Labor Supply and Mobility in a Newly Industrialized Area

Bulletin No. 1261

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
James P. Mitchell, Secretary

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS
Ewan Clague, Commissioner

Labor Supply and Mobility in a Newly Industrialized Area

Bulletin No. 1261

February 1960

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
James P. Mitchell, Secretary

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS
Ewan Clague, Commissioner

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington 25, D.C. - Price 35 cents

PREFATORY NOTE

This survey of employees and job applicants was conducted by Gerald G. Somers for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, while he was associated with the West Virginia University. He is now at the University of Wisconsin. Both Mr. Somers and the Bureau wish to express their appreciation of the help given by Carl E. Wade for assistance in coordinating the field interviews, and to officials of the Kaiser Corporation for their cooperation throughout the period of the survey.

CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES--CONTINUED

APPENDICES

Labor Supply and Mobility in a Newly Industrialized Area

INTRODUCTION

Areas of chronically limited employment opportunities have been a source of study and legislative concern for many years. In periods of national full employment these areas stand out as continuing sore spots in an otherwise healthy economy. In periods of rising national unemployment their chronic distress is aggravated through a further decline in local opportunities and the discouragement of outward migration.

Primary attention has been given to major depressed areas and to those with substantial, measurable labor surplus caused by dramatic declines in such industries as textiles or coal, or by the closing of a dominant industrial facility. Many smaller rural areas, however, are known to have longer standing problems of unemployment and underemployment even though they cannot readily be measured or documented. Many such areas have never developed a sufficient economic base to support natural population increase. A recent report cited some 315 counties in the United States which it may be assumed constitute the core of the lowest income rural areas.[1] Most of these rural depressed areas are in the Southeast, with 17 in West Virginia, representing 5.4 percent of the national total of such areas.[2] Little is known of the details of unemployment, underemployment, and labor mobility in these sectors of traditionally limited employment opportunities.

Although numerous suggestions have been made for the alleviation of distress in these areas, possible solutions essentially narrow down to two: the outward migration of surplus labor and/or the local attraction of new industry. In practice the first alternative is likely to be followed, regardless of whatever action may be taken to attract new industry. From the standpoint of the local communities, however, the second alternative is more often viewed as the only viable longrun solution. Much time and effort have been devoted to the attraction of industry to depressed areas, and there has been considerable study of the factors encouraging and inhibiting such movement. These studies show that one dominant consideration is the quantity and quality of the labor force awaiting a prospective employer. While the chronic lack of local employment opportunities might serve to assure a manufacturing firm of the quantitative adequacy of potential labor supply, there might be grounds for serious concern regarding qualitative adequacy. Because of a depressed rural area's limited industrial base and the outward migration of young workers, a shortage of qualified, experienced applicants might be anticipated.

The present study was designed to provide additional information on the character of the labor supply attracted to manufacturing employment in a chronically depressed rural area and, by analysis of the prior work histories of these employees, to gain insight into the problems of unemployment, underemployment, and mobility experienced in such an area.[3] The occasion for the study was the establishment of the Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corp. sheet and foil rolling mill on the Ohio River near the town of Ravenswood, W. Va. The mill began production in 1956. When the plant is completed as a fully integrated rolling mill, its annual capacity will be 250 million pounds of sheet and foil production. Employment in the plant numbered approximately 900 at the time of the survey in mid-1957 and was expected to reach over 3,000 by 1959.

[1] Sar A. Levitan, Federal Assistance to Labor Surplus Areas, (Committee on Banking and Currency, U.S. House of Representatives, 85th Cong., 1st sess.) Committee Print, April 15, 1957, pp. 29-35.

[2] Ibid., p. 32.

[3] See Gerald G. Somers, Labor Supply for Manufacturing in a Coal Area (in Monthly Labor Review, December 1954, pp. 1327-1330); and Mobility of Chemical Workers in a Coal-Mining Area (in West Virginia University Business and Economic Studies, Morgantown, W. Va., June 1954.)

The Area

At the time of the plant's establishment, Ravenswood was a small, rural community of 1,175 people in Jackson County, which had a wholly rural population of 13,900 (table 1) The predominantly rural character of the area extends to adjoining counties with the exception of Kanawha in which Charleston, the State capital, is located 55 miles from Ravenswood, and Wood County, containing Parkersburg, 39 miles from Ravenswood. The only other sizable West Virginia community within a 50-mile radius of Ravenswood is Pt. Pleasant (Mason County), 20 miles distant, with a population of 4,500. On the Ohio side of the Ohio River, Pomeroy and Middleport, 25 miles distant, had a combined population of 7,000, and Gallipolis, a population of 8,300. Even in the urban centers, the number of employees engaged in manufacturing is relatively small. With the exception of Kanawha County, coal mining is either nonexistent or insignificant in the area. Aside from agriculture, the bulk of employment is distributed among a variety of other small nonmanufacturing establishments.

The depressed condition of Jackson County prior to the plant's establishment can be seen in the fact that the county's population declined an estimated 16 percent between 1940 and 1956--a period in which the country as a whole experienced substantial population gains. Population also declined in two adjoining counties during this period. Jackson County and four adjoining West Virginia counties were listed by the Secretary of Agriculture as among the 500 counties in the United States having the largest percentage of commercial farms each producing less than $2,500 worth of products for sale in 1954--a criterion established for designation as rural "problem" areas.[4]

The impact of the plant must also be viewed in the light of the employment situation in West Virginia as a whole during the period since 1950. In those years West Virginia communities appeared prominently in the lists of areas with serious levels of unemployment. The difficulties stemmed not only from the depression in the State's agricultural sectors, but also from the continuing decline in coal-mining employment. From April 1, 1950, to July 1, 1954, the population of West Virginia decreased by an estimated 1 percent, while the population of the United States increased by an estimated 6.3 per-

[4]Levitan, op. cit. p. 85.

TABLE 1. Selected characteristics of population and industry data for Jackson County, W. Va., and adjoining counties

County	Population					Number of farms, 1954	Employees in manufacturing, 1954
	1940	1950			July 1956[1]		
		Total	Urban	Rural			
Jackson	16,598	15,299	---	15,299	13,900	1,751	107
Kanawha	195,619	239,629	135,514	104,115	254,000	1,735	21,222
Mason	22,270	23,537	4,596	18,941	23,500	1,648	1,087
Meigs (Ohio)	24,104	23,227	7,102	16,125	31,800	1,757	535
Putnam	19,511	21,021	1,391	19,630	21,000	1,537	2,518
Roane	20,787	18,408	2,587	15,821	16,300	1,904	365
Wirt	6,475	5,119	---	5,119	4,200	604	32
Wood	62,399	66,540	46,512	20,028	66,300	1,698	7,919

[1] Estimated.

Source: For population; U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Decennial Census 1940, 1950; and for 1956, Current Population Reports, June 1958, Series P-25, No. 178. For remaining items; Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book, 1956.

cent.[5] In March 1957, the Charleston area was listed among 19 major labor market areas in the United States as having a continuous history of "substantial labor surplus"; 6 additional smaller areas within the State were also included among those "probably eligible" for Federal assistance because of continuing high unemployment levels; and 17 counties, representing about 25 percent of the State's total population, were listed among 315 "problem" counties with the lowest farm incomes and levels of living in the country.[6]

Impact of the Plant

At the time of the survey in the summer of 1957, the plant's establishment had not yet had a marked tangible effect upon the area. The population of Ravenswood, 7 miles away from the plant, had increased to 2,500, and the town could boast of two new motels, a new restaurant, and a rental housing development for supervisory personnel. A housing project for hourly rated employees was in the planning stage. Although housing was in short supply, the shortage had not yet become critical because of the commuting patterns of employees. As yet there were no bus, rail, or air connections between Ravenswood and other communities, but the extension of a bus route was pending. In the absence of county action, the company had also arranged for the construction of a new elementary school. While most of the business proprietors and younger Ravenswood residents welcomed the changes brought by the plant, informal discussions with a number of residents indicated that some of the older persons deplored the impact on their traditional rural ways.

In spite of the widespread attraction of workers from other area establishments, the existence of a large surplus of labor softened the impact of the plant on labor supply in other companies. Complaints from other employers were raised only in connection with competition for clerical employees and skilled maintenance workers. But, even here, recognition of the isolated location of the plant and its consequent staffing problems served to moderate criticism of its policy of recruiting skilled employees from other area establishments.

The first major effect of the plant's establishment was the hope that was stirred among the unemployed, the underemployed, and the low-wage workers in depressed communities in the area. In West Virginia's campaign for industrial development the announced establishment of this large manufacturing facility was headline news. Job applications began pouring in long before construction and hiring began in 1955 and 1956. The number of applications had dropped by January 1957 to about 50 or 60 a day when the company's national television program presented a feature on the new plant which included a "Men Wanted" sign. In the following weeks, daily applications averaged 200 to 300, and by the summer of 1957, total applications on file exceeded 25,000.

Survey Methods[7]

Data on the characteristics of labor supply and the previous work experience of employees at the Ravenswood works were obtained through two principal sources during the summer of 1957: first, the company made available the job application forms of the approximately 900 employees who had been hired by the close of the survey on August 1. These were verifaxed and the information on them coded. The forms were complete for almost all hourly rated employees, but were lacking in a number of items of information for many of the salaried personnel. Second, personal interviews were conducted with 894 of the plant's employees, including top management, on the basis of a structured questionnaire form. Interview questions supplemented application form data.

In order to evaluate the company's hiring policies and gain a fuller picture of the characteristics of potential labor supply 522 application forms were selected from applicants deemed unacceptable by the company.[8]

[5] U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Series P-25, No. 124.

[6] Levitan, op. cit., pp. 12-13, and 26.

[7] Methods and forms employed in the survey are discussed in greater detail in appendices I and II.

[8] A 3-percent random sample was drawn from each of the occupational groups except the unskilled. Because of the large number of application forms in this group, a 1-percent random sample was drawn. These forms were verifaxed and coded and compared with the application form data of the employees.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE LABOR SUPPLY

The adequacy of the labor supply available to the company in the Ravenswood area is obviously related to the plant's hiring needs and standards both at the time of the survey and in the future. The local supply of workers must also be evaluated in conjunction with other sources of personnel available through transfer by the company. Finally, the company's ability to achieve a suitable full complement of employees by 1959 can be estimated through examination of the qualifications of applicants who were not hired at the time of the survey, in addition to those who were hired.

Hiring Needs

Fewer production employees were required at the time of the survey, relative to other occupations, than will be required as full capacity is approached. At an early stage in the plant's development the number of professional, technical, and managerial employees and foremen was disproportionately large (table 2). At the time of the survey, employees in these categories constituted 27 percent of the work force, whereas operatives represented only 18 percent of the total. These disproportions resulted from the plant's limited productive capacity during the construction phase and from the extensive training programs required for the relatively inexperienced work force. Plant activity during the summer of 1957 was still directed largely toward preparations for future production needs rather than toward those of current production.

As in other basic metal production, women employees are required primarily in clerical work and in a few technical occupations. Clerical employees constituted 87 percent of total female employment in mid-1957, and 65 percent of all clerical employees were women.

Hiring Standards

The company wished to find workers in an age group which combined physical vigor, experience, and intelligence with the requisite skills and with the highest possible levels of education. In practice, it was recognized that the optimum combination of these qualities would not be found in many cases, and that concessions would

TABLE 2. Employees at the Ravenswood plant, by occupation and sex, summer 1957

Occupational groups[1]	Total		Male		Female	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All occupations	888	100	780	100	108	100
Professional, technical, and managerial	174	20	164	21	10	9
Clerical	145	16	51	7	94	87
Foremen	67	7	67	9	---	---
Craftsmen	103	12	103	13	---	---
Operatives	160	18	157	20	3	3
Service[2]	51	6	50	6	1	1
Labor	156	17	156	20	---	---
Trainees[3]	32	4	32	4	---	---

[1] Six male employees whose occupational data were not available are excluded from this table and analyses involving occupational groups. The professional, technical, and managerial, and clerical employees, and foremen and trainees are salaried personnel. The remaining occupations are hourly rated.

[2] Includes watchmen, janitors, storeroom attendants, etc.

[3] Management trainees.

have to be made which, in the initial stages, would take the form of relaxing standards for the less essential occupations. It was further realized that a broader relaxation of standards might become necessary as full employment was approached. For this reason, many thousands of application forms were filed and designated as "temporarily unaccepted" rather than "rejected."

Employment officials attempted to follow a prescribed set of standards in selecting employees:

1. The completion of the application form had to demonstrate neatness and ability to comprehend and follow instructions.

2. Preference was to be given to applicants whose commuting time from the plant did not exceed a 30-minute drive. (It became necessary to abandon this standard in many instances.)

3. The minimum hiring age was 18 years. The maximum hiring age depended on the applicants' physical and mental condition, but in no case was it to exceed 65. Preference was to be given applicants between the ages of 25 and 35, and plans were made to select approximately 55 percent of the plant's employees within this age category. It was expected that 20 percent of the employees would be in the 18 to 25 year bracket and an additional 20 percent in the 35 to 50 year category. The number over 50 years of age was not to exceed 5 percent of the total.

4. The company's initial policy was to deny employment to all applicants with serious sight defects or chronic disease. Those with other physical defects were to be referred to the employment supervisor for his discretionary action. At the time of the survey, serious physical handicaps precluded employment, but officials of State agencies were discussing with the company the possibilities of increased employment of handicapped persons.

5. No minimum educational level was prescribed, but a high school education was preferred for hourly rated and clerical employees. A college or university degree was required for almost all technical and professional occupations and, usually, for inclusion in the management-training program.

6. Persons with previous military service were accorded preference over those whose service was pending. Those veterans without an honorable discharge were screened by the employment supervisor before hiring. Aliens and applicants declared unfit for military service were also given special screening.

7. No preference was established relative to single and married applicants except that the hiring of spouses of employees required special approval. A maximum of three applicants could be selected from the same family.

8. In reviewing the applicant's previous employment record, references were to be checked at the discretion of the employment supervisor, reasons for leaving previous jobs were to be appraised, and preference was given to those whose employment history showed reasonable job stability, with progression and growth. First preference was accorded to applicants with employment experience in aluminum manufacturing, and then, to those with experience in other light-metal manufacturing, and finally, to those who had worked in heavy industry. Because of the extensive training needs anticipated and the expectation that many of the employees first hired for hourly rated jobs would end up in supervisory positions, the personnel office gave preference to applicants with previous supervisory or managerial experience and to those whose background and general experience indicated potentiality for training.

Hiring Procedures

The company experienced its greatest difficulties in finding local employees with technical skill and supervisory experience in aluminum manufacturing, but was able to transfer a nucleus of such key personnel from its other establishments, primarily from the West Coast. Seventy-two of the surveyed employees, representing 8 percent of the total, had been employed by the company elsewhere prior to their employment in the Ravenswood works. More than 80 percent of the transferred employees were in the professional, technical, managerial, or supervisory occupations, representing about 25 percent of all employees in these essential occupations.

Application forms of local applicants were first examined in the light of the established selection standards. Where qualifications were found to be inadequate under those standards, the forms were set aside for possible use at a later date when relaxation of the initial standards might become necessary. Applicants who appeared acceptable were interviewed and tested. The tests included an oral ability test designed to determine general intelligence and a mechanical aptitude test. An applicant who performed satisfactorily in these tests was given a medical examination, and if this too was satisfactory, he was offered a job within a 6-weeks period. Other applicants were given varying degrees of encouragement or discouragement but were seldom rejected outright.

In appraising many of the characteristics of the labor supply available to the firm, it was possible to compare the qualifications of applicants who were hired with those of applicants not accepted. While total information from application forms and interview questionnaires was utilized in describing employees, it was necessary to rely wholly on application form data for unaccepted applicants. The latter group is discussed in terms of five occupational categories into which they were placed by the personnel office on the basis of prior experience disclosed in their application forms (table 3). The professional, technical, and managerial classification and the clerical classification among unaccepted applicants are generally comparable with the similarly designated categories among employees (table 2). The skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled categories among unaccepted applicants are generally comparable with craftsmen, operatives, and service and labor categories, respectively. Foremen and trainees in the employee group can most logically be classed with managerial personnel for purposes of comparison with the unaccepted applicants. Women are primarily concentrated in the clerical field in both groups, but they represent a smaller proportion of the total unaccepted applicants.

Personal Characteristics

The company was able on the whole to achieve its prescribed standards with regard to age and education of its employees. The proportion of employees in each of the

TABLE 3. Applicants unaccepted by the Ravenswood plant, by level of skill and sex, summer 1957

Occupational group[1]	Total		Male		Female	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All groups	522	100	486	100	36	100
Professional, technical, and managerial[2]	48	9	48	10	---	---
Clerical	67	13	35	7	32	89
Skilled[3]	124	24	121	25	3	8
Semiskilled[4]	100	19	100	21	---	---
Unskilled[5]	183	35	182	37	1	3

[1] Application forms which lacked data on the items under analysis were omitted from the total in determining percentages.

[2] Includes a few applicants who might also qualify for supervisory positions. Management trainees were not included among unaccepted applicants.

[3] Includes maintenance occupations: boilermakers, brickmasons, carpenters, electricians, machinists, painters, and pipefitters.

[4] Classified by the company as production occupations, including rollers, operators, shippers, potmen, and rodmen.

[5] Includes laborers and such service occupations as janitors, guards and storeroom attendants.

age categories corresponded generally with that specified as a guide to employment officials (table 4). Such departures as existed appeared to be primarily in the direction of a greater reliance on young workers than had been originally intended. The largest proportions of young employees were concentrated in the clerical and labor classification. With all but 3 percent of the technical-managerial employees between 20 and 44 years of age, the company was able to come closest to its established age standards in this group of personnel, most of whom were transferred. The average age of the foremen and craftsmen was notably higher than that of the other categories with 45 and 46 percent, respectively, 35 through 44 years of age, and 9 and 12 percent, respectively, 45 or over. For the employees as a whole, however, the company was able to obtain almost 50 percent of its personnel within its desired age range of 25 through 34.

It is instructive to compare these results with the age distribution of unaccepted applicants. The 25 through 34 age category (table 5) was also heavily represented in the sample of unaccepted applicants. But in comparison with the selected employees, a larger proportion was in the lowest and highest age categories (9 and 11 percent, respectively). In contrast with the unskilled employees, an especially large proportion of unskilled applicants was in these two age groups.

Only 4 percent of the plant's recruits had ended their formal education in elementary school. The remainder, in keeping with the company's hiring specifications, had at least some high school education, and more than 33 percent had attended a college or university. Those who had attended college or university included 88 percent of the professional, technical, and managerial employees, and 49 percent of the foremen. Even 13 and 12 percent, respectively, of the craftsmen and laborers were in this educational classification. The relatively high educational level of these hourly rated employees reflects the company policy of hiring with an eye to the future supply of supervisory personnel. These educational levels were substantially higher than those attained by a cross section of the adult population in the county and State.[9]

[9] 1950 Census of Population, Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population, pt. 49 (West Virginia), (U.S. Bureau of the Census), tables 20 and 42.

Many of the employees had supplemented their formal education with business, trade, or technical training. Almost one-fourth of the clerical employees had attended business school; and 28 percent of the craftsmen and 18 percent of the operatives had attended trade school.

The contrast in educational attainment between employees and unaccepted applicants is especially striking. Whereas, only 4 percent of the operative employees and 10 percent of the employed laborers had ended their education in elementary school, about 33 percent of the unaccepted applicants for unskilled and semiskilled jobs were at this level. Aside from those in the professional, technical, managerial, and clerical groups, only a handful of unaccepted applicants had attended college or university and, even in these occupations, the number with a higher education was substantially below that in the comparable occupational groups of employees. Given these sharp differences in representation at the lowest and highest levels of educational attainment, it is interesting to note that the proportions who had ended their formal education in high school were roughly the same among employees and unaccepted applicants. It is also significant that a slightly higher proportion of unaccepted applicants had supplemented their formal education with trade, business, or technical training. This provided some compensation for their deficiencies in formal schooling but apparently was insufficient to justify their employment.

In comparing the educational levels of employees and unaccepted applicants, it should be recalled that a relatively large proportion of employees with higher education were in the professional, technical, managerial, and supervisory categories and that about one-fourth of the employees in these categories had been transferred to Ravenswood from the company's other establishments. It should also be noted that the data on age and education for other employees as well as the unaccepted applicants were not restricted to residents of the Ravenswood area. As indicated later, a large proportion of employees and unaccepted applicants were living beyond a 50-mile radius of Ravenswood at the time their applications were submitted.

Although there were larger percentages of employees than unaccepted applicants in the preferred age and education cate-

TABLE 4. Employees at the Ravenswood plant, by age, education, birthplace, address on application form, and occupational group, summer 1957

(Percentage distribution)

Item	All occupations[1]	Professional, technical, and managerial	Clerical	Foremen	Craftsmen	Operatives	Service	Labor	Trainees
Number of employees	888	174	145	67	103	160	51	156	32
Age	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Under 20 years	6	---	19	---	---	4	---	8	4
20-24 years	20	18	32	4	---	26	20	24	44
25-34 years	48	57	39	42	42	54	55	44	52
35-44 years	22	22	9	45	46	15	23	19	---
45-64 years	4	3	1	9	12	1	2	5	---
Education[2]	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Elementary school	4	---	1	---	10	4	6	10	---
High school	49	9	56	43	51	69	74	68	3
College or university	30	81	20	39	11	9	8	11	94
Elementary plus trade school[3]	1	1	2	---	4	1	---	---	3
High school plus trade school[3]	12	2	18	8	22	14	12	10	---
College plus trade school[3]	4	7	3	10	2	3	---	1	---
Birth place	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ravenswood area[4]	40	17	52	2	31	54	57	56	9
Other West Virginia locations[5]	29	18	33	21	43	28	33	31	31
Contiguous State[5]	13	22	9	20	12	14	8	10	4
Noncontiguous State[5]	17	41	6	56	14	4	2	3	52
Foreign	1	2	---	2	---	---	---	---	4
Address on application form	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ravenswood area[4]	48	12	74	3	49	66	76	70	3
Other West Virginia locations[5]	17	16	16	9	22	16	14	20	38
Contiguous State[5]	13	13	7	19	17	12	6	8	12
Noncontiguous State[5]	22	59	3	69	12	6	4	2	47

[1] See footnote 1, table 3.
[2] Classifications include those who began, but did not necessarily complete, education at the specified level.
[3] Includes vocational, business, and technical schools.
[4] Within a 50-mile radius of Ravenswood.
[5] Beyond a 50-mile radius of Ravenswood.

gories, it can be inferred that the company will be forced to revise its hiring standards somewhat as it expands employment. Even in the unaccepted group from 34 to 48 percent of the applicants in the various occupational categories were in the preferred 25 through 34 age range. (See table 5.) More than 60 percent of the potential professional, technical, and managerial personnel had attended college or university, and from 60 to 72 percent of the other occupational groups had attended high school. Although it cannot be expected that all of the thousands of applicants from whom this sample was drawn would respond to a future company call, it is reasonable to assume that an adequate work force can be secured which will meet the standards of age and education without seriously reducing the quality of the work force.

TABLE 5. Applicants unaccepted by the Ravenswood plant, by age, education, birthplace, address on application form, and occupational group, summer 1957

(Percentage distribution)

Item	All occupations[1]	Professional, technical, and managerial	Clerical	Skilled	Semi-skilled	Unskilled
Number of unaccepted applicants---	522	48	67	124	100	183
Age----------	100	100	100	100	100	100
Under 20 years----------	9	---	18	2	4	16
20-24 years----------	16	4	24	10	16	20
25-34 years----------	39	48	34	42	44	35
35-44 years----------	25	40	18	32	24	18
45-64 years----------	11	8	6	14	12	11
Education----------	100	100	100	100	100	100
Elementary school----------	23	2	2	21	34	33
High school----------	48	21	46	46	50	55
College or university---------	10	52	24	2	4	3
Elementary school plus trade school[2]----------	2	---	2	4	1	1
High school plus trade school[2]	15	15	19	26	10	8
College plus trade school[2]----	2	10	7	1	1	---
Birthplace----------	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ravenswood area[3]----------	29	15	41	15	24	40
Other West Virginia locations[4]	50	41	42	57	53	49
Contiguous State[4]----------	16	23	11	23	19	10
Noncontiguous State[4]----------	5	19	6	5	4	1
Foreign----------	---	2	---	---	---	---
Address on application form-------	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ravenswood area[3]----------	37	31	57	33	27	41
Other West Virginia locations[4]	43	29	30	46	46	48
Contiguous State[4]----------	16	29	7	18	23	10
Noncontiguous State[4]----------	4	11	6	3	4	1

[1] See footnote 1, table 3.
[2] Includes vocational, business, and technical schools.
[3] See footnote 4, table 4.
[4] See footnote 5, table 4.

Birthplace and Pre-Kaiser Residence

While the company was generally able to maintain preconceived standards of age and education in selecting employees, it did so only at the cost of abandoning its preference for plant proximity. Fifty-two percent of the employees lived beyond a 50-mile radius of Ravenswood at the time of their application. (See table 4.) Seventeen percent lived in West Virginia beyond the 50-mile radius and over 20 percent lived in a noncontiguous state.

In general, distance from the plant immediately prior to their employment at the Ravenswood works increased with the applicant's level of skill. Only 12 percent of the professional, technical, and managerial group were within 50 miles of the plant, and only 3 percent of the foremen lived within this area. About 25 percent of the employees in these occupational groups had been transferred from the company's other plants. On the other hand, 49 percent of the craftsmen, 66 percent of the operatives, and 70 percent of the laborers employed applied from within the Ravenswood area. The geographic distribution of the management trainees was similar to that of the managerial and supervisory personnel, except that a larger proportion of trainees lived in other West Virginia locations at the time of their applications. The group with the greatest proximity to the plant was that of 145 clerical employees of whom 74 percent applied from within the Ravenswood area.

Even though the company accepted many applicants who lived substantial distances from the plant, examination of the background of unaccepted applicants reveals the exercise of considerable company discretion in this matter. A major distinction between accepted and unaccepted applicants was their distance from the plant at the time of application (table 5). In every occupational category except professional, technical, and managerial, the proportion of unaccepted applicants applying from within the Ravenswood area was smaller, and the proportion of unaccepted applicants applying from other West Virginia localities was larger. The fact that 43 percent of all the unaccepted applicants lived in West Virginia beyond a 50-mile radius of the plant is an indication of the attraction the plant had for workers in the State's depressed areas. But among the accepted employees, only 17 percent had applied from beyond a 50-mile radius in West Virginia. The comparison indicates the importance accorded plant proximity for hourly rated employees in the company's hiring policies.

The contrast between employees and unaccepted applicants is especially sharp for the professional, managerial, and supervisory occupations. From 59 to 69 percent of the employees in these occupations came from noncontiguous states, and only 12 percent of the accepted foremen came from the Ravenswood area and other West Virginia localities. The proportions of unaccepted applicants were almost completely reversed, with 60 percent of the professional, technical, managerial, and supervisory workers applying from the Ravenswood and other West Virginia areas, and only 11 percent applying from noncontiguous states. In these instances, prior industrial experience and personal characteristics outweighed plant proximity as decisive factors in company selection.

Industrial Experience

While the company was generally able to meet its requirements with respect to age and education, problems arose in finding local workers with the desired skills and industrial experience. Employees' principal industrial classifications since 1950 generally were the same as their last industrial classifications prior to employment at the Ravenswood plant (table 6). Only 10 percent of the employees had been primarily engaged in aluminum manufacturing in the 7 years preceding their move to the plant and over four-fifths of these were professional, technical, managerial, or supervisory personnel. Since more than 80 percent of those with previous aluminum experience had been transferred from other company plants, it can only be concluded that local resources were highly limited in this regard. In addition to those with aluminum manufacturing experience, 28 percent of the employees had been primarily engaged in other manufacturing industries before they came to the plant. The relatively less skilled employees--operatives and those working in service and laborer jobs--were especially lacking in previous aluminum and other manufacturing experience. It was apparent that the company would have to undertake a very considerable training

program. Consequently, emphasis was placed on the educability of these employees as indicated by their age, education, and test results. During the period of the survey, the principal responsibility in supervision and training programs was assumed by the experienced company transferees. Indeed, it was the company's intention to train many of the initially hired hourly rated employees as supervisors by

TABLE 6. Employees at the Ravenswood plant, by principal industrial classification since 1950, and last industrial classification preceding Ravenswood plant employment, by occupational group, summer 1957

Previous industrial classification	Number of employees[1]	Current occupation at Ravenswood plant (percentage distribution)								
		All occupations	Professional, technical, and managerial	Clerical	Foremen	Craftsmen	Operatives	Service	Labor	Trainees
Principal industrial classification since 1950	839	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Manufacturing:										
Aluminum:										
Kaiser	69	8	28	1	29	1	1	2	---	6
Other	18	2	2	---	9	4	1	---	1	---
Other manufacturing	233	28	22	17	31	47	29	29	28	22
Nonmanufacturing:										
Agriculture	13	2	---	---	---	---	2	2	5	---
Mining	3	(2)	---	---	---	1	---	---	1	---
Other nonmanufacturing	503	60	48	82	31	47	67	67	64	72
Last industrial classification	836	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Manufacturing:										
Aluminum:										
Kaiser[3]	68	8	27	1	27	2	1	2	1	6
Other	15	2	1	---	8	5	1	---	1	---
Other manufacturing	232	28	22	16	31	51	28	27	27	17
Nonmanufacturing:										
Agriculture	9	1	---	---	---	---	2	2	3	---
Mining	2	(2)	---	---	---	1	---	---	1	---
Other nonmanufacturing	510	61	50	83	34	41	68	69	67	77

[1] Does not include 30 employees whose records indicate no employment prior to that in the Ravenswood plant and others for whom relevant data were not available.
[2] Less than 1 percent.
[3] Transfers from other Kaiser plants.

the time the full employment complement was reached.

Aside from the professional, technical, managerial and supervisory force, and craftsmen, over two-thirds of the workers had been primarily engaged in nonmanufacturing industries in the years prior to their employment in the plant. These industries were largely trade and service, transportation, government agencies, and public utilities. Significantly, only 2 percent of these employees had been primarily employed in agriculture, the area's dominant industry in the 7 years prior to their Kaiser job, and less than 1 percent had been primarily employed in mining, the State's major industry. Further detail on farm ownership and farm work among employees is presented below.

Additional light on the reasons for the sparse representation of coal miners among the employees can be found in the industrial experience of the unaccepted applicants (table 7). This group, like the employees (except for those transferred), had almost no previous experience in aluminum manufacturing and less total manufacturing experience than those selected. It follows that

TABLE 7. Unaccepted applicants, by principal industrial classification since 1950, and last industrial classification preceding Ravenswood plant application, by occupational group, summer 1957

Previous industrial classification	Number of employees[1]	Occupation applied for at Ravenswood plant (percentage distribution)					
		All occupations	Professional, technical, and managerial	Clerical	Skilled	Semi-skilled	Unskilled
Principal industrial classification since 1950	479	100	100	100	100	100	100
Manufacturing:							
Aluminum:							
Kaiser	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Other	8	2	2	---	2	4	1
Other manufacturing	138	29	21	19	29	40	27
Nonmanufacturing:							
Agriculture	17	3	---	2	3	1	7
Mining	14	3	2	---	4	2	4
Other nonmanufacturing	302	63	75	79	62	53	61
Last industrial classification	472	100	100	100	100	100	100
Manufacturing:							
Aluminum:							
Kaiser	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Other	8	2	2	---	2	4	1
Other manufacturing	133	28	17	23	31	37	26
Nonmanufacturing:							
Agriculture	13	3	---	2	2	2	5
Mining	17	4	4	2	2	5	4
Other nonmanufacturing	301	63	77	73	63	52	65

[1] Does not include 35 applicants whose application forms indicated no employment prior to their aluminum application and others for whom relevant industrial data were not available.

greater proportions of unaccepted applicants had been primarily employed in nonmanufacturing industries. As in the case of the employees, this industrial distribution continued up to the time of application at the Ravenswood plant. Unaccepted applicants were somewhat more heavily represented in agriculture and mining than the selected employees. The area surrounding the Ravenswood plant is not a coal mining sector. Thus, miners were in that group applying from beyond a 50-mile radius whose age, education, and skills were insufficiently attractive to compensate for geographic distance. Some employers were convinced that miners would always return to the mines when an opportunity arose. At the same time, the relatively small number of applicants with a mining background suggests that the miners themselves may have been reluctant to change industries despite the long-run decline in coal mining employment.

Farm Ownership and Farm Work

Even though few employees had been primarily engaged in agriculture in the 6 or 7 years prior to their employment at the aluminum plant, the importance of agriculture in the background of the plant's work force can be seen from the fact that almost 40 percent of the employees had worked on a farm at some time during their previous employment histories, and more than 15 percent were living on a farm while working at the aluminum plant.

Of the 351 employees who had previously done farm work, 31 percent had farmed full time, 66 percent had farmed part time, and about 3 percent had engaged in varying periods of full-time and part-time farm work. The proportion of employees who had been employed in farm work was relatively high for operatives and laborers and relatively low for professional, managerial, and supervisory personnel, and for craftsmen. This distribution largely followed the geographic background of the employees, with local residence and previous farm work being closely related.

Almost one-third of those living on a farm at the time of the survey were operatives and more than one-fourth were laborers; but only 20 percent of the farm residents were in the professional, technical, and managerial classifications. Here again, the pattern of previous residence was significant in current farm status. Slightly over one-half of the 137 employees who lived on a farm were farm owners, and almost 70 percent of the farm residents did some farm work in addition to their work at the aluminum plant. As in farm residence, those engaged in some farm work were heavily concentrated in the operative and labor classifications.

Occupational Experience

The occupational background of the plant's employees was somewhat more difficult to determine than their industrial experience. From the specific occupations listed on their application forms, an effort was made to place each employee in one of the major occupational categories listed by the Bureau of the Census with respect to both the occupation just prior to employment at the Ravenswood plant and the occupation in which there had been the longest period of tenure since 1950. These prior occupational groups are compared with occupational categories assigned to employees in the aluminum plant after a 3-month period (table 8).

It appeared that the occupational level of most of the hourly rated employees had been higher in their previous employment. Three-fourths of those assigned to a laborer position by the company had been in a more highly skilled occupational category just prior to their employment at the aluminum works. Although a relatively large proportion of former laborers, service workers, and operatives continued in these categories in the Ravenswood plant, a large percentage had been formerly in a more skilled occupational category. The smallest movement between occupational categories was in the salaried and skilled occupations.

Working Wives

Forty-three of the 107 women employed in the plant were married at the time of the survey. All but six of them were in the clerical occupational category. Over 50 percent of the working wives were under 25 years of age, and 12 percent were 35 or over. Almost 90 percent of the wives who applied for aluminum company jobs were from within the Ravenswood area, a much

TABLE 8. Current occupational group of employees, by their last occupational group prior to Ravenswood plant employment, summer 1957

(Percentage distribution)

Employees' last occupational group prior to plant employment	All occupations[1]	Professional, technical, and managerial	Clerical	Foremen	Craftsmen	Operatives	Service	Labor	Trainees
Number of employees------	833	166	133	63	103	153	47	149	19
All occupations----------	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Professional, technical, and managerial---------	22	79	4	31	5	8	6	3	26
Clerical----------	21	9	79	5	---	16	15	13	21
Foremen----------	7	2	1	38	6	3	6	7	5
Craftsmen----------	13	2	2	5	74	6	13	7	---
Operatives----------	24	5	12	16	13	45	32	42	32
Service----------	2	1	---	---	1	1	17	2	---
Labor----------	10	2	2	5	1	20	9	23	11
Farm labor or farm owner-	1	---	1	---	---	1	2	3	5

[1] See footnote 1, table 6.

higher proportion than the average for all plant employees. Although they generally lived within the 50-mile radius at the time of the application, many of them were commuting considerable distances to the plant. Thirty percent traveled 30 miles or more each way, and 7 percent traveled at least 40 miles. Over three-fourths of the working wives' husbands worked somewhere other than the Ravenswood plant.

Additional insight into the problems of working wives in the Ravenswood area was gained from the records and responses of the 169 plant employees who indicated that their wives had been working at the time they (the husbands) left their previous jobs (table 9). After the husbands received jobs at the aluminum plant, slightly over 50 percent of the wives were still employed, 5 percent were looking for work, and the remainder were no longer in the labor force.

It would appear that one of the prices for migration to work in the Ravenswood plant was the possible loss of employment of one's wife, assuming that many of the wives no longer in the labor force withdrew because of their feeling that suitable employment opportunities were unavailable. Company policy, as seen in practice, did not readily welcome husband and wife teams in the plant. Many of the wives may have withdrawn from the labor force because their husbands improved their earnings at the aluminum plant. However, some confirmation that the wives' withdrawal from employment was at least partially involuntary and linked to inward migration is found in the cross-classification in table 9. Seventy percent of the wives whose husbands' job applications came from within the Ravenswood area continued to work after their husbands had transferred to the new plant. But only 44 percent of the wives whose husbands applied from West Virginia localities outside the Ravenswood area continued to work after their husbands moved to the plant; and the proportion was only 15 and 21 percent, respectively, for wives whose husbands applied from contiguous and noncontiguous states. In contrast with the number of wives who withdrew from employment when their husbands moved to the new Ravenswood plant, only 13 wives not working at the time of their husbands' previous jobs were reported as

TABLE 9. Wives who were working when husband applied for Ravenswood plant job, by current employment status and by husband's application address, summer 1957

Address on husband's application form	Number of wives	Current employment status (percentage distribution)				
		All wives	Employed at plant	Employed elsewhere	Looking for work	Not in the labor force
Address on application form	169	100	2	50	5	43
Ravenswood area[1]	89	100	2	68	2	28
Other West Virginia locations[2]	39	100	---	44	5	51
Contiguous State[2]	13	100	---	15	---	85
Noncontiguous State[2]	28	100	3	18	18	61

[1] See footnote 4, table 4.
[2] See footnote 5, table 4.

employed after the men took the aluminum plant jobs.

Estimates of the Value of Training

In concluding this section on the characteristics of the plant's labor supply, the employees subjective evaluation of the type of education or training which helped them most in obtaining employment at the aluminum plant is of interest. One-third listed their formal education in high school or college as the most helpful; 3 out of 10 designated on-the-job training and/or experience; and the remainder specified business, technical, or trade school, or some other type of training, or felt unable to specify any particular training as most helpful (table 10).

Of those who gave a specific reply, the salaried personnel favored formal education, while the hourly rated employees tended to stress on-the-job training. Significant numbers of clerical employees and craftsmen also mentioned business, technical, or trade school as most helpful.

TABLE 10. Employees' estimate of value of education and training in obtaining Ravenswood plant job, by occupational group, summer 1957

Occupational group	Number of employees	Types of valuable training (percentage distribution)					
		All estimates of value	None of special value	On-the-job training and experience	High school or college	Business, technical, or trade school	Other
All occupations	888	100	27	30	33	6	4
Professional, technical, and managerial	174	100	2	14	80	2	2
Clerical	145	100	14	27	37	18	3
Foremen	67	100	3	52	34	5	6
Craftsmen	103	100	12	64	4	12	8
Operatives	160	100	52	27	16	3	2
Service	51	100	23	57	10	4	6
Labor	156	100	69	22	7	1	1
Trainees	32	100	---	---	97	---	3

Relatively large proportions of employees in the least skilled categories were unable or unwilling to designate a specific type of training or education as helpful. This may have reflected their realization of lack of experience in aluminum manufacturing, but showed a lack of awareness of the weight given by the company to general educational background.

Summary

Although company officials were unable to maintain all the hiring standards set up as an ideal guide, they attracted a highly satisfactory initial labor supply. The relative lack of aluminum and other manufacturing experience among area residents was at least partially offset by applicants at the preferred age and educational levels. Basic skills gained at relatively high occupational levels contributed to the general educability of employees.

Even so, the lack of local workers with aluminum or other manufacturing experience would have constituted a serious problem if it had not been for the transfer of key personnel from the company's other plants and if some employees had not been attracted to the plant from considerable distances. One of the results of the transfer of employees into this area of limited employment opportunities may have been some loss of employment by married women.

Unaccepted applicants had less education than employees and were concentrated in less preferred age groups. Applicants with serious physical handicaps were not hired. On the average, the unaccepted applicants lived farther from the plant at the time of application. They had even less previous experience in aluminum and other manufacturing, but had been somewhat more generally engaged in agriculture and mining. Farm residence and farm work played a significant role in the background of employees, but very few were primarily engaged in farming just prior to being hired by the aluminum company. Although the employment qualifications of the unaccepted applicants were generally below those of the accepted employees, a sufficient number in this group with the requisite qualifications would permit substantial expansion beyond the plant's initial 900 employees without a serious reduction in the quality of the work force.

PATTERNS OF LABOR MOBILITY

The process by which a labor supply was made available to the Ravenswood plant cannot be fully understood without knowledge of the causes and patterns of labor mobility in this formerly depressed area. The patterns of mobility in the years prior to the move to the new aluminum plant help explain that move, and the nature of the move to the aluminum plant helps explain the characteristics of the labor supply described in the preceding section. Some of the most interesting variations in mobility occur along occupational lines; therefore, much of the following discussion continues the interoccupational analysis. Since age differences have also been found decisive in influencing mobility, analysis by age groups is used in some instances to supplement that of the occupational classifications. Patterns of mobility are discussed in terms of movement between industries, occupations, and geographic areas. Because of the environmental conditions in the present study, geographic movement was the most significant.

Changes of Industry

It is the nature of depressed areas that they are customarily dominated by a single declining industry. If employment problems in an area are to be solved by the introduction of diversification in the industrial base, it will necessarily involve a shift of many employees from one industrial classification to another. In the Ravenswood area, the dominant industry was agriculture, and 40 percent of the surveyed employees had been engaged in farm work during some period prior to their jobs with the aluminum company. A substantial shift out of agriculture had occurred before the establishment of the Ravenswood plant, however, as was shown by the very small percentage of applicants who had been primarily engaged in farm work in the previous 6 or 7 years (table 6). Although some ties to agriculture were maintained, only 15 percent of the company's employees still lived on a farm, and only 10 percent were still engaged in part-time farm work.

The local employees' mobility history showed little manufacturing industry attachment prior to or at the time of the move to the plant. With the movement out of agriculture, more than 60 percent of the employees had become attached to other nonmanufacturing industries, largely because of the lack of industrial alternatives. When opportunity for movement into manufacturing presented itself in the form of the new aluminum plant, the employees and thousands of unaccepted applicants were prepared to make another industrial transition. One divergent note in this picture of ready interindustry mobility was the limited transfer of coal miners from the depressed areas of West Virginia beyond the Ravenswood area. Analysis of the records of the sample of unaccepted applicants indicated that this limitation was caused as much by the miners' unwillingness to move as it was by company hiring standards (table 7).

Interindustry mobility as a solution to the problems of this depressed rural area is seen, then, to be primarily a result of the company's ability and willingness to hire local applicants from alien industrial backgrounds and train them in aluminum production.

Changes of Occupation

The shift to the aluminum plant further demonstrated the occupational adaptability of the local work force. Those who were transferred from the company's other facilities or attracted from considerable distances largely maintained the same occupational position before and after their job shift (table 8). These were technically trained persons who had acquired a vested interest in a particular type of skill. For the local applicants, however, the opportunity for a good job outweighed any consideration of occupational attachment. Operatives became laborers and laborers became operatives in a ready transition. The only exception to this pattern was the locally recruited clerical workers, who, like the technically trained, had a vested interest in a particular skill and, for the most part, maintained their previous occupational status after moving to the Ravenswood plant.

Geographic Movement

Mobility studies generally show that geographic mobility of labor is more restricted than interindustry or interoccupation movement.[10] As has been noted, neither industrial nor occupational attachment proved to be obstacles to mobility in the face of the outstanding employment opportunity provided by the newly established Ravenswood works. And yet, without an unusual amount of geographic movement on the part of inmigrants, returned migrants, and commuters the plant could hardly have begun operations.

Perhaps the most notable finding of the survey is that the company, despite its expressed preference for plant proximity in choosing employees, was forced to accept employees living at considerable distances to obtain its work force. More than half of the employees lived beyond a 50-mile radius of the plant at the time of their application (table 4). Moreover, even many of those who had applied from within this radius had apparently moved to the area only recently, since a little less than two-fifths of the employees had been living within 50 miles of Ravenswood for 5 years before their application (table 11). An additional one-fifth of the employees had lived in other West Virginia areas in the 5-year period, but over one-fourth of the plant's total work force had been living in noncontiguous states. As in the case of the addresses given in the applications, the largest proportions of persons living in distant places before their employment in the aluminum plant were in the professional, managerial, and supervisory occupational groups.

Additional indication of movement in and out of the Ravenswood area before applications were filed with the company can be seen in a comparison of the birthplaces of employees (table 4), their residence for 5 years before their application (table 11), and the address on their application forms (table 4). Examination of the professional-managerial group is especially instructive in this regard. Although 17 percent of these employees were born in the Ravenswood area, only 9 percent were still living in the area 5 years before their applications were submitted, but the proportion had increased to 12 percent by the time of the applications.

The fact that 29 percent of all plant employees were born in more distant West Virginia localities shows the importance of these areas in the patterns of geographic mobility. But 5 years before applications

[10] See the summary of research findings on this point discussed by Herbert S. Parnes, Research on Labor Mobility (Social Science Research Council, Bull. No. 54, 1954), pp. 73-80.

TABLE 11. Most distant residence and changes of residence of employees in 5 years preceding Ravenswood plant employment, by occupational group, summer 1957

Residence	Number of employees	Current occupation at Ravenswood plant (percentage distribution)								
		All occupations	Professional, technical, and managerial	Clerical	Foremen	Craftsmen	Operatives	Service	Labor	Trainees
Most distant residence in prior 5 years[1]	888	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ravenswood area[2]	335	38	9	55	---	39	52	61	54	3
Other West Virginia locations[3]	117	20	14	21	10	24	23	14	24	31
Contiguous State[3]	140	16	15	14	21	20	17	12	14	6
Noncontiguous State[3]	236	26	62	10	69	17	8	14	8	60
Number of changes of residence to find work in prior 5 years[4]	888	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None	678	76	56	82	84	74	78	84	88	78
One	147	17	25	13	16	18	18	12	10	13
Two	40	4	12	3	---	5	3	2	1	3
Three	16	2	6	1	---	1	---	2	1	6
Four or more	17	1	1	1	---	2	1	---	---	---

[1] Excludes residence while in Armed Forces or educational institution.
[2] See footnote 4, table 4.
[3] See footnote 5, table 4.
[4] Excludes the move to the Ravenswood plant and moves while in the Armed Forces.

were filed only 20 percent of the employees were still residents in those localities, and the number was further reduced to 17 percent by the time of the applications.

The ages of the employees were also significant as an influence on geographic movement. The youngest and oldest employees were most likely to be found in the Ravenswood area 5 years before application forms were filed (table 12). In contrast with 72 percent of the employees under 20 years of age and 50 percent of those 45 or over, only between 35 and 38 percent of those in the middle-age groups resided in the Ravenswood area.

Further insight into the patterns of geographic movement was obtained by examining the length of residence in the Ravenswood area of those employees who applied from within the area (table 13). More than 70 percent of these applicants had resided in the area for at least 10 years, while 42 percent of this group had lived in the area since birth; 10 percent had lived in the area less than 2 years and 18 percent more than 2 but less than 10 years. The length of residence in Ravenswood differed by occupational groups, with most of the hourly rated and clerical employees reporting a long tenure in the area and the professional-managerial group having a shorter period of residence.

TABLE 12. Age of employees,[1] by most distant residence and changes of residence in 5 years preceding Ravenswood plant employment, summer 1957

Residence	Under 20 years		20-24 years		25-34 years		35-44 years		45-64 years	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Most distant residence in prior 5 years[2]	49	100	175	100	406	100	188	100	36	100
Ravenswood area[3]	35	72	62	35	147	36	72	38	18	50
Other West Virginia locations[4]	3	6	44	25	91	22	33	17	15	14
Contiguous State[4]	7	14	37	21	63	16	28	15	4	11
Noncontiguous State[4]	4	8	32	18	105	26	55	30	9	25
Number of changes of residence to find work in prior 5 years[5]	49	100	175	100	406	100	188	100	36	100
None	43	88	134	77	306	76	143	76	33	92
One	5	10	32	18	67	16	31	16	2	5
Two	1	2	6	3	21	5	11	6	---	---
Three	---	---	2	1	7	2	2	1	1	3
Four or more	---	---	1	1	5	1	1	1	---	---

[1] Excludes employees for whom age data were unavailable.
[2] See footnote 1, table 11.
[3] See footnote 4, table 4.
[4] See footnote 5, table 4.
[5] See footnote 4, table 11.

TABLE 13. Employees applying from within the Ravenswood area, by length of residence in that area, by occupational group, summer 1957

Occupational group	Number of employees	Length of residence in Ravenswood area[1] (percentage distribution)						
		All periods of residence	Under 1 year	1 year but less than 2	2 years but less than 5	5 years but less than 10	10 years or more but not since birth	Since birth
All occupations	434	100	5	5	8	10	30	42
Professional, technical, and managerial	20	100	---	10	15	25	25	25
Clerical	107	100	5	3	7	12	32	41
Foremen	[2] 2	100	---	---	---	---	---	---
Craftsmen	50	100	6	8	6	10	38	32
Operatives	106	100	3	4	8	5	33	47
Service	39	100	8	8	3	8	29	44
Labor	109	100	6	2	8	11	27	46
Trainees	[2] 1	100	---	---	---	---	---	---

[1] Includes a radius of 50 miles around Ravenswood. Includes employees who left the Ravenswood area for brief intervals during the indicated periods.
[2] Number too small to permit calculation of percentage.

The aluminum plant benefited not only from the extensive movement into Ravenswood of first-time arrivals but also took advantage of the return migration of former residents (table 14). Fifty-eight of the non-Ravenswood applicants had previously resided in the Ravenswood area. Six of them had not lived in the area since prior to 1940, while almost one-third had lived in the area during the years 1940-49. All occupational groups were represented among these returned migrants except management trainees.

Long-Distance Commuters

Even the employees' extensive willingness to change residence would not have solved the plant's labor supply problems without another kind of geographic movement. Many employees were willing to commute considerable distances in order to work at the plant. In view of the scarcity of housing in Ravenswood in the early phase of the plant's operations, this was a peculiarly fortunate type of mobility. At the time of the survey, 33 percent of the employees were traveling from 5 to 10 miles to work; 11 percent were traveling from 40 to 50 miles, and 6 percent were commuting 50 miles or more each way to the plant (table 15). Craftsmen and laborers were among the most distant commuters, but the other hourly rated employee groups also had a relatively large proportion of long-distance commuters. The professional, managerial, and supervisory employees, on the other hand, who came largely from outside the Ravenswood area, tended to settle down closer to the plant.

Despite the great commuting distances, only 22 percent of the employees who lived beyond 5 miles of the plant expressed an intention of moving closer to it in the future (table 16). A large proportion of the craftsmen were included in this group. But the laborers, whose commuting distances exceeded those of the other employees and who had made fewer moves toward the plant after their employment, indicated an intention to change residence in the future in only slightly greater numbers than the average.

TABLE 14. Dates of previous residence in Ravenswood of employees who applied from outside this area, by occupational group, summer 1957

Occupational group	Number of employees reporting dates of most recent residence in the Ravenswood area						
	Total employees	No previous residence in Ravenswood	1956-57	1953-55	1950-52	1940-49	Before 1940
All occupations-----	454	396	6	16	10	20	6
Professional, technical, and managerial----------	154	145	---	3	2	3	1
Clerical----------	38	25	---	4	2	5	2
Foremen----------	65	63	1	---	---	1	---
Craftsmen----------	53	45	1	1	2	3	1
Operatives----------	54	40	2	6	2	3	1
Service----------	12	10	---	---	---	2	---
Labor----------	47	37	2	2	2	3	1
Trainees----------	31	31	---	---	---	---	---

TABLE 15. Employees' commuting distance to Ravenswood plant, by occupational group, summer 1957

Occupational group	Number of employees	Commuting distance to plant[1] (percentage distribution)							
		All distances	Under 5 miles	5-9 miles	10-19 miles	20-29 miles	30-39 miles	40-49 miles	50 miles and over
All occupations-------	888	100	2	33	14	20	14	11	6
Professional, technical, and managerial----------	174	100	1	62	7	15	7	5	3
Clerical----------	145	100	3	26	11	27	18	11	4
Foremen----------	67	100	---	73	6	10	7	2	2
Craftsmen----------	103	100	5	22	16	22	12	13	10
Operatives----------	160	100	3	14	21	25	15	16	6
Service----------	51	100	2	24	24	17	10	17	6
Labor----------	156	100	1	12	16	19	24	16	12
Trainees----------	32	100	3	72	3	22	---	---	---

[1] Distance, one way, from residence to the plant.

TABLE 16. Planned residence change of employees, by occupational group, summer 1957

Occupational group	Number of employees	Residence plans of employees (percentage distribution)			
		All plans	Currently living within 5 miles[1]	Plan to move closer	No plans to move closer
All occupations----------	888	100	3	22	75
Professional, technical, and managerial----------	174	100	2	13	85
Clerical----------	145	100	6	14	80
Foremen----------	67	100	1	24	75
Craftsmen----------	103	100	2	40	58
Operatives----------	160	100	4	25	71
Service----------	51	100	---	25	75
Labor----------	156	100	1	27	72
Trainees----------	32	100	12	13	75

[1] Those living within 5 miles of the plant were not asked if they planned to move.

Summary

In recruiting a work force, the aluminum plant was able to take advantage of an absence of industrial and occupational attachment on the part of the local work force. But, given the chronically depressed nature of the area, even this degree of flexibility would not have sufficed without substantial geographic movement. This movement took the form of company transfers of key employees from distant states, initial inward migration from surrounding areas, and return migration of former residents. Just as important as these modes of geographic mobility, however, was the willingness of residents in the surrounding area to commute great distances in order to obtain employment in the plant.

THE REASONS FOR MOBILITY

It remains to be asked "What prompted the patterns of prior mobility? What motivated workers to move to the new aluminum plant?" In answering these questions, understanding is gained of the basic problems of employment and income in a rural area chronically limited in job opportunities, and further light is thrown on sources of labor supply for new industrialization in such an area.

In this section, an objective appraisal of the circumstances prompting mobility is compared with the workers' subjective evaluations of past experience and future prospects.

Unemployment and Underemployment

A significant portion of the labor mobility in the area can be explained in terms of the lack of alternative employment opportunities. The attitude of many area workers toward employment in the aluminum plant can best be understood in the light of their employment status in the preceding years.

Twenty percent of the plant's employees had been totally unemployed at some time in the 3 years preceding their job with the aluminum company. For 49 percent of these unemployed workers, the total unemployment experienced during this period had been 1 but less than 3 months (table 17). Eighteen per-

TABLE 17. Duration of unemployment of employees in 3 years prior to Ravenswood plant job, by location and receipt of unemployment compensation, summer 1957

(Percentage distribution)

Location of unemployment and receipt of unemployment compensation	All unemployed[1]	Total unemployment in 3 years prior to plant job					
		Under 2 weeks	2-4 weeks	1 but less than 3 months	3 but less than 6 months	6 months but less than 1 year	1 year and over
All unemployed	100	6	11	49	18	11	5
Location of longest period of unemployment	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Ravenswood area[2]	52	80	32	50	53	58	78
Other West Virginia locations[3]	27	10	37	30	19	26	22
Contiguous State[3]	14	10	10	12	25	16	---
Noncontiguous State[3]	7	---	21	8	3	---	---
Number of times received unemployment compensation	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None	45	70	47	50	47	10	22
One	47	30	53	47	47	53	56
Two	7	---	---	3	3	32	22
Three	1	---	---	---	3	5	---

[1] Totals 175 employees who were unemployed in the preceding 3 years, not all of whom were necessarily in covered employment.
[2] See footnote 4, table 4.
[3] See footnote 5, table 4.

cent were unemployed for a total of 3 but under 6 months; 11 percent for 6 up to 12 months; and 5 percent for a year or more.

Lengthy periods of cumulative unemployment were especially prevalent among the hourly rated employees. About 33 percent of the laborers and almost 30 percent of the operatives who had been unemployed had been without work for a total period of 1 or more months during the 3 years (table 18). About 10 percent of the unemployed clerical, service, and labor groups and 15 percent of the unemployed operatives had been without employment for a total period exceeding 3 months. Significantly, these occupational groups were the ones recruited primarily from the Ravenswood and other West Virginia areas. The relationship between unemployment and location is emphasized in the cross classification contained in table 17. More than 50 percent of the unemployed had suffered their longest period of unemployment while living within a 50-mile radius of Ravenswood and 27 percent experienced their longest period of

TABLE 18. Cumulative unemployment of all employees in 3 years prior to Ravenswood plant job, by location of unemployment, and occupational group, summer 1957

(Percentage distribution)

Duration and location of unemployment	Professional, technical, and managerial	Clerical	Foremen	Craftsmen	Operatives	Service	Labor	Trainees
All employees	174	145	67	103	160	51	156	32
Cumulative unemployment in 3 years prior to Ravenswood plant job	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
No unemployment	98	82	96	85	67	86	59	91
Under 2 weeks	---	2	---	---	3	---	2	---
2-4 weeks	1	1	---	4	1	---	6	---
1 but less than 3 months	1	8	1	8	14	4	22	9
3 but less than 6 months	---	3	3	3	8	4	6	---
6 months but less than 1 year	---	3	---	---	4	2	4	---
1 year and over	---	1	---	---	3	4	1	---
Location of longest period of unemployment	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
No unemployment	98	82	96	85	67	86	59	91
Ravenswood area[1]	---	12	---	4	17	8	24	---
Other West Virginia locations[2]	---	4	3	6	8	6	10	6
Contiguous State[2]	---	1	1	2	6	---	6	---
Noncontiguous State[2]	2	1	---	3	2	---	1	3

[1] See footnote 4, table 4.
[2] See footnote 5, table 4.

unemployment while living in other West Virginia localities. These proportions are greater than the percentages of employees who were residents in these areas either at the time of their applications or 5 years earlier (tables 4 and 11).

A further indication of the relationship between location and long-term unemployment is disclosed in table 17. More than 70 percent of those who were unemployed for a total of 3 but less than 6 months suffered their longest period of unemployment in the Ravenswood and other West Virginia areas. And this ratio increased to 84 percent for those unemployed for 6 up to 12 months; and to 100 percent of those with cumulative unemployment of 1 year or more.

In spite of lengthy cumulative periods of unemployment in the 3 years preceding their jobs with the aluminum company, many employees had received no unemployment compensation. No benefits had been received by 50 percent of those who were unemployed for a total period of 1 month but less than 3 months. Even 47 percent of those who were unemployed from 3 up to 6 months received no benefits. This was also true in the case of several employees who suffered cumulative unemployment of 6 months or more. Widespread ineligibility for unemployment compensation may be typical of rural areas with only small nonmanufacturing establishments and may contribute further to the distress of these areas.

Unemployment and underemployment were especially serious problems for many employees in the year preceding their work at the Kaiser plant. One-fourth of them had worked less than full time during the year. Three-fourths of the management trainees, one-third of the laborers, and about two-fifths of the women technical-managerial employees and women clerical workers were in this category (table 19).

The reasons for less than full-time work differed among the occupational groups (table 19). Thirty-six percent of all employees who had not been fully employed indicated unavailability of work as the reason for part-time employment, while the percentage of part-time workers in the four hourly rated groups who had been involuntarily idle ranged from 56 to 68 percent. Twenty-four percent of the part-time clerical employees had cited household or family reasons for part-time work; and large proportions of the clerical workers, trainees, and professional-managerial personnel indicated that they had been completing their education during the year.

Four-fifths of those who worked less than a full year were working full time part of the year rather than part time part of the year (table 20). Forty percent of all the employees who worked less than a full year had worked 39 or more weeks, but 23 percent had worked less than 13 weeks, and 12 percent from 13 to 26 weeks. Forty-seven percent of the group that worked full time part of the year had worked 39 weeks or more in the year; and 28 percent of this group had worked 25 weeks or less.

A final indication of the importance of unemployment as a factor impelling movement is the fact that 11 percent of the plant's employees had been unemployed immediately prior to their Kaiser job. (See table 19). The less skilled and the clerical groups, primarily recruited locally, were found to have had least employment security. Twenty percent of the laborers were without work just before their plant employment while 13 percent of the clerical employees and 14 percent of the operatives were in this category. In these occupations, the unemployment rate was higher for men than for women.

Less than half of those out of work just before their aluminum plant employment had received unemployment compensation (table 19). A little over three-fifths of the craftsmen, labor, and operative employees had received such benefits, compared with smaller proportions in the salaried occupations. Since only a handful of salaried employees were among the unemployed, however, the percentage distribution of benefit recipients has little significance.

Area Attachment

The lack of employment opportunities as a factor impelling mobility in a distressed area becomes more significant when related to workers' attachment to particular geographic areas. Surveys show that workers in search of employment change residence only as a last resort.[11] When finally com-

[11] See pp. 16-17.

TABLE 19. Persons not working full time in year before employment at Ravenswood plant, and reasons for part-time work, by occupational group, sex and receipt of unemployment compensation

Occupational group and sex	Number of employees	Percent working part time	Reasons for part-time work			Unemployed immediately before Ravenswood plant employment	
			Number working part time	Full time work not available (percent)	Voluntary (percent)	Number	Number drawing unemployment compensation
All occupations	888	25	219	36	64	98	46
Male	780	22	173	(1)	(1)	86	44
Female	108	5	46	(1)	(1)	12	2
Professional, technical, and managerial	174	11	20	---	100	4	1
Male	164	10	16	---	(1)	4	1
Female	10	40	4	---	(1)	---	---
Clerical	145	38	55	11	[2] 89	19	5
Male	51	27	14	(1)	(3)	8	3
Female	94	44	41	(1)	(3)	11	2
Foremen, male[3]	67	13	9	22	78	3	1
Craftsmen, male[3]	103	12	13	62	38	8	5
Operatives	160	24	39	56	44	23	14
Male	157	25	39	(1)	(1)	23	14
Female	3	---	---	(1)	(1)	---	---
Service	51	12	6	67	33	3	1
Male	50	10	5	(1)	(1)	2	1
Female	1	100	1	(1)	(1)	1	---
Labor, male[3]	156	34	53	68	32	31	19
Trainees, male[3]	32	75	24	4	96	7	---

[1] Distribution by sex not available.
[2] Includes 24 percent working part time because of household or family reasons.
[3] No female employees in these classifications.

TABLE 20. Employees working less than the full year preceding Ravenswood plant employment, by number of weeks worked

Number of weeks	All employees[1]		Part time part of the year		Full time part of the year	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	209	100	45	100	164	100
Under 13 weeks	49	23	20	45	30	18
13 but under 26 weeks	24	12	7	16	16	10
26 but under 39 weeks	50	24	10	22	39	24
39 but under 52 weeks	83	40	6	13	77	47
Number of weeks unknown	3	1	2	4	2	1

[1] Excludes those who worked part time throughout the year.

pelled to leave the home area to find a job, there will often be a strong return pull. With better highways and the growing ownership of automobiles, long-distance commuting has become an increasingly important alternative to residence change. But commuting involves hardship and job choice is influenced by commuting distance as well as by other considerations.

In the 5 years prior to their jobs with the aluminum company, one-fourth of the plant's employees had made at least one change of residence in order to find work (table 11). Under the need to obtain employment, 4 percent had changed residence twice, 2 percent had moved 3 times, and 1 percent had moved four times. Changes of residence were especially numerous among the professional-managerial employees, the skilled craftsmen, and the operatives. Changes of residence in search of employment were more common among employees in the 20 through 44 age groups than among those under 20 or 45 or over (table 12).

Of 66 employees who had once lived in the Ravenswood area and left the area during the years before the establishment of the aluminum plant, almost one-half reported that they left because of a lack of local employment opportunities (table 21). An additional one-fifth moved "in order to get a better job" or for some other job-related reason. The outmigration of the hourly rated employees had been motivated by lack of employment to a greater degree than that of the professional-managerial or clerical employees. A larger proportion of the 25-34 year age group had migrated for employment reasons than had those in other age categories.

The return pull on these migrants can be seen in the fact that almost 60 percent reported that, in addition to their employment at the aluminum works, they returned to the Ravenswood area in order to get "closer to home" or for family reasons; and an additional 26 percent attributed their return to their previous residence in the area and/or a general area preference (table 22). Home and area attachment were cited more frequently by the clerical and hourly rated employees than by the professional-managerial occupational group. Home and area attachment also played a more important role in the return migration of the youngest and oldest employees than of those in the 25-44 age range.

While some sought to find work by changing their residence, many other Ravenswood area workers, faced by the chronic shortage of job opportunities, had been commuting considerable distances in order to obtain employment during the years

TABLE 21. Returned migrants, by reasons for leaving the Ravenswood area prior to plant employment, by occupational group and age, summer 1957

Occupational group and age	Number of returned migrants	Reasons for leaving area originally (percentage distribution)				
		All reasons	Lack of employment	Other job-related reasons	Family reasons	Other[1]
All returned migrants	66	100	48	21	14	17
Professional and managerial	12	100	42	25	8	25
Clerical	14	100	29	29	28	14
Hourly rated	40	100	57	18	10	15
Age (all returned migrants)	66	100	48	21	14	17
Under 24 years	20	100	45	30	10	15
25-34 years	33	100	55	15	18	12
35-44 years	[2] 13	100	38	23	8	31

[1] Includes a wide variety of reasons such as climate, health, etc.
[2] Includes 2 persons 45-65 years of age.

TABLE 22. Returned migrants, by reasons for returning to the Ravenswood area, by occupational group and age, summer 1957

Occupational group and age	Number of returned migrants	Reasons for returning to area (percentage distribution)				
		All reasons	No reason other than plant job	Closer to home or family reasons	Previous residence and area preference	Other
All returned migrants----	66	100	14	59	26	1
Professional and managerial----------	12	100	25	33	33	9
Clerical----------	14	100	14	72	14	---
Hourly rated----------	40	100	10	62	28	---
Age (all returned migrants)----------	66	100	14	59	26	1
Under 24 years-------	20	100	10	70	20	---
25-34 years----------	33	100	18	55	24	3
35-44 years----------	[1] 13	100	8	54	38	---

[1] Includes 2 persons 45-64 years of age.

before the establishment of the Ravenswood plant. In the 5 years before their Kaiser employment, over one-third of the Ravenswood area employees were commuting 30 miles or more to work, and 23 percent of the total were driving 50 miles or more to their place of employment (table 23). The long-distance commuters were most heavily concentrated among the hourly rated employees, with 31 percent of the service workers and 29 percent of the craftsmen commuting 50 miles or more to work.

TABLE 23. Commuting distance of employees in Ravenswood area during 5 years prior to Kaiser plant employment, by occupational group, summer 1957

Occupational group	Number of employees[2]	Commuting distance to area[1] (percentage distribution)				
		All distances	Under 10 miles	10-29 miles	30-49 miles	50 miles and over
All occupations----------	414	100	56	10	11	23
Professional, technical, and managerial----------	21	100	48	19	19	14
Clerical----------	97	100	64	7	10	19
Foremen----------	[3] 1	100	---	---	---	---
Craftsmen----------	49	100	45	16	10	29
Operatives----------	107	100	54	9	12	25
Service----------	35	100	54	6	9	31
Labor----------	104	100	59	11	8	22
Trainees----------	---	---	---	---	---	---

[1] Distance, one way, from residence to place of employment.
[2] Does not include plant employees who resided beyond a 50-mile radius of Ravenswood or had no job during the 5 years prior to plant employment.
[3] Number too small to permit calculation of percentage.

Wages and Salaries

In view of the lack of employment opportunities and the need to change residence and commute great distances in order to find work before establishment of the aluminum plant, it is understandable that the plant was viewed as an outstanding employment opportunity for Ravenswood area residents. But, in addition to these factors, the plant also represented a means of wage improvement for many workers in the area.

In order to determine whether employees improved their earnings position by accepting employment in the new plant, a comparison was made of their present plant earnings and those shown on their application forms for the previous job. Although the specific plant earnings data were generally complete for the hourly rated employees, they were not available for most of the salaried personnel. For this latter group, a breakdown of earnings on the prior job was provided, and inferences were drawn from a comparison with salaries received by similar occupational groups in the Ravenswood plant.

As is seen in table 24, 60 percent of the hourly rated employees received a higher wage at the Kaiser plant (either upon initial hiring or after a 3-month period if they were promoted) than on their previous job; 38 percent received a lower wage, and 2 percent, the same wage. The greatest wage improvement was experienced by the service workers and the craftsmen. Only slightly more than 50 percent of the employees who accepted unskilled positions in the plant improved their earnings. As previously noted, many of the employees in this occupational group had enjoyed a higher occupational status in their prior jobs. However, many of them were slated for higher occupational positions, including supervisory work, as plant production and employment expanded.

The aluminum plant apparently established occupational wage scales significantly above those prevailing in the Ravenswood area. These scales reflected the company's national wage policy and a recognition of the need to attract workers from other establishments. The plant raised its wage for skilled maintenance craftsmen after finding that the initial wage was not high enough to attract a sufficient supply of qualified workers. Similarly, it was felt necessary to set the salary for office workers above the area average because of a general shortage in this occupational category. The wage improvement experienced by service workers probably reflected their previous concentration in low-paying jobs in the immediate Ravenswood

TABLE 24. Wages received by hourly rated employees before and after Ravenswood plant employment, by occupational group

Occupational group	Number of employees[1]	Wage levels at Ravenswood plant[2] (percentage distribution)			
		All wage levels	Ravenswood lower than previous wage[3]	Ravenswood higher than previous wage[3]	Ravenswood the same as previous wage[3]
All hourly rated employees	403	100	38	60	2
Craftsmen	97	100	33	66	1
Operatives	137	100	37	61	2
Service	41	100	27	71	2
Labor	128	100	46	51	3

[1] Excludes employees who had no job prior to Ravenswood plant employment and those for whom no adequate wage data were recorded.

[2] Wherever possible, wages at the Ravenswood plant were those either upon initial hiring or 3 months later if employees were promoted in the interim.

[3] Wage on the preceding job disregarding any interval of unemployment.

area. Although their previous earnings and occupational background were similar to those of the laborers, service workers were paid more than laborers at the plant.

Forty-six percent of the salaried personnel, including foremen, had earned $300 or less per month, and over 40 percent of the clerical employees had earned less than $200 per month on their prior job (table 25). In contrast, the following salary ranges were established for these employees in the Ravenswood plant:

Professional and technical - - - -$555-$850
Clerical - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -$293-$530
Supervision (foremen) - - - - - - -$555-$700

It can be inferred from this that most of the clerical employees and a substantial number of other salaried employees improved their earnings by moving to the plant. On the other hand, prior earnings of unaccepted applicants had been generally higher than those of employees (table 25).

Among the hourly rated employees whose Kaiser plant earnings were lower than those on their last job, 29 percent had been working less than full time in the year before their employment at the Ravenswood plant, and 16 percent were unemployed immediately before their Kaiser job (table 26). Smaller percentages previously were underemployed and unemployed among workers who improved their earnings at the Ravenswood plant or who received the same earnings as on their last job. Eleven percent of those in these categories who received lower earnings relative to their previous job were receiving unemployment compensation just prior to their plant employment compared with 8 percent of those who improved their earnings at the aluminum works. Among salaried personnel, those who had received over $300 per month on their job prior to Kaiser employment had substantially lower rates of unemployment and underemployment than those who earned $300 or less per month.

A further indication of the significance of wages as a factor in movement to the Ravenswood plant is obtained in a comparison of earnings on the last prior job with the applicant's statement on his application form of the lowest wage or salary he would accept. Unfortunately, however, many of the applicants did not complete this section of the form and others merely indicated that they would accept whatever wage the company established for their grade of labor. As is seen in table 27, 27 percent of the employees indicated a wage equal to or higher than their previous earnings. These workers represented 63 percent of all employees who indicated a lowest acceptable wage. In general, the hourly rated employees, especially those at the lower skill levels, tended to indicate an

TABLE 25. Earnings of white-collar and supervisory employees and unaccepted applicants on job prior to Ravenswood plant application

Occupational group	Number of employees[1]	Earnings on prior job[2] (percentage distribution)			
		All earnings	Under $200 a month	$200-300 a month	Over $300 a month
Employees	276	100	19	27	54
Professional, technical, and managerial	120	100	4	16	80
Clerical	108	100	41	43	16
Foremen	48	100	8	15	77
Unaccepted applicants	92	100	17	21	62
Professional, technical, and managerial[3]	41	100	---	2	98
Clerical	51	100	32	35	33

[1] See footnote 1, table 24.
[2] See footnote 3, table 24.
[3] Includes some potential supervisory employees.

TABLE 26. Earnings levels of employees on preceding job, by employment status in preceding job

Level of earnings just prior to plant employment	All employees		Employment status prior to Ravenswood plant employment (percentage distribution)					
			During year before plant employment		Immediately preceding plant employment			
							Not employed	
	Number	Percent	Working full time	Working less than full time	Employed and unemployed	Employed	Drawing unemployment compensation	Not drawing unemployment compensation
Hourly rated employees								
Higher than plant earnings	161	100	71	29	100	84	11	5
Lower than plant earnings	258	100	79	21	100	88	8	4
Same as plant earnings	11	100	82	18	100	82	---	18
Salaried employees								
Under $200 a month	48	100	54	46	100	90	---	10
$200-$300 a month	82	100	67	33	100	88	5	7
Over $300 a month	164	100	90	10	100	97	1	2
No earnings data available	139	100	80	10	100	94	1	5

acceptable wage which was below that received on their prior job. The salaried personnel, on the other hand, were more insistent on earnings in excess of their previous earnings.

In the sample of unaccepted applicants, the proportion of those requesting a wage or salary the same as or higher than their previous earnings was equal to that of the employees. But a somewhat larger percentage, relative to the employed group, were willing to accept earnings below their previous level. As in the case of the employed applicants, the proportions of unaccepted applicants who were willing to take a cut in earnings were much lower among the salaried personnel than among the hourly rated employees.

In general, it can be concluded that improvement in earnings was a significant motive for movement to the Ravenswood plant among many of the employees. Most of the hourly rated employees improved their earnings position by accepting Kaiser employment, and it can be inferred that a similar improvement was experienced by a large proportion of the salaried personnel.

Subjective Evaluation of Motives

In the preceding discussion, the objective circumstances which prompted the employees to move to the Kaiser plant are indicated as follows: 1, the experience of extensive unemployment and underemployment in the years prior to the plant's

TABLE 27. Lowest acceptable earnings as indicated by employees and unaccepted applicants, by occupational group, summer 1957

Occupational group	Number of employees	Lowest acceptable earnings (percentage distribution)				
		All acceptable earnings	Earnings below last job	Earnings equal to or above last job	Left to company policy[1]	Not stated
Employees	888	100	16	27	13	44
Professional, technical, and managerial	174	100	9	39	5	47
Clerical	145	100	13	35	11	41
Foremen	67	100	11	25	6	58
Craftsmen	102	100	17	23	23	37
Operatives	161	100	24	21	15	40
Service	51	100	20	20	21	39
Labor	156	100	22	15	19	44
Trainees	32	100	3	31	3	63
Unaccepted applicants	522	100	21	27	17	35
Professional, technical, and managerial	48	100	10	42	23	25
Clerical	67	100	12	36	16	36
Skilled	124	100	20	23	15	42
Semiskilled	100	100	30	19	21	30
Unskilled	183	100	22	28	15	35

[1] Applicants in this category indicated that they would accept whatever wage the company established for their grade of labor.

establishment and immediately before job applications were made; 2, migration from the area, long-distance commuting, and frequent changes of residence in order to find work; and 3, an opportunity for improvement of earnings.

Indications of the employees' own subjective appraisal of their reasons for moving to the plant were obtained from their application forms and were compared with their response to the interview questionnaires. The employees' responses accorded closely with the reasons that emerged from the survey questions. The desire to return to the home area, the achievement of employment security, and the chance to improve earnings were all prominent among the reasons offered when asked why they chose to work at the Kaiser plant. Their primary reason, however, is one which cannot readily be related to any specific aspect of the employees' environment or work history discussed above and yet it reflects all of these factors, plus others. The employees wished to work at the aluminum plant because they felt that it constituted an "opportunity for advancement" in a new and progressive company; it was a "better job," not only from any single standpoint of employment security, geographic location, wages or working conditions, but from the standpoint of all of these considerations and the additional intangible one of advancement, of progress in the world of work.

Thus, in spite of widespread unemployment in the Ravenswood area and in West Virginia prior to their aluminum plant applications, the great majority of applicants were still employed at the time they applied. Nevertheless, the establishment of the aluminum plant in the depressed environment of Ravenswood, W. Va., was banner news, talked about and known by all

(table 28). Outside of the company transfers, most of the employees learned of the job openings at the plant through media of mass communication, with and without further discussion by their friends and relatives. A large group of respondents (included in the "Other" category in table 28) were unable to tell just when and how they had learned of the opportunities at the plant. The news was simply "in the air" from the time construction was first announced.

The essentially voluntary nature of the movement to the aluminum plant can be seen in the employees' reasons for leaving their last job, as indicated on their application forms (table 29). Only 15 percent of the employees indicated some such "involuntary" reasons as layoff, discharge, business closed, job finished, etc. The proportion of workers in this "involuntary" group was as high as 21 percent, however, for the less skilled occupations. The remainder indicated either that they were still employed or gave some other "voluntary" reason related to the job and its conditions. It is significant that 8 percent of the total indicated a locational preference in their reasons for leaving.

A marked difference is noted in the reasons given by the unaccepted applicants. In this group, 42 percent indicated an involuntary reason for leaving their last job. As in the case of the employees, involuntary job separations were especially significant among the hourly rated employees.

When asked why they chose to work at the aluminum plant, employees were urged to give more than one reason, if applicable. Their responses are presented in table 30. The foremost reason, given by almost 33 percent of the employees, was the opportunity for advancement in a new and progressive company. The second major reason, given as most important by 18 percent of the respondents, was the desire to work closer to home or the home area. Thirteen percent cited higher wages, and an equal number indicated previous unemployment, underemployment, or the desire to obtain more job security as their

TABLE 28. Ways in which employees at the Ravenswood plant learned about the job opening, by occupational group, summer 1957

Occupational group	Number of employees	Methods of learning about jobs (percentage distribution)						
		All methods	Newspaper, radio, television	Friends or relatives	Combination of communication media and friends	State employment service	Company transfer	Other
All occupations---	888	100	25	31	12	(1)	8	24
Professional, technical, and managerial------	174	100	14	16	3	1	25	41
Clerical----------	145	100	29	35	23	1	---	12
Foremen-----------	67	100	12	9	3	---	25	51
Craftsmen---------	103	100	34	35	16	---	2	13
Operatives--------	160	100	32	34	12	---	1	21
Service-----------	51	100	39	41	8	---	2	10
Labor-------------	156	100	23	47	16	1	1	12
Trainees----------	32	100	9	13	3	---	3	72

[1] Less than 1 percent.

TABLE 29. Reasons given by employees and unaccepted applicants for leaving last job prior to Ravenswood plant application, by occupational group

Occupational group	Number of employees[1]	Voluntary reasons[2] (percentage distribution)				
		All reasons	Still employed	Locational preference[3]	Other[4]	Involuntary reasons[5]
Employees	786	100	42	8	35	15
Professional, technical, and managerial	156	100	49	4	40	7
Clerical	121	100	36	9	45	10
Foreman	58	100	41	4	34	21
Craftsmen	99	100	54	6	30	10
Operatives	146	100	33	16	31	20
Service	44	100	36	11	32	21
Labor	146	100	44	7	29	20
Trainees	16	100	25	6	50	19
Unaccepted applicants	454	100	29	4	25	42
Professional, technical, and managerial	37	100	43	6	43	8
Clerical	41	100	36	5	36	22
Skilled	121	100	31	1	17	51
Semiskilled	100	100	23	9	23	45
Unskilled	155	100	25	5	25	45

[1] Excludes those who had no job prior to their plant application and those whose forms were incomplete.

[2] The classification is based on statements made by applicants when asked to list reasons for leaving previous jobs on their application forms. Those who simply stated "still employed" opposite the last job are classed among the potentially voluntary transfers. Those who gave other voluntary reasons may or may not have been still employed.

[3] Includes such reasons as "to get closer to home," "closer to relatives," etc.

[4] Includes "to get better" wages, conditions, advancement, etc.

[5] Includes layoff, discharge, "plant closed," etc.

primary reasons. Four percent specified job relations and conditions in the Kaiser plant. These factors were also the most frequently mentioned, usually in the same order, by those who gave second and third reasons for coming to the plant.

Interesting differences appeared among the occupational groups in these subjective evaluations. Although the opportunity for advancement was the foremost reason given by all occupational groups with the exception of the clerical employees, it was particularly dominant among the professional-managerial, supervisory, and trainee employees. Locational reasons were especially important among the hourly rated and clerical workers. Higher earnings were also stressed by the clerical staff, and job security as well as higher wages were emphasized by many of the craftsmen and other hourly rated employees.

The employees' subjective evaluation of their reasons for mobility accorded closely with the objective circumstances in which they found themselves before and at the time of the plant's establishment. Most left their previous jobs voluntarily because they considered this new plant, in an expanding industry, an outstanding opportunity for advancement. For many, the plant offered an opportunity to return to the home area or to end lengthy, daily travels to neighboring cities. Others, in outlying parts of the

TABLE 30. Employees' reasons for choosing to work at the Ravenswood plant, by occupational group, summer 1957

Occupational group	Number of employees	Reasons for choosing to work at the Ravenswood plant (percentage distribution)						
		All reasons	Opportunities for advancement	Closer to established home	Wages and/or fringe benefits	Employment security	Job relations and conditions	Other reasons or not stated[1]
	First stated reason							
All occupations	888	100	32	18	13	13	4	20
Professional, technical, managerial, foremen, and trainees	273	100	42	6	10	3	2	37
Clerical	145	100	21	24	31	9	4	11
Craftsmen	103	100	28	21	15	15	6	15
Other hourly rated	367	100	29	23	9	21	5	13
	Second stated reason							
All occupations	888	100	19	6	10	6	5	54
Professional, technical, managerial, foremen, and trainees	273	100	22	3	11	1	3	60
Clerical	145	100	16	7	17	4	9	54
Craftsmen	103	100	19	---	5	6	9	61
Other hourly rated	367	100	17	9	9	11	4	50
	Third stated reason							
All occupations	888	100	3	1	2	1	2	91
Professional, technical, managerial, foremen, and trainees	273	100	3	---	2	1	2	92
Clerical	145	100	2	4	3	3	1	87
Craftsmen	103	100	3	3	---	3	3	88
Other hourly rated	367	100	2	1	3	1	1	93

[1] Includes company transfers.

area, were willing to lengthen their daily travel time in order to work in the plant. Most of the employees improved their earnings by moving to the plant and, for some, this was the primary reason for transferring. Finally, for a significant number, the aluminum plant offered a job where before there had been no job, and this compelling reason overrode all other considerations.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this survey can be summarized as follows:

1. The Kaiser Aluminum and Chemical Corp.'s Ravenswood Works began production in 1956. The area in which it had been established, Jackson County, W. Va., was depressed from the standpoint of employment opportunities, and the State contained a number of areas with chronically serious levels of unemployment.

2. The survey of the plant's 894 employees was conducted in the summer of 1957 before full productive capacity and employment had been reached. In selecting employees, the company attempted to follow a prescribed set of standards covering age, education, residence, experience, and physical fitness.

3. The company generally was able to meet these standards with regard to age, education, and physical fitness; but in order to do so, it was necessary to accept applicants who lived considerable distances from the plant. Locally recruited employees were lacking in aluminum manufacturing experience, and, for the most part, in manufacturing experience of any kind. Key personnel for professional responsibilities, supervision, and training were transferred from other Kaiser plants.

4. A sample of 522 unaccepted applicants showed lesser qualifications in most key requirements, but their numbers and qualifications were sufficient to promise a successful expansion of future employment without seriously lowering the quality of the labor force.

5. The plant's employees had engaged in extensive geographic movement prior to its establishment, and many continued to commute considerable distances in order to avoid further residence change. In their move to the plant, employees demonstrated a marked willingness to transfer across industry and occupational lines established in their previous employment.

6. A substantial number of the plant's work force, especially in hourly rated occupations, had experienced unemployment and underemployment in the 3 years before their employment at the Ravenswood works as well as just prior to their job at the plant. Only a portion of their unemployment was covered by unemployment compensation. Unaccepted applicants had experienced even higher rates of unemployment. This previous job insecurity was a principal factor in the movement of workers to the plant.

7. Many employees moved to the plant in order to be closer to their home or home area. Hourly rated employees demonstrated greater area attachment than salaried personnel.

8. A majority of hourly rated employees improved their earnings position in moving to the plant and most of the salaried personnel looked upon their work with the company as an opportunity to increase earnings.

9. Most of the employees moved to the plant voluntarily (i.e., without preceding unemployment), motivated by a wish for advancement, a job closer to home or their home area, higher wages, and greater employment security.

The depressed rural area has continued to be almost entirely ignored in recent studies of labor mobility. Yet, a significant finding of the present survey is that the adequacy of the labor supply for a new manufacturing facility in such an area is basically determined by the preceding patterns of mobility. Since mobility patterns of depressed rural areas are likely to differ markedly from those of metropolitan centers and since the attraction of new industry is a continuing objective in depressed areas, further understanding of mobility patterns in these areas is an essential step toward alleviation of their depressed condition.

Before the coming of the aluminum plant, the most significant type of labor mobility in the Ravenswood area was geographic. Severely limited employment opportunities set the stage for persistent outward migration, as shown by the exceptional decline of the area's population during the period of great national population growth from 1940 to 1956. Potential manufacturing employees who continued to maintain a residence in the area appear to have followed one of two alternative courses: they transferred their primary industrial attachment

from agriculture to local, relatively low-paying nonmanufacturing establishments, or they commuted considerable distances to more lucrative employment in neighboring urban centers. The latter alternative is one which has presented itself only recently to workers contingent upon expanding ownership of automobiles. While this picture of mobility patterns before the establishment of the aluminum plant is based upon the limited information provided by the population census and the experience of workers who later became plant employees, it appears a valid inference from these data.

Given the area's mobility design, what kind of a labor supply could be anticipated by an aluminum manufacturer who chose to locate here? And, by implication, what kind of labor supply can other employers in the same industry, or similar expanding industries, such as chemicals, anticipate in a depressed rural area?

The findings of the present survey lead to the following conclusions regarding the sources of labor supply for a prospective manufacturing plant in a depressed rural area:

1. Since the manufacturer cannot realistically expect to find or attract a sufficient number of professionally trained and managerial personnel in such an area, transfer of a number of key employees from other plants becomes necessary. This fact, alone, points up the problems which such an area would present for a single-plant firm.

2. The manufacturer can expect some increase in the local labor force to result from the new demand for labor. In aluminum, chemical, and most heavy manufacturing plants where female employment is limited, however, employers cannot expect women to be a major source of required labor supply. Moreover, men who enter the labor force only because of the plant's establishment are not likely to fulfil the manufacturer's hiring specifications with regard to age, education, experience, or physical fitness. The present survey indicates that the widespread establishment of such plants in remote areas may even serve to lower--at least temporarily--the labor force participation rates in such areas; many wives who worked before their husband's transfer or attraction to the new plant might be unable to find employment in the limited industrial environment of the depressed area.

3. Unemployed and underemployed workers can be expected to constitute an important source of labor. Such workers would be plentiful in a depressed area, but this survey indicates that they would not constitute the most important source of labor for a high-wage firm with rigorous hiring standards. As can be inferred from the larger proportion of unemployed among the unaccepted applicants than among those hired, the qualifications of many of the unemployed would probably fall below selection specifications.

4. Most of the plant's employees would come to it voluntarily after having quit their previous jobs. Some would transfer from the local nonmanufacturing establishments in search of advancement and higher earnings. Others, in outlying sections of the area, would be willing to commute considerable distances in order to improve their employment position. Still o t h e r s, situated beyond the commuting range, would be willing to change their residence in order to work at the plant. But comparison of unaccepted applicants in the present survey indicates that the disadvantage of a distant application address would have to be offset by high qualifications if the applicant were to be found acceptable by the company.

5. A most significant source of voluntary transfer--the one which clearly reflects the peculiar patterns of mobility in a depressed rural area--would be the movement to the plant motivated by area attachment. Many workers who had been forced out of the area in a search for employment would return to their hometown, to their friends and relatives, or to the home they had left behind. And many others whose area attachment was such that they commuted great distances rather than migrate would now be eager to take a job nearer home. Both the returned migrants and the long-distance commuters are likely to possess more acceptable skills than those workers who accepted unemployment or lower paying local jobs in the depressed area rather than move.

These survey findings would not hold if the characteristics of mobility surrounding a new plant in a depressed rural area were similar to the characteristics dis-

closed in studies of labor mobility in metropolitan centers.[12] If the employment opportunities in the new plant had not been widely known, if the plant had been bound by a "no-pirating" agreement, or if the workers had been content with the wages, conditions, and geographic locations of the jobs they already held, then the principal sources of labor supply for the plant would have been far different and probably not nearly so productive of qualified employees. It is because the labor mobility surrounding a new plant in a depressed rural area has few typical imperfections that it becomes an interesting subject for analysis by students of the labor market.

[12] Reynolds, op. cit., pp. 17-19; Parnes, op. cit., pp. 138-40; Gladys L. Palmer and Carol P. Brainerd, Labor Mobility in Six Cities (Social Science Research Council, 1954), pp. 13-20.

APPENDIX I. SURVEY METHODS

Survey of Employees

1. Application form data. The company made available verifaxed copies of all application forms completed by August 1, 1957. The form used for hourly rated employees differed from that used for salaried employees, but both contained substantially the same information. (See appendix II.) Several of the forms for management trainees and employees transferred from other Kaiser plants were incomplete, but from interviews and data in the files of the transferred employees it was often possible to reconstruct the missing items. Since this was not uniformly possible, however, total numbers of employees included in analyses based on application form data vary slightly among tabulations. Absence of current occupational data for six of the employees was an additional reason for minor differences in total employees included in various tabulations.

Application forms of the 894 employees interviewed were verifaxed and matched with the corresponding name on the interview questionnaire forms. Utilization of application form data reduced the interview time. Since it was not always possible to reconstruct the items missing from the incomplete forms of some transferees and trainees, the total included fewer than 894 in most of the tabulations based on application form data. The total was further reduced by six in all tabulations involving analysis by the total employment in occupational groups. Unless otherwise specified, percentages indicated in the tabulations exclude employees for whom the item under analysis was unreported and could not be reconstructed from other data.

2. Sign-on and status change data. Employees' occupation upon being hired and change in occupational status were recorded from sign-on and status change forms included in their files. These forms also included earnings information for almost all hourly rated employees and for some of the salaried employees. All analyses involving occupational or wage information included the position for which the employee was hired unless a status change occurred within 3 months.

3. Interviews. Efforts were made to interview every employee (including top management) of the Ravenswood works as of August 1, 1957. A total of 894 employees were interviewed on the basis of a structured questionnaire form. (See appendix II.) There were 2 refusals and 17 employees who could not be interviewed because of continued absence from their indicated address. Almost all of the tabulations based on interview data included the total of 894 employees, with the exception of the tabulations using occupational analysis, in which the total was reduced to 888. Ten percent of the employees were hired before June 30, 1956; 24 percent between July 1 and December 31, 1956; and 66 percent between January 1 and August 1, 1957.

Survey of Unaccepted Applicants

The company had filed the unaccepted application forms in potential occupational groups. For purposes of comparison with data on employees, the unaccepted applications were grouped in five broad categories: professional, technical, and managerial (including some supervisory personnel), clerical, skilled, semiskilled, and unskilled. A sampling percentage was chosen on the basis of company estimates of the number of applications filed in each occupational category. A 3-percent random sample was drawn from each of the occupational groups except the unskilled. Because of the large number of application forms in this group, a 1-percent random sample was drawn, to give a total of 522 applicants. The numbers selected in each occupational group are indicated in table 2. These forms were verifaxed and coded and compared with the application form data of the employees.

APPENDIX II. EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION FORMS AND INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Application Form: Salaried Employees
B. Application Form: Hourly Rated Employees
C. Interview Questionnaire

APPLICATION FORM A: SALARIED EMPLOYEES

KAISER ALUMINUM AND CHEMICAL CORPORATION

1924 BROADWAY

OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION

Date_____

Name_____ Age_____
(LAST) (FIRST) (MIDDLE)
Sex_____

Present Address_____ Height_____
(STREET) (CITY) (STATE)
Weight_____

Permanent Address_____ U. S. Citizen?_____
(STREET) (CITY) (STATE)

Telephone No._____ Social Security No._____

Draft Classification_____

GENERAL INFORMATION:

Single____ Married____ Times____ Divorced____ Engaged____ Widowed____ No. of Dependents____

Date of Birth_____ Place of Birth_____ Date of Marriage_____

Name of Husband or Wife (maiden)_____ Children & Ages_____

Name of Father_____ Name of Mother (maiden)_____

Father's Birthplace_____ Mother's Birthplace_____

Father's Occupation_____ Mother's Occupation_____

Father's Address_____ Mother's Address_____

In Case of Emergency Call: Name_____ Relationship_____

Address_____ Telephone_____

HEALTH: Explain fully any physical defects or disabilities and the degree, if any, to which they affect your work:_____

EDUCATION: Years completed in Elementary____ High School____ College or University____ Business or Trade School____

Undergraduate Degree_____ Name of College_____ Year____

Graduate Degree_____ Name of College_____ Year____

Other Degrees_____ Name of School_____ Year____

Major Subjects

Undergrad.	Grad.

Languages

Speak	Read	Write

Scholastic Honors Received:_____

Clubs and Societies:_____

Extracurricular Activities:_____

Athletic Participation:_____

Part Time Work_____

Highest Elected or Appointed Office Held:_____

State any other Experience, Training or Hobbies:_____

What quarter of your class did you stand, academically?_____

REFERENCES: Name 3 persons not related to you who can attest to your Character, Experience and Qualifications:

Name	Address	Phone	Occupation

FORM 1R-600. 5M

Branch of Service_____ Length of Service_____ From_____ To_____

Assignment within Branch_____

Type of Discharge_____ Rank or Grade at Discharge_____

Highest Principal Duties and Responsibilities_____

Are you on a Reserve Status?_____

SERVICE SCHOOLS AND/OR EDUCATION: Type of Course Length of Course

CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT:

(Start with last job first. List only employment of 3 months or more. Be specific as to the kind of work you performed.)

INCLUSIVE DATES	NAME AND ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER	JOB DUTIES & TITLE	WAGE	REASON FOR LEAVING
FROM TO				
FROM TO				
FROM TO				
FROM TO				
FROM TO				
FROM TO				
FROM TO				
FROM TO				

In What Type of Work are you Primarily Interested?_____

What Qualifications Do You Possess for This Work?_____

Machines Operated Skillfully?_____

Shorthand Speed_____ Typing Speed_____ Read Blueprints?_____

Why Do You Desire to Affiliate With This Organization?_____

State Where You Prefer to Work: General Region_____ State_____ City_____ Willing to move?_____

Reason for Your Preference_____ No Preference_____

What is Lowest Starting Salary Acceptable?_____ Date Available_____

The answers I have made to each and all of the foregoing questions are true to the best of my knowledge.

Signature_____

APPLICATION FORM B: HOURLY-RATED EMPLOYEES

KAISER ALUMINUM AND CHEMICAL CORPORATION
RAVENSWOOD WORKS, RAVENSWOOD, WEST VIRGINIA
CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYMENT APPLICATION
Answer All Questions on Both Sides of Form in own Handwriting
Date_____

Name *(Last)*_____ *(First)*_____ *(Middle)*_____ Male ☐ Female ☐

Present Address *(No.& St.)*_____ *(City)*_____ *(State)*_____

Permanent Address *(No.& St.)*_____ *(City)*_____ *(State)*_____

Own or Nearest Phone _____ Social Security No. _____ Draft Classification _____

GENERAL INFORMATION

Age _____ Date of Birth *(Day)*_____ *(No.)*_____ *(Yr.)*_____ U.S. Citizen? Yes ☐ No ☐

Place of Birth *(City)*_____ *(State)*_____ *(Country)*_____

Height _____ Weight _____ Single ☐ Divorced ☐ Widowed ☐ Married ☐ Separated ☐ No. Dependents _____

IN CASE OF EMERGENCY NOTIFY

Name *(First)*_____ *(Last)*_____ Relationship _____

Address _____ Telephone No. _____

PHYSICAL Do you have any physical defects such as lameness, weak back, deafness, poor sight, high blood pressure, rupture? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, explain. _____

Have you ever filed a claim for an industrial injury? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, explain. _____

EDUCATION Circle highest grade completed.

Grammar School	High School	Business or Trade School	University
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4	1 2 3 4

REFERENCES Give three. Name persons not related to you.

Name	Address	Occupation	Phone No.

U.S. MILITARY SERVICE Branch: Army ☐ Air Force ☐ Coast Guard ☐ Navy ☐ Marines ☐ Merchant Marine ☐

Date Entered _____ Date Discharged _____ Type of Discharge: Honorable ☐ Dishonorable ☐

Are you a member of any armed forces reserve organization? Yes ☐ No ☐

(OVER)

IR-601 (11-15-55)

APPLICATION FORM B: HOURLY-RATED EMPLOYEES (cont'd)

EMPLOYMENT RECORD: Start with your last job first. List all employment for last 3 years. Be sure to indicate any experience particularly related to the type of work you are seeking no matter what date or how recent. For jobs held more than 3 years ago you need only include employment of 3 months or more.

DATES *(Mo. & Yr.)*	NAME AND ADDRESS OF EMPLOYER	JOB TITLE AND DUTIES	PAY RECEIVED	REASON FOR LEAVING
From: To:				
From: To:				
From: To:				
From: To:				
From: To:				
From: To:				
From: To:				

What kind of work do you wish to do? _____

What is the lowest wage you will accept?_____ When can you start to work?_____

What means of transportation have you?_____

Have you ever been arrested for other than minor traffic violations? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, give date and place of each arrest, offense, and final action._____

_____

Have you ever been employed by this Company? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, where and when?_____

_____

Do you have any friends or relative employed by this Company? Yes ☐ No ☐ If yes, give their names and job titles._____

I authorize my former employers to furnish all information they may have concerning me, whether on record or not, and I release them or their company from all liability for any damage arising from issuance of such information. I certify the information on this application to be true and accurate and I understand intentional misrepresentation may be cause for immediate dismissal

SIGN HERE_____

C. Interview Questionnaire

RAVENSWOOD, WEST VIRGINIA, MOBILITY SURVEY

Personal Interview Schedule

Any information given on this form will be kept in strict confidence and will be seen only by staff members of the West Virginia University and sworn employees of the Bureau of Labor Statistics

Name _____ Soc. Sec. No. _____
(last) (first) (middle)

Current Address _____ Telephone No. _____
(No. and Street) (City) (State)

1. Were you living in the Ravenswood area (within 50 miles) when you applied for work at the Kaiser plant? ..... Yes ____ , No _____

   a. (If "yes") How long have you lived here? _____

   b. (If "no") i. Where did you live? Town and State _____
      ii. Had you ever lived in the Ravenswood area before you came to work at the plant? _____ When?
      From (mo., yr.) _____ To (mo., yr.) _____

      (If employee had never lived in the Ravenswood area, omit 2a and 2b and move directly to 3.)

2. *a. If you had lived in the Ravenswood area and then moved away, why did you leave the Ravenswood area? _____

   b. In addition to your job at Kaiser, why did you decide to return to the Ravenswood area? _____

(For new arrivals only)

3. *Were there any reasons, in addition to your job at Kaiser, why you chose to live and work in the Ravenswood area rather than some other area? _____

*See instructions regarding positive and negative reasons. Interview No. _____

4. (For all employees) In what other areas have you lived in the last five years?
(If none, write "none" across first column. List under indicated headings, beginning with last area first. Moves within one town or contiguous area need not be recorded.)

(Where?)	(When?)	
Area (town and state)	Dates (mo. and year)	*Why did you move?
	From: To:	
	From: To:	
	From: To:	
	From: To:	

5. a. How did you learn about the job opening in the Kaiser plant?

Newspaper, radio, T.V. ..... _____

Friends or relatives ..... _____

State employment office ..... _____

Other (specify) _____

_____

b. What educational courses or training programs, if any, helped you most in getting the job at the plant? _____

_____

6. Why did you choose to work at the Kaiser plant?

Higher wages ..... _____
Larger "fringe" benefits ..... _____
More job security ..... _____
More desirable employer-employee relations ..... _____
Better working conditions ..... _____
Closer to established home ..... _____
Unemployed before coming to Kaiser ..... _____
Underemployed before coming to Kaiser ..... _____
Other (specify) _____

_____

7. Is your wife (husband) working now? ..... Yes ___, No ___

   a. If "no", is she (he) looking for work? ..... Yes ___, No ___

   b. If "yes", is she (he) working at Kaiser? ..... Yes ___, No ___

   c. Was she (he) working when you left your previous job to work at the Kaiser plant? ..... Yes ___, No ___

8. How far from the plant do you live? (miles) ..... _____

   a. How do you get to work? _____

   b. (If over 5 miles) Do you plan to move closer to the plant? ..... Yes ___, No ___
      Undecided _____

   c. Have you already moved closer to the plant since taking your Kaiser job? ... Yes ___, No ___

   d. Do you own your own home? ..... Yes ___, No ___
      (If "no") Do you plan to buy or build in the next year or two? ..... _____

   e. Do you live on a farm now? ..... Yes ___, No ___

      If "yes", do you own it? ..... Yes ___, No ___

      If "yes", do you lease it? ..... Yes ___, No ___

      If both own and lease, indicate the larger item Own _____ Lease _____

      If you live on a farm, (1) do you do some farm work yourself in addition to your regular work at Kaiser? ..... Yes ___, No ___

      (2) do you operate the farm with hired or family help? ..... Yes ___, No ___

   f. Did you do farm work before taking your job with Kaiser? ..... Yes ___, No ___
      If "yes", ... full time? _____ Part time? _____

9. During the entire year before you came to Kaiser, were you working <u>full time</u>? .. Yes ___, No ___
   (If "yes", omit remainder of question 9.)

   If you were <u>not fully employed</u>,

   a. Were you working part time throughout the year? Yes ___, No ___ Hours per week _____

   b. Did you work during only part of the year? ..... Yes ___, No ___
      If "yes," ... part time _____ How many weeks ___
      full time _____ How many weeks ___

   c. Why were you not working full time? _____
      _____
      _____

d. Were you not working (unemployed) but looking for work just before you came to work at the plant? ..... Yes ____, No ____

e. Were you drawing unemployment compensation just before you took the job at Kaiser? ..... Yes ____, No ____

10. What periods of <u>total</u> unemployment (not working, but looking for work) if any, have you experienced in the last 3 years?

(<u>List first any unemployment indicated in Question 9, and work backwards</u>, placing information under indicated headings. If there has been no unemployment, write "none" across the first column.)

When? (mo. and year)	Where? (town and state)	Did you draw unemployment compensation?	Did you use it up?
From: To:			
From: To:			
From: To:			
From: To:			

Location of interview: Employee's home ..... _____

Plant: At time of job interview ..... _____

Before or after work hours ..... _____

Interviewer's name _____ Date of interview _____

Form reviewed by _____

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1960 O—543728