

For Release on Delivery  
Wednesday, May 22, 1968  
9:30 a.m., E.D.T.

EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS AND THE QUEST FOR  
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN BANKING

A Paper Presented  
By

Andrew F. Brimmer  
Member  
Board of Governors of the  
Federal Reserve System

Before a

Conference on Bank Employment Practices

Sponsored by

U. S. Treasury Department  
and the  
Michigan Human Relations Commission

Civic Center  
Lansing, Michigan

May 22, 1968

EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS AND THE QUEST FOR  
EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN BANKING

by  
Andrew F. Brimmer\*

In the movement to expand employment opportunities for members of minority groups, the record of the nation's banks is fair-to-middling. While a number of banks (particularly the largest banks in our leading urban areas) have been among the pace-setters in the effort, the performance of banks as a group has fallen considerably short of that for American industry generally. Moreover, although striking gains have been achieved in recent years (again especially among large banks), the participation of Negroes and other minority groups in banking historically has been so low that the total picture has not changed appreciably.

Fortunately, however, since the vast majority of the jobs in banks falls in middle-grade, clerical categories -- and given the favorable outlook for bank employment generally -- a significant expansion in the employment of minority group members could be achieved rather rapidly -- if a broad-scale, systematic and informed campaign were launched and pursued with vigor. I am aware of the fact that several groups in the industry are attempting to do just this (including the American Bankers Association and a special section

---

\*Member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. I am indebted to several persons for assistance in the preparation of this paper, I particularly want to thank Miss Mary Ann Graves, my Assistant at the Board and Dr. Phyllis Wallace, Director of Economic Research at the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

of Plans for Progress), and a number of noteworthy accomplishments have been reported. Numerous individual banks -- working alone in some cases -- have gone a long way in opening employment roles to minority groups on the basis of equality. Nevertheless, very few of the 13,000-odd commercial banks in this country have developed positive programs to attract, train and upgrade such employees in significant numbers.

In fact, it appears that many banks (along with many firms in other industries) simply do not know how to fashion recruiting techniques which would enable them to tap the reservoir of talent (some of it already fashioned into skills) that can be found among Negroes and other minority groups residing not only in ghetto sections of large metropolitan areas but also in smaller cities and towns in most regions of the country. Consequently, an exchange of views and experience among bankers, government officials and experts in human relations appears to be a promising vehicle for the development of positive programs to achieve this goal.

But let me hasten to say that I, personally, have no illusions about the difficulties involved in attempting to enhance job opportunities in banks for minority groups: the experience in Federal Reserve Banks illustrates amply just how hard is the task -- even when management policies are positive and clearly announced and when the general environment is hospitable. While the Federal Reserve Banks as a group have more than twice the proportion of minority group members among their employees as do all firms in

the banking industry, some Reserve Bank Branches fall short of the ratios found in the purely private sector. This is true although in most cases Reserve Bank offices are located in cities where minority groups (especially Negroes) constitute a substantial proportion of the total population. It seems quite evident that the extent to which energy and imagination are devoted to the expansion of equal employment varies greatly among Federal Reserve Banks -- despite the clarity of the policies adopted by the Federal Reserve Board and the Boards of Directors of the different Banks.

But, in addition to having to overcome problems of developing and implementing policies to identify and attract minority group employees, many commercial banks seem to be encountering a particularly difficult obstacle: a Federal statute aimed at preventing the employment by insured banks of persons with criminal records may be interferring -- in an unintended manner -- with the efforts of banks to recruit among ghetto residents. A recent interpretation of this statute by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation shows clearly that the prohibition applies only to persons who have been convicted of a criminal offense involving dishonesty or a breach of trust. It does not apply to many misdemeanors and minor offenses -- such as offenses under the various Youth Offender Acts or juvenile delinquency laws. Since a great many of the arrest records encountered by banks trying to recruit in ghettos fall into these latter categories, such records do not pose a legal obstacle to the employment of persons who have had minor encounters with law enforcement institutions.

I will comment on each of these main points more fully in the rest of this paper.

Patterns of Minority Group Employment in American Industry

In speaking of equal opportunity for minority groups in banking, for practical purposes we are really talking about widening job horizons for Negroes. Except for a few regional concentrations of other groups (Puerto Ricans in New York, Mexican-Americans in the Southwest and in California and Orientals in Hawaii and on the West Coast), Negroes constitute over 90 per cent of all minority groups in the population. Thus, the analysis which follows is focused primarily on employment patterns of Negroes in the banking industry.

Other than the last decennial census (which is now almost a decade old), little information is readily available on the basis of which one can appraise the racial patterns of employment in banking. To overcome this handicap, I requested the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to prepare several special tabulations using the data reported to the Commission under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 or under Executive Order 11246.<sup>1/</sup> Most of the tabulations relate to employment during the first quarter of 1966; at that time, firms (including banks) with fewer

---

<sup>1/</sup> Typically, reports are required from employers subject to the Act with 100 or more employees and from holders of Federal Government contracts and depositaries of Federal funds subject to the Executive Order with 50 or more employees.

than 100 employees ordinarily were not required to report. Consequently, statistical coverage in terms of number of firms was rather narrow in many industries (including banking). However, in terms of the number of employees, the coverage of the reports was quite adequate. This is especially true for banking where employment is heavily concentrated in large establishments.<sup>1/</sup> Statistical data obtained from the special EEOC tabulations are summarized in the tables attached to this paper.

In early 1966, Negroes constituted 4.4 per cent of the total employment in banking. (Table 1.) This proportion was slightly more than one-half the 8.2 per cent found in American industry as a whole. On the other hand, the ratio in banking was somewhat higher than in other major financial sectors. For example, Negroes represented 2.4 per cent of the total employment in credit agencies and in stock exchanges and securities firms. The ratio was 3.3 per cent in insurance.

<sup>1/</sup> For the banking industry, this can be seen by comparing the EEOC data with all-industry statistics compiled by the Bureau of Census, U.S. Department of Commerce, for 1966:

Source:	Total Employment	Size of Firm			
		Under 100 Employees	100 to 250 Emp.	250 to 500 Emp.	Over 500 Emp.
Census	799,521	287,823	110,796	81,482	319,420
EEOC	509,214	22,503	103,191	71,824	311,696
Per cent of Census	64	8	93	88	98

The overall pattern of employment of Negroes in banking is not appreciably different from that observable in a number of other industries in which white collar occupations are dominant. Thus, in advertising, Negroes held 3.7 per cent of the jobs in 1966, while in communications they held 4.3 per cent. In contrast, Negroes represent much higher proportions of total employees in those industries where jobs are typically blue collar or service tasks, performed in factory or workshop settings rather than inside offices. In manufacturing industries, Negroes made up from 4 to 20 per cent of total employment, with a heavy concentration in the neighborhood of 10 per cent. Their share of the total jobs tended to be even higher in service occupations -- in some cases more than five times the proportion found in banking.

Although it may come as a surprise to many, a substantial number of firms (including some of substantial size) employ no Negroes at all. On the basis of the EEOC data covering about 117,600 establishments, about 55,400, or 47 per cent, employed no Negroes in 1966. The proportion was greater for the smaller firms, but even among those with 500 or more employees, 7 per cent had no Negroes on their payrolls. Among the 1,700 banks whose reports were included in the EEOC tabulations, 32 per cent had no Negro employees. Since the vast majority of the 13,000-odd banks were not included in the EEOC reports (because the total number of their employees fell below the minimum cut-off level), it is not possible to present a full picture for the banking industry in this regard.

However, if the smaller banks were included they probably would show a much higher proportion with no Negro employees -- thus raising the ratio for the industry as a whole. In many instances, banks may not have employed Negroes because they are located in sections of the country where few Negroes live. But, in view of the fact that Negroes are scattered so widely in the United States (despite their heavy concentration in the South and in large northern cities), the failure of many banks and other types of businesses to hire them probably can be traced more directly to management policies than to the absence of Negroes in the particular area.

Employment Patterns in the Principal Sectors of the Banking Industry

Commercial banks, which provide the great bulk of the jobs in the banking field, offer proportionately fewer jobs to Negroes than does any one of the smaller sectors of the industry. (Table 2.) In the commercial banking sector, Negroes constitute 4.1 per cent of total employment. The highest ratio of Negro-held to total jobs (9.0 per cent) was found among Federal Reserve Banks. Negroes represented 5.9 per cent of total employment in trust companies and 5.4 per cent in mutual savings banks.

The same pattern is observable with respect to white collar employment, the dominant type of jobs found in banking institutions. In every sector of the industry, Negroes tend to lag behind in white collar occupations. Whereas white collar jobs (clerical workers,

tellers, etc.) accounted for 94 per cent of total employment in the banking industry in 1966, only 66 per cent of the jobs held by Negroes were in this category. The lowest ratio of Negro-held white collar to total Negro-held jobs (52 per cent) was found in the Federal Reserve Banks. While Reserve Banks generally seem to have a somewhat larger proportion of their total employment in blue collar and service activities than do other segments of the banking industry, Negroes in these Banks tend to be found even more frequently outside the white collar area.

Negroes, far more than bank employees generally, are likely to find job opportunities in large institutions (Tables 3 and 4). In early 1966, there were about 390 commercial banks with total deposits exceeding \$100 million; these banks accounted for more than half of the 737,200 jobs in commercial banks in that year. In contrast, the 9,700-odd banks with deposits under \$10 million accounted for only one-seventh of the total employment. When the size of the banks is measured by number of total employees, the same pattern emerges. In the first quarter of 1966, there were 216 banks with 500 or more employees; in these institutions were found 62 per cent of the total bank employment reported in the EEOC tabulations. These same banks accounted for an even larger proportion (69 per cent) of the total number of Negroes employed. Only 5 of these banks (2.3 per cent) had no Negroes on their payroll. In the rest of the size scale, the proportions of banks with no Negro employees were: under 100 employees, 61 per cent; 100-250 employees, 21 per cent, and 251-500 employees, 10 per cent.

The same situation can be described positively as well. It will be recalled that Negroes in 1966 accounted for 8.2 per cent of total employment in all industries. This ratio varies little as the size of firm increases. In the smallest units, Negroes make up 7.0 per cent of total employment in industry generally, and the largest firms show 8.1 per cent. In banking, however, the pattern appears to be strongly influenced by the size of the institution. As the size of the bank increases, Negroes tend to be hired in greater numbers relative to total employment. Again, it will be recalled that Negroes accounted for 4.4 per cent of the total employment in the banking industry in 1966. The smallest banks shown in the EEOC data (those with fewer than 100 employees) reported only 3.0 per cent of their workers as Negroes. The proportion climbed to about 3.7 per cent in the next two size categories, and rose further to 5.0 per cent in banks with 500 or more employees.

#### Employment Patterns in Banking by Major Occupations

Until now, we have been looking at overall figures for total and white collar employment in the banking industry. A closer look at the principal occupations in which Negroes are employed is also possible. As I mentioned several times above, white collar jobs account for 94 per cent of all banking jobs. As shown in Table 5, of the remainder, 1 per cent are blue collar workers, and 5 per cent are service workers. Blue collar workers include craftsmen (typesetters, electricians, repairmen, engravers,

etc.), operatives (chauffeurs, carpenters, some electricians, machinists, etc.), and laborers (garage laborers, groundskeepers, car washers and greasers, etc.). Service workers include charwomen and cleaners, cooks, guards, janitors and the like.

The picture is strikingly different when Negro employment patterns are examined. Of Negro banking employees, 30 per cent are service workers, compared to 5 per cent for all banking employees. Five per cent of the Negro workers are in blue collar jobs, compared to 1 per cent for all bank employees.

The differences become even more striking when male employment only is examined. For all male banking employees, 90 per cent are classified as white collar, compared with only 43 per cent of Negro men. In the blue collar classification, 2 per cent of all male employees work in this area, compared to 8 per cent for Negroes. Whereas only 9 per cent of all male employees are service workers, 49 per cent of the Negro male workers are classified as such.

Even after he obtains a white collar job in a bank, it seems evident that a Negro man has a particularly hard time progressing into better paying positions. Of all male banking employees, 38 per cent are officials and managers. Only 3 per cent of Negro males are in these senior posts. Professionals account for 4 per cent of total male employment. Among Negro males, professionals represent less than 1 per cent of their total employment. In the largest category, office and clerical, the Negro man just begins to approach his own. Thirty-nine per cent of all Negro male

employees are classified as office and clerical, compared to 46 per cent for all male employees. But the same relatively small representation of Negro men is noticeable among technicians.

The Negro female seems to fair slightly better than her Negro brother does in the banking industry. Although 14 per cent of all Negro women in banking are classified as service workers (compared to 2 per cent of all women employees), the differentials in other categories do not appear as large. Two per cent of the Negro women employed in banking hold blue collar jobs, compared to less than 1 per cent for all women employees. About 84 per cent of the Negro women employed in banks are in white collar occupations. All women white collar workers account for 97 per cent of their employment.

Within the white collar group, 82 per cent of the Negro women employees work as office and clerical workers, compared to 93 per cent of all women workers. Similar differences hold for the remaining white collar jobs.

Within the banking industry, jobs are fairly evenly divided between the sexes; 58 per cent are female and 42 per cent are male. The division for Negro banking employment is nearly the same; 55 per cent female, 45 per cent male. But from the analysis in the preceeding paragraphs, it seems obvious that it is more difficult for a Negro man to get a well-paying, middle level job in banking than it is for his Negro sister (although it seems hardly "easy" for either of them).

Employment Outlook in Commercial Banking

As mentioned at the outset, commercial banks have a particularly promising prospect of expanding job opportunities for minority groups. While employment in finance generally is not expected to grow appreciably over the next decade, it is anticipated that banking will register rapid gains through 1980. In the first quarter of 1967, there were about 800,000 persons employed in commercial banks. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) has estimated that during the rest of the 1960's and through the 1970's, some 70,000 new jobs per year will be generated in commercial banking. These openings will arise from a combination of employment growth, retirements, deaths and other separations. (Table 6.) This estimate suggests a rough placement rate just under 10 per cent per year. In contrast, in insurance (where about 1.2 million workers were employed in 1967), BLS estimates that about 50,000 new jobs per year will arise over the next decade -- suggesting a placement rate of only 4.2 per cent.

A sizable proportion of the new jobs in banks will be derived from the growth in demand for banking services. However, in banking (as in other types of financial activity) the spreading use of electronic data processing equipment will enable banks to economize on their manpower needs. Nevertheless, banks will still require substantial numbers of employees in job categories for which the skill and other requirements can be met with only modest investment in recruitment and training efforts.

For example, over the next decade, BLS estimates that commercial banks will have openings for about 25,00 bank clerks per year. In early 1967, some 400,000 workers (predominantly young women) were found in this category. Since turnover among such employees is high, the banks will have considerable scope to attract members of minority groups into clerical occupations.

A similar opportunity will exist with respect to bank tellers. In early 1967, about 180,000 tellers were employed in commercial banks, and BLS estimates roughly 18,000 teller positions will become available each year through 1980 -- suggesting a placement rate of 10 per cent. Many of these positions are held by women on a part-time basis, and (while accuracy, good judgment and personal appearance are important) the level of skill needed can be acquired in a fairly short time. Thus, bank teller positions seem particularly well-suited as entry points for members of minority groups. Moreover, since tellers are the bank employees with most contact with the public, an institution can use such positions to demonstrate quickly and directly (to the general public as well as to minority groups) that it does in fact follow a program of equal opportunity.

Over the next decade, according to BLS, commercial banks will also have about 10,000 new jobs per year for bank officials through 1980. On the basis of the 140,000 senior personnel in banks in 1967, this implies a placement rate of over 7 per cent. Given the present rather high average age among bank officials,

retirements over the next decade will be especially numerous. So, the need for replacements also will be strong. Moreover, the growing complexity of many bank operations (stemming in large part from the application of EDP equipment) will require an expanding number of senior personnel familiar with computer technology. A fairly large number of minority group members have already acquired such skills and their ranks will undoubtedly increase rapidly in the future. Here also commercial banks will find a fertile ground for recruiting.

#### Equal Opportunity in the Federal Reserve System

As mentioned above, the Federal Reserve Banks have made considerable strides in expanding job opportunities for minority groups. However, despite a strong endorsement by policy officials in the System, the performance is uneven among Reserve Banks.

At the Federal Reserve Board, minorities (all except a few of whom are Negroes) represent almost one-fifth of total employment. (Table 7.) They constituted about one-seventh of the office and clerical staff -- but less than 10 per cent of the white collar group as a whole. In contrast, Negro employees make up nearly three-quarters of the blue collar and service workers. In fact, a fairly large number of blue collar workers began even lower down the occupational ladder (e.g., as messengers) and were promoted to semi-skilled jobs. On the other hand, considerable progress has been achieved in recent years in the employment of Negro clerical

workers and technicians. This improvement is the result of systematic recruiting efforts supported by a strong positive employment policy developed by the Federal Reserve Board.

Among Federal Reserve Banks also, considerable progress in the employment of minority group members has been achieved. Negro employment in the Banks increased from 9 per cent in 1966 to 11 per cent in 1967. By early 1968, the Reserve Banks employed more than 2,200 Negroes, representing nearly 12 per cent of their total work force. However, the pattern is quite uneven from one bank to another -- and even between the head offices and its branches. For example, in the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, minority employment represents 18.5 per cent of the total (the highest for all Banks). Yet, the ratio at its Buffalo branch was only 9.5 per cent, slightly below the 11.6 per cent in the Banks taken as a group. The differences are even more striking at some of the other Banks. In Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Omaha, the ratio of minority group to total employment is well below that at their head offices in Cleveland, Chicago and Kansas City, respectively. Moreover, in each of these cases, the branches have as large (if not larger) pool of potential minority group employees on which to draw.

Clearly, even in the Federal Reserve System, a positive program of active recruiting is necessary to translate a firm policy of equal opportunity into action. This is especially true if any

headway is to be made in expanding employment for minority groups in white collar occupations. At the Reserve Banks (as at the Federal Reserve Board), a disproportionate number of Negroes is concentrated in the less skilled jobs. (Table 9.)

Employment Patterns in Banks in Michigan and Neighboring States

The banking industry in Michigan has a slightly higher percentage of total Negro employment than the average for the nation. In early 1966, Negroes made up 5.1 per cent of total bank employment in this state. (Table 10.) The surrounding states show similar employment patterns. For the region as a whole, 4.7 per cent of the bank employment was Negro. But again, well over 90 per cent of the total working force was white collar while only two thirds of the Negro working force was white collar.

The pattern is again evidenced in city data. Of the 29 reporting banks in Detroit, 6.6 per cent of their total employment was Negro. But only two thirds of the Negroes were in white collar jobs, compared to 93 per cent for all workers. The two other cities of comparable size in the region show only minor variations on the same theme. In the 8 reporting banks in Cleveland, 7.5 per cent of the employment was Negro. Their proportion of white collar jobs was less than the average, 87 per cent, but only half of the Negroes worked in white collar jobs. The 40 reporting banks in Chicago showed a higher proportion of their Negro workers in white collar jobs, 89 per cent compared to 92 per cent for their total working force. Five per cent of their employment were Negroes.

Arrest Records and Bank Recruitment in Central Cities

As I mentioned at the outset, many banks have been under the impression that an arrest of a potential employee precluded his consideration for bank employment. Actually this is not dissimilar from the policies of many other industries, for according to the Report of the Commission on Civil Disorders, numerous firms in diverse sectors of American industry have established personnel policies which automatically exclude from further consideration any applicant whose record shows any kind of arrest by law enforcement officials. In many cases, such exclusion applies to even arrest for the most minor infraction -- such as juvenile delinquency, offenses under various youth misdemeanors statutes, lapses in family support, etc. While many ghetto residents, particularly non-white young men, have at one time or another had difficulties with law enforcement officials, usually these encounters resulted in arrest only and not conviction.

In the case of commercial banks, the situation is even more serious because of section 19 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, the pertinent section of which reads as follows:

"Except with the written consent of the Corporation no person shall serve as a director, officer, or employee of an insured bank who has been convicted, or who is hereafter convicted, of any criminal offense involving dishonesty or a breach of trust. For each willful violation of this prohibition, the Bank involved shall be subject to a penalty of not more than \$100 for each day this prohibition is violated, which the Corporation may recover for its use."

Actually, the above section is frequently misread and many banks apparently interpret it to mean that they are precluded from putting on their payrolls people who have simply been arrested -- even for minor infractions -- although no conviction and certainly no "criminal" conviction -- actually resulted. This misreading of the law has caused serious problems for bankers in some cities (particularly in New York) who are attempting to mount recruitment programs on a major scale to attract minority group members into their institutions. Against this background, the Federal Reserve asked the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation a few months ago to review the statute and indicate the way the Corporation would itself interpret the statute.

The FDIC has provided a preliminary response -- while continuing to give further attention to the basic issues involved. In its reply the Corporation pointed out that the section applies specifically to "criminal conviction" for dishonesty or breach of trust. It said that the statute was aimed exclusively at preventing the employment of any person as a director, official, or staff member in any insured bank if that person has been "convicted" of crimes such as larceny, forgery, robbery, and tax evasion. The FDIC went on to point out explicitly that the section does not cover minor misdemeanors such as juvenile delinquency, infraction of youth codes, disorderly conduct, -- although conviction may in fact have resulted. Moreover, the Corporation stressed that mere arrest without conviction certainly is not covered by the Act.

Under the law the FDIC must clearly be concerned with employee's actions involving a possible breach of trust or dishonesty. The Corporation will continue to review the section with such crimes in mind.

In the meantime, I see no reason whatsoever why this FDIC statute should hamper a commercial bank in its recruitment efforts in urban areas so long as the bank itself proposes to waive minor misdemeanors as a reason for exclusion from bank employment. Thus, I would personally urge banks to reexamine their own employment policies to see that they screen out those persons whose employment would pose serious risks while not excluding arbitrarily potentially useful employees who somewhere along the line (perhaps while they were juveniles) had some kind of trivial difficulties with law enforcement officials.

Table 1. Negro Employment in Selected Industries, First Quarter 1966

Selected Industries	Negro Employment as per cent of Total Employment	Percentage of Firms with No Negro Employees
All Industry	8.2	47.1
Banking and Finance	1.9 - 11.8	31.9 - 77.8
Banking	4.4	31.9
Insurance	3.3	77.8
Securities Dealers/Exchanges	2.4	75.5
Credit Agencies	2.4	71.3
Real Estate	11.8	39.0
Other Finance, Ins. & Real Estate	1.9	68.0
Advertising	3.7	60.2
Communication	4.3	40.9
Construction	12.7	47.0
Manufacturing	4.0 - 19.7	22.2 - 52.7
Food/Kindred prod.	11.1	39.0
Printing and Publishing	4.8	32.7
Primary Metals	12.3	23.5
Transportation Equip.	9.1	27.7
Machinery, non-electrical	4.3	37.4
Electrical Machinery	5.4	26.0
Railroad Transportation	8.0	25.5
Air Transportation	4.2	50.3
Electric, Gas, Sanitary services	3.8	48.4
Wholesale Trade	6.5	62.5
Gen. Merchandise Stores	7.4	33.4
Eating, Drinking places	23.3	28.4
Hotels, Lodging places	25.3	13.4
Medical, Health Services	16.4	17.8

Source: Special Tabulation by Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Table 2. Employment Patterns in the Principal Sectors of the Banking Industry, By Race, First Quarter, 1966

Category of Banking Industry	Number of Banks	Total Employment			Negro Employment				
		Total Employment	White Collar		Total Employment		White Collar		
			Number	Per cent of Total Employment	Number	Per cent of Industry Total	Number	Per cent of Industry Total	Per cent of Negro Employment
Federal Reserve Banks and Branches	36	19,149	15,840	82.7	1,727	9.0	891	5.6	51.6
Commercial Banks <sup>1/</sup>	1,588	473,424	446,173	94.2	19,562	4.1	13,069	2.9	66.8
Mutual Savings Banks	58	8,484	7,502	88.4	465	5.4	346	4.6	74.4
Trust Companies <sup>2/</sup>	12	5,851	5,422	92.7	347	5.9	227	4.2	65.4
Other Banking Establishments <sup>3/</sup>	16	1,952	1,911	97.9	83	4.2	72	3.8	86.7
Total	1,711	508,861	476,848	93.7	22,184	4.4	14,603	3.1	65.8

Source: Tabulation by Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

<sup>1/</sup> Including stock savings banks.

<sup>2/</sup> Not engaged in deposit banking.

<sup>3/</sup> Performing functions closely related to banking.

Table 3. Employment in Commercial Banks, By Size of Bank, First Quarter, 1966

Size of Bank (Total Deposits)	Number of Banks		Employment		Employees per bank (Average)
	Number	Per cent of Total	Number	Per cent of Total	
All Banks	13,800	100	737,200	100	53
Under \$10 million	9,700	70	103,200	14	11
\$10 - \$100 million	3,708	27	250,700	34	68
\$100 million and over	392	3	383,300	52	97

Sources: Federal Reserve Board; U. S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census; U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Table 4. Employment Patterns in Banking by Race and Size of Bank, First Quarter, 1966

	Total	Size of Firm (Number of Employees)			
		Under 100 <sup>1/</sup>	100-250	251-500	500 and over
Number of Firms	1,710	621	667	206	216
Number with no Negro employees	546	381	139	21	5
Per cent of Total	31.9	61.4	20.8	10.1	2.3
Total employment	509,214	22,503	103,191	71,824	311,696
Per cent distribution	100.0	3.9	20.5	14.1	61.5
Negro employment	22,581	684	3,787	2,564	15,546
Per cent distribution	100.0	3.0	16.7	11.3	69.0
Negro employment as Per cent of Total	4.4	3.0	3.7	3.6	5.0

Source: Special Tabulation by Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

<sup>1/</sup> This column is derived as a residual -- (i.e., total less sum of other three size categories).

Table 5. Percentage Distribution of Banking Employment According to Position, by Race and Sex  
1966

	<u>Total</u>		<u>Male</u>		<u>Female</u>	
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Negro</u>
Total Employment	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
White Collar	93.8	65.4	89.2	42.8	97.0	83.9
Officials and Managers	17.3	1.5	37.6	2.6	2.8	0.6
Professionals	2.1	0.4	4.4	0.7	0.5	0.1
Technicians	0.7	1.1	1.2	0.7	0.5	1.4
Sales Workers	0.3	0.1	0.5	0.1	0.1	-
Office and Clerical	73.4	62.4	45.6	38.7	93.1	81.8
Blue Collar	1.3	4.5	2.3	8.0	0.6	1.7
Service Workers	4.9	30.1	8.5	49.2	2.4	14.4

Source: Special Tabulation by Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Table 6. Employment Outlook in Commercial Banking and Insurance, 1967-80

Type of Employment	Employment First Quarter, 1967	New Jobs Per Year, 1967-80 <sup>1/</sup>	Placement Rate <sup>2/</sup> (Per cent)
<b>Commercial Banks</b>			
All occupations	800,000	70,000	8.8
Bank clerks	400,000	25,000	6.3
Tellers	180,000	18,000	10.0
Bank officials	140,000	10,000	7.2
Other employees	80,000	17,000	21.2
Insurance	1,200,000	50,000	4.2

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics; Occupational Outlook Handbook, Bul. No., 1550, 1968-69 Edition, (1968), pp. 707-721.

<sup>1/</sup> Positions arising from employment growth, retirements, deaths, and other separations.

<sup>2/</sup> New jobs per year as percentage of employment during first quarter, 1967.

Table 7. Employment Patterns at the Federal Reserve Board,  
By Occupation and Race, First Quarter, 1968

	<u>Number</u> <u>Total</u>	<u>Employed</u> <u>Negro</u>	<u>Negro as Per cent of Total</u>
Total Employment	771	140	18.2
White Collar	655	56	8.6
Officials and Managers	61	1	1.6
Professionals	235	3	1.2
Technicians	13	2	15.4
Office and clerical	346	50	14.5
Blue Collar	67	49	73.5
Service Workers	49	35	71.5

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

Table 8. Employment in Federal Reserve Banks and Branches, By Race, First Quarter, 1968

Federal Reserve Bank and Branches	Total Employment	Negro Employment		Other Minorities <sup>1/</sup>	
		Number	Per cent of Total	Number	Per cent of Total
Boston	1,203	68	5.6	6	0.5
New York	3,786	702	18.5	97	2.4
Buffalo	246	24	9.7	-	-
Philadelphia	899	85	9.4	-	-
Cleveland	709	58	8.1	2	0.3
Cincinnati	315	30	9.5	-	-
Pittsburgh	357	14	3.9	-	-
Richmond	901	151	16.7	-	-
Baltimore	302	84	27.8	-	-
Charlotte	250	45	18.0	1	0.4
Atlanta	599	94	15.6	4	0.7
Birmingham	195	26	13.3	-	-
Jacksonville	282	32	11.3	2	0.7
Nashville	158	17	10.7	-	-
New Orleans	255	44	17.2	1	0.4
Chicago	2,077	209	10.0	36	1.7
Detroit	536	24	4.4	-	-
St. Louis	742	136	18.3	-	-
Little Rock	127	14	11.0	-	-
Louisville	176	28	15.9	-	-
Memphis	131	17	12.9	-	-
Minneapolis	657	6	0.9	1	0.1
Helena	68	-	-	-	-
Kansas City	669	37	5.5	7	1.0
Denver	159	7	4.4	8	5.0
Oklahoma City	178	20	11.2	4	2.2
Omaha	158	5	3.1	2	1.3
Dallas	549	47	8.5	7	1.3
El Paso	86	9	10.4	20	23.2
Houston	183	15	8.1	4	2.1
San Antonio	159	7	4.4	13	8.1
San Francisco	657	56	8.5	94	14.2
Los Angeles	599	76	12.6	105	17.2
Portland	191	10	5.2	3	1.5
Salt Lake City	168	-	-	4	2.2
Seattle	251	13	5.1	8	3.0
All Federal Reserve Banks	18,978	2,210	11.6	419	2.2

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

<sup>1/</sup> Includes Spanish-Americans, Orientals and American Indians.

Table 9. Employment Patterns in Federal Reserve Banks  
By Occupation and Race, First Quarter, 1968

<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Number Employed</u>		Percentage Distribution of		<u>Negro Employment as Per cent of each Occupation</u>
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Negro</u>	<u>Employment Total</u>	<u>Negro</u>	
Total Employment	18,978	2,210	100.0	100.0	11.6
White Collar	15,480	1,321	81.6	59.8	6.9
Officials and Managers	1,629	1	8.6	*	*
Professionals	1,290	12	6.8	0.5	0.9
Technicians	326	17	1.7	0.8	5.2
Sales Workers	2	-	-	-	-
Office and clerical	12,233	1,291	64.4	58.4	11.6
Blue Collar	959	127	5.0	5.7	13.2
Service Workers	2,539	762	13.4	34.5	30.0

Source: Federal Reserve Board.

\* Less than 0.1 per cent.

Table 10.

Banking Employment Patterns in  
Selected Geographical Areas  
First Quarter, 1966

	Negro Employment as a Per Cent of <u>Total Employment</u>	White Collar Employment as a Per Cent of Total Employment	
		<u>Total</u>	<u>Negro</u>
Total, U.S.	4.4	93.8	65.4
States:			
Michigan	5.1	93.3	65.6
East North Central States <sup>1/</sup>	4.7	91.9	66.7
SMSA's: <sup>2/</sup>			
Detroit	6.6	93.2	66.9
Cleveland	7.5	87.1	52.2
Chicago	5.0	91.7	88.7
Grand Rapids	0.8	95.3	100.0

<sup>1/</sup> Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin

<sup>2/</sup> Data are for commercial banking only.