0.0	7	0.2	2989
22	367	12.3	1244	41.5	26	0 7	1337	44.6	6	0.2	8	0.3	0	0.0	7	0.2	2995
23	373	12.5	1254	41.9	29	1.0	1318	44.0	7	0.2	7	0.2	0	0.0	6	0.2	2994
24	374	12.5	1264	42.3	22	0.7	1298	43.5	6	0.2	16	0.5	1	0.0	6	0.2	2987
25	379	12.7	1283	43.0	28	0.9	1263	42.3	5	0.2	19	0.6	1	0.0	5	0.2	2983
26	377	12.6	1288	43.1	30	1.0	1261	42.2	10	0.3	15	0.5	1	0.0	5	0.2	2987

TABLE 12: RESPONSES TO SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE, PAGE TWO, SECTION II (UNWEIGHTED)

	SECTION II								
	Looked For Work:		Did not look for work because:						
			Had a job that satisfied need:		Temporary Illness or Disability:		Other:		
WEEK#	#	% of Responses	#	% of Responses	#	% of Responses	#	% of Responses	Total Number of Responses
1	3810	86.3	251	5.7	41	0.9	313	7.1	4415
2	3630	82.8	390	8.9	42	1.0	324	7.4	4386
3	3399	78.4	551	12.7	40	0.9	344	7.9	4334
4	3179	74.4	690	16.1	35	0.8	371	8.7	4275
5	2961	69.8	843	19.9	42	1.0	398	9.4	4244
6	2811	66.7	941	22.3	49	1.2	412	9.8	4213
7	2706	64.3	1025	24.4	54	1.3	424	10.1	4209
8	2608	62.3	1090	26.0	57	1.4	434	10.4	4189
9	2524	60.4	1157	27.7	50	1.2	445	10.7	4176
10	2447	58.9	1204	29.0	45	1.1	460	11.1	4156
11	2368	57.2	1269	30.6	49	1.2	457	11.0	4143
12	2306	55.7	1327	32.1	53	1.3	453	10.9	4139
13	2265	54.9	1358	32.9	48	1.2	458	11.1	4129
14	1297	50.8	906	35.5	60	2.3	291	11.4	2554
15	1230	48.4	949	37.3	63	2.5	299	11.8	2541
16	1196	46.9	988	38.8	61	2.4	304	11.9	2549
17	1183	46.4	998	39.1	56	2.2	313	12.3	2550
18	1159	45.5	1013	39.8	62	2.5	312	12.3	2546
19	1151	45.0	1021	40.0	63	2.5	320	12.5	2555
20	1110	43.4	1054	41.2	74	2.9	322	12.6	2560
21	1090	42.6	1068	41.7	78	3.0	325	12.7	2561
22	1068	41.7	1076	42.0	80	3.1	335	13.1	2559
23	1055	41.4	1094	43.0	73	2.9	324	12.7	2546
24	1061	41.6	1097	43.0	73	2.9	318	12.5	2549
25	1032	40.6	1121	44.1	74	2.9	317	12.5	2544
26	1037	40.8	1122	44.1	74	2.9	309	12.2	2542

TABLE NUMBER 13:

Labor Force Status of All Survey Respondents - C.P.S. Definitions (Unweighted)

	Employed		Unemployed		Out-of-Labor Force		Total
Week No.	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
1	512	11.1	3909	84.7	194	4.2	4615
2	718	15.6	3996	80.2	194	4.2	4608
3	994	21.5	3426	74.3	194	4.2	4614
4	1212	26.4	3139	68.4	241	5.2	4592
5	1419	30.9	2904	63.3	267	5.8	4590
6	1571	34.3	2720	59.3	292	6.4	4583
7	1674	36.5	2594	56.5	323	7.0	4591
8	1759	38.4	2469	53.9	349	7.6	4577
9	1821	39.8	2397	52.4	358	7.8	4576
10	1906	41.6	2304	50.3	368	8.0	4578
11	1976	43.1	2233	48.7	377	8.2	4586
12	2055	44.9	2142	46.8	383	8.4	4580
13	2093	45.8	2077	45.5	395	8.7	4565
14	1448	48.5	1310	43.8	230	7.7	2988
15	1500	50.2	1252	41.9	236	7.9	2988
16	1533	51.3	1213	40.6	241	8.1	2987
17	1544	51.9	1101	37.0	332	11.2	2977
18	1563	52.5	1079	36.3	333	11.2	2975
19	1565	52.6	1070	36.0	338	11.4	2973
20	1601	53.9	1031	34.7	341	11.5	2973
21	1598	53.7	1029	34.6	349	11.7	2976
22	1622	54.4	1004	33.7	354	11.9	2980
23	1640	55.0	988	33.2	352	11.8	2980
24	1652	55.5	979	32.9	345	11.6	2976
25	1680	65.5	949	31.9	344	11.6	2973
26	1683	56.6	953	32.0	339	11.4	2975

TABLE NUMBER 14:

Labor Force Status of Male Survey Respondents - C.P.S. Definition (Unweighted)

	Employed		Unemployed		Out-of-Labor Force		Total
Week No.	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
1	300	11.8	2173	85.5	70	2.8	2543
2	443	17.5	2026	79.8	69	2.7	2538
3	590	23.2	1881	74.0	70	2.8	2541
4	780	28.0	1721	68.0	101	4.0	2530
5	837	33.1	1590	62.8	104	4.1	2531
6	924	36.7	1486	59.0	110	4.4	2520
7	982	38.8	1418	56.0	130	5.1	2530
8	1034	41.0	1348	53.5	139	5.5	2521
9	1071	42.5	1305	51.7	146	5.8	2522
10	1136	45.1	1235	49.0	149	5.9	2520
11	1171	46.4	1205	47.7	149	5.9	2525
12	1208	47.9	1152	45.7	160	6.3	2520
13	1220	48.5	1136	45.2	159	6.3	2515
14	797	50.0	694	43.5	103	6.5	1597
15	841	52.7	651	40.8	104	6.5	1596
16	847	53.1	639	40.1	108	6.8	1594
17	848	53.4	602	37.9	139	8.7	1589
18	866	54.6	581	36.6	139	8.8	1586
19	868	54.8	575	36.3	142	9.0	1585
20	891	56.3	554	35.0	138	8.7	1583
21	888	56.1	555	35.1	140	8.8	1583
22	895	56.4	546	34.4	146	9.2	1587
23	908	57.2	537	33.8	143	9.0	1588
24	920	58.0	526	33.1	141	8.8	1587
25	928	58.6	513	32.4	142	9.0	1583
26	927	58.4	519	32.7	142	8.9	1588

TABLE NUMBER 15:

Labor Force Status of Female Survey Respondents - C.P.S. Definitions (Unweighted)

	Employed		Unemployed		Out-of-Labor Force		Total
Week No.	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
1	212	10.2	1736	83.8	124	6.0	2072
2	275	13.3	1670	80.7	125	6.0	2070
3	404	19.5	1545	74.5	124	6.0	2073
4	504	24.4	1418	68.8	140	6.8	2062
5	582	28.3	1314	63.8	163	7.9	2059
6	647	31.4	1234	59.8	182	8.8	2063
7	692	33.6	1176	57.1	193	9.4	2061
8	725	35.3	1121	54.5	210	10.2	2056
9	750	36.5	1092	53.2	212	10.3	2054
10	770	37.4	1069	51.9	219	10.6	2058
11	805	39.1	1028	49.9	228	11.1	2061
12	847	41.1	990	48.1	223	10.8	2060
13	873	42.6	941	45.9	236	11.5	2050
14	651	46.7	616	44.2	127	9.1	1394
15	659	47.3	601	43.2	132	9.5	1392
16	686	49.2	574	41.2	133	9.5	1393
17	696	50.1	499	36.0	193	13.9	1388
18	697	50.2	498	35.9	194	14.0	1389
19	697	50.2	495	35.7	196	14.1	1388
20	710	51.1	477	34.3	203	14.6	1390
21	710	51.0	474	34.0	209	15.0	1393
22	727	52.2	458	32.9	208	14.9	1393
23	732	52.6	451	32.4	209	15.0	1392
24	731	52.6	453	32.6	205	14.8	1389
25	751	54.0	436	31.4	203	14.6	1390
26	755	54.4	434	31.3	198	14.3	1387

TABLE NUMBER 16:

Labor Force Status of All Survey Respondents - U.I. Definitions (Unweighted)

	Employed:		Unemployed:		Out-of-Labor Force:		Total:
Week No.	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
1	512	11.2	3772	82.3	298	6.5	4582
2	718	15.7	3534	77.2	323	7.1	4575
3	994	21.7	3252	70.9	342	7.5	4588
4	1212	26.5	3005	65.6	363	7.9	4580
5	1419	31.0	2750	60.1	403	8.8	4572
6	1571	34.4	2577	56.4	423	9.3	4571
7	1674	36.6	2462	53.8	440	9.6	4576
8	1759	38.5	2359	51.6	451	9.9	4569
9	1821	39.8	2296	50.2	454	9.9	4571
10	1906	41.7	2202	48.2	463	10.1	4571
11	1976	43.2	2136	46.7	464	10.1	4576
12	2055	45.0	2046	44.8	463	10.1	4564
13	2093	46.0	1995	43.9	458	10.1	4546
14	1448	48.7	1185	39.8	341	11.5	2974
15	1500	50.4	1126	37.9	348	11.7	2974
16	1533	51.5	1092	36.7	353	11.9	2978
17	1544	51.9	1072	36.0	358	12.0	2974
18	1563	52.6	1046	35.2	363	12.2	2972
19	1565	52.7	1036	34.9	371	12.5	2972
20	1601	53.9	986	33.2	384	12.9	2971
21	1598	53.8	984	33.1	391	13.2	2973
22	1622	54.5	955	32.1	401	13.5	2978
23	1640	55.1	952	32.0	384	12.9	2976
24	1651	55.5	947	31.8	377	12.7	2975
25	1679	56.5	917	30.8	377	12.7	2973
26	1682	56.6	921	31.0	369	12.4	2972

TABLE NUMBER 17:

Labor Force Status of Male Survey Respondents - U.I. Definitions (Unweighted)

	Employed:		Unemployed:		Out-of-Labor Force:		Total:
Week No.	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
1	300	11.9	2101	83.3	122	4.8	2523
2	443	17.6	1941	77.2	131	5.2	2515
3	590	23.4	1788	70.9	145	5.7	2523
4	708	28.1	1668	66.2	145	5.8	2521
5	837	33.2	1531	60.8	151	6.0	2519
6	924	36.8	1428	56.8	161	6.4	2513
7	982	38.9	1360	53.9	181	7.2	2523
8	1034	41.1	1304	51.8	178	7.1	2516
9	1071	42.5	1271	50.5	177	7.0	2519
10	1136	45.1	1203	47.8	178	7.1	2517
11	1171	46.5	1167	46.3	181	7.2	2519
12	1208	48.1	1112	44.3	190	7.6	2510
13	1220	48.8	1100	44.0	182	7.3	2502
14	797	50.3	643	40.6	145	9.1	1585
15	841	52.9	603	37.9	145	9.1	1589
16	847	53.3	591	37.2	150	9.4	1588
17	848	53.4	588	37.1	151	9.5	1587
18	866	54.6	568	35.8	151	9.5	1585
19	868	54.8	564	35.6	152	9.6	1584
20	891	56.3	536	33.9	155	9.8	1582
21	888	56.2	534	33.8	157	9.9	1579
22	895	56.5	520	32.8	169	10.7	1584
23	908	57.3	522	32.9	155	9.8	1585
24	920	58.0	514	32.4	151	9.5	1585
25	928	58.7	501	31.7	152	9.6	1581
26	927	58.5	506	31.9	151	9.5	1584

TABLE NUMBER 18:

Labor Force Status of Female Survey Respondents - U.I. Definitions (Unweighted)

	Employed:		Unemployed:		Out-of-Labor Force:		Total:
Week No.	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number
1	212	10.3	1671	81.2	176	8.5	2059
2	275	13.3	1593	77.3	192	9.3	2060
3	404	19.6	1464	70.9	197	9.5	2065
4	504	24.5	1337	64.9	218	10.6	2059
5	582	28.3	1219	59.4	252	12.3	2053
6	647	31.4	1149	55.8	262	12.7	2058
7	692	33.7	1102	53.7	259	12.6	2053
8	725	35.3	1055	51.4	273	13.3	2053
9	750	36.5	1025	50.0	277	13.5	2052
10	770	37.5	999	48.6	285	13.9	2054
11	805	39.1	969	47.1	283	13.8	2057
12	847	41.2	934	45.5	273	13.3	2054
13	873	42.7	895	43.8	276	13.5	2044
14	651	46.9	542	39.0	196	14.1	1389
15	659	47.6	523	37.8	203	14.7	1385
16	686	49.4	501	36.0	203	14.6	1390
17	696	50.2	484	34.9	207	14.9	1387
18	697	50.3	478	34.5	212	15.3	1387
19	697	50.2	472	34.0	219	15.8	1388
20	710	51.1	450	32.4	229	16.5	1389
21	710	50.9	450	32.3	234	16.8	1394
22	727	52.2	435	31.2	232	16.6	1394
23	732	52.6	430	30.9	229	16.5	1391
24	731	52.6	433	31.2	226	16.3	1390
25	751	54.0	416	29.9	225	16.2	1392
26	755	54.4	415	29.9	218	15.7	1388

TABLE NUMBER 19:

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SURVIVING IN EACH SURVEY WEEK BY SEX (WEIGHTED)

Week No.	Male	Female	Total
1	84.8	83.4	84.2
2	77.0	79.4	78.1
3	70.1	72.2	71.0
4	63.6	64.9	64.2
5	58.3	58.6	58.4
6	54.2	53.3	53.8
7	50.5	49.6	50.1
8	48.0	47.0	47.5
9	45.9	45.1	45.5
10	42.3	43.2	42.7
11	41.0	41.3	41.1
12	38.6	38.7	38.7
13	37.3	36.3	36.8
14	34.0	35.5	34.7
15	31.5	34.2	32.7
16	30.1	32.2	31.0
17	28.2	27.6	27.9
18	27.2	27.5	27.3
19	26.5	27.1	26.7
20	25.6	25.7	25.6
21	25.1	25.5	25.3
22	24.7	24.8	24.7
23	24.0	24.1	24.1
24	23.5	24.1	23.7
25	22.7	23.4	23.0
26	22.8	22.8	22.8
No. Resp. Week 1 (before weighting)=	2543	2072	4615
No. Resp. Week 26 (before weighting) =	1882	1568	3450

TABLE NUMBER 20:

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SURVIVING IN EACH SURVEY WEEK BY ETHNIC GROUP (WEIGHTED)

Week No.	White	Black	Hispanic	Indian	Asian	Unknown
1	84.0	85.6	83.9	85.6	75.8	88.8
2	77.6	78.4	77.8	84.1	68.1	88.8
3	69.3	75.3	72.1	80.5	73.9	88.4
4	62.2	69.4	66.4	72.6	71.9	70.9
5	56.0	61.2	62.0	68.9	56.1	67.9
6	51.6	55.9	56.1	65.9	56.1	65.7
7	47.6	54.8	53.0	61.0	43.8	63.0
8	44.8	55.4	50.9	57.3	43.8	64.8
9	43.2	54.3	48.0	54.4	38.3	49.0
10	40.1	49.7	46.8	50.4	38.3	44.5
11	38.2	46.6	46.2	49.6	38.3	46.4
12	35.9	43.2	43.9	45.6	38.3	46.6
13	33.9	39.3	42.7	45.0	38.3	46.0
14	32.2	35.1	41.1	38.1	36.0	42.7
15	30.6	34.4	38.0	35.9	30.9	36.6
16	28.5	36.8	36.7	34.5	25.9	30.4
17	25.2	32.4	34.1	32.9	21.9	30.4
18	24.4	32.2	33.8	31.5	43.8	30.4
19	23.7	32.6	33.6	30.6	38.5	30.4
20	22.7	30.1	32.5	30.7	16.6	36.6
21	22.4	29.1	31.9	30.6	16.6	36.6
22	22.3	28.0	30.5	27.4	21.9	36.9
23	21.5	29.9	29.4	28.8	16.6	36.9
24	20.9	30.0	29.8	27.6	16.6	36.9
25	20.6	29.3	27.8	26.3	16.6	36.9
26	20.5	28.6	26.6	28.9	16.6	31.3
No. Resp. Week 1 (Before Weighting)=	2774	222	1153	422	19	25
No. Resp. Week 26 (Before Weighting)=	2093	153	889	290	13	12

TABLE NUMBER 21:

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SURVIVING IN EACH SURVEY WEEK BY DISTRICT (WEIGHTED)

Week No.	District 1	District 2	District 3	District 4	District 5	District 6
1	82.9	84.9	87.1	82.9	85.7	84.6
2	75.6	77.3	82.6	81.2	78.3	81.0
3	68.2	68.4	75.7	74.8	72.4	76.1
4	60.8	60.2	70.5	68.8	67.5	69.7
5	55.3	53.6	65.5	63.1	60.0	64.4
6	50.5	48.7	61.8	58.5	56.1	58.8
7	45.8	46.2	58.5	55.3	51.9	57.5
8	43.7	43.3	56.0	51.0	48.6	55.3
9	42.3	42.0	52.6	47.7	47.9	52.0
10	38.2	39.8	49.5	46.5	46.4	51.2
11	37.7	37.2	45.8	45.4	44.5	48.7
12	35.4	34.6	43.0	43.3	43.4	45.5
13	33.7	32.3	41.3	42.0	41.2	43.3
14	32.3	28.5	37.2	39.4	37.5	44.8
15	29.9	27.2	35.3	36.8	36.2	42.7
16	27.6	25.8	33.4	35.6	36.1	41.6
17	24.8	23.4	31.0	30.6	33.2	37.3
18	24.7	22.1	29.3	29.7	32.4	36.8
19	23.7	23.1	28.4	30.4	31.5	35.2
20	22.9	22.9	27.3	28.5	30.7	32.0
21	22.2	23.1	26.8	27.9	30.8	32.0
22	22.5	21.9	26.1	26.6	28.5	31.3
23	21.6	21.2	26.0	26.6	28.9	29.7
24	21.0	21.1	26.6	26.2	27.9	29.7
25	20.5	20.6	24.3	25.0	27.4	29.1
26	20.1	20.4	25.2	23.4	27.8	29.0
No. Resp. Week 1 =	1002	726	887	578	659	763
No. Resp. Week 26 =	743	559	625	447	485	591

TABLE NUMBER 22:

PERCENTAGE OF RESPONDENTS SURVIVING IN EACH SURVEY WEEK BY COUNTY

Week No.	Apache	Cochise	Coconino	Gila	Graham	Greenlee	Maricopa	Mohave	Navajo	Pima	Pinal	Santa Cruz	Yavapai	Yuma
1	84.0	85.3	89.2	86.1	78.9	80.6	82.9	82.7	87.4	85.0	85.4	88.6	86.9	83.0
2	82.6	81.8	83.0	80.6	77.7	73.5	75.7	85.4	81.8	77.3	77.3	82.9	83.3	79.4
3	76.0	77.4	80.0	73.1	74.0	63.9	68.5	74.6	74.0	68.1	72.3	76.3	73.4	74.9
4	69.2	71.5	74.1	68.8	66.9	61.8	61.1	67.9	70.7	59.9	67.1	67.6	67.9	69.3
5	62.9	66.3	69.0	61.7	60.3	61.8	55.5	61.0	66.4	53.4	59.5	61.9	62.8	63.8
6	62.1	59.8	66.0	56.7	56.2	58.8	50.7	53.8	61.4	48.6	56.1	57.6	57.1	60.9
7	57.7	59.5	63.3	53.2	53.7	60.0	46.2	49.7	59.7	46.1	51.3	53.2	51.0	58.1
8	54.7	57.7	61.5	52.5	51.2	55.9	44.2	42.7	55.4	43.2	46.9	50.4	50.8	55.1
9	51.6	54.1	53.9	51.2	50.0	61.1	42.5	40.5	55.0	42.0	46.1	43.9	49.0	51.3
10	47.2	53.9	52.3	47.8	46.7	57.1	38.4	41.8	50.0	40.0	45.6	44.3	46.5	49.0
11	48.0	50.9	48.6	44.9	41.7	54.3	37.9	40.0	46.4	37.2	44.1	44.7	39.4	48.3
12	45.9	48.0	43.2	44.1	38.0	44.4	35.6	36.2	42.7	34.6	42.8	43.6	39.1	46.9
13	44.6	45.2	40.2	42.4	36.1	42.9	33.9	35.5	42.5	32.5	40.4	42.9	36.5	45.3
14	42.1	47.8	38.6	31.7	31.8	48.0	32.4	34.5	37.0	28.8	39.8	44.0	28.7	42.1
15	41.5	45.9	35.8	32.6	31.0	48.0	30.0	32.2	33.7	27.5	37.6	40.0	29.4	39.4
16	39.5	45.1	31.7	34.5	27.6	51.9	27.8	31.5	32.4	26.3	36.7	38.5	28.2	38.0
17	36.6	40.6	28.8	32.1	24.1	40.7	25.0	27.6	30.3	23.8	33.6	36.1	25.7	32.5
18	36.9	40.8	26.1	29.8	23.0	37.0	24.9	26.9	28.2	22.5	33.4	34.3	24.5	31.5
19	35.8	38.9	25.6	25.9	22.7	33.3	24.0	26.7	26.7	23.5	33.8	33.0	24.0	32.6
20	36.6	35.8	23.6	26.4	20.5	37.0	23.1	24.7	25.0	23.3	32.4	27.3	23.3	30.8
21	36.1	35.6	24.8	27.9	19.3	33.3	22.4	22.4	24.7	23.5	31.8	29.6	21.4	31.0
22	36.8	33.7	23.0	25.5	18.2	40.7	22.6	21.1	23.7	22.5	29.4	31.2	21.8	29.7
23	35.2	33.6	24.4	25.4	13.6	42.3	21.7	18.4	22.6	21.7	30.0	26.4	22.4	31.0
24	31.2	34.2	26.9	23.2	15.9	38.5	21.1	20.5	25.1	21.6	29.5	23.6	22.4	29.3
25	29.6	33.6	23.6	22.5	15.9	40.7	20.6	20.7	22.5	21.1	29.1	21.6	21.1	27.5
26	30.4	33.2	23.1	25.0	15.9	37.0	20.2	21.8	24.9	20.9	28.7	23.4	21.8	24.7
No. Resp. Week 1 =	194	464	241	201	123	36	1002	185	254	726	458	140	198	393
No. Resp. Week 26 =	125	365	160	144	88	27	743	147	193	559	341	111	147	300

TABLE NUMBER 23:

EQUATIONS ESTIMATED FOR EACH
COUNTY OF THE FORM

$$Y = \frac{1}{a + b(x)}$$

COUNTY	Y-INTERCEPT TERM	REGRESSION COEFFICIENT
APACHE	.0058038	.0004342
COCHISE	.002355	.0001693
COCONINO	.0030661	.0006090
GILA	.0045808	.0006643
GRAHAM	.0031526	.0018483
GREENLEE	.0353265	.0017074
MARICOPA	.0010076	.0001579
MOHAVE	.0046916	.0008743
NAVAJO	.0031599	.0005634
PIMA	.0014870	.0002157
PINAL	.0025836	.0002082
SANTA CRUZ	.0066023	.0008759
YAVAPAI	.0025240	.0003920
YUMA	.002525	.0002727

TABLE NUMBER 24:

WEEKLY SURVIVAL RATES FOR
COUNTIES AND PLANNING DISTRICTS

COUNTY	SURVIVAL RATE FOR INITIAL WEEKS	SURVIVAL RATE TO BE APPLIED TO SURVIVORS FROM PAST WEEKS
APACHE	.840	.952
COCHISE	.853	.955
COCONINO	.892	.940
GILA	.861	.937
GRAHAM	.789	.937
GREENLEE	.806	.958
MARICOPA	.829	.926
MOHAVE	.827	.933
NAVAJO	.874	.939
PIMA	.850	.920
PINAL	.854	.941
SANTA CRUZ	.886	.936
YAVAPAI	.869	.930
YUMA	.830	.948
PLANNING DISTRICTS		
1	.829	.926
2	.850	.920
3	.870	.941
4	.829	.944
5	.856	.940
6	.847	.950

TABLE NUMBER 25:

CHANGE IN COUNTY UNEMPLOYMENT RATES
DUE TO THE INCLUSION OF INELIGIBLES
(FOR THE WEEK INCLUDING JULY 12, 1979)

County	Handbook Estimate of Unemployment*	Estimate of Surviving Ineligibles	Ineligibles+ Handbook Estimate of Unemployment	C.P.S. Labor Force Estimate*	C.P.S. Unemployment Rate*	Revised Unemployment Rate (With Ineligibles)	Change In Unemployment Rate
Apache	1,600	110	1,710	13,984	15.87%	15.84%	+.03%
Cochise	1,270	250	1,520	23,777	7.41%	8.20%	+.79%
Coconino	1,418	106	1,524	28,333	6.94%	6.96%	+.02%
Gila	797	88	885	13,765	8.03%	8.30%	+.27%
Graham	382	56	438	6,578	8.06%	8.57%	+.51%
Greenlee	122	22	144	3,922	4.31%	4.73%	+.42%
Maricopa	20,811	1,063	21,874	632,364	4.56%	4.48%	-.08%
Mohave	735	64	799	17,988	5.77%	5.75%	+.09%
Navajo	1,559	106	1,665	21,370	10.12%	10.09%	-.03%
Pima	5,909	371	6,280	184,471	4.44%	4.41%	-.03%
Pinal	1,342	225	1,567	26,794	6.95%	7.52%	+.57%
Santa Cruz	687	62	749	7,469	12.76%	12.95%	+.19%
Yavapai	768	54	822	25,658	4.15%	4.15%	.00%
Yuma	2,325	253	2,578	31,159	10.35%	10.67%	+.32%

*The Labor Market Information Section of the Arizona Department of Economic Security provided the data for these columns.

APPENDIX TWO

ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY

RS-111 (7-79)

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

A person is defined as "working for pay or profit" if they:

Work one or more hours for salary, wages, tips, or for meals, living quarters or supplies received in place of cash wages;

-or

Work 15 or more hours without pay in a family operated business or farm.

A person is considered as "looking for work" if any of the following activities are undertaken.

Registering at a public or private employment office;
Meeting with appropriate employers;
Checking with friends or relatives;
Placing or answering advertisements;
Writing letters of application;
Being on a union or professional register; or
Investigating possibilities for starting a business or professional practice.

Use these definitions in answering the following questions.

1. According to the definition above, did you "look for work" at any time during the four weeks prior to

   Check (✓) only one box. ☐Yes ☐No

If any of the following information is incorrect or missing, please make the necessary changes or additions.

Phone Number _____

CONTINUED ON OTHER SIDE

APPENDIX TWO (continued)

There are two sections to the table below. During each week listed, you either worked or did not work and at the same time you either looked for work or did not look for work. For each week listed, please check (✓) one box in Section I to indicate whether you worked or did not work during that week. Then make another check in Section II to indicate if during that week you were "looking for work" or not. Please remember to use the definitions which are given on the front page to determine if you should be considered as "working" and/or "looking for work." NOTE: each week begins at 12:01 a.m. Sunday and ends at 12:00 p.m. Saturday.

Following is an example of how the table is to be filled in.

Example: During the week beginning on January 7, 1979, John did not work and he was looking for work. *(See line A)*
On January 16, 1979, John started working 20 hours per week and during that time he was still looking for full-time work. *(See line B)*
On January 19, 1979, John was laid-off permanently from his part-time job but he did not look for work for a week because he was sick. *(See line C)*
John started a full-time permanent job on January 31, 1979 and did not look for work because he was satisfied with his full-time job. *(See line D)*

Week Beginning On:	SECTION I.						SECTION II.			
	Worked	Did not work because:						Did not look for work because:		
	1-34 hrs.	35 hrs. or more	Absent due to illness or vacation	Did not have a job	Accepted a job to start within 30 days	On layoff for less than 30 days	Looked for work	Had a job that satisfied need	Tempo-rary Illness or Disability	Other
Line A: Jan. 7, 1979				✓			✓			
Line B: Jan. 14, 1979	✓						✓			
Line C: Jan. 21, 1979				✓					✓	
Line D: Jan. 28, 1979		✓						✓		

For each of the following weeks, please check Only ONE box in Section I and Only ONE box in Section II as indicated in the example above. If you cannot remember exactly what you did each week please give us your best guess.

Have you checked only one box for each week listed in Section I and only one box for each week listed in Section II?

Date Questionnaire Completed: _____

APPENDIX THREE

COUNTIES AND PLANNING DISTRICTS
IN ARIZONA