

Dependents' Allowances Under State Unemployment Insurance Laws

by OLGA S. HALSEY*

The additional responsibilities of workers with families have been recognized in the unemployment insurance laws of 11 States, which supplement with special allowances the benefits paid unemployed workers who have dependents. All these States provide allowances for dependent children under a specified age, and four also provide allowances for dependent adults. The following article analyzes these provisions and discusses the assistance given by dependents' allowances and the practical effect of some of the differences in State laws.

ELEVEN State unemployment insurance laws now provide a weekly allowance for dependent relatives of claimants eligible to receive unemployment benefits.¹ These 11 laws have one feature in common: all provide a weekly allowance for dependent children. From this common starting point, differences emerge; there are variations in the definition of "children," in the definition of a "dependent" child, and in the maximum age of dependent children for whom allowances are payable. Four laws provide allowances not only for dependent children but also for dependent adult relatives. State laws also differ in the amount payable for each dependent, its maximum, and its method of limitation.

In April-June 1950, almost 65,000 beneficiaries were eligible for a dependent's allowance, or 19.4 percent of all beneficiaries in these 11 States during the quarter. This percentage was higher among men beneficiaries—30.1 percent—and substantially lower among women—only 4.6 percent (table 1). Among the beneficiaries receiving a dependent's allowance in the quarter, allowances added, on the average, \$4.06 or 17.7 percent to the

average basic weekly benefit² of \$22.90 (table 4). Individual States deviated substantially from these averages.

Statutory Provisions

A review of the provisions that govern the granting of dependents' allowances is an essential preliminary to any discussion of the significant differences in State experience.

Definition of Dependents

Children.—Ten of the 11 States recognize stepchildren as dependents. Massachusetts, while it excludes stepchildren, includes adopted children in its definition, as do six other States.³ Michigan considers dependent a child for whose support money is paid by the claimant under an order or decree of a court.

The maximum age of children for whom an allowance is payable probably has greater significance—in terms of the number of dependent children benefited—than the relationship of the children to the claimant. Six States limit the payment of an allowance for children to those under 18 years of age⁴; Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Maryland, and

Nevada restrict payments to children under 16; and Wyoming extends payments to children under age 19. Michigan, in addition, pays an allowance for a dependent child under age 21 who, because of physical or mental infirmity, is unable to engage in any remunerative occupation. Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Nevada also pay a dependent's allowance for any child or stepchild, regardless of age, who is unable to work because of disability and who is wholly or mainly supported by the parent-claimant.

"Dependent" child.—A child must not only be under the specified age if the parent is to receive a dependent's allowance; he must also be a "dependent," as defined in the State law and as interpreted by the State employment security agency. These definitions differ.

The most usual definition, found in the laws of seven States,⁵ requires, substantially, that the child must be wholly or mainly supported by the parent who claims him as a dependent. Under this definition, in households in which both parents are employed, the children will be considered the dependents of the father if his earnings exceed those of the mother, so that he supports the child "wholly or mainly." The Michigan law provides specifically that only the father may claim a child as a dependent unless the mother provides the sole or principal support of the child. The Michigan Unemployment Compensation Commission has defined "principal support" to mean that the parent claiming dependent children has regularly contributed during his base period more than half the cost of their support.

Arizona and North Dakota require as evidence of dependency that the child be living with or receiving regular support from the parent-claimant.

⁵ Alaska, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Michigan, Nevada, and Ohio.

* Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, Unemployment Insurance Service, Division of Program Standards.

¹ Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, the District of Columbia, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Nevada, North Dakota, Ohio, and Wyoming.

² Throughout the article the term "basic weekly benefit" refers to the weekly benefit for total unemployment for which claimants without dependents may be eligible.

³ Arizona, Maryland, Michigan, Nevada, North Dakota, and Wyoming.

⁴ Alaska, Arizona, Massachusetts, Michigan, North Dakota, and Ohio.

Arizona has further refined these two tests. It defines "living with" the parent as living in the same household with the parent-claimant, except for temporary absences. "Regular support" is interpreted as meaning the supplying of the necessities of life for the dependent, or making periodic payments for that purpose; such support must be expected to continue, except in temporary emergencies. Under the first half of this definition, an unemployed mother could claim the children as her dependents more frequently than under the more usual definition, which requires that the parent claiming dependent children support them "wholly or mainly."

Massachusetts requires that a dependent child must not be "self-supporting." The children are not normally considered the dependents of the mother unless the father is dead. If a mother claims dependent children under other conditions, individual consideration is given to each case. Wyoming requires that the parent-claimant be responsible for and support the child claimed as a dependent.

These definitions of dependency are supplemented by a variety of other requirements that a child must also satisfy before his parent is eligible for an allowance on his behalf. Alaska stipulates that a dependent must reside in Alaska. Both Alaska and Nevada require that a dependent child must not be gainfully employed, defined in Nevada as meaning employment for compensation contributing substantially and with reasonable regularity to his own support. Thus, in that State the inconsequential earnings of a dependent will not be a bar to an allowance on his behalf. North Dakota stipulates that an allowance is not payable on behalf of an otherwise dependent child who receives more than \$5 in remuneration during a claim week, while Arizona specifies that an allowance is not payable for any dependent for any week in which he receives unemployment benefits in his own right. In Arizona, Massachusetts, and North Dakota the child must be unmarried. Maryland requires a birth certificate, or a certified copy, before an allowance is payable.

As a matter of administrative convenience, six States determine the de-

Table 1.—Number and percentage distribution of beneficiaries entitled to dependents' allowances, by sex of beneficiary, 11 States, April-June 1950

State	Total number of beneficiaries			Percent entitled to dependents' allowances		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Total.....	333,784	192,808	140,976	19.4	30.1	4.6
With allowances for children only:						
North Dakota.....	986	785	201	34.3	38.1	19.4
Michigan.....	31,580	22,399	9,181	32.7	43.3	6.8
Wyoming.....	1,870	1,498	372	32.0	38.0	7.8
Ohio.....	51,454	32,589	18,865	27.7	39.2	7.8
Connecticut.....	27,577	14,521	13,056	18.4	30.4	5.0
Maryland.....	50,506	31,951	18,555	17.1	23.3	6.4
Massachusetts.....	157,695	80,862	76,833	13.6	24.5	2.2
With allowances for children and adults:						
Arizona.....	3,688	2,500	1,188	57.0	67.1	35.9
Nevada.....	1,587	1,098	489	28.0	37.3	7.2
District of Columbia.....	3,614	2,234	1,380	23.8	28.4	16.4
Alaska.....	3,227	2,371	856	15.6	15.1	17.1

pendency status and the number of dependents at the time the claimant files his first claim in his benefit year.⁶ Under this procedure, a dependent child who was just under the specified maximum age at the beginning of his parent's benefit year remains a "dependent child" throughout the year. Conversely, a child born after the beginning of the benefit year is not included in the count of dependents during that year. In Michigan a determination that one parent supports dependent children remains fixed for the benefit year and cannot be transferred to the other parent during this period. In Arizona, dependents who have been claimed by one parent may not be claimed by the other during the benefit year. If there are more than three children in the family, however, one parent can claim the first three children and the other, the remainder up to three.

Nine State laws have been alert to the possibility that both parents might be unemployed simultaneously and both might claim dependents' allowances for the same week. The laws of eight States⁷ provide that, under these conditions, only one parent may receive an allowance, while Nevada denies it to both.

Adults.—The four States—Alaska, Arizona, the District of Columbia, and Nevada—that provide allowances for dependent adults differ as to the rela-

⁶ Arizona, Connecticut, Maryland, Michigan, Ohio, and Wyoming.

⁷ Alaska, Arizona, Connecticut, Maryland, Michigan, North Dakota, Ohio, and Wyoming.

tives for whom allowances may be granted and in the definition of dependency.

Each of these laws provides an allowance for a "dependent" wife. In Alaska, it is sufficient that a woman is the wife of the claimant and resides in Alaska, regardless of whether she is supported by her husband who claims benefits. In Arizona the wife must be living with the husband-claimant or receiving regular support from him; she cannot be regularly rendering services for remuneration or profit. Nevada grants an allowance for a wife who is not gainfully employed and is wholly or mainly supported by her husband-claimant. The District of Columbia, however, restricts allowances for a wife to one who is unable to work because of age or physical disability and is wholly or mainly supported by her husband-claimant.

These laws also authorize an allowance to a wife on behalf of a dependent husband. In Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Nevada the dependent husband must be physically unable to work and wholly or mainly supported by his wife. Arizona, however, provides an allowance for a dependent husband under conditions identical with those for a dependent wife, as outlined above.

All four laws grant an allowance for a dependent parent or stepparent; Arizona includes parents-in-law, and Alaska, the District of Columbia, and Nevada include brothers and sisters. Arizona provides allowances on behalf

of such relatives when they are wholly or mainly supported by the claimant, regardless of their ability to work; the other three States, only when such relatives are physically unable to work and are wholly or mainly supported by the claimant.

Amount of Allowance

The amount of the weekly allowance payable for each dependent, its maximum weekly amount, and the method of determining the weekly maximum vary from State to State. In each State, however, the dependent's allowance is added to the basic weekly benefit for which a claimant without dependents normally qualifies on the basis of prior earnings.

Allowances per dependent.—Eight States provide, nominally at least, a uniform allowance for each dependent up to a specified maximum amount. The allowance per dependent is \$3.00 in Connecticut, Nevada, and Wyoming; \$2.50 in Ohio; \$2.00 in Arizona, Maryland, and Massachusetts; and \$1.00 in the District of Columbia. Michigan⁸ and North Dakota pay an allowance of \$2.00 for the first dependent but vary the amount payable for two or more dependents with the amount of the basic weekly benefit, increasing the maximum allowance as the basic weekly benefit increases. In Alaska the allowance is 20 percent of the basic weekly benefit for each dependent up to a maximum of 60 percent for three or more dependents.

Some of the restrictions that the States place on the maximum allowance payable may reduce the allowance payable per dependent for those in the lower benefit brackets. The effect of these restrictions is considered below.

Restrictions on the maximum allowance payable.—All States restrict the maximum allowance payable (table 4). These limitations take four major forms. The simplest, found in three State laws, provides a uniform allowance for each dependent up to a specified number. Arizona, for example, pays \$2.00 for each dependent up to \$6.00 for three or more; Mary-

⁸ Except that, for claimants qualifying for the minimum basic benefit of \$6, a dependent's allowance is \$1 for all dependents.

land, \$2.00 per dependent up to \$8.00 for four or more; and Ohio, \$2.50 for each dependent up to \$5.00 for two or more.

The second method, used by five States, grades the maximum allowance with reference to the basic weekly benefit for which the claimant qualifies.⁹ The precise methods used and their practical significance vary. Connecticut, for example, pays a weekly allowance of \$3 for each dependent up to a maximum of \$12, subject, however, to the limitation that the allowance may not exceed 50 percent of the basic weekly benefit, rounded downward to the next lower dollar. Under the method used in Alaska, all beneficiaries who have up to three dependents receive an allowance for each, which approximates a uniform percentage of the basic weekly benefit.

Michigan and North Dakota have approached this problem through a schedule of dependents' allowances in which the maximum allowance varies not only with the basic weekly benefit but also with the number of dependents. In Michigan a \$2 weekly allowance for the first dependent is payable to all claimants who qualify for more than the minimum basic weekly benefit of \$6; those who qualify for a \$7 basic weekly benefit may receive not more than \$2 a week in allowances, regardless of the number of dependents; those eligible for a \$10 basic weekly benefit may receive \$2 a week for the first dependent and a maximum of \$4 a week for two or more; and those qualifying for a weekly benefit of \$17 or more, \$2 a week for each dependent up to four. The effect of the North Dakota restriction is similar, except that the maximum is \$6 a week for three or more dependents.

The general effect of the limitations based on the basic weekly benefit is to provide a larger allowance for dependents of claimants in the upper benefit brackets; the effect of the restriction in the District of Columbia is just the reverse. There the law provides a weekly allowance of \$1 per dependent up to a maximum of \$3 for three or more dependents, but subject to the limitation that the basic weekly bene-

⁹ Alaska, Connecticut, District of Columbia, Michigan, and North Dakota.

fit plus the allowance may not exceed \$20 a week. Under this formula, no claimant who qualifies for a basic benefit of \$20—the maximum—is eligible for an allowance, regardless of the number of dependents; only those who qualify for a basic benefit of \$17 a week or less are eligible for an allowance of \$3 a week for three or more dependents.

Nevada and Wyoming have developed a third method of limiting the maximum allowance—a limitation based on high-quarter earnings. Although both States authorize a maximum weekly allowance of \$3 for the first dependent—up to maximums of \$12 for four or more dependents in Nevada and of \$6 for two or more dependents in Wyoming—in neither State may the sum of the basic weekly benefit and allowance exceed a specified percentage of earnings during the high quarter. In Nevada, this ceiling is 6 percent; in Wyoming, 8 percent. The Nevada formula severely reduces the allowance payable to those who qualify for the lower basic weekly benefit amounts. Claimants qualifying for the minimum basic weekly benefit of \$8, for example, may be ineligible for any allowance or for one varying from \$1 to \$4 for one or more dependents, depending on the amount of their high-quarter earnings. Only those claimants who have earned \$567 or more during their quarter of highest earnings and who qualify for a basic benefit of \$23 or more are eligible for the maximum of \$12 for four dependents. The effect of the Wyoming restriction is similar but less drastic.

Massachusetts has still a fourth type of limitation. An allowance of \$2 a week is paid for each dependent child, subject only to the limitation that the basic weekly benefit plus the dependents' allowance may not exceed average weekly wages, rounded to the next higher dollar. Under the Massachusetts law, basic weekly benefits are approximately 1/20 of high-quarter earnings. If a claimant has worked in only 1 calendar quarter, his "weekly wage" is obtained by dividing total earnings for this quarter by 13. If, however, he has worked in 2 or more quarters, the earnings in the 2 highest quarters are divided by 26 to obtain his "weekly wage."

The general effect of these limita-

tions, except those that vary the allowances only with the number of dependents, is to restrict, for claimants qualifying for the lower basic weekly benefit amounts, the number of dependents for whom allowances are payable. Their practical significance, however, depends on the proportion of claimants who qualify for the maximum basic weekly benefit and for the lower weekly benefits affected by the restrictions.

Miscellaneous Provisions

Most State laws provide that dependents' allowances are payable in addition to the basic weekly benefit and that they have no effect in determining the total amount of benefit, as expressed in dollars, for which a claimant is potentially eligible during his benefit year. Alaska and Maryland, however, are two exceptions.

Alaska includes sums received as dependents' allowances in the maximum potential amount of benefits a claimant may receive in a year. This provision, in effect, reduces the maximum number of weeks during which a beneficiary may receive his basic benefit, supplemented by an allowance. And, of course, the greater the allowance, the greater the reduction in the potential weeks of benefit.

In Maryland the potential duration of benefits for persons receiving an allowance is affected by the formula for determining maximum potential duration. This formula provides that the total amount of benefits that beneficiaries may receive in a year is the lesser of: (1) 26 times the basic weekly benefit, supplemented by allowances; or (2) one-fourth of earnings from insured work during the 1-year base period. Under the second half of this formula, a claimant who has earned \$2,600 in the 1-year base period and who qualifies for a \$25 basic benefit is eligible to receive this benefit for a maximum of 26 weeks. If this same claimant, however, is eligible for an \$8 allowance for four dependent children, his maximum duration is reduced to between 19 and 20 weeks.

State Experience

The variations in statutory provisions obviously contribute to the dif-

Table 2.—Number of beneficiaries entitled to dependents' allowances and percent entitled to allowances for specified types of dependents, by sex of beneficiary, four States,¹ April-June 1950

[Corrected to Sept. 15, 1950]

State and sex	Number of beneficiaries entitled to dependents' allowances	Percent entitled to dependents' allowances for—					
		Dependent children under age limit			Dependent spouse and no children under age limit	1 or more dependent parents or step-parents	Other dependents
		Total	With dependent spouse	Without dependent spouse			
Total.....	3,912	72.1	32.3	39.9	22.1	7.1	0.5
Alaska.....	504	72.8	31.3	41.5	26.0	1.0	.2
Arizona.....	2,103	70.6	40.7	29.9	23.0	8.9	(?)
District of Columbia.....	860	82.0	3.6	78.4	8.5	9.9	2.1
Nevada.....	445	59.8	48.8	11.0	40.2	-----	-----
Men.....	3,079	69.5	39.9	29.6	26.2	7.2	.6
Alaska.....	358	64.8	41.9	22.9	35.8	1.4	.3
Arizona.....	1,677	67.9	49.8	18.0	26.6	7.9	(?)
District of Columbia.....	634	82.8	4.7	78.1	10.9	13.4	2.8
Nevada.....	410	59.8	52.2	7.6	40.2	-----	-----
Women.....	833	81.9	3.8	78.0	7.0	6.6	-----
Alaska.....	146	92.5	5.5	87.0	2.1	-----	-----
Arizona.....	426	81.2	4.7	76.5	8.7	12.9	(?)
District of Columbia.....	226	79.6	.4	79.2	1.8	-----	-----
Nevada.....	35	60.0	8.6	51.4	40.0	-----	-----

¹ The only States that allow benefits for dependents other than children.

² Not applicable.

ferences in State experience in the proportion of beneficiaries who qualify for allowances, in the number of dependents for whom allowances are payable, and in the extent to which allowances increase the basic weekly benefit.

Entitled Beneficiaries

Nineteen percent of the total number of beneficiaries (333,800) in these 11 States were entitled to dependents' allowances during April-June 1950. This proportion varied markedly among the States, ranging from a high of 57.0 percent in Arizona to a low of 13.6 percent in Massachusetts (table 1). The proportion of the men beneficiaries entitled to an allowance is more useful than the total figure for comparative purposes and is a better guide to the operation of these provisions because of two factors. First, women members of the labor force, who generally have fewer "dependents" than the men, account for varying proportions of the beneficiaries, ranging in the quarter from a high of 49 percent in Massachusetts to a low of 20 percent in North Dakota and Wyoming. Secondly, when both husband and wife are insured, the children are the dependents of the father more frequently than of the mother, under the definitions of dependency

in the State unemployment insurance laws. The following discussion, therefore, is based on the percentage of men beneficiaries eligible for an allowance.

The proportion of men beneficiaries eligible for a dependent's allowance varied from a low of 15.1 percent in Alaska to a high of 67.1 percent in Arizona in April-June 1950 (table 1). These variations do not appear to be explained by the type of dependents for whom allowances are payable in the different States. The percentage of male beneficiaries who were eligible for a dependent's allowance in April-June 1950 was not consistently higher in the four States that provide allowances for both children and adults, for example, than among the seven States that limit allowances to dependent children. Among these seven States the proportion of male beneficiaries who were entitled to an allowance during this quarter did not vary directly with the requirement concerning the maximum age of the children for whom an allowance was payable. In Connecticut, for example, which limits allowances to children under 16 years of age, 30.4 percent of the men beneficiaries were eligible for an allowance, as contrasted with 24.5 percent in Massachusetts, which pays allowances for children under age 18.

In Michigan, which has the same age limit as Massachusetts, the corresponding percentage was 43.3 percent.

It has been suggested that these differences in the proportion of men beneficiaries who were eligible for an allowance reflect differences among the States in the average number of children under age 18 per male labor-force member. Thus, in Michigan, male members of the labor force were estimated to have had in 1940 an average of 0.7 children under 18; in Massachusetts and Connecticut, an average of 0.5.¹⁰ The State differences in the average number of children under age 18 per male labor-force member are relatively slight, however, and do not appear adequate to explain the much greater variations in the proportion of male beneficiaries who were eligible for an allowance on behalf of children under the specified age. In Connecticut and Massachusetts, for example, the average number of children under age 18 per male worker was identical. Despite this agreement and despite the fact that in Massachusetts an allowance is payable for dependent children under age 18, whereas Connecticut restricts such payments to those under age 16, a larger proportion of the men beneficiaries were eligible for an allowance in Connecticut than in Massachusetts.

In comparison with this factor, the various limitations on the maximum allowance payable and the different definitions of dependency probably play a greater part in the disparity among the States in the proportion of beneficiaries eligible for an allowance and in the number of dependents for whom allowances are payable.

The District of Columbia's experience illustrates the effect of the first type of statutory provision. Only 28.4 percent of the male beneficiaries were entitled to an allowance for either a dependent adult or a child during April-June 1950. Only three other States had lower proportions—Alaska, which also provides allowances for both adult and child dependents, and Maryland and Massachusetts, which grant allowances only for children

¹⁰ Marvin Bloom, "The Dependents of Workers: Selected Data on Numbers and Types," *Social Security Bulletin*, January 1949.

under age 16 and 18, respectively. In the District of Columbia, the \$20 limitation on the maximum amount payable excluded from all possibility of an allowance 48.2 percent of the new insured claimants who qualified for a basic benefit of \$20 during April-June 1950. This limitation, in effect, restricts allowances to claimants who qualify for the lower weekly benefits and who generally are the lower paid and younger workers. Though many of these workers may be unmarried and without a dependent wife or child, some may have dependent parents or brothers or sisters.

Variations in the State definition of dependency may affect the number of "dependent" relatives and also the proportion of beneficiaries who qualify for an allowance. Arizona and North Dakota illustrate some of the effects of these differences. Under the definitions of dependent children adopted by these two States, it is probable that some children under 18 years of age might meet the test of living in the household of the parent-claimant yet could not satisfy the more usual requirement that they were wholly or mainly supported by him. In North Dakota the proportion of men beneficiaries who qualified for an allowance is relatively high—38.1 percent—and that in Arizona—67.1 percent—is the highest in the country (table 1). The exceptionally high percentage of women beneficiaries in these two States who qualified for an allowance

is even more striking. Among the seven States that provide an allowance for dependent children only, North Dakota reported the largest proportion of women beneficiaries qualifying for an allowance—19.4 percent—a figure more than twice the corresponding proportion for any other State in the group. Similarly, the 35.9 percent of the women beneficiaries who qualified for an allowance in Arizona was more than twice the proportion in any of the other three States in the group that pays an allowance for adult dependents. Since more than four-fifths of the allowances for which women beneficiaries in Arizona qualified were payable for children (table 2), it seems probable that the Arizona definition of dependent children makes it easier for working mothers to claim their children as dependents than in other States.

The effect of a restrictive definition of a dependent is illustrated by Alaska, which lays down the simple requirement that a "dependent" must reside in Alaska. It is probable that this requirement, under conditions prevailing in Alaska, precludes payment of allowances on behalf of some persons for whom they would be payable in other jurisdictions.

The Dependents

Relationship to the claimant.—Allowances were paid exclusively for children in seven States. In the four States that provide allowances for both dependent children and adults (table 2), 72.1 percent of the 3,900 beneficiaries receiving an allowance in April-June 1950 received it on behalf of children (whether or not an allowance for a dependent spouse was also included). Thus, regardless of statutory differences, allowances were payable predominantly for children.

Number of dependents for whom allowances were payable.—Among the 64,600 men and women beneficiaries who qualified for an allowance during April-June 1950, 43.4 percent were eligible for an allowance for one dependent only; 36.4 percent for two dependents; 12.2 percent for three dependents; and 8.0 percent for four or more (table 3).

The proportion of beneficiaries who were eligible for an allowance but

Table 3.—Number of beneficiaries entitled to dependents' allowances and percentage distribution by number of dependents, 11 States, April-June 1950

State	Number of beneficiaries	Percentage distribution by specified number of dependents				
		1	2	3	4	5 or more
Total..	64,615	43.4	36.4	12.2	6.6	1.4
Alaska.....	504	39.9	22.6	37.5
Ariz.....	2,103	38.8	24.4	36.9
Conn.....	5,073	46.5	32.5	13.6	7.4
Dist. of Col.....	860	51.6	27.9	20.5
Md.....	8,614	40.7	28.8	15.9	14.7
Mass.....	21,514	46.3	30.0	13.8	5.9	4.1
Mich.....	10,312	40.3	32.4	14.6	12.8
Nev.....	445	46.1	25.4	18.0	10.6
N. Dak.....	338	34.6	26.3	39.1
Ohio.....	14,254	42.8	57.2
Wyo.....	598	33.4	66.6

who were entitled on the basis of only one dependent varied from 33.4 percent in Wyoming to 51.6 percent in the District of Columbia. The reasons for these differences are not always clear. It seems probable that Nevada's high percentage (46.1 percent) is due in some measure to the fact that 40.2 percent of the men eligible for an allowance were entitled on behalf of a dependent wife with no dependent children. In Nevada, a wife is considered a dependent when she is not gainfully employed and is wholly or mainly supported by her husband-claimant.

The District of Columbia recorded the largest proportion of beneficiaries eligible for an allowance who were entitled for only one dependent (51.6 percent). In contrast to the situation in Nevada, only 10.9 percent of the men qualified on the basis of a dependent wife, and 16.2 percent qualified on the basis of other adult dependents. Only 4.7 percent qualified for an allowance based on a dependent wife and children, as compared with 52.2 percent in Nevada. The small proportion of men beneficiaries in the District of Columbia who were eligible for an allowance on behalf of a dependent wife is probably due to the fact that a wife is considered a dependent only when she is physically unable to work and is wholly or mainly supported by her husband-claimant. Thus, a male beneficiary who supports a nongainfully employed wife and one dependent child generally would be eligible for an allowance only on behalf of the dependent child; the proportion eligible for an allowance on behalf of only one dependent is thus increased. The effect of the definition of a dependent wife in increasing the proportion of beneficiaries who qualify for an allowance on the basis of only one dependent is sharpened by the \$20 ceiling for basic benefit plus allowance.

In Ohio and Wyoming the unusually large proportions of the beneficiaries eligible for an allowance who were entitled to allowances for two dependents (57.2 and 66.6 percent, respectively) reflect the provisions in these States that restrict allowances to a maximum of two dependents.

Among the nine States that provide allowances for three or more depend-

Table 4.—Selected data on dependents' allowances, 11 States, April-June 1950

State	Minimum and maximum dependents' allowance	Average basic weekly benefit for beneficiaries receiving dependents' allowances	Increase resulting from dependents' allowances	
			Average weekly amount	Percentage increase
All States		\$22.90	\$4.06	17.7
Alaska	20-60 percent of basic benefit (\$2-\$15)	24.15	9.18	38.0
Arizona	\$2-\$6	18.71	3.99	21.3
Connecticut	\$3-\$12, but not more than 50 percent of basic weekly benefit.	21.01	6.09	29.0
District of Columbia	\$1-\$3, but sum of allowance and basic benefit may not exceed \$20.	14.80	1.56	10.5
Maryland	\$2-\$8	21.33	4.04	18.9
Massachusetts	\$2 for each dependent, but sum of allowance and basic benefit may not exceed "weekly wage."	23.87	3.63	15.2
Michigan	\$2-\$8 (schedule) ¹	23.49	4.06	17.3
Nevada	0-\$12, but sum of allowance and basic benefit may not exceed 6 percent of high-quarter wages.	23.53	5.79	24.6
North Dakota	\$2-\$6 (schedule)	18.56	4.12	22.2
Ohio	\$2.50-\$5.00	22.80	3.95	17.3
Wyoming	0-\$6, but sum of allowance and basic benefit may not exceed 8 percent of high-quarter wages.	24.42	4.93	20.2

¹ \$2 minimum for all basic benefit amounts above the \$6 minimum basic benefit, for which \$1 is payable, regardless of the number of dependents.

ents, the proportion of beneficiaries eligible for an allowance on the basis of three or more dependents varied as shown in the following tabulation.

State	Percent of beneficiaries eligible for allowances, qualifying on basis of three or more dependents, April-June 1950	Allowances payable in behalf of—	
		Dependent children under specified age	Dependent adult relative
Alaska	37.5	18	x
Arizona	36.9	18	x
Connecticut	21.0	16	-----
District of Columbia	20.5	16	x
Maryland	30.6	16	-----
Massachusetts	23.8	18	-----
Michigan	27.4	18	-----
Nevada	28.6	16	x
North Dakota	39.1	18	-----

These proportions, significantly, did not vary with the scope of the provisions governing the type of dependents for whom allowances are payable. The proportion was highest in North Dakota, which provides allowances only for dependent children under age 18, and lowest in the District of Columbia, where allowances are payable for dependent children under age 16 and adult dependents.

The high percentage in North Dakota may be the result not only of the unusually large average number of children under age 18 per male labor-force member, estimated at 0.9 for 1940,¹¹ but also of the very liberal

¹¹ Ibid.

definition of child dependents. In addition, North Dakota pays an allowance to all claimants who have three dependents and who are eligible for a basic benefit of \$11 or over. Alaska and Arizona, which provide allowances for both dependent children and adults, had the next highest proportions (37.5 percent and 36.9 percent, respectively). The extension of allowances to adult dependents, combined with the very liberal definition of some dependents, probably contributed to this result. An additional factor is that, under both laws, an allowance is payable for three dependents without any restriction being imposed.

The District of Columbia had the lowest proportion (20.5 percent) of beneficiaries receiving allowances on behalf of three or more dependents, which may reflect its strict definition of a dependent wife. Under this definition, only a small proportion of men beneficiaries, eligible for an allowance, qualified for an allowance for a dependent wife with children (4.7 percent), as compared with proportions nearly 9 to 11 times greater in other States that have a more liberal definition (table 3). More important, however, is the effect of the ceiling of \$20 for basic benefit plus allowances in curtailing the number of dependents for whom an allowance is payable.

Average Amount of Dependents' Allowances

Dependents' allowances in these 11 States added \$4.06 to the average basic benefit (\$22.90) of beneficiaries receiving an allowance in April-June 1950 (table 4).

The experience of individual States differed, however, due to variations in the amount of the allowance for the first dependent, the maximum payable, and the number of dependents on whose behalf allowances were paid. In general, the larger the allowance for the first dependent, the greater the monetary increase. Among States with the same allowance for the first dependent, the monetary increase varied with the maximum number of dependents for whom allowances are payable, the effect of special limitations, and the number of dependents per beneficiary.

The largest monetary and percentage increase occurred in Alaska; it is probable that most of the beneficiaries receiving an allowance qualified for the maximum benefit of \$25.00, since the average basic benefit was \$24.15. Beneficiaries qualifying for this maximum, therefore, received \$5.00 for each dependent.

As a group, the three States that pay an allowance of \$3.00 for the first dependent had the next largest monetary increase, varying from \$6.09 in Connecticut to \$4.93 in Wyoming,

where allowances are payable for a maximum of two dependents.

Among the four States that pay a benefit of \$2.00 for the first dependent, the largest monetary increase (\$4.12) occurred in North Dakota despite the fact that allowances in this State are payable for a maximum of three dependents, as compared with four in Maryland and Michigan and an unlimited number in Massachusetts. North Dakota's greater increase is probably due to the relatively smaller proportions of beneficiaries, eligible for an allowance, who qualified on the basis of one and two dependents and the unusually high proportion who qualified on the basis of three dependents (table 3). In Massachusetts, where the increase was least, a relatively large proportion qualified on the basis of only one dependent and a small proportion were eligible for allowances on behalf of three or more.

In the District of Columbia, the monetary increase was less than in any other State, not only because of the smaller allowance for each dependent but also because it had the highest proportion of beneficiaries, eligible for an allowance, who were entitled for only one dependent and the smallest proportion eligible on the basis of three or more.

Cost of Dependents' Allowances

Although dependents' allowances increased the weekly benefit of those

receiving them by an average of 17.7 percent in April-June 1950, the increase in the average weekly benefit of all beneficiaries was only 4.6 percent. This smaller increase in the average weekly benefit of all beneficiaries is due, of course, to the fact that only 19.4 percent of the beneficiaries were entitled to an allowance during this quarter. The increase in the weekly benefit of all beneficiaries represents the average increase in benefit expenditures resulting from the provision of dependents' allowances.

The increase in benefit expenditures varied among the States from a minimum of 0.9 percent in the District of Columbia to a maximum of 12.1 percent in Arizona. These differences, of course, reflect the disparity in the average allowance, in the percentage by which the average allowance increased the average basic benefit, and in the proportion of all beneficiaries eligible for an allowance. In the District of Columbia, for example, 23.8 percent of all beneficiaries were entitled to an allowance that, on the average, increased the average basic benefit of those receiving an allowance by \$1.56 or 10.5 percent. In Arizona, by contrast, 57.0 percent of all beneficiaries were eligible for an allowance that, on the average, increased the basic benefit of those receiving an allowance by \$3.99 or 21.3 percent.