# 1541

S. HRG. 101-151, PT. 39

**EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT** 

# HEARINGS

# BEFORE THE

# JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

# ONE HUNDRED FIRST CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

# **PART 39**

OCTOBER 5, NOVEMBER 2, AND DECEMBER 7, 1990

Printed for the use of the Joint Economic Committee



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE WASHINGTON : 1991

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

40-563

# JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE

(Created pursuant to sec. 5(a) of Public Law 304, 79th Cong.)

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

LEE H. HAMILTON, Indiana,

DAVID R. OBEY, Wisconsin

OLYMPIA J. SNOWE, Maine

JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York

HAMILTON FISH, JR., New York

FREDERICK S. UPTON, Michigan

FORTNEY PETE STARK, California STEPHEN J. SOLARZ, New York CHALMERS P. WYLIE, Ohio

AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, California

Chairman

PAUL S. SARBANES, Maryland, Vice Chairman LLOYD BENTSEN, Texas EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Massachusetts JEFF BINGAMAN, New Mexico ALBERT GORE, Jr., Tennessee RICHARD H. BRYAN, Nevada WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., Delaware STEVE SYMMS, Idaho PETE WILSON, California CONNIE MACK, Florida

SENATE

JOSEPH J. MINARIK, Executive Director RICHARD F KAUFMAN, General Counsel STEPHEN QUICK, Chief Economist JOE COBB, Minority Staff Director

(II)

# CONTENTS

# WITNESSES AND STATEMENTS

## FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1990

	Page
Hamilton, Hon. Lee H., chairman of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening	1
Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Depart- ment of Labor, accompanied by Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commission- er, Office of Prices and Living Conditions; and Thomas J. Plewes, Associate Commissioner, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics	1
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1990	
Solarz, Hon. Stephen J., member of the Joint Economic Committee, presiding: Opening statement	39
Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Depart- ment of Labor, accompanied by Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commission- er, Office of Prices and Living Conditions; and Thomas J. Plewes, Associate Commissioner, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics	40
FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1990	
Hamilton, Hon. Lee H., chairman of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement	75
Upton, Hon. Frederick S., member of the Joint Economic Committee: Opening statement	76
Norwood, Hon. Janet L., Commissioner, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Depart- ment of Labor, accompanied by Kenneth V. Dalton, Associate Commission- er, Office of Prices and Living Conditions; and Thomas J. Plewes, Associate Commissioner, Office of Employment and Unemployment Statistics	76
SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RECORD	
FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1990	
<ul> <li>Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.: Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods</li> <li>Press release No. 90-512 entitled "The Employment Situation: September 1990," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, October 5, 1990</li> </ul>	4 6
FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1990	
Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.: Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alterna-	

Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alterna-	
tive seasonal adjustment methods	44
Press release No. 90-567 entitled "The Employment Situation: October	
1990." Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, November 2,	
1990	46
2000	

# FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1990

Norwood, Hon. Janet L., et al.:	Page
Table reflecting unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alterna-	
tive seasonal adjustment methods	79
Press release No. 90-629 entitled "The Employment Situation: November	
1990," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, December 7.	
1990	81
Press release No. 90-629 entitled "The Employment Situation: November 1990," Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, December 7, 1990	81

# **EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT**

### FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1990

Congress of the United States, Joint Economic Committee, Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2359, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Lee H. Hamilton (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Hamilton and Solarz.

Also present: William Buechner, professional staff member.

### OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE HAMILTON, CHAIRMAN

Representative HAMILTON. The Joint Economic Committee will come to order. We meet to examine the employment and unemployment situation for September.

Our witness is the Honorable Janet Norwood, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The economic data of recent weeks suggest that the economy is beginning to turn down. The leading indicators are down 1.2 percent for August. Industrial production is down 0.2 of a percent. Retail sales are down. New orders for durable goods are down. Housing starts are down. Real personal income was down, and the list goes on.

At the same time, the inflation rate was up. The consumer price index rose at an annual rate of 7 percent in the last 3 months compared to 4.8 percent for all of 1989.

We are pleased to have Commissioner Norwood with us this morning. We hope her testimony today can shed some light on these growing problems.

The Joint Economic Committee will now ask you, Commissioner, to present your testimony on the employment and unemployment situation in September.

STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, AC-COMPANIED BY KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMIS-SIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS; AND THOMAS J. PLEWES, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mrs. Norwood. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It's a pleasure for us to be here and as always I have with me Mr. Dalton and Mr. Plewes.

The Nation's job market continued to slow down in September. Payroll employment declined slightly, and the civilian worker unemployment rate, at 5.7 percent, was 0.4 of a percentage point higher than the rate that generally prevailed through 1989 and the first half of 1990.

Payroll employment has progressively worsened in each of the last 3 months. Since June's gain of about 225,000 jobs, the over-themonth employment changes have been 85,000, 45,000, and now, for September, a decline of 60,000. These figures all include the effects of the Census Bureau's cut backs of temporary workers during that period. Employment declines continued in manufacturing and construction, and growth in most of the service-producing industries has either slowed dramatically or halted all together.

In September, for the second month in a row, more industries lost jobs than gained them, and the diffusion index, at 44 percent, is now at its lowest level since December 1982.

The Nation's factories lost 65,000 jobs in September, the secondlargest monthly loss since factory employment began decreasing in early 1989; the reductions now total more than half a million jobs. Among durable goods industries, where the bulk of the losses have occurred, declines were widespread in September, with the largest in transportation equipment, electronic equipment, and industrial machinery. Smaller losses occurred in fabricated metals, furniture, and stone, clay, and glass products. All the major industry groups within durables have lost jobs over the past year or two, with those losses generally representing from 3 to 6 percent of their employment. Motor vehicles has been hit even more, having lost 10 percent of its jobs. Among nondurable goods industries, textiles and apparel have experienced large losses during this period.

Construction employment fell for the fourth month in a row, with a September decline of 20,000. Mining was little changed over the month; we have not yet seen much change in employment levels in oil and gas extraction since the Middle East crisis began.

Within the service-producing sector, retail trade employment had been slowing for most of the year and now seems to be edging downward. The services industry itself, which employs 1 in 4 nonfarm workers, is also experiencing a notable slackening. September's gain of only 20,000 jobs is one of the smallest since the 1981-82 recession. Employment in health services increased as usual, rising by 45,000, while business services was down 15,000. Since June, employment in business services has decreased by 25,000.

A fall of 35,000 in government employment in September reflects a drop of some 40,000 census workers from Federal payrolls and 20,000 workers in State governments, which were partly offset by gains at the local level, particularly in education. Some 15,000 jobs were added in the transportation industry, in part because of a jump in the number of school bus drivers necessary to cope with rising school enrollments.

The household survey showed little change in employment and an unemployment rate not much different from the preceding month. The jobless rate for adult men and women—at 5.1 and 5 percent, respectively, in September—have been creeping up slowly for several months. The unemployment rate for Hispanics increased. The number of unemployed job losers rose for the second month in a row, and the number of persons working part time for economic reasons has also risen substantially. There was no significant movement among discouraged workers, whose number totaled 835,000 during the third quarter of the year.

In summary, Mr. Chairman, the employment situation deteriorated in September, as further job losses occurred in the Nation's factories, and employment in the service-producing sector failed to improve. Few areas of the economy are escaping the downward tug of the current economic slowdown.

We will be happy now to answer any questions you may have. [The table attached to Mrs. Norwood's statement, together with the Employment Situation press release, follows:]

				X-IL ARI	4A metho	bd			X-11 method	<u> </u>
Month	Unad-		Concurrent				1	12-month	(official	Range
and	justed	Official	(as first	Concurrent	Stable	Total	Residual	extrapola-	method	(cols.
year	rate	procedure	computed)	(revised)				tion	before 1980)	2-9)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1989										
September	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	-
October	5.0	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	.1
November	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.4	
December	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.4	1
1990										
January	5.9	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	-
February	5.8	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.3	
March	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.2	.2
April	5.2	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	-
May	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.2	
June	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.1	1.1
July	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.5	.1
August	5.4	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.6 (	1.1
September	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.7	.1

Unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods

SOURCE: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR Bureau of Labor Statistics

October 1990

(1) Unadjusted rate. Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) <u>unrequisity rate</u>. Uperpropertify rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.
(2) <u>official procedure (X-1) ANINA method</u>). The published eassonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 ms jor civilian labor force components—saftcultural exployment, nonagricultural exployment—for 4 ags-sax groups—males and females, ages 16-19 and 20 years and unexployment—for 4 ags-sax groups—males and females, ages 16-19 and 20 years and userployment—for 6 these rates components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using ARIMA (Auto-Regressive, Integrated, Howing Average) models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then seasonally adjusted with the X-11 portion of the X-11 ARIMA program. The 4 teenage userployment and unexployment and unexployment components and unonagricultural employment adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model. The unexployment for all as a percent of the civilian labor force consol and real la se apercent of the civilian bor force consol adjusted who are all as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted series are revised at the end of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become available. Each est of 6—sonth factors are published in advance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of Employment and Earnings. issues, respectively, of Employment and Earnings.

(3) <u>Concurrent (as first computed, X-11 ARIMA method)</u>. The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is seasonally adjusted with the X-11 ARIMA programs each month as the most rescut data become available. Mate for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) <u>Concurrent (revised, X-11 ARIMA method</u>). The procedure used is identical to (3) above, and the rate for the current month (the last month displayed) will always be the same in the two columns. However, all previous months are subject to revision each month based on the seasonal adjustment of all the components with data through the current month.

(5) <u>Stable (X-11 ARIMA method</u>). Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using ARIMA models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part using ANLTA models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year-to-year and computes final seasonal factors as unveighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure, factors are extrapolated in d-month intervals and the series are revised at the and of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical on the official procedure. is also identical to the official procedure.

(b) <u>Total (X-1) ARIMA method</u>). This is one alternative sggregation procedure, in which total unexployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with ARIMA models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X-11 part of the program. The tate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unexployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) <u>Residual (X-11 ARIMA method)</u>. This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using ARIMA models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted meployment level is derived by subtracting seasonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(8) <u>12-month extrapolation (X-11 ARIMA method)</u>. This approach is the same as the official procedure except that the factors are extrapolated in 12-month intervals. The factors for January-December of the current year are computed at the beginning of the year based on data through the preceding year. The values for January through June of the current year are the same as the official values since they reflect the same factors.

(9) X-11 method (official method before 1980). The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with ARIMA models and the factors are projected in 12-month intervals. The standard X-11 program is used to perform the sessonal adjustment.

<u>Methods of Adjustment</u>: The X-11 ARIMA method was developed at Statistics Canada by the Seasonal Adjustment and Times Series Staff under the direction of Estels Bee Dagum. Th method is described in The X-11 ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method, by Estels Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 12-564E, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in X-11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program, by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young and John Musgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).



United States Department of Labor



**Bureau of Labor Statistics** 

Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information (202) 523-1371 523-1944 523-1959 Media contact: 523-1913 USDL 90-512

TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS RELEASE IS DEMARGOED UNTIL 8:30 A.M. (EDT), FRIDAY, OCTOBER 5, 1990

#### THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: SEPTEMBER 1990

Employment continued to show weakness in September, and unemployment was essentially unchanged, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. The civilian worker unemployment rate was 5.7 percent, about half a percentage point higher than it had been earlier in the year.

Nonfarm payroll employment, as measured by the survey of business establishments, edged down by 100,000 in September, reflecting the further curtailment of decennial census work and weakness in most industries. Total civilian employment, as measured by the survey of households, rose slightly on a seasonally adjusted basis, after declining substantially in the prior 2 months.

#### Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

The civilian worker unemployment rate was 5.7 percent in September, not substantially different from the previous month but nearly half a percentage point higher than the rates which had prevailed from the fall of 1988 to mud-1990. Unemployment rates for most major worker groups--adult men (5.1 percent), adult women (5.0 percent), whites (4.8 percent), and blacks (12.1 percent)--changed little over the month. The rate for Hispanics, however, rose to 8.7 percent, while that for teenagers fell slightly to 15.5 percent. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

At 7.1 million, seasonally adjusted, the number of unemployed persons also was little changed over the month. There was an increase of about 150,000 in the number of unemployed on temporary layoff, but there was little change in the other unemployment categories--persons who had been permanently separated, job leavers, and labor force entrants. The number of persons working part time for economic reasons (often referred to as the partially unemployed) rose by 330,000 in September to 5.4 million. (See tables A-2, A-4, and A-8.)

### Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Total civilian employment, at 117.9 million, seasonally adjusted, rose a bit in September, after declining by 700,000 in the prior 2 months. The proportion of the working-age population that is employed (the employmentpopulation ratio) was 62.6 percent in September, little different from the July and August figures. While there was a seasonally adjusted rise in the

	Quarte averag	rly es	Mon							
Category	199	o .		1990	<u> </u>	Aug Sept. change				
:	11 ;	III	July	Aug.	Sept.					
ROUSEROLD DATA		Tho	usands of	persons						
Labor force 1/	126,550.	126,421;	126.394:	126,300:	126,568	268				
Total employment 1/.	119,927	119,459:	119,580:	119,298:	119,499	201				
Civilian labor force	124,908:	124,798:	124,767:	124,660:	124,967	307				
Civilian employment.	118,285:	117,836:	117,953:	117,658:	117,898	: 240				
Unemployment	6,623:	6,962	6,814:	7,003:	7,069	· 66				
Not in labor force	62,916.	63,468.	63,369:	63,601:	63,434	-167				
Discouraged workers.	893	835	N.A.	N.A. :	N.A.	N.A.				
-		Pe	rcent of	labor for	ce					
Unemployment rates:						•				
All workers 1/	5.2.	5.5.	5.4;	5.5:	5.6	0.1				
All civilian workers.	5.3:	5.6	5.5:	5.6	5.7	: .1				
Adult men	4.8	5.0:	4.9.	5.0.	5.1	.1				
Adult women	4.6:	4.8:	4.7	4.9:	5.0	: .1				
Teenagers	14.8	16.2:	16.3:	16.7:	15.5	: -1.2				
White	4.6:	4.8	4.6:	4.8:	4.8	.0				
Black	10.4.	11.7:	11.3:	11.8:	12.1	: .3				
Hispanic origin	7.6.	8.1	7.9:	7.8:	8.7	. <b>.</b> 9				
establishment data		т	housands	of jobs						
Nonfarm employment	110.541.	p110.651:	110.740.	p110.657:	p110,556	.p-101				
Goods-producing	25.178.	p25,016	25,105:	p25,013:	p24,929	p-84				
Service-producing	85,363:	p85,635.	85,635	p85,644	p85,627	p-17				
-	Hours of work									
Average weekly hours:										
Total private	34.6	p34.6	34.5	p34.5	p34.7	p0.2				
Manufacturing	40.9	p41.0.	40.0	p41.0.	p41.0	. p.0				
Overtime	3.7.	p3.7:	3.7:	p3.8.	p.3.7	p1				

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

1 Includes the resident Armed Forces. N.A. = not available.

p=preliminary.

number of working teens in September that offset somewhat the declines occurring during the summer months, these movements seem to reflect an unusual teenage employment pattern this summer. Substantially fewer teens than usual found jobs this summer; consequently, fewer than usual left the workforce when school resumed. (See table A-2.)

The total number of persons in the civilian labor force (125.0 million) and the labor force participation rate (66.3 percent) were little changed over the month, after seasonal adjustment. The labor force was up by 950,000 from a year earlier. (See table A-2.)

#### Discouraged Workers (Household Survey Data)

The number of discouraged workers--persons who report they want to work but have not looked for jobs because they believed that none was available--totaled 835,000 in the third quarter of 1990, after seasonal adjustment, essentially unchanged from the previous quarter. (See table A-14.)

### Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data).

Payroll employment exhibited further weakness in September. Job losses continued among goods-producing industries, and the serviceproducing sector showed virtually no net job growth. At a level of 110.6 million, total nonfarm employment was down by 100,000 over the month. About 40,000 of this decline, however, was among temporary census workers. (See table B-1.)

The number of factory jobs fell by 65,000 in September, after seasonal adjustment. Manufacturing has lost 520,000 jobs since its peak in January 1989, with 115,000 of that occurring in just the last 2 months. Durable goods industries continued to account for most of the declines, as transportation equipment, electronic equipment, and industrial machinery each lost nearly 15,000 jobs in September. Smaller but still significant losses occurred in fabricated metals, furniture, and stone, clay, and glass products.

Elsewhere in the goods-producing sector, construction employment fell by 20,000 in September, after seasonal adjustment, as job losses in the last 4 months have totaled over 100,000. In mining and its oil and gas extraction component, employment was about unchanged over the month.

Within the service-producing sector, only a few industries provided evidence of employment growth in September. Health services added 45,000 jobs over the month and has accounted for nearly two-fifths of total job growth thus far this year. Local government employment grew by 25,000 in September and has increased by 325,000 over the past year; much of the September increase was in local education, reflecting growth in school enrollments. Transportation employment rose by 15,000 over the month, partially due to increased hiring by school bus companies.

Among the industries losing jobs, business services declined by 15,000 over the month. The finance, insurance, and real estate industry experienced a further small decline; its real estate component has slipped

by 15,000 since May. Employment in retail trade edged down for the second consecutive month; general merchandise stores have led the dropoff in this industry, having lost 70,000 jobs since May 1989. Total government employment fell by 35,000 in September, as the gain in local government hiring was more than offset by declines at the state and federal levels (the latter due to continued cutbacks in the number of decennial census workers).

#### Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

The average workweek for production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonfarm payrolls rose by 0.2 hour in September to 34.7 hours, seasonally adjusted. The factory workweek was unchanged at 41.0 hours, while factory overtime edged down by 0.1 hour to 3.7 hours. (See table B-2.)

The index of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonfarm payrolls, at 124.7 (1982=100), edged up by 0.2 percent in September. By contrast, the index for manufacturing fell 0.5 percent, to 106.6. This index was down 2.2 percent over the past year, reflecting the cutbacks in manufacturing employment.

#### Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings of private production or nonsupervisory workers rose 0.5 percent in September on a seasonally adjusted basis. Prior to seasonal adjustment, average hourly earnings increased by 17 cents to \$10.17, and average weekly earnings rose by \$5.92 to \$353.92. Over the year, average hourly earnings increased by 4.1 percent and average weekly earnings by 4.4 percent. (See tables B-3 and B-4.)

The Employment Situation for October 1990 will be released on Friday, November 2, at 8:30 A.M. (EST).

## **Explanatory Note**

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey thousehold survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 60.000 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (alls).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonfarm payrolls that appears in the B tables, marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by 8LS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes over 340,000 establishments employing over 40 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

#### Coverage, definitions, and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as unemployed, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time; and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Persons laid off from their former jobs and awaiting recall and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days need not be looking for work to be counted as unemployed.

The labor force equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The unemployment rate is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1 and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroil records of nonfarm firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

— The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey eschudes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces;

- The household survey includes people on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not;

- The household survey is braned to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age;

— The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each indvadual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, employees working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

#### Seasonal adjustment

Over the course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 95 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemploy ment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January-June period and again for the July-December period. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are also calculated twice a year. In both surveys, revisions to historical data are made once a vear.

#### Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from these surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are approximately 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At approximately the 90-percent level of confidence—the confidence limits used by aLS in its analyses—the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 358,000; for total unemployment it is 224,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.19 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of trenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .25 percentage point; for therangers, it is 1.29 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment-against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

#### Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS It is available for \$8.50 per issue or \$25.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20204. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M. O, P, and Q of that publication.

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

							-		
	Not se	secnally a	djusted			lessonally	adjusted		
Employment stalus and eax	Sept. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population <sup>2</sup>	188,428	189,901	190,002	168,428	169,467	189,607	189,783	189,901	190,002
Labor foros'	125,530	127,652	126,380	125,725	125,643	126,466	126,394	126,300	126,568
Perticipation rate <sup>4</sup>	66.6	67.2	66.5	66.7	65.5	66.7	66.6	68.5	66.6
Total employed"	119,200	120,814	119,562	119,121	119,989	120,019	119,580	119,296	119,499
Employment-population ratio*	63.3	63.6	62.9	63.2	63.3	63.3	63.0	62.6	62.9
Resident Armed Forces	1,702	1,640	1,601	1,702	1,639	1,630	1,627	1,640	1,601
Civilian employed	117,498	119,174	117,961	117,419	118,350	118,389	117,953	117,658	117,898
Agriculture	3,329	3,473	3,269	3,219	3,305	3,348	3,085	3,137	3,181
Nonegricultural industries	114,169	115,702	114,672	114,200	115,045	116,041	114,867	114,621	114,717
Unemployed	6,330	6,837	6,818	0,004	0,003	0,44/	0,814	7,003	7,000
Unemployment rate"	5.0	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.3	5.1			5.6
Not in labor toroe	62,699	62,250	03,022	62,703	06,064	03,141	03,300	63,601	03,434
Men, 18 years and over		1							
Noninstitutional population <sup>4</sup>	80.458	91.240	91.271	90.456	91.014	91.087	91,168	91,240	91,271
Labor force <sup>1</sup>	69,123	70.600	69,569	69.360	69.737	69.599	69.544	69,459	69,609
Participation rate <sup>4</sup>	76.4	77.4	76.2	76.7	76.6	76.4	78.3	78.1	76.5
Total employed	65,875	67,079	66,053	65,681	66,058	66,000	65,740	65,596	65,867
Employment-population ratio*	72.8	73.5	72.4	72.6	72.6	72.6	72.1	71.9	72.2
Resident Armed Forces	1,531	1,475	1,441	1,531	1,472	1,465	1,462	1,475	1,441
Civilian employed	64,344	65,604	64,612	64,150	64,586	64,535	64,278	64,121	64,426
Unemployed	3,248	3,521	3,516	3,679	3,679	3,500	3,804	3,863	3,943
Unemployment rate <sup>a</sup>	4.7	5.0	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.5	5.6	5.6
Women, 18 years and over									
Noninetitutional non-intion <sup>2</sup>	97.972	98.661	98,731	97.972	98,453	96.520	98,595	98.661	98.731
Labor toron <sup>4</sup>	56,407	57.052	56.811	56,365	56,906	56.867	56.849	56,842	56,758
Participation rate <sup>1</sup>	57.6	57.8	57.5	57.5	57.8	57.7	57.7	57.6	57.5
Total emoloyed <sup>4</sup>	53.325	53,735	53,510	53,440	53,931	54,019	53.839	53,702	53,632
Employment-population ratio*	54.4	54.5	54.2	54.5	54.8	54.8	54.6	54.4	54.3
Resident Armed Forces	171	165	160	171	167	165	185	165	160
Civilian employed	53,154	53,570	53,350	53,269	53,764	53,854	53,674	53,537	53,472
Unemployed	3,061	3,316	3,302	2,925	2,975	2,848	3,010	5,140	3,126
Unemployment rate <sup>#</sup>	5.5	5.8	5.8	5.2	5.2	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.5
		1		1					L

<sup>1</sup> The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for essenced variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and essences adjusted columns. <sup>1</sup> Includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United Forces.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, sex, and age	Sept								-
	1969	1990	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990
TOTAL	1			ļ					
Civilian noninstitutional population	186,726	188,261	188,401	186,726	187,828	187,977	188,136	188,261	188,401
Civilian labor force	123,828	126,012	124,779	124,023	125,004	124,836	124,767	124,660	124,957
Participation rate	66.3	66.9	66.2	66.4	66.6	66.4	66.3	66.2	66.3
Employed	117,498	119,174	117,961	117,419	118,350	118,389	117,953	117,658	117,898
Employment-population ratio*	62.9	63.3	62.6	62.9	63.0	63.0	62.7	62.5	62.6
Unemployed	6,330	6,837	6,818	6,604	6,653	6,447	6,614	7,003	7,069
Unemployment rate	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.5	5.6	5.7
Men, 20 years and over									
Civitian noninetitutional constation	61,790	82 862	82.940	81,790	82.581	82.676	82,790	82 882	82 940
Civitian tabor force	63 771	64 773	64 576	63 771	64.312	64.364	64 344	64 362	64 573
Participation rate	78.0	78.2	77.9	78.0	77.9	77.9	77.7	777	77 9
Employed	61,113	61.862	61.651	60,729	61.265	61.345	61.196	61.143	61,264
Employment-occutation ratio <sup>2</sup>	74.7	74.7	74.3	74.2	74.2	74.2	73.9	73.6	73.9
Agnoutture	2.419	2.435	2.387	2,330	2,388	2,400	2,262	2 246	2,295
Nonagricultural industries	58,694	59.427	59,264	58,399	58,877	58,945	58,934	58.897	58,969
Unemployed	2.658	2,910	2.925	3.042	3.047	3,019	3,148	3,219	3,309
Unemployment rate	. 4.2	4.5	4.5	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.9	5.0	5.1
Women, 20 years and over			ļ						
Cvitian conjustitutional constanton	90 771	91 68A	91 765	90 771	91 414	91 495	91 581	01 688	01 785
Civitian labor force	52,558	52 974	53.322	52,358	53,146	53,174	53,211	53 315	53 121
Perticipation rate	57.9	57.6	58.1	57.7	58.1	58.1	58.1	58.1	57.9
Employed	50.040	50 183	50.531	49 984	50,709	50,776	50,719	50 699	50 489
Employment-population ratio <sup>2</sup>	55.1	54.7	55.1	55.1	55.5	55.5	55.4	55.3	55.0
Agnoutture	701	674	661	660	680	700	585	639	619
Nonagnouttural industries	49.339	49,509	49,870	49.324	50.029	50.077	50,135	50.060	49.870
Unemployed	2.518	2,791	2,790	2.374	2,438	2,398	2,492	2.616	2 632
Unemployment rate	4.8	5.3	5.2	4.5	4.6	4,5	4.7	4.9	5.0
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years				1	, ;				
Chilips compatibulicasi non dation	14 188		13.604	14 168	12 822	12 000	13 784		13 606
Civitian labor force	7 408	8 265	6 992	7 894	7 545	7 208	7 212	8083	7 272
Participation rate	520	60.3	50.2	557	54.6	520	524	50.0	611
Employed	6 345	7 129	5 779	6 708	6.376	6 269	6038	5.815	6 144
Employment-occulation ratio*	44.8	520	422	47.3	45 1	45.4	439	42.4	44.9
Aanculture	209	364	242	229	237	249	230	251	286
Nonecricultural industries	6.136	6.766	5.537	6.477	6.139	6.019	5,799	5.564	5,878
Unemployed	1,153	1,136	1,103	1 1.188	1.169	1.030	1.174	1.168	1,128
Unemployment rate	15.4	13.7	16.0	15.0	15.5	14.1	16.3	16.7	15.5
	1	1						1	

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not set	eonally ad	ljusted		Secondly adjusted					
Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hepanic origin	Sept. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1969	May 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	
WHITE						-				
				160 640	180 271	160 365	180 458	160 550	160.640	
Civilian nonnetitutional population	159,549	108 228	107 261	106 393	107,353	107.273	107,230	107,135	107,451	
Civilian labor force	68.6	67.4	66.6	66.7	67.0	66.9	66.8	66.7	66.9	
Participation ran	101,600	103,217	102,277	101,579	102,362	102,481	102,260	101,968	102,260	
Employed	63.7	64.3	63.7	63.7	63.9	63.9	63.7	63.5	63.7	
Unemployed	4,595	5.022	4,984	4,014	4,991	4,612	4,970	5,167	5,190	
Unemployment rate	4.3	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.0	•.5	•.0	•**		
Man, 20 years and over		60.372	58 118	55 485	55,919	55,932	55,895	56.035	56,144	
Civilian labor force	23,433	78.7	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.3	78.1	78.3	78.4	
Perception rate	53 416	54,149	53,990	53,153	53,578	53,650	53,576	53,613	53,721	
Employed	75.5	75.6	75.4	75.1	75.1	75.1	74.9	74.9	75.0	
Unemployed	2,017	2,173	2,125	2,312	2,341	2,282	2,318	2,423	2,423	
Unemployment rate	3.6	3.9	3.8	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.3	3	
Women, 20 years and over	44.755	44 817	45 164	44.198	44.925	45.055	45,120	45,100	45,000	
Civilian labor force	67 4	57 5	57.9	57.2	57.8	57.9	57.9	57.9	57.7	
Ferroretori (Elle	42.570	42,795	43,155	42,520	43,165	43,292	43,321	43,227	43,112	
Employment-consistion rebu <sup>4</sup>	55.1	54.9	55.3	55.0	55.5	55.6	55.6	55.5	55.3	
Licencicved	1,788	2,023	2,011	1,678	1,760	1,763	1,799	1,873	1,668	
Unemployment rule	4.0	4.5	4.5	3.6	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.2	•2	
Both sexes, 18 to 19 years	8 405	7 099	5.979	6.730	6.509	6,256	6,216	5,999	6,306	
Civilian labor force	55.9	64.3	54.3	58.7	58.4	56.6	56.1	54.3	57.3	
Fersional	5.614	6,273	5,132	5,908	5,619	5,519	5,363	5,128	5,427	
Employment-copulation ratio*	49.0	56.8	46.6	51.5	50.4	49.7	48.4	46.4	49.3	
Unemployed	790	626	B47	824	890	767	853	8/1	13.9	
Unemployment rate	12.3	11.6	1 14.2	12.2	13.7	122	13.7	16.7	15.3	
Men	. 12.9 . 11.7	12.1	13.3	1 11.1	13.1	11.4	12.3	13.2	12.5	
BLACK		1	:	1						
Chillen exercises social consideration	21.065	21,337	21,361	21,085	21,261	21,289	21,318	21,337	21,361	
Civilian labor force	13,481	13,584	13,425	13,518	13,587	13,472	13,379	13,366	13,470	
Participation rate	63.9	63.7	62.8	64.1	63.9	63.3	62.8	62.6	11 820	
Employed	, 11,958	12.027	11,855	11,938	12,179	12,004	55.7	55.3	55.4	
Employment-population ratio*	56.7	56.4	55.5	1 1 580	1 408	1 407	1 510	1.575	1,631	
Unemployed	1,524	1,557	1 1,508	1 117	10.4	10.4	11.3	11.8	12.1	
Unemployment rate	. 11.3	11.3							l	
Men, 20 years and over	6.246	6.302	6,332	6,239	6,241	6,293	6,293	6,235	6,330	
	74.6	73.9	1 74.1	74.6	73.5	74.0	73.9	73.1	74.1	
Employed	5,682	5,678	1 5,658	5,610	5,872	5,702	5,617	5,572	5,580	
Employment-population ratio*	. 67.9	66.6	1 66.3	67.0	66.8	67.1	65.9	00.4	750	
Unemployed	.  564	624	674	1 629	509	94	10.7	10.6	11.8	
Unemployment rate	., 9.0 I	9.9	1 10.0							
Women, 20 years and over	6.369	6,331	6,362	6,360	6,516	6,377	6,328	6,358	6,361	
Pertonation rate	60.6	1 59.3	59.5	1 60.5	61.3	59.9	59.4	59.6	59.5	
Employed	. 5,731	5.684	1 5,682	5,743	5,921	5,812	5,735	5,730	5,705	
Employment-population ratio*	., 54.5	53.3	53.2	54.6	55.7	54.6	53.8	53.7	65A	
Unemployed	639	646	10,7	9.7	9,1	8.9	9.4	9.9	10.3	
Both sames 16 to 18 years			1	1		1				
Civities tably force		5 İ 951	1 731	919	630	802	758	773	779	
Persception rate		1 44.4	34.2	41.8	38.6	37.4	35.4	36.1	38.5	
Employed	. 544	684	515	585	588	550	517	464	250	
Employment-population ratio <sup>4</sup>	24.1	31.0	24.1	1 215.0	21.3	25.0	24.1	20	225	
Unemployed	., 32	287	215	;; 334 ;; 38≊	244	314	31.8	38.7	28.9	
Unemployment rate		30.2	1 305	33.8	31.1	37.4	32.3	38.4	30 6	
Men		S 30.0	28.4	1 38.6	27.6	25.3	31.2	. 35.0	26.9	
						1	1		<u> </u>	

See footnotes at end of table.

### HOUSEHOLD DATA

\_

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin--Continued

(Numbers in thousands)

<b></b>	Not sea	Not seasonally adjusted					Sessonally adjusted'				
Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic ongin	Sept 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	Juby 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990		
HISPANIC ORIGIN											
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,894	14.356	14,396	13.894	14,238	14,277 '	14,317 '	14,356	14.396		
Crvikan labor force	9,332	9,841	9,629	9,342	9,669	9.651	9,665 1	9,707 1	9,643		
Participation rate	67.2 '	68.5	66.9	67.2	67.9 ·	676	6751	67.6	67.0		
Employed	8,610 +	9,067	8.852	8.564	8.927 ·	8,967	8.899	8.951	8,808		
Employment-population ratio	62.0 1	63.2 '	615.	61.6	62.7	62.8	62.2 1	62.3	61.2		
Unemployed	722 1	774 1	777	778	742	684	767	757	835		
Unemployment rate	7.7	7.9 ·	8.1	8.3 -	7.7	71	791	7.8	8.7		

The population inputes are not adjusted for seasonal vanation: therefore, dentical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

population NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-ongin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

#### Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(In thousands)

_			Not seasonally adjusted				Seasonally adjusted					
Category			Sept. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	
CHARACTERI	STIC											
Criman employed, 16 years and ove	•		117.498	119.174	117.961	117,419	118,350	118,389	117.953	117.658	117.898	
Marned men spouse present			40.856	40.726	41.083	40.649	40,881	40.554	40.545	40.604	40.919	
Married women, spouse present			29,608	29,290	29,869	29,506	30.046	29.856	29,909	29.949	29,780	
Women who maintain families			6.379	6,301	6,350	6,429	6.400	6,487	6,380	6,365	6,382	
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CL	ASS OF	WORKER										
Agniculture												
Wage and salary workers			1,686	1,904	1.822	1.680	1,728	1.685	1.628	1.666	1.608	
Self-employed workers			1,523	1,441	1,364	1.424	1.502	1,507	1.377	1.357	1.275	
Unpaid family workers			120	128	103	132	101	106	96	93	112	
Nonegnoultural industries												
Wage and salary workers			105.287	106,679	105.612	105,476	. 106,176	105,985	105,885	105.691	105,800	
Government			17,513	17,164	17,467	17,613	18,113	17,863	17,788	17.842	17.555	
Private industries			87,775	89,515	88,146	87,863	88,063	88,121	88.097	87.849	68,246	
Private households			1,011	1,105	1,026	1,065	941	1.056	989	1.033	1.074	
Other industries			86,764	88,410	87,120	86,798	87,122	87,065	87,108	86.816	87,171	
Sell-employed workers			8,586	8,793	8,810	8,581	8,783	8,759	8,709	8.629	8.810	
Unpaid family workers			296	229	250	279	254	226	269	229	235	
PERSONS AT WORK		ME'										
4il industries												
Part time for economic reasons			4.487	5,368	4,941	4 864	4,831	5.013	4.870	5.036	5.365	
SIACK WORK			2.097	2.392	2,386	2.321	2 4 3 9	2,499	2 565	2.424	2 654	
Could only find part-time work			1,991	2,382	2,245	2,161	2.052	2.224	2 070	2,123	2.462	
Voluntary part time		• •	15,666	12,332	15,482	15,506	15,592	15,125	15,311	15,377	15,283	
Nonagricultural industries												
Part time for economic reasons			4.229	5,072	4,660	4,605	4,666	4,734	4,710	4,780	5,093	
Slack work			1,935	2,195	2,203	2,165	2,317	2.284	2,408	2.242	2.481	
Could only find part-time work			1,910	2,293	2,157	2,095	2,004	2,141	2.048	2.069	2.386	
Voluntary part time		······	15,215	11,860	15.036	15,076	15,064	14.627	14,922	14,899	14,658	

Excludes persons with a job but not at work" during the survey penod for such reasons as vacation, illness, or industrial dispute

HOUSEHOLD DATA

•

#### HOUSEHOLD DATA

illy edij . r torce, a Table A-6. Range of uner same be d on verving d . ....

~	 _

			Quart	nty ave	ages		Monthly data			
	Menure	19	89	_	1990			1990		
			īv		a	m	Juny	Aug	Sect.	
U-1	Persons unemployers 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the obtain labor tons	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.3	
U-2	Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.5	2.7	2.8	
U-3	Unemployed persons 25 years and over as a percent of the ovidian lator force for persons 25 years and over	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.5	
U-4	Unamployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civilian labor force	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.2	5.0	5.2	5,4	
U-5	Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.4	6.5	5.6	
U-6	Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.5	5.0	5.7	
U-8	Total full-time jobesekers plus 1/2 pert-time jobesekers plus 1/2 total on pert time for economic reasons as a percent of the civilian labor force less 1/2 of the pert-time labor force	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.4	7.6	7.8	
U-7	Total full-time jobasetars plus 1/2 part-time jobasetars plus 1/2 total on part time for economic reasons plus discouraged workers as a percent of the civilian labor force plus discouraged workers liss 1/2 of the part-time tabor force	. 7.9	7.9	7.8	B.0	8.3	NA	NA.	NA	

N.A. - not available.

Table A-6. Selected unemploym int indicators, a đ .

Catagory		Number of ployed per thousends	8078   ))	Unemployment rates							
Cangoy	Sept. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990		
CNARACTERISTIC											
	6 604	7 003	7.069	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.5	5.6	5.7		
otal, 15 years and over	3,670	3,863	3 943	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.6	5.7	5.8		
Men, 16 years and over	3,042	3 219	3,309	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.9	5.0	5.1		
Men, 20 years and over	2 925	3 140	1,126	5.2	5.2	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.5		
Women, 15 years and over	2 374	2618	2.632	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.9	5.0		
Women, 20 years and over	1 188	1 168	1 128	15.0	15.5	14.1	18.3	16.7	15.5		
Both sexes, 15 to 19 years							1				
	1 402	1 463	1 462	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.5	3.4		
Mamed men, spouse present	1 185	1 205	1,231	3.8	3.5	3.7	3.5	3.9	4.0		
Married women, spouse present		591	626	7.7	7.4	8.0	8.5	8.5	8.9		
Women who mentain termine								1			
	6 904	6 645	5 780	5.0	4.9	4.8	5.0	5.2	5.4		
rus-eme woncers	1 272	1 459	1,269	7.3	7,4	7.6	6.1	7.9	7.1		
Partone workers				6.0	6.0	5.9	6.0	6.3	6.4		
Labor torce one lost					1						
INDUSTRY											
the second second second second second	5.025	5 327	5,460	5.4	5.5	5.3	5.5	5.7	5.8		
Nonagroutural private wage and salary workers	1842	1 000	2 006	6.3	6.7	5.9	6.6	6.9	7.0		
Goods-producing inclusives	1	37	27	8,4	3.3	3.6	4,4	4.9	3.8		
	1	680	736	10.1	11.5	9.7	10.2	11.1	11.8		
Construction	1 1 144	1 273	1,244	5.2	5.4	4.9	5.7	5.8	5.7		
	641	787	773	4.9	5.5	4.9	5.6	5.9	6.0		
Uurable goods	507	505	470	5.5	5.2	5.0	5.7	5.6	5.3		
Nondurable goods	2 182	3 3 3 8	3.454	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.2	5.3		
Service-producing multiples	201	266	261	4.5	3.2	3.0	3.7	4,1	3.9		
(ranaportation and plants bade	1 1 350	1.468	1.576	5.9	6.3	6.2	6.0	6.2	6.6		
	1 504	1 604	1.617	4.5	4,4	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.7		
	502	511	517	2.8	2.5	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.9		
	143	178	184	7.8	7.9	10.0	10.6	9.7	9.3		
Aductional and a surple surple surple and seems accounts		1	1			1	I	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		

Unemployment as a percent of the ovillen labor force.
 Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for

#### Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not set	econally at	djusted	Seasonally adjusted						
Weeks of unemployment	Sept. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	
DURATION										
Less than 5 weeks	3,355 1,737 1,237 664 573 11.3 4,2	3,225 2,197 1,414 674 741 12,1 5,2	3,230 2,112 1,478 755 721 12.2 5.1	3,169 2,030 1,359 769 590 11.5 5.0	3,028 2,238 1,374 610 11.8 5.4	3,048 2,049 1,408 763 643 12.0 5.1	3,120 2,159 1,513 809 704 12.0 5.2	3,325 2,048 1,809 845 764 12,3 5,2	3,044 2,479 1,620 872 748 12,5 6,2	
PERCENT OUSTRUBUTION Total unemployed Less than 5 weeks 5 seeks and over 15 to 20 weeks 27 weeks and over	100.0 53.0 27.4 19.5 10.5 9.1	100.0 47.2 32.1 20.7 9.9 10.6	100.0 47.4 31.0 21.6 11.1 10.8	100.0 48.3 31.0 20.7 11.7 9.0	100.0 45.6 33.7 20.7 11.5 9.2	100.0 46.9 31.5 21.6 11.7 9.9	100.0 45.9 31.8 22.3 11.9 10.4	100.0 47.6 29.3 23.0 12.1 10.9	100.0 42.6 34.7 22.7 12.2 10.5	

### Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not se	sonally a	djusted	Sessonally adjusted							
Reasons	Sept.	Aug.	Sept.	Sept.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.		
	1989	1990	1990	1969	1990	1990	1990	1990	1990		
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED											
Job losers	2,588	3,145	3,097	2,932	3,171	3,151	3,088	3,367	3,511		
	631	824	826	852	979	916	980	973	1,127		
	1,955	2,320	2,271	2,060	2,192	2,233	2,128	2,394	2,384		
	1,162	1,078	1,055	1,034	1,014	995	1,027	964	934		
	1,997	1,935	2,074	1,920	1,820	1,789	1,980	1,879	1,985		
	585	680	591	648	663	534	687	677	656		
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION											
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		
	40.9	46.0	45.4	44.9	47.4	48.7	45.7	48.7	49.5		
	10.0	12.1	12.1	13.0	14.6	14.2	14.2	14.1	15.9		
	30.9	33.9	33.3	31.8	32.8	34.5	31.5	34.7	33.6		
	18.4	15.8	15.5	15.8	15.2	15.4	15.2	14.3	13.2		
	31.5	28.3	30.4	29.4	27.2	27.7	29.0	27.2	28.0		
	9.2	9.9	8.7	9.9	10.2	8.3	10.2	9.8	9.3		
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE									ĺ		
Job losers	2.1	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.6		
	.9	.9	.8	.8	.8	.8	.8	.8	.7		
	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.6		
	.5	.5	.5	.5	.5	.4	.6	.5	.5		

### HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-6. Unemployed persons by sex and age, esseonally adjusted

Sex and age	י הואסרע רע)	Number of ployed peri thousands	iona	Unemployment rates							
	Sept. 1989	Aug. 1990 j	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990		
	6.604	7 003	7.069	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.5	5.6	5.7		
ICLU, 16 Years and over	2 4 26	2 387 1	2.454	\$1.1	11.0	10.3	11.0	11.5	11.6		
10 CO 24 YOR'S	1 188	1 168 1	1 128	15.0	15.5	14,1	16.3	16.7	15.5		
	534	494	512	17.2	20.0	16.1	17.4	19.2	18.4		
10 to 17 years	694	653 1	652	14.2	12.8	13.4	15.2	15.0	14.4		
	1 238 1	1 219 1	1 326	8.6	8.5	8.2	8.3	8.6	9.6		
20 to 24 years	4 197	4 617 1	4 667	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.5		
25 years and over	2 701	4.028	4 121	43	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.7		
25 to 54 years	445	538 (	513	30	3.0	2.8	3.2	3.5	3.3		
55 years and over				•.•							
Man 18 years and page	3 679	3.863	3.943	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.6	5.7	5.8		
16 to 26 years	1.361	1.253	1.326	11.9	11.2	11.1	11.8	11.6	12.0		
	637	644	634	15.7	16.0	15.4	17.5	17.8	16.7		
	311	287 1	274	19.5	20.6	16.4	18.4	21.5	18.8		
	340	351	379	13.7	13.4	14.8	16.3	15.5	16.2		
	724	609	692	9.8	8.6	6.9	8.5	8.5	9.5		
20 10 24 900	2 3 1 3	2616	2 642	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.4	4.6	4.6		
	1078	2 214	2 274	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.7		
25 to 54 years	310	224 1	342	35	34	3.1	3.6	3.0	3.8		
55 years and over	3.0	3.301	~	0.0		1					
Warmen 18 weets and cut	2,925	3,140	3,126	5.2	5.2	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.5		
16 to 74 works	1 065	1.134 (	1,128	10.2	10.7	9.3	10.4	11,4	11.2		
	551	524	494	14.4	14.9	12.8	14.9	15.6	14.2		
	223	207	238	14.7	19.4	15.9	16.4	16.6	17.9		
10 to 17 years	344	302	273	14.6	12.2	11.9	13.0	14.4	12.6		
10 UD 10 yours	514	610	634	7.7	8.4	7.5	6.0	9.3	9.6		
	1 884	2001	2 0 2 5	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4		
	1 721	1 794	1 847	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.6		
23 10 54 years	165	203	171	24	2.5	2.4	2.6	3.1	2.6		
23 Years and over	100	, 203 (		1 24			1	,			

' Unemployment as a percent of the civitan labor force.

#### Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not see	sonally ad	beteu	Seasonally adjusted*							
Employment statue	Sept. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	Mary 1990	June 1990	јају 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990		
Oviten normstrutional population Oviten labor force Paracession rate Emoloyed Emoloyed Unemployed Unemployed Nation Labor force Internet force	27,177 17,632 64.9 15,898 15,898 1,735 9,8 9,545	27,711 + 17,773 + 64 + 15,958 + 57.6 + 1,815 + 10.2 + 9,938 +	27,761 17,518 63.1 15,684 56.5 1,834 10.5 10,243	27,177 17,841 64,9 15,847 58,3 1,794 10,2 9,536	27,556 17,680 64,1 16,021 58,1 1,640 9,3 9,896	27,612 17,540 63.5 15,883 57.5 1,657 9,4 10,072	27,668 17,448 63,1 15,655 56,6 1,793 10,3 10,220	27,711 17,496 63.1 15,671 56.6 1,826 10,4 10,213	27,761 17,527 63.1 15,629 56.3 1,897 10.8 10,234		

The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal vanation. <sup>1</sup> Civitian employment as a percent of the civitian noninstitutional seasonality population.

#### HOUSEHOLD DATA

•

#### HOUSEHOLD DATA

#### Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not seesonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

	Contan	employed	Unemployed		Unemployment rate		
Occupation	Sept. 1989	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	Sept. 1990	
Total, 15 years and over'	117,498	117,961	6.330	6,818	5.1	5.5	
Managenal and professional specially	30.493	30,558	715	792	2.3	2.5	
Executive administrative and managerial	14 682	14,799	405	414	2.6	2.7	
Professional specialty	15,611	15,759	310	378	1.9	2.3	
Technical sales and administrative support	35.728	36,358	1,499	1,707	4.0	4.5	
Technolars and related support	3.486	3.741	91	134	2.5	3.5	
Sales occupations	13 939	14.034	617	730	4.2	4.9	
Administrative support, including clencel .	18,302	18,582	791	843	4.1	4.3	
Service occupations	15,626	15,719	1,089	1,170	6.5	6.9	
Private household	778	766	37	48	4.5	5.9	
Protective service	1,983	1,923	101	94	4.9	47	
Service, except private household and protective	12,864	13,031	951	1,028	6.9	7.3	
Precision production, craft, and repair	13,838	13,626	665	832	46	5.8	
Mechanics and repairers	4,507	4,447	165	175	3.6	3.8	
Construction trades	5,247	5.015	328	453	5.9	8.3	
Other precision production, craft, and repair	4,084	4,163	170	205	4.0	47	
Operators, tabncators, and laborers	18,158	18,047	1,482	1,414	. 7.5	73	
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	8.349	8,191	629	657	7.0	74	
Transportation and material moving occupations	5,129	5,087	267	273	4.9	1 5.1	
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	4,681	4,770	586	484	11.1	9.2	
Construction laborers	768	795	148	126	16.1	13.7	
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	3.912	3.974	438	358	10.1	8.3	
Farming, torestry, and fishing	3.656	3,654	177	208	4.6	5.4	

Persons with no previous work expenence and those whose last job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

#### Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by ege, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in (housands)

	CM	ten.	Civilian labor force							
Veteran status	noninst	noninstitutional Uner						Unemp	oloyed	
and age		Totai		tai	Empl	oyed	Nurr	ber	Perci	ent of force
	Sept. 1989	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1969	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1989	Sept. 1990
VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS										,
Total, 35 years and over	7,488	7,668	6,643	7,010	6.617	6,742	226	268	3.3	. 3.8
35 to 49 years	6.486	6,507	6,141	6,166	5.942	5,916	199 ·	250	3.2	4.0
35 to 39 years	1,673	1.360	1.561	1,295	1.486	1,216	75	79	48	8.1
40 to 44 years	3.296	3,265	3,146	3,096	3,058	2,975	88	121	2.6	3.9
45 to 49 years	1,517	1,882	1,434	1,775	1,397	1,725	37	50	2.5	2.8
50 years and over	1,002	1,161	702	644	675	825	27	19	3.6	2.2
NONVETERANS										1
Total. 35 to 49 years	16.376	17,623	15,375	16,520	14,673	15,968	502	553	3.3	3.3
35 to 39 years	7,506	8,094	7,121	7,676	6.867	7,420	255	256	3.6	3.3
40 to 44 years	4,758	5,334	4,485	4,971	4,341	4,797	143	174	3.2	3.5
45 to 49 years	4,112	4,195	3,770	3.873	3,665	3,751	105	122	2.8	3.2

NOTE Male Vietnami-era vaterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975 Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces, published data are limited to those 35 to 49 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for eleven large Stat .

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not set	sonally stip	ated'	Beauchally adjusted*							
State and employment status	Sept. 1989	Aug. 1980	Sept. 1990	Sept. 1969	May. 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990		
California			_								
and any set of the set of the set of the set	21 680	91 000	22.039	21,580	21.877	21,918	21,961	21,999	22,039		
Chilles blue fame	14 635	14,940	14.609	14,661	14,801	14,801	14,751	14,816	14,616		
Civilian labor force	13,909	14,126	13,761	13,914	13,996	14,073	13,995	14,010	13,747		
Lipenpirved	726	813	846	747	803	726	758	606	889		
Unemployment rate	5.0	5.4	5.8	5.1	5.4	4.9	5.1	54	5.9		
Pierida											
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,939	10,150	10,169	9,939	10,091 6,282	10,111 6,294	10,132 6,313	10,150 6,365	10,169 6,450		
	5 809	6.014	6.024	5.834	5,931	5,686	5,953	5,939	6,061		
Linemaland	353	440	395	350	351	406	360	426	389		
Unemployment rate	5.7	6.6	6.2	5.7	5.6	6.5	5.7	6.7	6.0		
lineis											
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,841	8,878	8,882	8,841 6,034	8,867 5,967	8,871 5,986	8,876 6,102	6,878 5,954	8,882 6,009		
Civilian Moor force	5,728	5 644	5,636	5,660	5,870	5,625	5,691	5,508	5,573		
Employed	395	381	393	374	317	361	411	386	435		
Unemployee	5.5	6.3	6.5	6.2	5.3	6.0	6.7	6.5	7.2		
Magaachusette											
Civilien noninstitutional population	4,618	4,620	4,621	4,618	4,619	4,620	4,620	4,620	4,621		
Civilian labor force	3,121	3,230	3,147	3,133	3 026	2.957	2,963	2,960	2,968		
Employed	. 2,900	3,031	104	138	175	185	194	211	199		
Unemployed	43	64	6.2	4.4	5.5	5.8	6.1	6.7	6.2		
Michigen			1			4 999	7 001	7 002	7 003		
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,968	7,002	7,003	0,900	4 591	4.631	4.614	4.599	4.568		
Civilian labor force	4,614	4,007	4,5/9	4.361	4 218	4 294	4 271	4,237	4,237		
Employed	- 4,2/0	349	315	360	353	337	343	362	331		
Unemployed	7.5	7.4	6.9	7.8	7.7	7.3	7.4	7.9	7.2		
New Jersey											
Civilian noninettutional population	6,032	6,028	6,027	6,032	6,028	6,028	6,025	6,028	6,027		
Civilian labor force	. 3,950	4,104	4,041	3,992	4,012	4,037	4,073	3,000	3,003		
Employed	. 3,780	3,915	3,838	3,812	3,620	3,043	104	194	213		
Unemployed	4.3	4.6	5.0	4.5	4.8	4.6	4.8	4.8	5.2		
New York											
Civilian noninstitutional population		13,801	13,801	13,605	13,800	13,801	13,802	13.801	13,801		
Civilian labor force	8,587	8,731	8,671	8,665	6,775	8,732	8,686	0,000	8 247		
Employed		8,311	8,198	6,203	0,320	44	484	431	444		
Unemployed	- 447	4.8	5.5	5.3	5.1	5.1	5.3	5.0	5.5		
North Caroline											
Ovilian noninstitutional population		5,006	5,012	4,951	4,991	4,996	5,002	5,008	5,012		
Civilian labor force	3,397	3,418	3,397	3,407	3,451	3,438	3,410	3,3/0	3,007		
Employed	3.278	3,300	3,295	3,2/2	130	124	159	121	127		
Unemployed	3.5	3.5	3.3	4.0	4.0	3.7	4.6	3.6	3.7		
Ohio					1						
Civilian noninstitutional population		8,288	8,290	8,266	8,261	8,283	6,266	8,208	8,290		
Civilian labor force	5,425	5,504	0,435	5,441	5 107	5 125	5.104	5,174	5,166		
Employed	0,156	3,245	2,1//	288	321	284	307	272	284		
Unemployed	···· 60/	47	4.8	5.3	5.9	5.2	5.7	5.0	5.2		
		1	1		1	1	1	1	1		

See footnotes at end of table.

#### HOUSEHOLD DATA

int status of the civilian population for sleven large States--Continu -Table A-13. Employme

(Numbers in thousands)

.

	Not see	eonally adj	usted <sup>1</sup>	Secondly adjusted						
State and employment statue	Sept.	Aug.	Sept.	Sept.	May.	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	
	1989	1990	1990	1989	1990	1990	1990	1990	1990	
Pennsylviate Ovtian noninstitutional population Civitian noninstitutional population Civitian store force Employed Unamploymed Unamploymed Unamploymed	9,372	9,392	9,393	9,372	9,385	9,387	9,390	9,392	9,393	
	5,823	5,877	5,858	5,808	5,941	5,894	5, <b>869</b>	5,777	5,850	
	5,588	5,824	5,581	5,550	5,648	5,623	5,674	5,496	5,531	
	235	253	297	256	293	271	295	281	319	
	4.0	4,3	5.1	4,4	4,9	4.6	5.0	4.9	5.5	
Texas Civilian noninstitutionsi population Civilian labor force Employed Unemployed Unemployed	12,249	12,391	12,404	12,249	12,351	12,365	12,379	12,391	12,404	
	8,438	8,459	8,491	8,428	8,425	8,452	8,371	8,325	8,484	
	7,907	7,958	7,965	7,588	7,880	7,979	7,853	7,639	7,953	
	532	501	526	538	545	473	518	492	531	
	6,3	5.9	6.2	8,4	6,5	5.8	6,2	5.9	6,3	

\* These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics' estimates used in the administration of Federal and allocation programs. \* The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal vanistor; therefore,

identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and the seasonally adju columns. d

HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-14. Persons not in the labor force by reason, sex, and race, quarterly average

(in thousands)

	Not sea	echelly sted	Sessonally adjusted						
Resson, sex, and race	1989	1990	198	9		1990			
			10				m		
TOTAL						42 018	A3 488		
Total not in labor force	61,447	62,370	62,567	62,024	02,783	w2,010			
Do not went a job now	56,153	57,297	57,626	57,577	57,272	57,476	69		
Current activity: Going to school	3,855	4,336	6,995	4.767	4.653	5.033	5,088		
U, disabled	24.028	23,655	24.031	23,886	23,961	23,305	23,607		
Retrac	18,026	18,751	17,673	18,270	18,227	18,378	18,510		
Other activity	5,550	5,479	4,256	4,425	4,052	4,051	4,004		
the second second	5,294	5,073	5,463	5,176	5,452	5,615	5,364		
Beauto not looking: School attendence	912	850	1,447	1,248	1,408	1,440	1,423		
(ii health, disability	915	857	888	907	1 184	1262	1.245		
Home responsibilities	1,307	1,362	817	827	747	893	635		
Think cannot get a job	513	522	518	563	488	537	520		
Personal tectors	322	319	299	263	259	356	315		
Other reasons <sup>2</sup>	1,325	1,163	1,138	945	1,214	1,096	963		
Men	1								
Total not in tabor force	20,135	20,784	21,009	20,953	21,183	21,310	21,622		
Do not want a job now	18,322	19,062	19,169	19,221	19,201	19,368	(1)		
West a ist star	1,613	1,722	2,015	1,765	2,006	2,038	1,973		
Research not toolong: School attandance	440	419	735	583	747	485	438		
IS health, disability	503	448	349	377	315	366	407		
Think cannot get a job Other reasons?	519	463	455	374	494	493	397		
Women	ł			ł					
Total not in labor force	41,311	41,586	41,559	41,670	41,600	41,607	41,846		
Do not want a job now	37,631	38,234	38,456	38,356	38,072	38,107			
Ward & ICD COW	3,481	3,351	3,448	3,411	3,446	3,577	3,391		
Resson not looking: School attendance	472	431	712	663	420	437	430		
ill heeth, daabiity	1 1 207	1 362	1,175	1,251	1,164	1,262	1,245		
Think respondents	484	447	468	450	432	527	429		
Other reasons	808	700	681	571	719	605	596		
White	1			1					
Total not in labor force	52,175	52,410	53,052	52,955	52,999	53,016	53,291		
Do not want a job now	48,513	48,693	49,310	49,298	48,997	49,033	48,384		
Want a job now	3,658	3,698	3,785	3,659	4,030	3,908	1,015		
Reason not looking: School attendance	- 507	590	599	634	663	649	673		
Si heelih, disebiity		1,015	801	699	649	922	918		
Think cannot det a job		554	525	531	549	629	577		
Other reasons'	1,048	898	878	764	960	814	1 "**		
Black	1	1	1						
Total not in labor force	7,347	7,738	7,547	7,601	7,678	7,716	7,934		
Do not went a job now	5,875	6,578	6,032	6,281	6,401	6,411	6,755		
Want a job now	1,472	1,158	1,558	1,295	1,291	1,370	1,226		
Resson not looking: School attendence	- 284	204	427	343	270	232	177		
till health, disability	- 310	320	354	313	288	265	318		
Home responsibilities	296	244	263	232	195	203	208		
Other reasons		203	226	142	218	251	196		

Publication of seasonally adjusted data has been temporarry subcended until altered seasonal patterns can be adequately measured by the seasonal adjust-ment process
 Includes small number of men not looking for work because of "home

responsibilities NOTE. Detail may not add to not-in-tabor force totals because of the weighting procedures

•

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table 8-1. Engloyees on conferm payrolls by industry (In thousands)

	Not seasonally edjusted					Seasonally adjusted						
Industry	5+#1 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990g/	Sept. 1990g/	Sept. 1989	May 1990	Juna 1990	July 1998	Aug. 1990g/	See1 1990g-		
Total	109.195	110.477	110.341	110.854	108.868	110.617	110.829	110.740	110.457	110.554		
Total private	\$1.583	93.008	93.132	92.812	90.985	92,120	92,282	42.300	92.307	92.Z40		
Goods-producing industries	25.725	25.352	25.456	25.336	25.304	25.191	25.162	25.105	25.013	24,929		
Manang	5917	752 415.7	769	748 414.5	709 589	734 408	744 613	745 413	736 410	71		
Construction General building contractors.	5,499 1,392.0	5,532 1,585.9	5,537 1,380.8	9,643 1,356.4	\$.225 1.343	5.286 1,334	5.270 1.334	5,229 1,319	5,194	5.174 1.308		
Manufactursng Production workers	13.334	19.044 12,919	19.170 15.032	19.145	19.370	19.167 13.025	19.148 13.007	13.010	19.083 12.967	12.917 12.911		
Dureble goods. Production workers	11.414	11,125 7,365	11.124	11,114	11,369	11.217	11.201	11,179 7,438	11.130 7.396	11.072 7.347		
Lumber and used products furniture and lister seducts Stone. Clay, and glass products Blast Virnacis and basic stell products. Fabricated metal products Industrial machinery and equipment. Industrial machinery and setting products Material machinery and setting products. Material machinery and setting products.	1 744 2 1 524 7 1 575 5 1 768 8 1 767 6 1 850 6 1 1 850 6 1 3 93 5 1 3 95 5 1 3 9	758.0 501.2 541.3 751.7 1.405.0 2.097.4 1.405.1 1.990.5 804.3 996.0 377.4	F 736.8 F 511.2 F 561.5 F 754.3 F 754.3 F 272.2 F 1,414.1 F 2,085.2 F 1,974.6 F 798.5 F 992.8 F 992.8 F 386.5	750.6 510.1 557.3 753.6 1270.6 11,618.8 12,076.7 11,618.8 12,076.7 11,617.5 11,986.7 1,986.7 1,912.8 1,992.8	750           524           563           767           276           1.438           2.132           1.743           2.132           1.743           1.438           2.132           1.743           1.438           1.438           3.88	748 516 559 755 271 1,417 2,112 1,711 1,711 1,711 817 1,002 387	743 515 556 756 756 270 1.415 2.108 1.703 1.703 1.703 1.703 1.703 384	742       511       552       759       271       1,419       2.104       1.695       824       996       386	739 514 7551 7551 1,620 2,096 1,685 1,997 814 990 585	737   509   546   751   270   1,413   2,083   1,683   1,983   1,983   384		
Nandurable goods Production workers	8.092 5.724	7.945	5.654	8.031 5.650	8.001 5.637	7.950 3.573	7.947 5.568	7,952 5,572	3:33	7,945		
Fand and bindrod products	11,733 7 49 9 724 0 11,074 7 698.1 11,558.4 11,076 2 159 4 880.1 134.7	1,684 6 691.9 997.0 704.6 1,378.0 1,096.5 163.7 864.2 120.6	1,730.8 47.2 703.4 1,025.4 705.8 1,578.7 1,094.3 164.4 870.5 125.7	1,729.5 48.7 700.3 11,029.0 701.8 11,573.2 11,084.9 1 469.7 1 125.3	1.653 48 720 1.070 1.366 1.075 1.075 1.57 880 133	1.650 46 703 1.031 1.581 1.581 1.085 159 848 129	1.643 47 702 1.029 1.582 1.086 1.086 140 871 128	1.645 46 702 1.027 1.583 1.088 1.088 1.088 1.088 1.088	1.650 67 701 1.025 1.583 1.087 161 873 126	1,649 47 697 1,025 701 1,541 1,089 1,089 162 870 124		
Service-producing industries	83.472	85.125	44.445	\$5.518	83.564	45.426	\$5.667	45.435	\$3.444	\$5.627		
Transportation and public utilities Transportation Communications and public utilities	5.700 3.525 2.175	5.843 3.407 2.236	5.850 3.415 2.235	5.905 3.688 2.217	5.434 3.483 2.173	5,833 3,613 2,220	5,844 3,627 2,219	5,441 3.425 2,216	5.845 5.630 2.215	5.859 3.644 2.213		
Nholesale trade	6.315 3.738 2.577	6.614 3.794 2.620	6,408 3,784 2,624	4.386 3.762 2.624	6,303 3,742 2,561	6,349 3,770 2,599	6.383 5.779 2.604	4.374 3.775 2.599	4.375 3.749 2.494	4.374 3.766 2,408		
Retal trade Gonard merchandise stores Food stores Automotive dealers and service statems Eating and drinking places	19.681 12.484 8 13.204 2 12.124 1 16.619 2	10.950 2,433.8 3,314.2 2.156.1 6,784.3	19.957 12,456.3 15,301.5 12,160.6 16,805.2	10,868 2,432.0 3,288.1 2,155.0 6,768.5	19.634 2,534 3,211 2,109 6,476	19,795 2,447 3,295 2,121 6,543	19,822 2,496 3,302 2,120 6,598	19.851 2,494 3.504 2.131 6.619	19,838 2,491 3,298 2,135 6,613	19.828 2.482 3.295 2.140 6.623		
Finence, insurance, and rael estate Finence Insurance Real estata	6,764 3,311 7,105 1,348	6.936 3.371 2.158 1,407	6.933 3.371 2.197 1.405	6.853 3,338 2.145 1.370	6.753 3.317 2.111 1.325	6,838 3,338 2,139 1,361	6.844 3.344 2.143 1.357	6.842 3.341 2.147 1.354	6,830 3,348 2,151 1,351	4.843 3.345 2.151 1,347		
Services,,	27,400	28.513 5.080.9 8.172.6	28.528	28,444	27,335 4,980 7,648	28.094 5.048 8.040	28,225 5,060 8,096	28,287 5,051 8,132	28,386 5,033 8,194	28.407 5.037 8.259		
Gevernment Føderal State Local	17.612 2.978 4.149 10.485	17,449 3.200 4.070 20,199	17.209 3.064 4.084 10.061	18.042 2.998 4.233 10.811	17,483 2,992 4,215 10,474	18.497 3.344 4.262 10.889	18,547 3,338 4,296 10,913	18,440 3,164 4,298 10,978	18.350 3.049 4.317 10.984	18.316 3.010 4.297 11.009		

gr f ereismonerv .

#### Note on temporary curace warkers

The number of temporary workers associated with the 1980 census has an impact on the mere levels for the Federal government, as well as for highle aggregates. The estimate of these was 22,000 h alareny, 27,000 h relevany, 117,000 h March, 127,000 h Arght, 127 in May

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers/ on private nonfare payrolls by industry

	Not seasonally adjusted					5	essonell:	edjust	ed .	
Industry	Sept. 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990g/	Sept. 1990g/	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990g-	Sept. 1990g/
Total private	56.7	34.9	34.8	34.8	34.6	34.5	34.7	34.5	34.5	34.7
Mining	44.0	43.6	43.9	64.3	43.7	43.6	44.4	43.7	43.8	45.9
Construction	38.6	38.3	39.0	59.3	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing. Overtime heurg	41.2 4.1	40.5 3.6	40.8 3.9	41.2 4.1	40.9 3.8	40.9 3.8	41.0 3.8	40.9 3.7	41.0 3.8	41.0 3.7
Durable goods Overtime hours	41.7 4.1	41.0 3.6	41.2 3.9	41:7	41.5 3.8	41.5 3.9	41.6 3.9	41.5 3.8	41.6 3.9	41:6
Lumber and ward products. Stone. clay. and glass products. Planty and links products. Planty and links for an explanation Industrial and products. Industrial methody and explanation Fransportation explanation Nator valcies and explanation Missoilaneous manufacturing. Nendrable products. Double media Double media Double media Double media Double media Double media Tatlie mill products.	40.4 40.1 42.7 42.8 41.7 42.8 41.2 42.8 42.8 40.9 39.3 40.5 4.1 41.5 40.3 41.0	40.0 38.9 42.8 44.1 40.1 41.6 41.6 41.9 41.6 41.9 40.3 8.8 38.8 39.9 3.6 40.6 38.7	40.6         39.6         42.6         41.3         41.3         41.4         41.3         41.4         41.3         41.4         41.5         41.3         41.3         41.3         41.4         40.9         40.9         40.9         40.9         41.4         40.3         41.4         40.3         41.4         40.3	40.9 39.5 43.2 43.8 41.7 42.8 41.0 42.8 41.4 39.9 40.5 4.1 40.5 4.1 40.5	40.1 39.5 42.2 41.5 42.2 41.5 42.2 41.0 42.7 43.0 42.7 43.0 59.2 40.2 3.7 40.2 3.7 40.2 40.4 40.4	40.4 39.2 42.1 43.0 41.7 42.1 42.9 42.5 43.4 41.1 39.4 40.1 39.4 40.1 3.6 40.2	40.3 39.3 43.0 43.0 41.6 41.0 42.6 41.2 59.4 40.3 3.6 40.3 (2) 40.4	40.2 59.6 41.7 43.1 41.7 42.8 43.6 41.2 39.5 40.1 3.6 40.2 (2) 40.2	40.4 39.4 42.3 43.6 42.1 40.5 42.7 43.8 41.3 42.7 43.8 41.3 39.8 40.2 3.7 40.9 42.9	$\begin{array}{c} 40.7\\ 38.9\\ 42.1\\ 43.8\\ 41.5\\ 42.9\\ 42.9\\ 42.7\\ 43.4\\ 39.9\\ 40.1\\ 39.9\\ 40.1\\ 39.7\\ 3.6\\ 12.7\\ 39.7\\ $
Apparel and other tettic products practing ad mobilshums Chemicals and allied products. Patrelaws and coal products. Rubber and mate. plastics products. Lasther and lasther products	36.9 43.7 38.4 42.5 44.4 41.3 38.2	36.3 43.2 37.7 42.1 44.7 40.9 37.4	38.7 43.2 58.3 42.2 43.8 41.1 38.0	30.0 43.4 34.5 42.7 44.3 41.5 57.4	30.8 43.2 58.0 42.5 (2) 41.1 38.2	43.3 37.9 42.6 (2) 41.4 37.4	43.5 38.0 42.6 (2) 41.6 37.5	43.5 38.0 42,4 (2) 41.5 37,4	43.5 58.2 42.5 (2) 41.3 37.7	42.9 42.9 42.7 (2) 41.3 37.4
Transportation and public utilities	38.9	39.4	39.5	39.4	38.8	59.1	39.2	39.0	39.0	39.3
Mulemle trade	38.1	38.3	38.1	38.2	38.1	58.0	34.1	38.1	38.1	38.1
Rotail trade	28.9	29.7	29.4	28.9	28.9	29.0	29.0	28.9	28.7	28.9
Finance, insurance, and real estate	35.6	36.2	35.7	36.2	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Services	32.5	33.0	32.6	52.7	32.6	32.5	32.6	32.6	\$2.5	32.8

1/ Data relate to production workers in mining and samplesturing; communition workers in construction; boblic utilities; whelesals and restail trade; finance; insurance; and real actits; and services. These groups account for approximation four-fithm of the total

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

exployees on private nonferm payrolls. 2' These series are not published resentily adjusted this of the sendor irregular components and commonwently cannot be separated with sufficient precision. p \* preliminery.

Table 3-5. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers]/ on private nonfarm payrolls by industry

	Ave	age hou	rly earn	ings	Average weekly earnings				
Industry	Sept. 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990g/	Sept. 1990g/	Sept. 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990g/	Sept. 1990g/	
Total private Seasonally adjusted	\$9.77 9.73	\$10.00 10.07	\$10.00	\$10.17	\$339.02	\$ 349.00 347.42	\$348.00 347.76	: 353.92 351.51	
Mining	13.29	13.69	13.62	13.74	584.76	596.88	597.9Z	608.68	
Construction	13.65	13.70	13.74	14.10	526.89	524.71	535.86	554.13	
Manufacturing	10.56	10.88	10.82	10.94	435.07	440.64	441.46	450.73	
Durable goods	11.11 8.95 8.95 12.54 14.40 10.87 12.54 14.40 10.13 13.86 11.46 8.36 9.81 9.81 14.71 4.71 4.641 12.04 11.07 13.20 15.61 9.50 6.65	11.38 9.16 8.50 11.21 13.04 14.95 10.86 11.78 10.54 14.59 11.37 8.60 10.54 14.59 11.37 8.60 10.54 14.59 12.56 8.01 12.56 8.01 12.56 8.59 12.55 13.55 13.55 15.55 15.75 1	$ \begin{array}{c} 11.35\\ 9.15\\ 8.57\\ 11.15\\ 12.94\\ 14.85\\ 11.80\\ 10.32\\ 14.08\\ 11.36\\ 11.36\\ 10.12\\ 8.60\\ 10.12\\ 8.60\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 8.60\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\ 10.12\\ 14.08\\$	11.49         9.20         8.65         11.22         13.02         14.94         10.95         11.42         14.96         11.42         14.96         11.45         14.90         11.45         14.90         11.45         14.90         11.45         15.76         9.57         15.76         15.76         15.76         12.39         12.39         13.63         16.35         9.86         6.94	463.29 361.58 336.84.15 536.74 464.15 536.71 620.64 445.36 445.36 447.45 537.21 627.13 447.45 327.31 447.45 327.31 388.86 592.81 317.34 236.53 425.09 526.15 425.09 684.20	466 58 366 40 330 65 40 558 11 659 30 444 17 490 05 444 17 490 05 444 17 490 05 444 17 490 05 444 17 490 05 444 17 416 62 333 68 333 06 533 95 424 13 533 95 424 13 533 95 424 13 533 95	$\begin{array}{c} 467.62\\ 371.49\\ 339.37\\ 476.11\\ 551.24\\ 447.69\\ 490.88\\ 447.69\\ 490.88\\ 464.62\\ 1340.56\\ 459.98\\ 464.62\\ 1340.56\\ 464.62\\ 1340.56\\ 464.39\\ 464.62\\ 1340.56\\ 464.39\\ 432.41\\ 243.69\\ 530.32\\ 432.41\\ 701.24\\ 401.96\\ 1401.25\\ 9.92\\ \end{array}$	4 779 13 376 28 377 27 341 68 477 97 562 46 553 02 456 26 503 02 456 26 456 26 457 22 416 61 427 22 416 65 455 60 474 03 412 97 412 br>412 97 412 97 417 417 417 417 417 417 4	
Transportation and public utilities	12.73	12.99	12.97	13.11	495.20	511.81	509.72	516.53	
Hholesale trade	10.48	10.82	10.77	10.92	\$99.29	414.41	410.34	417.14	
Retail trade	6.59	6.74	6.75	6.87	190.45	200.18	198.45	198.54	
Finance, insurance, and real estate	9.60	10.00	9.94	10.09	341.76	1 362.00	354.86	365.26	
Services	9.49	9.79	9.77	9.99	308.43	323.07	1 320.46	326.67	

1/ See footnote 1. table 8-2.

p \* preliminary.

Table 8-4. Average hourly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers]/ on private nonfarm payrolls by industry, seasonally adjusted

Industry	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	yîu 1990	Aug. 1990g/	Sept. 1990g/	Percent change from: Aug. 1990- Sept. 1990
Total private: Current dollars Constant (1982) dollars2/ Mining. Constant (1982) dollars2/ Constant (1982) Constant (1982) Constant (1982) Koluding overtime5/ Françourization and public utilities Hholessis trade. Finance, insurance, and real estate Services.	\$9.73 7.64 13.31 10.55 10.09 12.68 10.48 6.57 9.65 9.49	\$9.98 7.58 13.58 13.71 10.81 10.55 12.88 10.74 6.76 9.87 9.80	\$10.03 7.58 13.75 15.73 10.86 10.86 10.86 12.92 10.80 6.78 9.98 9.85	\$10.07 7.58 13.79 10.89 10.40 13.02 10.84 6.79 10.08 9.92	\$10.08       7.53       13.73       10.40       10.40       10.40       10.40       10.84       10.84       10.92       10.94       10.94       10.94       10.94       10.94       10.94       10.94       10.94       10.94       10.92	\$10.15   H.A.   \$13.75   10.43   10.43   10.43   10.45   10.92   6.85   10.14   9.99	0.5 (3) 1.6 .3 .4 .7 .4 1.0

1/ See footnote 1. table 8-2. 2/ The Consumer Price Index for Urban Name Earners and Clerical Morkers (CPI-M) is that to deflate this series. 2/ Change uss -0.7 percent from July 1990 to August 1990, the latest month available.

CSTARI	<b>ISHMENT</b>	DATA

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

C3188[5KHEHT DATA Table 8-5. Indexes of asgregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers[/ on private nonfarm payrolls by industry (1982+100)

(1982=100)											
	Not		nally ad	justed	Seasonally adjusted						
Industry		141y 1990	Aug. 1990g-	Sept. 1990g/	Sept. 1989	May 1990	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990 <u>p</u> /	3ept. 1990 <u>p</u> /	
Total private	124.4	127.1	127.1	125.9	125.2	124.6	125.3	124.8	124.5	124.7	
Joads-producing industries	115.4	111.3	113.2	112.0	111.9	111.2	111.7	1110.5	110.5	108.7	
Mining	64.5	67.4	47.7	68.2	62.9	65.9	68.0	66.9	66.0	66.4	
Construction	152.Z	151.4	154.2	142.3	140.6	142.1	144.3	138.4	139.8	131.6	
Henufacturing	110.8	105.6	107.3	108.4	109.0	107.5	107.4	1107.4	107.1	196.6	
Durable geeds Furniture and fristures Signe. Clary, and Jass reducts Blast furneses and benc steel product Tablicated antil predicts Indifficult and the second steel product Indifficult and the second steel product Indifficult and the second steel and Transportation exuperity Retor vehicles and exupert Miscellaneous serufatturing. Nord and informa products Testic and informa products Testic and staffed products Chericals and staffed products	110 135 131 131 131 131 135 131 146 135 146 146 146 146 146 146 146 146	1104.7 1122.5 1120.9 1120.9 120.9 120.9 120.9 120.9 120.9 120.9 140.5 105.5 1005.5 100	105.5           134.3           123.3           122.3           122.3           122.3           122.3           122.3           122.3           122.3           122.3           122.3           124.3           106.7           105.9           1124.3           1124.3           1124.3           104.9           1124.3           104.9           1124.3           104.9           104.9           1124.3           104.9           1129.3           1129.1           1129.1           1129.1           1125.9           1129.1           1125.9           1129.1           123.9           123.9           129.3	106.9 133.7 122.3 122.0 122.0 122.0 122.4 122.0 122.4 108.4 97.0 107.4 121.8 121.8 131.6 47.2 107.1 110.4 110.4 117.1 10.4 10.5 100.5 100.5 122.6 105.0 122.6 125.0	108.9 1129.55 1129.55 1129.45 1129.55 1129.55 1129.55 1129.45 1129.45 1129.45 1109.60 1129.11 125.11 125.11 109.61 129.15 109.11 109.22 109.11 109.5 100.5 1	107.3 131.9 125.7 110.5 193.5 181.2 108.3 198.9 109.5 121.8 131.2 121.8 131.2 107.9 109.5 109.5 109.5 109.5 109.5 109.2 100.2	107.1 126.0 110.5 93.5 93.5 93.5 93.5 93.5 107.4 109.6 123.7 109.6 123.7 108.7 109.6 109.6 109.6 109.6 109.6 109.6 109.6 109.6 109.6 109.6 109.7 100.7	107.1 125.8 108.2 94.3 108.5 108.5 108.5 108.5 108.3 124.1 1133.2 124.1 104.5 107.7 107.7 107.7 107.7 107.7 107.4 104.3 104.5 109.6 109.6 109.6 109.5 100.5	106.5 129.7 125.7 109.5 93.4 80.6 108.1 97.9 107.1 122.6 107.1 107.9 107.1 107.9 107.3 104.1 107.3 109.3 66.5 92.3 111.6 129.3 129.7 128.6 154.6	105.9         130.5         122.9         108.2         92.9         181.0         107.4         121.3         124.9         107.4         107.7         108.8         92.4         107.7         110.6         122.9         107.7         108.8         92.4         107.7         108.8         92.4         120.7         120.7         122.7         123.7         124.7	
Service-producing industries	128.	5 1 3 4 . :	2 133.3	132.2	128.2	2 130.4	131.4	131.2	130.8	131.9	
Transportation and public utilities	112.	117.	116.6	118.4	j	5 116.0	116.3	115.4	115.3	116.9	
Kholesala trade	118.	7 121.3	2 120.3	120.0	118.4	1118.9	119.1	ij 119.3	119.5	119.5	
Retail trade	124.	1 129.3	2 128.0	125.0	123.4	1125.1	125.	5 125.1	1 124.0	124.4	
Finance, insurance, and real estate	120.	126.	2 124.6	124.2	120.7	7 122.S	122.	123.1	122.8	124.4	
Services		4 148.	9 148.5	147.3	141.4	4   244 . (	6 143.1	145.9	146.0	147.4	

1/ See featnote 1, table 8-2.

p + oreliminary.

.

ESTABL 15	HMEI	NT DATA						
Table B-	6.	Diffusion	indexes o	f	employment	change.	seasonally	adjusted
(Percent	,							

|--|

trere	enty													
-	Time span	Jan.	Feb.	Har.	Apr.	Hay	June	July	Aug.	Sept	Oct.	Nov,	Dec.	
			L											
0ver	1-month spen: 1989 1990	64.5 55.6	58.7 58.6	58.0 53.7	57 0	55.6 55.8	57.3 49.9	55.8 50.8	57.7 g/47.3	50 0 g/44.0	55.2	59.6	56.6	
0/er	3-nonth span: 1989 1990	65.3 58.4	64.2 56.7	60.0 54.8	60.1 53.1	59.7 53.7	58.3 55.3	59.7 2/51.1	54.5 E/45.4	55.2	55.8	57.7	60.3	
Over	6-month span: 1989 1990	67.6 57.3	65.4 56.5	65.0	61.0 55.9	61.2 £/52.0	58.7 g/48.6	57.0	58.1	56.Z	58.3	57.4	58.4	
Over	12-month span: 1989	67.1 54.8	67.7 e/53.8	65.3 2/52.9	64.6	64.9	61.2	60.0	59.8	58.6	57.3	56.7	56.0	
		1	Manufacturing payrolls, 139 industries]/											
Over	1-month span: 1989 1990	60.4 42.4	48.6 45.7	50.4 45.3	67.1 66.8	45.3	45.7 40.3	45.0 48.2	45.7 [e/41.0	34.2 2/35.6	48.6	43.5	48.2	
0ver	1989	54.0 40.3	54.7 37.1	45.3 44.2	43.9 41.4	45.2 40.6	42.8 44.2	41.7 g/40.6	33.1 g/ 32.7	36.3	34.9	41.7	39.2	
0.44	5	56.5 37.1	49.6	49.3 36.3	43.5 43.2	42.1 g/38.8	37.1 2132.7	36.7	34.9	34.2	35.3	33.1	36.0	
Over	12-month spani 1989 1990	53.6 31.3	55.0 2130.9	49.3 gr 30.2	45.3	43.9	39.9	37.1	35.6	33.8	32.4	50.9	51.7	

1/ Based on teasonally adjusted data for 1-. 3-. and a-month spans and unadjusted data for the 12-month span Cata are centered within the span. p : oraljainary 1002 for igures are the percent of industries with

employment increasing plus one-half of the industries with unchanged employment, where 50 percent indicates an equal balance between industries with increasing and decreasing employment.

Representative HAMILTON. Well, what does all this tell us about recession?

Mrs. Norwood. I think that what it seems to be saying is that the labor market at least has slowed down considerably and, at least in terms of overall payroll employment, has declined. The definition of a recession, however, is much broader than labor market data.

There is, as you know, the short hand of two quarters of downward GNP which we have not yet had. But the more technical and the more important definition is really that there have to be significant reductions, as measured by how deep they are and how widespread they are, and how long they have endured. And that is what the National Bureau of Economic Research looks at in declaring recessions.

From these labor market data one cannot discern what they would do. It seems to me that what we've had is a real slowdown and that we are no longer having the kind of growth we've had in the service-producing sector to bolster the rest of the economy.

It's clear that manufacturing and construction have been going down for a considerable period of time. They're in very bad straits. It's the service-producing sector that we're watching with very great care.

**Representative HAMILTON.** Which sector?

Mrs. Norwood. The service-producing sector, which is where most of the people in this country now are working.

Representative HAMILTON. So you cannot look at the employment data, the labor market data, and say on the basis of that that we're in a recession?

Mrs. Norwood. That's correct. That's my view. I don't think we can do that.

Representative HAMILTON. You can't look at it and say we're near one, I guess?

Mrs. Norwood. I think you can say there's great risk, clearly.

Representative HAMILTON. We had Mr. Greenspan before us the other day. He defined a recession differently, as a kind of cumulative unwinding of the economy. Where did that definition come from? Is that an accepted definition or is that one that he spun off?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Alan Greenspan is probably one of the best students of, or professors of, data reading and understanding of anybody I know. And I think that what he was talking about is essentially what I was talking about in looking at how deep the declines are, how widely dispersed they are, and how long is their duration. I think he was just using different words.

Representative HAMILTON. That's not a very mathematical definition, is it? The other definition is two quarters of negative growth in a row; you can measure that precisely or relatively precisely. His is a little less measurable definition; is that right?

Mrs. Norwood. Well, I think so. And I think the major point is that it's somewhat broader. Of course, the GNP is the broadest data set that we have, but you would look at a whole lot of series to see just where we're heading.

My own view, if I may say, is that it really doesn't matter whether this is recession or not recession, we are seeing great difficulty in the labor market. Representative HAMILTON. It's kind of hairsplitting in a way, isn't it?

Mrs. Norwood. Yes.

Representative HAMILTON. But if you take his definition, then what kind of data do you look at to determine whether or not you have that cumulative unwinding that he's talking about?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Clearly he would be concerned, as many are, with the financial data, credit, savings, consumer expenditures, with what's happening to profits, with many of the data series that you ticked off at the beginning in your statement, as well as the labor market data.

Representative HAMILTON. Has this recent increase in unemployment been identifiable only in certain labor markets: unskilled workers, blacks, teenagers, or whatever? Or is it pretty much across the board?

Mrs. Norwood. We always have greater difficulty among the minority citizens of this country, and among the less well trained when the unemployment rate begins creeping upward. It's beginning, however, to affect some of the managerial and other occupations. The other thing, of course, is that there are big differences from one part of the country to another.

Representative HAMILTON. Now, despite the increase in unemployment, the unemployment rate for teenagers fell; it fell for both white teenagers and black teenagers. Black teenagers fell 8 percent. Is there a statistical explanation for that or did they actually find jobs?

Mr. PLEWES. In part, there is a statistical explanation. This summer, despite the fact that there were fewer teenagers in the work force, their unemployment rate rose.

I think the important thing for teenagers, perhaps, is to look at their experience over the period April through September where we don't have the fluctuation caused by summertime behavior. There we find, I think, that generally speaking their unemployment rate has been about unchanged.

Representative HAMILTON. So you don't really see anything very significant there?

Mr. PLEWES. Not in this 1-month movement, sir.

Mrs. NORWOOD. And as for black teenagers, they have been in a bad situation for some time. Their rate bounces up and down a bit, but it's still not very good.

Representative HAMILTON. Since May, the number of people unemployed has risen by about 400,000. Is that increase mainly people who lost their jobs or are on layoff, or was it due mainly to an increase in the number of people coming into the labor force?

Mrs. NORWOOD. We've had over the last couple of months a big increase in the number of people who lost their jobs. We are seeing here and there more evidence now that companies, particularly large ones, are often using a week or two of closedown and furlough with employees, perhaps reminiscent of the Federal Government in furloughing people so that they can reduce their costs.

Representative HAMILTON. Is there anything in the data to suggest that people who have recently lost their jobs are having a tougher time finding new jobs?

Mrs. Norwood. We don't have anything specific to that, but clearly—

Representative HAMILTON. That would ordinarily be typical of recession, wouldn't it?

Mrs. Norwood. Yes.

Representative HAMILTON. Excuse me, I didn't mean to interrupt. Mrs. Norwood. All I was saying was that clearly those who are in areas where there has been a significant downturn, a significant increase in unemployment, would be very much affected. The duration figures have gone up, the longer term unemployment, are edging up.

Representative HAMILTON. Let me just ask a question or two about inflation. The consumer price index rose 0.8 of a percent. The producer price index rose 1.3 percent in August. What is your general reaction to these figures as to the seriousness right now of our inflation problem?

Mrs. NORWOOD. It's always serious when the indexes go up because it means that people are faced with higher prices. Nevertheless, most of the cause seems to be oil prices, gasoline, and other kinds of energy. We don't know how long lived that will be. There are some—most of the economists with oil companies are forecasting that the high price of crude oil will go down, they have begun to go down recently, but that's something we're not sure about.

Representative HAMILTON. Now, you had a big jump, of course, at the pump for gasoline. Is that reflected in the August figures, that big jump in the gasoline price?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Yes. I want to make one other point and that is that it is important to recognize that the jumps we've had, the increases we've had for oil, in particular the PPI increases that we've had, will eventually find their way through the market, so there will be some secondary effects.

Mr. DALTON. Also, I think it's probably important for us to say that we are not sure that the entire impact of higher prices has been felt yet.

Representative HAMILTON. In that August figure.

Mr. DALTON. Right. We may have a further sharp increase in September.

Representative HAMILTON. The CPI has risen at an annual rate of 7 percent for the last 3 months, compared to 4.8 percent in 1989. What is it that accounts for that acceleration?

Mrs. Norwood. Well, a large part of it is—

**Representative HAMILTON. Energy?** 

Mrs. NORWOOD. Energy, yes. Excluding energy, last month the CPI increased about a tenth of a percent. That's more than we would like it.

Representative HAMILTON. That's the core rate you're talking about?

Mrs. NORWOOD. It's less energy. I'm not quite sure what the core rate is. If you don't live in a house and you don't drive a car, you have the core rate.

Representative HAMILTON. Is there a technical definition of a core rate?

Mr. Dalton. No.

Mrs. NORWOOD. But most people use the CPI excluding food, shelter, and energy.

Mr. DALTON. Or simply food and energy.

Mrs. NORWOOD. Yes. Another approach would be take out food and energy.

Representative HAMILTON. Is the inflation rate increase due to an increase in the prices of services at all? Is that involved?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Medical services have been going up steadily.

Do you have something to add to that, Mr. Dalton?

Mr. DALTON. I would only add that the acceleration up to a 7percent rate is largely due to higher energy prices. But if you look at the entire first 8 months of 1990, you see that the index for all items less energy is running at a 6-percent rate, and that compares with the 4.6-percent rate last year. So we are seeing some acceleration outside of energy, and a good part of that is split between the services and apparel.

Representative HAMILTON. If we had a recession, would we expect to see inflation in the price of services slow down?

Mr. DALTON. I'm not so sure we would.

Mrs. NORWOOD. I'm not sure that would happen to medical services, for example. It would occur with some services, clearly, but the big upward push has been medical services, and that's now what, 11 or 12 percent of GNP?

Representative HAMILTON. So if there is price restraint in a recessionary period, it would be not in the services area but in the goods-producing area; is that right?

Mrs. Norwood. If there is, there will be some in the services. I wouldn't rule that out, but it's not going to be as clear cut; it wouldn't be as clear cut. And, in fact, we've had periods when we have had a kind of stagflation, as you know.

Representative HAMILTON. Congressman Solarz.

Representative SOLARZ. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. Norwood, I noticed that the unemployment rate for blacks seems to have gone up substantially more than the unemployment rate for whites, three times as much. There's a zero increase in the unemployment rate for whites and a 0.3 increase for blacks. What accounts for that?

Mrs. NORWOOD. First of all, of course, we're comparing very different sized groups, and I'm not sure that the rate for blacks is really a statistically significant increase. But the point is, those rates are very high, so it doesn't matter really whether they have changed. They have stayed high and they are much higher than the rate for whites.

I continue to believe that it is based on really two things, perhaps three:

One is education. There is a difference in the educational attainment of these groups. More importantly, perhaps, even those minority citizens who are well educated seem to find jobs in different occupations than whites do. They have a harder time apparently, or they don't go into the law, medicine, or things of that sort. When they are in professional occupations, they seem to be more in the lower paying ones, such as teaching. So that's a problem. In addition, the minority groups have tended to find jobs in the industries that are being wound down in terms of employment, a lot more blacks in some of the construction and manufacturing.

Representative SOLARZ. I noticed that the increase in the unemployment rate for those of Hispanic origin was substantially greater even than the increase in unemployment for those who are black. What is the explanation for that? Is it that they are concentrated in areas of the economy which are suffering most at the present time?

Mrs. NORWOOD. It's always harder for minority groups to get jobs. I do want to caution that though it seems like a very large increase, that figure bounces up and down a bit, and we really need a couple of more months to be certain of it.

However, given the overall conditions of the labor market, I am sure that they are having greater difficulty than they did before.

Representative SOLARZ. Are you in a position at all to speculate about the impact of sequestration on the unemployment rate?

Mrs. NORWOOD. I'm having all I can do to speculate on the impact of sequestration on the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and I might say that the impact of sequestration would be that you wouldn't have any numbers to worry about because there wouldn't be any. You can't collect them. You can't put them in.

Representative SOLARZ. That may be comforting to the ostrich caucus around here inasmuch as the country will be unable to determine the precise measure of the catastrophe into which they've plunged us. But, nevertheless, while you're still at the table, for example how many Federal workers will be laid off? What will that do to the unemployment rate? Are you able to calculate what the ripple effect would be in other sectors of the economy with an overall cutback of Federal funding?

Mrs. NORWOOD. I certainly can't give you any specific numbers, but it's my understanding that, first of all, a lot of the Federal agencies for some period of time until it became permanent, would be furloughing people temporarily. And if they were on the payrolls at all during the survey period, they would be considered employed by our definition.

So I think that should be considered. There is a large community out there that is dependent in terms of business, and they would be losing jobs. More important I think is that there would be a contraction, I would expect, that would occur in financial markets, and that would have an effect overall across the board on business, but I cannot speculate as to how much.

Representative SOLARZ. Are you saying that if somebody is furloughed, by which I understand it to mean they're told not to report to work because there's no money to pay them—or presumably, if they wanted to work on a volunteer basis they could, but if they're not getting paid and they're not showing up for work—in what sense are they considered employed by your criteria?

Mrs. NORWOOD. That's why I was very careful to say depending on how long that goes on.

If people are furloughed for example 2 or 3 days a week, if they appear 1 day during the week, they're on the payroll and so they're not counted as unemployed. That was my point.
Representative SOLARZ. What have you decided to do in your shop? Would people be laid off for the whole week until such time as this was resolved, if it ever was? Or would you have everybody go 4 days, or 3 days? How are you working that?

Mrs. NORWOOD. We've considered a variety of options. It would cost us money to eliminate people from the payroll because of the rules of seniority and so on, and you'd lose people in one place rather than another place, and you'd have to also pay them certain amounts of money for unemployment compensation and for other kinds of things.

So we are looking at furloughs. I might say that what we're looking at is how to protect our work force as well as we can, because the Bureau of Labor Statistics is a professional agency that depends upon the people who are there, and we don't want them to rush off to find other jobs. It's hard enough to keep the good people we have.

We're looking at furloughs of—I'm not sure how much. It depends on how long this goes on. But we're looking at starting off with a day and then perhaps more. We're cutting all kinds of other things.

Representative SOLARZ. What has been the average duration of the recessions we've had in the post-World War II era? Am I correct in saying that the technical definition of a recession is two quarters of negative growth?

Mrs. NORWOOD. That's a definition. A more technical definition is, as I said to the chairman, the review by the National Bureau of Economic Research of the depth of the reductions, the dispersion of them, and how long they take place.

The average duration of postwar contractions has been about a year. But there have been tremendous variations from one to another.

Representative SOLARZ. What have been?

Mrs. Norwood. The specifics? How long? Well, if you go back to 1982, it was about 16 months. The 1980 recession was only 6 months. The 1975 recession was about 16 months, and you go back to 8, 10, 11, it just varied from 8 months, or from 6 months to about 16 months.

Representative SOLARZ. What is the average unemployment rate during these recessions?

Mrs. NORWOOD. I don't have that, but we know that it has gone up to double-digit range.

Mr. PLEWES. We have the highs here. I can go through them. The 1982 recession it got up to 10.8 percent; in 1980, 7.8 percent; in the 1975 recession, 9 percent; in the 1970 recession, 6.1 percent; the 1961 recession, 7.1 percent; in 1958, 7.5 percent; 1954, 6.1 percent; 1949, 7.9 percent.

Representative SOLARZ. So we can anticipate a fairly sharp increase in unemployment when we move into a recession?

Mrs. Norwood. It would appear so.

On the other hand, we are now a much more service-producing economy, and the service-producing sector in the past has been less susceptible than the goods-producing sector. That's what we've been seeing over the last months. The worrying thing I think right now is that the service-producing sector seems to have become stagnant.

Representative SOLARZ. Is there a significant regional differentiation in the unemployment picture?

Mrs. Norwood. Yes, there is a significant difference in the change. The difference in the unemployment rates is not so great, but you have the Northeast, for example, which had a very lowunemployment rate, which has come way up. But its rate is not terribly different from the rates in other sections of the country.

Representative SOLARZ. What was the explanation for the sharp increase in unemployment in the Northeast?

Mrs. Norwood. It's basically, I think, an industrial composition question. We have a lot of high-tech industry, for example, and as I indicated in my statement, the electronic equipment industry has had very severe declines. So I think it's largely that.

Do you have more to add to that Mr. Plewes?

Mr. PLEWES. And a slowdown in construction, which was generating a lot of jobs up in the Northeast.

Representative SOLARZ. Why has there been a slowdown in electronics?

Mr. PLEWES. Two reasons we see. First of all, it's connected with the slowdown in defense spending, and that's happened way over the last year and a half.

The second is in the computer industry, both a question of satiation and competition from different areas of the country and overseas.

Representative SOLARZ. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

I remember once Mrs. Norwood came on some snowy day and told us that neither rain nor sleet nor snow could stay this courrier from the traditional competiton of her appointed monthly rounds.

Representative HAMILTON. Did she include sequestration? [Laughter.]

Representative SOLARZ. Based on what she's told us, I fear that next month may be the first time in the history of the Bureau that we may not have this monthly hearing.

Mrs. Norwood. The thing that is troubling us that we have tried to examine every way we could as to how we can continue to collect data, because if you don't collect them, you can't ever have them, you can't go back and get them after the fact. And that's the big worry we have in our employment and in our price indicators in particular, which are monthly series.

So we'll do our best.

Representative SOLARZ. We will, too. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mrs. Norwood. We're counting on you.

Representative HAMILTON. I'm not sure we did last night. We'll try again today.

Thank you, Congressman Solarz.

The labor force growth has slowed quite dramatically, hasn't it? Mrs. Norwood. Yes.

Representative HAMILTON. Why is that happening? Is that strictly a function of birth rates? Why have we had that kind of drop? Mrs. Norwood. A large part of that is teenagers.

Representative SOLARZ. Fewer teenagers?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Yes, just fewer of them were born. On the other hand, the labor force participation rates are not up as much as they have been, and part of that I think may be two things.

One is that more of them may be going on for more education, but more importantly there are not so many jobs in the retail trade industry in particular, where teenagers have found jobs before. And so many of them may be opting not to come into the labor force to look for work.

Representative HAMILTON. Is a decline in the labor force a trend that is associated with a recession? Is there any relationship between that data and a recession?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Once a recession has been in place for awhile, or an economic downturn, or drops in employment growth for awhile, people often get discouraged and they don't go out looking for jobs because they think there aren't any available. In those cases you do see people dropping out of the labor force and you see an increase in the number of discouraged workers. We are not yet seeing an increase, at least not over the last quarter, in the number of discouraged workers.

Representative HAMILTON. In the last year, payroll employment rose by 1.7 million, but households reported employment growth of only 479,000. How do you explain the difference in that data?

Mrs. Norwood. I think a significant proportion, what, two-thirds of that difference is probably the effect of multiple job holding, and the differences in the definitions of the two surveys.

We recently did a special supplement to the CPS to see what had happened to multiple job holding. We found a tremendous increase in it. In the business survey, people are counted as many times as they appear on a payroll, and therefore if someone has two or three jobs part time, those people are counted two or three times.

In the household survey, that's a person concept, and it doesn't matter how many jobs a person has, we just find out whether that person has been employed at all. Therefore, you would expect some difference between the surveys. This has become much larger than we have ever seen really in the past. And we think that a larger part of it is that increase in multiple job holding.

I think the other part of it is probably the problem of estimating population counts. That involves immigration. The difficulty in coming up with an exact number, which the Census Bureau has to do between censuses, as well as people who are uncounted.

Representative HAMILTON. What will be the normal labor force growth that you would expect in the year to come?

Mrs. NORWOOD. We are anticipating that labor force growth will be much slower in the future than it has been in the past. Whereas, we were seeing rates of something like 3,  $3\frac{1}{2}$  percent in the 1960's because of the baby-boom generation, now we'll probably be seeing about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  percent growth.

Representative HAMILTON. That's based, of course, on the demographic figures.

Mrs. Norwood. That's largely demographic. Obviously, that will be affected in the short run by the state of the economy.

Representative HAMILTON. Now, if you don't have any economic growth, would most of that labor force growth add to unemployment?

Mrs. Norwood. If people can't find jobs, surely.

Representative HAMILTON. You would expect the unemployment rate to go up, right?

Mrs. Norwood. If we don't have any job growth, yes, but it won't go up as much as in previous recessions, because we don't have as many people. The birth rates were lower some years ago.

On the other hand, one of the things that I've been rather intrigued with is the fact it seems to me that as people come into the labor force, that also creates jobs. It creates a demand. If there are more people who reach adulthood who go into the labor force, they are consumers of products. You take them away, there is less consumption and, therefore, there is less need to develop. So in some ways it's a kind of circular sort of thing.

Representative HAMILTON. You can pretty well anticipate the labor force growth in the year ahead; is that correct?

Mrs. Norwood. Well, we try and we usually do a fairly good job of that because the demographics are so controlling. But obviously, the state of the economy, which we cannot anticipate very well, will be the controlling factor for the short term.

Over the long term, we are fairly certain that it will average out to about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  or so percent a year. But there may be some blips in the movement.

Representative HAMILTON. If you don't get any growth and you have 1<sup>1</sup>/<sub>2</sub> million new people coming in, what's that going to do to your employment rate?

Mrs. Norwood. Well, it will increase it. I don't know how much. Mr. Plewes. A percent and a half, basically. It's about 1 percent

per million.

Representative HAMILTON. So you'd see a  $1\frac{1}{2}$  percent increase if you had flat growth?

Mr. PLEWES. That's mathematical.

Representative HAMILTON. The National Bureau of Economic Research that tells us whether or not we have a recession. When do they meet?

Mrs. Norwood. They apparently have decided not yet to meet. They've considered it and they've decided there isn't sufficient evidence.

Representative HAMILTON. They don't meet at regular times, they just meet when they want to?

Mrs. Norwoop. They have a committee which looks at data and decides when there may be—they poll the members and see whether they think there's enough evidence yet to consider meeting, and they have decided not to meet.

And as you know, the latest reestimate of our gross national product is not negative. For whatever that means, it's not very positive either.

Representative HAMILTON. Is that a government bureau?

Mrs. Norwood. No.

Representative HAMILTON. That's private, no government funding?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Not that I'm aware of. Not for that purpose. They do studies. It's connected. It's resident in Massachusetts, in Boston. There are people who are professors who do all sorts of studies, and I don't know where they get the funding. From various sources, I suspect. But not this part of it.

Representative HAMILTON. While private-sector employment was falling in September, the average weekly hours were up. What does that mean; what's the significance of that?

Mrs. Norwood. For some time now, we have been seeing employers controlling costs by raising hours somewhat, and making the number of people somewhat reduced because it's cheaper for them, given the high cost of fringe benefits.

So I would not be surprised at this stage of what we're seeing in the labor market, to see hours holding up. They are still significantly high. They have gone down slightly in manufacturing, but that's a rather typical pattern, considering what we've been seeing here the last several months and years.

Representative HAMILTON. In the past, firms would cut hours before they'd lay off workers, wouldn't they?

Mrs. Norwood. That has not been happening over the last several years. Firms have been cutting workers and extending hours, or keeping hours quite high. We've seen that, particularly in manufacturing.

Representative HAMILTON. Do employers lay off temporary and part-time workers before they lay off full-time workers?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Usually. Usually it's the last hired who will become the first fired. They are also usually therefore the lowest paid, and that means that the average wage may in fact go up during that period.

Representative HAMILTON. Now, we have an increase in the number of people working part time.

Mrs. Norwood. We should remember that a significant portion of those people are working part time because that's what they want to do. We have had a significant increase this month in the number of people who are working part time because they can't find full-time jobs. That is the part time for economic reasons that we are always very concerned about. I think that figure bears watching, because a rise in it is not a good sign.

Representative HAMILTON. We have had a long-term decline in the number of young people in the labor force. How much did the decline in the number of young people reduce the unemployment rate, say, in the decade of the 1980's? Can you tell us that?

Mrs. Norwood. It's very hard to tell you that with accuracy, because what you have to do is to assume that all other things are equal, and that the fact that there are fewer teenagers doesn't do anything to what's happening to employment of adults. And I don't believe that's true.

If you hold that constant, however, we have had Paul Flaim's work, which was recently published in the Monthly Labor Review. Do you remember what the conclusions of that are, Mr. Plewes?

Mr. PLEWES. Somewhere around a half percent, but I'm not quite sure now.

Mrs. NORWOOD. I do want to emphasize that that's assuming a standardization of the rates, and that it's difficult to get at the interaction of facts, but we try. And it's a good piece of work.

Representative HAMILTON. The figures that I have here are that the unemployment rate in 1979 was 5.8 percent. In 1989 it was 5.3

percent, and what I was trying to get at is how much of that decline is due to the decline in the number of young people coming into the labor force.

Mrs. NORWOOD. Well, a goodly portion of it. A lot of it. Representative HAMILTON. I think that's pretty well got it for this morning. We'll conclude.

Thank you very much. [Whereupon, at 10:20 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

# **EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT**

# FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1990

Congress of the United States, Joint Economic Committee, Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:35 a.m., in room 2359, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Stephen J. Solarz (member of the committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Solarz and Hawkins.

Also present: William Buechner, professional staff member.

# **OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE SOLARZ, PRESIDING**

Representative SOLARZ. The committee will come to order. On behalf of the Joint Economic Committee, I'm very pleased to welcome Janet Norwood, Commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics before the committee this morning. Commissioner Norwood and her colleagues are here to testify on the employment and unemployment situation for October. This is a regular, routine appearance every month. You can set your clock by it. Neither rain nor snow nor sleet has stayed this messenger from the swift completion of her appointed rounds. And so we are particularly pleased to have her with us this morning.

During the past few months, as the economy has weakened and the unemployment rate has risen from 5.3 percent to 5.7 percent, there has been a growing interest in what Commissioner Norwood has to say at these hearings. Americans are worried about the prospect of a recession. I have just come from my constituency in Brooklyn. And I can tell you that all over New York one is hearing horror stories about the slack in the economy, the loss of income, the plummeting value of real estate. And I think the anxiety level, not only of my constituents, but of the American people, is rapidly rising.

We all know that recessions cost jobs. A million and a half jobs were lost in the last recession in 1981 and 1982. And right now we are coming off a year in which the number of jobs in manufacturing has already declined by 350,000. Two-thirds of the job losers in the last year were white-collar workers, middle managers, technical workers, professionals who are having a difficult time finding new jobs. Many of the rest are highly skilled craftsmen in factories and construction. These skills are needed to keep our economy competitive.

The country is watching your data very closely today, Commissioner Norwood, for information on the current direction of the economy and the security of their jobs. The Joint Economic Committee welcomes you, Commissioner. And we will now let you deliver your remarks on the employment and unemployment situation for October.

Before you do, however, I want to say that this is an historic occasion representing, as it does, the last congressional hearing in which one of the most distinguished members ever to serve in the House of Representatives will be participating. Today will mark the culmination of a 28-year career as a Member of the House of Representatives of the very distinguished gentleman from California, Mr. Hawkins. Actually, he will remain a Member of the House through the end of the year. But I believe this will be the last of countless hearings in which he has participated.

In over close to three decades of service in the House, he has had an enormous impact on the lives of millions of working men and women in our country. He has been an inspiration to his colleagues. I was privileged to serve under his skilled leadership on the House Education and Labor Committee for several years. He was always a gentleman. Even those who disagreed with him never found him disagreeable. He was, in many respects, the conscience of the Congress. I believe that all Americans are in his debt. And I think that it is characteristic of Mr. Hawkins that even though he is going to be leaving the Congress, he is to be found here on duty ever vigilant, prepared to contribute his wisdom, his experience, his values to the congressional process.

Douglas MacArthur, in his farewell address to the joint session of Congress said, "Old soldiers never die. They just fade away." I suspect that Congressmen are a little different. Mr. Hawkins, like former generals, will never die. But he is not going to fade away. He is going to be heard from. He is going to remain involved. And I am confident that those of us who have benefited from his experience, from his wisdom, from his insights, will be able to call upon him in the future as we have in the past.

So, Gus. I really want to tell you what a great privilege it is to serve with you, my friend. And I hope we will be seeing more of each other in the future.

Mrs. Norwood, on that note, I trust that Congressman Hawkins is not going to be among the increasing number of unemployed in the country. You can perhaps let us know if you factored that into your analysis.

# STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, AC-COMPANIED BY KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMIS-SIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS; AND THOMAS J. PLEWES, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mrs. NORWOOD. Let me say, Congressman Solarz, how much we at the Bureau of Labor Statistics appreciate the help and more importantly the wisdom that Congressman Hawkins has provided in many of the areas in which we work. He has continually supported the need for high-quality, accurate data that is totally objective, so that we in this country can have the kind of information that is needed to make and evaluate policy. And I am very grateful, personally, for the support that he has provided. And we, as an institution, are very indebted to you, sir, for the support, the help, and the understanding, as well as the wisdom that you have given to us.

I am here to present some comments on the data for October that we released this morning. I have with me on my right Kenneth Dalton, who heads our Price Office. And on my left is Thomas Plewes, who heads our Office of Employment and Unemployment. And we are very grateful for this opportunity.

The October job figures provide further evidence of deterioration in the labor market. Particularly large job cutbacks occurred in construction and manufacturing, and there was weakness in the service sector as well. For the third month in a row, more industries lost jobs than gained them. In addition, cutbacks occurred both in the overall average workweek and in the factory workweek.

Despite the broad job losses in October, the Nation's unemployment rate remained at 5.7 percent, after rising by half a percentage point between June and September. The labor force, which has shown little growth over the past year, declined in October.

The business survey continues to point to a worsening employment picture. If we exclude the effects of the Census Bureau's curtailment of temporary workers in recent months, payroll job movements have weakened each month since June. Over this period, the number of payroll jobs has shown no net gain, as sizable losses in the goods industries have been barely offset by gains in the service sector. Indeed, even the usually robust service sector has lost much of its vitality during this period.

Manufacturing and construction employment again bore the brunt of the over-the-month job reductions. The number of factory jobs fell by 60,000 in October and is down by 175,000 over the past 3 months alone. Since the January 1989 peak in factory employment, 580,000 jobs, or 3 percent of the total number of factory jobs, have been lost.

Over-the-month declines were widespread among both durable and nondurable goods industries, with the largest cutbacks in fabricated metal products, electronic equipment, transportation equipment, textiles, and apparel. Smaller losses occurred in lumber and wood products, furniture and fixtures, rubber and plastics, and leather products. Most of these industries have suffered substantial job losses over the past year or so.

Employment in construction, which has been declining steadily since last spring, fell by 80,000 in October, as heavy layoffs occurred throughout the industry. Employment cutbacks in the industry have totaled 165,000 since June. During that period, the unemployment rate for construction workers has increased from 9.7 to 13.2 percent.

Within the service-producing sector, retail trade employment declined by some 50,000 jobs in October, after seasonal adjustment. Job losses were widespread. Department store hiring for the upcoming Christmas period fell short of seasonal expectations, and employment was down by 15,000, after seasonal adjustment. Job cutbacks in department stores have totaled about 80,000 since the May 1989 peak employment level. Some over-the-month job gains did occur elsewhere in the services sector. Employment in the services industry itself rose by 95,000; about two-thirds of this increase was in health services, which has been showing extremely strong job growth this year. This industry comprises 12 percent of private service-sector employment but has accounted for 39 percent of the past year's employment growth in private service-sector jobs.

Despite the over-the-month increase in private service employment, job growth in the sector has slowed substantially from the strong pace of recent years. Over the past 12-month period, employment in this sector grew by 2.4 percent, compared with growth rates of 3.3 and 4 percent in the prior two 12-month periods.

The household survey showed a small labor force decline in October as employment edged down and no change occurred in unemployment. The labor force has, in fact, grown very slowly over the past year—by 600,000 persons—only about one-third of the pace of the past few years. This slower labor force growth has reduced the upward pressure on the unemployment rate in this otherwise soft labor market.

As fewer people enter the labor market, the proportion of the population that is employed—as measured by the employment-population ratio—has begun to trend downward in recent months. Since June, the ratio has declined from 63 to 62.4 percent. Over the same period, the ratio for adult women has dropped from 55.5 to 54.8 percent, while the ratio for adult men has fallen from 74.2 to 73.8 percent.

In summary, the data released this morning show that the employment situation continued to deteriorate in October. Employment declined substantially in manufacturing and construction, and weekly hours were reduced. Although the unemployment rate was unchanged over the month, it is up half a percentage point in just the last 4 months.

Congressman Solarz, there has been a great deal of discussion in terms of the trends of energy prices. We have been analyzing their effect on the price indexes. I would like to make a few points about that.

Consumer prices have risen at an annual rate of 6.6 percent in the first 9 months of this year, a rate that is about 2 percentage points higher than for all of last year. Changes in the price of energy, especially prices for gasoline and fuel oil, have dominated this acceleration. Energy prices surged during the first quarter and then even more in the third quarter following the Middle East crisis.

Through the month of September, energy prices rose at an annual rate of just over 17 percent. The direct effect of the sharp increases in gasoline and fuel oil during August and September accounted for nearly half of the 1.5 percent increase in the CPI-U for those months.

There seems to be some evidence in the press that gasoline prices have continued to rise in October. If so, we certainly will see their effect in the CPI for October, which will be released in 2 weeks. But it is important to remember that our price measures will be affected by the indirect as well as the direct effects of energy price increases. Some evidence—for example, higher airfares—has already begun to show up in the index. Based on past experience, we would expect that as the increased energy prices pass through the economy, the resulting secondary effects for the recent price increases could be as large as the initial effects.

Now, Congressman Solarz, we would all be very happy to try to answer any questions you have.

Representative SOLARZ. Thank you, Mrs. Norwood.

[The table attached to Mrs. Norwood's statement, together with the Employment Situation press release, follows:]

				X-11 ARI	4A metho	bd			X-11 method	r
Month	Unad-		Concurrent	[			[	12-month	(official	Range
and	justed	Official	(as first	Concurrent	Stable	Total	Residual	extrapola-	method	(cols.
year	rate	procedure	computed)	(revised)			L	tion	before 1980)	2-9)
	$\overline{\mathbf{n}}$	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
1989										
October	5.0	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	1.1
November	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.4	1.1
December	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.4	1.1
1990										
January	5.9	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	-
February	5.8	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.3	1.1
March	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.2	.2
April	5.2	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	-
May	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.2	1.1
June	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.1	1.1
July	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.5	1.1
August	5.4	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.6	1.1
September	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.7	1.1
October	5.4	5.7	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	

Unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods

SOURCE: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR Bureau of Labor Statistics November 1990 (1) Unadjusted rate. Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) <u>Official procedure (X-11 ARIMA method</u>). The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components-magricultural employment, nonagricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 agreesex groups—males and frmales, ages 10-19 and 20 years and over—ere seasonally adjusted independently using date from January 1974 forvard. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using ARIMA (Auto-Regressive, Integrated, Hoving Average) models chosen specifically for each series. Each extende series is then seasonally adjusted with the X-11 portion of the X-11 ARIMA program. The 4 is cauge unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustement model, while the other components are adjusted with the miltiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating its to take as a percent of the civilian labor force total derived by summing all 12 seasonally adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted areas are revised at the end of asch year. Extrapolated factors for Jaunary-June are computed at the beginning of each year; estrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the middle of the year after the June data become aveilable. Each set of 6-month factors are published in edwards, in the January and July issues, respectively, of <u>Employment end Earnings</u>.

(3) <u>Concurrent (as first computed, X-11 ARIMA method)</u>. The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extraplated factors are not used at all. Each component is essentilly adjusted with the X-11 ARIMA program each month as the most recent data become available. Eates for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 would be based, during 1984, on the edjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) <u>Concurrent (revised, X-1) ARIMA method)</u>. The procedure used is identical to (3) above, and the rate for the current month (the last month displayed) will always be the same in the two columns. However, all previous months are subject to revision each month. based on the seasonal adjustment of all the components with data through the current month.

(3) <u>Stable (X-11 ARIMA method)</u>. Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using ARIMA models as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that seasonal patterns are basically constant from year-tom-year and compute final seasonal factors as unweighted averages of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure, factors are estrapolated in b-month intervals and the series are revised at the end of each year. The procedure for computation of the rate from the seasonally adjusted components is also identical to the official procedure.

(b) <u>Crai</u> (X-1) <u>ARIMA method</u>). This is one alternative aggregatic: procedure, in which tota; unerployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with <u>ARIMA</u> models and directly adjusted with <u>multiplicative</u> adjustent models in the X-11 part of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unemployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in b-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(7) <u>Residual (X-11 ARIMA method)</u>. This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using ARIMA models and then directly adjusted with wultiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted unemployment level is derived by subtracting easonally adjusted employment from seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Factors are extrapolated in 6-month intervals and the series revised at the end of each year.

(8) <u>12-month extrapolation (R-1) ARIMA method</u>). This approach is the same as the official procedure except that the factors are extrapolated in 12-month intervals. The factors for January-December of the current year are computed at the beginning of the year based on data through the preceding year. The values for January through June of the current year are the same as the official values since they reflect the same factors.

(9) X-11 method (official method before 1980). The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with ARIMA models and the factors are projected in 12-month intervals. The standard X-11 program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

<u>Hethods of Adjustment</u>: The X-11 ARIMA method was developed at Statistics Canada by the Seasonal Adjustment and Times' Series Staff under the direction of Estels Bee Dagum. The method is described in <u>The X-11 ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method</u>, by Estels Bee Dagum, Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 12-3665, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in X-11 Variant of the Census Method II Seasonal Adjustment Program, by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young and John Husgrave (Technical Paper No. 13, Sureau of the Census, 1967).



of Labor



**Bureau of Labor Statistics** 

Washington, D.C. 20212

Technical information: (202) 523-1371 523-1944 523-1959 523-1913 Media contact:

USDL 90-567

TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL 8:30 A.M. (EST), FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 1990

# THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: OCTOBER 1990

The nation's job market showed further weakness in October, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. Nonfarm payroll employment fell slightly, as large job losses in construction and manufacturing were only partly offset by gains in the services industry. The civilian worker unemployment rate held steady at 5.7 percent.

# Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

After inching upward since June, both the number of unemployed, 7.1 million, and the civilian worker unamployment rate, 5.7 percent, were unchanged in October. The unemployment rate for all of the major worker groups--adult men (5.1 percent), adult women (4.9 percent), teenagers (16.2 percent), whites (4.9 percent), blacks (11.8 percent), and Hispanics (8.1 percent)-were little changed or unchanged in October. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

The proportion of the unemployed who lost their last jobs was about unchanged in October. At 3.5 million, the number of job losers was about 400,000 higher than the June level. The number of persons working part time who would prefer full-time work (workers on part time for economic reasons) also was little changed in October but has risen by 450,000 since June. (See tables A-4 and A-8.)

# Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Total civilian employment edged down to 117.7 million in October. Employment had risen by 500,000 during the first half of the year but since then has dropped by nearly 700,000. The proportion of the working-age population that is employed (the employment-population ratio) was 62.4 percent in October. That measure had hovered around 63.0 percent during all of 1989 and the first half of 1990. (See table A-2.)

The civilian labor force, at 124.8 million, has shown no growth since spring, although the working-age population has continued to increase. As a result, the labor force participation rate has begun to inch down. Most of this declining participatic has occurred among teenagers, but even the rate for adult women, which had been on a long upward trend, has been edging down in recent months. (See table A-2.)

	Quarte averag	erly   jes	Mor	à		
Category	199	10		1990		Sept Oct. change
	II	III	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	
HOUSEHOLD DATA		The	rusands of	f persons		
Labor force 1/	126,5501	126,423	126,300	126,568	126,354	-214
Total employment 1/.	119,927	119,459	119,298	119,499	119,281	-218
Civilian labor force	124,908	124,798	124,660	124,967	124,784	-183
Civilian employment. !	118,285	117,836	117,658	117,898	117,711	-187
Unemployment	6,623	6,962	7,003	7,069	7,073	4
Not in labor force	62,916	63,468	63,601	63,434	63,741	307
Discouraged workers.	8931	835	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
!		]			L	
1		Pe	rcent of	labor for	rce	
Unemployment rates:						
All workers 1/	5.2	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.6	.0
All civilian workers:	5.3	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.7	.0
Adult men	4.8	5.0	5.0	5.1	5.1	.0
Adult wamen	4.6	4.81	4.9	5.0	4.9	-0.1
Teenagers	14.8	16.2	16.7	15.5	16.2	.7
White	4.6	4.81	4.8	4.8	4.9	.1
Black	10.4	11.7	11.8	12.1	11.8	3
Hispanic origin	7.6	8.1	7.8	8.7	8.1	6 
establishment data	·	 1	Thousands	of jobs		
Nonfarm employment i	110,5411	p110,638	110,613	p110,561	p110,493	p-68
Goods-producing!	25,1781	p25.018	25.013	D24,936	024.794	0-142
Service-producing	85,3631	p85.6201	85,600	D85.625	p85,699	074
				1		
		ł	iours of v	vark		
Average weekly hours:						i
Total private	34.6	p34.6	34.5	p34.7	p34.2	p-0.5
Manufacturing	40.9	p41.0	41.0	p41.1	p40.8	p3
Overtime	3.71	p3.7	3.8	p3.7	p3.7	p.0
1/ Includes the re	sident Arm	ed Forces	3.	I	p=prelim	inary.

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

N.A.=not available.

.

### Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Nonfarm payroll employment signaled continued weakness in October, as substantial job losses in construction, manufacturing, and retail trade more than offset gains in services and state and local government. Total payroll employment edged down by 70,000 over the month, and, unlike recent months, temporary census workers accounted for a very small portion of that decrease. (See table B-1.)

Construction lost the most jobs in October, with a decline of 80,000 that was widespread throughout the industry. With building activity having slowed considerably, the industry has had decreases of 185,000 jobs over the last 5 months. Employment in mining was little changed over the month, despite a small increase in oil and gas extraction.

In manufacturing, employment declined by 60,000 in October, continuing a downward trend which has seen the number of jobs in the nation's factories drop by 175,000 in the last 3 months and by 580,000 since the peak level in January 1989. Durable goods industries have borne the brunt of these job losses, with widespread employment declines in October including losses in electronic equipment, fabricated metals, transportation equipment, lumber, and furniture. Reductions also occurred in several of the nondurable goods industries, including textiles, apparel, rubber and plastics, and leather.

In the service-producing sector, retail trade experienced a drop of 50,000 in October, following 2 months of smaller declines. Wholesale trade decreased by 10,000, as the problems in manufacturing and construction continue to affect adversely employment among the distributors of goods. The durable goods component of wholesale trade has lost 25,000 jobs since June.

Elsewhere in the service sector, the services industry itself added 95,000 jobs in October. As has been the case in recent months, health services accounted for most of this gain, but there were also increases in several other services industries in October, including social services and private education. Employment in business services edged down; this industry has shown no clear employment trend since May. Employment in state and local government rose over the month, mainly in education.

# Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

The average workweek for production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonfarm payrolls fell by half an hour in October to 34.2 hours, seasonally adjusted. The decline in hours was widespread across industries. In manufacturing, the workweek declined by 0.3 hour to 40.8 hours, while overtime was unchanged at 3.7 hours. (See table B-2.) Declines in both employment and the workswek resulted in steep declines in the indexes of aggregate weekly hours. The index for private production or nonsupervisory workers declined by 1.6 percent to 123.3 (1982=100) in October, seasonally adjusted. The construction index fell 5.6 percent to 132.4, and the index for manufacturing, at 105.8, was down about 1.0 percent over the month and 2.2 percent over the past year. (See table B-5.)

# Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonfarm psyrolls were unchanged in October at \$10.17. Average weekly earnings, however, were down 1.4 percent, seasonally adjusted, as a result of the sharp drop in weekly hours. Prior to seasonal adjustment, average weekly earnings decreased 34.07 to 3349.85. Over the year, average hourly earnings rose 3.7 percent and average weekly earnings were up 2.5percent. (See tables B-3 and B-4.)

The Employment Situation for November 1990 will be released on Friday, December 7, at 8:30 A.M. (EST).

# **Explanatory Note**

This news release presents statistics from two major surveys, the Current Population Survey (household survey) and the Current Employment Statistics Survey (establishment survey). The household survey provides the information on the labor force, total employment, and unemployment that appears in the A tables, marked HOUSEHOLD DATA. It is a sample survey of about 60,000 households that is conducted by the Bureau of the Census with most of the findings analyzed and published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

The establishment survey provides the information on the employment, hours, and earnings of workers on nonfarm payrolls that appears in the B tables. marked ESTABLISHMENT DATA. This information is collected from payroll records by BLS in cooperation with State agencies. The sample includes over 340,000 establishments employing over 40 million people.

For both surveys, the data for a given month are actually collected for and relate to a particular week. In the household survey, unless otherwise indicated, it is the calendar week that contains the 12th day of the month, which is called the survey week. In the establishment survey, the reference week is the pay period including the 12th, which may or may not correspond directly to the calendar week.

The data in this release are affected by a number of technical factors, including definitions, survey differences, seasonal adjustments, and the inevitable variance in results between a survey of a sample and a census of the entire population. Each of these factors is explained below.

#### Coverage, definitions, and differences between surveys

The sample households in the household survey are selected so as to reflect the entire civilian noninstitutional population 16 years of age and older. Each person in a household is classified as employed, unemployed, or not in the labor force. Those who hold more than one job are classified according to the job at which they worked the most hours.

People are classified as *employed* if they did any work at all as paid civilians; worked in their own business or profession or on their own farm; or worked 15 hours or more in an enterprise operated by a member of their family, whether they were paid or not. People are also counted as employed if they were on unpaid leave because of illness, bad weather, disputes between labor and management, or personal reasons. Members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States are also included in the employed total.

People are classified as unemployed, regardless of their eligibility for unemployment benefits or public assistance, if they meet all of the following criteria: They had no employment during the survey week; they were available for work at that time: and they made specific efforts to find employment sometime during the prior 4 weeks. Persons laid off from their former jobs and awaiting recall and those expecting to report to a job within 30 days need not be looking for work to be counted as unemployed.

The labor force equals the sum of the number employed and the number unemployed. The unemployment rate is the percentage of unemployed people in the labor force (civilian plus the resident Armed Forces). Table A-5 presents a special grouping of seven measures of unemployment based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force. The definitions are provided in the table. The most restrictive definition yields U-1 and the most comprehensive yields U-7. The overall unemployment rate is U-5a, while U-5b represents the same measure with a civilian labor force base.

Unlike the household survey, the establishment survey only counts wage and salary employees whose names appear on the payroll records of nonfarm firms. As a result, there are many differences between the two surveys, among which are the following:

-- The household survey, although based on a smaller sample, reflects a larger segment of the population; the establishment survey excludes agriculture, the self-employed, unpaid family workers, private household workers, and members of the resident Armed Forces;

- The household survey includes people on unpaid leave among the employed; the establishment survey does not;

- The household survey is limited to those 16 years of age and older; the establishment survey is not limited by age;

— The household survey has no duplication of individuals, because each individual is counted only once; in the establishment survey, employees working at more than one job or otherwise appearing on more than one payroll would be counted separately for each appearance.

Other differences between the two surveys are described in "Comparing Employment Estimates from Household and Payroll Surveys," which may be obtained from the BLS upon request.

#### Seasonal adjustment

Over the course of a year, the size of the Nation's labor force and the levels of employment and unemployment undergo sharp fluctuations due to such seasonal events as changes in weather, reduced or expanded production, harvests, major holidays, and the opening and closing of schools. For example, the labor force increases by a large number each June, when schools close and many young people enter the job market. The effect of such seasonal variation can be very large; over the course of a year, for example, seasonality may account for as much as 95 percent of the month-to-month changes in unemployment.

Because these seasonal events follow a more or less regular pattern each year, their influence on statistical trends can be eliminated by adjusting the statistics from month to month. These adjustments make nonseasonal developments, such as declines in economic activity or increases in the participation of women in the labor force, easier to spot. To return to the school's-out example, the large number of people entering the labor force each June is likely to obscure any other changes that have taken place since May, making it difficult to determine if the level of economic activity has risen or declined. However, because the effect of students finishing school in previous years is known, the statistics for the current year can be adjusted to allow for a comparable change. Insofar as the seasonal adjustment is made correctly, the adjusted figure provides a more useful tool with which to analyze changes in economic activity.

Measures of labor force, employment, and unemployment contain components such as age and sex. Statistics for all employees, production workers, average weekly hours, and average hourly earnings include components based on the employer's industry. All these statistics can be seasonally adjusted either by adjusting the total or by adjusting each of the components and combining them. The second procedure usually yields more accurate information and is therefore followed by BLS. For example, the seasonally adjusted figure for the labor force is the sum of eight seasonally adjusted civilian employment components, plus the resident Armed Forces total (not adjusted for seasonality), and four seasonally adjusted unemployment components; the total for unemployment is the sum of the four unemployment components; and the overall unemployment rate is derived by dividing the resulting estimate of total unemployment by the estimate of the labor force.

The numerical factors used to make the seasonal adjustments are recalculated regularly. For the household survey, the factors are calculated for the January-June period and again for the July-December period. For the establishment survey, updated factors for seasonal adjustment are also calculated twice a year. In both surveys, revisions to historical data are made once a year.

#### Sampling variability

Statistics based on the household and establishment surveys are subject to sampling error, that is, the estimate of the number of people employed and the other estimates drawn from these surveys probably differ from the figures that would be obtained from a complete census, even if the same questionnaires and procedures were used. In the household survey, the amount of the differences can be expressed in terms of standard errors. The numerical value of a standard error depends upon the size of the sample, the results of the survey, and other factors. However, the numerical value is always such that the chances are approximately 68 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than the standard error from the results of a complete census. The chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that an estimate based on the sample will differ by no more than 1.6 times the standard error from the results of a complete census. At approximately the 90-percent level of confidence—the confidence limits used by 81.5 in its analyses—the error for the monthly change in total employment is on the order of plus or minus 358,000; for total unemployment it is 224,000; and, for the overall unemployment rate, it is 0.19 percentage point. These figures do not mean that the sample results are off by these magnitudes but, rather, that the chances are approximately 90 out of 100 that the "true" level or rate would not be expected to differ from the estimates by more than these amounts.

Sampling errors for monthly surveys are reduced when the data are cumulated for several months, such as quarterly or annually. Also, as a general rule, the smaller the estimate, the larger the sampling error. Therefore, relatively speaking, the estimate of the size of the labor force is subject to less error than is the estimate of the number unemployed. And, among the unemployed, the sampling error for the jobless rate of adult men, for example, is much smaller than is the error for the jobless rate of teenagers. Specifically, the error on monthly change in the jobless rate for men is .25 percentage point; for teenagers, it is 1.29 percentage points.

In the establishment survey, estimates for the 2 most current months are based on incomplete returns; for this reason, these estimates are labeled preliminary in the tables. When all the returns in the sample have been received, the estimates are revised. In other words, data for the month of September are published in preliminary form in October and November and in final form in December. To remove errors that build up over time, a comprehensive count of the employed is conducted each year. The results of this survey are used to establish new benchmarks—comprehensive counts of employment—against which month-to-month changes can be measured. The new benchmarks also incorporate changes in the classification of industries and allow for the formation of new establishments.

#### Additional statistics and other information

In order to provide a broad view of the Nation's employment situation, BLS regularly publishes a wide variety of data in this news release. More comprehensive statistics are contained in *Employment and Earnings*, published each month by BLS. It is available for \$8.50 per issue or \$25.00 per year from the U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20204. A check or money order made out to the Superintendent of Documents must accompany all orders.

Employment and Earnings also provides approximations of the standard errors for the household survey data published in this release. For unemployment and other labor force categories, the standard errors appear in tables B through J of its "Explanatory Notes." Measures of the reliability of the data drawn from the establishment survey and the actual amounts of revision due to benchmark adjustments are provided in tables M, O, P, and Q of that publication.

Table A-1. Employment status of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by sex

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not ees	eonally e	djusted		5	Sessonally adjusted'			
Employment status and sex	Oct. 1989	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	QcL 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990
TOTAL									
Noninstitutional population <sup>2</sup>	188,580 126,125	190,002 126,380	190,095 126,590	188,580 125,857	189,607 126,466	189,763 126,394	189,901 126,300	190,002 126,568	190,095 128,354
Participation (819 <sup>2</sup>	66.9	66.5	66.6	66.7	66.7	66.6	66.5	66.6	66.5
Total employed"	119,903	119,562	119,869	119,294	120,019	119,560	119,298	119,489	119,201
Employment-population ratio	63.6	62.9	63.1	63.3	1 63.3	1 627	1 640	1 601	1 570
Resident Armed Forces	1,709	1,601	1,5/0	117 585	119 399	117 953	117 658	117,898	117,711
Civilian employed	118,194	117,801	2 280	3 197	3.348	3.085	3,137	3,181	3.167
Agriculture	114 685	114 672	115.018	114.388	115.041	114,687	114,521	114,717	114,545
Nonagricultural industries	6 222	6.618	6,722	6.563	6,447	6,814	7,003	7,069	7,073
Unemployed	4.9	5.4	5.3	5.2	5.1	5.4	5.5	5.6	5.6
Unertputinen fans	62,455	63,622	63,505	. 62,723	63,141	63,389	63,601	63,434	63,741
Men, 16 years and over									
				00 575	01.097	01 169	91 240	91 271	91 299
Noninstitutional population	90,535	91,2/1	81,299	60,535	69 599	69 544	69.459	69,609	69,780
Labor force	08,401	78 2	76.2	76.9	76.4	76.3	76.1	76.5	78.4
Participation rate"	88 917	66.053	66.010	66.046	66.000	65,740	65.596	65.867	65,862
Total employed	79.1	724	72.3	73.0	72.5	72.1	71.9	72.2	72.1
Employment-population ratio	1 533	1.441	1,414	1,533	1,465	1,462	1,475	1,441	1,414
Hestoen American	64.684	64.612	64,596	64,513	64,535	64,278	64,121	64,426	64,448
Uvisian eriptoyod	3,243	3,516	3,600	3,553	3,599	3,804	3,863	3,943	3,918
Linempioyee	4.7	5.1	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6
	ł					1			
Women, 16 years and over	t i		1	1					
			00 700	00.046	09 520	08 505	08 661	99 731	98,796
Noninstitutional population	98,045	66.011	54,790	56 258	58 867	56 649	56 842	56 758	56.575
Labor force"	57.8	57 5	57.7	57.4	57.7	57.7	57.6	57.5	57.3
Participation rate:	53 685	53,510	53,858	53.248	54,019	53,839	53,702	53,632	53,419
Total employed"	54.8	54.2	54.5	54.3	54.8	54.6	54.4	54.3	54.1
Consident Armed Forces	176	160	156	176	165	165	165	160	158
Chillian ambiovari	53,509	53,350	53,702	53,072	53,854	53,674	53,537	53,472	53,263
linemninueri	2,979	3,302	3,122	3,010	2,848	3,010	3,140	3,126	3,158
Linempioyment rate*	5.3	5.8	5.5	5.4	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.5	5.6
	1	J	1		1	1	4	1	

'The population and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns. I includes members of the Armed Forces stationed in the United States.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

<sup>3</sup> Labor force as a percent of the noninstitutional population. <sup>4</sup> Total employment as a percent of the noninstitutional population. <sup>9</sup> Unemployment as a percent of the labor force (including the resident Armed Forces).

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not se	econally a	djusted	Sessonally sojusted'							
Employment status, sex, and age	Oct. 1989	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990		
TOTAL					4						
Civilian noninstitutional population	186,871	188,401	188,525	186,871	187,977	188,136	188,261	168,401	188,525		
Civilian labor force	124,418	124,779	125,020	124,148	124,636	124,767	124,660	124,967	124,784		
Participation rate	66.6	66.2	66.3	66.4	66.4	66.3	66.2	66.3	66.2		
Employed	118,194	117,961	118,299	117,585	118,389	117,953	117,658	117,898	117,711		
Employment-population ratio <sup>2</sup>	63.2	62.6	62.7	62.9	63.0	62.7	62.5	62.6	62.4		
Unemployed	6,222	6,818	6,722	6,563	8,447	6,614	7,003	7,069	7,073		
Unemployment rate	5.0	5.5	5.4	5.3	5.2	5.5	5.6	5.7	5.7		
Men, 20 years and over											
Civilian conjustitutional constation	61.905	82.940	63.013	81,905	82.676	82,790	82.882	82 840	83.013		
Chillion labor force	63.973	64.57R	64.591	63,918	64.384	64.344	64.362	64.573	84.550		
Destination rate	78 1	77.9	77.8	78.0	77.9	777	77 7	77.0	77 8		
Employed	61 367	81.651	61 606	61.026	61.345	61,196	61.143	81 284	61 270		
Employee	74.9	74.3	74.2	74.5	74.2	73.9	73.8	73.9	73.8		
Acriculture	2,401	2.387	2.371	2.304	2,400	2,262	2.248	2,295	2,271		
Nonegricultural industries	58,966	59,264	59,235	58,722	58,945	58,934	58.897	58,969	58,999		
linemological	2,606	2,925	2,986	2,892	3.019	3,148	3,219	3,309	3,289		
Unemployment rate	4.1	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.7	4.9	5.0	5.1	5.1		
Women, 20 years and over											
and the state of t		01 765	01 057		01 405	01 501					
Cristian noninstitutional population	53,830	63 392	63 533	52 281	53 174	53 211	57 216	63 131	51,007		
Civitian labor force	58.000	68 1	68.3	57.5	58.1	581	59,515	67.0	52,003		
	50 245	60 631	60 015	49 796	60 778	60 719	60,600	60,480	60 270		
Employed	55.4	55 1	55.4	54.8	55.5	55.4	55.3	55.0	54 8		
A minute mo	686	661	666	641	700	585	639	619	810		
Noneoricultural industries	49.659	49.870	50,249	49,155	50.077	50,135	50.060	49.870	49.752		
licemiced	2.494	2,790	2,618	2,485	2,398	2,492	2.616	2.632	2.613		
Unemployment rate	4.7	5.2	4.9	4.8	4.5	4.7	4.9	5.0	4.9		
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years		1									
er itter ander sterne in en stellen	14 107	12 000	12.655	14 107	13 808	12 784	13 711	13.000	13.055		
Civilian noninstitutional population	7 602	6,800	6 805	70/0	7 200	7 213	8000	7 270	7 949		
Civitian labor force	1,003	60.2	60.605	68.2	620	62.4	60.000	1.212	1 245		
Farucpation (ave	8 481	5 770	5 777	8 763	A 264	6 038	5,815	8 144	8071		
Employee	450	42 2	423	47 0	454	43 0	424	44 0	44 4		
	221	243	243	252	249	230	251	200	277		
Non-print the state of the state	6 260	5 537	5 534	6.511	6.019	5,799	5.564	5 878	5 794		
Inempiovari	1,122	1,103	1,117	1,186	1.030	1.174	1,169	1,128	1,172		
Unemployment rate	14.8	16.0	16.2	14.9	14.1	16.3	16.7	15.5	18.2		
					1	1					
<sup>1</sup> The population figures are not adjusted for season therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and adjusted columns.	al variatio seasona	in; ily pi	* Civilian opulation.	employm	ent as a	percent	of the ci	dilan noni	nstitutions		

.

# HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

And the second s									
	Not se	asonally a	djusted	!	5	ieasonally	adjusted		
Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic ongin	Oct. 1989	Sept. 1 1990	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990
WHITE			İ	1					
Civilian noninstitutional population	159.644	160.640	160.717	159.644	160.365	160.468	160.550	160.640	160.717
Civilian labor force	106,780	107,261	107,362	106,618	107,273	107,230	107,135	107.451	107,238
Participation rate	66.9	66.8	66.8	66.8	66.9	66.8	66.7	66.9	66.7
Employed	102,291	102,277	102,452	101,862	102,461	102,260	101,968	102,260	102,013
Employment-population ratio*i	64,1	63.7	63.7	63.8	63.9	63.7	63.5	63.7	63.5
Unemployed	4,489	4,984	4,910	4,/56	4,812	4,970	5,167	5,190	5,225
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	55,659	56,116	56,119	55,626	55,932	55,895	56,035	56,144	56,111
Participation rate	/8.5	62,000	78.3	/8.5	/8.3	/8.1	78.3	78.4	78.3
Employed	23,735	53,990	53,900	03,483	23,050	33,5/0	53,613	53,721	53,632
Linemoloyed	1 924	2 1 2 5	2 219	2143	2 282	2 318	2 423	2423	2470
Unemployment rate	3.5	3.8	4.0	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.3	4.3	4,4
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	44,03/	40,100	45,302	44,207	45,055	40,120	45,100	45,000	44,668
Employed	42 876	43 155	42.441	42 497	43 202	43 321	42 227	47 112	42 011
Employee	55 4	55.3	55 7	54.9	55.6	55.6	55.5	55 9	43,011
Linemployed	1.761	2.011	1.862	1.770	1.763	1,799	1.873	1 689	1 877
Unemployment rate	3.9	4.5	4.1	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.2
Both serves 16 to 19 years									
Civilian labor force	6 484	5.979	5 941	6.785	6.286	6.216	5 999	6 306	6 239
Participation (ate	56.8	54.3	54.2	59.4	56.6	56.1	54.3	57.3	56.9
Employed	5,680	5,132	5,111	5,942	5,519	5,363	5,128	5,427	5,370
Employment-population ratio <sup>2</sup>	49.7	46.6	46.6	52.0	49.7	48.4	46.4	49.3	49.0
Unemployed	804	847	829	843	767	853	871	879	869
Unemployment rate	12.4	14.2	14.0	12.4	12.2	13.7	14.5	13.9	13.9
Men	13.9	15.0	15.0	13.8	12.9	15.1	15.7	15.3	14.8
Women	10.8	. 13.3	12.8	10.9	11.4	12.3	13,2	12.5	13.0
BLACK									
Civilian noninstitutional population	21,108	21.361	21.383	21,108	21,289	21.318	21.337	21.361	21.383
Civilian labor force	13,504	13,425	13,497	13,507	13,472	13,379	13.366	13,470	13,493
Participation rate .	64.0	62.8	63.1	64.0	63.3	62.6	62.6	63.1	63.1
Employed .	\$1,988	11,855	11,957	11,923	12,064	11,870	11,791	11,839	11,903
Employment-population ratio <sup>2</sup>	56.8	55.5	55.9	56.5	56.7	55.7	55.3	55.4	55.7
Unemployed	1,516	1,569	1,539	1,584	1,407	1,510	1,575	1,631	1,590
Unemployment rate	11.2	11.7	11.4	11.7	10.4	11.3	11.8	12.1	11.8
Men, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	6,218	6,332	6,339	6,234	6,293	6,293	6,235	6,330	6,351
Participation rate	/4.1	/4.1	/4,1	/4.2	/4.0	/3.9	73,1	74.1	74.3
Employed	5,630	5,656	5,570	5,593	5.702	5,617	5,5/2	5,580	5,631
Employment-population ratio	600	674	660	641	501	676	662	750	50.8
Unemployment rate	9.5	10.6	10.5	10.3	9.4	10.7	10.6	11.8	11.3
Women, 20 years and over									
Civilian labor force	6,401	6,362	6,389	6,336	6,377	6,328	6,358	6,361	6,335
Participation rate	60.8	59.5	59.7 l	60.2	59.9	59.4	59.6	59.5	59.2
Employed	5,759	5,682	5,762	5,706	5,812	5,735	5,730	5,705	5,722
Employment-population ratio*	54.7	53.2	53.8	54.2	54.6	53.8	53.7	53.4	53.5
Unemployed	642	680	628	530	565	592	628	656	613
Unemployment rate	10.0	10.7	9.0	9.9	0.9	9.4	9.9	10.3	9.7
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	885	731	76A	937	802	758	773	770	807
Participation rate	40.6	34,2	36.1	43.0	37.4	35.4	36.1	36.5	37.9
Employed	598	515	526	624	550	517	489	554	550
Employment population ratio	27.4	24.1	24.7	28.6	25.6	24.1	22.8	25.9	25.8
Unemployed	287	215	243	313	252	241	284	225	257
Unemployment rate	32.4	29.5	31.6 '	33.4	31.4	31.8	36.7	28.9	31.8
Men	32.2	30.5	31.0	32.0	37.4	32.3	38.4	30.6	30.7
Women	32.6	28.4	32.2	34.9	25.3	31.2	35.0	26.9	33.1

See footnotes at end of table?

Table - 3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin-Continued

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not sessonally adjusted				Sessonally adjusted'						
Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hispanic origin	Oct. 1989	5 1	iept. 990	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	June 1990	Juty 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	
HISPANIC ORIGIN											
Civitian noninstitutional population Civitian labor force Participation rate Employed Employed Unemployed Unemployment (site	13,936 9,333 67.0 8,631 61.9 702 7.5	- 1 - -	4,396 9,629 66.9 8,852 61.5 777 8.1	14,435 9,553 66.2 8,818 61.1 735 7.7	13,936 9,339 67.0 8,595 61.7 744 8.0	14,277 9,651 67.6 8,967 62.8 684 7.1	14,317 9,665 67.5 8,899 62.2 767 7.9	14.356 9,767 67.6 8,951 62.3 757 7.8	14,396 9,643   67,0   8,808   61.2   835   8,7	14,435 9,557 66.2 8,783 60.8 774 8.1	

<sup>1</sup> The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore, dentical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns. <sup>2</sup> Civilian employment as a percent of the civilian noninstitutional

population. NOTE: Detail for the above race and Hispanic-origin groups will not sum to totals because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

HOUSEHOLD DATA

# Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(In thousands)

	Not se	asonally a	djusted		Sessonally adjusted						
Category	Oct. 1989	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990		
CHARACTERISTIC											
Civilian employed 16 years and over	118,194	117,961	118,299	117,585	118,389	117,953	117,658	117,898	117,711		
Maged men sports present	41,142	41,083	41,156	40,839	40,554	40,545	40,604	40,919	40,870		
Mamed men, spouse present	29.947	29,869	30,159	29,544	29,856	29,909	29,949	29,780	29,772		
Women who maintain families	6,399	6,350	6,399	6,354	6,467	6,380	6,365	6.382	6,342		
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER			•	i	ļ				ļ		
Agriculture:							1				
Wage and salary workers	1,707	1,822	1,790	1,678	1,685	1.628	1,000	1,808	1,743		
Self-employed workers	1,481	1,364	1,396	1,406	1,507	1,3//	1,357	1,2/5	1,330		
Unpaid family workers	120	103	94	124	100	90	93	112	80		
Nonagricultural industries:						105 005	105 801	105 000	105 227		
Wage and salary workers	105,830	105,612	105,734	105,504	105,965	1105,665	17842	17 555	17 470		
Government	17,846	17,467	17,944	17,595	17,863	17,788	17,842	17,555	17,079		
Private industnes	87,984	88,146	87,790	87,909	68,121	66,097	07,049	00,240	07,000		
Private households	1,001	1,026	1,030	987	1,056	909	1.033	07.171	1,005		
Other industries	86,983	87,120	86,760	86,922	87,065	67,108	00,010	07,171	00,000		
Self-employed workers	8,784	8,810	9,049	8,610	0,/59	0,709	0,029	0,010	0,000		
Unpaid family workers	271	250	236	280	220	209	229	235	242		
PERSONS AT WORK PART TIME		;	1								
All industnes:			' .:		6 6 6 6 6	4 0.70	6.026	6.000	E 462		
Part time for economic reasons	4,435	4,941	5,052	4,767	1 5,013	4,070	5,030	5,365	0,402		
Siack work	2,240	2.386	2,522	2,314	2,499	2,505	2,424	2,004	2,021		
Could only find part-time work	1,905	2,245	2,1/2	2,082	2,229	2,070	15 277	1 15 202	15 105		
Voluntary part time	. 16,313	15,482	16,042	15,368	15,125	15,311	15,377	15,283	15,105		
Nonagricultural industries:					1 4 794	4 710	4 790	E 002			
Part time for economic reasons	4,216	4,660	4,788	1 4,520	1 4,/34	2,409	4,/00	2 4 9 1	2 436		
Slack work	2.084	2,203	2,324	2,166	2,204	2,400	2,242	2,401	2,430		
Could only find part-time work	1,851	2,157	2,114	1 2.021	14 6 27	14 022	2.009	14 959	14 688		
Voluntary part time	15,876	15,036	15,628	14,930	14.02/	14,922	14,699	14,036	1-4,000		

Excludes persons "with a job but not at work" during the survey period for such reasons as vacation, illness, or industrial dispute.

### HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-5. Range of unemployment measures based on varying definitions of unemployment and the labor force, sessionally adjusted

(Percent)

			Quart	terty ave	rages		M	onthly d	nte
	Маззите	18	89		1990			1990	
		Jtt			a	m	Aua.	Sept	Oct
U-1	Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the rollian labor force	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
U-2	Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.8	2.8
<b>U-3</b>	Unemployed persons 25 years and over as a percent of the civilian labor force for persons 25 years and over	4.0	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.4
U-4	Unemployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civilian labor force	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.2	5.2	5.4	5.5
U-54	Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.5	5.8	5.6
U-51	Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force	5.3	. 5.3	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.7
U-6	Total full-time jobsectors plus 1/2 part-time jobsectors plus 1/2 total on part time for economic ressons as a percent of the civilian labor force less 1/2 of the part-time labor force	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.6	7.8	7.9
U-7	Total full-time jobasekers plus 1/2 part-time jobasekers plus 1/2 total on part time for economic reasons plus discouraged workers as a parcent of the civilian labor force plus discouraged workers ites 1/2 of the part-time labor force	7.9	7.9	7.8	6.0	8.3	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

N.A. - not available.

Table A-6. Selected unemployment indicators, seasonally adjusted

Catagory	Number of unemployed persons (in thousands)				Unemployment rates*							
callinger y	Oct. 1989	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990			
CHARACTERISTIC									[			
Total, 16 years and over	6,563 3,553 2,892 3,010 2,485	7,069 3,943 3,309 3,126 2,632	7,073 3,918 3,289 3,156 2,613	5.3 5.2 4.5 5.4 4.8	5.2 5.3 4.7 5.0 4.5	5.5 5.6 4.9 5.3 4.7	5.6 5.7 5.0 5.5 4.9	5.7 5.8 5.1 5.5 5.0	5.7 5.7 5.1 5.6 4.9			
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	1,186 1,270 1,208 535	1,128 1,462 1,231 626	1,172 1,482 1,208 591	3.0 3.9 7.8	3.2 3.7 8.0	18.3 3.3 3.5 8.5	16.7 3.5 3.9 8.5	15.5 3.4 4.0 8.9	16.2 3.5 3.9 6.5			
Full-time workers Part-time workers Labor force time lost <sup>*</sup>	5,231 1,283 —	5,780 1,269 ~	5,847 1,212 —	4.9 7.1 5.9	4.8 7.6 5.9	5.0 8.1 6.0	5.2 7.9 6.3	5.4 7.1 6.4	5.5 6.8 6.6			
INDUSTRY												
Nonagricultural private wage and salary workers	4,921 1,819 32 591 1,196 682 514 3,102 245 1,409 1,448 491 183	5,460 2,006 27 736 1,244 773 470 3,454 261 1,576 1,617 517 184	5,487 2,107 27 834 1,246 743 503 3,380 276 1,609 1,495 507 155	5.3 6.2 4.8 9.3 5.4 5.2 5.6 4.9 3.9 5.9 4.3 2.7 9.8	5.3 5.9 3.6 9.7 4.9 5.0 5.0 5.0 3.0 6.2 4.5 2.9 10.0	5.5 6.6 4.4 10.2 5.7 5.6 5.7 5.0 3.7 6.0 4.5 2.8 10.6	5.7 6.9 4.9 11.1 5.8 5.9 5.6 5.2 4.1 6.2 4.7 2.8 9.7	5.8 7.0 3.8 11.8 5.7 6.0 5.3 5.3 5.3 5.3 6.6 4.7 2.9 9.3	5.9 7.3 3.7 5.8 5.6 5.8 5.6 5.3 4.1 6.7 4.4 2.8 8.2			

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

	Not se	teonally a	ljusted	Sessonally adjusted						
Weeks of unemployment	Oct.	Sept.	Oct.	Oct.	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	
	1989	1990	1990	1989	1990	1990	1990	1990	1990	
DURATION										
Less than 5 weeks	3,132	3,230	3,073	3,166	3,046	3,120	3,325	3,044	3,101	
	1,862	2,112	2,229	1,995	2,049	2,159	2,048	2,479	2,405	
	1,228	1,476	1,420	1,378	1,406	1,513	1,609	1,620	1,581	
	624	755	767	743	763	609	845	. 872	896	
	605	721	653	635	643	704	764	748	685	
	11.6	12.2	11.8	11.7	12.0	12.0	12,3	12.5	11.9	
	4.5	5.1	5.4	5.0	5.1	5.2	5,2	6.2	6.0	
Total unemployed	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
	50.3	47.4	45.7	48.4	46.9	45.9	47.6	42.6	43.8	
	29.9	31.0	33.2	30.5	31.5	31.8	29.3	34.7	33.9	
	19.7	21.6	21.1	21.1	21.6	22.3	23.0	22.7	22.3	
	10.0	11.1	11.4	11.4	11.7	11.9	12.1	12.2	12.6	
	9.7	10.6	9.7	9.7	9.9	10.4	10.9	10.5	9.7	

# Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not sea	secnally a	djusted	Seasonally adjusted							
Reasona	Oct.	Sept.	Oct.	Oct.	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.		
	1989	1990	1990	1989	1990	1990	1990	1990	1990		
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED											
Job losers	2,625	3,097	3,109	2,979	3,151	3,088	3,367	3,511	3,533		
	620	826	808	780	918	960	973	1,127	1,020		
	2,004	2,271	2,301	2,199	2,233	2,128	2,394	2,384	2,513		
	1,052	1,055	1,030	994	995	1,027	984	934	970		
	1,933	2,074	1,957	1,890	1,789	1,960	1,879	1,985	1,904		
	613	591	625	685	534	687	677	656	693		
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION Total unemployed Obiosers Other job losers Other job losers Job leavers Reentrants New entrants	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0		
	42.2	45.4	46.3	45.5	48.7	45.7	48.7	49.5	49.8		
	10.0	12.1	12.0	11.9	14.2	14.2	14.1	15.9	14.4		
	32.2	33.3	34.2	33.6	34.5	31.5	34.7	33.6	35.4		
	16.9	15.5	15.3	15.2	15.4	15.2	14.3	13.2	13.7		
	31.1	30.4	29.1	28.9	27.7	29.0	27.2	28.0	26.8		
	9.9	8.7	9.3	10.5	8.3	10.2	9.0	9.3	9.8		
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE											
Job losers	2.1	2.5	2.5	2,4	2.5	2.5	2.7	2.8	2.8		
	.9	.8	.8	.8	.8	.8	.8	.7	.8		
	1.6	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.5		
	.5	.5	.5	.6	.4	.6	.5	.5	.6		

.

# HOUSEHOLD DATA

.

.

Table A-9. Unemployed persons by sex and age, sessonally adjusted

Sex and ade	l unem (in	Number of ployed per thousands	sons · s)	Unemployment rates'						
	Oct. 1989	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	
	6 662	7 069	7 073	53	5.2	5.5	5.6	5.7	5.7	
Total, 16 years and over	0,303	2 454	2 403	11.1	10.3	11.0	11.5	11.6	11.8	
16 to 24 years	2,420	1178	1 172	14.9	14.1	16.3	167	15.5	16.2	
16 to 19 years	526	612	508	16.9	16.1	17.4	19.2	18.4	18.8	
16 to 17 years	530	660	660	13.6	134	15.2	15.0	14.4	14.6	
18 to 19 years	043 1	1 2 2 5	1 2 2 1	80	82	83	8.8	9.6	9.6	
20 to 24 years	1,242	1,320	4.505	4.1	4.1	43	44	45	4.4	
25 years and over	4,144	4,007	4,555	1.2		4.5	46	47	46	
25 to 54 years	3,652	1,121	4,036	2.0	2.4	3.2	36	33	3.6	
55 years and over	464	513	550	3.0	2.0	3.2	0.5	0.0	0.0	
Non 16 years and over	3,553	3,943	3,91B	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.7	5.8	5.7	
16 to 24 years	1.349	1,326	1,330	11.7	11.1	11.6	11.6	12.0	12.0	
16 to 19 years	661	634	629 1	15.9	15.4	17.5	17.8	16.7	16.5	
16 to 17 years	308	274	257	18.5	16.4	18.4	21.5	18.0	18.1	
10 to 10 years	353	379	371 -	14.2	14.8	16.3	15.5	16.2	15.7	
10 to 24 years	688	692	701	9.3	8.9	8.5	8.5	9.5	9.7	
20 to 24 years and over	2 2 1 4	2.642	2.606	3.9	4.1	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	
25 years and over	1 919	2,274	2.257	4.0	4.3	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.7	
25 to 54 years	280	342	360	3.2	3.1	3.6	3.8	3.8	4.1	
So years and over					1	1		1		
Mamon 16 years and over	3.010	3,126	3,156	5.4	5.0	5.3	5.5	5.5	5.6	
Women, to years and over mannaharman	1 079	1.128	1,163	10.4	9.3	10.4	11.4	11.2	11.6	
10 10 24 years	525	494	543	13.8	12.8	14.9	15.6	14.2	15.8	
10 10 19 years	228	238	251	15.0	15.9	16.4	16.6	17.9	19.6	
	292	273	289	12.8	11.9	13.9	14.4	12.6	13.4	
15 (U 19 YOLD	554	634	620	8.5	7.5	6.0	9.3	9.6	9.4	
ZU ID 24 Years	1 930	2 0 2 5	1 989	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3	
25 years and over	1 733	1 847	1 779	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.5	
25 to 54 years	184	171	196	2.8	2.4	2.6	3.1	2.6	3.0	
55 years and over	1 104		100	2.0	,			1	1	

Unemployment as a percent of the civilian labor force.

Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not sea	sonelly ad	ljusted	Sessonally adjusted'						
Employment status	Oct.	Sept.	Oct.	Oct.	June	Juty	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	
	1989	1990	1990	1989	1990	1990	1990	1990	1990	
Civitian noninstitutional population	27,227	27,761	27,808	27,227	27,612	27,668	27,711	27,761	27,808	
	17,636	17,518	17,658	17,601	17,540	17,448	17,498	17,527	17,614	
	64,8	63.1	63.5	64.6	63.5	63.1	63.1	63.1	63.3	
	15,902	15,684	15,846	15,797	15,883	15,655	15,671	15,629	15,746	
	58,4	56.5	57.0	58.0	57.5	56.6	56.6	56.3	56.6	
	1,734	1,834	1,811	1,804	1,657	1,793	1,826	1,897	1,868	
	9,8	10.5	10.3	10.2	9.4	10.3	10.4	10.8	10.6	
	9,591	10,243	10,150	9,628	10,07?	10,220	10,213	10,234	10,194	

The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal vanation; therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and seasonally adjusted columns.

.

## HOUSEHOLD DATA

.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not assonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

	Civilian e	mptoyed	Unem;	bioyed	Unemploy	ment rate
Occupation	Oct.	Oct.	Oct.	Oct.	Oct.	Oct.
	1989	1990	1989	1990	1989	1990
Total, 16 years and over'	118,194	118,299	6,222	6,722	5.0	5.4
Managenal and professional specially	31,224	30,679	593	707	1.9	2.2
	15,146	14,792	337	386	2.2	2.5
	16,078	16,087	256	321	1.5	2.0
Technical, sales, and administrative support	36,009	36,518	1,541	1,634	4,1	4,3
Technicans and related support	3,543	3,819	99	104	2,7	2.7
Sales occupations	14,006	14,055	664	701	4,5	4,7
Administrative support, including clerical	18,460	18,644	777	829	4,0	4,3
Service occupations Private household Protective service Service	15,407	15,758	1,032	1,103	6.3	6.5
	798	777	41	32	4.9	4.0
	1,883	1,926	62	88	3.2	4.4
	12,726	13,055	928	984	6.8	7.0
Precision production, craft, and repair	13,930	13,625	652	808	4.5	5.6
	4,482	4,478	147	163	3.2	3.5
	5,404	5,182	348	468	6.1	8.3
	4,044	3,965	156	177	3.7	4.3
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	18,145	18,084	1,438	1,574	7.3	8.0
	8,160	8,158	632	724	7.2	8.1
	5,113	5,013	267	258	5.0	4.9
	4,872	4,913	538	592	9.9	10.8
	733	742	104	167	12.4	18.3
	4,139	4,171	435	426	9.5	9.3
Farming, forestry, and fishing	3,478	3,434	233	186	6.3	5.1

<sup>1</sup> Persons with no previous work experience and those whose tast job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vietnam-era veterans and nonveterans by age, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

	Con		Civilian labor force								
Veteran status	noninstitutional population			i .			Unemployed				
and age			Total		Employed		Number		Percent of labor force		
	Oct. 1989	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	Oct_ 1990	Oct. 1989	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	Oct. 1990	
VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS											
Total, 35 years and over	7,504	7,680	6,872	6,980	6,630	6,718	242	262	3.5	3.8	
35 to 49 years	6,491	6,501	6,163	6,156	5,969	5,924	194	232	3.2	3.6	
35 to 39 years	1,644	1,339	1,538	1,253	1,486	1,172	51	61	3.3	6.5	
40 to 44 years	3,301	3,245	3,163	3,085	3,058	3,001	105	64	3.3	2.7	
45 to 49 years	1,546	1,917	1,463	1,818	1,424	1,/34	39	20	2.0	3.7	
50 years and over	1,013	1,179	109	024	001	/84	· • • •	30	0.7	3.7	
NONVETERANS	1			į							
Total 35 to 49 years	16,484	17,725	15,518	16,652	15,005	16,052	514	600	3.3	3.6	
35 to 39 years	7,549	8,133	7,185	7,764	6,958	7,460	227	303	3.2	3.9	
40 to 44 years	4,806	5,400	4,515	5,018	4,362	4,836	152	182	3.4	3.6	
45 to 49 years	4,129	4,192	3,818	3,870 ;	3,684	3,755	134	115	3.5	3.0	

NOTE: Male Vietnam-era veterans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to

those 35 to 49 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the bulk of the Vietnam-era veteran population.

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for eleven large States

(Numbers in thousands)

.

	Not sea	sonally adj	usted <sup>1</sup>	Seasonally adjusted <sup>4</sup>							
State and employment status	Oct. 1989	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990		
California											
Chillien conjustitutional constitution	21,602	22.039	22.078	21.602	21.918	21,961	21,999	22,039	22,078		
Chellen lehor force	14,708	14,608	14,659	14,673	14,801	14,751	14,816	14,616	14,613		
Employed	14,036	13,761	13,828	13,955	14,073	13,995	14,010	13,747	13,729		
Unemployed	670	846	832	718	728	756	806	869	884		
Unemployment rate	4.6	5.8	5.7	4.9	4.9	5.1	5.4	5.9	6.0		
Fiorida					·						
Civilian noninstitutional population	9,959	10,169	10,168	9,959	10,111	10,132	10,150	10,169	10,188		
Civilian labor force	6,249	6,419	6,475	6,225	6,294	6,313	6,365	6,450	6,454		
Employed	5,893	6,024	6,076	5,864	5,885	5,953	5,839	6,061	6,054		
Unemployed	357	395	399	361	408	360	420	369	-00		
Unemployment rate	5.7	6.2	6.2	5.0	0.5	3.7	· · ·	0.0	0.4		
Liinois											
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,845	8,882	6,685	8,845	8,871	8,876	8,878	6,682	8,885		
Civilian tabor force	6,044	6,029	6,044	6,031	5,800	5.601	5,604	5,000	5,676		
Employed	5,005	5,636	5,689	5,636	5,625	411	206	425	259		
Unemployed	3/9	383	340	380	60	A7	85	7 2	50		
Unemployment rate	0.3	0.5	5.7	0.5		<b>.</b>	0.5		5.5		
Massachusetts											
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,619	4,621	4,620	4,619	4,620	4,620	4,620	4,621	4,620		
Civilian labor force	3,121	3,147	3,116	3,136	3,1/2	3,15/	3,1/1	3,187	3,130		
Employed	2,993	2,953	2,930	2,997	2,987	2,963	2,960	2,966	2,837		
Unemployed	128	194	186	141	185	194	211	199	189		
Unemployment rate	4.1	6.2	6.0	4.5	0.6	<b>u</b> .1	0.7	0.2	0.3		
Michigan											
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,990	7,003	7,004	6,990	6,999	7,001	7,002	7,003	7,004		
Civilian labor force	4,684	4,579	4,563	4,658	4,631	4,614	4,599	4,568	4,524		
Employed	4,321	4,265	4,236	4,286	4,294	4,271	4,237	4,237	4,191		
Unemployed	363	315	327	372	337	343	362	331	333		
Unemployment rate	7.7	6.9	7.2	6.0	7.3	1.4	7.9	7.2	. 7.4		
New Jersey											
Civilian noninstitutional population	6,032	6,027	6,026	6,032	6,028	6,028	6,028	6,027	6,026		
Civilian labor force	3,962	4,041	4,068	4,021	4,037	4,073	4,066	4,083	4,126		
Employed	3,771	3,838	3,848	3,828	3,845	3,879	3,872	3,870	3,901		
Unemployed	190	203	220	193	192	194	194	213	225		
Unemployment rate	4.8	5.0	5.4	4,8	4.8	4.8	4.8	5.2	5.5		
New York											
Civilian noninstitutional population	13,606	13,801	13,799	13,606	13,801	13,802	13,801	13,801	13,799		
Civilian labor force	8,666	8,671	8,623	8,674	8,732	8,686	8,586	8,751	8,632		
Employed	6,265	8,198	8,161	8,253	8,287	8,222	8,155	8,267	8,151		
Unemployed	401	473	462	421	445	484	431	484	481		
		9.5	0.4				5.5	0.0			
North Carolina	4.050		6.014	4.054	4 000	6.002	6.000	E 012	6.016		
Civilian noninstitutional population	4,800	3 307	3,016	3 385	3 4 3 9	3,410	3,370	3 407	3,367		
UMILIAN ILLIOF TOFCE	3,307	3 294	3 222	3 275	3 312	3 252	3 247	3 280	3 212		
	104	110	148	110	124	158	123	127	155		
Unemployment rate	3.1	3.3	4.4	3.2	3.7	4.8	3.6	3.7	4.6		
Ohio											
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,269	8,290	8,291	8,269	8,283	8,296	8,288	8,290	8,291		
Civilian tabor force	5,477	5,438	5,493	5,462	5,419	5,411	5,448	5,450	5,470		
Employed	5,169	5,177	5,187	5,135	5,135	5,104	5,1/4	5,106	5,145		
Unemployed	308	259	306	327	204	307	2/2	204	325		
Unemployment rate	5.6	4.8	5.6	0.0	5.2	a./	5.0	5.2	5.9		

See footnotes at end of table.

# HOUSEHOLD DATA

# HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for eleven large States-Continued

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not se	sonally adj	usted <sup>1</sup>	Beasonally adjusted <sup>4</sup>						
State and employment statue	Oct. 1989	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Oct. 1969	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	
Pennsylvania										
Civilian noninstitutional population Civilian labor force Employed Unemployed Unemployment rate	9,374 5,817 5,560 257 4.4	9,393 5,858 5,561 297 5.1	9,395 5,897 5,550 346 5,9	9,374 5,803 5,530 273 4,7	9,387 5,694 5,623 271 4.6	9,390 5,869 5,574 295 5.0	9,392 5,777 5,498 281 4.9	9,393 5,850 5,531 319 5,5	9,395 5,897 5,535 362 6.1	
Texas										
Civilian noninstitutional population Civilian labor force Employed Unemployment rate	12,263 8,474 7,963 511 6.0	12,404 8,491 7,965 526 6.2	12,416 8,406 7,961 445 5,3	12,263 8,460 7,908 552 6.5	12,365 8,452 7,979 473 5.6	12,379 8,371 7,853 518 6.2	12,391 8,325 7,833 492 5.9	12,404 8,484 7,953 531 6.3	12,418 6,398 7,916 482 5.7	

<sup>1</sup> These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics' estimates used in the administration of Federal hand allocation programs.
<sup>2</sup> The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore,

identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and the seasonally adjusted columns.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table 8-1. Employees on nonfarm payrells by industry (In thousands)

	Not	seasone	lly adju	sted		5	asonall	adjust	ed	
Industry	Oct.	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Oct.	June	y1ut	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.
	1989	1990	1990g/	1990 <u>e</u> /	1989	1990	0991	1990	1990 <u>e</u> /	1990 <u>e</u> /
Total	109.719	110.304	110.858	111,235	108,980	110.829	110,740	110.613	110,561	110,493
Total private	91.606	93.147	92.834	92,669	91.096	92,282	92,300	92,320	92.262	92.164
Goods-producing industries	25.642	25,458	25,343	25,143	25.283	25,162	25,105	25,013	24,936	24,794
Mining.	719	748	746	745	710	744	745	735	736	735
Oil and gas extraction	393.1	414.4	415.3	415.1	390	413	413	410	410	412
Construction	5,491	5,537	5,452	5.348	5,239	5,270	5,229	5,194	5,183	5,103
General building contractors	1,387.6	1,381.6	1,357.8	1.332.0	1,338	1,334	1,319	1,307	1,309	
Manufacturing	19,432	19,173	19,145	19.050	19,334	19.148	19,131	19,084	19,017	18,956
Production workers	13.270	13,034	13,052	12,956	13,171	13.007	13,010	12,968	12,903	12,863
Durable goods	11.375	11,125	11.107	11,060	11,337	11.201	11,179	11,129	11,067	11.027
Production workers	7.578		7.383	7,350	7,541	7.439	7,438	7,395	7,340	7,315
Lumber and word products	759.5 525.0 573.8 763.0 272.4 1,440.9 2.119.1 1.746.3 2.032.5 836.4 1.020.5 594.6	756.9 510.7 561.3 754.1 272.1 1.413.7 2,085.9 1.686.5 1.974.7 799.2 993.2 387.7	749.6 511.6 558.4 752.8 270.5 1,417.0 2,075.8 1,677.8 1,677.8 1,677.8 1,677.8 1,677.8 312.0 989.2 390.4	737.9 511.1 552.5 750.3 269.6 1.410.5 2.071.3 1.673.8 1.974 1 807.5 987.8 391.0	753 521 566 764 274 1,433 2,125 1,737 2,031 833 1,021 386	743 515 556 270 1,415 2,108 1,703 2,021 2,021 2,021 1,000 384	742 511 552 759 2,104 1,419 2,104 1,695 2,015 2,015 824 976 386	739 513 551 271 1,419 2,096 1,685 1,997 384 990 384	736 511 547 751 2,082 1,411 2,082 1,673 1,981 405 990 385	731 508 545 751 1,403 2,078 1,665 1,974 989 383
Nondurable goods	8,057	8,048	8.038	7,990	7,997	7,947	7.952	7,955	7,950	7.929
Production workers	5,692	5,657	5,649	5,606	5,630	5,568	5.572	5,573	5,563	5.548
Fond and kindred products Tobacco products Total a sil products Paper and allied products Pranting and sublishing Chanicals and allied products Chanicals and alled products Rubber and estar products Leather and leather products	1,697.0 50.3 724.0 1,073.8 697.6 1,563.9 1,074.0 159.1 880.9 136.4	1,730.7 47.7 703.2 1,025.8 706.0 1,577.7 1,094.1 164.4 871.6 127.1	1,734.2 49.0 700.2 1,029.7 701.2 1,572.2 1,689.8 162.8 872.4 126.5	1,701.3 48.6 694.1 1,027.2 698.7 1,576.8 1,085.6 162.2 871.4 124.0	1,651 48 721 1,066 697 1,567 1,076 1,076 158 878 135	1,643 47 702 1,029 1,582 1,582 1,582 1,60 871 128	1,645 46 702 1,027 701 1,583 1,088 160 874 126	1,650 48 701 1,026 702 1,582 1,086 161 874 125	1,653 47 697 1,026 700 1,580 1,580 1,089 161 872 125	1.655 46 691 1.020 698 1.580 1.088 160 869 122
Service-producing industries	84.077	84.846	85,515	86.092	83.697	85.667	85,635	85,600	85.625	85.699
Transportation and public utilities	5,720	5,851	5.914	5,928	5.671	5,846	5.841	5,846	5,868	5.877
Transportation	3,549	3,616	3.693	3,707	3.500	3,627	3.625	3,631	3,649	3.656
Communications and public utilities	2,171	2,235	2.221	2,221	2.171	2,219	2.216	2,215	2,219	2.221
Hholessle trade	6.333	6.409	6.379	6.374	6,313	6,383	6.374	6,376	6,367	6,356
Durable goods	3.746	3.785	3.760	3.754	3,744	3,779	3.775	3,770	3,764	3,754
Nondurable goods	2.587	2.624	2.619	2.620	2,569	2,604	2.599	2,606	2,603	2,602
Retnil trade.	19.688	19,965	19.872	19,804	19.665	19.822	19.851	19.846	19.832	19.784
General merchandise stores	2.555.6	2,438.0	2.434.2	2,478.4	2.527	2.496	2.494	2,493	2.484	2,471
Food stores.	3.236.9	3,304.7	3.292.5	3,304.1	3.230	3.302	3.304	3,301	3.299	3,298
Automotive dealers and service stations.	2.123.6	2,160.8	2.152.4	2,137.0	2.115	2.120	2.131	2,135	2.137	2.128
Eating and drinking places.	6.481.4	6,805.2	6.768.3	6,619.4	6.491	6.598	6.619	6,613	6.623	6,633
Finance, insurance, and real estate	6,737	6,935	6.862	6.834	6.756	6,844	6.842	6,852	6.852	6,853
Finance.	3,306	3,372	3.343	3.334	3.520	3,344	3,341	5,349	3.350	3,347
Insurence.	2,104	2,157	2.144	2.150	2.109	2,143	2,147	2,151	2.150	2,156
Real estate.	1,327	1,406	1.375	1.350	1.327	1,357	1,354	1,352	1.352	1,350
Services	27,486	28,529	28,464	28,586	27.408	28,225	28.287	28,387	28.407	28,500
Business services	5,026.7	5,107.7	5,123.2	5,110.9	4,970	5,060	5.051	5.052	5.062	5.050
Health services	7,685.3	8,215.9	8,233.9	8,286.1	7.690	8,096	8,132	8,191	8.234	8.294
Government	18.113	17.157	18.024	18.566	17.884	18.547	18,440	18.293	18.299	18.329
Federal	2,969	3.060	2.995	2.975	2.986	3,338	3,164	3.045	3.007	2.992
State	4,301	4.073	4.253	4,430	4.202	4.296	4,298	4.305	4.318	4,330
Local	10,843	10.024	10.776	11.161	10.696	10.913	10,978	10.943	10.974	11,007

g/ T preliminary.

# Note on temporary census workers

The number of temporary workers associated with the 1990 census has an impact on the employment levels for the Federal government, as well as for hopper aggregates. The estimates of these workers exe 22.000 h alwarey, 27.000 in Federary, 117.000 v March, 174.000 in Arg, 378.000 in May, 387.000 in Juna, 184.000 in July, 65.000 in August, and 26.000 in September. For October, reestimated mumber (pair/marky vs 15,000)

Table 8-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers1/ on private nonferm payrolls by industry

	Not	Seasona	lly adju	ated		S	esonall	y adjust	ed	
Industry	Oct. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990g/	Oct. 1990g/	Oct. 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990g/	Oct. 1990g/
Total private	34.8	34.8	34.8	34.4	34.6	34.7	34.5	34.5	34.7	34.2
Hining	44.1	44.0	45.0	44.8	43.6	44.4	43.7	43.9	44.6	44 2
Construction	39.2	39.0	39.1	38.0	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Manufacturing Overtime hours	40.9 3.9	40.8 3.9	41.3 4.1	41.0 3.8	40.8 3.7	41.0 3.8	40.9 3.7	41.0 3.8	41.1 3.7	40 a 3.7
Durable goods Overtime hours	41,4 3.9	41.5 3.9	41.8 4.1	41.5 3.9	41.3 3.7	41.6 3.9	41.5 3.8	41.5	41.7	41.4 3.7
Lumbur and wead products. Stone. clav. and glass products. Primary mail industrians	40.6 39.8 42.4 42.5 42.0 41.3 43.0 41.3 39.7 40.3 41.3 40.3 40.3 40.3 40.4 41.3 40.4	40.6 39.6 42.5 43.2 41.3 41.4 40.4 40.4 39.7 40.3 41.5 3.9 41.5 3.9 41.5 3.9 41.5 40.4 40.5 40	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	40.3           39.2           42.0           42.0           42.5           42.5           42.5           42.5           41.6           42.5           43.9           42.5           43.5           41.6           40.3           3.8           41.0           40.2           36.7           43.8	40.3 39.2 42.4 42.4 42.5 42.4 42.1 41.3 41.3 41.3 41.3 41.3 41.3 41.4 41.0 41.4 41.0 41.3 40.1 40.6 40.6 36.3 43.5 43.5	40.3           37.3           42.3           43.0           43.0           441.6           42.0           42.6           42.6           42.6           43.7           41.6           42.6           42.6           43.7           41.6           42.6           42.6           43.7           40.3           30.4           40.3           3.6           40.3           3.6           40.3           3.6           40.3           3.6           40.3           3.6           40.3           3.6           40.3           3.6           40.4           3.6           40.4           3.6           40.4           3.6           40.4           40.4           40.4           40.4           40.4           40.4           40.4           40.5           41.5 <td>40.2 39.6 41.7 43.1 44.1 44.1 44.1 44.1 42.0 42.8 43.6 43.6 43.6 43.6 43.6 40.1 40.5 (2) 40.5 (2) 40.2 (3) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)</td> <td><math display="block"> \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc</math></td> <td><math display="block">\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc</math></td> <td>39.9 38.6 41.3 42.1 42.1 42.1 42.5</td>	40.2 39.6 41.7 43.1 44.1 44.1 44.1 44.1 42.0 42.8 43.6 43.6 43.6 43.6 43.6 40.1 40.5 (2) 40.5 (2) 40.2 (3) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) 40.5 (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4)	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	39.9 38.6 41.3 42.1 42.1 42.1 42.5
Printing and publishing. Chemicals and allied products. Petroleum and coal products. Rubber and nisc. plastics products. Leather and leather products.	42.4 45.2 41.3 37.9	43.8 43.8 41.1 38.0	42.7 45.2 41.6 37.5	42.6 44.5 41.3 37.3	42.5 (2) 41.1 37.7	42.6 (2) 41.6 37.5	42.4 (2) 41.5 37.4	42.3 (2) 41.3 37.7	42.7 (2) 41.4 37.5	42.7 (2) 41.1 37.1
Transportation and public utilities	39.0	39.2	\$9.3	38.8	38.8	39.2	39.0	38.9	39.2	38.6
Hholesale trade	38.2	38.1	38.3	38.2	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.1	38.2	38.0
Retail trade	28.9	29.4	28.9	28.4	28.9	29.0	28.9	28.7	28.9	28.4
Finance, insurance, and real estate	36.1	35.7	36.1	55.6	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Sarvices	32.8	32.8	32.7	32.4	32.7	32.6	32.6	52.5	32.8	32.3

1/ Data relats to production workers in mining and manufacturing: construction workers in construction; and nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities: wholesals and pretail trads; tinance, insurance, and real statis and services. These proves account for approximately down of the total employees on private monfarm payrolls.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

2.7 These series are not coublished seasonally divited from the seasonal component is small relative to the trand-cycle and/or irregular components and consequently cannot be separated with sufficient precision. p foreliningry.

### ESTABLISHMENT DATA

ESTABLISHMENT DATA Table B-5. Average hourly and wackly cornings of production or nonsupervisory workers[/ on private nonferm payrolls by industry

	Ave	rage hou	rly earn	ings	Ave	rege week	tly eern	inga
Industry	Oct. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990 <u>p</u> /	0ct. 1990 <u>e</u> /	Oct. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990 <u>p</u> /	0et. 1990g/
Total private Seasonally adjusted	\$9.81 9.78	\$10.00 10.09	*10.17 10.13	*10.17 10.13	\$341.39 338.39	#348.00 348.11	0353.92 351.51	\$349.85 346.45
Mining	13.23	13.63	13.81	13.77	583.44	599.72	621.45	616.90
Construction	13.71	13.74	13.92	13.90	537.43	535.86	544.27	528.20
Manufacturing	10.54	10.82	10.94	10.96	431.09	441.46	451.82	449.36
Durable goods	$11.07\\ 8.96\\ 8.41\\ 10.90\\ 12.50\\ 14.42\\ 10.61\\ 13.85\\ 14.42\\ 10.08\\ 14.42\\ 10.08\\ 13.85\\ 14.42\\ 10.97\\ 8.36\\ 9.81\\ 13.85\\ 14.91\\ 1.382\\ 14.91\\ 1.382\\ 14.91\\ 1.382\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.281\\ 1.109\\ 1.10$	11.35 9.14 8.56 11.17 12.94 14.86 10.84 11.80 10.33 14.07 14.54 11.35 8.59 10.12 9.55 16.54 8.62 12.29 11.357 16.54 8.62 12.39 11.357	11.49 9.22 8.64 11.27 13.05 14.99 10.43 14.31 14.31 14.45 11.47 8.62 10.20 9.56 16.12 8.69 12.45 11.41 13.65 16.9 12.45 11.41 13.65	11.50 9.13 8.61 11.23 13.07 15.07 10.96 11.91 10.462 14.42 15.00 11.48 8.68 10.23 9.56 15.66 6.67 12.66 11.37 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.76 13.77 13.76 13.77 13.76 13.77 13.76 13.77 13.76 14.42 15.66 14.42 15.66 14.42 14.42 14.42 14.42 14.42 14.42 14.42 15.66 14.42 15.66 14.42 15.66 14.42 15.66 14.42 15.66 14.42 15.66 14.42 14.42 15.66 14.42 14.42 14.42 15.66 14.42 14.42 14.42 14.42 14.42 14.42 14.42 15.66 14.42 14.44 14.4	458.30 363.78 334.72 468.70 530.00 612.85 460.32 482.16 414.29 4570.77 570.77 570.77 570.77 570.77 331.89 395.34 383.46 600.87 317.38 237.07 521.23 419.17 562.65 322.35 222.35	468.76 371.08 373.98 476.96 549.95 641.95 641.95 647.69 490.88 417.33 588.13 588.13 588.13 544.62 341.02 407.43 546.22 341.02 407.43 596.33 432.79 569.43 402.95 530.93 432.79 569.43 402.19	480,28 378,02 343,01 563,76 457,29 504,64 457,29 504,64 457,29 504,64 457,29 504,64 457,29 504,64 457,29 505,40 474,86 344,80 474,86 344,80 414,12 400,56 50,31 326,84 245,52 54,39,29 582,00 414,12 400,56 40,520	477.25 367.94 337.51 471.66 560.70 661.57 455.94 500.22 426.36 612.85 652.50 472.98 346.07 412.27 392.78 632.66 132.66 132.66 132.66 132.66 132.66 135.47 195.61 85.47 195.61 195.72 195.73 195.75 195
Transportation and public utilities	12.74	12.96	13.04	13.03	496.86	508.03	512.47	505.56
Wholesale trade	10.51	10.77	10.94	10.90	401.48	410.34	419.00	416.38
Retail trade	6.61	6.75	6.86	6.86	191.03	198.45	198.25	194.82
Finance, insurance, and real estate	9.70	9.56	10.12	10.09	350.17	355.57	365.33	359.20
Services	9.58	9.78	9.99	10.02	314.22	320.78	326.67	324.65

1/ See footnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary.

Table 3-4. Average hourly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers// on private nonferm payrolls by industry, seasonally adjusted

Industry	Oct. 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990 <u>p</u> /	0ct. 1990 <u>e</u> /	Percent change from: Sept. 1990- Oct. 1990
tal privata: Current dollars tining Sonstruction Castruction Excluding overland/ Transportation and public utilitie Wholesale trade Katil trade Singnee. ingurance. and real estat Singnee.	. 99.78 7.65 13.32 13.61 10.57 10.10 12.71 10.56 6 9.72 . 9.55	+10.03 7.58 13.73 10.86 10.38 12.92 10.80 6.78 9.98 9.85	\$10.07 7.58 13.79 10.89 10.40 13.02 10.84 6.79 10.84 6.79 10.08	\$10.09 7.54 13.73 13.78 10.90 10.40 13.00 13.00 10.84 6.82 10.06 9.93	\$10.13 7.50 13.82 10.93 10.94 12.99 12.99 12.99 12.99 12.99	010.13 W.A. 13.80 10.98 10.51 12.99 10.92 6.85 10.10 9.99	0.0 (3) -1 -5 -7 -0 -2 -1 -7 -7
remsportation and public utilitie Wholemale trade. Tensora, insurance, and real estat Services. 1/ See footnote 1, table B-2. 2/ The Consumer Price Index for	12.71 10.54 6.60 9.72 9.55	12.92 10.80 6.78 9.98 9.85	13.02 10.84 6.79 10.08 9.92 4/ 1 hours a	13.00 1D.84 6.82 10.06 9.93 Derived	12.9 10.9 6.8 10.1 9.9 by assu	94479	9 12.99 4 10.92 4 6.85 7 10.10 9 9.99 ming that rate of t

Mage Earners and Clerical Morkers (CPI-M): used to deflate this series. J/ Change was -0.5 percent from August 1990 to September 1990, the latest month available.

N.A. = not available. <u>p</u>/ = preliminary.

.

.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

ESTABLISHMENT DATA Table B-5. Indexes of aggregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers/ on private nonfare payrolls by industry (1982=100)

<b>I</b>	Not	\$e830	nally ad	justed		s	asona	lly ad	justed	
Industry	Oct. 1989	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990g/	Oct. 1990g/	Oct. 1989	June 1990	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990g/	Oct. 1990 <u>p</u> /
Total private	124.8	127.1	126.6	124.8	123.4	125.3	124.8	124.6	125.3	123.3
Goods-producing industries	114.8	113.2	113.9	111.4	111.6	111.7	110.5	110.5	110.4	108.3
Mining	64.8	67.8	69.1	68.8	63.1	68.0	66.9	66.1	67.3	66.9
Construction	154.4	154.1	151.9	144.2	141.7	144.3	138.4	139.8	140.3	132.4
Manufacturing	109.5	107.3	108.6	107.1	108.3	107.6	107.4	107.1	106.8	105.8
Durable goods Furniture and fixtures. Stone.clay, and class products Primary metal industries Fabriated astal products Industrial mechinery and equipment Industrial mechinery and equipment Transportation adulment Instruments and related products	108.7 135.0 130.8 116.7 93.1 79.8 110.1 98.8 112.7 120.3 133.3 133.3 89.0 108.1	105.5 134.3 125.6 113.1 92.2 81.0 95.9 106.4 117.4 124.1 85.9 105.4	107.1 134.1 126.3 12.5 93.8 82.1 108.5 97.1 108.0 121.8 131.7 86.7 107.0	1 105.7 129.4 124.5 109.5 92.7 81.3 107.6 96.1 106.9 120.2 129.6 120.2 129.6 107.4	107.9 132.6 127.9 113.3 93.6 81.4 108.9 99.2 111.9 120.2 132.3 88.5 104.3	107.1 130.5 126.0 110.5 93.5 80.4 107.8 98.4 109.6 123.3 133.7 87.2 102.7	107.1 129.7 125.8 108.2 94.3 82.3 108.5 98.5 108.3 124.1 135.2 86.8 104.5	106.5 129.7 125.7 109.5 93.0 80.8 108.1 98.1 107.2 122.2 131.2 86.5 104.8	106.1 130.8 124.2 108.7 92.9 81.7 107.4 97.1 107.7 121.3 128.9 86.4 105.0	104.8 126.9 121.7 105.9 93.1 82.9 106.4 96.7 106.0 120.0 127.7 85.8 103.9
Information of the second products Food and kindred products Textile mill products Apparel and other textile products. Paper and alled products. Printing and publishing. Chemicals and allied products. Rubber and misc. plastics products. Leather and leather products.	110.7 113.8 76.5 106.1 98.6 110.9 126.4 104.4 89.9 128.2 65.9	118.1 68.4 101.1 92.7 111.8 129.0 103.5 90.1 125.5 61.0	110., 119.5 74.2 101.0 93.1 112.1 129.0 104.6 91.8 127.6 59.6	107.0 117.3 72.3 99.4 92.7 112.4 128.5 104.1 90.2 126.3 57.9	108.9 68.8 104.9 97.3 110.2 126.4 105.0 87.5 126.9 64.3	108.7 64.3 101.2 93.0 111.4 128.6 104.4 93.0 127.3 61.1	107.9 66.6 100.6 92.4 111.6 129.0 104.3 88.3 127.2 59.8	109.7 68.8 100.1 92.4 111.8 129.6 103.2 88.0 126.8 59.6	1107.9 110.4 68.5 99.1 92.3 110.5 128.3 104.3 89.6 126.7 58.8	108.9 65.3 98.1 91.6 112.1 128.7 104.7 87.6 125.2 57.0
Service-producing industries	129.3	133.4	132.3	130.8	128.8	131.4	131.2	130.9	132.0	130.1
Transportation and public utilities	113.8	116.5	118.2	117.0	112.0	116.7	115.8	115.2	116.7	115.2
Wholesale trade	119.5	120.4	120.2	119.8	118.7	119.8	119.5	119.5	119.6	118.9
Retail trade	124.0	128.2	125.2	122.6	123.9	125.3	125.1	124.1	124.9	122.4
Finance, insurance, and real estate	121.7	124.7	124.3	121.7	121.8	122.9	123.1	122.9	124.3	121.9
Services	142.8	148.3	147.4	146.5	142.1	145.8	145.9	146.0	147.5	145.7

1/ See footnote 1, table 8-2.

p \* preliminary.

66

.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA Table 8-6. Diffusion indexes of employment change, seasonally adjusted (Percent)

				<u> </u>	<u> </u>						0.4	Neu	Dee
	Time span	Jan.	Feb.	Har.	Apr.	Лау	June	3019		Jape			
					Priva	te nonfa	rm payro	118. 356	industr	ies]/			
Over	1-month gpan: 1989 1990	64.5 55.6	58.7 58.6	58.0 53.7	57.0 49.9	55.6 55.8	57.3 49.9	55.8 50.8	57.7 48.2	50.0 2/44.9	55.2 Er 44.9	59.6	56.6
Over	3-month mpen: 1989 1990	65.3 58.4	64.2 56.7	60.0 54.8	60.1 53.1	59.7 53.7	58.3 55.3	59.7 50.1	54.5 8/44.5	55.2 2/41.6	55.8	57.7	60.3
Over	6-month span: 1989 1990	67.6 57.3	65.4 56.5	65.0 55.5	61.0 55.9	61.2 51.4	58.7 g/48.2	57.0 E* 46.8	58.1	56.2	58.3	57.4	58.4
Over	12-month span: 1989 1990	67.1 54.8	67.7 54.1	65.3 £⁄53.4	64.6 E/50.4	64.9	61.2	60.0	59.8	58.6	57.3	56.7	56.0
					Menv	facturin	o payrol	1s, 139	industri	e=1/			
Over	1-month span; 1989 1990	60.4 42.4	48.6 45.7	50.4 45.3	47.1 46.8	45.3 45.7	45.7 40.3	45.0 48.2	45.7 40.6	34.2 E/38.1	48.6 g/37.8	43.5	48.2
Over	3-month span: 1989 1990	54.0 40.3	54.7 37.1	45.3 44.2	43.9 41.4	43.2 40.6	42.8 44.2	41.7 39.9	33.1 ₽∕34.2	36.3 E <sup>29.9</sup>	34.9	41.7	39.2
Over	6-month span; 1989 1990	56.5 37.1	49.6 35.6	49.3 36.3	43.5 43.2	42.1 38.1	37.1 8/32.4	36.7 E <sup>29.9</sup>	34.9	\$4.2	35.3	53.1	36.0
Over	12-month spen: 1989 1990	53.6 31.3	55.0 31.3	49.3 g/30.2	45.3 2/27.0	43.9	39.9	57.1	35.6	33.8	32.4	30.9	31.7

1/ Based on seasonally adjusted data for 1-, 3-, and 6-month space and unadjusted data for the 12-month span. Data are control within the span. # proliminary. MOTE: "Fources are the percent of industries with

employment increasing plus one-helf of the industries with unchanged employment, where 50 percent indicates an equal balance between industries with increasing and decressing employment.

Representative SOLARZ. Congressman Hawkins, do you have any questions?

Representative HAWKINS. I really don't have any questions. But may I thank the Congressman, Mr. Solarz, for his very generous and rather unexpected remarks. I have enjoyed working with him and others. But in particular, Mrs. Norwood, I would like to express to you and your colleagues my very deep appreciation for the professional work you have done and the contribution you have made to Federal service, you and your colleagues. It has been a real pleasure to come to these hearings and feel confident that the presentation would be of very high professional character.

We haven't always agreed. We've had a few differences, not too many. And perhaps I was more irritable than constructive at times out of a very deep conviction that behind statistics we have human beings. And I always try to think in terms of human beings that are affected by the rise and fall of unemployment rates or inflation rates and so forth. And I can never quite console myself with the idea that we sat around from month to month and waited for you to come before the committee to give us either the good news or the bad news. And always when there was good news, there were a lot of individuals who would have praise for what was happening. But then with bad news, when it came about, they didn't seem to be around saying very much. That always worried me-not you, but reaction to your reports. And I shall miss your reports, but I will obviously keep up with them.

We have enjoyed the association and I want you to know that if I were abrasive at times, when I hope I wasn't, that it was not because of you. It was not anything personal. Obviously, we enjoy the great contribution you made. These are some of the things we will miss, but we will look forward to being advised of the reports.

I do hope to return to the private sector. I think I have been in the public sector too long. And I certainly look forward to continuing my friendship with Congressman Solarz. With that I am verv happy. Commissioner Norwood, I walked down the hall this morning primarily because I wanted to tell you this officially—and to let it be known-on the record-that I think you have done a wonderful job. And I hope that it will continue. Thank you.

Mrs. Norwood. Thank you very much. I appreciate that.

Representative Solarz. Congressman Hawkins, I hope you will forgive me if I correct one part of your statement. I cannot believe you were ever irritable.

Mrs. Norwood. Certainly not. In fact, appearing before Congressman Hawkins and trying to respond to some of the questions he had was always a very instructive experience for us, because he always set me to thinking about something that hadn't occurred to me. And we were able to go back and try to track it down further. So he has provided a great service to us as well.

Representative SOLARZ. Mrs. Norwood, fortunately for you, we no longer conduct ourselves the way they did in ancient Greece, where the messengers who brought ill tidings lost their heads.

Mrs. NORWOOD. I am very pleased at that. [Laughter.] Representative SOLARZ. I simply want to remind you of this contemporary reality, in order to encourage you to be as candid as possible with us on this occasion.

Are we in a recession?

Mrs. Norwood. I really don't know about that Congressman Solarz. Because the way I look at it is that what we are trying to do in talking about recession is to apply the rules of yesteryear to an economy that has changed completely. You yourself mentioned, for example, the fact that a lot of middle managers are now being eliminated from the payroll, that many of the senior skilled craftsmen, and the more experienced workers are being let go.

In other periods, the changes in the work force were somewhat different. Labor market declines were concentrated in the goodsproducing economy. What has happened until quite recently was that we had such a strong service-producing economy that its growth counterbalanced declines in the goods sector.

As you yourself said, and as my statement indicates, if you look at manufacturing and construction, the situation is pretty bad. We have lost a lot of jobs in those two areas. There is very little business activity going on in the real estate market. And that affects, of course, the production of things that go into houses. It is quite widespread. We reported, for example, that there was decline in the retail trade industry, and there is some evidence that consumers are not fully confident in rushing out to buy things. It is that kind of activity that stimulates the economy. And we are not seeing that.

The only growth we are seeing at the moment is in the health services industry, which is important. And those are varying kinds of jobs, very highly technical jobs and some custodial type jobs. But the important thing, I think, is that they are not as stimulating to the economic development of our country as some of the other types of employment are.

Representative SOLARZ. If you don't know if we are in a recession, how are we supposed to know if we are in a recession?

Mrs. Norwood. I think the important thing is not whether we call this a recession or whether we don't call this a recession. The important thing is that the employment data suggest an economy that is declining, that is deteriorating and that requires, I think, that we take pause and consider the situation. There are a lot of technical definitions of recession that have not been met. It is very clear from this set of data that the employment situation has deteriorated. And that is an important message that we have----

Representative SOLARZ. You would agree with Gertrude Stein that a rose by any other name is still a rose.

Mrs. NORWOOD. I think she had something there. [Laughter.]

Representative SOLARZ. Is the economy clearly heading for what, in old-fashioned terms, used to be called a recession, even if you are not sure we are in one now?

Mrs. Norwood. Well, you know, the technical definition of a recession is that there has to be, for some period of time, a very strong downturn in economic activity, not just in the labor market, but in all economic activity. It has to be widely dispersed throughout the economy. And it has to have significant duration. We haven't seen that combination of circumstances yet. We certainly have seen in the labor market a rather serious decline in the goods-producing areas. And we are seeing really very lackluster performance in the service-producing areas, in which growth is lim-
ited, primarily, to health services. That doesn't quite meet the definition of recession, but it certainly bears watching. It certainly is not what we would like to be reporting.

Representative SOLARZ. If I press you on this, it's only because I do believe that self-knowledge is the first step toward a cure. And it is important for us to——

Mrs. Norwood. I believe that too.

Representative SOLARZ [continuing]. Have a diagnosis of what the situation is, so we can then determine what we need to do in order to correct it.

When would you say that this decline in the labor market and in the economy as a whole began? To what date would you trace it?

Mrs. Norwood. My understanding is that the Bureau of Economic Analysis has just released data that suggest that the third quarter GNP was about 1.8 percent. That's low, but it is not down. That is the broadest measure of the economy that we have. If we look at the labor market, I would say that you have to look at the individual industries. If you take manufacturing, as I indicated, I think it was 589,000 jobs that we lost since the peak of employment in manufacturing. That is a pretty steep drop. A very steep drop.

Representative SOLARZ. Since when?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Since January 1989. That is when employment really stopped growing and manufacturing began heading downward. That is a very steep drop. It is a very serious kind of problem. Production didn't decline quite so much as employment did. But, clearly, manufacturing has been in some real difficulty.

The same thing is true of construction. Construction didn't begin to decline quite as early as did the Nation's factories. But construction, of course, has been very much affected by the financing problems that have occurred. And in some of the conversations that I have had with a number of business people, there is concern about the availability of financing for business purposes generally. And that is also something that has a dampening effect.

Representative SOLARZ. Are you saying that in addition to the decline in manufacturing and construction employment, we are now beginning to witness a decline in service-oriented employment?

Mrs. Norwood. Yes. I think so, except for health services and education, which are growing. Health services, particularly is expanding, because of the aging of the population and medical discoveries. Education, because we had an increase in births some time ago. Except for those two areas, I don't see in the labor market very much stimulating activity. And that is worrying.

Representative SOLARZ. To what do you attribute the decline in manufacturing employment? We're talking about a pretty large loss of jobs here, over half a million.

Mrs. Norwood. I think you need to look at that in a more disaggregated form. We have had a number of industries that have been declining for decades. And that decline goes in fits and starts. But it has continued. The one that I mentioned in my statement this month which lost jobs was leather producing. Leather has been going down in terms of employment in this country for many, many years. And we have had problems in the textile industry and the apparel industry and many, many other industries of that kind. The automobile industry is in a very different situation. It is decling in part because we have produced and sold in this country an awful lot of cars and we have fewer people in the market for an automobile now. The market is getting smaller. There are attitudes about domestic cars and foreign cars and quality and so on. But the automobile companies have been adjusting their production. We have had announcements from some of the largest ones that they are closing down a number of plants. There has been worldwide overproduction of automobiles, and the automobile companies are now beginning to adjust to that.

If you look at the high-tech area, we are seeing a turnaround there that is partly competition, and partly just the general economy. But there are special problems there and some of those companies are doing well and others are not.

There is also the issue of defense. We have had for many, many years a very strong defense buildup. We have not turned that around, but the future buildup is not anticipated to be as large. And so there probably will not be as much employment created for those purposes. So far, we are seeing a little bit of decline in the employment attributable to defense, but not a great deal.

And in construction, I've already talked about the problem of financing, the problem of people's incomes and so on.

Representative SOLARZ. How much of the loss in jobs in textiles is due to foreign imports and how much of it is due in automobiles?

Mrs. Norwood. I cannot tell you that. My own personal view is that it is very difficult to attribute sales or lack of sales to competition from imports. Competition from imports is like competition from anything else. If you produce a good product and you can sell it as a decent price, it will sell. I think that is what our automobile companies have found. They have been stressing now the development of higher quality, for example, which is probably the biggest problem in competition between the American and the Japanese companies.

Clearly, there has been a lot of automation in the textile industry. We have also cleaned up the textile industry. A couple of years ago I went through a textile plant. And it was highly mechanized, but it was also a lot cleaner. The air was cleaner and safer for the workers who were working there. All of that, of course, is adding to competitive costs.

Representative SOLARZ. Are you able to give us any estimate of what is likely to happen over the course of the next year or two in terms of the economy? Do you expect the situation to continue to deteriorate or do you anticipate a rebound?

Mrs. Norwood. I can't predict. We don't do any short-term forecasting. There are a number of companies that do, by feeding data into econometric models. I can tell you that one of the reasons that I included information on oil prices in my statement is that we anticipate that we will begin to see some of the indirect effects of the higher prices of oil and gasoline, in particular, and also fuel oil and other products that we have already have flowing through the economy. That causes pressure on inflation, which can have a dampening effect. Insofar as the labor market is concerned, that is something that the Federal Reserve Board is studying with great care. Representative SOLARZ. Do you think the Federal Reserve should be more concerned about inflation or recession?

Mrs. Norwoon. I leave that up to them to decide. We have spent some time with Alan Greenspan recently to review data with him so that he and his staff can be certain they have all the information that is available. That is a hard call to make. It is a policy judgment, I believe, which we don't get involved in.

Representative SOLARZ. I am told, Mrs. Norwood, that the labor force grows about 1.5 million per year. But there has been no labor force growth since March 1990. Do we normally go this long without getting new people entering the labor force? Why aren't people looking for jobs?

Mrs. Norwoon. If we compare this to past years, this is an unusual situation. But it is caused by several different forces. One is that we have, for example, over the last year, a decline of several hundred thousand teenagers. That is largely because there were fewer teenagers born years ago to grow up to labor force age to come into the labor force. There was also a small drop in the labor force participation rate of teenagers.

We are also beginning to see, as I think my statement indicates, that the increase in labor force participation of women has slowed. Whether that will continue or not, I don't know. That could be because the economy is somewhat slow, and there are fewer new jobs. And in addition, many of the young people, in particular, generally finds jobs in the service-producing sector, and now that sector is not growing.

Representative SOLARZ. You were reluctant to characterize the current economic situation as one in which we are in a recession.

Mrs. Norwood. Knowing the technical definition of that word, I just didn't want to get into it.

Representative SOLARZ. Sure. But would it be fair to say that there are regions of the country which, if you look at their economy in regional terms, are clearly in a recession?

Mrs. Norwood. I was in Boston last week. And I can tell you that the whole New England area has clearly turned around considerably. There is no doubt about that. We are beginning to see some very big differences from one region of the country to another. For example, New England had the lowest unemployment rate in the country, largely because of the high-tech industry; but high tech turned around and then their unemployment rate began to shoot up.

We have seen some improvement in the Southwest—Texas, in particular, and Louisiana—places that are oil producing, though we haven't seen any very large employment increase in oil and gas extraction. Clearly, those economies which had a very disastrous experience in construction, in particular, and banking are beginning now to turn around a little bit. There are big differences.

Representative SOLARZ. Do you expect the budget agreement, that was recently adopted by the Congress and signed into law by the President, to have an impact on the economy over the course of the next several months or year?

Mrs. Norwood. Yes. I think it clearly will.

Representative SOLARZ. Will that be positive or negative?

Mrs. Norwood. I might say that having gone through what has been perhaps the most difficult experience of a manager, of not knowing from one day to the next whether we can pay our people, that it is a great relief to the whole country to have that behind us.

Clearly, there are some effects in the budget, which we expect to be in our price indexes. We have looked at that. We include excise taxes, for example, in the CPI. And if you look at the sum of those things which we can measure, we expect we'll have about close to three-tenths, about 0.28 percent increase in the CPI. I believe from my reading of the newspaper that the Federal Reserve Board has already eased a little bit, in order to accommodate for the budget agreement.

Representative SOLARZ. And by comparison, what do you think the economic impact on the country of a \$100 billion sequestration would have been in the event we had failed to adopt a deficit reduction bill?

Mrs. Norwood. My own view is that—and I speak merely as myself and not as the representative in the Government—any kind of massive, across-the-board reduction is extremely hurtful, generally.

I also believe that makes it extraordinarily difficult to manage. We still have, after completing the Labor-HHS appropriation, an across-the-board 2.41 percent reduction. We had spent a great deal of time trying to be sure that we have carefully costed out our programs. So it becomes rather difficult to take the cut. Clearly, the magnitude of government services that would have been cut under sequestration would have been very, very serious.

Representative SOLARZ. And let me ask you finally, Mrs. Norwood, as I understood it, the survey from which your Bureau derived the October unemployment rate was conducted during the week of October 7 through the 13. The following week, according to information available to our committee, the number of new claims for unemployment insurance rose to 450,400.

Mrs. Norwood. Yes.

Representative SOLARZ. The second large weekly increase in a row. Would that have had any impact on the unemployment rate that you reported for October? And if it didn't, how will it affect next month's rate?

Mrs. Norwood. First, let me say that the definition of unemployment in the current population survey is not the same as the definition under unemployment insurance. We have seen an increase in job losers over the last several months. That's why we have had an increase in the unemployment rate of half a percentage point. Job losers are the ones who generally have UI coverage.

But we also include a lot of people who have not worked before or have reentered the labor force looking for a job as well as others who are not covered by UI. Only about a third of the total unemployed that we count are covered by UI for those reasons.

If the unemployment increases occurred after the survey, obviously we will pick it up next month. I'm not convinced that has happened, however. Really what we are seeing is, as I indicated, a very slow growth in the labor force, which means that it is a lot easier to have a lower unemployment rate. Representative SOLARZ. Congressman Hawkins, do you have any questions?

Representative HAWKINS. No, I haven't. I think you have carefully avoided policy, and I can appreciate that. In answer to the question of whether the budget agreement would be negative or positive, I take it that you hesitate to make predictions.

Mrs. Norwood. I have mixed feelings. I have some positive and some negative aspects.

Representative HAWKINS. I think we all have the right to have mixed feelings about it. It is not what you bring to us that I am so critical of, Mrs. Norwood, because I think it is excellent reporting of facts. However, I personally—and this is only an observation, nothing to do with your testimony—I don't see anything that we are doing in reaction to the problems that seem to be developing. We know that gasoline prices are rising and we are not moving to have an energy policy of any kind, although other nations are. And yet we seem to be waiting for them to rise and create problems. We are not reacting to that.

We know that productivity is at a very low rate. And yet we have not, in all of the budget process that we have gone through in the last several months, looked at all to address the problem of how to increase productivity to make us more competitive.

We know that our infrastructure is deteriorating at a very rapid pace, but we are doing nothing about that. Another several years will mean that it will be a lot more costly to handle.

All of these problems seem to be converging. I think the overall data indicate that they are creating very difficult problems as well. And yet, I have seen in several months of negotiation, summit meetings and all that, nothing that directly addresses the fundamental causes or anything that would lead us to be optimistic that there is any response to the problems that seem to be developing.

And yet we have the Council of Economic Advisers that I had always assumed would be on top of things—not to wait until you come back to us another month and let us know whether the unemployment rate has improved or has not—but to have something in place to address these problems.

There are some real serious problems out in communities in terms of job losses. And yet, when we dealt with the Job Training Partnership Act, which is the only employment program that we have on the statute books outside of the Job Corps, that was defeated in the Senate, which means that we don't really have any employment program to address the job losses. That is the fragility which seems to characterize this, and that causes me to be always troubled because I don't see any response to anything. We seem to be waiting for something to happen and then saying how bad it is. And as I said, that is getting into policy questions. And I appreciate that you would not want to comment on those. And I don't know how to frame a question to have you answer, because it would get us into policy.

But you have not indicated anything specific as to whether or not we even have a recession or whether one is likely, how deep it will be, if anything is being done to address it, or who is accountable for addressing it. You can tell us next month whether we have improved, but the point is that there's nobody responsible for seeing that any improvement takes place. Not even the Congress, it seems to me, addressed this in its budget process. And I voted for the final passage of the budget package, which may be one of the worst votes I have ever cast or it could be something to improve the situation.

But I saw nothing that would lead to any improvement. The premise seems to be that we're spending too much money and that we have to somehow cut back spending, which reduces demand, obviously, both public and private spending. But it certainly will not improve the employment rate. And yet we go on doing it without addressing the merit of whether it should or shouldn't be done. Let me stop there. I think I'm getting a little too far afield.

Representative SOLARZ. We, of course, can ask many more questions, but we do have another panel to appear before the committee. We can take comfort from the fact that you will be back next month, and we can resume this dialogue on that occasion.

Mrs. Norwood. We will. Thank you very much.

Representative SOLARZ. Thank you very much for coming. And remember to vote on Tuesday.

Mrs. Norwood. I always do.

[Whereupon, at 10:22 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

## **EMPLOYMENT-UNEMPLOYMENT**

### FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1990

Congress of the United States, Joint Economic Committee,

Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:30 a.m., in room 2359, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Lee H. Hamilton (chairman of the commmittee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Hamilton and Upton; and Senator Sarbanes.

Also present: Joseph J. Minarik, executive director; Stephen Quick, chief economist; and William Buechner and Chris Frenze, professional staff members.

### OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE HAMILTON, CHAIRMAN

Representative HAMILTON. The Joint Economic Committee will come to order.

Commissioner Norwood, I'm pleased to welcome you and your colleagues before the Joint Economic Committee this morning for your testimony on the employment and unemployment situation in November.

The figures you bring us this morning for November are cause for very serious concern about the direction of the economy; 450,000 people reported losing their jobs last month, the unemployment rate rose to 5.9 percent and payroll employment declined by 265,000.

Since June, more than a million people have reported losing their jobs. The downturn that began a couple of months ago seems to be taking a turn for the worse.

Before hearing your testimony, I'd like to comment on a major anniversary for the American statistical system. The data you report to Congress, to the Joint Economic Committee, are drawn from the current population survey, which the Census Bureau and the Bureau of Labor Statistics launched 50 years ago to provide the Nation with systematic and reliable information on the strength of our economy and our employment situation.

On this 50th anniversary to the current population survey, I want to let you know how much we at the Joint Economic Committee appreciate your good work and how much we rely on the information you present each month from this survey.

You have a great task ahead of you to keep the survey current with the rapid changes that are occurring in our economy, but we have every confidence that you and your colleagues at the Bureau of Labor Statistics will meet that important challenge. Congressman Upton, do you have a statement?

## **OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE UPTON**

Representative UPTON. I have a very brief statement. It's always a pleasure to join in welcoming Commissioner Norwood and her colleagues before the committee. Unfortunately, the unemployment data—or employment data, I guess they should be—released today are not good news. The employment declines in November as well as October are consistent with other recently released data reflecting economic weakness.

It appears that there is a good chance that the expansion has ended and, in fact, the recession has begun. Some of us have warned in recent months that policies to increase the tax and regulatory burdens on American workers and businesses could not have been more poorly timed. While these policies would always impose economic costs, their impact will be magnified by a vulnerable economy.

In the coming months, it will be interesting to examine whether the direction of Federal policy is consistent with current economic conditions.

Thank you.

Representative HAMILTON. Thank you, Congressman Upton.

The committee will now turn to Commissioner Norwood for her summary and analysis of the November job situation.

You may proceed however you wish.

### STATEMENT OF HON. JANET L. NORWOOD, COMMISSIONER, BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, AC-COMPANIED BY KENNETH V. DALTON, ASSOCIATE COMMIS-SIONER, OFFICE OF PRICES AND LIVING CONDITIONS; AND THOMAS J. PLEWES, ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, OFFICE OF EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mrs. NORWOOD. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. As usual, I have with me Kenneth Dalton on my right, and Tom Plewes on my left. We are very pleased to be here.

The job market conditions worsened considerably in November. Employment declined sharply, and the declines were widespread throughout both the goods and the service sectors of the economy. The unemployment rate rose from 5.7 to 5.9 percent. The rate is now more than half a point higher than it was during the first half of the year.

The number of payroll jobs declined sharply for the second month in a row. A reduction of 265,000 jobs in November followed a loss of 180,000 in October. We have not had consecutive job losses of this magnitude since the end of 1982.

Three-quarters of the November reduction occurred in the already weak manufacturing industry. Nearly 800,000 factory jobs have been dropped since January 1989. Although the November factory job cuts were widespread, they were especially sharp in durable goods manufacturing, where every one of our published industries lost jobs. The automobile industry was particularly hard hit, with some 55,000 workers temporarily laid off as a result of cutbacks in production in the face of slumping sales. Layoffs also occurred in supplier industries for auto manufacturing, such as fabricated metal products, rubber and plastics products and apparel and other textile products. Other manufacturing industries sustaining large employment declines in November included industrial machinery, electronic equipment, lumber, and furniture.

In addition to the large number of factory workers who were laid off, most of those who remained employed worked fewer hours. The factory workweek was cut back to 40.5 hours, down two-tenths of an hour in November and half an hour over the past 2 months. Factory overtime hours have also been edging down over the past few months.

The construction industry lost 60,000 jobs in November. The industry has lost 250,000 jobs over the past 6 months. We are, however, beginning to see a few new jobs in the oil and gas industry. Even service-sector jobs were affected in November. In retail trade, seasonal hiring for the Christmas period fell short of expectations, and, after seasonal adjustment, employment was down by 70,000. Wholesale trade employment fell by some 10,000 and has decreased by 40,000 over the past 3 months.

Job losses also occurred in the finance and real estate industries; the sharp drop in real estate sales in most of the Nation's housing markets continues to have an impact on employment.

In spite of these widespread declines, the number of jobs in the health services industry continued to increase. Three-quarters of the November increase of 80,000 jobs in the services industry was in health services. That industry has added more than 600,000 jobs, an increase of about 8 percent over the past year alone.

In contrast, the important business services industry, whose growth began to moderate early in 1989, lost 20,000 jobs in November.

The pervasive nature of November job losses is illustrated by the BLS diffusion index of employment change, which showed again that substantially more industries lost jobs than gained them. This index has declined in each of the last 4 months and, in November, was the lowest since November 1982.

Employment, as measured by the household survey, also showed a large decline from October. Total civilian employment was down by 450,000. Although this decline was widespread across the major age-sex groups, most of the employment decline occurred among adult women, whose employment-population ratio fell over the month to 54.5 percent; their ratio is down by a full percentage point from the June high.

The number of unemployed persons rose by nearly 300,000 in November to 7.4 million. This reflected an increase in the number of workers who had lost their last job; there was virtually no change in the number of jobless persons who had left their jobs voluntarily, or who were coming into the work force.

The recent increases in unemployment have occurred among both adult men and women. The jobless rate for adult men, at 5.4 percent in November, has risen by seven-tenths of a percentage point over the past 5 months, while the rate for adult women, at 5.1 percent, was up six-tenths of a point. The jobless rate for teenagers is, as you know, always much higher than for adults. About 1 out of every 16 workers was unemployed in November. Among black teenagers, the ratio was 1 out of 3.

In summary, the November labor market data show a substantial and widespread over-the-month deterioration. Employment fell sharply and in nearly every industry. There were especially large job losses in manufacturing and construction, as well as marked cutbacks within the service-producing sector.

The only industry with substantial employment growth was health services. Unemployment rose to 5.9 percent of the labor force.

We would all be glad to try to answer any questions.

[The table attached to Mrs. Norwood's statement, together with the Employment Situation press release, follows:]

		1	X-11 method							
Month	Unad-		Concurrent		· · · · ·	Γ	[	12-month	(official	Kange
and	justed	Official	(as first	Concurrent	Stable	Total	Residual	extrapola-	method	(cols.
year	rate	procedure	computed)	(revised)		I		tion	before 1980)	2-9)
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(1)	(8)	(9)	(10)
	1			1			l			
1989				1			ļ			Į
		_								
November	5.2	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.4	1.1
December	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.4	5.4	5.3	5.4	- 1
				1			1			ļ
1990		}					1			
	ļ			1	ļ					ļ
January	5.9	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	-
February	5.8	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.3	•1
March	5.4	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.1	5.2	5.2	.2
April	5.2	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	5.4	-
May	5.1	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.3	5.2	1 .1
June	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.1	5.2	5.2	5.2	5.1	.2
July	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.5	5.4	5.4	5.5	5.5	5.5	•1
August	5.4	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.5	5.6	5.6	.1
September	5.5	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.7	1.1
October	5.4	5.7	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	5.7	.
November	5.8	5.9	5.8	5.8	6.0	5.9	6.0	5.9	5.9	.2

Unemployment rates of all civilian workers by alternative seasonal adjustment methods

•

SOURCE: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR Bureau of Labor Statistics December 1990

1

.

.

(1) Unadjusted rate. Unemployment rate for all civilian workers, not seasonally adjusted.

(2) <u>Official procedure (X-11 ARIMA method</u>). The published seasonally adjusted rate for all civilian workers. Each of the 3 major civilian labor force components-agricultural employment, nonsgricultural employment and unemployment—for 4 agr=sex group=majles and females, ages 16-19 and 20 years and over-are seasonally adjusted independently using data from January 1974 forvard. The data series for each of these 12 components are extended by a year at each end of the original series using ARIMA (Auto-Regressive, Integrated, Howing Average) models chosen specifically for each series. Each extended series is then easonally adjusted with the X-11 portion of the X-11 ARIMA program. The 4 teenage unemployment and nonagricultural employment components are adjusted with the additive adjustment model, while the other components are adjusted with the multiplicative model. The unemployment rate is computed by summing the 4 seasonally adjusted unemployment components and calculating adjusted components. All the seasonally adjusted eartes are revised at the end of ach year; Extrapolated factors for January-June are computed at the beginning of each year; extrapolated factors for July-December are computed in the multiple selve mains all 12 seasonally asvisable. Each set of 6-month factors are published in edwance, in the January and July issues, respectively, of <u>Employment and Earnings</u>.

(3) <u>Concurrent (as first computed, X-11 ARIMA method)</u>. The official procedure for computation of the rate for all civilian workers using the 12 components is followed except that extrapolated factors are not used at all. Each component is assandly adjusted with the X-11 ARIMA rograms ach month as the most recent data become available. Eates for each month of the current year are shown as first computed; they are revised only once each year, at the end of the year when data for the full year become available. For example, the rate for January 1984 vould be based, during 1894, on the adjustment of data from the period January 1974 through January 1984.

(4) <u>Concurrent (revised, X-1) ARIMA method</u>). The procedure used is identical to (3) above, and the rate for the current month (the last month displayed) will always be the same in the two columns. However, all previous months are subject to revision each month based on the seasonal adjustment of all the components with data through the current month.

(5) <u>Statie (X-11 ARIMA method</u>). Each of the 12 civilian labor force components is extended using AAIMA robusts as in the official procedure and then run through the X-11 part of the program using the stable option. This option assumes that assessal patterns are basically constant from year-to-year and compute final seasonal patterns at many state of all the seasonal-irregular components for each month across the entire span of the period adjusted. As in the official procedure, factors are estrapolated in b-month intervals and the series are revised at the end of each year. The procedure is procedure.

(c) <u>Trial (Y-)! ARIMA method</u>). This is one alternative aggregation procedure, in which total unexployment and civilian labor force levels are extended with ARIMA models and directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models in the X-ll pert of the program. The rate is computed by taking seasonally adjusted total unexployment as a percent of seasonally adjusted total civilian labor force. Factors are extrapolated in o-month intervals and the metrics revised at the end of ach year.

(7) <u>Residual (X-11 ARIMA method)</u>. This is another alternative aggregation method, in which total civilian employment and civilian labor force levels are extended using ARIMA models and then directly adjusted with multiplicative adjustment models. The seasonally adjusted labor force. The rate is then computed by taking the derived unemployment level as a percent of the labor force level. Extors are extrapolated in 6-month the seasonal of the seasonal set of the seasonal set of the seasonal set.

(8) <u>12-month extrapolation (X-11 ARIMA method</u>). This approach is the same as the official procedure except that the factors are extrapolated in 12-month intervals. The factors for January-December of the current year are computed at the beginning of the year based on data through the preceding year. The values for January through June of the current year are the same as the official values since they reflect the same factors.

(9) X-11 method (official method before 1980). The method for computation of the official procedure is used except that the series are not extended with ARTMA models and the factors are projected in 12-month intervals. The standard X-11 program is used to perform the seasonal adjustment.

Methods of Adjustment: The X-11 ARIMA method was developed at Statistics Canada by the Seasonal Adjustment and Timer Series Staff under the direction of Estels Bee Dagum. The method is described in <u>The X-11 ARIMA Seasonal Adjustment Method</u>, by Estels Bee Dagut, Statistics Canada Catalogue No. 12-5645, February 1980.

The standard X-11 method is described in X-11 Variant of the Census Hethod II Seasonal Adjustment Program, by Julius Shiskin, Allan Young and John Husgrave (Technical Paper No. 15, Bureau of the Census, 1967).



United States Department of Labor



# Bureau of Labor Statistics

Technical information:	(202)	523-1371
		523-1944
		523-1959
Media contact:		523-1913

USDL 90-629

TRANSMISSION OF MATERIAL IN THIS RELEASE IS EMBARGOED UNTIL 8:30 A.M. (EST), FRIDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1990

Washington, D.C. 20212

THE EMPLOYMENT SITUATION: NOVEMBER 1990

Employment fell sharply in November and unemployment rose, the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the U.S. Department of Labor reported today. The civilian worker unemployment rate increased from 5.7 to 5.9 percent.

Nonfarm payroll employment declined by 265,000, as manufacturing, construction, and retail trade were particularly hard hit. The household survey reflected similar weakness, with a decline of 450,000 in November.

#### Unemployment (Household Survey Data)

The number of unemployed persons rose about 300,000 to 7.4 million in November, and the civilian worker unemployment rate increased to 5.9 percent. It had been 5.7 percent in both September and October and was 5.2 percent as recently as June. (See table A-2.) November's unemployment rate was the highest since October 1987, when it was 6.0 percent.

Most of the increase in joblessness in November occurred among adult men. Their unemployment rate rose by 0.3 percentage point to 5.4 percent and has been trending upward since midyear. Unemployment rates for other major worker groups in November--adult women (5.1 percent), teenagers (16.5 percent), whites (5.1 percent), blacks (12.4 percent), and Hispanics (8.6 percent)--were also generally up in recent months. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

Reflecting the escalating pace of factory job cutbacks, the unemployment rate for manufacturing workers rose nearly a percentage point in November, to 6.6 percent. The rate for construction workers, which has been inching up for several months, reached 13.6 percent. (See table A-6.)

The number of job losers, who now make up more than half of the unemployed, increased by almost 300,000 over the month and was nearly 700,000 higher than in June. November's increase resulted from a rise in both the number of permanent job losers and those who expected to be recalled from layoff. Increases occurred in both the newly unemployed—those jobless for less tlus 5 weeks-and in the very long-term unemployed—those jobless for 27 weeks or longer. The number of workers who would prefer full-time work but were employed part time due to slack work increased by nearly 200,000. (See tables  $\lambda$ -4,  $\lambda$ -7, and  $\lambda$ -8.)

c

	averag	es :							
Category	199	0		1990		Oct - Nov change			
:	11	111	Sept.	Oct.	Nov .				
HOUSEHOLD DATA		Tho	usands of	persons					
Labor force 1/	126,550	126,421	126,568	126,354	126,231	-123			
Total employment 1'.	119,927:	119,459	119,499.	119,281	118,876	-405			
Civilian labor force	124,908	124,798	124,967	124,784	124,616	-168			
Civilian employment.	118,285	117,836	117,898	117,711	117,261	-450			
Unemployment	6,623	6,962.	7,069	7,073	7,355	282			
Not in labor force	62,916	63,46B	63,434	63,741	64,081	340			
Discouraged workers.	893	835	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.			
		Percent of labor force							
Unemployment rates:									
All workers 1	5.2	5.5.	5.6	5.6	5.8	0.2			
All civilian workers	5.3	5.6	5.7:	5.7:	5.9	.2			
Adult men	4.8	5.0	5.1	5.1	5.4	• 3			
Adult women	4.6	4.8:	5.0	4.9.	5.1	.2			
Teenagers	14.8	16.2	15.5	16.2	16.5	.3			
White	4.6	4.8	4.8	4:9	5.1	.2			
Black	10.4	11.7:	12.1	11.8	12.4	.6			
Hispanic origin	7.6	8.1	8.7	8.1	8.6	•5			
ESTABLISHMENT DATA		т	housands	of jobs					
Nonfarm employment	110,541	110,655:	110,612	p110,434	p110,167	-p-267			
Goods-producing	25.178	25,016	24,931	p24,779	p24,524	p-255			
Service-producing	85,363	85,639	85,681	p05,655	<b>p</b> 85,643	p-12			
		Н	ours of w	work					
Average weekly hours:						:			
Total private	34.6	34.6:	34.7	p34.2	p34.4	. p0.2			
Manufacturing	40.9	41.0	41.0	p40.7	p40.5	: p2			

Table A. Major indicators of labor market activity, seasonally adjusted

1/ Includes the resident Armed Forces. p=preliminary. N.A.=not available.

С

## Civilian Employment and the Labor Force (Household Survey Data)

Total civilian employment declined by 450,000 to 117.3 million in November and has been trending downward since June. Employment among teenagers has been declining even longer--since March--and continued to trend downward in November. Most of the over-the-month losses were attributable to adult women. The proportion of the working-age population that is employed (the employment-population ratio) was 62.1 percent in November. This ratio had been holding at around 63.0 percent in 1989 and in the first half of 1990. (See tables A-2 and A-3.)

The civilian labor force was little changed at 124.6 million. As the working-age population continued to increase, the labor force participation, rate edged down to 66.0 percent in November and is down by more than half a percentage point since May. Most of this decline in participation has occurred among teenagers, but there has also been a small reduction among adult women, whose participation rate has been trending upward historically. (See table A=2.)

### Industry Payroll Employment (Establishment Survey Data)

Nonfarm payroll employment showed marked deterioration in November with a decline of 265,000. This came on the heels of a drop of 180,000 for October, as revised. Exceptionally large job losses occurred in manufacturing, particularly in durable goods. Also, constituction and retail trade had substantial declines for the second month in a ruw, and weakness was evident in most other industries. Only mining and the services industry added jobs over the month. (See table B-1.)

The decline in manufacturing totaled 200,000, as reductions werwidespread throughout the industry. The largest decline occurred in rotor vehicle manufacturing, where employment had been inching down since July. November's drop in this industry (55,000) reflected the temporary shutdowns of plants to avoid excessive inventory buildup. Employment also fell in several other industries that supply materials for auto manufacturing such as fabricated metals, rubber and plastics, and apparel and other textile products. Elsewhere in manufacturing, employment decreased substantially in industrial machinery and electronic equipment, about 15,000 each, and in industries thed to the slumping construction industry such as lumler and furniture. In total, manufacturing has now lost more than three-quarters of a million jobs since the peak level of January 1989.

The construction industry, which has been trending downward since spring, lost 60,000 jobs in November, following an even larger drop in October. In the last 6 months, the industry has shed about a quarter of a million jobs, with general building contractors (particularly residential) suffering disproportionately large losses. In mining, there was a 5,000 job gain in November, mainly in oil and gas extraction, which is reacting to the rise in fuel prices. Widespread weakness was also evident in the service-producing sector. Seasonal hirings have been far short of normal in retail trade this fall. In November, employment in the industry fell by 70,000, after seasonal adjustment, following a drop of 55,000 in October; general merchandise stores accounted for the bulk of the declines. Buployment also fell in wholesale trade and in finance, insurance, and real estate. Job losses in wholesale trade, which is closely tied to manufacturing and construction, have totaled 40,000 since August.

Employment in the services industry rose by 80,000 in November, with gains confined principally to health services and social services. Business services, which has been especially weak since June, declined by about 20,000 over the month.

#### Weekly Hours (Establishment Survey Data)

The average workweek for production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonfarm payrolls rose by 0.2 hour in November to 34.4 hours, seasonally adjusted, but this followed a decline of 0.5 hours in October. The manufacturing workweek decreased by 0.2 hour to 40.5 hours, and factory overtume edged down 0.1 hour to 3.5 hours. The factory workweek has declined by half an hour since September. (See table B-2.)

The index of aggregate weekly hours of private production or nonsupervisory workers was little changed in November at 123.4 (1982-100), seasonally adjusted. The index for manufacturing, at 103.6, declined by 1.8 percent over the month, reflecting the drops in both employment and hours. This index has fallen by 3.9 percent over the past year. (See table B-5.)

#### Hourly and Weekly Earnings (Establishment Survey Data)

Average hourly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers on private nonfarm payrolls were essentially unchanged in November. Average weekly earnings rose by 0.7 percent, measonally adjusted, as a result of the partial rebound in hours. Prior to seasonal adjustment, average weekly earnings edged down to \$348.49. Over the year, average hourly earnings increased by 3.6 percent and average weekly earnings by 3.0 percent. (See tables B-3 and B-4.)

The Employment Situation for December 1990 will be released on Friday, January 4, 1991, at 8:30 A.M. (EST).

Table A-1. Employment statue of the population, including Armed Forces in the United States, by ass

(Numbers in thousands)

						-			
Family mark and and an	Not se	eeonaliy (	djusted			Sessonally	/ edjusted	,	
Employment status end bex	Nov. 1969	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990	Nov. 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990
TOTAL									<u> </u>
Noninstitutions) population?		100.004							
Later force <sup>1</sup>	188,721	190,095	190,312	188,721	189,763	189,901	190,002	190,095	190,312
Performation rate?	120,300	128,590	120,430	120,112	120,394	128,300	126,568	128,354	126,231
Total employed	67.0	00.0	66.4	66.9	66.6	66.5	66.6	66.5	66.3
Employed and dation rate!	110,872	119,909	110,225	119,540	119,580	119,298	119,499	119,281	118,876
Besident Armed Forme	63.5	63.1	62.6	63.3	63.0	62.8	62.9	62.7	62.5
Chillen employed	1,704	1,570	1,615	1,704	1,627	1,640	1,601	1,570	1,615
	118,168	118,299	117,611	117,838	117,953	117,658	117,898	117,711	117,261
Nonconst the states	3,033	3,260	3,056	3,160	3,085	3,137	3,181	3,167	3,190
linempland	115,135	115,018	114,555	\$14,676	114,867	114,621	114,717	114,545	114,071
	6,495	6,722	7,211	6,652	6,614	7,003	7,069	7,073	7,355
Orientipoyment rate	5.1	5.3	5.7	5.3	6.4	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.8
Not in abov force	62,353	63,505	63,875	62,529	63,369	63,601	63,434	63,741	64,081
Men, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional constation?	0.000	01 200			~				
Labor torce?	60,000	40.410	40,454	80,606	91,100	91,240	91,271	91,299	B1,440
Particination rate <sup>3</sup>	78.4	70.0	00,050	76.0	63,544	09,459	69,809	69,780	69,874
Total employed	86 831	46 010	44 400	/0.9	/6.3	/6.1	76.5	78.4	76.4
Employee internation	65,631	66,010	65,590	66,011	65,740	65,596	65,867	65,662	65,759
Besident Armed Sorres	12.1	72.3		72.9	72.1	71.0	72.2	72.1	71,9
Chiles employed	1,529	1,414	1,453	1,529	1,462	1,475	1,441	1,414	1,453
Linemale ad	64,302	64,596	64,137	64,482	64,278	64,121	64,426	64,448	64,306
Unamployed	3,563	3,600	4,067	3,624	3,804	3,863	3,943	3,918	4,136
	5.1	9.2	5.8	5.2	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6	5.9
Women, 16 years and over									
Noninstitutional non-dation <sup>2</sup>		-							
I shor force	30,115	90,790	90,872	\$0,115	90,595	96,661	98,731	98,796	98,872
Destrimeton rate?	30,974	0692.00	56,780	90,557	36,849	56,842	56,758	56,575	56,357
Total employed	58.1	57.7	57.4	57.6	57.7	57.6	57.5	57.3	57.0
Employee and the stat	54,041	53,858	53,636	53,529	53,839	53,702	53,632	53,419	53,117
Devident Armed Earens	65.1	54.5	54.2	54.6	54.6	54.4	54.3	54.1	53.7
	175	156	162	175	165	165	160	156	162
	53,666	53,702	53,474	53,354	53,674	53,537	53,472	53,263	52,955
	z,933	3,122	3,144	3,028	3,010	3,140	3,126	3,156	3,240
Unemployment rate.	6.1	5.5	5.5	5.4	5.3	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.7

detion and Armed Forces figures are not adjusted for hor: Therefore, identical numbers appear in the unadjusted "Total employment as a percent of the non-institutional population." "Total employment as a percent of the non-institutional population." "Total employment as a percent of the labor force (including the resi-Armed Forces).

HOUSEHOLD DATA

.

#### Note on resident Armed Porces estimates

Beginning with data, for November, estimates of the number of persons in the resident Armed Forces reflect newly available formation from the Department of Defense accounting for Armed Forces personnel deployed from the United States to the P 404. The new information suggests that the number of the resident Armed Forces are published to Registributer and Occurs lichtly un

.

### HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-2. Employment status of the civilian population by sex and age

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not se	esonally e	djusted	Sessonally adjusted							
Employment status, sex, and age	Nov 1989	Oct. 1990	Nov 1990	Nov. 1989	یلار 1990	A:::) 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990		
TOTAL											
	187.017	188 525	188.697	157.017	188.135	188,261	188,401	188,525	186,697		
Comen labor labor	124 664	125.020	124,821	124,488	124,767	124,660	124,967	124,784	124,616		
Decretion rate	66.7	66.3	65.1	66.6	66.3	66.2	66.3	66.2	66.0		
Felocologian felo management	118,168	118,299	117,611	117,836	117,953	117,658	117,898	117,711	117,261		
Employee	63.2	62.7	62.3	63.0	62.7	62.5	62.6	62.4	62.1		
licemployed	6,495	6,722	7,211	6,652	6,814	7,003	7,069	7,073	/,355		
Unemployment rate	5.2	5.4	5.8	5.3	5.5	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.6		
Men, 20 years and over											
	81.968	63.013	83.092	81,968	82,790	62,662	82,940	83,013	83,092		
	63,919	64,593	64,622	63,967	64,344	64,362	64,573	64,559	64,649		
Bancoston rate	78.0	77.8	77.6	78.0	77.7	77.7	77.9	77.8	77.		
Employed	61,033	61,606	61,200	61,033	61,196	61,143	61,264	61,270	61,18		
Employee	74.5	74.2	j 73.7	74.5	73.9	73.8	73.9	73.8	73.0		
Americhing	2,248	2,371	2.261	2,292	2,262	2,246	2,295	2.271	2,305		
Nonagricultural industries	58,785	59,235	58,939	58,741	58,934	58,897	58,969	58,999	30,000		
Unemployed	2.887	2,986	3,422	2,934	3,148	3.219	3,309	3,209	3,404		
Unemployment rate	4.5	4.6	5.3	4.6	4.9	5.0	5.1	5.1			
Women, 20 years and over											
Cooken nonnstitutional population	90.952	91.857	91,963	90,952	91,581	91,688	91,765	91,657	91,963		
Conkan labor force	53,117	53.533	53,394	52,541	53,211	53,315	53,121	52,963	52.63		
Participation fale	58.4	. 58.3	58.1	57.8	58.1	58.1	57.9	57.7	37.4		
Employed	50,687	50,915	50,751	50,043	50,719	50,044	30,463	50,370	50,51		
Employment-population ratio	55.7	55.4	55.2	55.0	55.4	55.3	35.0	1 200	62		
Agriculture	612	666	609	024	505	60.080	49 870	40 767	40 400		
Nonagricultural industries	50,075	50,249	50,142	49,419	2 402	2,616	2 612	2 613	2 71		
Unemployed	2.430	2,010	2,043	2,400	47	40	50	4.8	5.		
Unemployment rate		1	1				1		-		
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	i	ł									
Contran connectivitional population	14,097	13,655	13.642	14,097	13,764	13,711	13,696	13,655	13,64		
Contan labor force		6.895	6,805	7,980	7,212	6,983	1 1,272	/243	1,13		
Participation rate		50.5	49.9	56.6	52.4	50.9	53.1	53.0	6.04		
Employed	8,449	5,777	5,660	6,760	6,038	3,815	1 44	44 5	1 283		
Employment-population ratio	45.7	42.3	41.5	48.0	43.9	42.4	204	977	1 2		
Agriculture	173	243	160	244	5 700	1 4 644	5 878	6 704	5 69		
Nonagricultural industries	6.275	5,534	5,474	1 220	1 174	1 168	1.128	1,172	1.18		
Unemployed		1 1.17	1,145	1 153	16.3	16.7	15.5	16.2	1 16.		
	15.5	: 10.2	1 10.0	1 .3.3	1	1	1	1	1		

### Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, eex, ege, and Hispanic origin

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not se	asonally a	djusted	Seasonally edjusted						
Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hapanic origin	Nov. 1989	Ocl. 1990	Nov. 1990	Nov. 1989	Juty 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990	
WHITE										
Cwtan noninstitutional population	159,736	160,717	160,831	159,738	160,468	160,550	160,640	160,717	160,831	
Civitan labor force	106,907	107,362	107,013	105,834	107,230	107,135	107,451	107,238	106,942	
Participation rate	66.9	66.8	66.5	66.9	66.8	66.7	66.9	667	66.5	
Employee	102,167	102,452	101,739	101,991	617	101,968	102,200	102,013	101,536	
Unemployed	4,740	4,910	5,274	4.843	4,970	5.167	5,190	5.225	5.406	
Unemployment rate	44	4.6	4.9	4.5	4.6	4.0	4.8	4.9	5.1	
Men, 20 years and over Cwhan labor force	55.632	56,119	56,101	55.676	55,895	56.035	56.144	55.111	56.143	
Perucipation rate	78 4	78.3	78.2	78.5	78.1	78.3	78.4	78.3	78.2	
Employed	53,457	53,900	53,536	53,482	53,576	53,613	53,721	53,632	53,536	
Employment-population ratio	754	75.2	74 6	754	74.9	74.9	75.0	74.8	74.6	
Unemployment rate	3.9	4.0	4.6	3.9	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.4	4.6	
Women, 29 years and over										
Crystan tabor force	44,809	45,302	45.098	44,350	45,120	45,100	45,000	44,688	44,650	
Participation rate	57.9	58.0	57.7	57.3	57.9	57.9	57,7	57.5	57.2	
Employed	43.094	43,441	43,210	42,586	43,321	43,227	43,112	43,011	42,698	
Unemployed	1.715	1.662	1.888	1.774	1,799	1.873	1.688	1.877	1,952	
Unemployment rate	3.6	41	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.4	
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years		,								
Civitian labor force	6,467	5,941	5,813	6.798	6,216	5,999	6.306	6.239	6,149	
Participation rate	56.8	54.2	53 1	59.7	56.1	54.3	57.3	56.9	56.2	
Employee	49 1	46.6	4,992	52.0	5,363	5,128	5,427	5,370	5,302	
Unemployed	851	829	821	875	853	871	879	669	647	
Unemployment rate	13.2	14 0	14.1	12.9	13.7	14.5	13.9	13.9	13.8	
Men	14.6	15.0	15.8	14.3	15.1	15.7	15.3	14.8	15.0	
B) ACK					16.3	19.2	12.5	13.0	12.0	
Crystan information population	13614	21,383 1	13,608	21,136	21,318	21,337	21,361	21,383	21,417	
Participation rate	64.4	63.1	63.5	64.2	62.8	62.6	63 1	63 1	63.3	
Employed	12.056	11,957	11,969	11,954	11.870 i	11,791	11,839	11,903	11,681	
Employment-population ratio	57.0	55.9	55.9	56 6	55.7	55.3	55.4	55.7	55.5	
Unemployed	1,558	1,539	1,639	1,622	1,510	1,575	1.631	1,590	1,683	
			12.0	11.4			12.1	11.8	12.4	
Men, 20 years and over	6 230	6 110	6 348	6 247	6 293	6 776	6 720	4 76 1	4 754	
Participation rate	74.0	74 1	74.3	74.2	73.9	73.1	74.1	74.3	74.4	
Employed	5,599	5.670	5,637	5,587	5,617	5,572	5,580	5,631	5,626	
Employment-population retio'	66.5	66.3	66.0	66.4	65.9	65.4	65.3	65.8	65.9	
Unemployment rate	10.1	10.5	11.2	10.6	10.7	10.6	11.8	11.3	11.5	
Women, 20 years and over										
Crystan labor force	6,480	6,389	6,452	6,373	6,328	6,358	6,351	6,335	6,359	
Participation rate	614	59.7	60.2	60.4	59.4	59.6	59.5	59.2	59.3	
Employee	55.3	51.8	54.2	54.2	53.6	517	514	5,722	5,711	
Unemployed	645	628	644	651	592	625	656	613	649	
Unemployment rate	10.0	9.8	10.0	10.2	9.4	9.9	10.3	9.7	10.2	
Both sexes, 15 to 19 years							_			
Participation rate	41.6	26.1	37.5	44.0	154	773	779	807	848	
Employed	622	526	524 i	645	517	489	554	550	544	
Employment-population ratio	28.7	247	24.3	29.7	24 1	22.8	25.9	25.8	25.3	
Unemployed	282	243	285	311	241	284	225	257	304	
Unemployment rate	31.2	31.6	35.2	32.5	31.6	35.7	28.9	31.8	35.8	
Warnen	304	32.2	377	32.7	31,2	35.0	26.9	30.7	33.5	
-									5.5	

See lootnotes at end of table

### HOUSEHOLD DATA

\_\_\_\_\_

.

### HOUSEHOLD DATA

.

Table A-3. Employment status of the civilian population by race, sex, ege, and Hispanic origin-Continued

(Numbers in thousands)

Employment status, race, sex, age, and Hospanic origin		asonaliy a	djusted	Sessonally adjusted					
		Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990	Nov. 1989	بلندار 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990
HISPANIC ORIGIN Civitan nonersitutional population Civitan labor force Employed Employed Demployed Unemployed Unemployed	13,977 9,473 67.8 8,719 62.4 754 8.0	14,435 9,553 66.2 8,818 61.1 735 7.7	14,474 9,508 65.7 8,682 60.0 825 8.7	13,977 9,424 67.4 8,672 62.0 752 8.0	14,317 9,665 67,5 8,899 62,2 767 7,9	14,356 9,707 67,6 8,951 62,3 757 7,8	14,396 9,843 67.0 8,808 61.2 835 8.7	14,435 9,557 66.2 8,783 60.8 774 8.1	14,474 9,452 85.3 8,639 59.7 813 8,6

The population figures are not adjusted for sessional variation; therefore, dentical numbers appear in the unadjusted and sessionally adjusted columns. NOTE: Detail for the showe race and Hispanic-ongin groups will not support to table because data for the "other races" group are not presented and Hispanics are included in both the white and black population groups.

Table A-4. Selected employment indicators

(in thousands)

	Not seasonally adjusted			Sessonally adjusted						
Category	Nov. 1989	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990	Nov. 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990	
CHARACTERISTIC				İ						
Culture excelosed 15 years and Over	118.168	118,299	117,611	117,836	117,953	117,658	117,898	117,711	117,261	
Linear man soore content	40.958	41,156	40.957	40,885	40,545	40,604	40,919	40,670	40,875	
Mamed women, spouse present	30,196	30,159	30,036	29,767	29,909	29,949	29,780	29,772	29.621	
Women who maintain families	6,420	6,399	6,401	6,351	6,380	6,365	6,382	6,342	6,325	
MAJOR INDUSTRY AND CLASS OF WORKER										
Agriculture:					1.070	1 888	1 000	1.743	1 877	
Wage and salary workers	1,590	1,790	1,595	1,08/	1.620	1,000	1 276	1 330	1 390	
Sell-employed workers	1,343	1,396	1,352	1,3/3	1.3//	1,457	1,2/3	1,350	127	
Unpaid family workers	100	<b>P4</b>	109	122			1 112			
Nonagnoultural industnes:					105 895	106 601	106 800	106 227	105.039	
Wage and salary workers	106,241	105,734	105.451	105,000	17 788	17842	17 665	17 870	17 611	
Government	18,042	17,944	17,961	17,00					87 428	
Private industries	88,199	87.790	8/,409	66.275	00,097	1 073	1.074	1,005	957	
Private households	1,039	1,030	902	87.228	87 108		87 171	66.653	86 462	
Other industries	87,160	80,760	00,407	0/220	8 700	8.879	8.810	8.880	8 775	
Sell-employed workers	6,645	9,049	6,663	0,520	260	220	235	242	260	
Unpad family workers	248	200		· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •						
PERSONS AT WORK PART TIME										
All industries:					4.070	6 026		6.483	5.450	
Part time for economic reasons	4,737	5,052	5.33/	1,003	9 646	3,434	9.854	2 8 27	9 797	
Slack work	2,374	2,522	2,001	2.637	2.000	9 1 9 3	2 482	2 403	2 377	
Could only find part-time work	2,054	21/2	2,239	12 064	1 16 111	15 377	15 281	15 105	14 953	
Voluntary part time	18,43/	18,042	15,140	10,204	,	10,011				
Nonagnouttural industries:				4 682	4 710	4 780	5.093	6 182	5.201	
Part time for economic reasons	4,468	1	0,002	9,002	3 408	9 943	2 481	2436	2 645	
Stack work	2,175	2.324	2,000	9 007	2048	2000	2 3 3 6	2 333	2,296	
Could only find part-time work	2,008	2,114	4,101	1 14 805	14 922	14 800	14 858	14 688	14.559	
Voluntary part time	16,035	13,628	13,762	1	1	1				

\* Excludes persons "with a job but not at work" during the survey penod for such reasons as vacabon, liness, or industnal dispute.

### HOUSEHOLD DATA

Table A-5. Range of uner ne based on varying definitions of un nt and the labor force, a adjusted (Percent)

			Que	nterty av	•	lonthly d	lata		
	Mezzure	1959			1990		1990		
		m	L N_		,		Sept	l Oca	Nov.
U-1	Persons unemployed 15 weeks or longer as a percent of the ovikan labor force	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	
U-2	Job losers as a percent of the civilian labor force	2.4	2.5	25	25	2.7	2.8	2.8	3.1
U-3	Unemployed persons 25 years and over its a percent of the overall labor force for persons 25 years and over	4.0	4.1	42	4,1	4.4	4.5		4.8
<b>U-4</b>	Unemployed full-time jobseekers as a percent of the full-time civitian labor force	5.0	5.0	4.9	5.0	5.2	5.4	5.5	5.7
U-6a	Total unemployed as a percent of the labor force, including the resident Armed Forces	5.2	5.3	5.2	5.2	5.5	5.6	5.6	5.6
U-56	Total unemployed as a percent of the civilian labor force	5.3	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.9
U-6	Total tu8-time jobseekers plus 1/2 pert-time jobseekers plus 1/2 total on part time for economic reasons as a percent of the civitum labor force less 1/2 of the part-time labor force	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.3	7.6	7.8	7.9	8.2
J-7	Total full-time jobseekers plus 1/2 part-time jobseekers plus 1/2 total on part time for economic ressons plus discouraged workers as a percent of the ovidan labor force plus								
	discouraged workers less 1/2 of the part-time labor force	7.9	7.9	7.8	8.0	8.3	N.A.	N.A.	NA

N.A = not evalable

Table A-5. Selected unemployment indicators, sessonally adjusted

Category		Number o nployed p n thousan	ds)	Unemployment rates'						
	Nov 1989	Oct. 1990	Nov 1990	Nov. 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oci. 1990	Nov. 1990	
CHARACTERISTIC					1		1		1	
Total, 16 years and over	6.652	7.073	7.355	5.3	5.5	56	47	4.7		
Men. 16 years and over	3.624	3,918	4,116	5.3	6.6	67		1	1 2.	
Men, 20 years and over	2.934	3,289	3.464	4.6	4.9	50	8.1			
Women, 16 years and over	3,028	3,156	3,240	54	63	5.6				
Women, 20 years and over	2,498	2.613	2,711	4.8	47	40		0.0	1 22	
Both sexes, 16 to 19 years	1,220	1,172	1,181	15.3	16.3	16.7	15.5	16.2	18.5	
Mamed men, spouse present	1,296	1.462	1.613	3.1	3.3	35	1		1	
Married women, spouse present	1,161	1,208	1,278	3.8	3.6	1 10	1 40	1 3.0		
Women who maintain families	568	591	602	6.2	8.5	8.5	8.0	0.5	8.7	
Full-time workers	6.301	5.847	8.091	80					1	
Peri-brie workers	1.347	1.212	1,261	7.4	81	7.0	1 77		1	
Labor force time lost'	-	-	-	6.9	6.0	6.3	6.4	6.6	6.8	
MOUSTRY					{					
Nonegnoultural private wage and salary workers	6.063	6.487	5,797	54	ás.	67				
Goods-producing industnes	1,870	2,107	2,326	6.3	6.6	6.9	7.0	1 22		
Mining	48	27	37	6.2	4.4	4.9	38	1 17	4.0	
Construction	620	834	854	9.8	10.2	11.1	11.4	13.2	13.6	
Manufacturing	1,202	1,248	1,434	5.4	5.7	5.8	57	6.7	8.6	
Durable goods	716	743	913	5.4	5.6	5.9	60	5.8	7.1	
Nondurable goods	485	503	521	5.3	6.7	5.6	5.3	5.4		
Service-producing industries	3,193	3,380	3,471	5.0	8.0	82	5.3	6.1	6.4	
Transportation and public utitibes	227	276	291	3.8	3.7	4.1	3.9	41	4.2	
Wholesale and retail trade	1.535	1,609	1,610	6.4	6.0	62	6.6	87		
Finance and service industries	1,431	1,495	1.581	4.3	4.6	47	47		4.8	
Government workers	498	507	513	2.7	2.6	28	2.9	2.6	2.8	
Agricultural wage and asiary workers	232	155	179	12.1	10.6	9.7	0.3	0.2	9.7	

<sup>1</sup> Unemployment as a percent of the ovikan labor force. <sup>2</sup> Aggregate hours lost by the unemployed and persons on part time for economic reasons as a percent of potentially available labor force hours.

Table A-7. Duration of unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not sea	sonally ac	ljusted	Sessonally adjusted						
Weeks of unemptoyment.		Oct 1990	Nov 1990	Nov 1989	July 1990	Aug 1930	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov 1990	
DURATION										
time man 6 ments	124	3 073	3,326	3,258	3,120	3,325	3,044	3,101	3,323	
Less Edit 5 works	1.963	2,229	2,255	1,991	2,159	2,048	2,479	2,405	2,308	
15 weeks and own	1.298	1,420	1,630	1,422	1,513	1,609	1,620	1,581	1,776	
15 to 25 weeks	682	767	856	765	809	645	672	896	980	
27 weeks and over	616	653	764	657	704	764	745	685	815	
	11.6	11.6	12.4	11.6	12.0	12.3	12.5	11.9	12.4	
Median duration, in weeks	4.5	5.4	5.4	4.8	5.2	5.2	6.2	6.0	5.8	
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION										
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	
I dial unemployed	49.8	4571	45.1	48 8 1	45 9	47.6	42.6	43.8	44.9	
Less than 5 weeks	30.2	332	31.3	29.8	318	29.3	34.7	33 9 (	31.2	
5 to 18 weeks	200	211	22.6	21.3	22.3	23.0	22.7	22 3 '	24 0	
15 to 25 weeks	10.5	114	12.0	11.5 .	119	12.1	12.2	12.6 /	13.0	
27 weeks and over	9.5	9.7	10.6	9.8	10.4	10.9	10.5	97 -	11.0	

### Table A-8. Reason for unemployment

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not seasonally adjusted			Sessonally adjusted						
Reasons		Oct ' 1990	Nov 1990	Nov. 1989	July 1990	Aug 1990	Sept 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990	
NUMBER OF UNEMPLOYED										
Jot losers On layoft Oner yob losers Job leavers Reentants New entrants	3.023 912 2.111 1.051 1.602 619	3,109 608 2,301 1,030 1,957 625	3.743 1.104 2.639 1.002 1.878 587	3,092 959 2,123 1,049 1,845 695	3.088 960 2.128 1.027 1.960 687	3.367 973 2.394 984 1,879 677	3,511 1,127 2,384 934 1,985 656	3.533 1.020 2.513 970 1.904 693	3,815 1,177 2,639 994 1,914 855	
PERCENT DISTRIBUTION					1					
Total unempooyed	100 0 46.5 14 0 32.5 16.2 27 7 9.5	100 0 46.3 12.0 34.2 15.3 29.1 8.3	100 0 51.9 15.3 36.6 13.9 26.0 8 1	100.0 46.3 14.5 31.8 15.7 27.6 10.4	100.0 45.7 14.2 31.5 15.2 29.0 10.2	100.0 48.7 14.1 34.7 14.3 27.2 9.8	100.0 49.5 15.9 33.6 13.2 28.0 9.3	100.0 49.8 144 35.4 13.7 26.8 9.8	100.0 51.7 16.0 35.8 13.5 25.9 6.9	
UNEMPLOYED AS A PERCENT OF THE CIVILIAN LABOR FORCE										
Job losers	2.4 1 .8 . 1.4 .5	2.5 .8 1.6 .5	3.0 .8 1.5 .5	2.5 .8 1.5 .6	2.5 .8 1.6 .6	2.7 .8 1.5 .5	2.8 .7 1.6 .5	2.8 .8 1.5 .6	3,1 ,8 1,5 ,5	

### HOUSEHOLD

\_

Table A-8. Unemployed persons by sex and age, seasonally adju •0

Sex and age	uner (r	Number of rployed per h thousand	nsons IS)	Unemployment rates*						
	Nov 1989	Oct. 1990	Nov 1890	Nov 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1890	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990	
Tota: 15 years and over		1.070				<u> </u>	t		1	
16 to 24 years	1,472	1,0/3	1,355	5.3	5.5	5.6	5.7	5.7	5.9	
16 to 19 years	2.072	2,493	2,430	11.2	\$1.0	11.5	11.6	\$1,8	11.6	
16 to 17 years	1220	1.1/2	1,181	15.3	18.3	16.7	15.5	16.2	16.5	
18 to 19 years	246	508	512	12.4	17.4	19.2	18.4	18.8	18.6	
20 to 74 years	005	860	005	13,8	15.2	15.0	14.4	14.6	15.2	
25 years and over	1,252	1,321	1,249	9.0	8.3	8.6	9.6	9.6	9.1	
25 to 54 years	4,188	4,595	4,931	4.1	4.3	44	4.5	44	4.8	
55 want and and	3,688	4,036	4,451	4.2	4.5	46	4.7	46	5.0	
	496	556	516	3.2	3.2	3.5	3.3	3.6	3.4	
Men 16 years and over	3 624	1 918	4.116							
16 to 24 years	1 380	1 220 1	1 140	13.0		9.7	5.0	9.7	6.0	
16 to 19 years	690 1	670	44.7	18.7	11.0	11.6	12.0	12.0	12.2	
16 to 17 years	312	267	704	10.7		17.8	16.7	16.5	17.3	
18 to 19 years	363	20/	204	10.0	184	21.5	18.8	18.1	19.2	
20 to 24 years	600			15.1	16.3	15.5	16.2	15.7	161	
25 years and over	630		09/1	8.4	6.5	8.5	8.5	9,7	9.6	
25 in 54 years	2.258	2,606 (	2.777	4.0	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.8	
55 years and over	1,967	2,257 1	2.485	4.1	4.5	4.6	4,7	4.7	5.1	
	303	360	344	3.5	3.6	3.8	3.6	4.1	3.9	
Women 16 years and over	3 028	3 156	3 240							
16 to 24 years	1.092	1 161	1,081		3.3	5.5	5.5	5.6	5.8	
16 to 19 years	530	547	8 20		10.4	- 114	11.2	11.6	10.9	
16 to 17 years	236	261	228 1	13.0		15.6	14.2	15.8	15.7	
18 to 19 years	242	201	220 :	13./	104	10.6	17,0	19.6	17.9	
20 to 24 years	203 1	209	200	12.3	13.9	14.4	12.6	13.4	14,3	
25 years and over	302 .	620	552	8.5	8.0	9.3	9.6	94	8.5	
25 to 54 years	1.930	1,989	2,154	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.7	
55 years and over	1,721 /	1,779 +	1,966	44	44	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.9	
	193	196 -	172	2.9	2.6	3.1	2.6	3.0	2.7	

Unemployment as a percent of the civitian labor force

### Table A-10. Employment status of black and other workers

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not sessonally adjusted Sessonally adjusted						d'				
Employment status	Nov 1989	Oct. 1990	Nov 1990	Nov. 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov 1990		
Cwikin nonnistutional bobulation Criville albor force	27.280 17,757 65.1 16,002 58.7 1,755 9 9 9,524	27.808 17.658 63.5 15.846 57.0 1.811 10.3 10,150	27,866 17,609 63,9 15,872 57,0 1,936 10,9 10,057	27.280 17,686 64.8 15,961 58.1 1,825 10.3 9,594	27,658 17,448 63.1 15,655 56.5 1,793 10.3 10,220	27,711 17,498 63 1 15,671 56,6 1,826 10,4 10,213	27,761 17,527 63.1 15,629 56.3 1,697 10,8- 10,234	27,808 17,614 63.3 15,746 56.6 1,868 10,8 10,194	27,866 17,741 63,7 15,752 56,5 1,989 11,2 10,125		
The population figures are not adjusted for seasona therefore identical numbers appear in the unadjusted and adjusted continues.	l veriation seasonal	); y po	Covilian putation.	employme	ni es a	percent o	t the ow	than noner	150,12		

.

Table A-11. Occupational status of the employed and unemployed, not essentially adjusted

#### ....

Numbers in thousands)						
	Cevilian	employed	Unem	ployed	Unemploy	ment rate
Occupation .	Nov. 1989	Nov. 1990	Nov. 1969	Nov. 1990	Nov. 1969	Nov. 1990
Total 15 years and over	118,168	117,611	6,495	7,211	5.2	5.8
	30,727	30,858	625	630	2.0	2.0
Managenal and protessional speciality	14 637	14,718	365	367	2.4	2.4
Executive, administrative, and managenal	16,089	16.142	259	264	1.6	1.6
		94 631	1 482	1 718	3.8	4.5
Technical, sales, and administrative support	30,044	30,551	· · · · · ·	102	23	2.6
Technicians and related support	3,730	3.632	845	791	43	54
Sales occupations	18,721	18,703	731	824	3.8	4.2
		10.747	1 1 1 1 1	1 208	69	7.1
Service occupations	15,352	13,747			61	6.1
Private household		100			3.4	3.9
Protective service	1,917	1,8/2	1	1 1000	7.4	7.7
Service, except private household and protective	12,586	12,883	1,009	1,0/8		
-	14,124	13,494	693	942	4.7	6.5
Precision production, d'an, and repair	4,566	4,389	139	200	2.9	4.4
Mechanics and reparers	5,358	5,108	403	537	7.0	9.5
Other precision production, craft, and repair	4,200	3,997	152	205	3.5	4.9
	17 832	17 823	1,559	1.814	8.0	9.2
Operators, fabricators, and laborers	8 174	8 081	690	758	7.8	8.6
Machine operators, assemblers, and inspectors	4 013	5.025	276	332	5.3	6.2
Transportation and material moving occupationa		4 718	592	724	10.9	13.3
Handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	4,043	748	144	205	17.3	21.6
Construction laborers	- 002	1 071		516	9.7	11.5
Other handlers, equipment cleaners, helpers, and laborers	4,153	3.07	l –			
Farming Idnestry and futurio		3,158	295	236	6.5	7.0

Persons with no previous work expensions and those whose last job was in the Armed Forces are included in the unemployed total.

Table A-12. Employment status of male Vistnam-era vetarans and nonvetarans by ege, not seasonally adjusted

(Numbers in thousands)

	Cwiben					Civilian Ial	bor torce			
	noninstr popul	population					Unemployed			
and age			Tot	Total Employed		oyed	Number		Perce	ins of
	Nov. 1989	Nov. 1990	Nov. 1969	Nov. 1990	Nov. 1959	Nov. 1999	Nov. 1989	Nov. 1990	Nov 1989	Nov 1990
VIETNAM-ERA VETERANS Total: 35 years and over 35 to 45 years 30 to 44 years 30 to 44 years 30 to 44 years 50 years and over 30 years and over	7,519 6,496 1,614 3,307 1,575 1,023	7,689 6,494 1,319 3,223 1,952 1,195	6,852 6,140 1,515 3,134 1,491 713	7,044 6,179 1,236 3,060 1,863 865	6.575 5.917 1,449 3.025 1,444 658	6.702 5.878 1,165 2,937 1,775 624	277 222 68 109 47 55	342 301 71 143 87 41	4.0 3.6 4.4 3.5 3.1 7.7	4.9 5.7 4.6 4.7 4.7
NONVETERANS Total. 35 to 49 years	16,615 7,614 4,843 4,158	17,812 8,137 5,474 4,202	15,541 7,246 4,565 3,829	16,787 7,745 5,143 3,879	15.053 6,943 4,420 3,690	15,985 7,361 4,948 3,676	587 303 145 139	782 385 195 203	3.8 4.2 3.2 3.6	4.7 5.0 3.8 5.2

NOTE Male Vistnam-era velarans are men who served in the Armed Forces between August 5, 1964 and May 7, 1975. Nonveterans are men who have never served in the Armed Forces; published data are limited to

those 35 to 49 years of age, the group that most closely corresponds to the buck of the Vietnem-era vetaran population.

Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for eleven large States

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not ee	sonally adj	usted'	Seasonally adjusted						
State and employment status	Nov. 1969	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990	Nov. 1969	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990	
California										
Cellian nonrestautonal population	21,842	22,078	22,122	21,642	21,961	21,999	22.039	22,078	22.122	
Cevilian tabor force	14,701	14,659	14,063	14,653	14,751	14,816	14,818	14,613	13,590	
Encloyed	13,962	13,828	13,711	13,913	13,005	14,010	13,/4/	884	874	
Unemployment rate	4.9	5.7	6.5	5.1	5.1	5.4	6.9	6.0	6.7	
Florida										
Civilian noninstitutional population	8,979	10,188	10,209	8,979	10,132	10,150	10,169	10,168	10,209	
Center labor torce	6.237	8,475	6,460	6,258	6,313	6,365	6,450	6,454	6,467	
Employed	6,690	6,076	6,052	953	360	426	389		411	
Unemployed	5.6	6.2	2	5.6	6.7	6.7	6.0	6.2	6.3	
Illinois										
Ceden nonmittational population	8,849	8,885	8,690	8.849	8,876	8,878	8,882	8,885	8,890	
Cevian labor force	6,068	6.044	6,056	6,065	6,102	5,954	6,008	6.034	6,044	
Employed	5,684	5,699	5,697	5,669	5,691	5,568	8,573	0.070	3,062	
Unemployed	204 6.3	346 5.7	359 5.9	6.5	6.7	6.5	7.2	5.9	6.0	
Massachusetts										
Cuden acceptiti transi non datan	4 619	4 620	4.621	4.619	<b>4.62</b> 0	4,620	4,621	4,620	4,621	
Center labor force	3,140	3,116	3,108	3,165	3,157	3,171	3,187	3,136	3,134	
Employed	3.013	2,930	2,903	3,025	2,963	2,960	2,985	2.937	2,915	
Unemployed	127	186	205	140	194	211	199	199	210	
Unemployment rate	4.0	6.0	8.0	••	0.1	0./	•~	0.3		
Michigan										
Certilen noninstitutional population	6,991	7,004	7,008	6,991	7,001	7,002	7,003	7,004	7,006	
Ceven labor force	4,660	4,563	4,545	4,626	4,614	4,599	4,568	4,524	4,499	
Employed	4,338	4,230	4,216	120/	343	387	331	333	345	
Unemployee	6.9	7.2	72	7.3	7.4	7.9	7.2	7.4	7.7	
New Jarsey										
Certain connectutional population	8.032	6,026	6,027	6,032	6.028	6,028	6,027	6,026	8,027	
Certian labor force	4,010	4,068	4,052	4,034	4.073	4,066	4,083	4,126	4,073	
Employed	3,822	3,848	3,843	3,634	3,879	3,8/2	3,8/0	3,901	3,651	
Unemployed	4.7	5.4	5.2	5.0	4.8	4.8	5.2	5.5	5.5	
New York										
Civilian nonrestsuboral population	13,606	13,799	13,801	13,806	13,802	13,801	13,801	13,799	13,801	
Cevilian labor force	8,749	8,623	0,569	8,738	8,686	8,586	8,751	8,632	8,546	
Employed	8,307	8,161	0,117	8,278	6,222	0,100	6,267	481	440	
Unemployment rate	5.1	5.4	5.3	5.3	55	5.0	5.5	5.6	5.4	
North Carolina										
Cedian noninstitutional population	4,961	5,016	5,022	4,981	5.002	5,008	5.012	5,016	5,022	
Civitian labor force	3,377	3,380	3,384	3,373	3,410	3,370	3,407	3,367	3,375	
Employed	3,261	3,232	3,212	3,2/5	3,252	123	127	155	173	
Unemployed	2.8	4.4	5.1	2.9	4.6	3.6	3.7	4.6	6.1	
Ohio										
Civitien noninstitutional population	8,271	8,291	6,295	8,271	8,255	8,288	8,290	8,291	8,295	
Centan labor force	5,434	5,493	5,463	6,415	5,411	5,446	5,450	5,470	5,442	
Employed	5,113	5,187	6,176	5,081	0,104	2,174	284	324	2,145	
Unemployed	321	306	51	6.2	5.7	5.0	5.2	5.9	5.5	
			1			L				

See footnotes at end of table.

\_

.

### Table A-13. Employment status of the civilian population for eleven large States-Continued

(Numbers in thousands)

	Not sea	sonaliy edj	usted'		Seasonally adjusted'						
State and employment status	Nov 1929	Oct. 1890	Nov 1990	Nov. 1989	يغد 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990	Nov. 1990		
Penns ytvania											
Cvdan nororstitutonsi population Crvban labor force	9,376 5,901 5,600 301 5,1	9,395 5,897 5,550 345 5,9	9,398 5,911 5,563 347 5.9	9.376 5.910 5,598 312 5.3	9,390 5,869 5,574 295 5.0	9,392 5,777 5,496 281 4,9	8,393 5,850 5,531 319 5,5	9,395 5,897 5,535 362 6.1	9,398 5,929 5,571 358 6.0		
Texas											
Civitan noninstitutional population	12.276 8.515 7.927 588 6.9	12.416 8.406 7.961 445 5.3	12,432 8,524 7,941 583 6.8	12,276 8,450 7,854 596 7,1	12,379 8,371 7,853 518 6.2	12,391 6,325 7,833 492 5,9	12,404 8,484 7,953 531 6,3	12,416 8,398 7,916 482 5 7	12,432 6,470 7,878 592 7,0		

These are the official Bureau of Labor Statistics estimates used in the administration of Federal fund alocation programs
 The population figures are not adjusted for seasonal variation; therefore.

dentical numbers appear in the unactusted and the seasonably adjusted columns

HOUSEHOLD DAT

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

· ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Table 5-1. Employees on monfarm payrolls by industry (In thousands)

tin theusenus?

	Not		lly adju	ated		54	esonall;	edjuste	d	
Industry	Nov. 1989	Sept. 1990	Det. 1990 <u>p</u> /	Nov. 1990 <u>p</u> /	Nov. 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	Get. 1990 <u>p</u> /	Nev. 1990g/
Total	110,168	110,910	111,171	111.104	109.245	110.740	110,613	110.612	110,434	110.167
Total private	91.893	92,879	92,602	92.378	91.344	92.300	92,320	92,306	92.100	91.830
Goods-producing industries,	25.512	25.339	25,126	24,753	25.280	25.105	25,013	24,931	24,779	24,524
Mining Oil and gas extraction	723 398.4	746 413.3	745 416.2	749 423.1	716 394	745 413	735 410	736 410	235 413	742
Censtruction General building centrastors	5.398 1.369.5	5.445 1.354.6	5,340 1,325.0	5.169	5.258	5,229 1,319	5,194 1,307	5,176 1,306	5.095 1.279	5,033 1,256
Manufacturing Production workers	19.391 13.221	19,148 13,031	19.041 12.942	18,435	19,306	19,131 13,010	19.084	19.019 12.899	18.949	18.749
Durable goods Production workers	11.364 7.563	11,109 7.381	11.059	10.917	11.314	11,179 7,438	11,129	11.068	11.027	10.868
Lumber and wood products. Functives and fixings. Stone, clay, and class products. Primary metal industries Blast furnaces and best steel reducts. Industrial machinery and equipment. Electronic and other electric&l equipment. Transportation equipment. Industrial machinery and equipment. Transportation equipment. Industrial machinery and equipment. Transportation equipment. Industrial and related products. Miscellaneous manufactoring.	752.5 526.1 571.8 760.6 270.8 1.437.6 12,128.6 1.437.6 1.743.4 1.744.4 1.744.744.4 1.7	749.9 511.1 558.5 753.2 753.2 1753.2 1753.2 1754.2 1.415.9 12.075.8 1.675.2 1.675.2 1.985.2 1.815.3 1.989.7 1.390.6	736.3 511.1 553.0 750.7 1269.3 11,412.0 12,073.9 11,674.5 11,969.0 18050.0 1750.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 1750.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 19050.0 19050.0 18050.0 17500.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050.0 18050	716.5 503.5 545.4 745.8 1 269.9 11,397.5 12.063.3 11,664.9 11,909.5 755.4 984.2 1 386.1	752   521   567   760   272   1,429   2,129   1,732   2,023   2,023   826   1,018   583	742 511 552 759 759 759 759 759 759 759 759 759 759	734 513 551 755 271 1,419 2,096 1,685 1,685 816 990 384	737 510 547 751 751 270 1,410 2,082 1,674 1,674 1,674 1,674 3806 991 345	730   508   546   751   271   1.405   2.080   1.666   1.666   1.669   803   988   384	716   498   541   746   272   1,389   2,063   1,653   1,653   1,653   1,900   749   983   379
Nondurable gapds Production workers	8.027	8.039 5,650	7.982	7.918	7,992	7:952 5:572	7.955 5.573	7.951	7.922 5.536	7,881
Food and bindred products. Tobacco products. Apparel and other tertis Protion and other tertis Proting and sublishing Chenicals and allow products. Petroleum and ceal products. Leather and saiter products.	1.666.6 720.6 1.071.8 697.5 1.576.5 1.074.3 1.58.4 877.9	1,733.4 60.0 700.0 1,031.5 701.0 1.572.9 1.089.3 162.9 872.5 126.2	1,696,6 689,7 1,029,1 698,7 1,574,8 1,085,4 1,085,4 1,085,4 1,24,5	1,660.1 67.6 685.2 1,020.0 1,579.0 1,579.6 1.084.8 162.4 856.7 122.4	1,651 48 718 1,064 697 1,571 1,077 1,077 158 875 133	1.645 46 702 1.027 1.583 1.088 1.088 1.088 1.088 1.088 1.088 1.088 1.088	1,650 48 701 1,026 1,582 1,086 161 873 125	1,652 47 1,027 1,027 1,581 1,088 1,088 1,088 1,088 1,088 1,088 1,088 1,088 1,088 1,088 1,652 1,652 1,077 1,077 1,087 1,097 1,007 1,0	1.650 687 1.022 1.578 1.578 1.578 1.088 161 869	1,644 683 1,012 698 1,573 1,088 1,573 1,088 1,573 1,088 1,573 1,088 1,573 1,088 1,573 1,088 1,573 1,088 1,573 1,012 1,01
Service-producing industries	84.656	85.571	86.045	\$6.351	83,965	85,635	85,600	85,681	85.655	\$5.643
Transportation and public utilities Transportation Computer tang and public utilities	5.735	5.916	5.925	5.914 3.701 2.213	5,693 3,523 2,170	5.841 3,625 2,216	5,845 3,631 2,215	5,870 3,652 2,218	5,874 3.656 2,218	5.870 3.657 2,213
Hholesale trade Durable goods	6,344 3.760 2.584	6.382 3.759 2.623	6.362 3.750 2.618	6.348 3.743 2,605	6,335 3,760 2,575	6.374 3.775 2.599	6,376 3,775 2,606	6.370 3.763 2,607	6.350 3.750 2.600	6,338 3,743 2,595
Retail trade. General merchandise stores. Food stores. Automotive dealers and service stations. Esting and dranking places.	20.031 12.712.1 13.279.4 12.112.2 16.463.6	19,884 12,436.7 3,297.0 12,154.5 16,768.5	19,807 2,472.5 3,313.2 2,139.1 6,619.4	20,035 2,588.4 13,350.8 12,122.7 4,592.9	19.714 2.542 3.240 2.116 6.511	19.851 2.494 3.304 2,131 6.619	19,846 2,493 3,301 2,135 6,613	19.844 2.486 3.304 2.140 6.623	19,787 2,465 3,307 2,131 6,633	19.719 2,426 3.311 2.127 6,639
Finance, insurance, and real estate finance Insurance Real estate	6.752 3.320 2.110 1.322	6.861 3.342 2.146 1.373	6.828 3,333 2,148 1,347	6,814 3,334 2,149 1,331	6.774 3.327 2.114 1.533	6.842 3.341 2.147 1.354	6,852 3,349 2,151 1,352	6.851 3.349 2.152 1.350	6,847 3,346 2,154 1,347	6.834 3.341 2.153 1.342
Services Business services Health services	27,519 5,023.8 7,738.7	28.497 5.132.2 8.237.2	28,548 5,120.9 8,285.1	28,514	27.548	28.287 5,051 8,132	28.387 5,052 8.191	28.440 5.071 8.237	28.463 5.060 8.293	28.543 3.041 8.352
Government Federal State Local	18,275 2,970 4,332 10,973	18.031 2.987 4.244 10.800	18,549 2,971 4,410 11,184	18.726 2.958 4,438 11,330	17.901 2.982 4.212 10.707	18,440 3,164 4,298 10,978	18.293 3.045 4.305 10.943	18.306 2,999 4,309 10,998	18.334 2.989 4.311 11.034	18.337

p/ \* preliminary.

### Note on temporary census workers

The number of temporary workers associated with the 1990 census has an impact on the employment levels for the Footestalgovernment, as well as for higher aggregates. The estimate of these workers was 22,000 m Jauany, 27,000 m JAV, 56,000 m Alcroft 178,000 m Algort, 178,000 m JAV, 357,000 m June, 198,000 m JAV, 56,000 m Algust, 28,000 m September, and 23,000 m October For November, the estimated number (preliminary was 12,000).

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

Seasonally adjusted Not seasonally adjusted Industry Nov. 1990g/ July Aug. Sept. Oct. Nov. 1990g/ 1990g/ .dov. 1989 Sept. 1990 0ct. 1990p/ Nov. 1989 34.5 34.5 34.5 34.7 34.2 34.4 34.4 \$4.3 Total neivata 36 5 36.8 43.7 63.7 43.9 66.7 .... Mining..... 43.8 45.1 44.5 44.0 43.9 38.3 (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) (2) Construction..... 38.0 39.0 38.0 Manufacturing..... Overtime hours..... 41.1 41.3 40.9 40.8 40.7 40.9 41.0 41.0 40.7 40.5 Durable goods.... Overtime hours..... 41.5 41.8 41.4 41.3 41.2 41.5 41.5 3.9 41.7 41.3 40.9 Overtae hours furniture and fixtures Stone clay, and glass products Primery matal industries Blast furness and basis steal products. Industrial machinery and equimment Transportation equipment Transportation equipment Thator vehicles and equipment Mator vehicles and equipment 40.2 39.6 41.7 44.1 41.7 42.0 40.7 42.8 43.6 43.6 43.5 40.2 39.4 42.5 41.3 42.8 41.3 42.8 41.0 42.3 41.0 39.7 60.4 39.4 42.9 43.5 41.6 42.6 42.6 42.6 43.3 39.9 40.7 39.1 42.2 43.0 43.9 41.6 62.1 41.1 62.8 43.5 41.3 39.9 39.7 38.6 41.2 42.8 43.9 41.2 42.1 42.1 42.5 43.0 41.0 39.8 40.1 39.8 42.7 43.8 42.4 41.2 41.3 41.440.9 39.7 43.2 43.9 41.8 42.2 42.2 42.9 41.3 39.9 40.1 39.2 41.9 42.7 43.6 41.4 42.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.9 42.5 43.4 40.939.55 412.42 430.79 443.79 441.80 441 Nondurable goods..... 40.4 40.6 40.2 40.2 3.8 40.1 40.1 40.2 40.2 3.6 40.0 39.9 Overtise hours Food and hindred products. Tobics products Appared and other tortis products. Appared and other tortis Appared and other tortis Appared and other tortis Printing and vublishing. Chemicals and allied products. Robber and mice plastics products. Lasther and lasther products. 40.5 (2) 40.2 34.6 43.5 38.0 42:4 (2) 41.5 37.6 41.0 (2) 40.0 36.6 43.5 38.2 42.3 (2) 41.3 37.7 41.2 (2) 40.0 36.6 43.2 38.0 42.7 (2) 41.4 37.5 41.9 40.9 40.3 36.7 43.7 38.5 42.7 45.3 41.6 37.5 40.8 (2) 40.4 36.8 43.4 37.9 42.4 (2) 41.1 37.6 40.5 (2) 39.8 43.6 43.6 38.0 42.7 (2) 41.0 36.9 41.2 39.0 40.8 37.1 43.7 38.2 42.7 44.8 41.3 37.5 40.9 40.9 40.1 56.6 43.7 58.1 42.6 43.7 41.2 37.1 40.8 40.7 40.0 36.7 43.8 38.0 42.9 44.1 41.2 36.6 40.4 (2) 39.6 36.5 37.7 42.) 41.0 36.7 38 -Transportation and public utilities..... 38.7 38.8 38.6 39.0 38.9 39.1 58.5 38.7 39.2 38.1 38.1 34.1 38.3 38.7 17.9 38 Wholesale trade.... 38.1 38.3 54 1 28.4 35.6 28.4 28.8 28.9 28.7 28.9 28.4 28.7 Retail trade..... 28.6 Z8.9 35.6 (2) (2) 35.6 (2) (2) (2) (2) Finance, insurance, and real estate...... 36.1 32.7 32.4 32.4 32.6 32.6 32.5 32.8 32.3 32.5 

Table B-2. Average weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers1/ on private nonfarm payrolls by industry

1/ Deta relate to production workers in mining and manufacturing; construction workers in construction; and nonsupervisory workers in transportation and public utilities; wholesale and retail trade; finance, insurance, and real attate; and services. These prouse account for approximately four-fifths of the total amployees on private nonferm payrolls.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA

2/ These series are not published sessibility adjusted since the sessional component is small relative to the transforceyls and/or irregular components and creation. You have a sessively with sufficient p = proliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA	ESTABLISHMENT	DATA
Table 8-3. Average hourly and weekly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers1/ peyrolls by industry	on private nenf	fara

	Ave	rape hou	rly earn	ings	Ave	rage wee	kly marn	ings
Industry	Nov. 1989	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990 <u>-</u>	Nev. 1990 <u>e</u> /	Nov. 1989	Sept. 1990	Oct. 1990g/	Nov. 1990g/
Total private Seasonally adjusted	*9.81 9.78	*10.16	\$10.15 10.12	*10.16	1338.45 337.41	• 353 . 57 351 . 51	\$349.16 346.10	\$368.49 348.47
Hining	13.27	13.82	13.72	13.76	581.23	623.28	610.54	603.44
Construction	13.69	13.92	13.90	13.79	520.22	542.88	528.20	528.16
Manufacturing	10.59	10.94	10.95	10.97	435.25	451.82	447.86	447.58
Durable goods	$\begin{array}{c} 11.11\\ 8.96\\ 4.41\\ 10.95\\ 12.57\\ 14.50\\ 10.53\\ 10.53\\ 16.43\\ 10.99\\ 8.47\\ 9.63\\ 15.01\\ 7.80\\ 6.43\\ 15.01\\ 7.80\\ 11.07\\ 13.262\\ 9.562\\ 9.564\end{array}$	11.49 9.22 8.64 11.27 13.04 14.98 10.95 11.94 10.45 11.47 8.43 11.46 11.47 8.63 10.20 9.57 16.12 8.09 6.70 12.42 11.41 13.62 16.40 9.90 6.97	11.49 9.13 8.62 11.22 13.05 15.03 10.94 11.90 10.44 11.47 8.62 10.22 9.57 16.03 8.11 12.45 12.45 13.54 12.45 13.54 12.45 13.54 12.45 13.54 12.45 13.54 12.45 13.45 13.45 13.45 15.45 13.45 14.45 14.45 14.45 14.45 15.45 15.45 14.45 15.45	$\begin{array}{c} 11.45\\ 9.10\\ 8.64\\ 11.28\\ .13.10\\ 15.07\\ 10.91\\ 11.46\\ 14.16\\ 14.57\\ 11.48\\ 8.64\\ 10.32\\ 9.76\\ 14.74\\ 8.13\\ 6.66\\ 12.36\\ 13.76\\ 15.50\\ 9.94\\ 7.05\\ \end{array}$	461.07 354.72 466.47 334.72 466.47 336.74 453.50 463.50 463.57 465.35 371.18 474.65 371.18 474.97 378.55 585.39 318.24 238.55 528.77 422.87 522.87 522.87 522.87 522.87 520.78	480.24 377.10 343.01 481.23 543.33 657.62 457.71 503.87 429.30 653.86 457.61 503.87 429.30 653.84 473.71 344.34 414.12 400.98 659.31 327.65 5245.89 542.75 639.29 583.57 742.92 411.84 261.33	475.69 366.11 337.90 470.12 557.24 455.31 452.92 429.82 429.82 429.82 410.84 391.41 2545.12 244.12 545.19 410.84 432.82 545.19 432.82 545.32 714.50 408.29 259.70	472.89 336.10 472.63 358.06 558.06 651.02 469.49 502.67 502.47 502.47 502.47 502.47 502.47 502.47 502.47 502.47 502.47 350.78 414.82 168.32 255.20 243.69 550.13 55
Transportation and public utilities	12.71	13.07	13.02	13.05	491.88	512.34	503.87	506.34
Wholesale trade	10.56	10.94	10.88	10.95	402.34	439.00	414.53	417.20
Retail trade	6.63	6.85	6.85	6.86	189.62	197.97	194.54	194.82
Finance, insurance, and real estate	9.67	10.12	10.09	10.13	344.25	365.33	359.20	360.63
Servicas	9.61	9.98	10.0ď	10.04	312.33	326.35	324.00	325.30

1/ See footnote 1, table 8-2.

p = preliminary.

Table 3-4. Average hourly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workersl/ on private nonfarm payrolls by industry, seasonally adjusted

Industry	Mov. 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sept. 1990	0ct. 1990 <u>p</u> /	Nov. 1990g/	Percent change from: Dct. 1990- Nev. 1990
Tetal private Correct dellars Correct dellars Mining Thing T	89.78 7.62 13.32 13.66 10.58 10.12 12.65 10.55 10.55 10.55 10.55 10.55 10.55 10.55	\$10.07 7.58 13.79 13.76 10.89 10.40 13.02 10.84 13.02 10.84 6.79 15.08 9.92	\$10.09 7.56 13.73 13.78 10.90 10.40 13.00 10.84 6.82 10.06 9.93	010.13 7.50 13.83 13.82 10.93 10.94 13.02 10.94 13.02 10.94 6.83 10.17 9.98	010.12 7.45 13.80 10.97 10.50 12.98 10.90 6.84 10.10 9.97	\$10.13 M.A. 13.82 13.76 10.96 10.49 13.00 10.94 13.00 10.94 13.00 10.94 13.00	0.1 (3) 3 1 1 .2 .4 .1 .1

2. Sae footnote 1, table 5-2. 2. The Consumer Fries Index for Urban Mage Eerners and Clarical Markers (CTI-H) is used to deflate this series. 3. Change was -0.7 sercent from September 1990 to October 1990: the latest month

evailable. ý/ Derived by assuming that evertime heurs are peid at the rate of time and one-hif. = not available. g/ = preliminary.

ESTABLISHMENT DATA Table 3-5. Indexes of acoregate weekly hours of production or nonsupervisory workers]/ on private nonfare payrolls by industry (1982-100) ESTABLISHMENT DATA

	Not		nally ad	justed		54	esona	lly ad	usted	
Industry	Nov . 1989	Sept. 1990	0ct. 1990g/	Nov. 1990 <u>e</u> /	Nov . 1989	July 1990	Aug. 1990	Sest. 1990	Oct. 1990 <u>e</u> /	Nov. 1990 <u>e</u> /
Total private	124.2	126.5	124.6	124.1	123.5	124.8	124.6	125.3	123.1	123.4
Goods-producing industries	113.4	113.8	111.0	109.0	111.6	110.5	110.5	110.3	308.0	107.1
Hining	65.0	69.3	68.3	67.8	63.8	66.9	66.1	67.3	66.4	66.5
Construction	146.6	151.4	143.9	139.6	143.0	138.4	139.8	139.7	132.2	135.9
Manufacturs.ng	109.4	108.5	106.7	105.1	108.0	107.4	107.1	106.8	105.5	103.6
Durble goods. Furniture and void products. Furniture and firtures. Stone. Clar, and plant and and and and and and and and and and	108.8 1131.0 1131.0 115.0 93.6 93.6 115.0 115.0 115.0 110.3 112.8 1100.3 112.8 1100.3 1100.3 1100.3 1100.3 1100.3 1100.3 1110.5 1100.4 98.6 1111.8 1128.5 1106.9 1128.5 11	1107.0 1133.9 1126.1 112.5 135.7 108.5 108.5 1108.2 112.9 1108.2 112.9 1108.2 112.9 1109.7 1119.7 120.7 1119.7 120.7 120.7 1119.7 120.7 1119.7 120.7 1	105.5           128.6           129.2           129.2           129.2           192.3           192.3           107.1           119.9           1129.3           107.1           119.9           1129.3           107.1           1129.3           108.5           111.8           127.3.4           112.8           127.6           123.6           126.3	103.3         122.6           122.2         121.2           107.5         80.2           105.6         96.2           107.5         105.6           96.2         107.5           110.5         100.7           100.6         97.6           97.6         97.6           97.6         97.6           97.6         122.3           110.9         12.3           122.3         122.3	107.6 1128.2 1128.2 113.6 93.1 99.8 110.8 108.8 110.8 1128.6 108.8 108.8 108.8 108.8 108.8 108.8 108.8 108.8 108.8 109.9 106.4 108.8 109.9 100.6 100.8 1	1107.1 1125.8 1108.2 1105.2 194.3 182.3 108.5 108.3 108.3 1124.1 1133.2 184.8 1004.5 1104.3 1004.3 1107.7 1107.9 1006.6 192.4 1004.3 1127.2 159.8	106.5  129.7  109.5   93.0   80.8  108.1   80.8  108.1   98.1  107.2  122.2  122.2  122.2  122.2  124.8  109.7  131.2  131.2  146.5  109.7  131.2  146.5  109.7  131.2  146.5  109.7  129.6  131.2  1	<pre>[105.9] [123.5] [123.5] [123.5] [123.5] [123.5] [123.5] [123.5] [127.4] [107.4] [121.3] [129.1] [121.3] [129.1] [121.3] [129.1] [121.4] [107.9] [110.4] [107.9] [110.4] [107.9] [110.4] [</pre>	$1 104.7 \\ 126.0 \\ 121.4 \\ 105.6 \\ 82.0 \\ 192.6 \\ 82.0 \\ 106.9 \\ 106.0 \\ 106.0 \\ 106.0 \\ 106.2 \\ 107.5 \\ 106.7 \\ 106.7 \\ 106.7 \\ 106.7 \\ 106.7 \\ 106.7 \\ 106.7 \\ 106.7 \\ 107.1 \\ 106.7 \\ 107.1 \\ 106.7 \\ 107.1 \\ 106.7 \\ 107.1 \\ 106.7 \\ 107.1 \\ 106.7 \\ 107.1 \\ 106.7 \\ 107.1 \\ 106.7 \\ 107.1 \\ 106.7 \\ 107.1 \\ 107.$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$
	129 0	1132.2	130.7	130.9	128.8	131.2	130.9	132.0	129.9	130.8
Transportation and public utilities	1113.Z	117.8	116.6	116.9	111.8	115.8	115.Z	116.4	114.8	115.5
Wholesale trade	119.0	120.3	119.5	118.9	119.0	119.5	1119.5	119.6	118.5	118.8
Retail trade	125.1	125.1	122.7	124.0	123.8	125.1	124.1	124.9	122.4	123.1
Finance, insurance, and real estate	120.5	123.9	121.4	121.1	121.1	123.1	1122.9	1124.1	121.5	121.9
Services	141.9	147.5	146.5	146.4	1142.4	1145.9	1146.0	147.7	145.6	146.8

1/ See foctnote 1, table B-2.

p = preliminary

-

(Percent)		T employ	ment che	1798, S48	sonelly	adjusted	1				
Time span	Jan.	Feb.	Her.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept	Oct.	Nov .
_				Priva	te nonfa	ra payro	11s. 556	industr	ies]/		
Over 1-month span: 1989 1990	64.5 55.6	58.7 58.6	58.0 53.7	57.0 49.9	55.6 55.8	57.3 49.9	55.8 50.8	57.7 48.2	50.0 45.8	55.2 g/41.7	59.6 2/40.2
Over 3-month span: 1989 1990	65.3 58.4	56.2 56.7	60.0 54.8	60.1 53.1	59.7 53.7	\$8.3 55.3	59.7 50.1	\$4.5 45.2	55.2 g/40.6	55.8 g/36.5	57.7
Over 6-month span: 1989 1990	67.6 57.3	65.6 56.5	65.0 55.5	61.0 55.9	61.2 51.4	58.7 48.3	57.0 2/45.6	58.1 £/38.8	56.2	58.3	57.4
Over 12-month span: 1989 1990	67.1 54.8	67.7 54.1	65.3 54.1	64.6 2 51.0	64.9 2/46.8	61.2	60.0	59.8	58.6	57.3	56.7
				Kenu	facturin	p peyrol	18, 139	industri	es]/		
Over 1-month gpan: 1989 1990	60.4 42.4	48.4 45.7	50.4 45.3	47.1 46.8	45.3 45.7	45.7 40.3	45.0 48.2	43.7 40.6	34.2 38.1	48.6 B-36.3	43.5 2/27.7
Over 3-month span: 1985 1990	54.0 40.3	54.7 37.1	45.3 44.2	43.9 41.4	43.2 40.6	42.8 44.2	41.7 39.9	33.1 33.8	36.3 g-29.1	\$4.9 22.3	41.7
Over 6-month span: 1989 1990	56.5 37.1	49.6 35.6	49.3 34.3	43.5	42.1 38.1	37.1 31.7	36.7 P/28.8	34.9 20.5	34.2	35.3	33.1

c-act, masse on associatly adjusted data for 1., 3., and exclosure increasing plus one-hait of the industries and balance between industries with increasing and decreasing employment.

99

Representative HAMILTON. OK. Are we in a recession? [Laughter.]

Mrs. Norwood. I thought you'd ask that.

Let me say that the labor market data really show a dismal picture, and the labor market is really acting as though it is in recession. We've had steep job cuts, reduced hours, an increase in job losers. One doesn't determine a recession entirely on the basis of labor market data, however; you need to look at the whole set of economic indicators.

When you look at the leading economic indicators, the coincident

indicators, and lagging indicators, they're all down. If you look at the housing market—housing permits, housing starts, housing completions are down.

Auto sales, domestic and imported, are down.

You look at industrial production; it's down.

You look at durable orders; they're up some. But they were down in the previous month and September. These are, of course, all data for October. We have the first set of data for November.

Retail sales have been flat. Capacity utilization is down. Personal income is flat. Real disposable income is down. But, the GNP data still show for the third quarter a 1.7-percent increase.

The data that we have released this morning are input into many of those indicators and certainly provide a large part of the data that goes into both the industrial production data and to the national accounts.

I would expect them to have considerable downward pull on the GNP numbers for the fourth quarter.

Representative HAMILTON. Do we have here the kind of cumulative unwinding of the economy that characterizes a recession?

Mrs. Norwood. We are certainly beginning to see signs of that. I would feel, however, that we need to have declines registered in production and in GNP for the technical definitions of "recession," but it is clear to me that all of the surrounding data that are available present an extremely pessimistic view of the economy.

Representative HAMILTON. Total payroll employment now has fallen for 5 straight months.

Have we ever had a prolonged employment decline like that without having a recession?

Mr. PLEWES. We had a short period in early 1986 where there was a decline, particularly in manufacturing, that was not accompanied by a decline in services.

That situation improved after a short period of about 4 months. But, generally speaking, you're right, there haven't been these periods unless there's been a recession.

Representative HAMILTON. Is the decline in employment concentrated in a few sectors, or is it across the board?

Mrs. Norwood. For the last year or so, of course, we've had a concentration in manufacturing and in construction. And we're certainly seeing that in the real estate markets. It has begun over the last several months, particularly last month and this month, to move further into service-producing sectors.

And, as I indicated, except for a few thousand jobs in oil and gas extraction, we are really left with only the health services industry increasing in employment.

And I'm concerned about that.

Representative HAMILTON. Do you have any information about the number of unemployed people who qualify for unemployment benefits?

Mrs. Norwood. Yes. Approximately, a third qualify for unemployment benefits.

Representative HAMILTON. Is that roughly what it's been in the past, that one-third of the people unemployed qualify for unemployment benefits?

Mrs. Norwood. It is what it has been over the past decade or so. But, if you go back to the seventies, it was probably twice that amount.

Representative HAMILTON. Is that roughly what it has been in the last two decades or so in the percent of the unemployed who qualify for unemployment insurance benefits?

Mrs. Norwood. That's correct. Part of that, I think, is because of the tightening in administration of unemployment insurance benefits and eligibility that has occurred in almost all of the States, for a variety of reasons.

And part of it is because of the expanding service-producing sector and the expanding number of jobs to which people move in and out, particularly some of the part-time jobs and otherwise; so that the workers often don't have the the sustained period of employment with one employer to qualify for unemployment insurance benefits.

We've done a supplement to the current population survey to ask unemployed workers if they have applied for unemployment insurance benefits and, if not, why not.

And we expect to have some information, perhaps by next month's hearing.

Representative HAMILTON. Can you tell whether there's genuine hardship or are a number of these people who are unemployed in families who have other sources of income?

Is there any way to separate that out?

Mrs. Norwood. We do have data which show that there are a significant number of families, two-earner families, where one earner may still be employed.

We do have 5-plus million female-headed households where there is generally no one else in the work force.

Mr. Plewes has written down a figure of 83 percent. Perhaps he can tell you what it is. [Laughter.]

Representative HAMILTON. It's a good, solid figure, no matter what it stands for. [Laughter.]

Mr. PLEWES. In the third quarter of this year, 83 percent of married couple families that had an unemployed member also had another person who was employed.

So that gives you an indication.

Mrs. Norwood. I would like to point out that that's an important figure. It's also very important for us to remember that analyses have shown, that over time, in the case of wives, those who suffer periods of unemployment often have husbands who also suffer periods of unemployment. There seems to be a linkage there that I think is terribly important. The second point is that, as you know, we have had a period of time over the past couple of decades where many of our young families have developed lifestyles that are based upon two-earner incomes. The houses they buy, the cars they buy, the credit that they assume, depend on two earners.

And so, when one of them is unemployed, there is a financial difficulty in the family. It is not the same thing as a family of very low income, where it takes two people's incomes just to feed the children. It is a hardship of a different kind.

Representative HAMILTON. Much of the decline in employment in manufacturing was due to layoffs in the automobile industry. Is that correct?

Mrs. NORWOOD. A good section of it, certainly. But, not all of it by any means.

Representative HAMILTON. Are the automobile workers—yes, here it is:

"The automobile industry is particularly hard hit with 55,000 workers temporarily laid off."

Mrs. NORWOOD. And then some of the feeder industries into the automobile industries have temporarily laid off people.

Representative HAMILTON. Are those folks going to be called back soon?

Mrs. NORWOOD. The expectation is that many of them will be. But, I do think we need to recognize that the purchasers of automobiles are changing. There are fewer of them. The composition of the population has changed and there is a worldwide problem with the supply of automobiles.

Representative HAMILTON. Too many automobiles?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Yes. And I think our automobile companies are all trying to figure out exactly how to cope with that. Many of them focus their attention on the share of the market. But I think we're going to be seeing in coming years more of a focus on how they can sell what they produce.

Representative HAMILTON. When people are called up to the military service and go to the Persian Gulf and leave their civilian jobs, how are they counted in the statistics? Are they unemployed?

Mrs. NORWOOD. No. And I think I'll let Mr. Plewes answer that because he has a great deal of military experience. He's a general in the Reserves.

Representative HAMILTON. OK, General, you can answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. PLEWES. I'm still here. The way these people are counted depends on their previous employment and whether or not the company has continued to extend benefits to them.

The clearest case is a person who is called up and leaves his other job and is not replaced by another worker—in which case, the employment count goes down.

We think that that's a very small portion of this activity.

There are indications that in some cases employers are continuing to keep these people on their payrolls, either for payments of benefits or for payments of the differential between what the Army or Air Force or Navy is paying them and what they earned before, in which case, they'll be continued on the payroll, and reported to us in the employment count. There are other cases in which persons were called up either from homemaking or other activities in which they were not on a payroll. And there would be no effect whatsoever.

The bottom line is we haven't had any way of disentangling all these various statuses.

We do not believe, however, that very much of the employment decline as registered this month, or even over the last couple of months, is attributable to the callup of persons for the Persian Gulf.

Representative HAMILTON. Congressman Upton.

Representative UPTON. Thank you.

Mrs. Norwood, how do the new employment statistics put forward today compare to other industrialized nations, particularly in Europe, as well as countries such as Japan? Where do we stand to the rest of the world, both in terms of the trend and actual numbers?

Mrs. NORWOOD. We have, of course, had an unprecedented period of expansion. Our numbers are clearly higher than Japan and Germany and Sweden, the Scandinavian countries; they are lower than Canada, Australia, France, Italy, and the United Kingdom.

Representaive UPTON. When you say Germany, is that the old West Germany or the unified Germany?

Mrs. Norwood. West Germany. We do not as yet have numbers for a combined Germany. As you probably know, the Bureau of Labor Statistics has technical assistance work going on with several of the countries of Eastern Europe, in particular with Poland and with Hungary.

I have visited the Soviet Union and we're looking at the possibility of working with Czechoslavakia. We are coordinating all of that work with the European Community's Statistical Office, which is trying to coordinate this around the world.

But, there is a great deal of work that needs to be done in determining how to measure the change that is occurring in all of the countries of Eastern Europe and, of course, in that part of Germany that was East Germany.

Representative UPTON. I note that the Michigan unemployment rate has been doing some ups and downs over the last couple of months.

How would you read the November increase to 7.7 percent? Obviously, a major part of that would be the auto industry and the auto parts.

I'd be interested in any specific evaluation.

Mrs. Norwood. As you well know, the automobile industry and some of the allied industries surrounding the automobile industry are a very important part of the economy in the State of Michigan. And we're seeing exactly what we would expect, which is a big increase in the unemployment rate for workers in the automobile industry. Close to 14 percent.

Many of the workers in that State and some others are being very much affected by what it seems to me is the decision that many automobile manufacturers are making, which is that they're going to look at their markets, and adjust their production schedules to what they think the next couple of months are going to show. So what we're seeing is a ratcheting effect of the shutdown, the layoff for a few weeks, and then hiring people back.

The workers, therefore, are really being pushed in many ways by having several weeks of layoff. It also, of course, affects the unemployment insurance system.

Representative UPTON. Thank you.

Representative HAMILTON. The mass layoff program has been canceled hasn't it? You announced that earlier this year.

Mrs. NORWOOD. Yes. But, in the 1991 budget for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Appropriations Committees and the Congress passed an appropriation which includes it.

Representative HAMILTON. So there's been no cancellation of it then?

Mrs. Norwood. That's correct.

Representative HAMILTON. That's good.

Mrs. Norwood. I should point out, however-

Representative HAMILTON. It has gone on just as if it has not been interrupted?

Mrs. Norwood. Well, yes. I guess that's true. Of course, the States knew that the program was in some jeopardy, and so there was a little period when it didn't move as fast foward as fast as we would have liked.

But I think it is now back on track.

I should point out, of course, that, although that was restored and several other additions were made to the Bureau of Labor Statistics budget, there were also some severe cuts in the BLS budget. And we're still trying to figure out how to take them.

We've had to absorb all of the pay raise. And we had a 2.41 percent cut across the board. That's about \$10 million that we have to find in fiscal 1991.

Representative HAMILTON. Let me ask a few questions about your data on employment and unemployment in rural areas.

I hear the comment from time to time that the unemployment data underreport rural unemployment.

Could you comment on that for me?

Mrs. NORWOOD. I believe that's probably true. And I think the reason for that is that the official definition of "unemployment" requires that people have not only not worked but have been looking for work during the preceding 4 weeks.

In many rural areas, in the farm areas, in particular, they're not going to look for work in the middle of the winter on a farm.

Now, they may, and many of them are, going off to the nearby towns and finding jobs there.

But, it seems to me, and I discussed this with Congressman Obey on several occasions, it may be that, at some point, we ought to think about some kind of a special study based on a survey of how you really should be looking at these rural areas.

Representaive HAMILTON. Do you have any plans to expand your data collection to improve the quality of statistics on rural areas? Mrs. NORWOOD. No, sir.

Representative HAMILTON. Would it be correct to say that rural areas generally suffer more from a recession than urban areas?

Mrs. NORWOOD. No, I don't think that's so. We're seeing a considerable amount of suffering in the automobile industry, which is
certainly in industrialized urban areas. Basically, we find that in good times as well as in bad times, there are enormous differences from one part of the country to another.

Representative HAMILTON. Is it correct that during the 1981-82 recession, rural workers were more likely than urban workers to lose their jobs? They were unemployed longer? They suffered larger wage cuts?

Mrs. Norwood. There often are larger, more severe effects in plant closings and layoffs; mainly, because there isn't anywhere else available for those people who have lost a job to go find jobs.

The ability of adjust, the flexibility, is not there in rural areas. So, what I was referring to really is the specifics of the data that we now have. But it is certainly true that people in rural areas have much less flexibility, unless they want to move, than do people in urban areas.

Representative HAMILTON. Can you generalize and say that, in recessions, generally, rural areas suffer more than urban areas?

Mrs. Norwood. We've seen that, in our mass layoff program, the layoffs seem to be more severe in rural areas.

I think we should be watching that to see where we go.

Perhaps Tom Plewes has something to add to that.

Mr. PLEWES. I think that's correct. We don't see large differentials between the urban areas and the rural areas in terms of the incidence of the unemployment, although with the caveat that unemployment may not be a good measure for the rural areas.

But, when there is an episode of unemployment, it affects rural areas much more deeply and more severely than the urban areas. Representative HAMILTON. OK.

Representative HAMILTON.

Senator Sarbanes.

Senator SARBANES. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, Commissioner and your colleagues.

This is the highest unemployment rate since when?

Mrs. Norwood. October 1987.

Senator SARBANES. October 1987. Was it 5.9 percent then?

Mrs. NORWOOD. Six percent. September 1987 it was 5.9 percent. Senator SARBANES. Now, as I understand from your statement here, particularly the beginning of the paragraph:

"Most of the increase in joblessness in November occurred among adult men."

Isn't that the last category that you reach in unemployment situations, when you have some degree of concern about where the economy is going?

Mrs. Norwood. That's true. We're getting to the point where women are also affected in periods of downturn.

But what we're seeing with the women is that their labor force participation is going down some, so they're not there. Or, they're not coming in as they were before.

The men are losing their jobs. The women are, too. Their rates have gone up. But, yes, traditionally, it is the adult men unemployment rate which goes way up in a period of recession because of the layoffs in heavy industry and manufacturing.

We've been experiencing that for sometime. It's just going on more.

Senator SARBANES. I think that supports the point I'm trying to get at, which is that you have a concern about a rising unemployment rate and what that may mean about where the economy is trending. That's the general rate. If we go then below the general rate, as I've just done, to look at what component of the unemployment rate is worsening, the component that is worsening, as you put it in this report, is the component which at least on a historical basis would most likely indicate a trend, an economic trend that ought to be of concern to us.

Mrs. Norwood. Absolutely.

Senator SARBANES. Do you have any regional data on the distribution of this unemployment situation?

Mrs. NORWOOD. We had declines in employment in most regions except the West, which is increasing very slightly. In terms of unemployment levels, the Midwest has been down a bit. The others are up except for the East-North-Central.

In terms of the rates, again, the Midwest and the East-North-Central are less affected than the others by increases.

Senator SARBANES. Would you say that this trend in unemployment represents a move into a recessionary situation in the economy?

Mrs. Norwood. It's very clear to me that this set of data shows the labor market in tremendous difficulty. And it's not just this month, but last month we were showing the same thing.

As I indicated earlier, if you review all of the other data that we have, most of them, of course, are for the month of October, in just about all cases they're down. In one or two cases, like retail sales, they're flat.

The GNP numbers for the third quarter are still positive, but there will be a revision of that in a week or so and I don't know what it will be. It's quite clear that the data we've released today and the data that we have been releasing for this quarter are going to have a very strong downward pull on things like the industrial production index and on the GNP.

And I think we're in trouble.

Senator SARBANES. You probably answered this before I got here but, in these monthly figures, was the labor force participation normal? I mean, did we have normal labor force participation? If we didn't, what would the unemployment rate have been?

Mrs. Norwood. Over the year, the labor force participation rate for the civilian population is down about six-tenths of a point. The labor force participation rate for women is down more than that. We've have had a tremendous decline of 800,000 teenagers in the labor force over the past year, and as a result, I think there has been much less upward pressure on the unemployment rate than we would have seen.

Teenagers generally have a very high unemployment rate compared to the rest of the population.

Senator SARBANES. Now, that's not a decline because of demographics, is it? It's that they've dropped out of the market?

Mrs. Norwood. It's partly demographics. It's partly a reduction in their participation rates, I believe, because there are fewer jobs. There's no longer an expansion in some of the industries that teenagers tend to work in. But we are seeing a clear decline in labor force participation, as you would expect, given the rest of these data. As to how that would transfer into unemployment, I'm reluctant to give you a figure. You can estimate that for every 100,000 or so people we have about a tenth of a percent unemployment. But it's more complicated than that because of the changing composition of the labor force. If you were to standardize—and I'm not suggesting you should, because I'm not always sure that's a good way to look at it—but if you were to hold the labor force composition constant and apply current unemployment rates for teenagers, blacks, Hispanics, women and men, I think you would have a larger increase in overall unemployment than we currently have.

Now, the danger with doing that kind of analysis, I think, is that sometimes you can wish away problems by saying, well, let's see what would have happened if some group were not here.

But, in this case, because the teenagers generally have unemployment rates in double digits, the fact that there have been fewer of them in the labor force means that the overall unemployment rates are lower than they would be if you just looked at the adult population.

Senator SARBANES. Do you mean the unemployment rate is worse than if you just looked at the adults?

Mrs. Norwood. If you're looking at the scenario of what would have happened if participation stayed up.

Senator SARBANES. Here's my point. The way we do our surveys, if you get a worsening economic situation and people, therefore, say, "I'm not even going to look for a job. I'm not going to enter the labor market because there are no jobs out there to be found," although, in the normal situation, they would be looking, the unemployment rate understates what's happening with the economy.

Mrs. Norwood. That's right.

Senator SARBANES. Because these people have self-selected themselves out and, therefore, are not counted as unemployed. So, then, if you start trying to look at the labor force participation rates to get some handle on that, I take it what you're telling me is that the labor force participation rates now are below what one might normally expect them to be.

Mrs. NORWOOD. Yes, they are. And if we look at the employmentpopulation ratios, you find that they are down considerably, too. Overall, the EP ratio has gone from 63 percent a year ago to 62.1 percent now.

So, the proportion of the population that has jobs, which is another way of looking at it and, in many ways, a better way, particularly for some of the minority groups that have the hardest time and get discouraged more easily, you see that there has been a considerable decline. The EP ratio for adult men is down almost a full percentage point. The EP ratio for adult women is down more than that. It's down from 55 to 54.5 percent. The EP ratio for teenagers is down about 4 points.

And if you look at the EP ratio for the black population, it's also down actually more than a point.

Senator SARBANES. Is the 5.9 percent unemployment figure with the military or without the military?

Mrs. Norwood. That's the civilian population.

Senator SARBANES. What's the figure if you include the military? Lower, I take it?

Mr. PLEWES. 5.8 percent with just the resident U.S. military. We don't count the overseas military as part of that labor force.

Senator SARBANES. Now, I want to ask about the average hourly earnings, table B-4, way in the back of your news release. And I want to use a chart that we've put together on real average hourly earnings.

Now, this is in constant dollars. As I understand it, in your table—your table is a much shorter timeframe than we have up here—but you don't have a constant dollar figure for this month because it's not yet computated?

Mrs. Norwood. That's right.

Senator SARBANES. But, I would take it that, since the nominal figure only went up a penny—that's the line above—that the constant figure will probably be the same as last month, or conceivably somewhat lower? You count inflation against it; is that correct?

Mrs. Norwood. I would expect so, yes.

Senator SARBANES. What I'm trying to get at here is there's a concern about not only how many are at work but also how much those who are at work are earning.

Mrs. Norwood. Yes.

Senator SARBANES. And you can have an economic slowdown and the resulting pain of such slowdown not only because people don't have jobs, although that's the most serious thing, but also because people who do have jobs are less able to cope because their real earnings are not holding up.

Mrs. Norwood. It is clearly true that real earnings, real average hourly earnings, have declined. If you look at it year over year or whether you look at it in terms of monthly change when these earnings are adjusted for inflation.

Senator SARBANES. What factors seem to account for this decline in real earnings? Charted out like that, that's pretty dramatic actually.

Mrs. Norwood. Of course, year over year, we had a 6.3-percent increase in the CPI from October to October. So we have rates of inflation going up. And we have had somewhat of a dampening on the rate of increase in wages and in salaries.

I think, on the other side, we have to look at a couple of things. One is that, particularly in collective bargaining situations, lumpsum payments are becoming more usual than before, partly because then it doesn't get to be a part of the basic wage for the next negotiation.

But, those are excluded from the average hourly earnings figures themselves.

The other point, however, is that the cost of fringe benefits to employers seems to be rising much faster than the increase in wages and salaries. And, of course, the average hourly earnings does not take into account the fringe benefit costs and the largest fringe benefit cost is health care. Health insurance costs to employers seem to be going fairly steadily upward if you look at it over a period of some time. One of the problems is that although it is a benefit to workers to have health insurance, I don't think a worker feels much better off if his employer is paying another \$1,000 a year toward his health insurance; he doesn't really see it. He has had health insurance coverage before. He has health insurance coverage now.

To the employer, that's an increase in cost. And it's a large and a worrying increase because it seems to go on and on.

Senator SARBANES. The employee is not getting better health care, it's just costing more money to get the same amount of health care, as a general proposition, isn't it?

Mrs. Norwood. He's probably getting a little less health care because many of the insurance policies now are being rewritten to provide for a little bit larger initial payment. Deductibles are changing, and so on.

As to whether he's getting better health care or not, that's another whole area of whether we're doing many, many more things technically to give people better care and keep them alive more, and so on.

I think we're seeing some of the employment increases in the health care industry that are really related to all of this. The expenditures in this country on health care are continuing to rise; whether it's private or publicly financed is a separate question.

Senator SARBANES. I think it's absolutely striking, the percentage of our GNP that we put into health care compared with other industrial countries.

And then you try to compare the substance of what people get in terms of health care. That's more of an ad hoc comparison. There are no strict standards to measure that.

But, in many instances, it doesn't seem to be any better except that we have very high technology. And, in some instances, less good. So that we seem to be putting more resources into health care, significantly more than other societies, but not for the ordinary citizens.

I mean, it would be one thing if you said, well, look how much better the health care coverage and services people are getting compared with countries A, B, and C. That doesn't seem to be the case.

Mrs. NORWOOD. Some people would argue with that, and I'm not really very expert about it. I do know there are a lot of procedures we're doing now. There's a lot more heart surgery, for example. There's some controversy about whether that's better or not better.

But, there are things that are being done using new technology. I also personally believe, and I don't have a lot of evidence for it, but I do think that an important part of the increase in health care expenditures is because of all the litigation that goes on in this country.

And so, as a result, a lot more procedures are undertaken and a lot more is spent in a sense for protection.

Senator SARBANES. A lot of it apparently. I don't have the figures but, apparently, health care costs in the last year of people's lives is an extraordinarily large percentage of their total health care costs.

What other factors account for this decline?

You're saying, in part, this decline in real earnings is overstated because it doesn't reflect fringe benefits?

Mrs. Norwood. Yes, I believe that's true. Senator SARBANES. That hardly explains this. I mean, this is pretty dramatic. You don't quarrel with what this chart shows, just in terms of real average hourly earnings, do you?

Mr. DALTON. Those two big peaks, of course, are the oil shocks. And, for some reason, at that time, workers were able to get compensated for that inflation.

Senator SARBANES. I'm less concerned about the peaks than I am about the valleys. Even if you leveled it up, up there, I'm concerned about this drop. Interestingly enough, about 1975 and 1980-81, and then the continued downtrend that's going on more recently, including what's happening now. As you can see, you're going to have to redo the table in order to include the downturn in the next few months.

Mrs. Norwood. That's true. I would also point out, as was just pointed out, that the hourly earnings refers really only to production, nonsupervisory workers. So they are concentrated heavily in the goods producing sector, in which we've been losing a lot of jobs; since demand for workers in manufacturing has gone down so much. This is what you would expect.

As you produce jobs in the service-producing sector, many of which are not production or nonsupervisory jobs, you're getting some increases. If you look even at average hourly earnings for production nonsupervisory workers, you find that manufacturing has come down now without correction for inflation to \$10.97 with an average for the country in November of \$10.16.

Services has gone up to \$10.04. It's only in the last several months that wages in services has gone up over \$10. I think you're quite right that real earnings are declining. They're declining even when you look at the employment cost index, which includes some of these additional workers who are not covered in the average earnings series. It's not declining as much, but it's still a problem.

But that's what you would expect in these conditions of supply and demand now. That is this latest part of that.

Senator SARBANES. Do you expect these trends to continue in the future, or do you think we can expect some reversal into a pattern of stronger wage growth?

Mrs. Norwood. There are several issues that one needs to factor into answering that question, I think.

One is what's going to happen to the rate of inflation. What we're seeing now is that, when we get to 4.5 to 5 percent inflation, people consider that's fairly good. That's quite a lot of inflation, it seems to me.

And we're above that now, largely because of what's happening in the Middle East.

Senator SARBANES. Let me just note on that point for the record that, when you get the perception that there's going to be a peaceful resolution of the Mid-East situation, the price of oil drops quite substantially. In fact, it's gone down 12 to 14 percent in the last couple days on that basis.

And when you get the war scares, it shoots back up again.

So, the notion that an offensive war is going to ease the oil situation doesn't seem to jive with the market's judgment about that, at least in the short run.

But, please, that's a diversion.

Mrs. Norwood. The important thing really is that there are two sides to this. One is inflation, and the other is earnings.

Senator SARBANES. But, we used to have inflation of the sort you've been talking about and earnings didn't take the kind of pounding that they've been taking recently.

Mrs. Norwoop. That's true, but we've also become very noncompetitive. We also were an economy with a much more heavily goods-producing work force than we have now.

And as I've said, I think the hourly earnings data do not include many of the newer kinds of occupations that are emerging.

Senator SARBANES. When you say we became less competitive, do you mean internationally as judged by what? The trade deficit?

Mrs. Norwood. Yes.

Senator SARBANES. Why do the big trade deficit figures occur at the same time as these very low real average hourly earnings?

Mrs. Norwood. A lot of it is oil, but not all of it.

Senator SARBANES. I don't follow you.

Mrs. Norwood. Oil prices go up and that has an effect.

Senator SARBANES. But, oil prices were up there at those peaks, I was just told. Yet, the time period when oil prices were way up when we had the oil shocks, we, in fact, did pretty well on real average hourly earnings.

We had large trade deficits in the 1980's and, in effect, the cumulative impact was to thrust us from being a creditor to being a debtor nation. And that was at a period when we had these very low real average hourly wages.

Mrs. Norwood. But, the situation was very different then because there were many larger union and management settlements, and other wage increases that occurred. Obviously, wages were higher then. That's really what you're saying. They were much higher then, in relation to inflation than they are now. That's quite true.

We have really changed, I think, the structure.

Senator SARBANES. When real earnings were much higher, we weren't taking a beating on the trade deficit. Then, they became much lower and we are taking a beating on the trade deficit in that same period.

So, I don't understand how your reference to competitiveness squares with that situation.

Mrs. Norwood. We're using our workers in manufacturing apparently a little bit more effectively because their productivity in manufacturing is somewhat up.

And, therefore, our costs should be lower, which should be reflected in prices. And for a while, in the early eighties, were reflected in prices.

Now I think we're seeing something of a turnaround. Manufacturing output has kept up more than have the number of workers.

And we're seeing, for example, that unit labor costs are still declining slightly, not as much as they were before, but output has over a period of time not declined to the same extent that employment has.

That's what I meant about efficiency.

Senator SARBANES. Aren't real average hourly earnings in some other industrial countries outpacing the United States?

Mrs. NORWOOD. In some countries, they are higher. I don't have that in real terms. But, I do have the data through 1989.

Senator SARBANES. For which countries?

Mrs. NORWOOD. A lot of them. The series are not the same as the average hourly earnings we were just discussing. These series attempt to account for the costs of benefits that people get. It's very difficult to do that internationally because many of the benefits that workers get in other countries are financed not by employers but out of tax revenue, such as, obviously, medical care.

But, the United States is lower than Canada and lower than Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. It is higher certainly than the Latin American countries, than several of the countries in the Far East and Israel. Even higher than Australia and New Zealand. It is higher than Austria, higher than France, and higher than some of the countries like Greece and Ireland.

Senator SARBANES. How about Japan?

Mrs. Norwood. Japan, we calculate as approximately \$12.63 versus \$14.31 for the United States.

Senator SARBANES. What did you calculate for Germany?

Mrs. Norwood. Germany is \$17.58.

Senator SARBANES. Well, from that data, one could not really sustain the proposition that, to the extent we can compete or are having difficulty competing internationally, it's because our workers make so much more than workers make in those other countries.

Mrs. Norwood. No. I don't think you can state that.

Senator SARBANES. In other words, the Germans are paying their workers more. Yet, if you judge effectiveness by their surpluses, the current account balance and everything else, they are competing much better.

So, the cause has to be found somewhere else than in the worker's pay package.

Mrs. Norwood. I would argue that the Germans have been more successful in some ways in handling their fiscal and economic policy. I mean, they've maintained inflation at much lower levels than we have. They don't have the kind of problems that we are facing with our budget, and so on.

So it has been somewhat easier for them. Also, the European Community.

Senator SARBANES. I don't think they have the same disparities in income and wealth in terms of their tax policy as we have.

Mrs. NORWOOD. I think that's probably so. You should also know, however, that they have a very different attitude about young people in the labor market. They have had a good deal more unemployment among young people and have handled it in different ways from the way in which we have.

I haven't looked at those data in the last year or so.

Senator SARBANES. Thank you.

Representative HAMILTON. Just a couple of other questions.

The groups of workers that have lost jobs—Senator Sarbanes was asking about that a little earlier—women have really experienced a sharp drop, haven't they? Between June and October, the number of people employed fell by 670,000, and women accounted for 87 percent of the job loss.

Mrs. Norwood. I don't have the figures exactly but it's quite clear that, yes, women lost 590,000 jobs. Employment was down; put it that way. A hundred and eighteen thousand in October.

Representative HAMILTON. Why did women have such a disproportionately bad job loss?

Mrs. Norwood. Partly because the decline in construction and manufacturing that affected men so much more occurred much earlier. And job declines are expanding into services, so that many of the industries, like retail trade and some of the individual services industries, where so many women are working—even things like the banking industry, which employs a lot of women—have begun losing jobs.

For quite a while, until really the last 3 months or so, those industries were continuing to expand.

Representative HAMILTON. Now, we expect to see, in this downturn or recession, that blacks, Hispanics, and teenagers would suffer the largest loss, won't we?

Mrs. Norwood. Generally, in a period of economic distress, or economic downturn, minority groups suffer. We haven't seen any special evidence of that now. Their unemployment rates are extremely high.

They are generally, however, those who get the jobs last, who often have the least training. And they're usually the first fired.

Representative HAMILTON. We haven't talked much about the inflation rate. Let's get that on the record here.

How much of the inflation rate—now at almost 9 percent for the past 3 months—increase is due to energy?

Mr. DALTON. It's about half.

Representative HAMILTON. And the other half?

Mr. DALTON. Nonenergy components. [Laughter.]

Representative HAMILTON. Everything.

Mr. DALTON. Yes.

Representative HAMILTON. So we have about a 4.5-percent inflation, roughly, without energy?

Mr. DALTON. Well, if we take out food and energy, and I know there's some reservation about doing that, you have a 5.5-percent annual rate through the first 10 months of this year.

Representative HAMILTON. Are the higher energy prices beginning to push up the prices of other goods and services?

Mrs. Norwood. Yes.

Mr. DALTON. To some extent. Airline fares, in particular, seem to be rising in response to the fuel costs.

Mrs. Norwood. We anticipate that the indirect effects, that is, the effect of energy increases on other products which are priced through the CPI, will probably be about as large as the direct effects of the increased price of energy.

Representative HAMILTON. So do you see any reason to be concerned about the acceleration of nonenergy prices at this time? Mrs. NORWOOD. I'm always concerned about any acceleration of the prices. I think our inflationary expectations in this country keep rising. We become a bit complacent about it.

Representative HAMILTON. So the concern that the Fed has now about not moving to reduce interest rates because of the possibility of inflation accelerating is a genuine concern, a valid concern?

Mrs. Norwood. It's always a tradeoff that has to be made, and I don't know how they should make it, but I do believe that they have to take it into account.

Mr. DALTON. If you take out energy from the CPI and look at the rate of increase, so far this year, it's 5.5 percent. It was 4.6 percent for all of last year; 4.7 the year before; 4.1 the year before that.

So, clearly, it is an acceleration.

Representative HAMILTON. So there has been a jump of about a full percentage point?

Mr. DALTON. Yes.

Senator SARBANES. Why would a lower interest rate in the current economic circumstances be inflationary?

Mrs. NORWOOD. I didn't say that it would. I merely said that I believe the Fed should look at all of the data, and it certainly does.

Senator SARBANES. I thought the assumption was that, if we have this economic slack, which clearly we have in the labor market and we also have in the industrial production index, that you could lower interest rates and try to stimulate some economic activity without it being reflected in an increase in inflation.

Mrs. Norwood. That may well be.

Senator SARBANES. In fact, a lower interest rate in some ways would help to reduce other aspects of inflation.

Mrs. Norwood. That may well be.

Representative HAMILTON. Anything further?

Senator SARBANES. I have one final question.

If you were in charge of a station that posted flags for people who were out boating or sailing, and I take that analogy over now to the economic winds that are at work as we see them through these figures, would you run up at this point the red warning flag?

Mrs. Norwood. I believe that we have a set of data for November that are extremely worrying for the labor market. And as I look at the other economic data that are out for the month of October, and I reviewed them before—almost every one of them is down—so I have concerns, yes.

Senator SARBANES. Thank you.

Representative HAMILTON. Thank you very much, Commissioner Norwood and your colleagues. We were pleased to have you.

The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:40 a.m., the committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

Ο