

WILS
GOVU
Y 3.W 89/2:13/4-2

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION
Division of Social Research

==

SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR
WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT
IN 13 CITIES



=====

==

Series IV

Number 2

WORKS PROGRESS ADMINISTRATION

Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator
Corrington Gill, Assistant Administrator

Howard B. Myers, Director
Division of Social Research

RESEARCH BULLETIN

SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT
IN 13 CITIES

Prepared by
Susan M. Shepherd and Gertrude Bancroft

under the supervision of
A. Ross Eckler
Coordinator of Special Inquiries
Division of Social Research

Washington

1937

CONTENTS

	Page
Works Program status of cases.....	1
Relief status of cases.....	2
Employment experience on the Works Program.....	3
Private employment.....	5
Characteristics of economic heads of cases.....	6
Characteristics of other certified members of cases.....	8
Size of household.....	9
March income of certified cases.....	9
Appendix A—Statistical procedure.....	15
Table A Number of certified cases on April 15, 1936, and sampling ratios used for study of certi- fied load in 13 cities.....	16
Table B Class of usual occupation of economic heads by sex, in 13-city sample and in Labor Inven- tory.....	17
Appendix B—Supplementary tables.....	21
Table 1 Works Program status of all certified cases as of April 15, 1936.....	21
Table 2a Relief status of certified cases according to Works Program status, by months in 13 cities, September 1935 through March 1936.	22
Table 2b Relief status of certified cases according to Works Program status, November 1935 and March 1936.....	22
Table 3 Number of months on relief of all certified cases in 13 cities, between September 1, 1935 and April 15, 1936.....	23
Table 4 Means of support of all certified cases in 13 cities, between September 1, 1935 and April 15, 1936.....	23
Table 5 Success of assignments to Works Program em- ployment.....	24
Table 6 Assignment and work experience of certified load.....	24
Table 7 Supervising agency of cases employed on Works Program on April 15, 1936.....	25

	Page
Appendix B—Supplementary tables—Continued	
Table 8 Median length of time employed on Works Program and average period per job, classified by number of jobs held, for all cases having had Works Program employment in 13 cities.....	26
Table 9 Number of weeks without Works Program employment since first successful assignment of all cases.....	27
Table 10 Number of weeks without Works Program employment since first successful assignment of cases employed on the Program as of April 15, 1936.....	28
Table 11 Class of assigned occupation on latest Works Program job of certified workers, by class of usual occupation, in 13 cities.....	29
Table 12 Percent of persons employed on latest job on Works Program in same skill class of occupation as their usual, by type of project, in 13 cities.....	30
Table 13 Private employment and Works Program employment status of all certified cases on April 15, 1936.....	30
Table 14 Class of usual occupation of all economic heads as of April 15, 1936, and of economic heads with private employment in March 1936 in 13 cities.....	31
Table 15 Class of occupation in private employment during March 1936 of economic heads, by class of usual occupation in 13 cities....	32
Table 16 Class of usual occupation of economic heads by Works Program status as of April 15, 1936, in 13 cities.....	33
Table 17 Age of economic heads of all certified cases by Works Program status as of April 15, 1936, in 13 cities.....	33
Table 18a Sex of economic heads of all certified cases by Works Program status as of April 15, 1936, in 13 cities.....	34
Table 18b Sex of economic heads of all certified cases, by Works Program status as of April 15, 1936	34
Table 19 Number of months since ending of last job of 4 weeks or more at usual occupation of economic heads, by class of usual occupation, in 13 cities.....	35

CONTENTS

v

Page

Appendix B—Supplementary tables—Continued

Table 20a	Number of months since ending of last job at usual occupation of economic heads by Works Program status as of April 15, 1936, in 13 cities.....	36
Table 20b	Number of months since ending of last job of 4 weeks or more at usual occupation of economic heads.....	37
Table 21	Availability of additional assignable member in cases employed on the Works Program, by size of household, in 13 cities.....	38
Table 22	Class of usual occupation, sex, and age, of certified members able to accept assignment in cases with no member employed on the Works Program and with no economic head able to accept assignment, in 13 cities.....	38
Table 23a	Size of household of all certified cases by Works Program status, in 13 cities.....	39
Table 23b	Size of household of all certified cases..	39
Table 24	Works Program income in March.....	40
Table 25a	General relief grants of certified cases in March 1936, by size of household, in 13 cities.....	41
Table 25b	March relief grants of certified cases....	42
Table 26	Total March income of certified cases, by source of income, in 13 cities.....	43
Table 27	Median income from private employment of cases with and without Works Program employment in March 1936.....	44
Table 28	Private earnings of cases with and without Works Program employment in March 1936....	45
Table 29	Total March incomes of certified cases, by size of household, in 13 cities.....	46

PREFACE

In the spring and early summer of 1936 the Division of Social Research undertook a series of studies of families which had been certified as eligible for employment on the Federal Works Program under the terms of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. Executive Orders under this Act stipulated that families which had received relief within the period May through October 1935 were to be certified for Works Program employment.¹ The term "certified load", for a given date, refers to the total number of cases with one or more members certified as eligible for Works Program employment.

The studies of the certified load were designed to give information on the following points:

1. The proportion and characteristics of cases with Works Program employment, of those waiting to be assigned, and of those unable to accept assignment for various reasons.
2. The extent to which relief rolls had been cleared of certified cases as the volume of Works Program employment rose.
3. The employment experience of those workers who had been assigned to Works Program projects.
4. The extent and nature of private employment obtained by certified cases.
5. The characteristics of economic heads of cases in relation to their status on the Works Program.
6. Incomes of cases employed on the Program, of cases continuing on relief, and of cases having private employment.

Studies of the certified load as of April 15, 1936, were conducted in 13 cities² widely scattered throughout the United States and representative of varied types of industrial employment. The findings are believed to be generally applicable to the certified load in most urban areas for the period covered by the studies.

In each of the 13 cities, random samples of approximately 250 cases with a member employed on the Program, and a similar number

¹Under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1936, this provision was modified to include as eligible for employment on the Program all persons in need, regardless of their relief status.

²The cities are: Atlanta, Georgia; Baltimore, Maryland; Bridgeport, Connecticut; Butte, Montana; Chicago, Illinois; Detroit, Michigan; Houston, Texas; Manchester, New Hampshire; Omaha, Nebraska; Paterson, New Jersey; St. Louis, Missouri; San Francisco, California; Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania.

with no member employed, were drawn from Work Division Occupational Classification Records (FERA Form 144). From these and other available forms, including assignment documents and earnings records, the following basic data were transcribed: number of persons in the relief group; age, sex, and usual occupation of each certified member of the case; Works Program status as of April 15; and Works Program assignment history and income. Relief data were secured from local relief agencies. Home interviews elicited information on the extent of private employment, date when last job at usual occupation ended, ability to accept assignment to Works Program employment, and incomes from sources other than Works Program employment and relief.

The studies were conducted in the 13 cities by the supervisors of the Economic Trends Survey staffs, and the data, together with a background report upon the work in each city, were sent for analysis to the Special Inquiries Section of the Division of Social Research.

Presentation of the collected data in brief form makes it desirable to omit certain details from the discussion. The analysis, therefore, is based on the combined figures for all 13 cities, with no reference to inter-city differences. Data for individual cities and variations among cities may be found in the accompanying tables. Similarly, some of the characteristics of cases, or members of cases, are not fully discussed but are shown in tables 13, 15, 16, 17, 23a, and 23b.

Throughout the report, the figures used in both text and tables are in the form of percentage distributions. A description of the method of combining data for the 13 cities is included in appendix A.

SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT IN 13 CITIES

WORKS PROGRAM STATUS OF CASES

On April 15, 1936, 85 percent of the cases certified for Works Program employment in 13 cities were either employed on the Program or had no member able to accept assignment. Sixty percent of the cases had a member employed on the Program on that date, and an additional twenty-five percent were unable to accept assignment for various reasons (table 1). The remaining 15 percent were reported as able and willing to take Works Program jobs, but probably not more than 10 percent of these could have been put to work at any one time, in view of the magnitude of assignment and transfer operations resulting from the turnover of employed cases.¹

The 25 percent unable to accept an assignment were not available for Works Program jobs because the certified members of these cases had private employment, were disabled, or were needed at home to care for dependents. Private employment was the most important factor accounting for inability to accept assignment; 15 percent of all certified cases were unable to take a Works Program job for this reason. Insofar as private employment provided the equivalent of the Works Program security wage for unskilled labor, these cases were not in need of Works Program jobs. Cases unable to accept an assignment because their certified members were physically disabled constituted 3 percent of the certified load. Some of these handicapped persons had been certified by relief agencies because it was thought that special projects would be designed for them, and others had become disabled after certification. Four percent of the cases were not available for assignment because their certified members were needed at home to care for small children or invalids, or for other reasons. A small group (3 percent) could not be located for interview.

¹ In Butte and Bridgeport, where only 4 percent of the cases were awaiting assignment, full employment of cases able to accept assignment had probably been reached.

RELIEF STATUS OF CASES

Monthly data on the sources of aid to these certified cases show that the movement from relief to Works Program rolls got under way slowly in September and October 1935, and became very rapid in the last 2 months of 1935. In September, 7 percent of all certified cases in the 13 cities were employed on the Program (table 2a). By December, this proportion had increased to 66 percent and it reached a maximum of 69 percent in February and March 1936. The absorption of cases by the Works Program is also reflected in the decreasing percentage without Works Program employment receiving relief in each month. The size of this group fell from 80 percent of all certified cases in September to 15 percent in March.

During the first several months of the Program, many cases had both Works Program jobs and relief in the same month. For the most part, relief grants were made to such cases to provide needed assistance until the receipt of the first full pay check for work on projects (usually 14 to 21 days after assignment). Thus, the large proportion reporting both relief income and Works Program employment in November (44 percent) is explained by the fact that most of the cases receiving initial assignments between October 15 and November 30 would require relief assistance for a part of November. In March, when the bulk of assignments had been completed, a much smaller group, 6 percent of the total, reported both forms of aid. This group was composed, in part, of large families whose Works Program income was insufficient for budgetary needs and had to be supplemented by relief, and, in part, of cases continued on relief until receipt of their first project pay check.

A sizable group in each month, about 13 percent, was able to do without both Works Program and relief assistance; most of these cases had secured some private employment. With the revival of industry in the spring of 1936, an increasing proportion of cases came into this category. The percentage of all economic heads who had some private employment in March (20 percent—table 14) is comparable to the percentage of cases (16 percent—table 2a) without public aid in that month; the former is larger because some cases with private jobs were not wholly self-supporting.

Policies with regard to giving relief to cases with Works Program employment differed from city to city and changed with fluctuations in the amount of State and city funds available for relief. In Atlanta, Butte, and Houston, almost no relief at all was given in March 1936 to certified cases, whether or not they were employed on the Program (table 2b). Relief was granted to fairly large proportions of certified cases in the other cities, but only in six—Bridgeport, Chicago, Detroit,

Manchester, Paterson, and St. Louis—was there a definite policy of supplementing WPA wages that were below budgetary needs. In the other four cities—Baltimore, Omaha, San Francisco, and Wilkes-Barre—practically none of the cases working on the Program were given relief assistance in March.

Over the entire period between September and April the majority of certified cases received relief for a period of from 2 to 4 months (table 3). Only 2 percent of the certified load was completely independent of public assistance throughout the period studied (table 4). A much larger group, 29 percent of the cases, were able to support themselves at some time between September and April, but the remaining cases which held Works Program certifications in April had been continuously in need of public aid of some sort throughout the 7½ months.²

EMPLOYMENT EXPERIENCE ON THE WORKS PROGRAM

A review of the records of those cases which had been assigned to the Program at some time prior to April 15 (five-sixths of all certified cases) indicates that, in most instances, assignments to jobs resulted in placement and that subsequent employment on the Program was continuous. With allowance for the limitations imposed by available projects, existing skills of workers had been taken into account to a considerable extent in making assignments.

Success of Assignments

The present study indicated that a large proportion of assignments (84 percent) had resulted in placements in Works Program jobs (table 5). An earlier survey of failures to accept assignment made in the same 13 cities³ during December 1935 showed that up to that time 72 percent of all assignments had resulted in placement on projects. The record subsequent to December reflects selective elimination of cases not in need of Works Program employment and improvement in the procedure of handling records concerning availability of certified persons.

Among the cases not employed on the Program on April 15 (39 percent of all cases), about two-fifths had been employed at some time previously, two-fifths had never been assigned, and one-fifth had been assigned to the Program but had never taken a job (table 6). Since many of the last group had private employment they were not in need of Works Program jobs.

² Since the sample drawn for this study was based on active certified cases as of April 15, 1936, it did not include any cases whose certifications were cancelled prior to that date.

³ *Survey of Failures to Accept Assignments to Works Program Employment in 13 Cities*, Division of Social Research, Works Progress Administration, Series II, No. 16, April 6, 1936, p. 1.

4 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

Supervising Agencies

Among the small group of cases having more than one member employed on the Program (4 percent of the total employed), the second member was generally on National Youth Administration or Civilian Conservation Corps projects (table 7). These agencies, under the regulations governing the Works Program, are permitted to employ young persons who are members of families with other Works Program employment.

Duration of Employment

Cases which had had Works Program employment had worked for an average period of 21 weeks, or approximately the length of time between December 1, 1935, the peak of activity in making assignments, and April 15, 1936 (table 8). Forty-nine percent had worked at one job during their Works Program employment; 30 percent had held two assignments; and the remaining 21 percent had held three or more Works Program jobs.

The average length of the individual job decreased, of course, as the number of jobs held increased. The average length of job for those having held only one Works Program job was 20.5 weeks; for those having held three jobs, the average length was only 7.1 weeks (table 8).

For the entire group studied, the average period per job on the Works Program was 10.3 weeks (table 8). This considerably understates the duration of an average Works Program job. Allowance should be made for the fact that jobs held in the early stages of the Program tended to be short, and that about half of the jobs were still continuing in April, when the study was made.

Continuity of Employment

On the whole, the Works Program provided fairly continuous employment to needy workers once they had been successfully assigned. The average amount of time lost after the first successful assignment was only 2.3 weeks, and for two-thirds of all cases assigned to the Program, employment had been continuous through April 15 (table 9). When those holding Works Program jobs on April 15 are considered, a much larger proportion is found to have had continuous employment (table 10). Eighty-five percent had lost no time at all and seven percent had lost only 1 week.

Utilization of Workers' Skills

In the process of assignment, an attempt was made to place workers in jobs which best utilized their skills, in order to

preserve skills and to increase project efficiency. The requirement that projects should not compete with private industry, however, made it impossible to employ at their usual occupations certain types of workers such as those skilled in manufacturing, and resulted in a disproportionately large number of unskilled jobs. More than three-fifths of the available jobs were in unskilled occupations, although only one-fifth of the workers had been unskilled laborers by usual occupation (table 11). Consequently, a certain amount of occupational "degrading" occurred. Professional workers and office workers were given work of their usual kind in about half of their assignments. Most of the skilled and semiskilled workers were assigned to laboring jobs.

Nevertheless, some workers were placed in occupations of higher ratings than their usual occupations. The proportion of workers whose status was improved varied from 37 percent of the domestic workers to 6 percent of the office workers.

In general, the types of projects most successful in employing workers in their usual skill groups were the professional and the public building projects. Most workers above the unskilled class suffered some occupational "degrading" even on types of projects which required large numbers of skilled and professional workers: Professional projects and those set up for the distribution of surplus commodities were the only ones on which the majority of white collar workers found white collar jobs (table 12). Public building projects offered the best opportunities for skilled workers to work in their customary trades. The position of the skilled building workers was, of course, much more favorable than that of the skilled factory operatives; the latter were best utilized in the goods projects (sewing, canning, etc.,) but even on such projects, four-fifths of them were employed at jobs requiring less skill than required in their usual occupations.⁴ Goods projects were also the only kind on which a large proportion of semiskilled manufacturing workers were employed at their usual occupations.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT

Approximately one-quarter of all families had one or more members employed in private industry at some time in March (table 26). The bulk of these families were in the group not assigned to the Program. In one-fifth of all cases it was the head of the family who held private employment (table 14). A majority of these workers secured the kinds of jobs for which they were trained. The percentages of economic heads working at less skilled jobs than their usual ranged from 14 percent of those

⁴Based on tabulated data which are not presented in this report.

6 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

semiskilled in manufacturing to 37 percent of the proprietors and managers (table 15).

A comparison of occupational adjustment on the Works Program and in private industry indicates that workers are more likely to secure work at their usual jobs in private industry than on the Program. This is due, in part, to the fact that the Works Program is unable to offer certain types of work.

CHARACTERISTICS OF ECONOMIC HEADS OF CASES

Whether a case had a Works Program or private job depended to some extent on the employment characteristics of the economic head.⁵ Such characteristics as usual occupation, age, sex, and duration of unemployment differed among economic heads with Works Program employment on April 15, those waiting to be assigned, and those unable to accept an assignment, but the degree of difference was not great.

Occupation

There was relatively close agreement, with respect to distribution by class of usual occupation, among the economic heads of all certified cases, the heads of cases with a member employed on the Program, and the heads of cases with no member able to accept assignment (table 16). In the remaining significant group, those able to take assignment, two of the classes hardest to place on the Works Program are relatively over-represented: semiskilled factory operatives, and persons without work experience.

Age

The average age of workers in the three groups did not differ markedly (table 17). The average family head with a Works Program job was 41 years old, about 1½ years older than the average worker awaiting assignment or unable to accept assignment. Among those not employed but able to accept assignment, there was a definite concentration of economic heads in the age range from 18-24 years (many of them with no usual occupation) and of heads over 65 years of age. Persons in both age groups were evidently at a disadvantage in getting Works Program jobs. Workers in the most employable age group, those between 35 and 45 years of age, were comparatively over-represented among the economic

⁵The economic head of a case is the man or woman who, in the opinion of the certifying agency, should be given preference in employment on the Works Program. In some reports on the Works Program such workers are designated "first priority workers."

heads who were unable to accept a Works Program assignment, principally because of private employment. Persons in this age group are best able to hold private jobs since they are old enough to have obtained experience in their jobs, but are not too old to learn new processes and skills.

Sex

Men secured Works Program employment more easily than women because the prevailing types of work projects were road and building construction,⁶ on which women obviously could not be employed (table 18a). The larger proportion of women in the group unable to accept an assignment than in the group already assigned reflects, on the one hand, the greater employability of women in private industry and, on the other, their inability to take any job because of home obligations.

The greatest difficulty was found, therefore, in providing Works Program jobs for women, for the extremely young or old, and for persons with no working experience. All of these types were represented in considerable proportions among the group with Works Program employment, however, and in a few cities, women were assigned to the Program in proportions greater than their representation in the total load (table 18b).

Duration of Unemployment

Although in the total certified load there was wide variation in the length of unemployment reported, economic heads had not worked at their usual occupations in private industry for an average of nearly 3 years. At one extreme, 8 percent of the economic heads were currently employed at their usual occupation and 13 percent had lost their last jobs at their usual occupation within the last 12 months. At the other extreme, 17 percent had not worked at their customary jobs within 5 years (table 19).

Differences in duration of unemployment are to some extent explained by the occupations of the workers. Duration of unemployment tended to be shortest for certain types of unskilled and semiskilled workers. For example, relatively large proportions of semiskilled workers in manufacturing and of domestic servants had been unemployed 1 year or less. The number of those who had not worked for 5 years or more was relatively greatest among office workers and skilled building workers. They were, in part, the long-time unemployed and, in part, persons who had worked in the last 5 years at an occupation other

⁶ Approximately 70 percent of all WPA workers were employed on construction projects in March 1936.

than that reported as their "usual occupation." Median duration of unemployment was longest for office workers (44 months) and shortest for domestic workers (29 months).

Economic heads working on the Program had been unemployed for an average of 41 months, a longer period than that of any other group except the group of economic heads unable to accept an assignment because of physical disability (table 20a). Economic heads unassigned but able and willing to take an assignment had been unemployed 29 months, on the average. Both the occupational and age characteristics of this group tend to explain their shorter average period of unemployment. A large proportion had usually worked as domestic servants and semi-skilled factory operatives, groups for which duration of unemployment was relatively short. Moreover, these unassigned workers included many young persons whose maximum period of unemployment is limited by the short length of time they have been in the labor market.

A majority of the family heads unable to accept an assignment because they already had private jobs were not working at their usual occupations. The average length of time since these heads had worked at their usual jobs was only slightly over 2 years, the shortest period of unemployment of any class of family heads.

Inter-city differences in average duration of unemployment were greater than differences among occupations or between workers with and without Works Program employment (table 20b). This fact suggests that the length of time a worker had been unemployed was influenced more by the general economic conditions prevailing in his community than by the demand for workers with his skill.

CHARACTERISTICS OF OTHER CERTIFIED MEMBERS OF CASES

In the great majority of cases (95 percent) only one member of a family had employment on the Program. This was usually the economic head. As a means of increasing the income of large families, local requests have been made that a second member from such families be assigned to the Program. It was found in the present study that only 17 percent of the cases already assigned had another member ready to accept an assignment (table 21). In the larger families, where supplementation of income would tend to be needed, another member was available in a greater proportion of cases, although only one-quarter of the families with from five to seven members, and less than one-half of those with eight or more had another member who could take an assignment. The other certified members available for assignment included relatively large proportions of persons over 65, of young and inexperienced workers, and of women—the types of workers most difficult to place satisfactorily on work projects (table 22).

SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD

Size of family had almost no influence in the selection of cases for Works Program employment. Those employed on the Program in April were of approximately the same average size (3.1 persons) as those awaiting assignment (3.0 persons), although a larger proportion of the latter consisted of only one person (table 23a). Households unable to accept an assignment because of private employment, however, were markedly larger than other types of cases. On the other hand, small families predominated among those cases in which all certified members were physically disabled and unable to accept assignment.

MARCH INCOME OF CERTIFIED CASES

Works Program Income

The three major sources of the income of certified cases were the Works Program, private employment, and relief. Cases receiving all or part of their income from Works Program employment in March constituted 69 percent of the total load and received an average income of \$57.40 from such employment (table 24). Average Works Program income in each city was close to the minimum security wage for unskilled labor, since most of the assignments were made to workers in that skill class. The proportion of workers receiving more than the minimum security wage was largest in Atlanta, Baltimore, and Butte. Works Program income showed no tendency to vary with the size of the case receiving it.

Relief Income

One-fifth of all certified cases received assistance from local public relief agencies in March 1936 (table 25a). The average amount received was \$24.90. Grants naturally differed from city to city, as they depended both on local policy and the amount of funds available for relief (table 25b). For the total number of relief cases studied, general relief grants ranged from \$16.80 for one-person households to \$40.70 for seven-person households.

Income From Private Employment

Private employment was the sole source of income in March for 11 percent of the certified cases; earnings for this group averaged \$68.30 (table 26).

Private jobs were held both by cases with Works Program employment and by cases without such employment, but there were

10 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

marked differences between the two groups with respect to the proportion holding private jobs and the average earnings derived from them. Only about one-tenth of the cases employed on the Program in March received any income from private employment (table 26). Such income, in most cases, was earned by some member other than the worker assigned to the Program. Many of these cases did not hold both types of jobs at the same time; the Works Program job was given up in favor of private employment.

The average private earnings of cases with Works Program and private employment were comparatively low in every city, ranging from \$13.50 in Atlanta to \$44.20 in Baltimore (table 27). Few cases received income from private employment exceeding the minimum security wage for unskilled labor (table 28). By contrast, about three-fifths of the cases without employment on the Program received some income from private employment (table 26) and their earnings ranged from \$28.20 in Atlanta to \$114.80 in Butte (table 27). As average earnings indicate, a considerable proportion of these cases received March earnings from private employment exceeding the minimum security wage for unskilled labor on the Works Program (table 28).

Total Income

Cases which received their whole income in March from only one of the three main sources constituted approximately three-quarters of the total load (table 26). Among the remaining cases whose total incomes were derived from some combination of sources, those receiving income from private employment in addition to Works Program earnings fared best. Their median income was \$79.50 and nearly a third of them received \$100 or more.

The average income of cases receiving both relief and Works Program income was \$64.30, an amount higher than that of cases with only Works Program income but not as high as the average for cases with only private earnings. A much lower average income was received by cases supported by relief and private earnings, or relief and other income, since relief is granted only when income from other sources is inadequate. The average income from a combination of relief and private earnings was \$54.76; from relief and other sources (such as aid from relatives or the sale of personal possessions) it was \$43.20. Only 4 percent of the total load, however, drew income from these two combinations of sources.

Average total incomes for all cases combined increased uniformly with size of household. The average income for one-person households was \$52.40 in March and for households with eight or more members, \$71 (table 29).

Analysis of incomes indicates that the great majority of cases certified for the Works Program were still in need of public aid in March and that Works Program assistance was given, in the main, to those cases without substantial earning power and most in need. Only a small group, cases without either Works Program or private employment, had extremely low average incomes. A considerable proportion of cases without Works Program employment but with private jobs were not in need at the time of the survey. Reinvestigations of the certified load, conducted in many areas since April, have operated to reduce the proportion of cases no longer requiring assistance.

APPENDIX A

STATISTICAL PROCEDURE

APPENDIX A

STATISTICAL PROCEDURE

Sampling Procedure

On April 15, 1936, the total of all cases certified for Works Program employment in the cities studied was over 314,000. Since a study of the entire group was out of the question, the decision was made to base the survey upon a sufficient number of cases to be representative of the total load for each city.

The cases selected for study were drawn at random from the Occupational Classification files (Form 144). It was originally intended that there should be approximately 500 cases drawn in each city, but the sampling procedure resulted in a somewhat lower figure in several of the cities.

Instructions to the local supervisors provided that the sampling procedure should be so set up in each city as to provide approximately equal numbers of cases with and without employment on the Program. Since these two groups were generally of unequal size, it was necessary to apply two separate sampling ratios to the Occupational Classification files in most of the cities.

The total sample drawn constituted 6,333 cases, or approximately 2 percent of the total certified load in the 13 cities. The sample included 2.4 percent of cases not employed on the Program, as against 1.8 percent of those employed. In individual cities the proportion of cases included ranged from 0.4 percent in Chicago to about 15 percent in Butte, Montana.

Table A presents for each of the 13 cities the total number of certified cases on April 15, 1936, the number with and without Works Program employment, and the samples and sampling ratios for each of these groups.

Since the samples for individual cities were restricted to about 500 cases, considerable care must be used in interpreting the results. A sample of this size is clearly too small to provide dependable evidence of the proportion of cases falling in minor occupational groups or having unusually high or low earnings. Accordingly, a number of the tables in appendix B present the minor occupational classes in combinations rather than individually.

16 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

Combining of Results

In order to present data for the 13 cities combined, it was necessary to make a choice between the following alternatives: (1) an aggregate of the samples drawn for each city, and (2) a weighted total with the weights for each city proportional to the total certified load in that city. The second of these plans was adopted. The process of summation required, as a first step, the adjustment of distributions based on city samples to a level representing the total certified load in each city. The probable errors in the components of the city distributions thus obtained are of appreciable magnitude in the

Table A—NUMBER OF CERTIFIED CASES ON APRIL 15, 1936, AND SAMPLING RATIOS
USED FOR STUDY OF CERTIFIED LOAD IN 13 CITIES

City	Total Certified Cases	Sample ^a	Cases Employed on Works Program			Cases Not Employed on Works Program		
			Total	Sampling Ratio	Number in Sample	Total	Sampling Ratio	Number in Sample
All Cities	314,582	6,333	191,600	—	3,420	122,982	—	2,913
Atlanta	14,883	451	8,481	1 in 33	257	6,402	1 in 33	194
Baltimore	20,573	500	12,576	1 in 48	262	7,997	1 in 34	238
Bridgeport	4,740	502	2,820	1 in 12	239	1,920	1 in 7	263
Butte	3,373	500	2,663	1 in 12	231	710	1 in 3	269
Chicago	122,653	508	79,724	1 in 243	328	42,929	1 in 238	180
Detroit	39,623	483	21,711	1 in 88	247	17,912	1 in 76	236
Houston	9,262	500	3,719	1 in 15	241	5,543	1 in 21	259
Manchester	5,131	487	3,731	1 in 13	287	1,400	1 in 7	200
Omaha	14,453	500	7,309	1 in 23	311	7,144	1 in 38	189
Paterson	6,734	494	2,761	1 in 12	236	3,973	1 in 15	258
St. Louis	32,202	451	21,251	1 in 79	269	10,951	1 in 60	182
San Francisco	30,429	442	18,504	1 in 72	258	11,925	1 in 65	184
Wilkes-Barre	10,526	515	6,350	1 in 25	254	4,176	1 in 16	261

^a Sampling ratio for total is not computed, since in all cities except Atlanta the total sample was a combination of two separately drawn sub-samples, each with its own sampling ratio.

case of larger cities like Chicago and Detroit. Consequently, it was decided not to present any of the absolute figures built up from the samples, because of the danger that such figures would be used without allowance for their probable errors. All the tables are presented in the form of percentage distributions rounded to the nearest percent; the probable errors of the percentages shown are relatively small. For many tables, the absolute figures upon which the percentages are based are given in table A; for most of the other tables, they may be obtained by referring to the first row of figures which shows the relationship of the column totals to the total certified load.

Representativeness of the Samples

Both internal and external evidence suggests that the sample drawn was reasonably satisfactory for the purposes for which it has been used. The substantial similarity in the results for

the several cities makes it possible to place considerable confidence in the general findings of the study. Additional confirmation of the validity of the conclusions has been obtained from time to time by checking the results for this group of cases against those for another group from the same cities which has been interviewed monthly by the Economic Trend Survey staffs of the Division of Social Research.

The representativeness of the samples drawn in the cities was also tested by comparing the sex and occupational distributions of the cases in the survey with those obtained through the complete Labor Inventory for the counties in which the 13 cities are located (table B). The sex distributions shown in

Table B—CLASS OF USUAL OCCUPATION OF ECONOMIC HEADS BY SEX,
IN 13-CITY SAMPLE AND IN LABOR INVENTORY
(Percent Distribution)

Class of Usual Occupation	Sample			Labor Inventory ^a		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
All economic heads	100	83	17	100	83	17
All occupations	100	100	100	100	100	100
Professional and technical workers	2	2	3	2	1	3
Proprietors, managers, and officials	3	4	2	2	3	1
Office workers	6	5	9	5	4	7
Sales and kindred workers	4	4	5	3	3	4
Skilled workers in building and construction	11	13	*	9	11	-
Other skilled workers	6	7	*	5	6	*
Semiskilled workers in building and construction	6	7	*	5	7	-
Other semiskilled workers	23	23	22	22	22	19
Unskilled laborers	18	21	*	16	19	1
Domestic and personal service workers	13	9	37	10	6	29
Farm operators	*	1	*	*	1	*
Farm laborers	1	1	*	1	1	*
No usual occupation	6	3	21	5	2	17
Unknown	*	*	1	15	14	18

* Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Labor Inventory, January 15, 1936, of economic heads in counties in which the 13 cities are located.

the survey and the inventory were exactly the same. Only slight differences appear in the proportions of the two groups in various occupational classes, and they are probably accounted for by the fact that the usual occupations of 15 percent of the economic heads were not reported in the Labor Inventory. Persons in occupations such as the skilled building trades and domestic service were relatively more numerous in the sample because it was drawn from cities, while the Labor Inventory used the county as a unit. That the effect of this difference in the area covered is less serious than might have been expected, however, is indicated by the fact that agricultural workers were an equal part of the relief load in both cities and counties.

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLES

Table 1—WORKS PROGRAM STATUS OF ALL CERTIFIED CASES AS OF APRIL 15, 1936
(Percent Distribution)

Works Program Status	Total	Atlanta	Balti- more	Bridge- port	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Man- chester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes- Barre
Total certified cases	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cases employed on Works Program	60	57	61	59	79	65	55	40	73	51	41	66	61	60
Cases not employed on Works Program	40	43	39	41	21	35	45	60	27	49	59	34	39	40
Member able to take assignment	15	13	10	4	4	18	13	10	10	14	24	11	18	18
No member able to take assignment	22	30	27	33	17	17	27	50	16	22	25	18	21	20
All certified members in private employment	11	16	10	16	14	9	13	42	5	10	11	13	8	11
1-worker cases	10	13	9	13	13	8	12	36	4	9	9	11	8	10
2 or more worker cases	1	3	1	3	1	1	1	6	1	1	2	2	*	1
One certified member in private employment others unable to take assignment	4	8	3	4	*	3	4	6	3	4	4	2	4	3
Physical disabilities	3	2	5	2	2	2	5	2	2	3	5	1	5	1
Other reasons ^a	4	4	9	11	*	3	5	-	6	5	5	2	4	5
Unknown	3	-	2	4	*	-	5	-	1	13	10	5	*	2

^a Less than 0.5 percent.

^b Eighty-nine percent of the cases in this category in Baltimore and ninety-two percent in Bridgeport were not registered at the United States Employment Office and were barred from Works Program assignment because of this fact.

22 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

Table 2a—RELIEF STATUS OF CERTIFIED CASES ACCORDING TO WORKS PROGRAM STATUS,
BY MONTHS IN 13 CITIES, SEPTEMBER 1935 THROUGH MARCH 1936
(Percent Distribution)

Month	All Cases	Cases With Works Program Employment			Cases Without Works Program Employment		
		Total	Relief	No Relief	Total	Relief	No Relief
1935							
September	100	7	6	1	93	80	13
October	100	19	16	3	81	70	11
November	100	56	44	12	44	32	12
December	100	66	34	32	34	21	13
1936							
January	100	68	11	57	32	18	14
February	100	69	9	60	31	17	14
March	100	69	6	63	31	15	16

Table 2b—RELIEF STATUS OF CERTIFIED CASES ACCORDING TO WORKS PROGRAM STATUS,
NOVEMBER 1935 AND MARCH 1936
(Percent Distribution)

City	Month	All Cases*	Cases With Works Program Employment			Cases Without Works Program Employment		
			Total	Relief	No Relief	Total	Relief	No Relief
Atlanta	November	100	54	19	35	45	4	41
	March	100	62	*	62	37	—	37
Baltimore	November	100	37	23	14	61	50	11
	March	100	62	1	61	36	22	14
Bridgeport	November	100	43	25	18	57	33	24
	March	100	63	5	58	37	13	24
Butte	November	100	51	49	2	49	32	17
	March	100	80	1	79	19	*	19
Chicago	November	100	64	54	10	36	29	7
	March	100	72	9	63	28	19	9
Detroit	November	100	52	31	21	47	34	13
	March	100	66	7	59	34	12	22
Houston	November	100	56	42	14	44	15	29
	March	100	62	1	61	38	2	36
Manchester	November	100	24	20	4	76	59	17
	March	100	78	18	60	22	15	7
Omaha	November	100	44	38	6	56	42	14
	March	100	69	2	67	31	8	23
Paterson	November	100	53	49	4	44	26	18
	March	100	55	8	47	42	23	19
St. Louis	November	100	63	58	5	36	30	6
	March	100	76	11	65	22	11	11
San Francisco	November	100	49	46	3	51	41	10
	March	100	72	2	70	28	14	14
Wilkes-Barre	November	100	51	38	13	49	31	18
	March	100	59	3	56	41	17	24

* Less than 0.5 percent.

* Includes cases for which relief status was unknown.

Table 3—NUMBER OF MONTHS ON RELIEF OF ALL CERTIFIED CASES IN 13 CITIES,
BETWEEN SEPTEMBER 1, 1935 AND APRIL 15, 1936
(Percent Distribution)

Months on Relief	Certified Cases
All certified cases	100
None	4
1 month	5
2 months	13
3 months	24
4 months	26
5 months	8
6 months	6
7 months and over	14
Unknown	*

* Less than 0.5 percent.

Table 4—MEANS OF SUPPORT OF ALL CERTIFIED CASES IN 13 CITIES, BETWEEN
SEPTEMBER 1, 1935 AND APRIL 15, 1936
(Percent Distribution)

Means of Support	Certified Cases
All certified cases	100
Cases which supported themselves continuously	2
Cases which supported themselves at some time	29
Cases with continuous relief and Works Program income ^a	60
Cases with continuous relief only	8
Cases with continuous Works Program income only	*
Unknown	1

* Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Cases receiving both types of income throughout the period but not concurrently, and cases receiving both types concurrently.

Table 5—SUCCESS OF ASSIGNMENTS TO WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT
(Percent Distribution)

Success of Assignment	Total	Atlanta	Baltimore	Bridgeport	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Manchester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes-Barre
All assignments	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Successful	84	72	93	93	97	77	94	91	97	87	88	88	81	95
Unsuccessful	16	28	7	7	3	23	6	9	3	13	12	12	19	5
Because of private employment	4	6	1	3	1	7	1	4	1	3	2	5	1	4
Because of disability	4	7	4	1	1	5	1	1	1	3	2	2	6	*
Because of other reasons	8	15	2	3	1	11	4	4	1	7	8	5	12	1

* Less than 0.5 percent.

Table 6—ASSIGNMENT AND WORK EXPERIENCE OF CERTIFIED LOAD
(Percent Distribution)

Assignment and Work Experience	Total	Atlanta	Baltimore	Bridgeport	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Manchester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes-Barre
All certified cases	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
No assignment made	16	18	35	28	17	9	15	13	16	21	29	13	12	32
Assignment made but case never employed on Works Program	7	11	2	4	1	11	1	9	3	3	6	6	6	5
Case formerly employed on Works Program but not as of April 15, 1936	16	14	2	6	3	15	25	38	7	18	19	11	21	2
Case employed on Works Program as of April 15, 1936	60	57	61	60	79	65	55	40	73	51	41	66	61	60
Status unknown	1	—	—	2	—	—	4	—	1	7	5	4	*	1

* Less than 0.5 percent.

Table 7—SUPERVISING AGENCY OF CASES EMPLOYED ON WORKS PROGRAM ON APRIL 15, 1936
(Percent Distribution)

Supervising Agency	Total	Atlanta	Balti- more	Bridge- port	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Man- chester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes- Barre
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cases with 1 member employed on Works Program	95	96	92	96	97	94	94	92	94	93	91	96	99	95
WP exclusive of CCC and NYA	92	89	90	94	93	91	92	90	93	91	87	95	98	91
CCC	1	2	1	-	1	1	*	1	1	-	2	-	*	3
NYA	2	5	1	2	3	2	2	1	*	2	2	1	*	1
Cases with 2 members employed on Works Program	4	4	6	3	3	5	4	7	5	5	5	4	1	5
2 in CCC and/or NYA	*	*	-	-	-	*	-	-	*	*	1	-	-	-
1 CCC and 1 other WP	1	-	-	-	-	1	2	*	1	1	2	1	*	2
1 NYA and 1 other WP	3	3	6	3	2	4	2	6	3	3	1	2	*	3
Combinations exclusive of CCC	*	*	-	-	1	-	-	*	*	-	1	1	-	-
Cases with more than 2 members employed on Works Program	*	*	1	1	-	*	-	1	1	1	*	-	-	-
Unknown	1	-	1	-	*	1	2	-	-	1	4	-	-	-

*Less than 0.5 percent.

26 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

Table 8—MEDIAN LENGTH OF TIME EMPLOYED ON WORKS PROGRAM AND AVERAGE PERIOD PER JOB, CLASSIFIED BY NUMBER OF JOBS HELD, FOR ALL CASES HAVING HAD WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT IN 13 CITIES

Number of Jobs	Percent of Cases	Median Length of Time on Works Program (weeks)	Average Period per Works Program Job (weeks)
Total	100	20.8	10.3 ^a
1 job	49	20.5	20.5
2 jobs	30	20.8	10.4
3 jobs	13	21.3	7.1
4 jobs	5	22.5	5.6
5 jobs	2	21.7	4.3
6 jobs	1	21.9	3.7
7 jobs	#	19.1	2.7
8 or more jobs	#	22.1	b

^a Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Total man-weeks worked divided by total number of jobs held.

^b Indeterminate.

Table 9—NUMBER OF WEEKS WITHOUT WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT SINCE FIRST SUCCESSFUL ASSIGNMENT OF ALL CASES
(Percent Distribution)

Weeks Without Works Program Employment Since First Assignment	Total	Atlanta	Balti- more	Bridge- port	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Man- chester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes- Barre
All cases	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
No weeks	67	69	77	64	72	75	59	46	84	57	55	77	48	67
1 week	7	4	8	17	11	4	5	8	6	7	8	4	18	17
2 weeks	4	5	5	7	6	2	6	4	2	6	4	5	5	5
3 weeks	4	2	4	3	4	3	4	8	1	7	7	4	5	2
4 weeks	2	#	1	1	2	2	2	6	1	5	7	2	4	1
5- 8 weeks	6	9	2	3	3	5	5	13	3	9	13	4	10	3
9-12 weeks	3	3	2	1	1	2	4	9	2	3	3	2	6	3
13-16 weeks	2	3	1	3	1	3	3	3	1	3	#	#	3	1
17-20 weeks	2	1	-	1	#	2	4	3	-	2	2	#	1	#
21-24 weeks	2	2	#	#	#	2	5	-	-	1	#	#	#	#
25 weeks and over	1	2	-	-	-	#	3	-	#	-	-	#	-	#
Average number of weeks lost ^a	2.3	2.7	0.8	1.4	0.9	2.1	4.1	3.4	0.7	2.4	2.4	1.1	2.5	1.2

Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Average is the arithmetic mean.

Table 10—NUMBER OF WEEKS WITHOUT WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT SINCE FIRST SUCCESSFUL ASSIGNMENT OF CASES EMPLOYED ON
THE PROGRAM AS OF APRIL 15, 1936
(Percent Distribution)

Weeks Without Works Program Employment Since First Assignment	Total	Atlanta	Balti- more	Bridge- port	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Man- chester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes- Barre
All cases	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
No weeks	85	86	79	71	75	90	89	86	92	81	83	92	63	70
1 week	7	3	8	16	11	3	5	10	5	8	9	3	20	17
2 weeks	2	3	5	7	7	2	■	2	1	2	1	1	6	5
3 weeks	1	1	3	2	4	1	2	1	-	3	1	1	3	2
4 weeks	1	-	1	1	1	1	■	-	■	1	2	1	4	1
5-8 weeks	2	5	3	3	2	2	1	-	2	3	2	2	3	2
9-12 weeks	1	■	1	-	■	1	1	1	-	1	-	■	1	2
13-16 weeks	■	1	-	■	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1
17-20 weeks	■	■	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	■
21-24 weeks	■	-	■	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25 weeks and over	-	-	-	-	-	■	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

■ Less than 0.5 percent.

Table 11—CLASS OF ASSIGNED OCCUPATION ON LATEST WORKS PROGRAM JOB OF CERTIFIED WORKERS,
BY CLASS OF USUAL OCCUPATION, IN 13 CITIES^a
(Percent Distribution)

Class of Usual Occupation	Distribution by Class of Usual Occupation	Distribution by Class of Assigned Occupation									
		Total	Professional	Office Workers	Skilled in Building	Other Skilled	Semiskilled in Building	Other Semiskilled	Unskilled	Domestic	Miscel- laneous ^b
All occupations ^c	100	100	4	9	6	1	2	13	64	1	*
Professional and technical workers	3	100	54	11	1	1	—	7	23	3	—
Proprietors, managers, and officials	4	100	5	18	7	2	1	12	55	—	*
Office workers	6	100	6	49	4	—	1	9	29	1	1
Sales and kindred workers	4	100	8	27	2	5	*	13	40	5	*
Skilled workers in building and construction	11	100	3	3	34	*	3	4	53	*	—
Other skilled workers	5	100	1	7	7	7	3	3	72	*	*
Semiskilled workers in building and construction	7	100	2	1	3	*	8	1	84	1	—
Other semiskilled workers	21	100	1	4	3	*	1	20	70	1	*
Unskilled laborers	19	100	*	1	2	—	1	3	93	*	*
Domestic and personal service workers	12	100	*	3	1	1	*	32	59	4	—
No usual occupation	8	100	4	22	1	1	1	31	38	2	—

* Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Percentages of persons working on Program in same class of occupation as their usual are in *italics*.

^b Includes salesmen, managers, and farm operators.

^c Includes workers whose usual occupation was unknown. Farm operators are combined with proprietors, farm laborers with unskilled laborers.

Table 12—PERCENT OF PERSONS EMPLOYED ON LATEST JOB ON WORKS PROGRAM IN SAME SKILL CLASS OF OCCUPATION AS THEIR USUAL, BY TYPE OF PROJECT, IN 13 CITIES

Skill Class of Usual Occupation	Type of Works Program Project											
	All Projects	Highway, Road, and Street	Public Building	Recreation Facilities	Conservation	Utilities, Sewers, and Water Works	Transportation Facilities	Educational, Professional, Etc.	Goods	Sanitation and Health	Distribution of Surplus Commodities	Project Not Elsewhere Classified and Unknown
All classes	46	41	57	38	51	52	42	73	39	20	63	43
White collar	44	13	8	31	24	16	13	93	4	†	95	45
Skilled	27	11	69	15	9	30	11	11	17	—	†	31
Semiskilled	18	5	10	22	17	9	3	21	98	†	—	2
Unskilled	83	96	92	85	98	98	97	61	2	—	†	89

† fewer than 100 workers.

Table 13—PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT AND WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF ALL CERTIFIED CASES ON APRIL 15, 1936
(Percent Distribution)

Employment Status of Case	Total	Atlanta	Balti- more	Bridge- port	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Man- chester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes- Barre
All cases	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Employed on Works Program	60	57	61	59	79	65	55	40	73	51	41	66	61	60
No member in private employment	53	44	55	51	76	57	49	36	61	44	34	53	57	55
One member in private employment	6	12	5	7	3	7	4	4	9	6	4	9	4	5
More than one in private employment	1	1	1	1	—	1	2	*	3	1	*	1	*	*
Unknown	*	—	—	—	—	*	—	—	*	—	3	3	—	—
Not employed on Works Program	40	43	39	41	21	35	45	60	27	49	59	34	39	40
No member in private employment	19	14	20	15	5	20	20	8	15	20	30	12	26	21
One member in private employment	16	26	14	18	15	13	17	45	9	15	16	15	12	15
More than one in private employment	2	3	3	4	1	2	3	7	2	1	3	2	1	2
Unknown	3	—	2	4	*	*	5	—	1	13	10	5	*	2

* Less than 0.5 percent.

Table 14—CLASS OF USUAL OCCUPATION OF ALL ECONOMIC HEADS AS OF APRIL 15, 1936,
AND OF ECONOMIC HEADS WITH PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT IN MARCH
1936 IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Class of Usual Occupation	All Economic Heads	Economic Heads With Private Employment
All economic heads	100	20
All occupations	100	100
Professional and technical workers	2	3
Proprietors, managers, and officials ^a	4	3
Office workers	6	6
Sales and kindred workers	4	3
Skilled workers in building and construction	11	11
Other skilled workers	6	6
Semiskilled workers in building and construction	6	8
Other semiskilled workers	23	26
Unskilled laborers ^b	18	17
Domestic and personal service workers	14	16
No usual occupation	6	■
Unknown	■	1

■ Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Includes farm operators.

^b Includes farm laborers.

Table 15—CLASS OF OCCUPATION IN PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT DURING MARCH 1936 OF ECONOMIC HEADS,
BY CLASS OF USUAL OCCUPATION IN 13 CITIES^a
(Percent Distribution)

Class of Usual Occupation	Class of Occupation in Private Employment												
	Total	Profes- sional	Proprie- tors, etc.	Office Workers	Sales and Kindred	Skilled in Building	Other Skilled	Semiskilled in Building	Other Semiskilled	Unskilled	Domestic	Farm	Unknown
All occupations ^b	100	2	3	5	4	9	4	4	22	18	13	*	16
Professional and technical workers	100	54	2	4	1	1	14	-	*	-	-	-	24
Proprietors, managers, and officials	100	-	53	*	9	1	*	1	4	17	1	3	10
Office workers	100	-	-	46	9	2	-	-	10	9	5	-	19
Sales and kindred workers	100	2	3	3	41	-	-	1	20	5	4	-	21
Skilled workers in building and construction	100	-	1	-	-	64	3	1	9	10	2	-	10
Other skilled workers	100	-	1	*	11	5	43	3	14	11	3	1	8
Semiskilled workers in building and construction	100	-	3	4	-	12	1	36	8	13	4	-	19
Other semiskilled workers	100	-	2	1	2	2	2	2	62	10	4	*	13
Unskilled laborers	100	-	1	1	2	1	2	1	11	61	6	*	14
Domestic and personal service workers	100	-	1	2	2	-	*	1	5	9	61	-	19
No usual occupation	100	-	-	8	-	-	-	-	1	38	20	-	33

* Less than 0.5 percent.

^aPercentages of persons working in private employment in same class of occupation as their usual are in italics.

^bIncludes workers whose usual occupation was unknown. Farm operators are combined with proprietors, farm laborers with unskilled laborers.

Table 16—CLASS OF USUAL OCCUPATION OF ECONOMIC HEADS BY WORKS PROGRAM STATUS
AS OF APRIL 15, 1936, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Class of Usual Occupation	Total	Employed on Works Program	Not Employed on Works Program		
			Able To Take Assignment	Unable To Take Assignment	Unknown
All economic heads	100	57	15	26	2
All occupations	100	100	100	100	100
Professional and technical workers	2	3	2	2	2
Proprietors, managers, and officials ^a	4	4	3	3	3
Office workers	6	7	3	4	8
Sales and kindred workers	4	4	4	5	2
Skilled workers in building and construction	11	11	13	11	9
Other skilled workers	6	5	4	7	3
Semiskilled workers in building and construction	6	7	4	6	8
Other semiskilled workers	23	21	27	23	20
Unskilled laborers ^b	18	20	16	16	18
Domestic and personal service workers	14	12	14	17	19
No usual occupation	6	6	10	6	1
Unknown	*	*	-	*	7

* Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Includes farm operators.

^b Includes farm laborers.

Table 17—AGE OF ECONOMIC HEADS OF ALL CERTIFIED CASES BY WORKS PROGRAM STATUS
AS OF APRIL 15, 1936, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Age Interval	Total	Employed on Works Program	Not Employed on Works Program		
			Able To Take Assignment	Unable To Take Assignment	Unknown
All economic heads	100	57	15	26	2
All ages	100	100	100	100	100
16-17 years	1	1	1	2	*
18-24 years	11	10	16	11	14
25-34 years	22	22	21	22	25
35-44 years	28	28	24	31	27
45-54 years	24	26	21	20	19
55-59 years	7	7	9	6	7
60-64 years	4	4	3	4	4
65 years and over	3	2	5	4	2
Unknown	*	*	*	*	2
Median Age	40.1	40.8	39.4	39.1	38.2

* Less than 0.5 percent.

34 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

Table 18a—SEX OF ECONOMIC HEADS OF ALL CERTIFIED CASES BY WORKS PROGRAM
STATUS AS OF APRIL 15, 1936, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Sex	Total	Employed on Works Program	Not Employed on Works Program		
			Able To Take Assignment	Unable To Take Assignment	Unknown
Total	100	100	100	100	100
Male	83	86	75	81	83
Female	17	14	25	19	17

Table 18b—SEX OF ECONOMIC HEADS OF ALL CERTIFIED CASES, BY WORKS PROGRAM
STATUS AS OF APRIL 15, 1936
(Percent Distribution)

City	Total		Employed On Works Program		Not Employed on Works Program					
					Able To Take Assignment		Unable To Take Assignment		Unknown	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Atlanta	63	37	68	32	58	42	56	44	—	—
Baltimore	78	22	84	16	68	32	70	30	86	14
Bridgeport	84	16	96	4	78	22	67	33	76	24
Butte	78	22	75	25	77	23	90	10	74	26
Chicago	91	9	98	2	74	26	83	17	—	—
Detroit	88	12	90	10	72	28	88	12	92	8
Houston	79	21	56	44	84	16	94	6	—	—
Manchester	78	22	78	22	80	20	77	23	63	37
Omaha	81	19	87	13	68	32	80	20	75	25
Paterson	87	13	81	19	95	5	86	14	93	7
St. Louis	70	30	69	31	57	43	75	25	75	25
San Francisco	77	23	70	30	89	11	84	16	100	—
Wilkes-Barre	95	5	99	1	90	10	89	11	100	—

Table 19—NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE ENDING OF LAST JOB OF 4 WEEKS OR MORE AT USUAL OCCUPATION^a OF ECONOMIC HEADS,
BY CLASS OF USUAL OCCUPATION, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Class of Usual Occupation	Total	Employed at Date of Interview	Number of Months Since Last Job at Usual Occupation										Median Duration of Unemployment ^c
			1-12 Months	13-24 Months	25-36 Months	37-48 Months	49-60 Months	61-72 Months	73-84 Months	85-96 Months	97 Months and Over	Unknown	
All occupations ^b	100	8	13	13	10	8	9	8	5	2	2	22	35.4
Professional and technical workers	100	3	9	16	11	8	12	9	4	1	2	25	37.7
Proprietors, managers, and officials	100	9	9	8	14	11	11	8	1	2	3	24	39.8
Office workers	100	5	10	11	12	8	9	14	4	5	2	20	44.0
Sales and kindred workers	100	5	8	14	13	9	8	7	5	2	4	25	36.6
Skilled workers in building and construction	100	8	14	11	10	6	9	10	8	1	2	21	38.5
Other skilled workers	100	8	11	14	11	10	5	8	6	3	1	23	35.6
Semiskilled workers in building and construction	100	7	12	11	12	5	14	10	7	1	1	20	40.2
Other semiskilled workers	100	10	18	11	10	8	8	6	5	2	2	20	32.5
Unskilled laborers	100	6	12	15	8	8	9	9	7	2	1	23	38.2
Domestic and personal service workers	100	9	16	14	11	8	8	5	2	3	1	23	29.2

^aUsual occupation is defined as that at which a person has worked the greatest length of time during the last 10 years. He may have been unemployed at this occupation since 1929 but still have had fairly continuous employment in other occupations.

^bIncludes workers whose usual occupation was unknown. Farm operators are combined with proprietors, farm laborers with unskilled workers.

^cMedians calculated on cases for which duration of unemployment was reported. Cases employed at date of interview were excluded in calculation of median.

36 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

Table 20a—NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE ENDING OF LAST JOB^a AT USUAL OCCUPATION
OF ECONOMIC HEADS BY WORKS PROGRAM STATUS AS OF
APRIL 15, 1936, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Number of Months Since Last Job at Usual Occupation	Total	Employed on Works Program	Not Employed on Works Program				
			Able To Accept Assignment	Unable To Accept Assignment			
				Private Employment	Physical Disability	Other Reasons	Unknown
All economic heads	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
No months ^b	8	•	1	40	4	6	28
1-12 months	13	12	20	13	12	23	1
13-24 months	13	13	16	10	9	12	•
25-36 months	10	12	12	8	9	9	-
37-48 months	8	9	8	3	13	8	-
49-60 months	9	11	8	4	7	10	•
61-72 months	8	10	6	5	13	3	•
73-84 months	5	7	5	1	6	1	-
85-96 months	2	2	2	1	6	2	-
97 months and over	2	2	3	1	6	4	-
Unknown	22	22	19	14	15	22	70
Median duration of unemployment ^c	35.4	40.6	29.2	25.4	46.6	26.3	11.5

^a Less than 0.5 percent.

^b Last job of 4 weeks or more.

^c Employed at usual occupation on date of interview.

^d Persons working at their usual occupation on date of interview are excluded in calculating the medians.

Table 20b—NUMBER OF MONTHS SINCE ENDING OF LAST JOB OF 4 WEEKS OR MORE AT USUAL OCCUPATION OF ECONOMIC HEADS
(Percent Distribution)

Cities	Total	Employed at Date of Interview	Number of Months Since Last Job at Usual Occupation										No Usual Occupation	Median Duration of Unemployment ^a
			1-12 Months	13-24 Months	25-36 Months	37-48 Months	49-60 Months	61-72 Months	73-84 Months	85-96 Months	97 Months and Over	Unknown		
Atlanta	100	10	13	24	16	9	4	2	3	1	1	10	7	24.9
Baltimore	100	9	10	14	12	12	7	5	3	2	1	19	6	33.1
Bridgeport	100	16	11	6	7	2	3	3	2	1	*	45	4	28.6
Butte	100	11	7	11	7	11	12	6	8	2	2	11	12	45.4
Chicago	100	5	8	11	11	9	11	12	8	2	2	15	6	47.9
Detroit	100	7	19	11	6	5	9	7	4	2	*	21	9	28.7
Houston	100	9	18	18	14	7	8	6	4	1	1	10	4	28.1
Manchester	100	6	51	12	5	1	2	1	1	*	1	15	5	9.7
Omaha	100	8	14	15	8	6	3	2	2	1	*	35	6	22.9
Paterson	100	12	19	11	6	3	2	2	2	1	*	39	3	17.8
St. Louis	100	11	12	6	7	5	4	3	2	2	1	42	5	28.6
San Francisco	100	3	12	14	13	8	11	10	6	4	3	10	6	39.4
Wilkes-Barre	100	12	18	9	3	4	5	3	2	*	2	38	4	20.3

* Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Medians calculated on totals reporting both usual occupation and duration of unemployment.
Cases currently employed were excluded in calculation of medians.

38 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

Table 21—AVAILABILITY OF ADDITIONAL ASSIGNABLE MEMBER IN CASES EMPLOYED ON THE WORKS PROGRAM, BY SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Size of Household	Total	No Additional Member Able To Accept Assignment	Additional Member Able To Accept Assignment		Unknown
			Male	Female	
Total	100	83	9	8	*
1-person	100	100	—	—	—
2-person	100	89	1	10	*
3- to 4-person	100	81	9	9	1
5- to 7-person	100	73	17	10	*
8-person and over	100	51	38	10	1

* Less than 0.5 percent.

Table 22—CLASS OF USUAL OCCUPATION, SEX, AND AGE, OF CERTIFIED MEMBERS ABLE TO ACCEPT ASSIGNMENT IN CASES WITH NO MEMBER EMPLOYED ON THE WORKS PROGRAM AND WITH NO ECONOMIC HEAD ABLE TO ACCEPT ASSIGNMENT, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

A. Class of Usual Occupation	Other Certified Members Able To Accept Assignment
Percent of total certified load	2
All occupations	100
Professional and technical workers	—
Proprietors, managers, and officials	—
Office workers	1
Sales and kindred workers	10
Skilled workers in building and construction	1
Other skilled workers	*
Semiskilled workers in building and construction	*
Other semiskilled workers	26
Unskilled laborers	9
Domestic and personal service workers	28
No usual occupation	25
B. Sex and Age	
Total	100
Male	50
Female	50
All ages	100
16-17 years	6
18-24 years	43
25-34 years	22
35-44 years	17
45-54 years	3
55-59 years	1
60-64 years	1
65 years and over	7
Median age	24.6

* Less than 0.5 percent.

Table 23a—SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD OF ALL CERTIFIED CASES BY WORKS PROGRAM STATUS,
IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Size of Household	Total	Member Employed on Works Program	No Member Employed on Works Program					
			Able To Accept Assign- ment	Unable to Accept Assignment				
				All Certi- fied Mem- bers in Private Employment	One but Not All Certi- fied Members in Private Employment	Physical Dis- ability	Other Reasons	Unknown
All certified cases	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
1-person	18	17	22	14	—	38	16	33
2-person	21	23	18	14	18	16	27	18
3- to 4-person	34	34	33	38	36	21	31	30
5- to 7-person	23	22	23	29	39	21	22	13
8-person and over	4	4	4	5	7	4	4	4
Unknown	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Median size of household ^a	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.7	4.3	2.3	2.8	2.4

^a Less than 0.5 percent.

^b For the purpose of calculating medians, actual figures on household size were assumed to lie at the mid-points of class intervals. Thus, a 3-person household was taken as the central point of an interval extending from 2.5 to 3.5 persons.

Table 23b—SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD OF ALL CERTIFIED CASES
(Percent Distribution)

City	All Households	Size of Household				
		1- person	2- person	3- to 4- person	5- to 7- person	8-person and over
Atlanta	100	13	25	35	24	3
Baltimore	100	13	17	34	28	8
Bridgeport	100	8	24	33	28	7
Butte	100	43	23	23	9	2
Chicago	100	17	18	36	24	5
Detroit	100	9	24	36	26	5
Houston	100	14	17	37	27	5
Manchester	100	18	16	35	24	7
Omaha ^a	100	18	22	36	20	3
Paterson	100	21	20	33	21	5
St. Louis	100	14	27	34	21	4
San Francisco	100	48	25	18	8	1
Wilkes-Barre	100	7	8	39	36	10

^a For 1 percent, size of household is unknown.

Table 24—WORKS PROGRAM INCOME IN MARCH^a
(Percent Distribution)

Income Interval	Total	Atlanta	Balti- more	Bridge- port	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Man- chester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes- Barre
Percent of certified cases with March WP income	69	62	64	63	80	71	67	62	78	68	58	77	72	60
Total with WP income	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
\$ 1- \$ 4	#	1	#	-	-	1	-	1	#	#	1	-	-	-
5- 9	1	3	-	-	-	2	1	5	#	3	2	1	1	1
10- 14	1	4	-	1	-	1	1	2	#	2	1	#	5	1
15- 19	2	6	1	2	1	1	#	6	1	4	1	#	1	1
20- 24	2	8	-	1	#	1	2	1	1	1	3	1	1	-
25- 29	2	11	1	1	1	1	1	9	1	3	2	1	2	-
30- 34	4	32	1	1	#	3	1	2	1	3	4	2	2	3
35- 39	3	1	1	1	-	1	1	54	2	3	3	3	3	1
40- 44	3	2	1	7	-	3	1	1	1	4	3	3	3	-
45- 49	9	14	55	2	64	6	2	1	2	5	2	4	7	#
50- 54	9	1	6	24	1	10	2	13	81	10	2	8	11	#
55- 59	30	#	1	13	22	48	3	#	-	36	1	53	19	-
60- 64	13	-	5	18	#	3	56	1	2	2	48	1	16	76
65- 69	7	3	4	4	2	7	10	3	2	9	1	12	7	1
70- 74	1	#	2	5	5	1	1	-	1	2	2	#	#	5
75- 79	1	3	11	3	1	1	1	1	3	#	1	-	#	#
80- 84	1	2	2	2	-	1	1	-	1	1	1	-	1	1
85- 89	6	#	3	2	-	6	12	#	#	6	3	3	15	6
90- 94	2	1	#	6	-	2	3	-	-	3	4	3	4	2
95- 99	#	#	#	2	-	#	-	-	-	#	-	-	-	1
100 and over	2	7	2	4	2	1	1	-	#	1	2	2	1	1
Unknown	1	-	3	1	#	#	#	-	-	1	13	2	#	-
Median income	\$57.40	\$32.70	\$48.80	\$58.60	\$48.70	\$57.10	\$63.10	\$37.30	\$52.50	\$56.70	\$61.90	\$57.40	\$58.60	\$62.80
Minimum security wage for unskilled labor	-	33.00	49.50	60.50	48.00	55.00	60.00	35.00	52.00	55.00	60.50	55.00	60.00	60.50

^a Less than 0.5 percent.^b Works Program income was also tabulated by size of family but showed no tendency to increase with family size.

Table 25a—GENERAL RELIEF GRANTS OF CERTIFIED CASES IN MARCH 1936,
BY SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Size of Grants	Total ^a	Size of Household							
		1- person	2- person	3- person	4- person	5- person	6- person	7- person	8-person and over
Percent of certified cases with general relief grants in March	21	15	19	19	19	25	26	28	46
Total with general relief grants	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
\$ 1-\$ 4	6	6	5	2	9	8	5	10	6
5- 9	10	14	13	9	10	4	10	7	13
10- 14	8	17	11	5	5	9	3	8	8
15- 19	14	37	24	9	7	2	13	4	5
20- 24	11	13	15	11	13	5	9	6	13
25- 29	9	5	11	7	16	12	10	5	3
30- 34	9	5	8	17	5	13	8	4	3
35- 39	7	2	5	14	4	9	5	6	5
40- 44	7	*	3	9	10	14	10	3	5
45- 49	6	*	3	6	9	10	9	6	7
50 and over	12	*	*	8	12	14	18	40	32
Unknown	1	*	2	3	*	*	-	1	-
Median income	\$24.90	\$16.80	\$19.10	\$31.70	\$26.90	\$33.80	\$30.50	\$40.70	\$32.40

* Less than 0.5 percent.

^aTotal includes households of unknown size.

Table 25b—MARCH RELIEF GRANTS OF CERTIFIED CASES
(Percent Distribution)

Size of Grants	Atlanta	Baltimore	Bridge- port	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Manchester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes- Barre
Percent of certified cases with relief grants in March	1	23	18	2	28	19	3	33	11	31	22	17	20
Total with general relief grants	†	100	100	†	100	100	†	100	100	100	100	100	100
\$ 1-\$ 4		-	5		8	8		8	2	4	3	6	1
5- 9		4	7		11	10		13	26	11	15	4	3
10- 14		4	11		7	11		21	2	11	14	4	8
15- 19		8	19		13	4		14	16	13	15	38	10
20- 24		12	12		11	12		10	12	15	12	6	9
25- 29		9	12		10	6		11	12	4	12	6	9
30- 34		19	8		8	6		9	5	6	7	5	15
35- 39		7	8		5	6		6	3	13	10	9	11
40- 44		11	5		8	7		2	5	5	3	6	5
45- 49		6	4		7	9		2	3	4	4	3	9
50 and over		20	8		11	21		4	10	13	5	12	20
Unknown		-	1		1	-		•	4	1	-	1	-
Median Income		\$33.50	\$23.10		\$24.70	\$29.70		\$17.80	\$20.10	\$23.70	\$21.30	\$19.70	\$33.00

* Less than 0.5 percent.

† Base too small for calculations.

Table 26—TOTAL MARCH INCOME OF CERTIFIED CASES, BY SOURCE OF INCOME, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Income Interval	Total ^a	Works Program Only	Works Program and Private Employment	Works Program and Relief	Works Program and Other Combinations	Private Employment Only	Private Employment and Relief	Private and Other Combinations Except Works Program	Relief Only	Relief and Other Except Works Program and Private Employment	Other Income Only
All Certified Cases	100	52	8	5	4	11	3	3	10	1	1
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
None	2										
\$ 1- \$ 4	*	*	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	-	-
5- 9	1	*	-	-	-	2	*	*	5	1	1
10- 14	2	1	*	-	1	2	*	4	5	8	16
15- 19	3	1	*	1	*	2	4	3	15	11	13
20- 24	2	1	1	*	1	3	2	2	9	3	27
25- 29	3	1	3	*	*	3	9	2	10	*	7
30- 34	4	3	1	2	*	3	5	1	11	13	10
35- 39	3	3	2	2	*	4	6	1	8	10	1
40- 44	3	3	3	2	*	5	10	3	6	6	1
45- 49	7	11	2	4	1	4	7	1	10	3	2
50- 54	7	8	3	8	4	6	7	1	4	19	-
55- 59	18	30	5	13	5	3	7	1	5	10	1
60- 64	11	14	13	18	10	5	5	1	4	-	1
65- 69	7	8	5	12	14	7	5	*	2	*	3
70- 74	3	1	5	10	6	6	6	5	2	3	*
75- 79	3	2	6	6	9	5	4	1	1	9	*
80- 84	2	1	5	3	8	3	2	-	*	-	-
85- 89	5	7	7	4	4	5	4	-	*	-	*
90- 94	2	3	2	3	4	2	5	1	*	-	1
95- 99	1	*	4	2	*	3	2	-	*	3	-
100 and over	7	2	31	6	11	24	9	3	1	-	-
Unknown	4	*	1	3	20	2	1	69	-	*	15
Median Income	\$58.30	\$58.10	\$79.50	\$64.30	\$71.90	\$68.30	\$54.76	\$41.83	\$32.20	\$43.20	\$22.20

* Less than 0.5 percent.

^aCases with no income and with source of income unknown are included in total column.

44 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

Table 27—MEDIAN INCOME FROM PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT OF CASES WITH AND WITHOUT WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT IN MARCH 1936

City	Cases With Works Program Employment	Cases Without Works Program Employment	Unskilled Security Wage Rate
Atlanta	\$13.50	\$28.20	\$33.00
Baltimore	44.20	50.30	49.50
Bridgeport	42.90	73.60	60.50
Butte	34.20	114.80	48.00
Chicago	30.60	60.60	55.00
Detroit	35.00	99.20	60.00
Houston	14.70	45.70	35.00
Manchester	35.00	47.50	52.00
Omaha	26.30	53.40	55.00
Paterson	40.00	60.80	60.50
St. Louis	18.50	49.20	55.00
San Francisco	30.00	71.70	60.00
Wilkes-Barre	29.40	48.10	60.50

Table 28—PRIVATE EARNINGS OF CASES WITH AND WITHOUT WORKS PROGRAM EMPLOYMENT IN MARCH 1936
(Percent Distribution)

Private Earnings in March	Atlanta	Baltimore	Bridge- port	Butte	Chicago	Detroit	Houston	Manchester	Omaha	Paterson	St. Louis	San Francisco	Wilkes- Barre
<i>Cases With Works Program Employment</i>													
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cases with no private earnings	77	89	84	94	87	87	74	82	81	90	76	92	90
Cases with private earnings	23	11	16	6	13	13	26	18	19	10	24	8	10
Above security wage	4	5	5	3	3	4	5	6	3	2	2	3	2
Below security wage	19	6	11	3	10	9	21	12	16	8	22	5	8
<i>Cases Without Works Program Employment</i>													
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Cases with no private earnings	22	52	35	15	54	33	2	51	34	38	29	57	47
Cases with private earnings	78	48	65	85	46	67	98	49	66	62	71	43	53
Above security wage	31	21	36	77	24	38	67	17	17	16	24	24	18
Below security wage	47	27	29	8	22	29	31	32	49	46	47	19	35

46 SURVEY OF CASES CERTIFIED FOR WORKS PROGRAM

Table 29—TOTAL MARCH INCOMES OF CERTIFIED CASES, BY SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD, IN 13 CITIES
(Percent Distribution)

Income Interval	Total ^a	Size of Household							
		1- person	2- person	3- person	4- person	5- person	6- person	7- person	8-person and over
All certified cases	100	18	21	18	16	11	7	5	4
None	100	46	16	9	6	13	3	5	2
\$ 1-\$ 4	100	39	10	8	2	41	—	—	—
5- 9	100	39	35	6	11	3	1	4	1
10- 14	100	51	29	11	6	2	1	—	—
15- 19	100	46	29	12	4	4	2	1	2
20- 24	100	25	28	15	13	10	5	3	1
25- 29	100	15	29	20	15	7	10	2	2
30- 34	100	21	20	25	15	9	6	2	2
35- 39	100	17	28	23	9	12	3	3	5
40- 44	100	11	20	21	22	12	6	3	5
45- 49	100	26	19	17	14	11	7	3	3
50- 54	100	21	25	18	16	10	5	1	4
55- 59	100	20	26	18	18	9	5	2	2
60- 64	100	12	22	20	16	11	10	6	3
65- 69	100	13	14	24	18	15	4	6	6
70- 74	100	6	12	15	12	8	22	13	12
75- 79	100	8	11	12	20	20	10	9	10
80- 84	100	9	11	18	10	5	22	10	15
85- 89	100	14	24	19	18	14	5	1	5
90- 94	100	14	15	13	16	15	8	7	12
95- 99	100	2	9	14	10	25	17	16	7
100 and Over	100	2	10	18	17	21	13	8	11
Unknown	100	25	22	19	14	8	4	3	2
Median income	\$58.30	\$52.40	\$56.40	\$58.60	\$59.00	\$62.00	\$63.60	\$66.70	\$71.00

^a Less than 0.5 percent.

^a Total includes cases with size of household unknown.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1957

UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA



3 1951 D03 772 120 S