#### **DOCUMENT RESUME**

ED 298 024

SO 019 199

**AUTHOR** 

Cantor, Muriel G.

TITLE

Employment Status of Performing Artists, 1970-1980.

Prepared for the Research Division, National

Endowment for the Arts.

SPONS AGENCY

National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, DC.

Research Div.

PUB DATE

Dec 87

CONTRACT

NEA-C86-205

NOTE

235p.

**PUB TYPE** 

Statistical Data (110) -- Reports -

Research/Technical (143)

**EDRS PRICE** 

MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.

**DESCRIPTORS** 

Art; \*Artists; Census Figures; Dance; \*Economic Change; Economic Factors; Economic Opportunities;

Economic Status; Employment; Employment

Opportunities; Employment Patterns; Employment Statistics; Musicians; Social Science Research; \*Socioeconomic Influences; \*Socioeconomic Status;

Statistical Analysis; \*Theater Arts

**IDENTIFIERS** 

Bureau of the Census

#### **ABSTRACT**

This report describes and analyzes the socioeconomic characteristics of performing artists in the fields of acting, dancing, and music who were employed during both 1970 and 1980. Using U.S. Census Bureau data, emphasis is placed on socioeconomic changes that occurred during this decade. The report consists of specific sections devoted to each of these occupations, an overview and summary of findings, and a review of research methodology. Findings indicate that: (1) except for dancing, women and minorities are not represented in the performing arts in numbers proportionate to their representation in the general population; (2) performing artists have had to subsidize their earnings through either full-time or part-time jobs; (3) except for a very few performers, the performing arts! occupations are low-paying; (4) no formal education requirements existed for entry into the profession; and (5) while performing jobs require migration, employment opportunities were rather evenly distributed throughout the United States. The bulk of the report consists of 80 appended tables supplying parallel data for each of the 2 years studied. Twenty-two references are also included. (JHP)

#### 

- \* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
  - from the original document.



PREPARED FOR THE RESEARCH DIVISION NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

MURIEL G. CANTOR, PH.D.

U S DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reProduction quality
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CONTRACT NO. C86-205

DECEMBER 1987

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

30 Ø1919



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION		1
SECTION I	ACTORS (1970) AND ACTOR/DIRECTORS (1980)	8
SECTION II	DANCERS (1970 -1980)	16
SECTION III	MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS (1970 - 1980)	22
SUMMARY AND OVERVIE	₩	29
METHODOLOGICAL PROB	LEMS AND SUGGESTIONS	36
NOTES		46
REFERENCES		49
APPENDIX (TABLES)		
TITLE	1970	NUMBER
ACTORS	AGE BY GENDER BY MINORITY STATUS	70- 1
DANCERS	AGE BY GENDER BY MINORITY STATUS	70- 2
	AGE BY GENDER BY MINORITY STATUS	70- 3
ACTORS	AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER	70- 4
	AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER	70- 5
	AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER	70- 6
ACTORS	EDUCATION BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	70- 7
DANCERS	2000111201 21 02112211 21 11111121	70- E
	EDUCATION BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	70- 5
ACTORS	EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE,	70.47
	BLACK AND OTHER	70-10
DANCERS	EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE,	70-11
	BLACK AND OTHER	70-11
MUSICIAN/CUMPUSERS	EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE.	70-12
407000	BLACK AND OTHER	70-12
ACTORS DANCERS	HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	70-14
	HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	70-15
ACTORS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1969	
DANCERS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1969	
	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1969	
ACTORS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND	
ACTORS	OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	70-19
DANCERS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND	
DANCENO	OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	70-20
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK	
	AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	70-2
ACTORS	PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER, BY WHITE, BLACK, AND	-
	OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	70-22
DANCERS	PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER, BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	
	AND EMPLOYMENT STATIS	70-2



MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS		70-24
	AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	70-24
ACTORS	WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	70-25
DANCERS	WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND	
	OTHER	70-26
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS	WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND	
THE STATE OF THE S	OTHER	70-27
ACTORS	INCOME BY GENDER BY AGE	70-28
	INCOME BY GENDER BY AGE	70-29
	INCOME BY GENDER BY AGE	70-30
ACTORS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1969	70-31
DANCERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1969	70-32
	INCOME BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1969	70-33
ACTORS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND BY	70 55
HCTURS	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	70-34
DANCERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHE	70-34
DHNLERS	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	70-35
MUCTOTAN /COMPOSEDS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND BY	70-00
MUSICIAN/CUMPUSERS	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	70-06
ACTORE	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS	70-37
ACTORS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS	70-38
DANCERS		70-39
	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS	70-39
	INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES	70-40
MUSICIAN-COMPOSER		
	•	
	1980	
ACTORS	AGE BY GENDER BY MINORITY STATUS	80- 1
DANCERS	AGE BY GENDER BY MINORITY STATUS	80- 2
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS		B0- 3
ACTORS	AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER	BO- 4
DANCERS	AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER	80- 5
	AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER	80- 6
ACTORS	EDUCATION BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	80- 7
DANCERS	EDUCATION BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	80- B
	EDUCATION BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	80- 9
ACTORS	EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE.	
	BLACK AND OTHER	80-10
DANCERS	EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE.	
	BLACK AND OTHER	80-11
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS	EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE,	_, _,
,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	BLACK AND OTHER	80-12
ACTORS	HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	80-13
DANCERS	HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	80-14
	HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	80-15
ACTORS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1979	
DANCERS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1979	
	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1979	80-18
ACTORS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1979 INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND	80-18
ACTORS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1979 INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	80-18



DANCERS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND	
	OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	80-20
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS	INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK	
	AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	80-21
ACTORS	PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER, BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	
	AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	80-22
DANCERS	PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER, BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	
	AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	80-23
MUSIC#AN/COMPOSERS	PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER, BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER	
	AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS	80-24
ACTORS	WEEKS WORKED IN 1979 BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND	
	OTHER	80-25
DANCERS	WEEKS WORKED IN 1979 BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND	
	OTHER	80-26
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS	WEEKS WORKED IN 1979 BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND	
	OTHER	80-27
ACTORS	INCOME BY GENDER BY AGE	80-28
DANCERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY AGE	80-29
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY AGE	80-30
ACTORS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1979	80-31
DANCERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1979	80-32
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1979	80-33
ACTORS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND BY	
	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	80-34
DANCERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND BY	
	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	80-35
MUSICIAN/COMFOSERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND BY	
	EMPLOYMENT STATUS	80-36
ACTORS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS	80-37
DANCERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS	80-38
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS	INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS	80-39
ACTORS-DIR/DANCERS/	INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES	80-40



MUSICIAN-COMPOSERS

This report describes and analyzes the socio-economic characteristics of performing artists, the actors, dancers and musicians who were working in 1970 and 1980, and how they changed over the decade.1

The report will consist of a section on each occupation, an introduction describing the data bases that were used, an overview and summary of the findings, followed by a critical review of extant methodology and an Appendix with the Tables generated from the source tapes provided by the NEA Research Division.

- o Introduction
- o Section I Actors (1970) and Actor/Directors (1980)
- o Section II Dancers (1970 1980)
- o Section III Musicians/Composers (1970 -1980)
- o Summary and Overview
- o Methodological Problems and Suggestions
- o Appendix (Tables)

The Sections describe the occupational, income, residential, etc. status at particular times (1970 and 1980) for the three groups. Although membership in each group had undoubtedly changed over the intervening years, the data where possible were analyzed as though drawn for particular cohorts. Also, in addition to presenting findings in toto, the analysis will rely principally (as did Ellis, e.g. 1987) on data taken from cross-tabbed membersets linking gender (sex), ethnicity, income, employment status, etc. in different combinations (see Tables). Thus, the income and work experience of older black female musicians, for example,



will be compared with those of younger white male ones. The Tables were generated from source tapes provided by the NEA Research Division. In addition, data will be used from publications on the 1970 and 1980 Census and other interim and periodic reports from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the NEA Research Division.

### INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Data for this report are primarily from the long form questionnaires (20 percent, 15 percent and 5 percent samples) used in both the 1970 and 1980 decennial census by the Bureau of the Census. The data were and still are collected for numerous reasons vital to the public and private sectors. However, although (to be explained) the occupation I and industrial data on performing artists obtained from Federal sources are not adequate to estimate their numbers as supply in the labor force and availability for work, they do help in projecting the demand for their talents and skills. One source of difficulty is the problem that groups with small memberships create for national sampling in terms of cost and logistics. The actual numbers of performing artists in the general population are so small that unless very large samples are drawn, the few there are may be under-selected, thereby leading to false conclusions about their locations, activities and status. For example, just 1,085,693 persons (1.04 percent of the experienced civilian labor force) were found for the eleven arts-related occupations in the 1980 Census, probably a minimum estimate rather than a realistic



approximation of their actual numbers in the population (Footnote #1; Ellis 1984, Tables 1 and A1). The number of performing arts workers was reported at less than a quarter million. However, in spite of the sampling error inherent in finding and sampling such small groups, the data the Bureau provides are still the single best empirical resource to discover how artist-workers behave in comparison with other workers in the labor force and how they are utilized in the American economy.

The way in which the Census Bureau defines participation in the labor force might also contribute to an under-count of persons with performing talents and skills: just those who earn their principal income at acting, dancing or music are included. Not listed are the "semi-pro's" --- those with principal incomes from other occupations but who are paid to act in community playhouses, for example, or sing in barber-shop quartets or play in jazz combos. There are also amateurs, in the labor force or not, such as retirees and housewives, who perform or pursue artistic crafts and talents as hobbies. From that perspective, the "official" estimates of those who could earn income at arts-related activities would be both low and inaccurate.

As noted, the focus of this report is on just three of the arts-related occupations: Actors (in 1980, Actors and Directors); Dancers; and Musicians (in both 1970 and 1980, Musicians and Composers). 2 Although questions could be raised why the Bureau of the Census uses certain procedures, categories and definitions to collect and report data on the labor force, the data on the



Artistic Occupations in particular, especially on performing artists, are probably the most problematic. 3 Some of the difficulty arises from the necessity of parceling out space for all the tables needed in Census reports. Consequently, the Bureau can avoid too many separate reporting categories as well as gain reliability by assembling workers with similar talents and skills into larger reporting groups, no matter how diverse the job titles. Strip teasers are grouped with ballet dancers, radio producers with vaudeville actors, and church organists with guitar players and opera stars. 4 However, the resulting groups as composites of diverging backgrounds, training and work settings make it difficult if not impossible to describe the different occupational titles involved.

In addition to the decennial Census, the Bureau of the Census collects monthly data, known as the Current Population Survey (the CPS), for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, Department of Labor, by interviewing samples of approximately 60,000 households. Although the questionnaire used for the CPS resembles the longer form used for the decennial Census, again, 60,000 are too few households to provide reliable statistics on the participation of, for example, members of the smaller minority groups in the performing occupations. In addition, the steps required for gathering and coding the data could lead to further loss in accuracy. First, the occupational information that the field interviewers obtain may not be reliable. The coders then use the information which in some cases may be faulty to assign



those in the household to an occupation title and employment status. Those with two or more jobs are assigned to the occupation at which they work the greater number of hours. For example, a music student working more hours as a part-time sales clerk would be included in the CPS as a clerk even though he or she may be earning more money from playing weekends in bands. It is also possible that as students and without full-time jobs, they could be ignored as active participants of the labor force. There is room on the survey forms for just brief descriptive responses to questions on "the kind of work done" and "the most important activities or duties on the job." As a consequence, the coders, handicapped by inadequate responses, may leave out of the employed labor force bona-fide part-time performing artists or those still seeking their first jobs as performers. Borderline or ambiguous occupational status such as co-existing jobs or hobbies from which income is earned cannot be accommodated. It is also not possible to determine whether performers who are not working as performers but are working at other jobs, have left their occupation permanently or just temporarily. 5 However, unlike the Census which is mostly self-administered, data from the monthly CPS are still considered more reliable because they are obtained through direct interviews.

In spite of these concerns, government, academic and union social scientists and economists still consider the information on employment and unemployment given in the Census and CPS basic to understanding the state of the economy and essential to



understanding employment trends and planning labor policy. The data also make it possible to demonstrate how opportunities for work in the various industrial sectors for performers increase or decrease over time, or could change in the future (Bradshaw 1986). For example, while the size of the experienced labor force increased between 1970 and 1980, the increase did not occur evenly throughout the economy. It occurred principally in the sectors serving the public, including the performing arts, not in those involved in basic production, such as Agriculture and Manufacturing.

The purpose of this report is to describe performing artists who were active members of the civilian labor force. The civilian labor force is the total of all classified as employed or unemployed. To provide a basis for comparison, the social and employment characteristics of women and minorities will be compared with those of the white male majority working in each of the performing arts groups. Although data more recent than 1980 are available from the CPS, they will not be used because as noted, its sample of approximately 60,000 households is too small to enable detailed analysis of smaller components of the labor force such as performing artists, and especially, reliable analysis of even smaller categories such as minority representation.

## Problems Encountered in Comparing 1980 to 1970 Data

The Bureau of the Census made changes in how it classified the performing arts occupations when it adopted the Standard



Occupational Classification System for the 1980 census. One could still compare data directly for Dancers and Musicians/Composers over the decade because their occupational categories did not change, However, when Actors were combined with Directors, the opportunity was lost for tracking acting as a separate occupation and studying its changing status over time. (Directors were denied study as a separate occupation both in 1970 and 1980 because in 1970 they were in a catch-all category called Writers, Artists and Entertainers, Not elsewhere classified.) For example, Table 1 shows that the performing arts groups increased in size over the 10 year period but it was no longer possible to determine how much of the growth could be attributed to either the Actors and Directors as separate groups.

TABLE 1

PERFORMING ARTISTS IN THE EXPERIENCED LABOR FORCE - 1970 AND 1980

COUNT : 1970 PERF. ARTISTS COUNT : 1980 PERF. ARTISTS

ACTORS 14,140 : ACTORS AND DIRECTORS 67,180 MUSICIANS & COMPOSERS 96,537 : MUSICIANS & COMPOSERS 140,556 DANCERS 6,924 : DANCERS 13,194

Source - Table 1, Bradshaw 1984.

To resolve questions such as these, the Bureau selected a sample of 120,000 cases from the 1970 census and recoded them according to the 1980 occupational classification system. When the category of Actors/Directors was reconstructed, the combined total increased to a hypothetical 41,536. If the original total



for just Actors had been used, the percentage of increase to the 1980 total for Actors/Directors would have been a phenomenal 375 percent! However, the increased (adjusted) total of 41,536 gives a growth rate of 62 percent, an increase more compatible with that for the entire Artist category, 51 percent (Bradshaw 1984, Table 3).6 However, such attempts at reconstruction, no matter how ingenious, must remain speculative unless the original Census data filed for the Actors in 1980 could be isolated for separate analysis.

Although most of the major data and findings have already been made available by other sources, when possible, this Report the data found in the Tables in the Appendix.7 Where necessary, data from other (referenced) sources will be used to supplement data missing from the Tables. (Unless otherwise essential to the discussion, percentages will be rounded.)

## SECTION I--ACTORS AND ACTOR/DIRECTORS

The 1970 census showed 14,140 actors in the experienced civilian labor force, 8,213 (58 percent) males and 5,927 (42 percent) female. It was neither predominantly a male or female occupation. The unemployment rate for actors was also the highest for performing artists in the experienced labor force at the time, 33.4 percent, compared to 14.7 for dancers and 6.75 for musicians/composers (1970 Subject Reports, Table 51). Just 10 percent of actors, 12 percent of the males and 7 percent of the females were self-employed so that the vast majority had to work



for public or private organizations and enterprises (1970 Subject Reports , Table 43). The Theatre/Motion Picture and Radio/TV industrial sectors provided the bulk of employment for actors and the Theatre/Motion Picture and Eating/Drinking Place sectors for dancers. One must look to their structures as entertainment industries to explain why unemployment rates were so much higher for actors and dancers than for musicians. All three offer just limited work assignments which lead to higher labor turnover. As Bert Freed, then a member of the Board of the Screen Actors Guild, testified to a Congressional Subcommittee in 1971: "...on an average day something over 95 percent of all actors in the United States are unemployed. On an annual basis, 75 percent earn under \$2,500. No more than 10 percent [of SAG members]...earn \$10,000 a year or more..." (Hearings 1971, p. 45). Consequently, for the reasons already cited, the figures reported for unemployment are probably underestimates. Except for the few actors associated with permanent repertory companies or longrunning plays or television shows like soap operas, most work is seasonal (like summer theatre) or otherwise temporary. Even famous actors, for example, work for just the time it takes to film the scene, in which they will appear. Thus, jobs are not only scarce, but there is an over-supply of actors seeking the jobs and television and film producers and directors are free to choose from that enormous supply to fill the few they have available. The impossibility of balancing labor supply with job demand is reflected both in the figures on their unemployment and



in the number of weeks they worked. Male actors worked a median of just 37.9 weeks in 1969, and female actors even less, 28.5 weeks (1970 Subject Reports, Table 1). Just one in four male actors was able to work 50-52 weeks in 1969, 24 percent, and less than one in five females, 17 percent (Table 70-16).

The median age for male actors in 1970 was 35.1 and for females, 34.8, which would suggest that overall the male actors were older (1970 Subject Reports, Table 1). However, using just medians can be deceptive. For example, according to Table 70-1 which compares male and female actors by race and 5-year age intervals, the highest percentage for minority female actors in the 16 to 24 year bracket, 33 percent, was higher than that for all males, 21. However, skipping over the 30 to 34 bracket (just 8 percent), 25 percent of the minority females were between 35 and 39 years of age, twice the percentage for all males, 12.

Looking at median years of school completed, it appeared in 1970 that male actors were better educated than females, 14.5 vs. 13.8 (1970 Subject Reports, Table 1). This was due primarily to more males finishing 4 years of college or more, 38 percent vs. 28 percent for women (Table 70-7). However, both genders had become better educated by 1980, with more females finishing college. The percentage of males finishing college increased to 59 in 1980 while that for females doubled to 55 percent, nearly equal to the males (Table 80-7). The percentage of males who had not finished high school also dropped from 10 in 1970 to 3 in



1980, and for females, from 8.4 percent to 3.4 (Tables 70-7, 80-7). It should be noted that this interest in higher education did not mean that advanced degrees had become a requirement for obtaining acting jobs. Rather, for those who could not afford or did not have access to private acting studios in metropolitan areas, college drama departments throughout the United States filled the function of trade schools for aspiring actors and actresses.

Male actors earned more money than actresses in 1969. the median for men, \$6816, and for women, \$5021 (1970 Subject Reports, Table 1).8 The data in Table 70-37 confirm that men had higher earnings because nearly half of the males, 48 percent, earned more than \$10,000 that year while just one in four females, 26 percent, earned that much. However, the median figures also conceal differences in income in favor of higher earnings for women. For example, less than 2 percent of male actors (all white) earned over \$60,000 in 1969 but 5 percent of all female actresses (8 percent from other minorities) earned that much (Tables 70-34, 37).9

Acting was predominantly a white occupation in 1970 and still was in 1980. The percentage of white males was 52.5 percent in 1970 and, for females, 93.2 percent, with the largest minority group Black, 7.1 percent males and 5.1 percent females (Table 70-4). Although a few actors were reported as belonging to other minority groups such as American Indian and Chinese, their numbers were so small that they were lost when converted to



percentages. The percentage of Spanish origin actors was also negligible, just 2 percent male and 3 percent female (1970 Subject Reports, Table 2).

The 1980 census showed 67,180 actors and directors in the experienced civilian labor force, 44,049 males (66 percent) and 23,131 females (34 percent), a 375% increase over 1970. As noted, because the occupations were merged, one cannot determine how much of that increase can be allocated separately to growth in the numbers entering the fields of acting or directing. However, en adjusted figures for 1970 are used, the increase for just actors is estimated to be 62 percent, more within the range of the increase for all Artist occupations, 51 percent (Table 4, Ellis 1984). Merging the occupations also did not alter the racial composition of the occupational group; the whites still predominated, the percentage of white males remaining about what it was in 1970, 92 percent and for females, dropping slightly to 90.6 percent (Table 80-4).

The new occupational category of actor/directors showed an increase in median income in 1979, to \$12,529 (Ellis 1987a, Table 3). The median figure compares with that of \$13,005 found in Table 80-40. Males still earned more than females, according to Ellis, 26 percent more (1987a, Table 4). This is borne out by the data in Table 80-34. While one in five males (22 percent) were earning over \$30,000, less than one in ten females (8.2 percent) were in that earnings bracket.



Combining the occupations had also increased the number of younger females. Using 34 as a cut-off age, their percentage increased from 49 to 62 over the decade, an increase of 26.5 percent. Among minority female actors/directors, the increase of those under age 34 was a remarkable 88 percent even though they had started out younger than white women in 1970, 58 percent (under age 34) compared to 48 percent (Tables 70-1, 80-1). The percentage of non-Black females also nearly doubled, although in 1980 they were still just 3.1 percent of the female group (Tables 70-4, 80-4). If we can assume that these women chose acting or directing in 1980 as lifelong careers, this would have represented an important, although still slight, shift away from control of the occupations by white males. In the absence of separate data for the fields, it is difficult to determine whether this increase could be attributed solely to the affirmative action programs that entertainment industries instituted for directing jobs or to the producers who began to use more minority players because of the growth of Blacks and other minorities in the audience.

Combining the occupations also dropped the unemployment rate for the females from 32 percent in 1970 to 20 in 1980, a decrease of 60 percent. The rate for white males dropped even more, from 32 to 12 percent, while that for Black males remained about the same, 18 percent in 1970 and 17 percent in 1980 (Tables 70-10, 80-10). This decline in unemployment paralleled the growth of the entertainment industry which continued over the decade, for



example, the increase in radio and television stations and the production jobs they provided. 10 This inference is supported by the changes recorded in employment in industrial sectors. The percent of actors working in the Radio/Television sector was about 5 percent in 1970 but after directors were added for the 1980 Census, the percentage grew to 32 percent for men and 27 for women (Tables 70-19, 80-19). However, merging a group with fulltime jobs, directing, with one subject to short-term work assignments, acting, might have created a statistical artifact which gives the appearance of declining unemployment rates for actors but in reality they could have remained the same. For example, the same Tables show that 83 percent of the white male actors who were unemployed in 1970 were in the Theatre/Motion Picture sector and that percentage remained at about 81 for 1980. (One could also speculate that the 1980 employment rate for directors would have been even higher if it had not been increased by combining their data with actors.) However, in spite of job opportunities for actors improving by 1980, if one were to compare their rates of unemployment with the national rates for 1970 and 1980, 4.8 percent and 7.0 percent, they were high in 1970 and still so in 1980 (Statistical Abstracts, Table 637).

The inclusion of directors with actors in the 1980 census not only obscured the moves of actors between industrial sectors during the decade but how many had migrated from one part of the country to others.11 As in all occupations, the actors probably migrated to where the majority of jobs were clocated and if one



were to study the entertainment industry itself, for example, how the locations of television production centers changed over the decade, one could probably determine how many of the actors migrated. It is not surprising that in 1970 approximately 60 percent of male and female actors worked either in the New York and California areas (Table 70-22). In 1980, even with the high percentage of missing data (see Footnote 11), the New York and California areas still showed the highest concentrations although they added to just under 20 percent for the males and females (Table 80-22). Although the overall percentage dropped, again probably due to merging with directors whose work-locations were distributed more evenly throughout the country, New York and California (actually the Los Angeles area) still showed higher percentages than the other States due to the presence of actors. Ellis noted that nearly "...15 percent of actors and directors moved across regions, mostly from the Northeast to West" (1987a, p. 17). Taking a logistical approach, that is, how many and to where the jobs shifted, Ellis' chart Direction of Net Migration Flows for Artists (1987a, Figure 1), takes on a different meaning. Rather than tracing the moves of the artist-workers, it could represent how structural changes in the art-industries affected employment opportunities. However, here again the analysis for just actors remains uncertain, because many could have maintained permanent legal and voting residences in one place while moving to or living temporarily in other cities as required by changing work opportunities. Thus, an actor could



have maintained a home in Connecticut while acting in plays in New York City and commuting to Los Angeles to make films. In such cases, residential and work place data cannot be considered congruent and are meaningless.

### SECTION II--DANCERS

Dancing was a predominantly female occupation in 1970 and still was in 1980. The 1970 census showed 6,924 dancers in the experienced civilian labor force, with 82 percent of them female (1970 Subject Reports, Table 1). It still was in 1980 although the number of dancers had nearly doubled to 13,194. However, either more males were choosing dancing as their occupation during the decade or fewer females were entering it because the percentage of females dropped to 75 (Ellis 1984, Table 6). The occupation was also more female for minorities in 1970, 87.5 percent, and remained so although the percent also dropped, to 71.2 in 1980 (Tables 70-2, 80-2).

Dancers were also the smallest employment category in 1970 among performing artists and remained so in 1980. Among the reasons for their small number, aside from physical requirements and talent and the long years of training required, were the lack of economic incentives. The job market was not only uncertain but there was also little future for dancers who grew old

Like the other performing arts, dancing was predominantly a white occupation in 1970, 86 percent. Blacks were the next largest group, 8.6 percent, followed by those of Spanish origin,



Reports, Table 2). The Census reported no American Indian dancers which again could be due either to under-sampling or to coding procedure. The zero-projection was unrealistic because for example, tourists visiting Indian reservations in the Southwest know that traditional dances are performed as entertainment.

Dancing also attracted more dancers of Spanish origin in 1970 than the other performing arts, 6.4 percent compared to 3.5 and 3.4 for actors and musicians/composers (1970 Subject Reports, Table 2).

Both male and female dancers earned low incomes in 1969, their respective medians, \$4421 and \$3469 (1970 Subject Reports, Table 1). However, the medians conceal other group-specific data. For example, according to Table 70-35, no male Black dancer earned more than \$1,000 in 1969 while 44 percent of female Black dancers were earning between \$5,000 and \$10,000. Also, the only dancers earning over \$60,000 were white females or minority males from non-Black groups.

The median income of all dancers rose to \$5805 in 1979 (Table 80-40). Ellis places it at \$5296 (1987a, Table 3). However, because of erosion of earnings due to inflation, this was not real growth in income (see discussion below). Again, the only whites earning over \$60,000 were female and in 1979, the only males earning that much were Black.

The rates of unemployment in 1970 for all male dancers, 17.6 percent, and all female dancers, 13.4 percent, were extremely



high when compared to the national rate (1970) of 4.94 (Table 70-11; World Almanac, p. 128). However, the rate for white males taken separately was 19.4, and for minority males, zero. This latter-finding could have been due either to sampling error (the size sample used) or to the possibility that the work market at the time had absorbed the available supply. The possibility that it was sampling error is borne out by looking at the number of weeks minority male dancers worked in 1969. None had worked longer than 13 weeks while just 4 percent of (employed) white male dancers worked so few weeks, and as many as half, 48 percent, found work for 50 to 52 weeks. However, the apparent difficulty that Black and other minority males faced in working steadily was not shared by Black and other minority females. While as many as 33 percent of them worked less than 13 weeks, 33 percent of the Black females and 40 percent of other minority females worked at least 48 weeks (Table 70-26).

The job market did not improve for Black and other minority male dancers during the decade. While the unemployment rate for all males remained stable, moving from 19.4 to 18.1, and that for white males declined slightly to 16.2, that for Black and other minority males rose to 36 and 19 percent respectively. Again, the job market was different for Black and other minority females whose unemployment rates dropped: from 31 to 22 percent, and from 37.5 to 16 (Tables 70-11, 80-11). However, the rate of unemployment for Black males conceals an interesting discrepancy. While 20 percent worked less than 13 weeks, 55.5 percent found



work at least 48 weeks in 1979. Either the supply of minority male dancers grew too quickly to be absorbed in the job market or the better dancers simply found it easier to stay employed. For example, 60 percent of the unemployed Black males and 67 percent of the unemployed other minority males had worked less than 13 weeks but the rates dropped to 40 percent and zero at 50 to 52 weeks (Table 80-26).

The employment rate for all female dancers dropped from 13.4 in 1970 to 8.3, not much higher than the national rate (1980) of 7.1 (Table 80-11, World Almanac, p. 128). The rate for white females in 1970 had been 10.5, for Black females, 30.8, and for other minority femalés, 37.5. In 1980, the rates were lower for all three groups, but that for Black females, 21.6, remained much higher than that for the whites, 6.4. However, in their case as in the case of the male dancers, these figures might lead to false inferences. Examining the Tables on weeks employed, it is evident that those who worked fewer weeks during the prior year were also more likely to be unemployed at the time they were surveyed. As with the males, one can speculate that "good" dancers were kept working while "bad" ones had difficulty finding jobs and hanging on to them. Dancing was also not an occupation that opened opportunities for self-employment. More than 94 percent of the dancers, 96 percent of the males and 94 percent of the females worked for private and public organizations or enterprises (1970 Subject Reports, Table 43).



Dancing was a decidedly young occupation in 1970. Seventynine percent of the males and 93 percent of the females were 34 and younger, and two-thirds of the females were 24 years old and younger (Table 70-2). Dancers also tended to be younger when compared to other performing artists, especially the women. For example, 62 percent of the female dancers in 1970 were age 24 years and under, compared to 23 percent for female actors and 26 percent for female musicians/composers (Table 70-1, 70-3). The percent for minority female dancers age 24 and younger was even higher, 67 percent. In 1980, the percentage of males 34 and younger remained nearly the same, 81 percent, while for females, it dropped slightly to 88 percent (Table 80-2). The percentage of females 24 and younger also dropped to 50 (49.7). It is possible that one reason for the 4.5 percent increase in females 35 and older working as dancers, 7.3 to 11.8, is that some of the 25 year-olds working in 1970 had "aged" on the job and were still working in 1980.

The principal change in educational attainment during the decade was that more dancers had gone on to college. In 1970, the percentages of dancers completing just 4 years of high school was 41 for males and 46 for females, and 50 percent of the males and 22 percent of the females had had one or more years of college. However, in 1980, fewer had completed high school, 26 percent of the males and 40 percent of the females, while more had gone on to college, 64 percent of the males and 39.5 of the females (Tables 70-8, 80-8).



There was a marked gender difference in the type of industrial sectors male and female dancers worked for in 1970. Just over half of the males (56 percent) worked for the Theatre/Motion Picture sector while half of the females (49 percent) worked in Eating/Drinking Places. Just 15 percent of the males worked for the Eating/Drinking Place sector and 34 percent of the females for Theatre/Motion Pictures (Table 70-17). In 1980, over half (53 percent) of the males were still working for the Theatre/Motion Picture sector but jobs in Eating/Drinking Places had dropped to 7.5 percent (Table 80-17). That represented a shift in employment to Miscellaneous Entertainment Services which tripled from 9 percent in 1970 to 27.5 in 1980. This shift occurred for female dancers too. The percentage working in Eating/Drinking Place jobs was halved to 24 percent while working in the Miscellaneous Entertainment Services sector rose from 8 to 21 percent. Employment in the Theatre/Motion Picture sector also increased by 10 percent for females, to 44.

However, one should not take these figures at face value because the structure of the entertainment industries provides an uncertain and varying job market for dancers. To earn a living from dancing, dancers must be willing to go from job to job and from sector to sector to find work as the jobs arise. They must even be willing to work simultaneously in more than one sector. The entertainment industries cannot provide and guarantee the type of full-time, salaried jobs that the typical business can offer. Consequently, the majority must earn their livelihood by



taking the job offered, no matter which sector and where the job is located. The sector that they happen to be working in at the time of a survey would be the one recorded for census purposes.

This situation, as with actors, makes it difficult to determine migration patterns for dancers, and missing data are again a problem. For example, 32.1 percent of the female dancers were working in California and 5.4 percent in New York in 1970 (Table 70-23) In 1980, those percentages changed to 4.3 percent for California and 4.9 percent for New York (Table 80-23). Either the industry changed and fewer female dancers were needed in movie and television production in California by 1980 or with data missing for 61 percent of the sample, the data are too unreliable to draw conclusions about migration. (One could of course distribute the unknowns proportionately to the States and try again but it is dangerous to stack inferences.) One could also take the data at face value and conclude that the reason that the number of dancers nearly doubled between 1970 to 1980 (from 6,924 to 13,194) is that the job market had shifted from concentration in just a few locations to a more even national distribution.

### SECTION III -- MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS

Musicians and composers (henceforth referred to as musicians) were the largest of the performing arts occupations both in 1970, 96,537, and in 1980, 140,556. Approximately onethird were females in 1970 (34 percent), and it remained so in



1980 (31 percent). Their median income in 1970 was also lower than that of the males, \$1395 vs. \$4668, 70 percent lower. Also, ranking in terms of income, the median for female musicians was not only the lowest among actors, dancers and musicians, both male and female, but it ranked lowest for all artist occupations (1970 Subject Reports, Table 1).

As in the other performing arts, whites predominated among musicians in 1970, 92 percent, and in 1980, 90 percent (among men. 91 percent, and women, 95). Blacks were 6.8 percent, Spanish origin, 3.4 percent, and the remaining minorities less than one percent. Males also outnumbered women, two to one for the whole group, whites alone and other minorities. However, the ratio for Black males over Black women was higher, four to one. In 1980, the ratios remained about the same for whites and Blacks but it shifted higher for the group as a whole, 2.4 to one, and for other minorities, to five to one. (1970 Subject Reports, Table 2; Table 70-12, 80-12).

Comparing median ages, female musicians tended to be older than the males in 1970, 37.5 vs. 28.9. This was borne out by comparing the percentages of musicians over and under the age of 34. While 63.4 percent of the males (63% white, 69% Black and 53% other minority) were 34 and younger, less than half of the females, 46.2 percent, were (46% white and 48% Black). However, females from other minorities also tended to be younger, 55.5 percent (Table 70-6, 80-6). While overall the males were still younger than the females in 1980, 68.5 percent 34 and younger



(63% white, 61% Black, and 65% other minority), compared to 52.2 percent females in that age group, the number of younger females especially from Black and other minority groups entering the profession increased. Although the percentage of white females 34 and younger remained stable at 51.3, those for Black and other minority women rose to 64 and 72 (Table 80-6).

The female musicians were also better educated than the males in 1970, showing median years of school of 13.6 compared to 12.9 for the men (1970 Subject Reports, Table 1). This is confirmed by looking at the numbers of those who completed high school or graduated from college. In 1970, the percentages of male musicians who completed 4 years of high school and four or more years of college were 27 and 22, while the percentages for female musicians were higher, 28 and 28.5. Female musicians maintained their educational advantage in 1980 because while the percentage of men with four or more years of college grew 10 percent to 33, the percentage of females grew 18.5 percent, to 47 (Tables 70-9, 80-9).

Of all the performing artists, musicians had the lowest rate of unemployment in 1970, just 6.3 percent, compared to 14.7 percent for dancers and 33.4 percent for actors. (1970 Subject Reports, Table 51). However, this low rate did not mean that the majority of musicians had been earning adequate livelihoods. For example, as many as 51 percent had worked less than 30 hours in a prior week and 32 percent less than 15 hours (Table 70-15). Ordinarily, one would expect that type of finding because many



jobs, in night clubs for example, require musicians to work just on week-ends and in evenings. Thus, musicians working five to seven nights a week might consider themselves working "full-time" although they might work less than 30 hours. However, with just 14 percent of the males and 5 percent of the females working in Eating/Drinking Places, it is obvious that the overall job market was not providing adequate employment (Table 70-18). This was also evident in that just four in ten, 39 percent of the men and 37 percent of the women, were able to work 50 to 52 weeks in 1969 (Table 70-27). Also, the job market did not improve significantly over the decade because the percentage of musicians able to work as many as 50 to 52 weeks in 1979 remained at 40 for both genders (Table 80-27).

Although male musicians on the whole fared better than the females in 1969 (earning more money, working more weeks and as will be seen, more likely to be employed in the higher-paying entertainment sector of the economy), compared to the total of artist occupations, they did not work as many weeks or earn as much (1970 Subject Reports, Table 1). Also, there was probably a relationship between the lower rate of employment of women and their low earnings because of the different sectors they and men worked in (Tables 70-12). The majority of male musicians worked in the entertainment and recreation industry while over half of the women worked for religious (church) groups (53 percent) with the option of steadier work but lower (non-union) wages.



Consequently, as in the case of dancers, there were two occupations, one for men and another for women, with a marked gender difference in the types of industrial sectors they worked in both in 1970 and 1980. In 1970, approximately half of the males (53 percent) worked for the Theatres/Motion Picture sector with lesser numbers working for Eating/Drinking Places, 14 percent, and Religious Organizations, 14 percent. Conversely, over half of the females (53 percent) were working for Religious Organizations while 23 percent were in the Theatre/Motion Picture sector (Table 70-21). The disparity held up in 1980 although the percentage of males working in the Theatre/Motion Picture sector rose to 63 (representing a shift from Eating/Drinking Places and Religious Organizations sectors). Also, enough females had shifted sectors to begin to equate the Religious Organizations and Theatre/Motion Picture sectors, 43 and 36 percent (Tables 80-20).

The data for the trade-off that female musicians made of lower income for job security can be found in Tables 70-18 and 80-18. Of the females working 50 to 52 weeks in 1970, 72 percent worked for Religious Organizations and just 17 percent in entertainment sectors, Theatre/Motion Picture and Eating/Drinking Places. Over half of the male musicians working 50 to 52 weeks, 59 percent, worked in those entertainment sectors while just 20 percent worked for religious groups. Those percentages held up for males and females in 1980, for males 65 percent in entertainment sectors/17.5 percent for religious groups, and for



females, 61 percent for religious groups/26 percent for entertainment sectors.

Again, as in the case of the dancers, because of the structure and pay-scales of the entertainment sectors, the data cannot be relied on to present the actual status of full or part-time employment opportunities for musicians. Just as actors and dancers, musicians can go from job to job and from sector to sector as jobs arise. We are handicapped in that one cannot determine from the census data exactly how many musicians with full-time employment have continuing jobs year to year with the same organizations or businesses, although there are clues in Tables such as 70-21 and 80-21.12 Because many must earn a living by taking the job available, they must be willing to move between sectors as the opportunities arise. Also, again, as in the case of actors and dancers, the sectors they work in at the of a survey would be the ones reported.

Musicians in 1970, unlike actors (12 percent) and dancers (4 percent), were also more likely to report themselves as self-employed, 29 percent (1970 Subject Reports, Table 51). However, it is not clear from the data available whether those musicians actually owned businesses employing other musicians, for example, or used the status for tax purposes or simply used the label as another term for free-lancing because they did not have salaried jobs. We also do not know the extent to which the percentage reported for self-employment was determined by the presence of composers in the group. Composers, unlike most actors/directors,



dancers and musicians, can be "self-employed" because, like authors and painter/sculptors, they can create (cultural) goods which they can then sell to support themselves. Musicians, on the other hand, with just services to sell, unless they want to bother with self-management, must work for others or hire themselves out as casual workers.

A chronic condition of the occupation over the decade was underemployment, defined as working less than full-time (according to the Bureau, less than 35 hours a week). Using a stricter standard, 29 hours a week or less, 51 percent of all male and 78 percent of all female musicians were underemployed during the reference week in 1970 (Table 70-15). Although faced with the problem of missing data for the 1980 sample, the greater percentages of men and women, 24 and 20, worked just 15 to 29 hours a week (Table 80-15). However, longer work-weeks for some males were not uncommon. For example, 12 percent of the males in 1970 and 13 percent in 1980 worked over 40 hours a week. However, the disparity between the sexes remained outstanding. For example, just 3 percent of the females in 1970 and 6 percent in 1980 worked that many hours. This is another difference that can be attributed to their employment in different industrial sactors.

However, attention must also be paid to race differences. In comparison to white female musicians in 1980, fewer Black females worked 15 to 29 hours a week and more were working 40 hours. The latter was also true for Black male musicians, more of whom were



working 40 hours a week than white males. A clue to this disparity can be found by comparing the industrial sectors for female white and Black musicians. While white females worked 47 percent for Religious Organizations and 33 percent for the Theatre/Motion Picture sector, the percentages reversed for Black females, who worked 45 percent for the Theatre/Motion Picture sector and 30 percent for Religious Organizations (Table 80-21). Presumably, the Theatre/Motion Picture sector in 1980 offered longer work weeks than Religious Organizations.

Although musicians were the largest of the performing arts occupations in 1969, their overall median income was lower than that for actors and dancers and female musicians earned the least for their gender (see Bradshaw 1984, Table 6 and Table 2 below). It should also be noted that while inflation eroded the buying power of the income of the male musicians by 25 percent, the earnings of female musicians actually outraced inflation by 13 percent. In spite of that, their median income was just \$3186, a level of income that was obviously inadequate. One in three male musicians (33 percent) and over half of the females (58 percent) earned less than \$5000 in 1979. Just 4 percent, mostly male, were able to earn \$40,000 or more (Table 80-30).

## SUMMARY AND OVERVIEW

# Representation of Women and Minorities

Except for dancing where women were in the majority, women and minorities were not represented in the performing arts in numbers proportionate to their numbers in the general population.



However, the situation is problematic. The data suggest that because women and minorities had to take jobs that white males rejected, they tended to work in less valued sectors which also paid less. Therefore, one would have to conclude that in terms of opportunities and earnings, patterns of discrimination did exist for women and minorities in the performing arts. However, the data also show that certain of the groups were favored for work in particular settings which suggests that the labor market for performers was (and probably still is) far too complex for the usual criteria for discrimination to apply. Ordinarily, consumers of manufactured products will show little interest in the cultural backgrounds of the workers, but for public appearances, the cultural backgrounds of the performers might be essential to the type of entertainment offered. Thus, there can be no universal or absolute barriers to employment for all performers in a pluralistic society such as the United States because the entertainment settings and resources generated by each cultural group create job niches for their members which members of other minority cultures or the majority culture cannot fill.13 Thus, one must look beyond the overall percentages of hiring to examine the hiring patterns and opportunities peculiar to the minisectors of entertaining within the overall sectors. Rather than being monolithic, the labor market is a matrix of large and small segments which allow performers the choice of competing in multiple sectors with members of the majority, other minorities or their own.



## Work Experience

Earnings

This was discussed in detail in the separate sections. However, the data indicate that a minority of performing artists had jobs which provided 35+ hours per week for 50 to 52 weeks per year. It was at best a casual labor force which more often than not had to subsidize their earnings as performing artists by working at either full-time or additional part-time jobs.

Except for a very few performers, the performing arts occupations were low-paying at best. Although the mean income for actors/directors in 1979 was about \$18,463, for the reasons stated above, one does not know how well that figure represents the earnings of the actors in the group.14 For dancers, it was \$8290, and for musicians/composers, \$9423 (Table 80-40). One problem here (as with all occupations providing personal services) is that we do not know to what extent these incomes were understated for Census purposes and perhaps also to mislead the IRS. It is not uncommon, for example, for pianists and strip teasers to entertain at private functions and receive payments in cash which go unreported. It is possible also that some performers participate in the "underground" economy where they barter their performances for goods and services instead of cash.

In terms of Constant Dollars, the earnings of all Artists declined 37 percent between 1969 and 1979, for men, 29 percent less, and for women, 14 percent less (Table 6, Bradshaw, 1984).



Table 2 compares Constant Dollars for the separate performing arts groups, using 1.98 as the inflation index for the decade.

TABLE 2

EARNINGS IN CONSTANT DOLLARS (MEDIANS)

Occupation	1969	1979	1979*	Diff	%Diff_
-Male-					
Actor/Actor-Dir	6816	14526	13496	1030	+ 7.6
Dancers	4421	6952	8754	1802	-20.6
Musicians/Comp	4668	6909	9243	2334	-25.3
-Female-					
Actor/Actor-Dir	5021	9159	9942	783	- 7.9
Dancers	3469	4970	6869	1899	-27.6
Musicians/Comp	1395	3186	2762	424	+13.3

\* Projected 1979 Income - 1970 \$ X Inflation Index of 1.98

The Table shows that only the earnings of the male

Actors/Directors and female Musicians/ Composers kept pace with

inflation over the decade although the actual "increase" for male

Actor/Directors is questionable because earnings for Directors

had not been included in the data for 1970. Consequently, the

"increase" for male actors could have been due just to the

inclusion of the higher earnings of directors while the "decline"

for female actor/directors might have been due to the fact that

directing was still a predominantly male occupation, and female

actors out-numbered female directors. If just the earnings for

Actors could have been computed, it is possible that no increase



•

would have been shown or even that inflation had created a loss in earning power. The increase in earnings shown for female musicians was also more apparent than real because their 1969 income was so low that, even with the increase, their 1979 earnings were still not sufficient for some to stay above the poverty threshold.

Comparing these 1979 income figures with the poverty threshold figures used for 1979, \$3686 for single person households and \$4723 for two persons (Detailed Pop. Chars., Table, p. B-20), many performers, single and married, probably fell below the thresholds. Table 3 uses \$5000 as a cutoff figure to determine the percentages of males and females getting close to the thresholds. The percentages for female Dancers and Musician/Composers are so large that undoubtedly many would have qualified.

TABLE 3
INCOMES UNDER \$5,000 IN 1979

Occupation	Male%	Female%
Actor/Directors	15	25
Dancers	31	47
Musician/Composers	33	58

Source: Table 80-28, 29, 30.



#### Self-Employment

As Table 4 shows, except for some musicians/composers, the majority of performing artists were not self-employed in 1979.

TABLE 4
SELF-EMPLOYMENT STATUS IN 1979

Occupation	Self-Employed %			
Actor/Directors	16			
Dancers	13			
Musician/Composers	37			

Source: Table C-1, Ellis (1986)

It is possible that true "self-employment" might not be possible for the majority of performing artists because the entertainment industries are so decentralized that intermediaries and management structures must be relied on to find work opportunities. Some also might have listed themselves as "self-employed" because it was advantageous for tax purposes. For others, the term might have been synonymous for free-lancing. Industry of Employment

# work experience of males and females in dancing and music that it would be worthwhile to analyze the gender-data as though four occupations were involved, not two. There might even be more than four because the work experience of racial and ethnic groups

Analysis of the data showed such marked differences in the

differ enough to warrant separate analysis.

However, overall, male and female actors and directors in 1980 worked principally in the Theatre/Motion Picture and



Radio/Television sectors of the economy, with either simultaneous employment or movement between the sectors as work opportunities arose. 15 Male dancers worked principally in the Theatre/Motion Picture sector and for Miscellaneous Entertainment Services. Female dancers also worked in those sectors in addition to Eating/Drinking Places where they were employed over male dancers by a three to one ratio. Male musicians/composers were employed principally in the Theatre/Motion Picture sector while many females, in addition to that sector, worked also for Religious Organizations.

#### Educational Attainment

There are apparently no formal educational requirements for starting work in the performing arts. This is made possible by the tremendous variety of job titles and employment settings open to aspiring artists. However, the majority of actors, dancers and musicians did go on to college (85%, 64% and 64% - Table 80-7, 8, 9) because apparently performing arts departments on U.S. campuses had become the trade schools of the occupations.

Migration Patterns

Unlike the typical job where it is expected that employees would reside nearby, the jobs offered performing artists could be anywhere and require mobility. Therefore, data from different years comparing places of residence to find migration patterns can lead to erroneous conclusions.16 Performing artists can maintain permanent residences in one area (for legal purposes) while working more or less full-time in others. The issue is also



moot because except for certain industrial sectors which concentrate their production and activities in particular locations (such as Los Angeles and New York City for Theatre/Motion Picture work and Radio/Television), the Tables (70 and 80-22, 23, 24) indicate that employment opportunities were more or less distributed rather evenly throughout the country.

#### METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS AND SUGGESTIONS

The number of performing artists in the labor force increased substantially in the decade covered by this report. This increase reflected two phenomena: one, a general increase of workers in the knowledge and information sub-sectors of the service sector of the economy, and the other, with expansion of the economy and overall increase in population, the increase in employment opportunities in the entertainment and recreation industries to serve the growing audience. Not only did the actual numbers of workers increase but performing artists showed a much higher proportion of growth than most other occupational groups. Also, as noted in the Introduction, the data used for this report are of limited use in describing the total population of artists in American society. Because of the particular work characteristics, such as the causal work and in many cases, unreported part-time employment, performing artists are likely to be under-sampled in many cases. These data can tell far more about demand for performing artists than about supply. Also it should be remembered that the data were collected during the census week, the first week in April for both 1980 and 1970. It



would take a far more developed inquiry than now available into the industries that employ performing artists to know whether employment is higher or lower during that week than others during the Year. This analysis tells us just about who was working as performing artists during that week.

The sampling data and procedures now in use were devised to provide detailed and dependable information about labor market behavior. However, the actual numbers of performing artists in the United States are so small that only the largest socioeconomic categories and variables used to describe them will allow accurate and reliable estimates. Even then, because of the enormous variety in type of performing work and the settings they work in, the statistics and descriptions derived from such large categories are meaningless for the single case. Merging data from singular job categories into broad occupational categories makes direct analysis of those sub-categories difficult, if not impossible. Exc pt for the few with steady, full-time jobs in performing arts, we are as seriously handicapped in obtaining useful knowledge about all performing artists as we are about migrant agricultural workers or all those who live on unreported earnings from the underground economy. At best, we are dealing with severely limited data to describe the working conditions for performing artists and their contribution to the labor economy.

The formula used to define unemployment also underestimates their number. The Bureau restricts the term "unemployed" to just those who are available to work and looking for jobs.



Consequently, it do? not count as unemployed those who have given up looking for work. Thus, artists moving in and out of the civilian labor force as casual workers, taking performing jobs as they become available, who periodically become discouraged when there is no opportunity to work at their craft, can "disappear" from the active performing labor force. Although the figures reported on unemployment for artists were generally higher than for other professionals (see 1970 Subject Reports, Table 1) they might even have been higher if the Bureau had recognized them as members of the reserve labor force, who could be unemployed.

The difficulty arises partially because the work typically available for performing artists is at best part-time, seasonal or periodic. For example, one-third of the female dancers and one-fifth of the males reported that they had less than half a year's work in 1969, and also, approximately one-third, less than 29 hours a week (1970 Subject Reports) Tables 11 and 45). The lack of full-time work creates ambiguity in coding because as with all periodic workers, interviewers and coders must decide whether their status between jobs should be classified as "unemployed." The decision is even more difficult when artists between jobs are undecided whether or when to look for another. The coding rules drop those without jobs and not looking for work from the labor force. Also, if they took other jobs between performing assignments, for example, as store clerks or waiters, that work activity would determine their occupational category rather than their basic occupational preference and commitment.



Because "occupation" was defined by the work the performers actually did during a reference week, their self-descriptions as "performing artists" ran the risk of being ignored. A more realistic picture of the employment status of the artists would emerge if the Bureau of the Census were to collect its data on artists using an approach more sensitive to the self-declared and continuing occupational identity of the artist and the casual working environment that performing work involves.17 The approach now used makes it impossible to ascertain whether artists working at other jobs were on temporary leave or discouraged by the lack of earning opportunities in the performing arts, had left the field permanently.18

The contention here is that errors due to under-sampling and built-in limitations in the questionnaires and interview schedules used to collect data, along with the structural feature of casual work for performing artists will always lead to under-reporting of the actual numbers of artists (supply), Thus, attempts to determine changes or trends in employment are prone to error because the data reported could reflect actual underlying increases or decreases or rather might be reflecting problems inherent to the sampling or coding process. Although Census data are cited that the artist population increased by 81 percent between 1970 and 1980, the accuracy of that finding can be called into question because of such problems (National Endowment for the Arts 1983). The increase would probably have been larger if data collection techniques more suitable to the



working environments of performing artists (and other workers in the casual labor force) had been used.

Although for the reasons stated above, it is not possible with the current approach to assemble exact data, there are methods and data available which could supplement census data to provide more accurate information about the supply of performing artists and their labor market behavior. Data should also be gathered from unions, other professional associations, and professional schools and training programs regularly, possibly every five years. In addition, if funds were available, a special sample survey of the population should be undertaken to discern career patterns and work histories in more depth, especially of the age/gender/race groups on career tracks apart from each other who occupy different niches in the performing world. Not only would it benefit those who wish to know more about the careers of artists, it would also benefit all those who are interested in how the labor force, taken as a whole, adjusts to varying work opportunities and industrial conditions. There is some indication from these as well as other data that many people go from one occupation to another, especially since the industrial structure has changed so dramatically toward emphasizing the service sector in the last twenty years.

Also, the data that are available provide little usable information on the migration patterns of performing artists.

Knowing where respondents lived five years before the census week tells little about their actual migration priterns as workers,



especially if they remain domiciled in one area while traveling to others to work. The special census suggested above would provide more and better detailed information. A simple example illustrates the ambiguity that arises from the data as they are presently obtained. Ten percent of all dancers leave Los Angeles for New York. A different ten percent simultaneously leave New York for Los Angeles. The moves cancel each other out. On paper, no migration occurred. In reality, one-fifth of the dancers migrated. The instability, mobility and turnover intrinsic to the worlds of acting, dancing and music make the data on their working status more chaotic than orderly. It is impossible to compare fields of shifting targets at different times. We are dealing with occupations in which, simultaneously, workers retire and are replaced, others leave the field and return, some work only where they live, others travel and return, others migrate and stay, others migrate and return, and still others are always traveling without a permanent residence. One cannot find consistency in an occupation where data on the work status and careers of middle-aged female pianists playing church organs in home towns are merged with those for steel drum band players who live and work on cruise ships in the Caribbean.

Also, to find out more details about the employment and unemployment of performing artists, a special survey on the industries hiring performers should be conducted to find out more about industrial hiring practices and standards, variations in wages and work opportunities for women and minorities. As noted



throughout this report, there is no way at present to find out how careers progress or what the patterns of success or failure are in any of these occupational categories. One possibility would be to use time-series methodology, for example, long-term follow-up of cohorts as in public health studies. One would start by creating typologies of artists for each of the performing occupations. One would then establish cohorts within classes of those typologies to track individuals over time. The approach would provide harder data on the types and amounts of migration that can occur as well as delineate the types of career patterns possible and how those patterns may vary among the races, genders, and occupations.

It then becomes necessary to supplement the data by from other sources, for example, union/guild and professional organization membership rolls. Some data can also be found in foundation, academic and institutional reports (in some cases, qualitative studies), when available. Although the latter are useful for generating hypotheses about occupational trends, the data from organizations when properly used assure more reliable estimates of employment status. To our knowledge, no studies have been issued comparing the accuracy of public and private-source data.

Whatever the features that set artistic occupations apart from other professions and occupations, they remain subject to the same political, social and economic forces governing the availability of work in the job market. This holds true for



performing artists as well although some might believe that having unique talents to offer frees them from the constraints which those in ordinary jobs face. Instead they also gain the stress of becoming dependent on the information and entertainment industrial structures that provide work so that they can earn a livelihood as artists. The history of the House Un-American Activities Committee with the black lists it generated al\_o shows the occupations vulnerable to political influence as well. Thus the puzzling relationship between employment and unemployment for all workers is even more perplexing when the analysis is limited to just performing artists.

This report shows that although the supply of available artists seems to be under-reported, the economic conditions for most performing artists is substandard when compared to other workers in the society. The median income for both dancers and musician/composers is below the poverty line, and the median income for actor/directors at the edge. No doubt if directors were separated out from the actors, the median income for actors would fall as well. As noted earlier, median income is not a good measure, but the Tables on income show that few performing artists earn incomes comparable to those of other professional workers. The data show that most performing artists are poorly paid and have little job security and that just a few are among the highest paid people in American society. The person who made the most money from acting during 1985 and 1986 was Bill Cosby. However, the numbers of performing artists who made over \$60,000



was small compared to the number of all professionals who earned over that amount, but when the rare performing artist becomes a star, the salary plus other commercial opportunities are enormous, pointing out once more how difficult it is to consider economic conditions and opportunities for performing artists using the same data sources as used for the entire labor force.

The discussion in this Report has focused also on the difficulties of trying to determine who performing artists are and where and how often they work when employed. Much could be learned about employment by studying the records and reports of organizations which have jurisdiction in their workplaces, such as Actors' Equity, Screen Actors Guild, and the Directors Guild of America, especially their pension and welfare funds. However, again, such data provide little information on the causes of unemployment, especially structural unemployment due to changes in the industrial sectors. To understand both employment and unemployment of actors, dancers, and musicians, one must understand the changes in the structure of their jobs in the industries and economic sectors in which they work. As the structure of the entertainment industries has changed, so has and will employment for actors, dancers, and musicians. Therefore to simply use Census data on employment and unemployment figures, industrial sectors, residence and migration without thorough and concurrent analyses of economic and industrial trends in the two major industrial employers of performing artists, the movie and television industries, yields little useful information for



planning purposes. Related to structural unemployment among performing artists are cultural as well as economic conditions. For example it is well documented that more acting roles are written for men than for women, thus contributing to the scarcity of work for women in the movie and television industries. This and other reasons may be why many female performing artists, especially dancers, to continue in their occupations were found working in sectors with lower status and poorer pay. It also suggests that those working in the performing arts fall into two socio-economic groups, one small and advantaged, and the other large and disadvantaged. The group with advantages work regularly and have relatively high incomes. The insadvantaged are more likely to be unemployed or be members of the working poor, without either sufficient work or income to rise above the poverty level.



#### NOTES

- 1. Actors were combined with Directors for the 1980 Census while Musicians were combined with Composers for both. The list of Artist occupations in 1970 included Actors; Architects; Art-Drama-Music Teachers (post-secondary); Athletes and kindred workers; Authors; Dancers; Designers; Editors/ Reporters; Musicians/Composers; Painters/Sculptors; Photographers; Public Relations Specialists/Publicity Writers; Radio/Television Announcers; and Writers, Artists, and Entertainers, n.e.c. (not elsewhere classified). In 1980, the list included Actors/Directors; Announcers; Architects; Art-Drama-Music Teachers (post-secondary); Authors; Dancers; Designers; Musicians/Composers; Painters, Sculptors, Craft-Artists and Artist Printmakers; Photographers; and Artists, Performers and Related Workers, n.e.c.
- 2. The new occupational classification system used for the 1980 census was based on the Federal Standard Occupational Classification Manual issued in 1977 and revised in 1980. The Manual was a project of the Office of Management and Budget to assure comparability in occupational statistics throughout government agencies. When the Bureau of the Census adopted it for the 1980 census, it changed some of the classifications and occupational titles used in 1970, including Actors and Directors.
- 3. The survey of occupations conducted every three years for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the Occupational Employment Statistics Survey, will not be discussed.
- 4. The specific job titles included in the Artist Occupation Codes for the 1980 census were 40 for Actors and Directors, 22 for Dance:s and 60 for Musicians and Composers (Ellis 1984, Appendix B).
- 5. For this reason, one must be wary of the data used in publications such as <a href="Employment and Unemployment of Artists: 1970-1975">Employment and Unemployment of Artists: 1970-1975</a> (NEA 1976). For example, the Bureau reported 140,556 musicians and composers for the 1980 Census but the American Federation of Musicians (NY, NY) claimed 330,000 as members (World Almanac, 1983).
- 6. The NEA Research Division found that the total of Writers, Artists and Entertainers grew at a compounded annual growth rate of 5.7% between 1970 and 1975 (NEA 1976, Report #1). Using that rate to project increase, it estimated that the labor force of artists would double in 12.5 years. However, that rate would have severely underestimated the number of actors in 1980 because the 21,000 projected, as one-third of the total, defies common sense. There would have been two directors for every actor.



The membership figures provided by the Actors' Equity Association, 28,000, and the Screen Actors Guild, 53,000, are more helpful, in spite of overlap (World Almanac 1983).

- 7. The data in the Tables were obtained from source tapes (Households and Persons---Artist Extract Files) provided by the NEA Research Division. It will be noted that certain findings differ slightly from other published data because of the different sized samples that could have been used (e.g. 3 or 5-percent samples) and rounding.
- 8. There is a serious problem in using medians from different sized samples to estimate group earnings. For example, the median income for all Actors in Table 70-40 is \$3500 but the figure is far below those found for men and women in Table 1, 1970 Subject Reports).
- 9. Again, this is due to under-sampling because there were black actors at the time, such as Sidney Poitier who starred in Lilies of the Field, released in 1963, Harry Bellafonte, and Bill Cosby, co-star of the TV series, <u>I Spy</u>), who must have earned at least that level of income.
- 10. The number of AM stations increased from 4,269 in 1970 to 4,558 in 1980, by 7 percent, FM stations from 2476 to 4190, by 69 percent, and TV stations from 872 to 1013, by 16 percent (Broadcasting 1987, p. H-58).
- 11. The availability of data are another problem. For example, Place of Work data are missing for 58 percent of the male group and 60 percent of the female (Table 80-22).
- 12. For example, the unemployment rates for white, Black and other minority males in the Theatre/Motion Picture sector in 1980 ranged from 70 to 82 percent while for those who worked for Religious Organizations, they ranged from 2 to 6.
- 13. For example, Ellis (1987c) found more than twice as many dancers with Asian or Native American backgrounds, 5.4 percent, compared to 2.6 percent for the artist occupations generally and 2.2 percent for all workers (p. 8).
- 14. See Cantor and Peters 1980.
- 15. Numerous performers hold simultaneous memberships in the unions with jurisdiction in both the Radio/TV and Theatre/MP sectors. For example, 53 percent of the members of the Actors' Equity Association in 1977 belonged to the American Federation of Television and Radio Artists and 60 percent to the Screen Actors Guild (Report #11, NEA Research Division).



- 16. For example, according to Ellis (1987b), 71 percent of the Actors and Directors who moved between 1975 and 1980 selected the Boston metropolitan area to live in (Table 15). The statistic runs counter to what is known about the structure of the TV and movie industries, who are principal employers, and their principal centers of production.
- 17. Apparently, reliance on Just "definitional" or subjective criteria had to develop because more objective criteria, typical of other occupations, were unavailable. For example, the NEA Research Division: "The distinction between as unemployed artist and a self-employed artist without income is largely a personal self-view." (Report #1, p. 24). However, Jeffri et al., moving toward empiricism, would define artists according to three basic categories: Marketplace (making a living at it?), Education and Affiliation, as well as Self and Peer. (1987, p. 9)
- 18. A perennial problem. Sommers and Eck (1977) reported that just half (50.7 percent) of the musicians and composers surveyed in 1970 had been employed in those occupations in 1965.



#### REFERENCES

Bradshaw, Thomas F.

"An Examination of the Comparability of 1970 and 1980 Census Statistics on Artists." Third

International Conference on Cultural Economics and Planning. Akron, Ohio. April 24-26, 1984.

"Projecting Growth in Artistic Occupations." Fourth International Conference on Cultural Economics and Planning. Avignon, France. May 12-14, 1986.

Broadcasting

Broadcasting Cablecasting Yearbook 1987. Washington, DC: Broadcasting Publications, Inc.

Cantor, Muriel G. and Anne K. Peters

"The Employment and Unemployment of Screen Actors in the United States" in W. S. Hendon, J. L. Shanahan, and A. J. MacDonald (eds) Economic Policy for the Arts. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Books.

Detailed Population Statistics

1984 1980 Census of the Population - United States Summary.
Volume 1. Detailed Population Statistics. Washington,
DC: U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Ellis, Diane C.

Trends in the Artist Occupations: 1970-1980. May 1984, Arlington, VA: Data Use & Access Lab. (NEA Res Div - Coop. Agree. NEA CA 81-59)

Ellis, Diane C.

The Distribution of Artists Among Industrial Sectors.

Dec 1986, Brunswick, MD: WORDWORKS (NEA Res Div - Coop.

Agree. NEA DCA 86-19)

Ellis, Diane C.

1987a <u>Earnings of Artists: 1980</u>. Feb 1987, Brunswick, MD: WORDWORKS (NEA Res Div - Coop. Agree. NEA DCA 86-19)

Ellis, Diane C.

1987b Artists by Place of Residence: 1980. Feb 1987,
Brunswick, MD: WORDWORKS (NEA Res Div - Coop. Agree.
NEA DCA 86-19)



Sommers, Dixie and Alan Eck.

"Occupational mobility in the American labor force."

<u>Monthly Labor Review</u> Reprint (with corrections). Bureau of Statistics, U.S. Dept. of Labor, January 1977.

Statistical Abstract

1986. <u>Statistical Abstract of the United States</u>: 1987. (107th Edition) Washington, DC, 1986.

Subject Reports

1970 Census of Population - Subject Reports: Occupational Characteristics. PC (2)-7A. Issued June 1973.

World Almanac

1983 The World Almanac & Book of Facts - 1985. New York, NY: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc.



Sommers, Dixie and Alan Eck.

"Occupational mobility in the American labor force."

<u>Monthly Labor Review</u> Reprint (with corrections). Bureau of Statistics, U.S. Dept. of Labor, January 1977.

Statistical Abstract

1986. <u>Statistical Abstract of the United States</u>: 1987. (107th Edition) Washington, DC, 1986.

Subject Reports

1970 Census of Population - Subject Reports: Occupational Characteristics. PC (2)-7A. Issued June 1973.

World Almanac

1983 The World Almanac & Book of Facts - 1985. New York, NY: Newspaper Enterprise Association, Inc.



#### TABLE 70-1 ACTOPS -- AGE BY GENDER BY MINORITY STATUS 1970

		Male	
0 - 0	Total	White	Minority
Age Groups			
LESS THRN 16 Frequency	67	67	•
Percent	. 8%	. 9%	0
FROM 16 TO 24	. 0/-	. 7/-	0.0%
Frequency	1700	1533	167
Percent	21.3%	20.7%	27.8%
FROM 25 TO 29		20.77	C/ . C/.
Fr <del>equen</del> cy	1133	1033	100
Percent	14.2%	14.0%	16.7%
FROM 30 TO 34			
Frequency	1267	1133	193
Percent	15.8%	15.3%	22.2%
FROM 35 TO 39			
Frequency	967	900	67
Percent	12.1%	12.2%	11.1%
FROM 40 TO 44			
Frequericy	967.	900	€.7
Percent FROM 45 TO 49	12.1%	12.2%	11.1%
	543	500	<b></b>
Frequency Percent	567 7.1%	500	67
FROM 50 TO 54	7.1%	6.8%	11_1%
Frequency	600	600	n
Percent	7.5%	8.1%	0.0%
FR0% 55 TO 59	1 . 3/.	0. 1%	0.0%
Frequency	133	133	n
Percent	1.7%	1.8%	0.0%
FROM 60 TO 64			
Firequericy	300	300	0
Percent	3.8%	4.1%	0.0%
65_+			
Frequericy	300	300	0
Percent	3.8%	4.1%	0.0%
Total			
Frequency	8000	7400	600



# 1970 TABLES TABLE 70-1 AC:TORS -- AGE BY GENDER BY MINOR(TY STATUS 1970

#### Females

	Total	White	Minority
AGE GROUPS			
LESS THAN 16			
Frequency	33	33	0
PercentFPOM 16 TO 24	-6%	.6%	0.0%
Frequency	1333	1200	133
Percent	22.6%	21.8%	33.3%
FROM 25 TO 29			
Frequency	1033	967	67
Percent	17.5%	17.6%	16.7%
FPCM 30 TO 34			
Frequency	467	433	33
Fercent	7.9%	7.9%	8.3%
FPOM 35 TO 39			
Frequency	733	633	100
Percent	12.4%	11.5%	25.0%
FROM 40 TO 44			
Frequency	467	467	0
F'ercent	7.9%	8.5%	0.0%
FPOM 45 TO 49			
frequency	467	433	33
Percent	7.9%	7.9%	8.3%
FP0M 50 TO 54			
Frequency	467	433	33
Percent	7.9%	7.9%	8.3%
FROM 55 TO 59			
Frequency	400	400	0
Fercent	6.8%	7.3%	0.0%
FROM 60 TO 64			
Frequency	_300	300	0
Fercent	5.1%	5 <b>.5</b> %	0.0%
65_+			
Frequency	_200	200	0
Percent	3.4%	3.6%	0.0%
Total			
Frequency	5900	5500	400



# TABLE 70 -- 2 DANCERS -- AGE BY GENDER BY MINORITY STATUS 1970

#### Males

	Total	White	Minority
Age Groups			•
LESS THAN 16	_		
Frequency	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 16 TO 24			
Frequency	400	333	67
PercentFROM 25 TO 29	35.3%	32.3%	66.7%
	267	222	
Frequency Percent	267	233	33
FROM 30 TO 34	23.5%	22.6%	33.3%
Frequency	233	233	•
Percent	20.6%	23.6%	0
FROM 35 TO 39	20.0%	22.0%	0.0%
Frequency	67	67	٥
Percent	5.9%	6.5%	0.0%
FROM 40 TO 44	<b></b>	0.0%	U. C/.
Frequency	100	100	0
Percent	8.8%	9.7%	0.0%
FROM 45 TO 49	000.0		0.0
Frequency	33	33	o
Percent	2.9%	3.2%	0.0%
FROM 50 TD 54			<b>0.</b> 0
Frequency	33	33	0
Percent	2.9%	3.2%	0.0%
FROM 55 TO 59		•	
Frequency	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 60 TO 64			
Frequency	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	۵	0	٥
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	wit	J. U/.	0.0%
Frequency	1133	1033	100
**			



## TABLE 70-2 ORNCERS -- AGE BY GENOER AND MINORITY STATUS 1970

#### Females

	Total	White	Minoratu
RGE GROUPS	, , , ,	,	Minority
LESS THAN 16			
Frequency	0	0	0
Fercent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FPOM 16 TO 24		0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	3367	2900	467
Percent	61.6%	60.8%	66.7%
FROM 25 TO 29			00.17.
Frequency	1167	1067	100
Percent	21.3%	22.4%	14.3%
FROM 30 TO 34			· · · · · · · ·
Frequency	533	467	67
Fercent	9.8%	9.8%	9.5%
FROM 35 TO 39			J. 0/.
Frequency	200	200	0
Percent	3.7%	4.2%	0.0%
FROM 40 TO 44			0.0%
Frequency	67	0	67
Percent	1.2%	0.0%	9.5%
FPOM 45 TO 49			
Frequency	0	0	Ŋ
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 50 TO 54			
Frequency	67	67	0
Percent	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%
FROM 55 TO 59			
Frequency	33	33	0
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%
FROM 60 TO 64			
Frequency	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
65 <u>+</u>			
Frequency	33	33	0
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%
Total			
Frequency	5467	4767	700

# MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS TABLE 70-3 -- AGE BY GENDER BY MINORITY STATUS 1970

		Male	
Age Groups	Total	White	Minority
LESS THAN 16			
Frequency	1000	933	67
PercentFROM 16 TO 24	1.6%	1.6%	1.1%
Frequency	24500	22933	1567
Percent	38.3%	39.7%	25.5%
FPON 25 TO 29			LC. 0/.
Frequency	8567	7100	1467
Percent	13.4%	12.3%	23.9%
FROM 30 TO 34			
Frequency	6467	5400	1067
Percent	10.1%	9.3%	17.4%
FROM 35 TO 39			
Frequency	4433	3933	500
Percent	6.9%	6.8%	8.2%
FROM 40 TO 44			C-1 C/-
Frequency	4233	3767	467
Percent	6.6%	6.5%	7.6%
FROM 45 TO 49			
Frequency	3333	3100	233
Percent	5.2%	5.4%	3.8%
FROM 50 TO 54			334.0
Frequency	3500	3167	333
Percent	5.5%	5.5%	5.4%
FROM 55 TO 59			
Frequency	3133	2867	267
Percent	4.9%	5.0%	4.3%
FROM 60 TO 64			
Frequency	2133	2033	100
Percent	3.3%	3.5%	1.6%
65_+			
Frequency	2667	2600	67
Percent	4.2%	4.5%	1.1%
Total			
Frequency	63967	57833	6133

## TABLE 70-3 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- AGE BY GENDER BY MINORITY STATUS 1970

#### Female

	Total	White	Minority
Age Groups			
LESS THAN 16			
Frequency	800	733	67
Percent	2.4%	2.3%	3.8%
FROM 16 TO 24	7000	7.00	
Frequency	7900	7433	467
PercentFROM 25 TO 29	38.3%	23.5%	26.4%
Frequency	2222	3100	222
Percent	3333 10.1%	3100 9.8%	233
FROM 30 TO 34	10.1%	7.0%	13.2%
Frequency	3367	3267	100
Percent	10.1%	10.3%	5.7%
FROM 35 TO 39	10. 1/.	10.5%	J. 7%
Frequency	3367	3167	208
Percent	10.1%	10.0%	11.3%
FROM 40 TO 44	200 270	10.0%	11.00
Frequency	3600	3367	233
Percent	10.8%	10.7%	13.2%
FROM 45 TO 49			
Frequency	2700	2667	33
Percent	8.1%	8.4%	1.9%
FROM 50 TO 54			
Frequency	1857	1767	100
Percent	5.6%	5.6%	5.7%
FROM 55 TO 59			
Frequency	2133	2033	100
Percent	6.4%	6.4%	5.7%
FROM 60 TO 64			
Frequency	1700	1567	133
Percent	5.1%	5.0%	7.5%
	26.00		
Frequency	2600	2500	100
Percent	7.8%	7.9%	5.7%
	222267	21/20	.7.7
Frequency	333367	31500	1767



TABLE 70 -- 4
RCTORS -- AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER
1970

		Males		
Age Groups LESS THAN 16	Total	White	81ack	Other
Frequency Percent FROM 16 TO 24	67 •8%	67 .9%	0.0%	0 0.0%
Frequency Percent FROM 25 TO 29	1700 21.3%	1593 20.7%	167 29.4%	0 %0.0
Frequency Percent FROM 30 TO 34	1133 14.2%	1093 14.0%	100 17.6%	0.0%
Frequency Percent FROM 25 TO 39	1267 15.8%	1193 15.3%	133 23.5%	0.0% 0
Frequency Percent FROM 40 TO 44	967 12.1%	900 12.2%	33 5.9%	33 100.0%
Frequency Percent FROM 45 TO 49	967 12.1%	" 900 12.2%	67 11.8%	0.0%
Frequency Percent FROM 50 TO 54	567 7.1%	500 6.8%	67 11.8%	0 0.0%
Frequency Percent FR0M 55 TO 59	600 7.5%	600 8.1%	0 0.0%	0 %0.0
PercentFR0M 60 TO 64	133 1.7%	133 1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency Percent	300 3.8%	300 4.1%	0 0.0%	0 8.0%
Frequency Percent Total	<b>300</b> 3.8%	300 4.1%	0.0% 0	0.0% 0.0%
Frequency	8000	7400	567	33



TABLE 70 -- 4
ACTORS -- AGE BY GENDER BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER
1970

#### Females

	Total	White	Black	044
Age Groups		M11.06	BISCK	Other
LESS THAN 16	٠			
Frequency	33	33	O	0
Percent	.6%	.6%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 16 TO 24			0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1333	1200	133	0
Percent	22.6%	21.8%	44.4%	0.0%
FROM 25 TO 29				0.00
Frequency	1033	967	33	33
Percent	17.5%	17.6%	11.1%	33.3%
FROM 30 TO 34				
Frequency	467	433	33	0
Percent	7.9%	7.9%	11.1%	0.0%
FROM 35 TO 39				
Frequency	733	633	33	67
PercentFROM 40 TO 44	12.4%	11.5%	11.1%	66.7%
	4			
Frequency	467	467	0	0
FROM 45 TO 49	7.9%	8.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	467	477	22	
Percent	7.9%	493 7.9%	33 11.1%	0
FROM 50 TO 54	1 . 2/.	( . 3%	11.1%	0.0%
Frequency	467	433	33	0
Percent	7.9%	7.9%	11.1%	0 %0.0
FROM 55 TO 59			*****	0.0%
Frequency	400	400	0	0
Fercent	6.8%	7.3%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 60 TO 64			2001.	0.0/.
Frequency	300	300	0	0
Percent	5.1%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%
65_+				3,0,,
Frequency	200	200	0	0
Percent	3. 4%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Total				•
Frequency	5900	5500	300	100



TABLE 70 -- 5
ORNCERS -- AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER
1970

#### Males

	Total	White	Black	Other
Age Groups				O O I I C I
LESS THAN 16				
Frequency	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 16 TO 24			4.4	0.0%
Frequency	400	333	33	33
Percent	35.3%	32.3%	100.0%	50.0%
FROM 25 TO 29				
Frequency	267	233	0	33
Percent	23.5%	22.6%	0.0%	50.0%
FROM 30 TO 34				
Frequency	233	233	0	0
Percent	20.6%	22.6%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 35 TO 39				
Frequency	67	67	0	0
Percent	5.9%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 40 TO 44				
Frequency	100	100	0	0
Percent.	8.8%	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%
FRUM 45 TO 49				
Frequency	_ 33	33	0	0
Percent	2.9%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 50 TO 54		_		
Frequency	33	33	0	0
Percent	2.9%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 55 TO 59				
Frequency	_ 0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 60 TO 64	_			
Frequency	0	0	0	0
Percent65 +	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	_	_		
Frequency	0	0	0	9
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	1103			
Frequency	1133	1033	33	67



TABLE 70 -- 5
DANCERS -- AGE BY GENDER BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER
1970

#### Females

LESS THAN 16	Total	Whi	te Bla	ck Other
Frequency	0	0	0	O
Percent	0.0%		0.0%	0.0%
FROM 16 TO 24			0.0	0.0%
Frequency	3367	2900	333	133
Percent	61.6%	60.8%	76.9%	50.0%
FROM 25 TO 29				
Frequency	1167	1067	67	33
Percent. FROM 30 TO 34	21.3%	22.4%	15.4%	12.5%
	<b>F</b> 22			
Frequency Percent	533	467	33	33
FROM 35 TO 39	9.8%	9 8%	7.7%	12.5%
Frequency	200	200	•	_
Percent	3.7%	200 4.2%	0	0
FROM 40 TO 44	J. 7 %	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	67	0	0	67
Percent	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%
FROM 45 TO 49		J. J.,	0.0%	25.0%
Frequency	0	0	0	ο
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 50 TO 54				
· Frequency	67	67	0	0
Percent	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 55 TO 59				
Frequency	33	33	0	0
PercentFROM 60 TO 64	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%
	•	_	_	
Frequency Percent	0	0	0	0
65 +	0.0%	0:0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	33	33	•	_
Percent	.6%	.7%	0 0.0%	0
Total	. 0%	-1%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	5467	4767	433	267
			~~~~~~	



TABLE 70 -- 6
MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS --- AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE BLACK, AND OTHER
1970

Male

	Total	White	Black	Other
Age Groups				C 0
LESS THAN 16				
Frequency	1000	933	67	O
Percent	1.6%	1.6%	1.2%	0.0%
FROM 16 TO 24				4.0
Frequency	24500	22933	1433	133
Percent	38.3%	39.7%	25.7%	23.5%
FROM 25 TO 29				
Frequency	8567	7100	1400	67
Percent	13.4%	12.3%	25.1%	11.8%
FROM 30 TO 34				
Frequency	6467	5400	967	100
Percent	10.1%	9.3%	17.4%	17.6%
FROM 35 TO 39				
Frequency	4433	3933	500	0
Percent	6.9%	6.8%	9.0%	0.0%
FROM 40 TO 44				
Frequency	4233	3767	333	133
Percent	6.6%	6.5%	6.0%	23.5%
FROM 45 TO 49				
Frequency	3333	3100	200	33
Percent	5.2%	5.4%	3.6%	5.9%
FROM 50 TO 54				
Frequency	3500	3167	300	33
Percent	5.5%	5.5%	5.4%	5.9%
FROM 55 TO 59				
Frequency	3133	2867	233	33
Percent	4.9%	5.0%	4.2%	5.9%
FROM 60 TO 64				
Frequency	2133	2033	67	33
Percent	3.3%	3.5%	1.2%	5.9%
65 +				
Frequency	2667	2600	67	٥
Percent	4.2%	4.5%	1.2::	0.0%
Total	6006T			
Frequency	63967	57833	5567	567



TABLE 70 -- 6

MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS --- AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1970

#### Female Total White Black Other Age Groups LESS THAN 16 Frequency..... 800 733 67 0 2.3% Percent..... 2.4% 4.5% 0.0% FROM 16 TO 24 Frequency..... 7900 7433 367 100 Percent..... 23.7% 23.5% 25.0% 33.3% FROM 25 TO 29 Frequency..... 3333 3100 200 33 Percent.... 9.8% 10.0% 13.6% 11.1% FROM 30 TO 34 Frequency..... 3367 3267 67 33 Percent..... 10.1% 10.3% 4.5% 11.1% FROM 35 TO 39 Frequency..... 3367 3167 133 67 Percent..... 10.1% 10.0% 9.1% 22.2% FROM 40 TO 44 Frequency..... 3600 3367 200 33 Percent.... 10.8% 10.7% 13.6% 11.1% FROM 45 TO 49 Frequency..... 2700 2667 33 0 Percent..... 8.1% 2.3% 8.4% 0.0% FROM 50 TO 54 Frequency..... 1867 1767 100 0 Percent..... 6.8% 5.6% 5.6% 0.0% FROM 55 TO 59 Frequency..... 2133 2033 100 0 Percent.... 6.4% 6.4% 6.8% 0.0% FROM 60 TO 64 Frequency..... 1700 1567 100 33 Percent.... 5.1% 5.0% 6.8% 11.1% 65 + Frequency..... 2600 2500 100 0 Percent..... 7.8% 7.9% 6.8% 0.0% Total Frequency..... 1467 33367 31600 300



TABLE 70 -- 7
RCTORS -- EDUCATION BY GENOER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER

-	-	4	_
-	-	•	-

	Total	White	Black	Other
Education Level				
Grades 1 - 6				
Frequency	33	33	0	n
Percent	. 4%	.5%	G. 0%	ง.อะ
Grades 7-8			0.4%	0.0%
Frequency	267	267	0	O
Percent	3.3%	3.6%	0.0%	ຄ. ຕະ
Some Migh School		0.0%	o. 0/.	C. 0/.
Frequency	533	533	0	a
Percent	6.7%	7.2%	0.02	0.0%
Grad. H. S.		4	0.0%	C
Frequency	1667	1467	167	33
Percent	20.8%	19.8%	29.4%	100.0%
Some College			<b>C.</b> , <b>C</b>	100.07.
Frequency	2467	2200	267	0
Percent	30.8%	29.7%	47.1%	0.0%
Grad. College				C
Frequency	1900	1833	67	0
Percent	23.8%	24.8%	11.8%	0.0%
Graduate Nork				C. O/.
Frequency	1133	1067	67	O
Percent	14.2%	14.4%	11.8%	0.0%
Total		_ , _ , , ,		·· · · · ·
Frequency	9000	7400	567	33

TABLE 70 -- 7
ACTORS -- EDUCATION BY GENDER BY WHITE, STACK, AND OTHER

#### Female

Education Level	Total	White	Black	Other
Grades 1 - 6				
Frequency	0	_		
Percent	0	0	_ 0	0
Grades 7-8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	400	_	
Percent	100	100	0	0
Some High School	1.7%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	400	333	67	מ
Fercent	6.8%	6.1%	22.2%	0.0%
Grad. H. S.				0.0%
Frequency	1533	1433	67	33
Percent	26.0%	26.1%	22.2%	33.3%
Some College				J-7- J/-
Frequency	2200	2033	133	33
Percent	37.3%	37.0%	44.4%	33.3%
Grad. College				33.3%
Frequency	1133	1067	33	33
Percent	19.2%	19.4%	11.1%	33.3%
Graduate Work				00.0%
Frequency	<b>5</b> 33	593	O	0
Percent	9.0%	9.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Total			57.	0.0%
Frequency	5900	5500	300	100

TABLE 70 -- 8
DANCERS -- EDUCATION BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER

#### Males

Education Level	Total	White	Black	Other
Grades 1 - 6 Frequency Percent Grades 7-8	33	33	0	0
	2.9%	3. 2%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency Percent Some High School	0	0. 0%	0	0
	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency Percent Grad. H. S.	67	33	33	0
	5.9%	3.2%	100.0%	0.0%
Frequency Percent Some College	467	433	0	93
	41.2%	41.9%	0.0%	50.0%
Frequency. Percent. Grad. College	267	233	0	33
	29.5%	22.6%	0.0%	50.0%
Frequency	167 14.7%	167 16.1%	0.0%	0 0.0%
Frequency	133	133	0	0
	11.8%	12.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1133	1033	33	67



TABLE 70 -- 8

DRNCERS -- EDUCATION BY GENDER BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER

1970

#### Females

F	ll Females	White	Black	Other
Education Level Grades 1 - 6				
Frequency	. 33	33	0	0
Percent	2.9%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%
Grades 7-8		0.67	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	. 133	100	0	33
Percent	2.4%	2.1%	0.0%	12.5%
Some High School			0.0%	12.3%
Frequency	. 1567	1467	67	33
Percent	. 28.7%	30.8%	15.4%	12.5%
Grad. H. S.		0.01.3/1	13.4%	12.5%
Frequency	2500	2133	233	133
Percent	. 45.7%	44.8%	53.8%	50.0%
Some College		1 1 2 2 2 2	03.0%	30.0%
Frequency	• 900	700	133	67
Percent	. 16.5%	14.7%	30.8%	25.0%
Grad. College		2	00.0%	23.0%
Frequency	267	267	0	0
Percent	4.9%	5.6%	0.0%	00%
Graduate Work		<b>C.</b> <i>G</i>	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	. 33	33	0	0
Percent	6%	.7%	0.0%	
Total		- 1 /-	G. U%	C-0%
Frequency	5467	4767	433	267
				201

TABLE 70 -- 9

MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS --- EDUCATION BY GÉNDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER
1970

#### Female Total White Black Other Education Level Grades 1 - 6 Frequency..... 233 200 33 0 Percent..... .7% .6% 2.3% 0.0% Grades 7-8 Frequency..... 833 767 33 33 Percent..... 2.5% 2.4% 2.3% 11.1% Some High School Frequency..... 3733 3400 300 33 Percent..... 11.2% 10.8% 20.5% 11.1% Grad. H. 5 Frequency..... 9233 8633 567 33 Percent..... 27.7% 27.3% 38.6% 11.1% Some College Frequency..... 9833 9233 433 167 Percent..... 29.5% 29.2% 29.5% 55.6% Grad. College Frequency..... 5967 5833 100 33 Percent..... 17.9% 18.5% 6.8% 11.1% Graduate Work Frequency..... 3533 3533 0 0 Percent.... 10.6% 11.2% 0.0% 0.0% Total Frequency..... 33367 31600 1467 300

## MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS --- EDUCATION BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER

1970

### Male

	Total	White	Black	Other
Education Level				
Grades 1 - 6				
Frequency	1100	933	167	0
Percent	1.7%	1.6%	3.0%	0.0%
Grades 7-8				515/1
Frequency	2300	2033	233	33
Percent	3.6%	3.5%	4.2%	5.9%
Some Hist School				J. 7/.
Frequency	9833	8467	1233	133
Percent	15.4%	14.6%	22.2%	23.5%
Grad. H. S.				23.0%
Frequency	17300	15067	2133	100
Percent	27.0%	26.1%	38.3%	17.6%
Some College		201111		17.0%
Frequency	19100	17867	1000	233
Percent	29.9%	30.9%	18.0%	41.2%
Grad. College	2505.0	001111		41.2/-
Frequency	7000	6433	533	33
Percent	10.9%	11.12	9.6%	5.9%
Graduate Work	100 11		J. O/.	J. 5%
Frequency	7333	7033	267	33
Percent	11.5%	12.2%	4.8%	5.9%
Total		46-6-	7.0%	J. 7/.
Frequency	63967	57833	5567	567

TABLE 70 -- 10

### ACTORS ---- EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1970

ı			Male			Female		
Employment Status Employed Civilian	Total	Whi	te Bla	∍ck Other	Total	White	Black	Other
Frequency Percent Unemployed	5467 68.3%	5000 67.6%	467 82.4%	0 0.0%	4033 68.4%	3667 66.7%	300 100.0%	67 66.7%
Frequency Percent Total	2533 31.7%	2400 32.4%	100 17.6%	33 100.0%	1867 31.6%	1 <b>93</b> 3 33.3%	0.0% 0.0%	33.3%
Frequency	8000	7400	567	33	5900	5500	300	100



TABLE 70 - 11
DANCERS -- EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE AND BLACK
1970

		Male			Females				
Employment Status Employed Civilian	Total	White	Black	Other	Total	White	Black	Other <b>s</b>	
Frequency. Percent. Unemployed	933 82.4%	833 80.6%	33 100.0%	67 100.0%	4733 86.6%	4267 89.5%	300 69.2%	167 62.5%	
Frequency. Percent Total	200 17.6%	200 19.4%	0 %0.0	0.0% 0.0%	733 13.4%	500 1 <b>0.</b> 5%	193 30.8%	100 37.5%	
Frequency	1133	1033	33	67	5467	4767	433	267	



TABLE 70 - 12

MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER

1970

		Males				Females			
Employment Status Employed Civilian	Total	White	Black	Other	Total	White	B) ack	Other	
Frequency Percent Unemployed	59267 92.7%	53867 93.1%	4867 87.4%	533 94.1%	31900 95.6%	90300 95.9%	1300 88.6%	30:0% 30:00	
Frequency Percent Total	4700 7.3%	3967 6.9%	700 12.6%	33 5. 9%	1467 4.4%	1300 4.12	167 11.4%	0. <b>0</b> %	
Frequency	63967	57833	5567	567	33367	31600	1467	300	



TABLE 70 -- 13
ACTORS -- HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1970

		₩h	ite	E11	ack	Oti	ner
.101.5	Total	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unempil.	Employed	
HOURS HORKED LAST WEEK		_	•				
1 <u>t</u> o 14							
Frequency	867	867	Ð	0	0	0	0
Percent	10.8%	17.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
15_to 29							555
Frequency	1133	1133	CI	0	0	0	0
Percent	14.2%	22.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
30_to 34							0.0%
Frequency	367	300	()	67	0	0	0
Percent	4.6%	6.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
35 to 39			•	2 1 1 2 1 2	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	233	167	CI	6.7	0	0	Ω
Percent	2.9%	3.3%	0.0%	14.3%	ຄ.ກະ	0.0%	0.0%
40 hours				- 11 - 11	C	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1000	833	Cı	167	D	0	O
Percent	12.5%	16.7%	0.0%	35.7%	C.0%	0.0%	0.0%
41 to 48				33.17	C . U/.	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	700	600	CI	100	n	D	0
Percent	8.8%	12.0%	0.0%	21.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
49 to 59		22.01.	0.0/.	C1. 7/.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	400	367	£i	33	0	0	0
Percent	5.0%	7.3%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	_	_
60 or more	0.0	1 . 5/.	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	467	467	O	0	0	0	_
Percent	5.8%	9.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0
N.∕A	0.0%	y. J	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	2833	267	2400	33	1.00	_	
Percent	35.4%	_	100.0%		100	0	33
Total	33.4%	J. 3/.	100.0%	7.1%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Frequency	8000	5000	2400	467	100	0	33



### TABLE 70 -- 13 ACTORS -- HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1370

### Females

		White	,	B1:	ack:	Other	
	Totals	Employed	Unemp1.			Employed	Unemp1.
HOURS HORKED LAST WEEK		, ,	•	. ,		<b></b>	
1 to 14							
Frequency	800	700	0	67	0	33	0
Percent	13.6%	19.1%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%
15 to 29	10.0%		O. 07.	CC . C/.	0.0%	JU. 0%	0.0%
Frequency	967	653	O	133	Ω	0	0
Percent	16.4%	22.7%	0.0%	44.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>30</b> to 34			5.50.6		0.00		0.00
Frequency	500	500	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	8.5%	13.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
35 to 39							
Frequency	267	267	G	0	0	0	0
Percent	4.5%	7.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
40 hours							
Frequency	1067	967	0	100	0	0	0
Percent	18.1%	26.4%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
41 to 4B							
Frequency	67	67	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.1%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
49 to 59							
Frequency	167	167	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	2.8%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
60 or more							
Frequency	33	33	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 6.:	. 9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
N/A							
Frequency	2033	1 <b>3</b> 3	1833	0	0	33	<b>3</b> 3
Percent	34.5%	3.6%	100.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	100.0%
Total							
Frequency	5900	3667	1833	<b>30</b> 0	0	67	33



TABLE 70 -- 14
DANCERS -- HOURS WORKED BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS
1970

		MH	nite		Black	Other		
	Total	Employ.	Unempl.	Employ.		Employ.	Unempl.	
HOURS WORKED LAST			•		•			
HEEK								
1 to 14								
Frequency	167	100	0	33	O	33	0	
Percent	14.7%	12.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	
15 to 29								
Frequency	133	100	0		0	33	0	
Percent		12.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%	
30 to 34							2.0.0	
Frequency	233	233	0	0	0	0	O	
Percent	20.6%	28.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
35 to 39								
Frequency	67	67	0	0	0	0	Ω	
Percent	5.9%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	
40 hours								
Frequency		100	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	8.8%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
41 to 48			•					
Frequency	67	67	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	5.9%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
49 to 59								
Frequency	133	133	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	11.8%	16.0%	0.0%	0.0%	۷.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
60 or more								
Frequency	33	<b>3</b> 3	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	2.9%	4.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
, N∕A								
Frequency	200	0	200	0	0	0	0	
Percent	17.6%	0.0%	100.0%	0. CIX	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	
Total							•	
Frequency	1133	833	200	33	0	67	0	



TABLE 14

DRNCERS -- HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS
1970

### Females

		Whi	t.e	В	lack	01	ther
	Total		Unempl.				
HOURS NORKED LAST NEEK		, ,	•	,	· · • -		= · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
1 to 14							
Frequency	600	533	0	ņ	0	67	0
Percent	11.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%
15 to 29				-		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Frequency	1100	967	0	<b>10</b> 0	0	33	0
Percent	20.1%	22.7%	0.0%	33.3%	0_ (i%	20.0%	0.0%
30 to 34			<del>-</del> -				
Frequency	733	700	0	<b>3</b> 3	0	0	. 0
Percent	13.4%	16.4%	0.0%	11.1%	0. CIX	0.0%	0.0%
35 to 39			•				
Frequency	733	633	· O	100	0	0	0
Percent	13.4%	14.8%	0.0%	33.3%	0. (1%	0.0%	0.0%
40 hours			-				
Frequency	1033	967	Ũ	33	0	33	0
Percent	18.9%	22.7%	0.0%	11.1%	0. CI%	20.0%	0.0%
41 to 48			•				
Frequency	200	167	0	<b>3</b> 3	0	0	0
Percent	3.7%	3.9%	0.0%	11.1%	0. CI%	0.0%	0.0%
49 to 59						<del></del>	
Frequency	67	67	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0. CI%	0.0%	0.0%
60 or more							
Frequency	67	67	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	D. C1%	0.0%	0.0%
N/A							
Frequency	933	167	500	0	1313	33	100
Percent	17.1%	3.9%	100.0%	0.0%	100. Ciz	20.0%	100.0%
Total				2			
Frequency	5467	4267	<b>50</b> 0	300	1513	167	100



## TABLE 70 -- 15 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- HOURS WORKED BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

			nite		Black:		Other		
	Total	Employ.	Unemp1.	Employ.		Employ.			
HOURS HORKED LAST					•				
HEEK									
1 to 14	_								
Frequency	50500	18700	0	1367	0	133	0		
Percent	31.6%	34.7%	0.0%	28.1%	0.0%	25.0%	i).0%		
15_to 29									
Frequency	12233	10867	0	1133	0	233	0		
Percent	19.1%	20.2%	0.0%	23. 3%	0.0%	43.8%	0. <b>0</b> %		
30 to 34									
Frequency	7133	6533	0	567	0	33	0		
Percent	11.2%	12.1%	0.0%	11.6%	0.0%	6.3%	0. <b>0</b> %		
35_to 39									
Frequency	3500	3067	0	433	0	0	0		
Percent,	5.5%	5.7%	0.0%	8.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
40_hours									
Frequency	6867	6100	0	667	0	100	0		
Percent	10.7%	11.3%	0.0%	13.7%	0.0%	18.8%	0.0%		
41 to 48									
Frequency	3033	2933	0	10 <b>0</b>	0	0	0		
Percent	4.7%	5.4%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
49 to 59									
Frequency	2367	2133	8	20 <b>0</b>	0	33	0		
Percent	3.7%	4.0%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%		
60 or more							••••		
Frequency	2200	1967	0	233	0	0	0		
Percent	3.4%	3.7%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
N/A							0.0		
Frequency	6433	1567	3967	167	700	0	<b>£</b> 3		
Percent	10.1%	2.9%	100.0%	3.4%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
Total									
Frequency	63967	53867	3967	4867	700	533	33		



TABLE 70 -- 15

MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- HOURS WORKED BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

1970

### Females

		Mi	ite		llack	Other	
	Total	Employed	Uniemp1.	Employed			Unempil.
HOURS NORKED LAST NEEK		. •	•				
1 to 14							
Frequency	21600	20967	0	5′ "	Ω	100	0
Percent	64.7%	69.2%	0.0%	41.0%	.0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
Frequency	4500	4033	0	400	0	67	O
Percent	13.5%	13.3%	0.0%	30.8%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%
Frequency	1867	<b>170</b> 0	0	100	0	67	0
Percent	5.6%	5.6%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%
Frequency	500	467	0	33	0	0	0
Percent	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	2.6%	n. 0%	Ω. 0X	0.0%
Frequency	1333	1167	0	100	0	67	0
Percent41 to 48	4.0%	3.9%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	28.2%	0.0%
Frequency	367	333	0	33	ច	0	O
Percent	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	267	233	0	33	O	۵	0
Percent	.0	- 8%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	367	<b>33</b> 3	0	33	O	0	0
Percent N/A	1.1%	1.1%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	2567	1067	1300	3 <b>3</b>	167	0	0
Percerit	7.7%	3.5%	100.0%	2%	100.0%	0.0%	Ú. 0%
Frequency	33367	30300	1300	1300	167	300	0



### TABLE 70 -- 16 RCTORS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1969 1970

### Males WEEKS WORKED

	Total	13 or 1	less 14-26	27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode						10 12	<i>-</i>	
Radio/Television								
Frequency	433	67	33	33	33	67	200	0
Percent	5.4%	4.8%	2.4%	2.3%	2.9%	12.5%	10.5%	0.0%
Eating/Orinking Pl.							1010/1	0.0
Frequency	<b>. 190</b>	0	0	33	33	0	33	0
Percent	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	2.9%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%
Advertising								<b></b>
Frequency	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b> 3	0	0	33	33	0	0
Percent	1.3%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.9%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Hotels/Motels							0,000	
Frequency	33	0	0	0	0	33	0	0
Percent	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Theatres/Mot. Pic.								
Frequency	6133	1100	1200	1233	933	367	1133	167
Percent	76.7%	78.6%	85.7%	84.1%	82.4%	68.8%	59.6%	100.0%
Misc. Ent. Serv.							<b>33 1</b> - 13	
Frequency	167	33	Ð	33	0	0	100	0
Percent	2.1%	2.4%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%
College/Univ.								
Frequency	233	67	33	67	67	0	0	0
Percent	2.9%	4.8%	2.4%	4.5%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Relig. Org.								000.0
Frequency	33	0	33	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 4%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other								
Freruency	767	100	100	67	33	33	433	0
Percent	9.6%	7.1%	7.1%	4.5%	2.9%	6.3%	22.8%	0.0%
Total								
Frequency	9000	1400	1400	1467	1133	533	1900	167



### TABLE 70 -- 17 DANCERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY HEEKS WORKED IN 1969 1970

#### Males HEEKS WORKED

	Total	13 or less	14-26	27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode								
Radio/Television								
Frequency	67	0	0	0	67	0	0	Ω
Percent	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%
Eating/Orinking Pl.								
Frequency	167	<b>3</b> 3	33	33	33	O	33	D
Percent	14.7%	25.0%	33.3%	14.3%	20.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%
Advertising					•			
Frequency	,	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ω
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hotels/Motels						230.0		
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Theatres/Mot. Pic.								
Frequency	633	100	67	167	67	67	167	0
Percent	55.9%	75.0%	66.7%	71.4%	40.0%	100.0%	38.5%	0.0%
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	100	0	0	33	0	0	67	0
Percent	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%
College/Univ.								
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other								
Frequency	167	0	0	0	0	0	167	0
Percent	14.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%	0.0%
Total								
Frequency	1133	133	100	233	167	6?	433	0



### TABLE 70 -- 17 DANCERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY HEEKS WORKED IN 1969 1970

#### Males HEEKS WORKED

	Total	13 or less	14-26	27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode								
Radio/Television								
Frequency	67	0	0	0	67	0	0	Ω
Percent	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%
Eating/Orinking Pl.								
Frequency	167	<b>3</b> 3	33	33	33	O	33	D
Percent	14.7%	25.0%	33.3%	14.3%	20.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%
Advertising					•			
Frequency	,	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ω
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hotels/Motels						230.0		
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Theatres/Mot. Pic.								
Frequency	633	100	67	167	67	67	167	0
Percent	55.9%	75.0%	66.7%	71.4%	40.0%	100.0%	38.5%	0.0%
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	100	0	0	33	0	0	67	0
Percent	8.8%	0.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%
College/Univ.								
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other								
Frequency	167	0	0	0	0	0	167	0
Percent	14.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	38.5%	0.0%
Total								
Frequency	1133	133	100	233	167	6?	433	0



### TABLE 70 -- 17 DANCERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 1970

### Females WEEKS WORKED

	Total	13 or les	s 14-26	27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode				a. 52		40 45	30 32	not ubbit.
Radio/Television								
Frequency	33	0	33	0	0	0	o	ก
Percent	.6%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Eating/Drinking Pl.				== 0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	2667	333	267	467	300	233	767	300
Percent	48.8%	38.5%	36.4%	45.2%	47.4%	70.0%	56.1%	60.0%
Advertising						10.0%	30.1%	60.0%
Frequency	Ð	0	0	0	Ð	ស	ο	O
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hotels/Motels					0.0	0.0%	0.0/.	0.0%
Frequency	367	67	100	100	33	O	67	n
Percent	6.7%	7.7%	13.6%	9.7%	5.3%	0.0%	4.9%	0.0%
Theatres/Mot. Pic.					0.0	J.C.,	7. 3/.	0.0%
Frequency	1867	367	167	333	267	100	500	193
Percent	34.1%	42.3%	22.7%	32.3%	42.1%	30.0%	36.6%	26.7%
Misc. Ent. Serv.			•			33.0%	30.07.	20.7%
Frequency	433	100	133	100	33	Ð	0	67
Percent	7.9%	11.5%	18.2%	9.7%	5.3%	0.0%	0.0%	13.3%
College/Univ.					- 1 0/.	<b>5.</b> 0/.	C. 0/.	13.3%
Frequency	67	0	<b>3</b> 3	33	១	Ð	Ð	O
Percent	1.2%	0.0%	4.5%	3.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Relig. Org.					0.0%	0.0%	V. 0/.	0.0%
Frequency	Ð	Ŋ	· O	O	Ð	Ð	n	O
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other					J. 0/.	0.0%	0.0/.	0.0%
frequency	33	0	0	Ð	Ð	Đ	33	O
Percent	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%
Total					2.0	0/.	E 7/.	0.0%
Frequency	5467	867	733	1033	633	333	1367	500



### TABLE 70 -- 18 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1969 1970

### Males WEEKS WORKED

	Total	13 or	less 14	1-26 27-3	9 40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not	Appl.
Industry Recode									• -
Radio/Television									
Frequency	400	67	(	33	0	33	267	0	
Percent	. 6%	.8%	0.0	. 4%	0.0%	.6%	1.1%	0.0%	
Eating/Orinking Pl.									
Frequency	9133	867	700	1433	1300	1067	3467	300	
Percent	14.3%	10.6%	10.37	16.5%	14.3%	20.8%	14.1%	19.6%	
Advertising									
Frequency	133	0	(	0 0	33	33	67	8	
Percent	.2"	0.0%	0.07	0.0%	. 4%	.6%	. 3%	0.0%	1
Hotels/Motels									
Frequency	2133	100	300	3 400	267	100	967	0	
Percent	3.3%	1.2%	4.47	4.6%	2.9%	1.9%	3.9%	0.0%	
Theatres/Mot. Pic.									
Frequency	34067	5133		5367	5300	2600	11033	733	
Percent	53.3%	62.9%	57.67	61.7%	58.2%	50.6%	44.9%	47.8%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.									
Frequency	1733	300			233	167	467	100	ļ
Percent	2.7%	3.7%	4.47	1.9%	2.6%	3.2%	1.9%	6.5%	ł
College/Univ.									
Frequency	700	133	133		67	33	200	0	
Percent	1.1%	1.6%	2.07	2 1.5%	.7%	.6%	. 8%	0.0%	•
Relig. Org.									
Frequency	8700	733	733	<b>667</b>	867	667	4833	200	
Percent	13.6%	9.0%	10.82	7.7%	9.5%	13.0%	19.7%	13.0%	ļ
Other									1
Frequency	6967	833			1033	433	3267	200	
Percent	10.9%	10.2%	10.32	5.7%	11.4%	8.4%	15.3%	13.0%	
Total									
Frequency	63967	8167	6767	9700	9100	5133	24567	1533	



TABLE 70 -- 18

MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY WEEKS WORKED IN 1969
1970

### Females WEEKS WORKED

	Total	13 or 3	less 14-2	6 27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode	, , ,				,			••
Radio/Television								
Frequency	67	0	0	0	33	0	33	Ð
Percent	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	.3%	0.0%
Eating/Drinking Pl.								
Frequency	1667	200	167	433	167	133	533	33
Percent	5.0%	3.9%	4.0%	9.1%	4.8%	6.2%	4.4%	2.3%
Advertising								
Frequency	Ð	0	0	0	. 0	0	0	Ð
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hotels/Motels								
Frequency	700	33	100	209	33	67	257	Ð
Percent	2.1%	.6%	2.4%	4.2%	1.0%	3.1%	2.2%	0.0%
Theatres/Mot. Pic.								
Frequency	7567	1700	1367	1300	1000	267	1567	367
Percent	22.7%	32.9%	32.8%	27.3%	28.8%	12.3%	12.8%	25.6%
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	933	133	200	233	133	33	167	33
Percent	2.8%	2.6%	4.8%	4.9%	3.8%	1.5%	1.4%	2.3%
College/Univ.								
Frequency	867	167	133	267	167	33	0	100
Percent	2.6%	3.2%	3.2%	5.6%	4.8%	1.5%	0.0%	7.0%
Reliq. Org.								
Frequency	17667	2500	1800	1333	1433	1200	8800	600
Percent	52.9%	48.4%	43.2%	28.0%	41.3%	55.4%	72.1%	41.9%
Other								
Frequency	3900	433	400	1000	500	433	833	300
Percent	11.7%	3.4%	9.6%	21.0%	14.4%	20.0%	6.8%	20.9%
Total								
Frequency	33367	5167	. 4167	4767	3467	2167	12200	1433

## TABLE 70 -- 19 ACTORS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

	Total	Hi Emplo	nite	mpl. Empl	Black	1	Other	lluna 3
Industry Recode	IULBI	r.mp.r.c	geo are	mpr. empr	ogeo une	mpl.	Employed	Unempl.
Radio/Telvision								
Frequency	433	233	167	33	0	0	0	
Percent	5.4%	4.7%	6.9%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	_	
Eating/Orinking Pl.			00011		0.0	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	100	67	0	33	0	0	0	
Percent	1.3%	1.3%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%		
Advertising			0.0	• • • • • •	0.00	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	100	<b>3</b> 3	67	0	0	0	0	
Percent.	1.3%	.7%	2.8%	0.0%	9.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Hotels/Motels				5.5.5	0.0	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	.4%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Theatres/Mot. Pic.						0.0	0.0	
Frequency	6133	3633	2000	367	100	0	33	
Percent	76.7%	72.7%	83.3%	78.6%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.					000000			
Frequency	167	133	0	33	0	0	0	
Percent	2.1%	2.7%	0.0%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
College/Univ.								
Frequency	233	233	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	2.9%	4.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Relig. Org.		•					2	
Frequency	33	<b>3</b> 3	O	0	0	0	0	
Percent	. 4%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Other								
Frequency	767	600	167	0	Ð	0	0	
Percent	9.6%	12.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total						**		
Frequency	8000	5000	2400	467	100	0	33	



## TABLE 70 -- 19 ACTORS -- INOUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

Females

		White	•	Blac	:k	Other	
•	Tot al	Emp1 oyed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	Employ	jed Unempil.
Industry Recode				_	· ·		
Radio/Telvision							
Frequency	367	300	67	0	Ū	0	Ð
Percent	6.2%	8.2%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Eating/Drinking Pl.							
Frequency	33	33	Ð	0	0	0	0
Percent	.6%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Advertising							
Frequency	133	<b>3</b> 3	100	0	0	0	0
Percent	2.3%	. 9%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Hotels/Motels							
Frequency	0	0	0	0	Ð	0	O
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Theatres/Mot. Pic.							
Frequency	4267	2367	1567	233	Ð	67	33
Percent	72.3%	64.5%	85.5%	77.8%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Misc. Ent. Serv.					3.0		
Frequency	67	67	0	Ð	O	D	Ð
Percent	1.1%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
College/Univ.						5.0,0	
Frequency	233	233	D	0	Ð	0	ស
Percent	4.0%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Relig. Org.				0.0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	0	Ð	O	G	Ð	O	Ð
Percent	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other			•••	0.000	0.0	0.0/.	0.0%
Frequency	800	633	100	67	ก	O	O
Percent	13.6%	17.3%	5.5%	22.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	20.5%	3	••••		J. 0/.	····	J. 0/.
Frequency	5900	3667	1833	300	O	67	33
	0.00			<b></b>	0	Of	JJ



TABLE 70 -- 20
DANCERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS
1970

All Females

			White	В	lack	Other		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	Employe		
Industry Recode			•				<b>3</b> - 12 p 3	
Radio/Television								
Frequency	33	0	0	33	O	Ð	ស	
Percent	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	11.12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Eating/Drinking Pl.							0.0	
Frequency	2667	2200	167	167	93	67	33	
Percent	48.8%	51.6%	33.3%	55.6%	25.0%	40.0%	33.3%	
Advertising						.0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	Ð	0	Ð	Ð	Ð	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Hotels/Motels							0.0	
Frequency	367	233	67	0	Ð	Ð	67	
Percent	6.7%	5.5%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	
Theatres/Mot. Pic.							•	
Frequency	1867	1433	233	67	67	67	0	
Percent	34.1%	33.6%	46.7%	22.2%	50.0%	40.0%	0.0%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.		:						
Frequency	433	300	<b>3</b> 3	33	33	33	0	
Percent	7.9%	7.0%	6.7%	11.1%	25.0%	20.0%	0.0%	
Coilege/Univ.								
Frequency	67	67	Ð	0	C	0	0	
Percent	1.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	0	O	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Other								
Frequency	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	.6%	.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total								
Frequency	5467	4267	<b>50</b> 0	300	133	167	100	



TABLE 70 -- 20
DANCERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS
1970

All Females

			White	В	lack	Other		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	Employe		
Industry Recode			•				<b>3</b> - 12 p 3	
Radio/Television								
Frequency	33	0	0	33	O	Ð	ស	
Percent	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	11.12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Eating/Drinking Pl.							0.0	
Frequency	2667	2200	167	167	93	67	33	
Percent	48.8%	51.6%	33.3%	55.6%	25.0%	40.0%	33.3%	
Advertising						.0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	Ð	0	Ð	Ð	Ð	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Hotels/Motels							0.0	
Frequency	367	233	67	0	Ð	Ð	67	
Percent	6.7%	5.5%	13.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	
Theatres/Mot. Pic.							•	
Frequency	1867	1433	233	67	67	67	0	
Percent	34.1%	33.6%	46.7%	22.2%	50.0%	40.0%	0.0%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.		:						
Frequency	433	300	<b>3</b> 3	33	33	33	0	
Percent	7.9%	7.0%	6.7%	11.1%	25.0%	20.0%	0.0%	
Coilege/Univ.								
Frequency	67	67	Ð	0	C	0	0	
Percent	1.2%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	0	O	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Other								
Frequency	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	.6%	.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total								
Frequency	5467	4267	<b>50</b> 0	300	133	167	100	



## TABLE 70 -- 21 MUSICIANS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

		Whit		81 <b>a</b>	ck	Other		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.		Unempl.	Empl		
Industry Pecode		• -	•	, ,	•	•		
Radio/Telvision								
Frequency	400	333	33	33	0	O	0	
Percent	.6%	.6%	.8%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Eating/Drinking Fl.								
Frequency	9133	7767	367	667	200	133	0	
Percent	14.3%	14.4%	9.2%	13.7%	28.6%	25.0%	0.0%	
Advertising								
Frequency	133	133	0	0	0	0	0	
Per cent	.2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Hotels/Motels								
Frequency	2133	1933	167	0	33	0	0	
Percent	3.3%	3.6%	4.2%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	
Theatres/Mot. Pic.								
Frequency	34067	27700	2500	3167	400	267	33	
Parcent	53.3%	51.4%	63.0%	65.1%	57.1%	50.0%	100.0%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	1733	1367	300	67	0	0	0	
Percent	2.7%	2.5%	7.6%	1.4%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	
College/Univ.						_	-	
Frequency	700	633	0	33	O	<b>3</b> 3	0	
Percent	1.1%	1.2%	0.0%	.7%	8.0%	6.3%	0.0%	
Relig. Org.								
Frequericy	8700	6400	133	133	33	0	0	
Per cent	13.6%	15.6%	3.4%	2.7%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	
Other								
Frequency	6967	5600	467	767	33	100	0	
Percent	10.9%	10.4%	11.8%	15.8%	4.8%	18.8%	0.0%	
Total							-	
Frequency	63967	53867	3967	4867	700	<b>53</b> 3	33	



## TABLE 70 -- 21 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER NHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STRIUS 1970

### All Females

		+	<b>Hhite</b>		B1ack	Other-		
	Totai	Employed	Unempl.		d Unempl.	Employed	Unemp.	
Industry Recode					•			
Radio/Telvision								
Frequency	67	67	0	0	0	0	0	
Fercent	.2%	- 2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Eating/Drinking Pl.								
Frequency	1667	1367	67	133 .	33	67	0	
Fercent	5.0%	4.5%	5.1%	10.3%	20.0%	22.2%	0.0%	
Advertising								
Frequency	Ci	0	0	0	0	0	0	
fercent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Hotels/Motels								
Frequency	700	533	100	67	0	0	0	
Fercent	2.1%	1.8%	7.7%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Theatres/Mot. Pic.						202.0		
Frequency	7567	6133	700	533	67	133	0	
Fercent	22.7%	20.2%	53.8%	41.0%	40.0%	44.4%	0.0%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.							<b>0.</b>	
Frequency	933	867	67	0	8	Ω	Ω	
Fercent	2.8%	2.9%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
College/Univ.						<b></b>		
řrequency	867	767	33	67	0	3	O	
Percent	2.6%	5%	2.6%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	1 <b>76</b> 67	17067	233	300	0	67	O	
Percent	52.9%	56.3%	17.9%	23.1%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	
Olther								
Frequency	3900	<b>3</b> 500	100	201)	67	33	0	
Percent	11.7%	11.6%	7.7%	15.4%	40.0%	11.1%	0.0%	
Total							- 3 <b></b>	
Frequency	33367	<b>3</b> 0300	1300	1300	167	300	0	



# ACTORS --- PLACE OF MOPY BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER\*\* AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970 Males

TABLE 70 -- 22

White

Total Employed Unempl. Employed Unempl.

	• •	•		•	
109	100	n	n	(3	
		_	_	-	
2	2	Ç		0.0/.	
2500	7000	1300	100	100	
32.1%	21.3%	56.5%	14.3%		
100	100	3	0	CI	
1.3%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	9.0%	
0	0	0	0	ÇI	
0.0%	0.0%	€. O%	0.0%	0.0%	
100	100	_0	0	0	
1.3%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0x	
4.5-5		_	_	_	
		_	_	-	
1.3%	2.1%	U. U%	Ų.U%	U. 0%	
160	0	100	0	٠.	
	_		_	-	
1.3%	0.0%	4.3%	U. U/2	0.0%	
Ω	Ω	n	n	O	
_	_	_	_	-	
0. 0.7.	0.0%	<b>0.</b> 0/.	e.o/.	0.0/	
1 fin	100	ה	n	n	
			_	-	
		0.0	4,00.0	0.0	
200	200	0	0	CI	
2.6%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
300	2'00	100	O	0	
3.6%	4.3%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	
100	100	0	0 .	Cı	
1.3%	2.1%	0.0::	0.0%	0.0%	
		_		_	
		_			
1.3%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	CC
222	***		• •	<b>.</b>	(S
		<del>-</del> - · ·	<del></del>	_	<i>ce</i> : 1 :
J. E%	4.3%	4.3%	U.U%	<b>Ū.</b> U%	(Cont.)
	100 1.3% 0 0.0% 100 1.3% 100 1.3% 0 0.0% 100 1.3% 200 2.6% 3.6%	1.3% 2.1% 2500 1090 32.1% 21.3% 100 100 1.3% 2.1% 0 0.0% 0.0% 100 100 1.3% 2.1% 100 100 1.3% 2.1% 100 0 1.3% 0.0% 100 1 1.3% 0.0% 100 1 1.3% 0.0% 100 1 1.3% 0.0% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 2.00 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1% 100 1 1.3% 2.1%	1.3%       2.1%       0.0%         2500       1000       1300         32.1%       21.3%       56.5%         100       100       3         1.3%       2.1%       0.0%         0       0       0       0         0       0.0%       0.0%       0.0%         100       100       0       0         1.3%       2.1%       0.0%       0.0%         100       100       0       0         1.3%       0.0%       0.0%       0.0%         1.3%       0.0%       0.0%       0.0%         1.3%       0.0%       0.0%       0.0%         1.3%       2.1%       0.0%       0.0%         200       200       0       0         2.6%       4.3%       0.0%       0.0%         300       200       100       0         1.3%       2.1%       0.0%       0.0%         100       100       0       0         1.3%       2.1%       0.0%       0         100       100       0       0         1.3%       2.1%       0.0%       0         100 <th>1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         0.0%           2500         1090         1300         100           32.1%         21.3%         56.5%         14.3%           100         100         0         0           1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         0.0%           0         0         0         0         0           0.0%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0           1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         0.0%           100         0         0         0           1.3%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0         0         0           1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           200         200         100         0         0           100         100         0         0         0           100&lt;</th> <th>1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         £.0%         0.0%           2500         1000         1300         100         100           32.1%         21.3%         56.5%         14.3%         100.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         9.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         9.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0         0           2.6%         4.3%         0.0%         0.0%</th>	1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         0.0%           2500         1090         1300         100           32.1%         21.3%         56.5%         14.3%           100         100         0         0           1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         0.0%           0         0         0         0         0           0.0%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0           1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         0.0%           100         0         0         0           1.3%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0         0         0           1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           200         200         100         0         0           100         100         0         0         0           100<	1.3%         2.1%         0.0%         £.0%         0.0%           2500         1000         1300         100         100           32.1%         21.3%         56.5%         14.3%         100.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         9.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         9.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%         0.0%           100         100         0         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0         0           100         100         0         0         0         0           2.6%         4.3%         0.0%         0.0%

	TABLE	70 22	(Males, C	Cont.)	
		Whi	ite	B1.	ack
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.
PLACE OF WORK-STATE					
NEW JERSEY					
Frequency	20ú	100	0	100	0
Fercent	2.6%	2.1%	0. 0%	14.3%	0.0%
NEH YORK					
Frequency	2400	1600	600	200	0
Fercent	30.8%	34.0%	26 1%	28.6%	0.0%
NORTH CAROLINA					
Frequency	100	100	0	O	0
Percent	1.3%	2.1%	00%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>CHI</b> O					
Frequency	100	0	0	100	0
Percent	1.3%	0.0%	0 <b>0%</b>	14.3%	0.0%
DKLAHDMA				_	_
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0
Percent	1.3%	2.1%	O CIX	0.0%	0.0%
ORE.GON			_	_	_
Frequency	100	100	0	_0	0
Fercent	1.3%	2.1%	O., Q%	0.0%	0.0%
TEXAS		_	_	_	_
Frequency	300	300	0	Q .	0
Percent	3.8%	6.4%	מ" מא	0.0%	0.0%
UTAH	_		_	_	_
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	O 0%	0.0x	0.0%
MAZHINGTON					_
Frequency	300	0	lcio	200	0
Percent	3.8%	0.0%	43%	28.6%	0.0%
WISCONSIN			_	c.	
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0
Fercent	1.3%	2.1%	0 ር%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	2000	4555	22-2	700	•00
Frequency	7800	4700	2300	700	100



## ACTORS -- PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER, BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

### Females

	Total	Whit Employed		Black** Employed		
PLACE OF WORK-STATE ARIZONA			O	emp10ge0	rmp10ge.	•
Frequency	0	Ð	Ð	Ð	Ð	
Percent CALIFORNIA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	1700	1000	600	0	100	
Percent	34.0%	27.0%	54.5%	0.0%	100.0%	
Frequency	100	100	Ð	Đ	0	
Percent	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	100	100	Ð	0	0	
Percent	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	200	200	0	0	0	
PercentGEORGIR	4.0%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	0	O	Ð	0	Ð	
PercentILLINOIS	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	200	Ð	200	0	0	
Percent KRNSRS	4.0%	0.0%	18.2%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	100	100	0	0	Ð	
Percent LOUISIANA	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	0	Ð	0	Ð	Ð	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	300	300	O	0	0	
Percent MASSACHUSETTS	6.0%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	200	200	0	0	8	
Percent MICHIGAN	4.0%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	200	200	Ð	Ð	Ð	
Percent MISSOURI	4.0%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	Cı	0	Ð	0	0	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
ED C quericy	0	0	O	0	0	
Afail Red Provided by EBES	980.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	(Cont.)
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					_	

	TABLE 70 22 (Females, Cont.)							
		Nhite	Black≭×	Other**				
•	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Employed			
PLACE OF WORK-STATE			•	• •	, ,			
NEW JERSEY	•							
Frequency	100	100	0	O.	0			
Percent	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
NEH YORK								
Frequency	1 300	90C	300	100	0			
Percent	26.0%	24.3%	27.3%	100.0%	0. <b>0</b> %			
NORTH CAROLINA								
Frequency	0	C	0	0	0			
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
OHIO								
Frequency	0	0	0	_0	0			
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0. <b>0</b> %			
OKLAHOMA	_	_	_	_	_			
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0			
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
OREGON	_	_	_	_				
Frequency	0	. 0	0	0	0			
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %			
TEXAS	200	200	•	•	•			
Frequency	300	300	0	0	0			
Percent	6.0%	8.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
UTAH	100	100	0	0	O			
Frequency Percent	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %			
WASHINGTON	4. • U/·	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0			
Percent	2.0%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
WISCONSIN	۷. ۵٬۰	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Frequency	0	0	0	0	ο.			
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%			
Total	~	<b>0.</b> 57.	J. 0	0.0/	J. J			
Frequency	5000	3700	1100	100	100			
	2.000		• • • •					

\*:No unemployed blacks or others.



# TABLE 70 --- 23 DANCERS --- PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER\*\* AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

	Males White						
PLACE OF WORK-STATE	All Males	Employed	Unemp1.				
ALASKA							
Frequency	. 0	0	O				
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
CALIFORNIA		4.					
Frequency	. 100	100	0				
Percent	. 7.7%	10.0%	0.0%				
COLORADO	_	_	_				
Frequency Percent	. 0	0.04	0				
WASH, DC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
Frequency	. 0	n	0				
Percent		0.0%	8.0%				
FLORIDA			0.0				
Frequency	. 0	0	0				
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
HAWAII		_	_				
Frequency	. 0	0	0				
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
Frequency	. 0	0	n				
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
ILLINOIS		<b>313.</b> 1	0.0%				
Frequency		100	0				
Percent	7.7%	10.0%	0.0%				
KENTUCKY							
Frequency	. 0	0	. 0				
PercentLQUISIANA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
Frequency		O	O				
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
MARYLAND	0.0%	0.0/.	0.0%				
Frequency	. 0	0	0				
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
MICHIGAN							
Frequency	0	0	0				
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				



Table 70--23 (Males Cont.)

able 7023 (Males Co	23 (Males Cont.) White							
	All Males		d Haasal					
PLACE OF WORK-STATE	urr neres	rwbroden	Citempi.					
MISSISSIPPI								
Frequency	. 0	Ð	0					
Percent		0.0%	0.0%					
NEVADA								
Frequency	. 0	0	0					
Percent	. 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					
NEW JERSEY			_					
Frequency		100	0					
Percent	. 7.7%	10.0%	0.0%					
NEW MEXICO	c	0						
Frequency Percent		0. <b>0</b> %	0.0%					
NEW YORK	. 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					
Frequency	. 600	300	300					
Percent		30.0%	100.0%					
OHIO								
Frequency	. 0	0	0					
Percent		0.0%	0.0%					
OKLAHOMA								
Frequency		0	0					
Percent	. 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					
OREGON	0	•	0					
Frequency	. 0	0	0 0 0 0 0					
Percent	. 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					
Frequency	. 100	100	Ω					
Percent		10.0%	0.0%					
TEXRS		1010/	0.00					
Frequency	. 100	100	0					
Percent		10.0%	. 0.0%					
VIRGINIA			•					
Frequency		_ 0	9					
Percent	. 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%					
WASHINGTON	400	100	_					
Frequency	. 100	100	0					
Percent WISCONSIN	. 7.7%	10.0%	0.0%					
Frequency	. 100	100	Ω					
Percent		10.0%	0.0%					
Total		10.0%	0.0%					
Frequency	. 1300	1000	300					

 $\mathtt{MNO}$  ata missing for Black and Other male dancers due to the sample size.

## DANCERS -- PLACE OF WORK BY GENUER, BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

Females

	· Chares						
	Total	Whit Employed	_	Blac	ck d Unempl.	Other	Hanna Sarra
PLACE OF WORK-STATE ALASKA	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	-mproged	onemp1	. cmproged	з опетрі.	Embito Asa	Unemployed
Frequency	200	100	CI	100	0	O	Cı
PercentCRLIFORNIA	3.6%	2.5%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1800	1300	300	100	0	100	CI
Percent	32.1%	32.5%	60.0%	25.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0	0	O
Percent	1.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	0	٥	0	0
PercentFLORIDA	1.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	0	0	100	0	G	0
Percent	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	200	0 .	0	0	0	200	CI
PercentIDAHO	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ILLINOIS			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0,0%	0.0%
KENTUCKY				= 0 = 0.0		0.00.	
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0	0	CI
Percent LOUISIANA	1.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	200	200	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	3.6%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	300	100	0	100	100	0	CI
Percent MICHIGAN	5.4%	2.5%	_		50.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0	0	CI
Percent MISSISSIPPI	1.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0	0	0
Percent NEVAOR	1.0%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	٥. ٥٪	0.0%
Frequency	400	100	100	0	0	0	200
Percerit	7.1%	-	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	٥.٤٪	100.0%
( ()		~· ~· · · ·		J. C/.	J. U/.	U. U/.	109.0%

102

TABLE 70 23 (Females, Cont.)									
		Whit	te:	81	lack	Other			
PLACE OF HORK-STATE NEW JERSEY	Total	Employed	d Unempl.	Employ	yed Unempl.	Employed	Unemployed		
Frequency	O	0	0	0	0	O	O		
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
NEW MEXICO						0.0			
Frequency	100	100	Ð	Ð	0	0	0		
Percent	1.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
NEI YORK									
frequency	_300	100	100	0	100	Ð	0		
Percent OH:[0	5.4%	2.5%	20.0%	0.0%	50.0%	9.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	400	400	0	0	Ð	O	Ð		
Percent OKLAHOMA	7.1%	10.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	200	200	O	0	O	O	O		
Percent	3.6%	5.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
f-requency	300	300	O	0	0	0	O		
Percent	5.4%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
PENNSYLVANIA					0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	Ð	0	0	Ð	0	0	O		
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.0%		
Frequency	Ð	0	0	0	0	Ð	O		
Percent VIRGINIA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	100	100	O	0	O	0	0		
Percent	1.8%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	300	300	Ð	0	0	Ð	O		
Percent	5.4%	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	0	0	D	0	0		
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Total							- <b></b>		
Frequency	<b>5</b> 60 <b>0</b>	4000	500	400	<b>20</b> 0	300	200		



INDLE (U == 24

MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER, BY WHITE BLACK, AND OTHER AND BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

1970

	Females						
		White	-	Black	Other		
DI 005 OF HODIL - CTOTH	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employe	ed×× Employed××		
PLACE OF WORK STATE ALABAMA							
Frequency	50CI	400	Ð	100	0		
Percent	1.6%	1.3%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%		
Frequency	EI	0	0	0	0		
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
ARIZONA							
Frequency	200	200	0	0	0		
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
ARKANSAS			_	_			
Frequency	300	300	0	0	0		
Percent CALIFORNIA	.9%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	2600	2400	100	100	O		
Percent	8.1%	8.0%	7.7%	14.3%	0.0%		
Frequency	200	200	0	0	0		
Percent	. 6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Fr <b>equ</b> ency	300	300	0	0	0		
Percent DELAWARE	. 9%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	200	200	0	0	0		
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
WASH, DC							
Frequency	100	100	0	8	0		
Percent	.3%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
FLORIDA							
Frequency	1200	1100	100	_0	0		
Percent GEORGIA	3.7%	3.7%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	1000	1000	Cŧ	0	0		
Percent HAWAII	3.1%	3.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Fr <b>eq</b> uency	100	0	O	0	100		
Percent IDAHO	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
Frequency	200	200	()	0	0		
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
ILLINOIS				7			
Frequency	2400	2400	0	0	0		
© cent FRIC'>	7.5%	8.D%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Fall Sect Provided by ERIC		104					

		White		Black	Other
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	
PLACE OF WORK STATE			•	, 5	
INDIANA		•			
Frequency	700	600	100	Ð	0
Percent	2.2%	2.0%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
IOHA					
Frequency	300	300	0	0	0
Percent	. 9%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
KANSAS					
Frequency	500	400	100	O	0
Percent KENTUCKY	1.6%	1.3%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	500	500	0	Ð	0
Percent	1.6%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
LOUISIANA					0.0%
Frequency	200	200	0	Ð	0
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MAINE					
Frequency	200	200	Ð	O	0
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MARYLAND					
Frequency	900	900	0	Ð	0
Percent	2.8%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MRSSACHUSETTS					
Frequency	1100	900	100	100	0
Percent MICHIGAN	3.4%	3. <b>0</b> %	7.7%	14.3%	0.0%
Frequency	1300	1300	0	Ð	0
Percent	4.0%	4.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MINNESOTA					
Frequency	800	800	O	0	0
Percent	2.5%	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MISSISSIPPI	_				
Frequency	. 0	0	0	Ð	0
Percent MISSOURI	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	900	700	100	100	O
Percent	2.8%	2.3%	7.7%	14.3%	0.0%
MONTANA					·· · · · ·
Frequency	100	100	O	0	0
Percent	. 3%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NEBRASKA					
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0
Percent	. 3%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NEVADA				•	
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0
Percent	. 3%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NEW HAMPSHIRE					
Frequency	100	100	O	Ð	0
Percent	. 3%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% (Cont.)



		White		Black	Other-
PLACE OF WORK STATE	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	d≍× Employed××
NEW JERSEY					
Frequency	1200	1200	n	0	0
Percent	3.7%	1200 4.0%	0.0%	0 0.0%	0
NEW MEXICO	3.7%	7.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	200	200	0	0	0
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NEH YORK			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	3300	2800	400	100	0
Percent NORTH CAROLINA	10.2%	9.3%	30.8%	14.3%	0.0%
Frequency	600	600	0	Q	0
Percent	1.9%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NORTH DAKOTA			0.0	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	200	100	100	Ð	0
Percent	- 6%	.3%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
онто					
Frequency	1700	1700	_ 0	0	0
Percent OKLAHOMA	5.3%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	300	200	100	0	0
Percent OREGON	.9%	- 7%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	con	600		•	•
Percent	600 1.9%	600	0	0	0
PENNSYLVANIA	1.5%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1700	1700	0	O	0
Percent	5.3%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RHODE ISLAND	0	0	_		
Frequency Percent	0 0.0%	0	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	200	200	O	Ð	0
Percent TENNESSEE	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	600	500	0	100	0
Percent	1.9%	1.7%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
TEXAS					
Frequency	2100	2000	0	100	0
Percent	6.5%	6.6%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%
UTAH	•		_	_	_
Frequency Percent	0	0	0	g O Ou	0
VERMONT	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	200	200	0	CI	0
Percent	.6%	. 7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
VIRGINIA	000	000	_	<b>a</b> .	•
Frequency	900 2.5%	800 3. <b>7</b> %	0	() 0.0%	0 0% (6%)
ERIC	E. 7/.	2.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% (Cont.)

TABLE 70 -- 24 (Females, Cont.)

·		White		31ack	Other
PLACE OF WORK STATE	Tota1	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	×× Employed×κ
Frequency	<b>60</b> 0	500	100	0	ก
Percent	1.9%	1.7%	7.7%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0
Percent	. 3%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	<b>6</b> 00	600	0	Ð	0
Percent	1.9%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	Ð	0
Percent	. 3%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total					
Frequency	32200	30100	1300	700	100

\*\*No unemployment data for blacks and others.



## MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

		Whi	te	<b>B</b> 1.	ack	n	ther
	All Males	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	Employe	
PLACE OF HORK-STATE				, ,	•	,	
ALABAHA							
Frequency	500	500	0	0	Đ	Ð	0
Percent	-8%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ALASKA			_	_			
Frequency Percent.		200	0	0	. 0	0	0
ARIZONA	.3%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	400	400	Ð	Ð	0	_	•
Percent		-7%	0.0%	0.0%	0 0.0%	0	0
ARK:ANSAS	• 4.7.	• 1 %	0. 6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		400	0	Ð	0	Ð	0
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CALIFORNIA							
Frequency	9900	7500	1300	700	200	100	100
Percent	15.2%	13.7%	31.0%	14.6%	28.6%	16.7%	100.0%
COLORADO	000	300	_		_		
Frequency	900	700	0	100	100	_ 0	្ស
Percent	1.4%	1.3%	0.0%	2.1%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	700	700	0	0	•	_	•
Percent.	1.1%	1.3%	0.0%	0 <b>0.</b> 0%	0.0%	0 0.0%	0
DELAHARE	1-1/-	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	ก	O	O	Ð	O
Percent	.2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
WRSH,DC				0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	200	200	O	0	0	0	O
Percent	.3%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FLORIDA							
Frequency	3000	2500	200	<b>30</b> 0	Ð	0	Ð
Percent	4.6%	4.6%	4.8%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1100	1100	ប៉	O	0	Ð	O
Percent	1.7%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HAMAII					J. 07.	C. 0/.	0.0.
Frequency	500	200	Ð	O	0	300	Ð
Percent	.8%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%	0.0%



		Whi	White		ther		
	All Males	Employed	Unemp1.			Employ⊕d	Unemp
PLACE OF HORK-STATE IDAHO							
Percent	. 100	100 .2%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
ILLINOIS Frequency Percent	2500 3.8%	2300	200	0	0	0	0
INDIANA	3.8%	4.2%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency Percent	1400 2.2%	1000 1.8%	<b>3</b> 00 7.1%	100 2.1%	0 0 <b>.0</b> %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
IONA	1					0.0%	0.0%
Percent KANSAS	300 .5%	300 .5%	0.0%	0.0%	0. <b>0</b> %	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
Frequency	700	500	100	100	0	0	0
PercentKENTUCKY	1.1%	.9%	2.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	400 .6%	400 .7%	0 0.0%	0 0,0%	0	0	0
LOUISIANA			0.0%	0.0%	0. <b>0</b> %	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency Percent	1600 2.5%	1500 2. <b>7</b> %	0 0.0%	100 2.1%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	ر. 0.0%
MAINE Frequency	100	100	0	0	0	0	O
Percent	.2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	۵.۵٪	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1200	1000	0	100	100	0	0
Percent	1.8%	1.8%	0.0%	2.1%	14.3%	<b>0.</b> 0%	0.0%
Frequency Percent	2900 4.5%	2500 4.6%	100 2.4%	300 6.3%	0	0	0
MICHIGAN	7 . 4%	7.0%	2.4%	D. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency Percent MINNESOTR	1900 2.9%	1500 2.7%	0.0%	400 8.3%	0 0. <b>0</b> %	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1100	900	100	0	100	0	0
Percent	1.7%	1.6%	2.4%	0.0%	14.3%		0.0%
Frequency Percent	600 .9%	500 •9%	0 0.0%	100 2.1%	0 0.0%	0	0
MISSOURI							0.0%
Frequency Percent	1500 2.3%	1300 2.4%	100 2. <b>4</b> %	100 2.1%	0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%
MONTANA Frequency	400	300	100	0	0	0	0
Percent	.6%	.5%	2.4%	0.0%	າ. 0%	-	0.0%



		Hhi		Black Of	ther		
	All Males	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unemp:
PLACE OF WORK-STATE NEBRASKA						, -	·
Frequency	. 300	300	0	0	Ð	0	Ð
Percent NEUADR		. 5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	. 600	600	0	0	Ð	0	Ð
Percent NEW HAMPSHIRE	9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	. 100	0	0	0	0	100	O
Percent NEH JERSEY	2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%
Frequency	1700	1500	100	O	100	Ð	O
Percent		2.7%	2.4%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
NEW MEXICO							
Frequency	. 800	500	300	0	0	0	Ð
Percent NEW YORK		.9%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		6600	300	1000	100	0	0
Percent NORTH CAROLINA	12.3%	12.1%	7.1%	20.8%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	700	<b>?0</b> 0	Ð	0	0	O ·	0
Percent NORTH DAKOTA		1.3% .	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0	O	Ð
Percent OHIO		.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	3000	2500	200	300	O	Ð	Ð
Percent OKLAHOMA		4.6%	4.8%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	500	500	0	0	0	ស	Ð
Percent DREGON		. 9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1200	1100	0	100	O	0	0
PercentPENNSYLVANIA	1.8%	2.0%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	3000	2700	100	200	0	0	0
Percent		4.9%	2.4%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RHODE ISLAND	•					u. o	0.0%
Frequency		300	Ð	Ð	O	0	0
Percent	.5%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	400	200	Ð	200	0	0	0
Percent	.6%	. 4%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
		1500	200	200	_	_	_
Frequency	2000	1500	200	300	0	Ð	0



Table 70 -- 24 (Males, Cont.)

		White		Ellack Di	ther		
	All Males	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unemp1.
PLACE OF WORK-STATE		• •	•		•		
TEXAS		•					
Frequency	3200	3000	0	200	0	Ð	0
Percent	4.9%	5.5%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
UTAH							
Frequency	100	100	0	0	0	Ð	0
Percent	.2%	. 2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
VERMONT						•••	
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
VIRGINIA							
Frequency	900	900	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.4%	1.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
WRSHINGTON							
Frequency	1600	1100	400	0	0	100	0
Percent	2.5%	2.0%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%	16.7%	0.0%
WEST VIRGINIA							
Frequency	400	400	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0. <b>0</b> %	0.0%
WISCONSIN							,,,,,,,
Frequency	1600	1400	100	100	0	0	0
Percent	2.5%	2.5%	2.4%	2.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HYDMING							
Frequency	0	0	. 0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	<b>0.</b> 0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total				-			
Frequency	65100	54700	4200	4800	700	600	100



ACTORS -- WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENDER, BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1970

		Whi	te	814	nck	Other		
	Tota1	Employed	Unempl.		Uriemp1.	Employe	ed Unempl.	
WEEKS WORKED IN 69								
13 WEEKS OR LESS								
Frequency	3300	500	833	67	Ð	O	0	
Percent	23.7%	10.0%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
14 TO 26 HEEKS								
Frequency	2200	800	500	<b>3</b> 3	33	0	33	
Percent	15.8%	16.0%	20.8%	7.1%	33.3%	0.0%	100.0%	
27 TO 39 WEEKS								
Frequency	2300	933	433	67	33	0	0	
Percent	16.5%	18.7%	18.1%	14.3%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	
40 TO 47 HEEKS								
Frequency	1967	800	167	133	33	0	0	
Percent	14.1%	16.0%	6.9%	28.6%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	
48 TO 49 HEEKS								
Frequency	700	300	200	33	Ð	0	0	
Percent	5.0%	6.0%	8.3%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
50 TO 52 WEEKS								
Frequency	2900	1633	133	133	0	0	0	
Percent	20.9%	32.7%	5.6%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
NOT APPLICABLE								
Frequency	533	33	133	CI	0	0	0	
Percent	3.8%	.7%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0. <b>0</b> %	
Total								
Frequency	8000	5000	2400	467	100	0	<b>3</b> 3	



TABLE 70 -- 25

ACTORS -- WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1970

		W	nite		Black	Other		
	Total	Employ	Unempl.	Employ	Unempl.	Employ	Unemp1.	
WEEKS WORKED IN 69			•	, ,	•		•	
13 WEEKS OR LESS								
Frequency	1900	833	967	33	0	67	0	
Percent	32.2%	22.7%	52.7%	11.1%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	
14 TO 26 WEEKS								
Frequency	800	567	200	33	0	0	0	
Percent	13.6%	15.5%	10.9%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
27 TO 39 WEEKS								
Frequency	<b>8</b> 33	600	200	33	0	0	0	
Percent	14.1%	16.4%	10.9%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
40 TO 47 NEEKS					• .	=		
Frequency	<b>83</b> 3	633	133	67	0	0	0	
Percent	14.1%	17.3%	7.3%	22'.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
48 TO 49 HEEKS								
Frequency	167	16.7	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	2.8%	4.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
50 TO 52 HEEKS								
Frequency	1000	733	133	133	Ú	0	Ð	
Fercent	16.9%	20.0%	7.3%	44.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
NOT APPLICABLE								
Frequency	367	133	200	0	0	0	<b>3</b> 3	
Percent	6.2%	3.6%	10.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	
Total								
Frequency	5900	3667	1833	300	0	67	<b>3</b> 3	



## TABLE 70 -- 26 DEMICERS BY NEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER 1970

		W	hite		Black		Other		
	Total	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unempl.	Empiloyed	Unempl.		
HEEKS WORKED IN 69			•	, ,	•	, ,			
13 NEEKS OR LESS									
Frequency	1000	33	0	33	Đ	67	O		
Percent	15.2%	4.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%	100.0%	0.0%		
14 TO 26 HEEKS									
Frequency	833	100	0	0	ŋ	0	0		
Percent	12.6%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0x	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
27 TO 39 WEEKS									
Frequency	1267	133	100	Ð	0	0	0		
Percent	19.2%	16.0%	50.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
40 TO 47 HEEKS									
Frequency	800	100	67	0	0	0	0		
Percent	12.17	12.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%		
48 TO 49 HEEKS									
Frequency	400	67	0	0	0	0	0		
Percent	6.1%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
50_TO 52 HEEKS									
Frequency	1800	400	33	0	Đ	0			
Percent	27.3%	48.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	500	0	0	0	) (	) (i	O		
Percent	7.6%	0.0		0.0%		•	0.0%		



# TABLE 70 -- 26 DANCERS -- WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1970

		White	ı	B1	ack	Other		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.		d Unempl.	Employed	Unencil	
WEEKS WORKED IN 69	•					emproge s	C. (C.)	
13 WEEKS OR LESS								
Frequency	867	600	67	100	33	67	0	
Percent	15.9%	14.1%	13.3%	33. 3%	25.0%	40.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	733	<b>53</b> 3	133	33	<b>3</b> 3	0	Ŋ	
Percent 27 TO 39 WEEKS	13.4%	12.5%	26.7%	11.1%	25.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	1033	733	133	33	33	<b>3</b> 3	67	
Percent40 TO 47 WEEKS	18.9%	17.2%	26.7%	11.1%	25.0%	20.0%	66.7%	
Frequency	633	567	33	33	0	O	Û	
Percent	11.6%	13.3%	6.7%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	333	200	33	67	0	<b>3</b> 3	O	
Percent 50 10 52 WEEKS	6.1%	4.7%	6.7%	22.2%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	1367	1167	67	33	33	33	33	
Percent NOT APPLICABLE	25.0%	27.3%	13.3%	11.1%	25.0%	20.0%	33.3%	
Frequency	500	467	33	0	0	0	0	
Percent Total	9.1%	10.9%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	5467	4267	500	300	133	167	100	



TABLE 70 --27
MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- NEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1970

Males

			White		81ack		Other		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Urmempl.	Employed	Unemp1.		
HEEKS WURKED IN 69									
13 WEEKS OR LESS									
Frequency	8167	6467	1133	400	133	0	33		
Percer t	12.8	12.0%	28.6%	8.2%	19.0%	0.0%	100.0%		
14 TO 26 HEEKS									
Frequency	6767	7 5700	633	233	133	67	O		
Percent				4.8%	19.0%	12.5%	0.0%		
27 TO 39 HEEKS			10.0%			12.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	8700	6667	867	<b>90</b> 0	133	133	O		
Percent	13.6%	12.4%	21.8%	18.5%	19.0%	25.0%	0.0%		
40 TO 47 HEEKS									
Frequency	9100	7900	333	733	100	33	Ð		
Percent		14.7%	8.4%	15.1%	14.3%	6.3%	0.0%		
48 TO 49 HEEKS						0.0			
Frequency	5133	4300	133	633	0	67	0		
Percent		8.0%	3.4%	13.0%	0.0%	12.5%	0.0%		
50 TO 52 WEEKS									
Frequency	24567	21700	667	1833	133	233	O		
Percent		40.3%	16.8%	37.7%	19.0%	43.8%	0.0%		
NOT APPLICABLE									
Frequency	<b>15</b> 33	1133	200	133	67	0	O		
Percent		2.1%	5.0%	2.7%	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%		
Total					·				
Frequency	63967	53867	3967	4867	700	533	33		



# TABLE 70 --27 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1970

Females

		Whit	:е	81	ack	Other		
HEERE HODIED IN CO	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed				
HEEKS WORKED IN 69							•	
13 HEEKS OR LESS								
Frequency	5167	4633	367	100	0	67	0	
Percent	15.5%	15.3%	28.2%	7.7%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	
Frequency	4167	<b>3500</b>	433	167	33	33	0	
Percent	12.5%	11.6%	33.3%	12.8%	20.0%		0	
27 TO 39 WEEKS	-2.0%	-1-0/.	JJ. J/.	12.02	20.0%	11.1%	0.0%	
Frequency	4767	4300	200	200	67	0	0	
Percent	14.3%	14.2%	15.4%	15.4%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
40 TO 47 WEEKS						0.0/.	0.0%	
Frequency	3467	3133	33	200	O	100	0	
Percent	10.4%	10.3%	2.6%	15.4%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	
48 TO 49 HEEKS			2.0%	10.4%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%	
Frequency	2167	2100	0	67	0	0.	0	
Percent	6.5%	6.9%	0.0%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
50 TO 52 WEEKS								
Frequency	12200	11433	133	500	33	100	O	
Percent	36.6%	37.7%	10.3%	38.5%	20.0%	33.3%	0.0%	
NOT APPLICABLE					201011	J. J.	0.0%	
Frequency	1433	1200	133	67	33	0	O	
Percent	4.3%	4.0%	10.3%	5.1%	20.0%	<del>-</del>	6.0%	
Total				- • - • •		J. 0/.	J. 3/.	
Frequency	33367	30300	1300	1300	167	300	O	

TABLE 70 -- 28 ALTORS -- INCOME BY AGE 1970

Males AGE												
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969	Total	-16	16-24	25-29	3(1-34	35-39	4(1-44	45- <b>4</b> 9	50 <b>-54</b>	55-59	60-61	6'5+
LESS THAN ZERO	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	_	_	_	_	_
Percent	0.0ä	80.0	0.0x	0.02	0.0%	0 %0.0	0 %0.0	0 %0.0	0 x0.0	0 ۵.0٪	0 x0.0	0 %(1.1)
Frequency	500	33	333	33	0	0	<b>3</b> 3	67	0	0	0	•
PercentFROH 1000 TO 4939	6.3%	50.02	19.6%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	11.8%	0.02	0.0%	8ü.0	0 \$(1.13
Frequency	2067	0	767	533	200	167	167	100	100	0	33	0
PercentFROM 5000 TO 9999	25.8%	0.02	45.12	47.1%	15.8%	17.2%	17.2%	17.6%	16.7%	0.0%	11.12	מנו.ו)
Fr equency	2400	33	433	333	400	167	300	133	167	33	167	2:33
Percent	30.0%	50.0%	25.5%	29.4%	31.6%	17.22	31.02	23.5%	27.82	25.0%	55.68	77.13%
Fr equericy	1867	0	67	133	567	400	233	100	133	67	100	157
Percent	23.32	0.0%	3.9%	11.82	44.7%	41.4%	24.1%	17.6%	22.2%	50.02	33.3%	22.:2%
Frequency	533	0	0	100	33	133	67	100	67	33	0	0
Percent	6.7%	20.0%	0.0%	9.8%	2.6%	13.8%	6.9%	17.62	11.12	25.0%	8.02	80.13
Fr equency	167	0	0	0	33	33	33	0	67	0	0	0
Percent	2.1%	80.0	0.0%	50.0	2.6%	3.4%	3.4%	0.0%	11.12	0.0%	80.0	0.03
Frequency	33	0	0	0	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.4%	80.0	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.02	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0x	0.102
Frequency	300	0	0	0	33	33	100	67	67	0	0	0
Percent	3.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.6%	3.42	10.3%	11.82	11.1%	0.0%	86.0	80.0
Fr equericiy	133	0	100	0	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.72	0.02	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	83.0	0.0 צ	גס.ט	0.0%	80.03	אנו.יו)
Fr equency	8000	67	1700	1133	1267	967	967	567	600	133	300	300

TABLE 70 -28 ACTORS -- AGE BY INCOME 1970

	Females FIGE											
INCORE FROM ALL	Totel	-16	16-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-54	60-64	65+
SOURCES 1969												
ZERO												
Frequency	0	ÇI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0ಜ	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	80.0	0.0%	מ.0	80.0	0.DZ
FROH ONE TO 999								0.00	0.01	0.08	0.0%	V.D.
Frequency	633	Û	367	100	33	33	33	0	0	0	33	33
Percent	10.72	0.0ಜ	27.5%	9.7%	7.1%	4.5%	7.1%	מט.ו)	0.02	0.02	11.12	16.7%
FROH 1000 TO 4999												24.01.10
Frequency	2033	33	500	400	100	26.7	2:00	100	167	133	100	33
PercentFROH 5000 T(1 9939	34.5%	100.0ಜ	37.5%	38.7%	21.4%	36.4%	42.9%	21.4%	35.72	33.3%	33.3%	16.72
Frequency	17:00		200	~-								
Percent	28.82	0.02	309 22.5%	367	100	200	133	200	167	133	100	0
FROM 10000 TO 19993	20.08	0.02	66.7%	35.5%	21.4%	27.3%	28.6%	42.9%	35.7%	33.3%	33.3%	0.0%
Frequency	900	CI	67	100	133	133	63	45				
Percent	13.62	0.02	5.0%	9.7%	28.6%	18.2%	67	67	67	67	0	100
FROM 20000 TO 29993	20.000	0.0.2	0.0%	3.16	£0.0%	10.2%	14.3%	14.3%	14.32	18.72	0.0%	50.0%
Frequency	300	CI	0	67	67	67	33	0	0	22	333	•
Percent	5.1%	30.0	0.0%	€.5%	14.3%	9. וֿאַ	7.1%	0.0x	۵.0٪	33 8.38	33 11.1%	0 %0.0
FF:0H 30000 TO 39993				***************************************		J. 21.	1 - 41-	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	11.1%	แ.บล
Frequency	133	()	0	0	33	0	0	0	33	33	0	33
Percent	2.3%	0.0ಜ	0.0%	0.0%	7.1.2	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	7.12	8.38	0.0%	16.7%
FROM 40000 TO 49999										0.5%	0.0%	40.1 h
Firequency	0	Ç	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	מנו.ט	\$0.0	0.0x	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	0	0	0	0	Ð	0	0	0	6	0	0	0
Percent	80.0	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	אט.0	0.02	אט.0	ט.0	0.0%	80.0
60,000 +								· · · · · ·	0.04	0.01.	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	30	ĘI	1:00	0	Ð	33	0	100	33	0	33	0
Percent	5.1%	0.0ಜ	7.5%	0.0%	0.0%	4.5%	0.0%	21.4%	7.12	ג0.0	11.12	0.0%
Total												
Frequency	59430	33	1333	1033	467	733	467	467	467	400	300	200



### TABLE 70 -- 29 DANCERS -- INCCIME BY AGE 1970

					Mal⊕: RGE	<b>;</b> ,						
INCOME FROM ALL SCIURCES 1969	Total	~16	16-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	<b>15- <del>1</del>9</b>	50-54	55-59	60-64	65+
LESS THAN ZERO	_	_	_								^	
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent FROM ZERO TO 999	0.0%	0.0%	80.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	80.0	0.02	0.02	0.0%
Frequency	133	0	67	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent FROM 1000 TO 4999	11.92	0.0%	16.7%	18'.5%	14.3%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	מנו.ם	0.0%
Frequency	367	0	2:00	1100	67	0	0	0	0	0	•	•
PercentFROM 5000 TO 9999	32.4%	0.0%	50.02	37.52	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0 %(1.0	0.0%
Fréquency	333	0	100	100	67	33	33	0	0	•	•	_
Percent	29.4%	0.0%	25.0%	37'.5%	28.6%	50.0%	38.38	0.0%	0.0%	0 גנ.0	۵۰۱۶ ۲(۱۰۵	0 %0.0
Frequency	167	0	0	33	33	<b>3</b> 3	0	33	33	•	•	_
Percent	14.7%	0.0%	80.0	12:-5%	14.3%	50.0%	0.0%	100.02	100.0%	0 %0.0	0 ۲۵۱۰۵	0. <b>0</b> %
Frequency	100	0	0	0	33	0	67	0	0	0	•	•
PercentFROM 30000 TO 39999	8.8%	0.0%	80.0	0.0%	14.32	0.0%	66.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.13X	0 %0.0
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	•	•	•
PercentFR0M 40000 TO 49999	0.02	0.0%	80.0	0.0%	ຄ.ບຂ	0.0%	0.0%	0.0x	0.0% 0	0 גמ.0	0 برن. 0	0. <b>0</b> %
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	c	•	•	
Percent FROM 50000 TO 59999	80.0	0.01	80.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ດ.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.0	0 %0.0	0.02
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	i)	0	•	•	•	_	_
Percent	0.08	0.0%	80.0	0.0%	0.0x	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	0.0% 0	0 %0.0	0.0%
Frequency	33	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	•	•	•	_
Percent Total	2.9%	0.0%	9.3%	0.02	80.0	0.0%	0.0%	0 0.0%	0 %0.0	0 גט.ס	0 %().0	0.0% O
Frequency	1133	O	100	267	233	67	100	33	33	0	0	O



### DANCERS -- AGE BY GENDER BY INCOME

					F	eneles AGE						
	Total	-16	16-24	25-29	30-34	70E 35-39	40-44	45-49	5(1-54	EF . F0	60-64	
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969 ZERO			30	20 23	<b>3</b> (* <b>3</b> )	30 (3	10 - 44	45-45	JU-34	55-59	60-64	<b>6</b> 5.+
Frequency	0	0	. 0	•	•	•	•	_	_	_	_	_
Percent	80.0	0.0%	ס.טא	0.02	0 מס.0	0	0	0	0	0	0	, i)
FROM ONE TO 999				0.02	0.0%	x0.0	0.02	0.0x	0.0%	0.0%	20.0	0.0;8
Frequency	833	0	600	167	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	i)
Percent	15.22	8.0%	17.82	14.32	6.3%	16.7%	\$0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0x	80.0	0.0%
Frequency	2300	0	<b>16</b> 67	233	267	67	0	0	0	33	0	3:3
PercentFROM 5000 TO 9999	42.12	0.0%	49.5%	20.0%	\$0.0%	33.32	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	100.0x	0.0x	100.0:
Frequency	1467	0	667	500	200	33	67	0	0	0	0	Ð
Percent	26.8%	0.0%	19.82	42.92	37'.5%	16.72	100.02	0.0%	עט.0	0.0%	\$0.0	2:0.0
FROM 10000 TO 19999			2000		<b>4 10</b>	20111	200.00	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0.6
Frequency	400	0	200	67	33	33	0	0	67	0	0	1)
Percent	7.32	0.0%	5.9%	5.72	6.3%	16.72	0.02	0.0%	100.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%
FROM 20000 TO 29999							3,000		100.0.	0.00	0.0	0.0.
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ð
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	80.0	0.0%	0.0%	20.0	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	80.0	0.0:5
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ð	0	0	1)
Percent	0.07	0.0%	20.0	80.0	80.0	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0:5
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1)
Percent	0.0x	%0.0	0.02	0.0%	80.0	80.0	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	ช.0x	0.0;8
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0	0.02	0.0x	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	80.0	0.0;8
60000 +								0.0		0.0.	0.0	0.0,0
Frequency	467	0	233	200	0	33	0	0	0	0	0	1)
Percent	8.5%	0.0%	6.9%	17.12	0.0%	16.7%	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0.8
Total												
Frequency	5467	0	3367	1167	533	500	67	0	67	33	0	3.3



### TABLE 70 -30 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- AGE BY INCOME 1970

Males ABE Total -16 16-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65+ INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969 LESS THAN ZERO Frequency..... 167 33 67 67 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Percent..... .3% 3.3% .3% .82 0.0% 0.0% S.0.2 0.02 \$0.0 \$0.0 \$0.0 SG.0 FROM ZERD TO 999 9133 Frequency..... 533 7300 467 200 100 133 0 133 33 2100 33 Percent..... 14.32 53.3% 29.8% 5.4% 3.1% 2.3% 3.8% 0.0% 6.32 1.2% 4.7% 1.02 FROM 1000 TO 4999 Firequency..... 21467 100 11967 2900 1533 767 533 433 600 1067 767 8130 Percent..... 33.62 10.0% 48.8% 33.9% 23.7% 17.32 15.2% 13.82 28.12 40.0% 24.1)% 18.12 FROM 5000 TO 9999 Frequency..... 17233 100 3000 3233 2633 186.7 1333 1167 567 1033 1200 11:00 Percent..... 26.9% 10.0% 12.22 37.7% 40.7% 42.1% 38.1% 37.2% 38.82 28.32 33.0% 26.62 FROM 10000 TO 19999 Frequency..... 9967 0 600 1333 1500 1100 1100 1167 500 367 1433 867 Percent..... 15.62 2.4% 0.0% 15.62 23.2% 24.6% 31.4% 37.2% 23.4% 13.72 33.9% 26.0% FROM 20000 TO 29999 Frequency..... 2233 0 67 233 433 233 2:33 133 21)0 67 367 267 Percent..... 3.5% 0.0% .3≈ 2.7% 6.7% 5.3% 3.8% 7.4% 9.4% 2.5% 8.72 6.0% FROM 30000 TO 39999 Frequency..... 900 0 33 67 133 16.7 133 67 1:00 33 100 67 Percent..... 1.4% 0.0% .12 .82 2.1% 3.8% 3.8% 2.1% 4.72 1.2% 2.4% 2.0% FROM 40000 TO 49999 Frequency..... 433 33 0 33 0 6.7 67 33 0 33 1:00 67 Percent..... .7% 3.3% 0.0% .4% 0.0% 1.5% 1.9% 1.12 0.0% 1.22 2.4% 2.0% FROM 50000 to 59999 Frequency..... 600 0 0 100 33 133 67 33 33 100 33 67 Percent..... .9% 0.0% \$0.0 1.2% .5% 3.0% 1.9% 1.12 1.62 1.2% 1.62 3.02 60000 + Frequency..... 1833 200 1467 133 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 33 Percent..... 2.9% 20.0% 6.0ฆ 1.6% 0.02 0.0% 39.0 0.0% 0.0x 0.0% 30.0 1.0% Total

6467

4433

3500

3133

2133



4233

3333

2667

Frequency.....

63967

1000

24500

8567

### TABLE 70 -30 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- AGE GENDER BY INCOME 1970

				•		Females AGE							
	Total	- 16	16-24	25-2	?9 30	-34	35-39	40-44	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65+
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969						-						•••	
ZERO													
Frequency	33	0	0	0	33		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PercentFROM ONE TO 999	. 12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	1.02	0.0	ж 0.	.0z	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%
Frequency	11733	633	4233	1100	1267	116	7 9	33	600	500	467	433	200
PercentFROM 1000 TO 4999	35.2%	79.2%	53.6%	33.0%	37.62	34.7	2 25.	92	29.62	26.82	21.92	25.5%	7.7%
Frequency	14567	67	2567	1500	1267	130	0 17	'33	1133	1 100	1 100	900	1900
Percent	43.7%	8.32	32.5%	45.0%	37.62	38.6	-		42.0%	58.92	51.6%	52.92	73.12
Frequency	4333	0	400	633	500	53	3 5	00	467	200	367	300	433
Percent	13.02	0.02	5.1%	19.0%	14.92	15.8		97	17.3%	10.7%	17.2%	17.6%	16.72
Frequency	1200	0	100	0	200	20	0 2	67	200	67	100	0	67
Percent	3.68	0.02	1.32	0.8%	5.92	5.9	-	47	7. <b>4</b> %	3.6%	4.72	80.0	2.6%
FROM 20000 TO 29999			•		3.50		• ••	***		J. 0K	7.1%	0.00	2.06
Frequency	67	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	33	0
Percent	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	1.0		Oχ	0.0%	0.02	0.0x	2.0%	0.02
Frequency	67	0	0	0	0		0	33	0	0	33	0	0
Percent	.2%	0.0%	30.0	0.0%	0.02	: 0.0		9%	0.0%	0.0%	1.62	0.02	מס.0
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0		CX	0.0%	0.0%	מס.ס	0.02	0.0%
Frequency	33	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	9	0
Percent	.12	0.0%	30.0	0.02	30.0	1.0		0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0x	0.0%
Frequency	1333	100	6120	100	100	10	0 1	33	100	0	67	33	0
Percent	4.0%	12.5%	7.62	3.0%	3.02	3.0	•	77	3.7%	0.0%	3.12	2.02	0.0%
Total							- ••			~			C-10H
Frequency	33367	800	7900	3333	3367	336	7 36	.00	2700	1967	2133	1700	2600



TABLE 70 -- 31
ACTORS -- INCOME BY NEEKS HORKED IN 1969
1970

		13	•	(	HEEKS HOR	KE O						
	A11	13 or			14-26			27-39				
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969 ZERO	ull	Hal es	Fond	oles Ail	Hele#	Fonalos	A11	Males	Fenales	A11	Hales	females
Frequency	0	0	•		•	_	_	_	_			
Percent	0.0x	80.0	0 % <b>0.</b> 0	0 %0.0	0	0	0	_ 0	C	0	0	0
FROM DO1 TO 999	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	מ0.0	0.0%	0.0%	20.0	0.0%	0.0%	ง.อะ	\$0.D
Frequency	867	367	500	167	100	67	33	33	0	33	0	33
Percent	26.32	26.2%	26.3%	7.5%	7.12	8.3%	1.42	2.3%	0.0%	1.72	چن.0	4.0%
Frequency	1433	500	933	1133	733	408	633	333	300	433	200	233
PercentFROM 5000 TO 9999	43.4%	35.7%	49.12	51.52	52.4%	50.02	27.5%	22.72	36.0%	22.0%	17.6%	261.0%
Frequency	467	267	200	46.7	233	233	1000	667	333	733	433	300
Percent	14.12	19.02	10.5%	21.2%	16.72	29.22	43.5%	45.5%	40.0%	37.32	38.2%	36.0%
FROH 10000 TO 19999								101011	10.0%	51.5%	<b>50.</b> En	30.06
Frequency	333	200	133	300	200	100	367	233	133	400	233	167
Percent	10.12	14.3%	7.02	13.62	14.3%	ג2.52	15.92	15.92	16.0%	20.3%	20.6%	20.02
FROH 20000 TO 29999											2000.	CC-1044
Frequency	100	33	67	67	67	0	200	133	67	167	67	100
Percent FROM 30000 TO 39999	3.02	2.4%	3.5%	3.0%	4.8%	0.02	8.72	9.12	8.0%	8.5%	5.9%	12.0%
Frequency	67	0	67	33	33	0	33	33	0	33	33	0
Percent	2.0%	20.0	3.5%	1.52	2.4%	0.02	1.42	2.3%	0.0%	1.72	2.9%	0.0%
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	O	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.02	20.02	80.0	80.0	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.0x	0.0%	0.02
Frequency	33	33	0	33	33	0	33	33	0	167	167	•
Percent	1.0%	2.4%	0.0%	1.5%	2.4%	0.02	1.4%	2.3%	0.0%	8.5%	14.72	0.0%· 0
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	Ð	0	0	0	0	0	•
Percent	0.02	\$0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.0x	0.0%	۵.0٪	80.0	0 \$0.0
Frequency	3308	1400	1900	2200	1400	800	2300	1467	833	1967	1133	833

TABLE 70 -- 31
ACTORS -- INCOME BY MEEKS HORKED IN 1969
1970

		<b>4</b> 8-49		HEEKS HORKED (Continued) 50-52					Not Applicable		
THOOME FROM ALL	A11	Hales	Fond	des All	Heles	Females	A11	Meles	Females		
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969											
ZERO											
Frequency	0	0	0	O	ı	0	0	0	0		
Percent	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.02	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	0	0	^	•		_			
Percent	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.0x	0.02 \$0.0	33	0	33		
FROM 1000 TO 4999			0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	6.32	0.02	9.1%		
Frequency	100	100	0	267	167	100	100	33	67		
Percent	14.32	18.82	0.02	9.2%	8.8%	10.02	18.82	20.0%	18.2%		
Frequency	300	200	100	1133	600	533	0	0	0		
Percent	<b>12.9</b> %	37.5%	60.02	39.1%	31.6%	53.32	0.02	0.02	0.02		
Frequency	300	233	67	967	767	200	0	0	0		
Percent	<b>42.9</b> %	43.82	40.02	33.3%	40.4%	20.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%		
Frequency	0	3	0	300	233	67	0	0	0		
Percent	8.02	0.02	0.132	10.3%	12.3%	6.7%	0.02	מ.0.	0.0x		
Frequency	0	0	0	133	67	67	0	0	0		
Percent	80.0	0.02	8.138	4.6%	3.5%	\$7.6	0.02	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	0	33	33	0	0	0	0		
Percent	0.02	0.02	0.132	1.12	1.82	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.02		
Frequency	0	0	0	33	33	0	0	0	0		
Percent	0.0%	0.02	0.02	1.12	1.82	0.02	0.02	0.02	٥.٥٪		
Frequency	0	0	0	33	0	33	400	133	267		
Percent Total	8.02	20.0	80.0	1.1%	0.0%	3.32	75.0%	80.0%	72.7%		
Frequency	700	533	167	2900	1900	1000	533	167	367		



### TABLE 70 -- 32 DANCERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1969 1970

HEEKS HORKE'D 13 or 1ess 14-26 27-39 40-47 A11 Hales Foneles All Males Fenales Al1 Hales Fenal es A11 Hales Fenales INCOME FROM PLL SOURCES 1969 **ZERO** Frequency..... 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 Ð 0 0 Ω Ω Parcent..... 0.02 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.02 0.02 0.0% 0.0% 0.02 0.02 0.02 FROM 001 TO 999 Frequency..... 533 100 433 267 0 267 67 33 33 33 0 33 Percent..... 53.32 75.02 50.0% 32.0% 0.02 36.42 5.32 14.32 3.2% 4.2% 0.02 5.3% FROM 1000 TO 4999 Frequency..... 333 0 333 500 100 400 800 167 633 233 0 233 Percent..... 33.32 \$0.0 38.5% 60.0% 100.02 54.52 63.2% 71.42 61.3% 29.2% 0.02 36.82 FRON 5000 TO 9999 Frequency..... 67 0 67 67 0 67 333 33 300 400 100 300 Percent ..... 6.72 0.02 7.7% 8.02 0.0% 9.12 26.32 14.3% 29.0% 50.02 60.02 47.4% FROM 10000 TO 19999 Frequency..... 0 0 O 0 0 0 67 0 100 67 33 67 Percent..... 0.0% CL.OX 0.0% 0.0% 0.02 0.02 5.3% 0.0% 6.5% 12.5% 20.02 10.5% FROM 20000 TO 25999 Frequency..... 0 0 O 0 Ω Ū 0 0 0 33 33 0 Percent..... 0.02 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.02 0.0% 0.02 0.0% 0.0% 4.2% 20.02 0.0% FROM 30000 TO 39939 Frequency..... 0 0 0 0 0 Ū 0 0 0 0 0 0 Percent..... \$0.0 0.02 0.0ಜ \$0.0 50.0 0.02 0.0% 50.0 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.0% FROM 40000 TO 49939 Frequency..... 0 0 0 0 0 Ω 0 0 0 0 0 0 Percent..... 0.02 0.02 0.03 0.02 0.02 0.02 ט.0% 0.0% 0.0% 20.0 0.02 0.0% FROM 50000 TO 59939 Frequency..... 0 0 0 0 0 Ω 0 0 0 Ω 0 0 Percent..... 0.02 0.02 0.0% 0.02 0.02 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.02 9.0% 0.02 60000 + Frequency..... 67 33 33 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0. Percent..... 6.7% 25.02 3.8% 0.0% \$0.02 0.02 0.02 0.0% 0.02 0.02 0.0% 0.0% Total Frequency..... 1000 133 867 833 100 733 1267 233 1033 800 167 633 (Cont.)

### DANCERS -- INCOME BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1969 1970

		48-49	MEEKS HORKED (Continued) 48-49 50-52						Not Applicable		
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969 ZERO	A11	Heles	Fend	ales All	Halos	Fenales	A11	Males	Fonales		
Frequency	0	0	0	۵	0	٥	Q	0	O		
Percent	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	80.0	0. <b>0</b> %		
Frequency	0	0	0	33	0	33	<b>3</b> 3	0	33		
Percent	\$0.0	0.02	0.02	1.9%	0.02	2.42	6.72	3.02	6.7%		
Frequency	133	33	100	600	67	533	67	0	67		
Percent	39.32	50.02	30.02	33.3%	15.42	39.02	13.32	\$0.0	13.3%		
Frequency	267	33	233	667	167	500	8	0	0		
Percent	<b>6€.7</b> %	50.02	70.0%	37.0%	38.5%	36.6%	0.02	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	0	400	133	267	0	0	0		
Percent	0.02	80.0	0.0%	22.2%	<b>3</b> 0.8%	19.5%	0.02	20.0	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	0	67	67	0	Ð	0	0		
Percent	0.0%	\$0.0	80.0	3.7%	15.4%	0.0%	0.02	\$0.0	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	0	8	0	0	O	0	0		
Percent	0.02	80.0	80.0	0.0%	0.0%	30.0	0.02	80.0	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Percent	0.02	0.0x	80.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.02	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0		
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	80.0	0.0%	0.0%	ง.เร	30.0	0.02	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	0	33	0	33	400	0	40:)		
Percent Total	8.0%	30.0	\$0.0	1.9%	0.0%	2.4%	80.02	80.0	80.0%		
Frequency	400	67	333	16:00	433	1367	500	0	500		





TABLE 70 -- 33

MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY HEEKS HURKED IN 1969
1970

		13 or	1055		HEEKS HOR	KED		27-39			40.45	
	A11	Hales	Fone	les All	Hales	Females	A11	Males	Fonales	011	40-47	- 1
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969		***************************************	, •,,,		114143	, 4110143	*11.4	Her 62	LAMMIAN	All	Males	Femal ex
ZERO			_									
Frequency	67	67	. 0	33	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PercentFROM 001 TO 999	.52	.8%	80.0	.3%	.5%	8:0.0	0.0%	30.0	80.0	80.0	30.0	0.02
Frequency	6233	4900	3333	3167	1500	166.7	2700	933	1767	1633	667	967
Percent	61.72	\$0.0x	64.52	29.0%	22.2%	40.0%	20.02	10.72	37.12	13.0%	7.3%	27.92
Frequency	4133	2<67	1667	5867	4100	176.7	5933	386.7	2067	1400	2900	15:30
Percent	31.02	30.2%	32.3%	53.7%	60.6%	42.4%	44.1%	44.4%	43.47	35.0%	31.9%	1500 43.3%
Frequency	333	333	0	1267	667	600	3333	2600	733	4167	3300	
Percent	2.5%	4.1%	0.0%	11.6%	9.9%	14.4%	24.8%	29.92		4167	3300	7ذاك
FROM 10000 TO 19993		*****	0.0%	11.00	J. Ji.	17.76	27.0%	23.3%	15.42	33.2%	36.3%	25.0%
Fraquency	100	67	33	300	167 -	133	1067	900	163			-1
Percent	.72	.8%	.6%	2.7%	2.5%	3.2%	7.92		167	1867	1733	1'33
FROM 20000 TO 29999	****		-0/-	L. 17.	L . J.	J. E.	1.36	10.3%	3.5%	14.9%	19.0%	3.BX
Fraquency	0	0	0	33	<b>3</b> 5	٥	233	200	33	267	267	0
Percent	\$0.0	\$0.0	0.02	.3%	.5%	0.02	1.72	2.3%	.7%	2.1%	2.9%	8(1.0
Frequency	33	33	0	33	33	0	33	33	0	67	67	0
Percent	.2%	. <b>4</b> %	80.0	.3%	.5%	0.02	.2%	.4%	80.0	.5%	.7%	80.02
Frequency	33	33	0	0	0	0	67	67	0	67		^
Percent	.2x	.42	0.0%	0.02	9.0%	0.02	.5%	.8%	0.0%	.5%	53 %5.	0
FRCH 50000 TO 59999					0.0	0.02		.0.	0.0%	.5%	. 1%	0.08
Frequency	33	33	0	33	<b>3</b> 3	0	67	6.7	0	100	100	•
Percent	.22	.4%	80.0	.3%	.5?	0.02	.5%	.8%	0.0x	.82	1.1%	0 . גנו.ט
Frequency	36?	233	133	200	200	٥	33	33	Δ.	0	•	•
Percent	2:.72	2.9%	2.6%	1.8%	3.02	8B.0	.2%	.33 .4%	0	0	0	0
Total				•••	J. U	v.u.		٠٦،	80.0	0.0%	8O.0	Ø.0%
Frequency	13333	8167	5167	10933	6767	4167	13467	8700	4767	12567	9100	3467

TABLE 70 -- 33
MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INCOME BY GENDER WEEKS WORKED IN 1969
1970

				HEEKS HORKED (Continued)					
	011	48-49	_		50-52				licable
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969 ZERO	A11	Hales	Fend	oles Ail	Hales	Foneles	All	Hales	Females
Frequency	0	0	8	100	67	<b>3</b> 3	٥	0	0
FROM 001 TO 999	0.0x	0.02	0.0%	,3E.	.3%	.32	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	833	267	567	4133	733	3400	167	133	33
Percent FROM 1000 TO 4999	11.42	5.2z	26.2%	11.22	3.02	27.92	5.6%	9.72	2.3%
Frequency	2600	1500	1100	12833	6567	6267	267	67	200
Percent. FROM 5000 TO 9999	35.62	29.2x	50.8%	3 <b>4.</b> 9x	26.72	51.42	9.0%	4.32	14.0%
Frequency	2000	1700	300	1043,	8633	1800	33	0	33
Percent	27.42	33.12	13.6%	29.42	35.1%	14.82	1.12	80.0	2.3%
Frequency	1100	1000	100	6733	6100	633	0	0	0
Percent FR0M 20000 TO 29999	15.12	19.5%	4.6%	18.32	24.8%	5.22	0.02	80.0%	0.0%
Frequency	400	367	<b>3</b> 3	1367	1367	0	0	0	0
Percent	5.5%	7.1%	1.5%	3.72	5.62	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%
Frequency	167	133	33	633	600	<b>3</b> 3	0	0	0
Percent	2.32	2.6%	1.5%	1.72	2.4%	.32	0.0%	80.0	ว.0%
Frequency	67	67	0	200	· 200	Đ	0	0	0
Percent	.92	1.32	0.0%	.52	.8%	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%
Frequency	67	67	0	333	300	· <b>3</b> 3	0	0	0
Percent	.9%	1.3%	0.0%	.9%	1.2%	.32	0.0%	80.0	0.02
Frequency	67	33	33	0	0	0	2500	1333	1167
Percent Total	. <del>9</del> 2	.6%	1.5%	0.0%	80.0	0.02	84.3%	80.18	81.42
Frequency	7300	5133	2167	36767	24567	1.2200	2967	1533	1433



# TABLE 70 -- 34 ACTORS -- INCOME BY GENOER BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

		Whi			Other	
	Total	Employed	Unemp1.	Employ	Black jed Une	mpl. Urempl.
INCOME FROM ALL			•	•	•	
SOURCES 1969						
FROM ZERO TO 999						
Frequency	500	200	300	O	0	0
Percent	6.3%	4.0%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 1000 TO 4999						<b>0.</b> 0
Frequency	2067	1067	767	200	0	33
Percent	25.6%	21.3%	31.9%	42.9%	0.0%	100.0%
FROM 5000 TO 9999						
Frequency	2400	170 <b>0</b>	500	100	100	ß
Percent	30. O%	34,0%	20.8%	21.4%	100.0%	0.0%
FROM 10000 TO 19999						0.0/
Frequency	1867	1200	533	133	0	0
Percent	23.3%	24.0%	22.2%	28.6%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 2000D TO 29999	i					
Frequency	<b>5</b> 13	400	100	33	0	0
Percent	6.7%	8.0%	4.2%	7.1%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 30000 TO 39999						
Frequency	167	133	33	0	0	0
Percent	2.1%	2.7%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 40000 TO 49999						
Frequency	33	33	0	O	0	0
Percent	.4%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 50000 TO 59999						
Frequency	300	233	67	0	0	Ω
Percent	3.8%	4.7%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
60000 +						W. U.V
Frequency	133	33	100	0	0	Ω
Percent	1.7%	. 7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Total						
frequency	8000	5000	2400	467	100	<b>3</b> 3



# TABLE 70 -- 34 ACTORS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND BY EMPLOYMENT STATIS 1970

•		Whit	e	Blac	k	Other
	Total	Employe	d Unemp			loyed Unempl.
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969 FROM DNE TO 999			<b>,</b>	<b></b>	<b>3</b> 4	
Frequency	633	400	167	33	33	O
Percent	10.7%	10.9%	9.1%	11.1%	50.0%	0.0%
FROM 1000 TO 4999						
Frequency	2033	1300	633	6.7	33	0
Percent	34.5%	35.5%	34.5%	22.2%	50.0%	0.0%
FROM 5000 TO 9999						
Frequency	<b>170</b> 0	1100	433	16.7	8	0
Percent	28.8%	30.0%	23.6%	55.6%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 10000 TO 19999						
Frequency	800	467	300	33	0	0
Percent	13.6%	12.7%	16.4%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 20000 TO 29999						
Frequency	300	200	100	0	0	0
Fercent	5.1%	5.5%	5.5%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
FROM 30000 TO 39999						
Frequency	133	100	33	0	0	0
Fercent	2.3%	2.7%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %
FROM 40000 TO 49999						•
Frequency	0	0	O	0	0	0
Fercent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0. <b>0</b> %
FROM 50000 TO 59999						
Frequency	0	0	Ð	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
<b>600</b> 00 +						
Frequency	300	100	167	0	0	<b>3</b> 3
Fercent	5.1%	2.7%	9.1%	0. (IX	0.0%	100.0%
Total						
frequency	5900	3667	1833	300	67	<b>3</b> 3
			140			



TABLE 70 -- 36.

DRNCERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

1970

#### Males

•		White		Black	Other
	Total	Employed	Unempl.		Employed**
INCOME FROM ALL					
SOURCES 1969					
FROM ZERO TO 999					
Frequency	133	33	33	33	33
Percent	11.8%	4.0%	16.7%	100.0%	50.0%
FROM 1000 TO 4999					
Frequency	367	300	67	O	O
Percerit	32.4%	36.0%	33.3%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 5000 TO 9999					0.0%
Frequency	<b>33</b> 3	300	33	0	Ω
Percent	29.4%	36.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 10000 TO 19999					<b>4.</b> 0
Frequency	167	133	33	0	0
Percent	14.7%	16.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 20000 TO 29999		- 4.0			0.07
Frequency	100	67	33	0	Û
Percent	8.8%	8.0%	16.7%	0.0%	0.0%
60000 +					•••
Frequency	33	0	0	0	33
Percent	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	50.0%
Total					-
Frequency	1133	<b>83</b> 3	200	33	67

\*\*No unemployed blacks or others.



# TABLE 70 -- 35 DANCERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

		White		Bla			Other		
INCOME FROM ALL	Total	Employ	jed Un <del>e</del> mp	l. Emplo	yed Uner	թ1. Εտբ	loyed Unemp	oł.	
SOURCES 1969									
FROM ONE TO 999									
Frequency	833	<b>5</b> 33	133	33	67	67	0		
Percent	15.2%	12.5%	26.7%	11.1%	50.0%	40.0%	0.0%		
FROM 1000 TO 4999						_	_		
Frequency	2300	1933	167	100	67	33	_ 0		
Percent	42.1%	45.3%	33.3%	33.3%	50.0%	20.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	1467	1000	167	133	Ð	67	100		
Percent	26.8%	23.4%	33.3%	44.4%	0.0%	40.0%	100.0%		
FROM 10000 TO 19999									
frequency	400	<b>3</b> 67	0	33	0	0	0		
Fercent	7.3%	8.6%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	0	0	O	Đ	0	O	O		
Fercent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
<b>6000</b> 0 +									
Frequency	467	433	33	0	O	O	Ð		
Percent	8.5%	10.2%	6.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Total									
Frequency	5467	4267	500	300	133	167	100		





# TABLE 70 -- 36 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

		Whi	te		Black		Othe	er
	Total	Employed	Unempl.			ol. Emp	loyed	Unempl.
INCOME FROM ALL			•	, -	•	•	3	
SOURCES 1969								
Less than Zero								
Frequency	167	133	33	0	0	0	C	)
Percent	. 3%	.2%	.8%	0.0%	00%	0.0%	0.02	:
FROM ZERO TO 999								
Frequency	9133	7733	733	500	100	67	C	)
Percent	14.3%	14.4%	18.5%	10.3%	14.3%	12.5%	0.0%	:
FROM 1000 TO 4999								•
Frequency	21467	17333	1600	2033	533	233	33	l
Percent	33 <b>.</b> 6%	32.2%	40.3%	41.8%	33. 3%	43.8%	100,0%	:
FROM 5000 TO 9999								
Frequency	17233	14667	900	1367	200	100	0	l
Percent	26.9%	27.2%	22.7%	28.1%	28.6%	18.8%	0.0%	•
FROM 10000 TO 19999								
Frequency	9967	8933	300	567	67	100	0	1
Percent	15.6%	16.6%	7.6%	11.6%	9.5%	18.8%	0.0%	
FROM 20000 TO 29999								
Frequency	2233	2033	33	133	33	0	0	l
Percent	3.5%	3.8%	.8%	2.7%	48%	0.0%	0.0%	
FROM 30000 TO 39999								
Frequency	900	767	33	67	0	33	0	
Percent	1.4%	1.4%	.8%	1.4%	00%	6.3%	0.0%	
FROM 40000 TO 49999	400							
Frequency	433	400	33	0	0	0	0	
Percent	.7%	-7%	. 8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
FROM 50000 TO 59999								
Frequency	600	467	67	67	0	0	EI	
Percent	.9%	. 9%	1.7%	1.4%	0. <b>0%</b>	0.0%	0.0%	
	1600							
Frequency	1833	1400	233	133	67	. 0	CI	
Percent	2.9%	2.6%	5.9%	2.7%	9. 5%	0.0%	0.0%	
	60063	F25.67	0000					
Frequency	63967	53867	3967	4867	700	533	33	

# TABLE 70 -- 36 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER FIND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1970

	Total	White Employed	Unasa	Black Employed		Other .
INCOME FROM ALL	10141	rmbroden	nuembt.	cmh to dea	nusubi.	Employed
SOURCES 1969						
ZERO						
Frequency	33	33	0	O	O	O
Percent	. 1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM ONE TO 999	• • • • •		<b>5.</b> 5	0.0/.	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	11733	10833	267	500	Ð	133
Percent	35.2%	35.8%	20.5%	38.5%	0.0%	44.4%
FROM 1000 TO 4999					0.0	
Frequency	14567	13300	633	500	67	67
Percent	43.7%	43.9%	48.7%	38.5%	40.0%	22.2%
FR01 5000 TO 9999						
Frequency	4333	3867	209	167	33	67
Percent	13.0%	12.8%	15.4%	12.8%	20.0%	22.2%
FROM 10000 TO 19999						
Frequency	1200	933	133	67	<b>3</b> 3	33
Percent	3.6%	3.1%	10.3%	5.1%	20.0%	11.1%
FROM 20000 TO 29999						
Frequency	67	67	0	0	0	Ð
Percent	.2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 30000 TO 39999						
Frequency	67	67	0	0	0	CI
Percent	.2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 40000 TO 49999	_	_	_			
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	CI
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 50000 TO 59999			_	_	_	
Frequency	33	33	0	0	O	0
Percent	.1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
60000 +	1000	4445				_
Fr <b>e</b> quency Percent	1939	1167	67	67	33	CI
Total	4.0%	3.9%	5.1%	5.1%	20 <b>.0</b> %	0.0%
	2226	25.500	1500	4.00%		A.C.
frequency	33367	30300	1300	1300	167	300



TABLE 70 --37

ACTORS --- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS1970

		Male		Fema]	le	
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969	Total	White	Minority	Total	White	Minority
ZERO						
Frequency	0	. 0	_ 0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 001 TO 999	500	500	•	400		
Frequency	500	500	0	633	567	67
PercentFROM 1000 TO 4999	6.3%	6.8%	0.0%	10.7%	10.3%	16.7%
Frequency	2067	1833	222	2022	1000	100
Percent	25.8%	24.8%	233 38, 9%	2033 34.5%	1933 35.2%	100 25.0%
FROM 5000 TO 9999	23.0%	24.0%	30. 5%	34.3%	55.2%	23.0%
Frequency	2400	2200	200	1700	1533	167
Percent	30.0%	29.7%	33. 3%	28.8%	27.9%	41.7%
FROM 10000 TO 19999						
Frequency	1867	1733	133	800	767	33
Percent	23.3%	23.4%	22.2%	13.6%	13.9%	<b>8.3</b> %
FROM 20000 TO 29999						
Frequency	533	500	33	300	300	0
Fercent	6.7%	6.B%	5.6%	5.1%	5.5%	(I. 0%
FROM 30000 TO 39999			_			
Frequency	167	167	0	133	133	0
Percent	2.1%	2.3%	0.0%	2.3%	2.4%	0.0%
FROM 40000 TO 49999	33	33	0	0	0	
Frequency Fercent	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	0	0	0
FROM 50000 TO 59999	- 7%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	300	300	0	0	0	0
Percent	3.6%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
60000 +			2.2%	0.0%	0.0%	C
Frequency	133	133	D	300	267	33
fercent	1.7%	1.8%	0.0%	5.1%	4.8%	6.3%
Total					,	
Frequency	8000	7400	600	5900	55:00	400



TABLE 70 -- 38

DANCERS --- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS
1970

Male Female Total White Minority Total White Minority INCOME FROM ALL **SOURCES** 1969 ZERO Frequency..... 0 0 0 0 U 0 Percent..... 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 9.0% 0.0% 0.0% FROM DO1 TO 999 Frequency..... 67 133 67 833 667 167 Percent..... 11.8% 6.5% 66.7% 15.2% 14.0% 23.8% FROM 1000 TO 4999 Frequency..... 367 367 0 2300 2100 200 Percent..... 32.4% 35.5% 0.0% 42.1% 44.1% 28.6% FROM 5000 TO 9999 Frequency..... 333 333 0 1467 116.7 300 Percent...... 29.4% 32.3% 0.0% 26.8% 24.5% 42.9% FROM 10000 TO 19999 Frequency..... 167 167 0 400 367 33 Fercent..... 14.7% 16.1% 7.7% 0.0% 7.3% 4.8% FROM 20000 TO 29999 Frequency..... 100 100 N 0 0 0 fercent.... 8.8% 9.7% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% FROM 30000 TO 39999 Frequency..... 0 Ω 0 0 0 Ω Fercent..... 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% FROM 40000 TO 49999 0 Frequency..... U 0 Û 0 0 f'ercent..... 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% FROM 50000 TO 59999 Frequency..... Ω Ð O 0 Ω 0 Fercent..... 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 60000 + 33 Frequency..... Ω 33 467 46.7 0 Percent..... 2.9% 0.0% 33.3% 8.5% 9.8% 0.0% Total Frequency..... 1133 1033 100 5467° 4267 700



TABLE 70 --39

MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS --- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS
1970

		Male		Female		
	Total	White	Minority	Total	White	Minority
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969			_			_
ZERO						
Frequency	167	167	0	· 33	33	0
Percent	.3%	. 3%	0.0%	. 1%	.1%	0.0%
FROM DO1 TO 999						
Frequency	9133	8467	667	11733	11100	633
Percent	14.3%	14.6%	10.9%	35.2%	35.1%	35.8%
FROM 1000 TO 4999						
Frequency	21467	18933	2533	14567	13933	633
Percent	33.6%	32.7%	41.3%	43.7%	44.1%	35.8%
FROM 5000 TO 9999						
Frequency	17233	15567	1667	4333	4067	267
Percent	26.9%	26.9%	27.2%	13.0%	12.9%	15.1%
FROM 10000 TO 19999						
Frequency	9967	9233	733	1200	1067	133
Percent	15.6%	16.0%	12.0%	3.6%	3.4%	7.5%
FROM 20000 TO 29999						
Frequency	2233	2067	167	67	67	0
Percent	3.5%	3.6%	2.7%	.2%	.2%	0.0%
FROM 30000 TO 39999						
Frequency	900	800	100	67	67	0
Percent	1.4%	1.4%	1.6%	. 2%	.2%	0.0%
FROM 40000 TO 49999				_	_	_
Frequency	433	433	. 0	0	0	0
Percent	.7%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 50000 TO 59999				•		_
Frequency	600	533	67	33	33	0
Percent	. 9%	. ه.	1.1%	.1%	.1%	0.0%
60000 +						
Frequency	1833	1633	200	1333	1233	100
Percent	2.9%	2.8%	3.3%	4.0%	3.9%	5.7%
Total						. = . =
Frequency	63 <del>96</del> 7	57833	6133	93367	31600	1767



### 70-40 ACTORS, DANCERS, AND MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS -- INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1969

### INCOME

MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEDIAN
ACTORS	18210.3 18434.6	3500.0 6100.6
MUSICIANS/COMPOSERS11879.80	25550.D	4000.0



## TABLE 80-1 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- AGE BY GENDER AND MINORITY STATUS 1980

		Male			Female			
	Total	White	Minority	Total	White	• Minority		
fige Groups								
FROM 16 TO 24								
Frequency	6220	5540	680	4160	3580	580		
Percent	13.8%	13.47	18.2%	18.4%	17.5%	27.1%		
FROM 25 TO 29								
Frequency	9360	8440	920	<b>5</b> 360	4760	600		
Percent	20.8%	20.4%	24.6%	23.7%	23.2%	28.0%		
FROM 30 TO 34								
Frequency	9340	8400		4540	4040	500		
Percent	20.7%	20.3%	25.1%	20.1%	19.7%	23.4%		
FROM 35 TO 39								
Frequency	6000	5560		2340	. 2180	160		
Percent	13.3%	13.5%	11.8%	10.3%	10.6%	7.5%		
FROM 40 TO 44	05.40							
Frequency	3540	3260		2000	1940	60		
Percent	7.9%	7.9%	7.5%	8.8%	9.5%	2.8%		
FROM 45 TO 49	2260	2000	100	1000		00		
Frequency Percent	3260 7.2%	3060 7.5%		1260	1180	80		
FROM 50 TO 54	( . 2/.	7.5%	4.8%	5.6%	5.8%	3.7%		
Frequency	2960	2820	140	1120	1040	00		
Percent	6.6%	6.8%		4.9%	1040	80 3.7%		
FROM 55 TO 59	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	9.3%	5.1%	3.7%		
Frequency	2020	1960	60	1000	940	60		
Percent	4.5%	4.7%		4.4%	4.6%	2.8%		
FROM 60 TO 64			1.0/,	4.4%	4.0%	2.0%		
Frequency	1140	1140	0	460	460	Ð		
Percent	2.5%	2.8%		2.0%	2.2%	0.0%		
65 +			2.0		2007	<b>U.</b> 0		
Frequency	1180	1080	100	400	380	20		
Percent	2.6%	2.6%		1.8%	1.9%	.9%		
Total								
Frequency	45020	41280	3740	22640	20500	2140		



## TABLE 80-2 DRNCER BY AGE AND MINORITY STATUS 1980

	Male				Females		
	Total	White	Minority	Total	White	Minority	
Age Groups			-			•	
FROM 16 TO 24							
Frequency	1020	760	260	4900	35.30	920	
Percent	31.9%	29.2%	43.3%	49.7%	47.5%	62.2%	
FROM 25 TO 29							
frequency	980	760	200	2700	2340	360	
Percent	30.6%	30.0%	33.3%	27.4%	27.9%	24.3%	
FROM 30 TO 34							
Frequency	600	520	80	1100	960	140	
Percent	18.9%	20.0%	13.3%	11.2%	11.5%	9.5%	
FROM 35 TO 39							
Frequency	160	129	40	400	380	20	
Percent	5.0%	4.6%	6.7%	4.1%	4.5%	1.4%	
FROM 40 TO 44							
Frequency	80	60	20	400	<i></i> €0	40	
Percent	2.5%	2.3%	3.3%	4.1%	4.3%	2.7%	
FROM 45 TO 49							
Frequency	60	60	0	120	120	£0	
Percent	1.9%	2.3%	0.0%	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%	
FROM 50 TD 54							
Frequency	120	120	0	100	100	0	
Percent	3.8%	4.6%	0.0%	1.0%	1.2%	0.0%	
FROM 55 TO 59							
Frequency	60	60	0	60	80	()	
Percent	1.9%	2.3%	0.0%	.8%	1.0%	0.0%	
FROM 60 TO 64							
frequency	40	40	0	20	20	0	
Percent	1.3%	1.5%	0.0%	.2%	.2%	0.0%	
65_+							
requency	<b>8</b> 0	80	ກ	40	40	Q	
Percent	2 <b>.5</b> %	9.1%	0.0%	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	
Total							
Frequency	32' <b>00</b>	<b>260</b> 0	600	9860	0868	1480	



# TABLE 80-3 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- AGE BY GENDER AND MINORITY STATUS 1980

	Male			Females		
	Total	White	Minority	Total	White	Minority
fige Groups						_
FROM 16 TO 24						
Frequency	· 21820	19600	2220	8680	7 <del>9</del> 20	<b>76</b> 0
Percent	22.6%	22.9%	20.1%	21.2%	20.7%	28.6%
FROM 25 TO 29						
Frequency	28480	25740	2740	7360	6760	600
Percent	29.5%	30.1%	24.9%	18.0%	17.7%	22.6%
FROM 30 TO 34						
Frequency	15840	13880	1960	5320	4920	400
Percent	16.4%	16.2%	17.8%	13.0%	12.9%	15.0%
FROM 35 TO 39						
Frequency	8040	6860	1180	4080	3900	1 <b>8</b> 0
Percent	8.3%	8.0%	10.7%	10.0%	10.2%	6. <b>8</b> %
FROM 40 TO 44						
Frequency	4780	4120	660	3000	2840	1 <b>6</b> 0
Percent	5.0%	4.8%	6.0%	7.3%	7.4%	6.0%
FROM 45 TO 49						
Frequency	4120	<b>35</b> 00	620	2360	2220	140
Percent	4.3%	4.1%	5.6%	5.8%	5.8%	5.3%
FROM 50 TO 54						
Frequency	<b>3</b> 660	3100	560	2800	2600	SLJ
Percent	3.8%	3.6%	5.1%	6.8%	6.8%	7.5%
FROM 55 TO 59						
Frequency	3240	2700	540	1800	1700	1 <b>0</b> 0
Percent	3 4%	3.2%	4.9%	4.4%	4.4%	3.8%
FROM 60 TO 64						
Frequency	2460	2280	180	1980	1880	20
Percent	2.5%	2.7%	1.6%	4.6%	4.9%	.8%
<b>65</b> +						
Frequency	4040	3680	360	3640	3540	100
Percent	4.2%	4.3%	3.3%	8.9%	9.2%	3.8%
Total						
Frequency	96480	85460	11020	40940	38280	2660



## TABLE 80 -- 4 ACTORS AND DIRCTOR'S -- AGE BY GENCIER BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER 1980

	Total	White	81ack	Other
Age Groups				
FROM 16 TO 24			_	
Frequency	6220	5540	540	140
Percent	13.8%	13.4%	20.6%	12.5%
FROM 25 TO 29				
Frequency	9360	8440	<b>5</b> 80	34D
Percent	20.8%	20.4%	22.1%	30.4%
FROM 30 TO 34				
Frequency	9340	8400	680	260
Percent	20.7%	20.3%	26.0%	23.2%
FROM 35 TO 39				
Frequency	6000	5560	300	140
Percent	13.3%	13.5%	11.5%	12.5%
FROM 40 TO 44				
Frequency	3540	3260	180	100
Percent	7.9%	7.9%	6.9%	8.9%
FROM 45 TO 49				
Frequency	3260	3080	140	40
Percent	7.2%	7.5%	5.3%	3.6%
FROM 50 TO 54				
Frequency	2960	2820	100	40
Percent	6.6%	6.8%	3.8%	3.6%
FROM 55 TO 59				
Frequency	2020	1960	40	20
Percent	4.5%	4.7%	1.5%	1.8%
FROM 60 TO 64				
Frequency	1140	1140	Çi	0
Percent	2.5%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%
65 +				
Frequency	1180	1080	60	40
Percent	2.6%	2.6%	2.3%	3.6%
Total				
Frequency	45020	41280	2620	1120



# TABLE 80 -- 4 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1989

	Total	White	Black	Other
Age Groups				
FROM 16 TO 24				
Frequency	4160	3580	340	240
Percent	18.4%	17.5%	23.6%	34.3%
FROM 25 TO 29				
Frequency	5360	4760	420	180
Percent	23.7%	23.2%	29.2%	25. 7%
FROM 30 TO 34				
Frequency	4540	4040	380	120
Percent	20.1%	19.7%	26.4%	17.1%
FROM 35 TO 39				
Frequency	2340	2180	120	40
Percent	10.3%	10.6%	8.3%	5. 7%
FROM 40 TO 44				0
Frequency	2000	1940	60	0
Percent	8.8%	9.5%	4.2%	0.0%
FROM 45 TO 49		•		0.0%
Frequency	1260	1180	40	40
Percent	5.6%	5.8%	2.8%	5. 7%
FROM 50 TO 54		******	2.0%	0.17
Frequency	1120	1040	40	40
Percent	4.9%	5.1%	2.8%	5.7%
FROM 55 TO 59			2.0%	0.17.
Frequency	1000	940	20	40
Percent	4.4%	4.6%	1.4%	5.7%
FROM 60 TO 64	•••	,,,,,,	1 . 4/.	0
Frequency	460	460	0	ŋ
Percent	2.0%	2.2%	0.0%	0.0%
65 +		Ç. Ç/.	Ç. O/.	0.0%
Frequency	400	380	20	0
Percent	1.8%	1.9%	1.4%	0.0%
Total		4 . 7/.	4 • 4/•	0.0%
frequency	22640	20500	1440	700
		20000	1770	, 00



## TABLE 80 -- 5 DANCERS -- AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1980

	Total	White	Black	Giher
Age Groups				
FROM 16 TO 24				
Frequency	1020	<b>7</b> 60	60	200
Percent	31.9%	29.2%	21.4%	62.5%
FROM 25 TO 29				
Frequency	980	780	140	60
Percent	30.6%	30.0%	50.0%	18.8%
FROM 30 TD 34				
Frequency	€00	<b>5</b> 20	40	40
Percent	18.8%	20.0%	14.3%	12.5%
FROM 35 TO 39				
Frequency	160	120	20	20
Percent	5.0%	4.6%	7.1%	6.3%
FROM 40 TO 44				
Frequency	80	60	20	0
Percent	2.5%	2.3%	7.1%	0.0%
FROM 45 TO 49				
Frequency	60	60	0	0
Percent	1.9%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 50 TO 54				
Frequency	120	120	0	0
Percent	3.8%	4.6%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 55 TO 59		_	_	_
Frequency	60	60	0	0
Percent	1.9%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 60 TO 64			_	_
Frequency	40	40	0	_ 0
Percent	1.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%
65_+			_	_
Frequency	80	80	0	0
Percent	2.5%	3.1%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	05:0=			
Frequency	32:00	2600	280	320



# TABLE 80 -- 5 DANCERS -- AGE BY GENDER BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER 1980

	Total	White	Black	Other
Age Groups				
FROM 16 TO 24				
Frequency	4900	3980	400	520
Percent	49.7%	47.5%	54.12	70.3%
FROM 25 TD 29		***************************************	011-11	
Frequency	2700	2340	280	80
Percent	27.4%	27.9%	37.8%	10.8%
FROM 30 TD 34	L1 . 4%	L	51.0%	10.0%
Frequency	1100	960	20	120
Percent	11.2%	11.5%	2.7%	16.2%
FROM 35 TO 39		11.0/		10.1.
Frequency	400	380	O	20
Percent	4.1%	4.5%	0.02	2.7%
FROM 40 TO 44	7. 1/.	7.0/.	0.0%	E . 1 /-
Frequency	400	360	40	១
Percent	4.1%	4.3%	5.4%	0.0%
FROM 45 TD 49	4.1%	4.5%	5.4%	0.0%
Frequency	120	120	O	ก
Percent	1.2%	1.4%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 50 TO 54		1.4/.	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	Ω	ก
Percent	1.0%	1.2%	ດ. ຄະ	0.0%
FROM 55 TO 55	2.0%	2.6/	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	80	80	Ω	Ð
Percent	.8%	1.0%	0.02	0.0%
FROM 60 TO 64	. 07.	1.0%	0.07.	0.0%
Frequency	20	20	១	ก
Percent	.2%	.2%	0.02	0.0%
65 +		,-	0.00	
Frequency	40	40	O	ស
Percent	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Total	• 470		0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	9660	8380	740	740
	20.00	رادد	. 40	140



# TABLE 80 -- 6 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS --- AGE BY GENDER BY WHITE BLACK, OTHER 1980

Male

	Total	White	Black	Other
Age Groups				
FROM 16 TO 24				
Frequency	21820	19600	1600	620
Percent	22.6%	22.9%	23.2%	15.0%
FROM 25 TO 29				
Frequency	28480	25740	1540	1200
Percent	29.5%	30.1%	22.3%	29.1%
FROM 30 TO 34				
Frequency	15840	13880	1100	860
Percent	16.4%	16.2%	15.9%	20.9%
FROM 35 TO 39				
Frequency	8040	6860	700	480
Percent	8.3%	8.0%	10.1%	11.7%
FROM 40 TO 44				
Frequency	4780	4120	440	220
Percent	5.0%	4.8%	6.4%	5.3%
FROM 45 TO 49				
Frequency	4120	3500	320	300
Percent	4.3%	4.1%	4.6%	7.3%
FROM 50 TO 54				
Frequency	3660	3100	400	160
Percent	3.8%	3.6%	5.8%	3.9%
FROM 55 TO 59				
Frequency	3240	2700	380	160
Percent	3.4%	3.2%	5.5%	3.9%
FROM 60 TO 64				
Frequency	2460	2280	160	20
Percent	2.5%	2.7%	2.3%	.5%
65 +				
Frequency	4040	<b>36</b> 80	260	100
Percent	4.2%	4.3%	3.8%	2.4%
Total			•	-: <del>-</del>
Frequency	96:480	85460	6900	4120
• •				



### TABLE 80 -- 6 --- RGE BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, OTHER 1980

	Female								
	Total	White	Black	Other					
Age Groups									
FROM 16 TO 24									
Frequency	8680	7920	580	180					
Percent	21.2%	20.7%	30.9%	23.1%					
FROM 25 TO 29									
Frequency	7360	6760	360	220					
Percent	18.0%	17.7%	20.2%	28.2%					
FROM 30 TO 34									
Frequency	5320	4920	240	160					
Percent	13.0%	12.9%	12.8%	20.5%					
FROM 35 TO 39									
Frequency	4080	3900	160	20					
Percent	10.0%	10.2%	8.5%	2.6%					
FROM 40 TO 44									
Frequency	3000	<b>28</b> 40	100	60					
Percent	7.3%	7.4%	5.3%	7.7%					
FROM 45 TO 49									
Frequency	2360	2220	100	40					
Percent	5.8%	5.8%	5.3%	5.1%					
FROM 50 TO 54									
Frequency	2800	2600	140	60					
Percent	6.8%	6.8%	7.4%	7.7%					
FROM 55 TO 59									
Frequency	1800	1700	100	0					
Percent	4.4%	4.4%	5.3%	0.0%					
FROM 60 TO 64									
Frequency	1900	1880	0	20					
Percent	4.6%	4.9%	0.0%	2.6%					
<b>65</b> +									
Frequency	3640	3540	80	20					
Percent	8.9%	9.2%	4.3%	2.6%					
Total									

Frequency...... 40940 38280

1880

780

### ACTORS AND DIRECTORS — EDUCATION BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER $1980\,$

			Males	<b>;</b>		Females			
	Total	White	Black	Other	Total	White	Black	Other	
Education Level						1			
Grades 1 - 6									
Frequency	320	260	40	20	120	100	0	20	
Percent	.7%	.6%	1.5%	1.8%	.5%	-5%	0.0%		
Grades 7-8									
Frequency	300	290	20	0	40	40	0	0	
Percent	.7%	.7%	.8%	0.0%	.2%	.2%	0.0%		
Some High School							0	0.0	
Frequency	860	600	200	60	620	540	40	40	
Percent	1.9%	1.5%	7.6%	5.4%	2.7%	2.6%	2.8%		
Grad. H. S.	2223						2,00	0.1%	
Frequency	5260	4520	560	180	3400	3120	140	140	
Percent	11.7%	10.9%	21.4%	16.1%	15.0%	15.2%	9.7%		
Some College					20000		2	20.00	
Frequency	11800	10640	820	340	6080	5540	400	. 140	
Percent	26.2%	25.8%	31.3%	30.4%	26.9%	27.0%	27.8%		
Grad. College					207 773	2	C O/L	20.0%	
Frequency	14860	14160	500	200	8480	7620	540	320	
Percent	33.0%	34.3%	19.1%	17.9%	37.5%	37.2%	37.5%		
Graduate Hork		<b></b>		21.02.	0.00.	0	31.00	40.1%	
Frequency	11620	10820	480	320	3900	3540	320	40	
Percent	25.8%	26.2%	18.3%	28.6%	17.2%	17.3%	22.2%	5.7%	
Total	<b>300</b>	30			21.2	41.44.	mus in	<i>4.17.</i>	
Frequency	45020	41280	2620	1120	22640	20500	1440	700	



# TABLE 80 -- 8 DANCERS -- EDUCATION BY BLACK, WHITE, RIND OTHER 1980

			Males			Femal	Females		
	Total	White	Black	Other	Total	White	Black	Other	
Education Level									
Grades 1 - 6									
Frequency	40	4D	0	0	100	40	20	_ 40	
Percent	1.3%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	1.0%	.5%	2.7%	5.4%	
Grades 7-8									
Frequency	60	60	0	0	<b>22</b> 0	220	0	0	
Percent	1.9%	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.2%	2.6%	0.0%	0. <b>0</b> %	
Some High School									
Frequency	200	160	Ð	40	1740	1440	160	140	
Percent	6.3%	6.2%	0.0%	12.5%	17.6%	17.2%	21.6%	18.9%	
Grad. H. S.									
Frequency	840	660	100	80	3900	3180	440	280	
Percent	26.3%	25.4%	35.7%	25.0%	39.6%	37.9%	59.5%	37.8%	
Some College									
Frequency	1080	820	120	140	2300	2000	60	240	
Percent	33.8%	31.5%	42.9%	43.8%	23.3%	23.9%	8.1%	32.4%	
Grad. College	00.0								
Frequency	560	520	<b>4</b> 0	0	<b>96</b> 0	<b>9</b> 20	40	0	
Percent	17.5%	20.0%	14.3%	0.0%	9.7%	11.0%	5.4%	0.0%	
Graduate Work	21.00%								
Frequency	420	340	20	60	640	580	20	40	
Percent	13.1%	13.1%	7.1%	18.8%	6.5%	6.9%	2.7%		
Total									
Frequencu	3200	2600	280	320	<b>98</b> 60	8380	740	740	



## TABLE 80 -- 9 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- EDUCATIONAL LEVEL BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER! 1980

		м	ales .			Females			
	Total	White	Black	Other	Total	White	Black:	Other	
Education Level									
Grades 1 - 6									
Frequency	1940	11 <b>6</b> 0	220	<b>5</b> 60	160	120	20	20	
Percent	2.0%	1.4%	3.2%	13.6%	. 4%	.3%	1.12		
Grades 7-8									
Frequency	1520	1280	140	100	400	380	0	20	
Percent	1.6%	1.5%	2.0%	2.4%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%		
Some High School									
Frequency	<b>776</b> 0	6340	1060	360	1860	1660	160	40	
Percent	8.0%	7.4%	15.4%	8.7%	4.5%	4.3%	8.5%		
Grad. H. S.									
Frequency	23880	20580	2160	1140	7700	6900	<b>70</b> 0	100	
Percent	24.8%	24.1%	31.3%	27.7%	18.8%	18.0%	37.2%		
Some College									
Frequency	29560	26500	2040	1020	11540	10720	500	320	
Percent	30.6%	31.0%	29.6%	24.8%	28.2%	28.0%	26.6%		
Grad. College									
Frequency	16160	14740	780	640	10300	9820	300	180	
Percent	16.7%	17.2%	11.3%	15.5%	25.2%	25.7%	16.0%		
Graduate Hork									
Frequency	15660	14860	500	300	8980	8680	200	100	
Percent	16.2%	17.4%	7.2%	7.3%	21.9%	22.7%	10.6%		
Total			_						
Frequency	96480	85460	6900	4120	40940	38280	1680	780	



### TABLE 80 -- 10 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS ---- EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1980

		Male			Female				
Employment Status Employed Civilian	Total	White	Black	Other	Total	<b>H</b> hi <b>te</b>	Black	Other	
FrequencyPercent	39220 87.1%	36180 87.6%	2180 83.2%		18200 80.4%	16540 80.7%	1120 77.8%	540 77.1%	
Frequency Percent Total	5800 12.9%	5100 12.4%	440 16.8%	260 23.2%	4440 19.6%	3960 19.3%	920 22.2%	160 22.9%	
Frequency	45020	41280	2620	1120	22640	20500	1440	<b>70</b> 0	



## TABLE 80 - 11 DANCERS -- EMPLOYMENT STATUS 8Y BLACK, WHITE AND OTHER 1980

### Male

	Total	White	Black	Other	Total	White	Black	Other
Employment Status							DIGON	00.14.
Employed Civilian								
Frequency	2620	2180	180	260	9040	7840	580	620
Percent	81.9%	83.8%	64.3%	81.3%	91.7%	93.6%	78.4%	83.8%
Unemployed								55.5%
Frequency	<b>58</b> 0	420	100	60	820	540	160	120
Percent	18.1%	16.2%	35.7%	18.8%	8.3%	6.4%	21.6%	16.2%
Total					•••			10.6/
Frequency	3200	2600	280	320	9860	8380	740	740



# TABLE 80 - 12 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY GENOER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1980

	•		Male	Females				
<b>.</b>	Total	White	Black	Other	Total	White	<b>Black</b>	Other
Employment Status Employed Civilian								
Frequency	87540	77940	5820	3780	38520	36280	1520	720
Percent	90.7%	91.2%	84.3%	91.7%	94.1%	94.8%	80.9%	92.3%
Unemployed						<i>-</i>	001711	
Frequency	8940	7520	1080	340	2420	2000	360	60
Percent	9.3%	8.8%	15.7%	8.3%	5.9%	5.2%	19.1%	7.7%
Total								
Frequency	96480	85460	6900	4120	40940	38280	1880	780



## TABLE 80 -- 13 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1980

		Whi	ite		B1ack		Other
	Total	Employed	Unempl.		d Unempl.	Eaployed	
HILLIRS WORKED LAST			•			J	
HEEK							
15 to 29							
Frequency	2780	2620	0	100	0	60	0
Percent	6.2%	7.2%	0.0%	4.6%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%
30 tr 34							
Frequency	1440	1300	0	100	а	40	0
Percent	3.2%	3.6%	0.0%	4.6%	9.0%	4.7%	0.0%
35 to 39							0.0
Frequency	1760	1520	0	180	ט	60	0
Percent	3.9%	4.2%	<b>0.</b> 0%	8.3%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%
40 hours							0.0
Frequency	13620	12249	0	1040	១	340	ο .
Percent	30.3%	33.8%	0.0%	47.7%		39.5%	0.0%
41 to 48				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	0.0		0.0%
Frequency	4660	4380	0	220	១	60	0
Percent	10.4%	12.1%	0.0%	10.12	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%
49 to 59							0.0
Frequency	6300	6060	0	180	0	<b>6</b> 0	0
Percent	14.0%	16.7%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%
60 or more					0.0.0		0.0
Frequency	5460	5260	0	120	0	80	Ω
Percent	12.1%	14.5%	0.0%	5.5%	0.0%	9.3%	0.0%
N/A					4.0		0.00
Freque :cy	9000	2800	5100	240	440	160	260
Percen	20.0%	7.7%	100.0%				00.0%
Total							
Frequency	<b>4502</b> 0	36180	5100	2180	440	860	260



# TABLE 80 -- 13 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- HOURS MORKED BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1980

		Nhite		B1ack	B1ack		0+her	
	Total	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Uneapl.	Employe	Unemp1.	
HOURS HORKED LAST			•		•		•	
MEEK								
15 to 29								
Frequency	2420	2240	0	120	0	60	8	
Percent	10.7%	13.5%	0.0%	10.7%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	
<b>30 to 3</b> 4								
Frequency	1060	1040	0	20	0	0	0	
Percent	4.7%	6.3%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
35 to 39								
Frequency	840	800	Ð	40	O	0	0	
Percent	3.7%	4.8%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
40 hours								
Frequency	6080	<b>5</b> 340	Đ	480	0	260	. 0	
Percent	26.9%	32.3%	0.0%	42.9%	0.0%	48.1%	0.0%	
41 to 48								
Frequency	2060	1920	. 0	60	0	80	0	
Percent	9.1%	11-6%	_ 0%	5.4%	0.0%	14.8%	0.0%	
49 to 59								
Frequency	2060	1860	Ð	180	0	20	0	
Percent	9.1%	11.2%	0.0%	16.1%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	
60 or more								
Frequency	1460	1360	0	<b>8</b> 0	0	20	0	
Percent	6.4%	8.2%	0.0%	7.1%	0%	3.7%	0.0%	
N/A								
Frequency	6660	1980	3960	140	<b>3</b> 20	106	160	
Parcent	29.4%	12.0%	100.0%	12.5%	100.0%	18.5%	100.0%	
Total								
Frequency	22640	16540	3960	1120	320	540	160	



## TABLE 80 -- 14 DANCERS -- HOURS WORKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1980

		₩hi	ite	8	lack	Other		
	Total	Employed	Unemp1.		Unempl.			
HOURS HORKED LAST HEEK			•		•	,		
15 to 29								
Frequency	400	340	0	20	O	40	O	
Percent	12.5%	15.6%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	15.4%	0.0%	
Frequency	300	280	8	20	0	Ð	O	
Percent	9.4%	12.8%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	160	140	0	20	0	Ð	O	
Percent	5.0%	6.4%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	680	520	0	60	0	100	0	
Percent41 to 48	21.3%	23.9%	0.0%	33. 3%	D.0%	38.5%	0.0%	
Frequency	200	160	0	20	0	20	O	
Percent	6.3%	7.3%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	
Frequency	<b>22</b> 0	220	Ð	O	0	0	0	
Percent	6.9%	10.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	120	120	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent N/A	3.8%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	1120	400	420	40	100	100	60	
Percent	35.0%	18.3%	100.0%	22.2%	100.0%		100.0%	
Total								
frequency	3200	2180	420	180	100	260	60	



# TABLE 80 -- 14 DANCERS -- GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

		Whit	Æ	Bl	ack		Other	
•	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed		. Em	ployed	Unempl.
HOURS HORKED LAST			•	, ,		•		•
HEEK								
15 to 29								
Frequency	1580	1340	Ð	40	0	200	0	
Percent	16.0%	17.1%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	32.3%	0.0%	
<b>30</b> to <b>34</b>								
Frequency	1140	980	0	100	0	. 60	0	
Percent	11.6%	12.5%	0.0%	17.2%	0.0%	9.7%	0.0%	
35 to 39					33313			
Frequency	700	620	0	80	0	0	0	
Percent	7.1%	7.9%	0.0%	13.8%	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	
40 hours								
Frequency	2340	2060	0	240	0	40	0	
Percent	23.7%	26.3%	0.0%	41.4%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	
41 to 48								
Frequency	620	580	0	40	Ð	0	0	
Percent	6.3%	7.4%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
49 to 59								
Frequency	280	240	Ð	20	0	20	Ω	
Percent	2.8%	3.1%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%	
60 or more								
Frequency	360	320	O	O	0	40	Ð	
Percent	3.7%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	
N/A		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		0.0	0.00	••••		
Frequency	2840	1700	540	60	160	260	120	
Percent	28.8%	21.7%	100.0%	10.3%	100.0%	41.9%	100.0%	
Total							10010/	
Frequency	9860	7840	540	580	160	620	120	



### TABLE 80 -- 15 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- HOURS WORKED BY GENDER WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1980

•		H	hite		Black		Other
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unemp1.
HOURS HORKED LAST HEEK			•		•	- (5-	
15 to 29							
Frequency	22880	20520	Ō	1340	0	1020	ถ
Percent	23.7%	26.3%	0.0%	23.0%	0.0%	27.0%	0.0%
30 to 34							0.0%
Frequency	9260	8660	Ð	340	0	260	Ð
Percent	9.6%	11.1%	0.0%	5.8%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%
35 to 39	••••			0.0	0.0%	0. 77.	0.0%
Frequency	3980	3420	O	420	Ω	140	O
Percent	4.1%	4.4%	0.0%	7.2%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%
40 hours					0.0%	J. 1 /2	0.0%
Frequency	16460	14100	Ð	1520	Ð	840	Ð
Percent	17.1%	18.12	0.0%	26.1%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%
41 to 48				2012/	J. 01.	LC . L/.	J. U/.
Frequency	3920	3560	0	200	O	160	O
Percent	4.1%	4.6%	0.0%	3,4%	0.0%	4.2%	0.0%
49 to 59				<b></b>	0.0%	7.6	0.0%
Frequency	4600	4300	O	220	Ð	80	១
Percent	4.8%	5.5%	0.0%	3.8%	0.0%	2.1%	0.0%
60 or more			•	J. 0/.	0.5/.	L- 4/•	0.0%
Frequency	4320	3900	0	240	O	180	Ð
Percent	4.5%	5.0%	0.0%	4.1%	0.0%	4.8%	0.0%
N/A		•••	0.0.0	*****	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%
Frequency	31660	19480	7520	1540	1080	1100	340
Percent	32.2%	25.0%	100.0%	26.5%	100.0%	29.1%	100.0%
Total		20.07	100.0%	~~· • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	200.0%	CJ. 1/	100.0%
Frequency	96480	77940	<b>7</b> 52 <b>0</b>	<b>5</b> 82 <b>0</b>	1080	3780	340



### TABLE 30 -- 15 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- HOURS WERKED BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER 1980

		Nhi	te	1	Black	Other	
	Total	Employed				Employed	Unemp1.
HOURS HORKED LAST			•				
HEEK							
15 to 29							
Frequency	8220	7840	0	180	0	200	0
Percent	20.1%	21.6%	0.0%	1_8%	0.0%	27.8%	0.0%
30 to 34							
Frequency	2540	2420	0	120	0	0	0
Percent	6.2%	6.7%	0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
35 to 39							
Frequency	1060	<del>96</del> 0	0	40	O	60	0
Percent	2.6%	2.6%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%
40 hours							
Frequency	<b>3</b> 520	3100	0	340	Ð	80	0
Percent	8.6%	8.5%	0.0%	22.4%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%
41 to 48							
Frequency	940	840	0	60	Ð	40	0
Percent	2.3%	2.3%	0.0%	3.9%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%
49 to 59							
Frequency	880	800	0	40	0	40	0
Percent	2.1%	2.2%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	5.6%	0.0%
6L or more							
Frequency	760	740	Ð	20	0	0	0
Percent	1.9%	2.0%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
N/A							
Frequency	23020	19580	2000	720	360	300	60
Percent	56.2%	54.0%	100.0%	47.4%	100.0%	41.7%	100.0%
Total							
Frequency	40940	36280	2000	1520	360	720	60



### TABLE 80 -- 16 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1979 1980

#### Hales HEEKS HORKEO

	Total	13 or less	14-26	27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode								
Radie/Television								
Frequency	14400	360	660	620	<b>′ 8</b> 60	500	11320	80
Percent	32.0x	10.12	14.72	<b>14.2</b> %	22.32	32.5%	43.72	6.22
Eating/Orinking Pl.						•••		
Frequency	280	20	20	100	60	0	80	0
Percent	.62	.62	-42	2.32	1.62	0.02	.32	0.02
Advortising				•	-			
Frequency	820	80	80	20	20	40	560	20
Percent	1.82	2.22	1.82	.52	.52	2.62	2.2%	1.52
Bus Serv. N.E.C.								
Frequency	140	20	48	0	0	0	80	0
Percent	.32	.62	.92	0.02	0.0%	0.02	.32	0.02
Hotels/Notels								
Frequency	40	0	20	0	0	0	20	0
Percent	- 12	0.02	.42	80.0	0.0%	0.02	. 12	0.0z
Theatres/Not. Pic.								
Frequency	24160	2840	<b>3</b> 580	3280	2680	840	<del>99</del> 20	1100
Percent	53.7%	79. <b>8</b> 2	77.02	75.2%	69.42	54.52	38.3%	84.62
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	420	20	Ð	80	20	20	260	20
Percent	.92	.62	0.02	1.82	.5%	1.3z	1.0%	1.5%
College/Univ.								
Frequency	860	100	40	28	60	80	540	0
Percent	1.92	2.92	.9z	.52	2.12	5.22	2.12	0.02
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	300	0	0	0	40	0	<b>26</b> 0	0
Percent	.72	0.02	0.02	۵.0٪	1.02	0.02	1.02	0.02
Misc. Prof. Serv.								
Frequency	20	0	0	0	0	0	20	0
Percent	۵۲-	0.0%	0.0%	0.0x	0.0%	0.02	.12	0.0%
Other								
frequency	3580	120	140	240	190	60	2840	80
Percent	\$.0x	3.4x	3.1x	5.5%	2.62	3.52	11.0%	6.2 <b>x</b>
Total								
Frequency	45020	3560	4500	<b>43</b> 60	3860	15⊀0	25900	1300



### TABLE 80 -- 16 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY BENDER BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1979 1980 .

### Fenales HEEKS HORKED

	Total	13 or less	· • 14-26	27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode		10 0, 102.		£, 55	10	70 75	30 - 32	HOC APPI.
Redio/Television								
Frequency	6 160	420	520	360	580	240	3880	140
Percent	27.22	15.72	14.92	14.38	21.0%	23.52	42.92	14.32
Eating/Orinking Pl.				- **				- 11011
Frequency	200	20	20	20	140	0	0	0
Percent	.9z	.72	.62	.82	5.12	0.02	0.02	0.02
Advertising							0.00	7.00
Frequency	940	80	160	80	60	0	460	100
Percent	1.22	3.02	4.62	3.02	2.2%	0.02	5.12	10.22
Bus Serv. N.E.C.								54124
Frequency	100	40	0	0	8	0	60	0
Percent	.42	1.52	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	.72	0.02
Hotels/Notels								
Frequency	20	Ci	0	0	0	0	20	0
Percent	. 12	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	,29	<b>0.</b> 02
Theatres/Mot. Pic.								
Frequency	12900	1920	2540	1980	1640	640	3440	740
Percent	57.02	71.62	72.62	74.4%	59.42	62.72	38.12	75.52
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	160	20	40	0	40	0	60	0
Percent	.72	.72	1.12	\$0.0	1.42	0.02	.72	0.02
College/Univ.				:				
Frequency	280	80	20	40	80	20	40	0
Percent	1.22	3.02	.62	1.5%	2.9%	2.02	.4%	0.02
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	200	40	0	40	40	0	80	0
Percent	.92	1.52	0.02	1.5%	1.42	0.02	.9%	0.0%
Higc. Prof. Serv.								
Frequency	40	0	0	0	0	6	40	0
Percent	.2≿	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.02	.42	0.0x
Other								
Frequency	1640	60	200	120	180	120	960	0
Percent	7.2%	2.22	5.72	4.5%	6.5%	11.8x	10.62	0.02
Total								
Frequency	22640	2680	3500	2660	2760	1020	9010	980

### TABLE 80 -- 17 DANCERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1979 1980

#### Hales HEEKS HORKED

	Total	13 or	less 14-26	27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode				2. 3.		10 13	30 JE	not oppas
Radio/Television								
Frequency	20	0	0	0	0	0	20	0
Percent	.67	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	2.02	0.02
Eating/Drinking Pl.								0.00
Frequency	240	80	20	60	20	0	40	20
Percent	7.52	20.02	5.62	10.02	3.8%	0.02	4.0%	14.32
Advertising								
Frequency	0	0	0	0	O	0	0	0
Percent	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.82
Bus Serv. N.E.C.								
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.02
Hotels/Motels								
Frequency	100	20	20	0	0	20	40	0
Percent	3.12	5.02	5.62	0.02	0.0%	11.12	4.0%	0.02
Theatres/Not. Pic.								
Frequency	1700	180	200	460	280	100	420	60
Percent	53.1%	45.02	55.62	76.7 <b>z</b>	53.8%	55.62	42.0%	42.9%
Hisc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	<b>8</b> 80	80	100	60	200	60	<b>3</b> 60	20
Percent	27.5%	20.02	27.82	10.02	38.5%	33.32	36.0x	14.32
College/Univ.								
Frequency	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.32	10.02	0.0%	0.0%	80.0	0.02	0.0%	0.02
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	20	^	20	0	Ð	0	2	0
Percent	.62	0.02	5.6%	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.02
itisc. Prof. Serv.								
Frequency	80	0	0	0	20	0	30	40
Percent	2.5%	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	3.8%	0.02	2.0%	28.62
Other		_						
Frequency	120	. 0	0	20	0	0	100	0
Percent	3.8%	0.02	0.8%	3.3%	0.0%	0.02	10.0%	0.02
Total	****				_			
Frequency	3200	400	360	600	520	180	1000	140



### TABLE 80 -- 17 DANCERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1979 1980

#### Females MEEKS WORKED

	Total	13 or less	: 14-26	. 27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode								
Redio/Television								
Frequency	20	O	0	20	0	0	G	0
Percent	.2%	0.02	0.02	1.32	0.02	20.0	80.0	0.02
Eating/Orinking Pl.								
Frequency	2380	200	<b>36</b> 8	340	440	<b>9</b> 0	760	200
Percent	24.1%	21.32	25.02	22.4%	26.8%	13.32	2 <b>4.8</b> %	30.32
Rdvertising								
Frequency	20	0	0	0	0	0	20	0
Percent	.2%	0.0x	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.02	.72	0.02
Bus Serv. N.E.C.								
Frequency	0	ภ	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	20.0	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.02
Hotels/Motels								
Frequency	400	20	40	40	40	80	180	0
Percent	4.1z	2.1%	2.82	2.62	2.42	13.32	5.9z	0.02
Theatres/Hot. Pic.								
Frequency	<b>43</b> 60	<b>3</b> 20	720	<b>64</b> 0	780	340	1240	<b>3</b> 20
Percent	44.22	34.0%	50.02	42.12	47.62	<b>56.7</b> 2	40.5%	46.52
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	2100	340	280	400	300	60	620	100
Percent	21.32	36.22	19.42	26.3%	18.32	10.02	20.32	15.2%
College/Univ.								
Frequency	20	0	0	0	0	0	20	0
Percent	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0::	0.02	0.02	.?x	20.0
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	۵.0٪	0.0z	೦.೦ಜ	0.0%	0.0x	20.0	0.0%	0.02
Hisc. Prof. Serv.								
Frequency	60	0	0	0	40	0	20	0
Percent	.62	0.02	30.0	0.0%	2.4%	0.02	27،	0.0%
Other								
Frequency	500	60	46	80	40	40	200	<b>4</b> 0
Percent	5.1%	6.4x	2.82	5.32	2.4%	5.72	6.5x	6.1x
Total								
Frequency	9860	910	1440	1520	16 <b>4</b> 0	<b>60</b> 0	3060	660

TABLE 80 -- 18
MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY MEEKS MORKED IN 1979
1980

#### Hales HEEKS MORKED

	Total	13 or less	14-26	27-39	40-47	48~49	50 - 52	Not Appl.
Industry Recode								
Redio/Television								
Frequency	700	40	100	20	80	0	460	0
Percent	.72	.6Z	.72	.22	.5ጽ	0.0%	1.22	0.02
Eating/Orinking Pl.								
Frequency	10440	940	1220	1520	1900	680	3700	480
Percent	10.8%	13.42	9.12	12.72	12.32	11.5z	9.62	11.32
Advertising								
Frequency	120	0	8	0	20	40	60	0
Percent	. 1%	0.02	0.02	0.0%	. 12	.72	.2%	0.0%
Bus Serv. N.E.C.								
Frequency	1320	60	200	100	260	80	560	60
Percent	1.4%	.92	1.52	.8%	1.7%	1.42	1.5%	1.42
Hotels/Hotels								
Frequency	2380	146	340	280	520	280	800	20
Percent	2.5%	2.02	2.52	2.32	3.4%	4.72	2.1%	.5%
Theatres/Hot. Pic.								
Frequency	60860	<b>4</b> 500	9640	8140	10560	3920	21420	2680
Percent	63.1%	64.32	71.5%	67.92	68.4%	66.4%	55.7%	63.2%
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	2520	140	360	380	368	100	1000	180
Percent	2.6%	2.02	2.7%	3.22	2.3%	1.72	2.6%	4.2%
College/Univ.								
Frequency	880	120	220	60	220	40	220	0
Percent	.9%	1.72	1.62	.52	1.4%	.72	.6%	א0.0
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	10 160	648	600	640	81J	480	6720	260
Percent	10.5%	9.12	4.5%	5.3%	5.3%	8.1%	17.5%	6.1%
Misc. Prof. Serv.								
Frequency	1980	80	180	160	240	60	1020	240
Percent	2.1%	1.1%	1.3%	1.32	1.62	1.0%	2.7%	5.7%
Other								
Frequency	5120	340	620	680	<b>46</b> 0	220	2480	<b>3</b> 20
Percent	5.3%	4.92	4.62	5.7%	3.0%	3.72	6.5%	7.5%
Total								
Frequency	<b>964</b> 80	<b>70</b> 00	13400	11980	15440	5900	38440	4240



### TABLE 80 -- 18 \*\*USICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1979 1980

#### Fenales HEEKS HORKED

	Total	13 or	1035	14-26	27-39	40-47	48-49	50 - 52	Hot	Appl.
Industry Recode										
Redic/Television										
Frequency	· 100	0		0	<del>1</del> 0	20	0	40	0	
Percent	.22	0.0%	0.0		72	.3%	8.0%	.2%	ג0.0	
Eating/Brinking Pl.										
Frequency	1620	220	200		20	340	180	300	160	
Percent	4.02	5.72	4.4	% <b>1</b> .	12	5.6%	6.62	1.8%	8.82	
Advertising										
Frequency	40	0		-	20	0	0	20	0	
Percent	. 12	0.02	0.0	<b>.</b>	4%	0.0x	80.0	. 1%	0.0%	
Bus Serv. N.E.C.										
Frequency	340	20	120	_	10	<b>4</b> 8	0	90	40	
Percent	.82	.52	2.6	. ·	7%	.72	ง.0ะ	.5%	2.2%	
Hotels/Motels										
Frequency	428	40	60	-	60	100	60	60	20	
Percent	1.02	1.02	1.3	ž 1.	12	1.7%	2.2%	.5%	1.12	
Theatres/Hot. Pic.										
Frequency	14780	1720	1960			2760	1080	4060	600	
Percent	36.12	44.6%	42.8	% <b>4</b> 8.	0%	45.72	39.72	24.6%	33.0%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.										
Frequency	800	180	120	-	10	80	60	160	60	
Percent	2.0%	4.72	2.6	2.	6%	1.32	2.22	1.02	3.32	
College/Univ.										
Frequency	1120	160	200	-	00	180	120	160	100	
Percent	2.7%	4.1%	1.4	ž <b>3</b> .	72	3.0%	4.4%	1.0%	5.5ะ	
Relig. Org.										
Frequency	17760	1120	1540	-		1840	980	10120	620	
Percent	43.42	29.0%	33.68	28.	12	30.5%	36.0%	61.3%	34.12	
Hisc. Prof. Serv.				_	_		_			
Frequency	300	20	60	-	0	20	0	180	20	
Percent	.72	.5%	1.37	<b>.</b> 0.	אט	.3%	۵.0%	1.12	1.1%	
Other				_						
Frequency	3660	380	320		60	660	240	1300	200	
Percent	8.9%	9.8%	7.07	10.	5%	10.9%	8.8%	7.9%	11.0%	
Total										
Frequency	40940	3860	4580	0 54	20	6040	2720	16500	1820	



# TABLE 80 -- 19 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

		Wh	ite	8	lack		Other	
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	Eaple		hempl.
Industry Recode		• -	•		•	• -	<b>J</b> -	•
Radio/Telvision								
Frequency	14400	12420	600	900	60	420	0	
Percent	32.0%	34.3%	11.8%	41.3%	13.6%	48.8%	0.0%	
Eating/Drinking Pl.								
Frequency	280	240	40	0	0	0	0	
Percent	.6%	.7%	.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Advertising								
Frequency	820	<b>660</b>	140	20	O	0	٥	i
Percent	1.8%	1.8%	2.7%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Bus Serv. N.E.C.								
Frequency	140	60	60	20	0	Ð	0	
Percent	.3%	.2%	1.2%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Hotels/Motels							••••	
Frequency	40	20	0	20	0	0	0	
Percent	. 1%	.1%	0.0%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Theatres/Mot. Pic.				***			0.000	
Frequency	24160	18140	4120	1000	300	360	240	
Percent	53.7%	50.1%	80.8%	45.9%	68.2%	41.9%	92.3%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	420	320	20	60	Đ	20	۵	
Percent	.9%	.9%	. 4%	2.8%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	
College/Univ.					0.0	O/.	0.0%	
Frequency	860	800	40	20	Ð	0	O	
Percent	1.9%	2.2%	.8%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Relig. Org.					<b>5.5</b>		J. 0/.	
Frequency	300	280	20	Ð	Đ	0	0	
Percent	.7%	.8%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Misc. Prof. Serv.				J. J	0.0%	C. 0/.	0.0/.	
Frequency	20	20	Ð	0	O	0	0	
Percent	.0%	.12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Other			0.0%	J. 0/.	0.0/.	U. U.	U. U/.	
Frequency	3580	3220	60	140	<b>8</b> 0	60	20	
Percent	8.0%	8.9%	1.2%	6.4%	18.2%	7.0%	7.7%	
Total				O. 47.		0%	1 - 1 /-	
Frequency	45020	36180	5100	2180	440	860	260	
	,0000	00.00	0,00	-100	770	000	200	



# ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

		What	e	B1	ack	Oth	er
	Total	Employ.	Unempl.	Employ.		Employ.	
Industry Recode		, ,	·	, ,	•		•
Radio/Television							
Frequency	6160	4760	600	620	40	140	0
Percent	27.2%	28.8%	15.2%	55.4%	12.5%	25.9%	0.0%
Eating/Drinking Pl.							
Frequency	200	160	40	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 9%	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Advertising							
Frequency	940	680	180	40	20	20	0
Percent	4.2%	4.1%	4.5%	3.6%	5.3%	3.7%	0.0%
Bus Serv. N.E.C.							
Frequer-j	100	80	0	0	0	0	20
Percent	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	12.5%
Hotels/Motels							
Frequency	20	20	0	O	0	0	.0
Percent	. 1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Theatres/Mot. Pic.							
Frequency	12900	8900	2980	320	260	300	140
Percent	57. <i>0</i> %	53.8%	75.3%	20.€%	81.3%	55.6%	87.5%
Misc. Ent. Serv.							
Frequency	160	140	20	0	0	0	0
Percent	.7%	.8%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
College/Univ.							
Frequency	290	240	4(1	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.2%	1.5%	1.0%	0.0%	0. ox	0.0%	0.0%
Relig. Org.							
Frequency	200	140	40	20	0	0	0
Percent	. 9%	.8%	1.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Misc. Prof. Serv.	_						
frequency	40	40	C	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Other							
Frequency	1640	1380	60	120	Ü	810	0
fercent	7.2%	8.3%	1.5%	10.7%	Ü. 0%	14.6%	Ü. 0%
Total							
frequency	22640	16540	3960	1120	320	540	160



# DANCERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

			ite		Black		Other-	
To almost on the second	Total	Employ.	Unempl.	Employ.	Unempl.	Employ.	Unempl.	
Industry Recode							•	
Radio/Television		_						
Frequency	20	ū	0	0	20	0	0	
Percent.	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	20.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Eating/Drinking Pl.								
Frequency	_240	160	40	20	0	0	20	
Percent	7.5%	~ 3%	9.5%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	33.3%	
Advertising								
Frequency	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Bus Serv. N.E.C.	_	_						
Frequency	0	0	O	Ð	0	0	0	
Percent	0.0%	0.07	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Hotels/Motels								
Frequency	100	60	Û	20	0	20	0	
Percent	3.1%	2.8%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	
Theatres/Mot. Pic.								
Frequency	1700	1200	560	120	20	80	20	
Percent	53.1%	55.0%	61.9%	66.7%	20.0%	30.8%	33.3%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	880	<b>54</b> 0	120	20	20	160	20	
Percent	27.5%	24.8%	26.5%	11.1%	20.0%	61.5%	33.3%	
College/Univ.								
Frequency	40	0	Ω	0	<b>4</b> 0	0	0	
Percent	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	40.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Relig Org.								
Frequency	20	20	CI	0	0	0	0	
Percent	.6%	.9%	0.0%	0.CX	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Misc. Prof. Serv.								
Frequency	80	80	Ð	0	Ü	CI	0	
Percent	2.5%	3.7%	0.0%	O. 0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Other								
Frequency	120	120	Ci	0	0	CI	0	
Fercent	3.6%	5.5%	Ŭ <b>. O</b> %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total	*****							
Frequency	32'00	2180	4.20	180	100	260	£D	



# TABLE 80 -- 20 DANCERS -- INOUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

### All Females

			White		Black	Other		
	Total	Emp1c	yed Unemp	l. Employ	ed Unempl.	Employ	ed Unemp.	
Industry Recode								
Radio/Television								
Frequency	20	20	0	0	0	0	. 0	
Percent	.2%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %	0.0%	0.0%	
Eating/Drinking Pl.								
Frequency	2380	1900	160	<b>16</b> 0	<b>4</b> 0	80	40	
Percent	24.1%	24.2%	29.6%	27.6%	25.0%	12.9%	33.3%	
Advertising								
Frequency	20	20	0	0	0	0	_ 0	
Percent	. 2%	. 3%	0.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %	. 0 <b>.0</b> %	0.0%	0.0%	
Bus Serv. N.E.C.						_	_	
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %	0.0%	
Hotels/Motels								
Frequency	400	<b>34</b> 0	<b>2</b> 0	0	0	40	0	
Percent	4.1%	4.3%	3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%	
Theatres/Mot. Pic.								
Frequency	4360	<b>34</b> 60	300	<b>2</b> 00	100	260	40	
Percent	44.2%	44.1%	55.6%	34.5%	62.5%	41.9%	33.3%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	2100	<b>16</b> 60	<b>4</b> 0	160	0	200	40	
Percent	21.3%	21.2%	7.4%	27.6%	0.0%	32.3%	<b>33.3</b> %	
College/Univ.								
Frequency	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	.2%	. Эх	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Misc. Prof. Serv.							_	
Frequency	60	60	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	. 6%	.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Other								
Frequency	ይቦባ	<b>3</b> 60	20	60	20	40	0	
Percent	5.1%	4.6%	3.7%	10.3%	12.5%	6.5%	0.0%	
Total								
Frequency	<b>98</b> 60	7840	540	580	160	620	120	



# TABLE 80 -- 21 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

### Males .

		White		8	lack	Other		
	Total	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Urempl.	
Industry Recode			•				mp	
Radio/Television								
Frequency	700	580	20	60	20	20	O	
Percent	.7%	.7%	. 3%	1.0%	1.9%	.5%	0.0%	
Eating/Drinking Pl.								
Frequency	10440	8340	<b>5</b> 20	700	120	740	20	
Percent	10.8%	10.7%	6.9%	12.0%	11.1%	19.6%	5.9%	
Advertising							•••	
Frequency	120	80	20	0	0	20	0	
Percent	.1%	. 1%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	. 5%	0.0%	
Bus Serv. N.E.C.								
Frequency	1320	840	100	320	0	60	Ð	
Percent	1.4%	1.1%	1.3%	5.5%	0.0%	1.6%	0.0%	
Hotels/Hotels								
Frequency	2380	2060	100	40	40	140	0	
Percent	2.5%	2.6%	1.3%	.7%	3.7%	3.7%	0.0%	
Theatres/Mot. Fic.								
Frequency	60860	47820	6080	3560	760	2360	280	
Percent	63.1%	61.4%	80.9%	61.2%	70.4%	62.4%	82.4%	
Misc. Ent. Serv.								
Frequency	<b>2</b> 520	2140	160 -	60	40	120	0	
Percent	2.6%	2.7%	2.1%	1.0%	3.7%	3.2%	0.0%	
College/Univ.								
Frequency	880	760	20	80	0	20	Ð	
Percent	. 9%	1.0%	. 3%	1.4%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%	
Relig. Org.								
Frequency	10160	9480	160	380	20	100	20	
Percent	10.5%	12.2%	2.1%	6.5%	1.9%	2.6%	5.9%	
Misc. Prof. Serv.								
Frequency	1980	1800	20	100	40	20	0	
Fercent	2.1%	2.3%	. 3%	1.7%	3.7%	- 5%	0.0%	
Other								
Frequency	5120	4040	320	520	40	180	20	
Percent	5.3%	5.2%	4.3%	8.9%	3.7%	4.8%	5.9%	
Total								
Frequency	96480	77940	<b>75</b> 20	5820	1080	3780	<b>34</b> D	



# TABLE 80 -- 21 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INDUSTRIAL SECTOR BY GENDER BLACK, WHITE, AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

	. Total	Employed	White Unempl.	Employed	Black Unempl.	Employed	Other Une <b>m</b> p.
Industry Recode					•		-
Radio/Television							•
Frequency	100	80	8	0	O	20	0
Percent	. 2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%
Eating/Drinking Pl.							
Frequency	1620	1360	60	100	0	60	<b>4</b> D
Percent	4.0%	3.7%	3.0%	6. <b>6</b> %	0.0%	8.3%	66.7%
Advertising							
Frequency	40	0	20	20	0	0	0
Percent	.1%	0.0%	1.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0. <b>0%</b>	0. <b>0</b> %
Bus Serv. N.E.C.						_	_
Frequency	340	240	40	40	20	0	. 0
Percent	.8%	.7%	2.0%	2.6%	5.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Hotels/Motels							_
Frequency	420	260	20	40	_ 20	80	0
Percent	1.0%	.7%	1.0%	2.6%	5.6%	11.1%	0.0%
Theatres/Mot. Pic.							
Frequency	14780	12100	1360	680	200	420	20
Percent	<b>36.</b> 1%	33.4%	68.0%	44.7%	55.6%	58.3%	<b>33.3</b> %
Misc. Ent. Serv.		740			_	_	_
Frequency	800	760	20	20	0	. 0	0
Percent	2.0%	2.1%	1.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
College/Univ.	4400	***		_	_	_	
rrequency	1120	1100	20	0	0	0	0
Percent	2.7%	3.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Relig. Org.	43360	17040	100	440	_	•	•
Frequency	17760	17040	180	460	0	80	0
Percent	43.4%	47.0%	9.0%	30.3%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%
Misc. Prof. Serv.	300	220	40	40	•	0	0
Frequency Percent	.7%	220	. –	40	0	0	0 0.0%
Other	. (%	.6%	2.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	3660	3120	240	120	120	60	0
Percent	8.9%	8.6%	12.0%	7.9%	33.3%	8.3%	[ <i>J</i> %
Total							_
Frequency	40940	36280	2000	1520	360	720	60



## ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- PLACE OF MURK BY GENUER BY WHITE, BLACK AND UTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

#### Males

		H	hite		B1ack		Other
	Total	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unemp1.	Enployed	Unempl.
PLACE OF MORK-STATE		, ,	·	• •	•	, ,	•
N/A							
Frequency	<b>26</b> 020	18480	5100	1120	440	620	260
Percent	57.8%	51.1%	100.0%	51.4%	100.0%	72.1%	100.0%
AL <u>AB</u> AMA	_						
Frequency		120	0	0	_ 0	0	0
Percent	3%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ALASKA			_	_	_		_
Frequency	. 20	20	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.0%	- 1%	0.0%	0.0%	אני.0	0.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %
***************************************	200	240	•	0	•	20	^
Frequency Percent		240 .7%	0	0	0	20	0
arkansas			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%
Frequency		80	Đ	Ð	O	0	Ų
Percent	. 2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CALIFORNIA			_		_		_
Frequency		3800	0	160	0	40	0
Percent COLORADO	8.9%	10.5%	0.0%	7.3%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%
Frequency		180	0	0	Ð	Ð	0
Percent	.4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	320	320	១	Đ	Ð	0	O
Percent		.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
DELAHARE				•••	0.0		
Frequency	40	20	0	20	0	0	0
Percent		. 1%	0.0%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Wash, DC							
Frequency		280	0	120	0	0	0
Percent	.9%	.8%	0.0%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FLORIDA							
Frequency	620	620	0	0	0	Ð	0
Percent	1.4%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GEORGIA	400	100	_		_	_	_
Frequency	120	100	0	20	0	0	0
Percent HAWAII	. 3%	.3%	0.0%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	60	O	٥	C	20	0
Percent	.2%	.2%	0.0%	-	0 0.0%	20 2.3%	0 0.0%
FRIC	- 41.	• 41.	0.0%	5.0%	U. U.	c. 5/.	U. U/.
1 1 1 1 1 1			_				

182

		Whi	te '	81.	ack		Other
	All Males		Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	Emplo	
PLACE OF HORK-STATE IDAHO			•	. 3	•		
Frequency	40	40	0	0	O	0	0
Percent ILLINOIS	.1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	740	720	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	1.6%	2.0%	0.0%	. 9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	160	160	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.4%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
IOHA			_				
Frequency	140	140	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.3%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	80	60	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	.2%	. 2%	0.0%	. 9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	200	200	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 4%	. 6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	0	0	Ð	0	o ·
Percent	.2%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	40	40	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.1%	. 1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MARYLAND							
Frequency	220	200	Ö	20	0	0	0
Percent	.5%	.6%	0.0%	. 9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	460	440	0	20	0	0	0
Percent HICHIGAN	1.0%	1.2%	0.0%	. 9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	300	240	Ô	60	0	0	0
Percent MINNESOTA	.7%	.7%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	220	200	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	.5%	.6%	0.0%	. 9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	120	80	0	40	O	0	0
Percent	.3%	. 2%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	320	<b>30</b> 0	0	20	Ö	0	0
Percent	.7%	.8%	0.0%	. 9%.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	2:0	20	0	0	O	0	0
Percent	.0%	. 1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	00%	0.0%



		<b>H</b> hi			ack	Other		
		Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Une≈⊋1.	Emple	oy <b>e</b> d .Unempl.	
PLACE OF HORK-STATE	•							
iraska			_	_	_	_	_	
Frequency		90	8	0	0	0	0	
Percent	2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
NEVADA			_	_	_	_	_	
Frequency	120	120	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	3%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
NEH JERSEY	200	222	•	•	•	•	•	
Frequency		220	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	5%	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
NEH LEXICO	60	60		0	•		0	
Frequency		60	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
EH YORK	0400	2220		240	•	60	0	
Frequency		3320	0	240	9	60	0	
Percent	8.0%	9.2%	0. <b>0</b> %	11.0%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	
NORTH CAROLINA	222	200	•	20		•	•	
Frequency		200	0	20	0	0	0	
Percent	5%	.6%	0.0%	.9%	8.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
IORTH DAKOTA	40	40	0	•		0	O	
Frequency		40 .1%	0	0	0 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Percent	1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.</b> 0%	
HIO	340	300	8	40	O	O	O	
Frequency	_	.8%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Percent IKLAHOMA		.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	. 100	100	0	O	o	Ð	Ð	
Frequency		.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0-0%	0.0%	0.0%	
DREGON		. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	p. 0	
	260	260	Ð	O	o	Ð	Ð	
Frequency		.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
PENNSYLVANIA			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	380	360	0	O	o	20	Ð	
Frequency		1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	
RHODE ISLAND		1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	£ . J/.	0.0%	
Frequency	. 40	49	0	0	0	0	Ð	
Percent	-	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
SOUTH CAROLINA		• 1/-	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.0</b> %	
Frequency	60	60	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent		.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
SOUTH DAKOTA		• ~ / •	0.0%	0.0/.	J. 0/.	J. U/.	Q. O/.	
Frequency	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent		.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
TENNESSEE		. 17.	0.0%	0.0%	J. U/.	0.0%	<i>0.0</i> %	
	240	220	0	20	n	0	Ð	
Francis	2411	//11						
Frequency		220 .6%	0 0.0%	20 .9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	



		Mhi	te	81	ack		Other
F	All Males	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed		Eapl	oyed Unempl.
PLACE OF HORK-STATE			•				
TEXAS							
Frequency	720	<b>72</b> 0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1.6%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
UTAH							
Frequency	80	80	0	0	Ð	O	0
Percent	.2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	D.0%
VERMONT							
Frequency	40	40	0	0	O	0	0
Percent	.1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
VIRGIT.IA							
Frequency	400	380	0	0	Ð	20	0
Percent	.9%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%
HASHINGTON							
Frequency	280	280	O	0	Ð	Ð	0
Percent	.6%	.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HEST VIRGINIA							
Frequency	68	60	0	0	O	0	0
Percent	.1%	. 2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	9.0%	0.0%
HISCONSIN							
Frequency	160	160	8	0	O	Ð	O
Percent	.4%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.</b> 0%
HYDMING							
Frequency	0	8	8	8	0	Ð	Ð
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ABROAD							
Frequency	60	60	9	0	0	Ð	0
Percent	.1%	. 2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
STATE NOT IDENTIFIED							
Frequency	1980	1720	0	<b>20</b> 0	0	60	O
Percent	4.4%	4.8%	0.0%	9.2%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%
Total							
Frequency	45020	36180	5100	2180	440	860	260



# ACTORS AND DIRECTORS --- PLACE OF HORK BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

		White		B1.	ack	Other		
At	ll Females					Employed	d Unempl.	
PLACE OF HORK-STATE		, ,	•	, 3				
N/A								
Frequericy	13600	8360	3960	600	320	200	160	
Percent	60.1%	50.5%	100.0%	53.6%	100.0%	37.0%	100.0%	
ALABAMA								
Frequency	60	60	O	O	0	0	0	
Percent	. 3%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
rlaska								
Frequency	20	<b>2</b> 0	Đ	0	0	Ð	0	
Percent	-1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
RRIZONA			_	_	_			
Frequency	80	40	0	_ 0	. 0	40	0	
Percent	. 4%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	
Frequency	0	0	O	0	0	Ð	9	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0. <b>0</b> %	0.0%	
CALIFORNIA								
Frequency	2160	1980	O	20	Ω	150	0	
Percent	9.5%	12.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	29.6%	0.0%	
COLORADO			_		_			
Frequericy	60	40	0	0	0	20	0	
Percent	- 3%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%	
CONNECTICUT	ocı	20	_	_	_	_	_	
Frequency	80	80	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent ELRURRE	- 4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
	Ω	ก	0	•	•	•	_	
Frequericy Percent	0.0%	•	0	0	0	0	0	
HRSH, DC	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequericy	<b>2</b> 20	160	Ð	60	O	Ð	Ω	
Percent	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	5.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
FLORIDA	1.0%	1.0%	0.0%	J. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequericy	<b>2</b> 20	220	0	O	O	O	ខ	
Percent	1.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
SEORGIA	2.0%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	<b>2</b> 20	180	ก	40	a	n	O	
Percent	1.0%	1.1%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
MARII			••••		J. 511	0.0/.	<i></i>	
Frequency	60	20	0	0	Ð	40	()	
Percent	.3%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%	0.0%	
		= - =	. =					



		White		Blac	:k	Other	
DI 005 05 11001/ 57077	All Females	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unempl	Employed	Unemp1.
PLACE OF WORK-STATE IDAHO							
Frequency	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	9.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	O. CI%
ILLINOIS							
Frequency	. <b>3</b> 20	280	0	20	0	20	0
Percent	. 1.4%	1.7%	<b>0.</b> 0%	1.8%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%
INDIANA							
Frequency	. 80	80	0	Ð	0	Ο.	0
Percent	.4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	80	80	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	60	60	C	0	0	o	0
Percent	.3%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
KENTUCKY	•		0.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	U. C/.
Frequency	40	40	0	0	O	Ω	Ω
Percent	. 2%	. 2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%
LDUISIANA							
Frequency	<b>6</b> 0	<b>4</b> 0	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	. 3%	.2%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	O. CIX
MRINE							
Frequency	0	_ 0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0. Ci%
MARYLAND	460	400	_				
Frequency	1 <b>6</b> 0	120	0	40	0	0	0
Purcent	.7%	.7%	0.0%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0. <b>0</b> %
Frequency	200	200	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 9%	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0	0	0
MICHIGAN	• 21.	1.6%	<b>4.</b> 0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	140	120	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MINNESOTA					0.0%	0.0%	O. C.//.
Frequency	80	80	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MISSISSIPPI							
Frequency	60	60	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.3%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	80	80	0	O	O	O	0
Percer.t	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MONTANA			<del>• •</del>			J. J.	J. 47.
Frequency	0	ប	0	O	Ü	O	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



Table 8022 (Females	s, Cont.)						
		White		Bla	ck	Other of the other	
	All Females	Emp1oyed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl	Employed	Unempl.
PLACE OF HORK-STATE NEBRASKA							
Frequency	20	20	۵	0	0	0	0
Percent	1%	. 1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NEVADA							
Frequency	40	40	0	O	_ 0	0	0
Percent	2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NEW JERSEY	80	6.3	0	•	•	_	_
Frequency Percent	4%	<b>გ</b> ე .5%	0 <b>0.</b> 0%	0	0	0	0
NEW MEXICO			<b>U.</b> U.	0.0%	¢.J%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	. 20	20	0	0	0	0	0
Percent		.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	. 2100	1920	0	<b>16</b> 0	0	20	0
Percent	. 9.3%	11.6%	0.0%	14.3%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%
Frequency	. 80	<b>6</b> 0	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	4%	. 4%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
North Dakota							
Frequency		20	_ 0	0	0	0	o <sub>.</sub>
Percent	1%	. 17.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
OHIO Frequency	. 220	200	0	20	Ω	0	0
Percent	1.0%	1.2%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
OKLAHOMA			0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Frequency	. 20	20	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	U. 0%
OREGON		_					
Frequency		80	. 0	O	0	0	Ð
Percent PENNSYLVANIA		.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		<b>8</b> 0	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	4%	.5%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
RHODE ISLAND	<b>60</b>	<b>C</b> (2)	-	•	-	_	_
Frequency Percent	• 60 • .3%	60 •4%	0	0	0	0	0
SOUTH CAROLINA			0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
' Frequency		D	0	20	0	0	0
PercentSOUTH DAKOTA		0.0x	Ü.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		20	0	0	0	0	0
Percent TENNESSEE		.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		100	0	0	٥	0	0
Percent	4%	.6%	0.0%	۵. Ox	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%



Table 8022 (Females, Cont.)  White Black Other											
0.	11 6 1			Blac		Other					
PLACE OF WORK-STATE	ll Females	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unemp1	Employed	Unempl.				
TEXAS			•								
Frequency	420	400	0	20	0	0	0				
Percent	1.9%	2.4%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
UTAH		•,									
Frequency	60	<b>6</b> 0	0	0	0	0	0				
Percent	.3%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
VERMONT											
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	Ω				
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
VIRGINIA											
Frequency	80	80	0	0	0	O	Ω				
Percent	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
WASHINGTON						0.0	0.0				
Frequency	120	120	0	0	0	0	Ω				
Percent	.5%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
WEST VIRGINIA						0.0%	0.0/.				
Friequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.0%				
WISC:ONSIN				0.0%	0.0/	0.0%	0.0%				
Frequency	60	60	0	0	0	0	Ð				
Percent	.3%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
HYDMING		•		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0/.				
Friequency	20	0	0	0	0	20	ស				
Percent	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%				
abrciad						J. 1 %	0.0%				
Friequency	60	40	0	20	0	0	Ω				
Percent	.3%	.2%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%				
STATE NOT IDENTIFIED			W . W	2.0	0.0/.	0.0%	0.0%				
Frequency	700	660	0	20	0	20	0				
Percent	3.1%	4.0%	0.0%	1.8%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%				
Totail					C-1 O/1	J. 17.	0.0%				
Frieduencia	22640	16540	3060	1120	220	540	160				



Friequency.....

# TABLE 80 -- 23 CHANCERS -- PLACE OF WORK BY GENCIER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

		Whit	h.a.	Other				
	All Males			Facilo	Black Jed Unempl	lou Fo	otner ployed Unemp	la
PLACE OF WORK-SITATE	1121 1131 13	e.mogeu	onemprog.	- mprog	ged Onemp	iog. En	Pioged Orient	, <b>.</b> Og
Frequency	2020	1060	420	160	100	220	60	
Percent	. 63.1%	48.6%	100.0%	88.9%	100.0%	84.6%	100.0%	
alaska								
Frequency		0	Û	Ð	0	0	Ð	
Percent	. O. 0%	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
ARIZONA								
Frequency	. 20	20	0	0	O	0	0	
Percent	6%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	. 0	0	CI	0	0	0	0	
Percent	. 0.0%	£1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	. 180	180	0	Ð	0	0	0	
Percent	. 5.6%	81.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
COLORADO							•	
Frequency		0	0	0	0	20	0	
Percent	6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	
Frequency	. 0	O	Đ	0	0	0	0	
Percent	0_0X	(i. 0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	. 0	Ð	EI	0	0	O	Û	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	. 610	80	Ci	0	S	Ð	0	
Percent		3.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	. 0	0	(I	0	0	Ci	0	
Percent		CI. D%	0.0%	0.0%	0 0%	0.0%	0.0%	
HAMAII					•			
Frequency	. 0	0	נו	0	Ú	(3	Ω	
Percent	0 CIX	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	



Table 80--23 (Males, Cont.)

atile on En (lietes) (			Nhib	Mhite		lack		Other		
	A11	Males	Employed	Unemploy.	Employed	Unemplo	u.	Employed Unemploy.		
PLACE OF HORK-STATE NEBRASKA			, ,	, ,	,		<b>.</b>	,,		
Frequency	,	Ŋ	១	D	C	0		0 0		
Percent	•	<b>8.</b> 0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	0.0%		
Frequencii	,	80	ac	0	0	0		0 0		
Pantoent		2.5%	3.7%	0.0x	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	0.0%		
Frequency		60	60	0	0	0		0 0		
Percent		1.9%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	0.0%		
Frequency		225	200	J	0	0	2	90 0		
Percent		6.3%	9.2%	0.0%	0. ¢%	0.0%	7.7			
Frequency		40	40	C	U	0		១ ០		
Percent		1.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	0.0%		
'Frequency		20	20	0	0	Ω		0 0		
PercentOREGON		.£%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0			
Frequency		0	0	0	0	0		0 0		
Percent		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	% 0.0%		
Frequency		40	40	0	0	Ω		0 0		
Percent		1.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	% B.0%		
Frequency		0	0	0	0	0		0 0		
Percent		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	•		
Frequency		0	0	0	0	0		0 0		
Percent		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	-		

Table 8023	(Males,	Cont.)
------------	---------	--------

idote do co (liates) conc.								
	Whit	e	B1	ack		Other		
All Males	Employed	Unemploy.	Employed	Unemplo	u.	Employed Unemploy.		
PLACE OF WORK-STATE	, ,	, ,	<b>, .</b>		9.	emprogramme and a		
TEXAS								
Frequency 40	40	O	0	0		0 0		
Percent 1.3%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	% 0.0%		
UTAH								
Frequency	Ω	0	0	0	1	0 0		
Percent 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0			
VERHONT								
Frequency 0	0	0	0	Ð	1	0 0		
Percent 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	<del>-</del>		
' VIRGINIA			<b>0.0</b>	0.0%	0.0	. 0.0%		
Frequency 20	20	D	0	0		0		
Percent	. 9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0	<del>-</del>		
WASHINGTON	****	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0,	. 0.0%		
Frequency 20	0	0	20	٥		0 0		
Percent	0.0%		11.1%	_	0.0	<del>-</del>		
WEST VIRGINIA	0.0.0			0.0%	0.0	. 0.0%		
Frequency 0	0	ο.	O	0	ſ	0 0		
Percent 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0	<del>-</del>		
WISCONSIN	010/	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	U. U,	. 0.0%		
Frequency 0	0	0	0	0	(	0 0		
Percent 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	_	0.0	•		
ABROAD	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0,	. 0.0%		
Frequency 8	Ð	٥	O	0	ε	0 0		
Percent 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0	_		
STATE NOT IDENTIFIED	U. U/.	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	U. U.	. 0.0%		
Frequency 200	200	0	O	0	ε	0		
			11	2.1		J U		
			_		_	=		
Percent 6.3%	9.2%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0	=		



# TABLE 80 -- 23 DANCERS -- PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK AND GTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

		White		R	Females		Other		
	All Females	Employed	Unemploy.		d Unemploy	. Emp	loyed Unemploy		
PLFICE OF HORK-STATE			, ,			, <b>,</b>	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		
Firequency	. 6000	4540	540	280	160	360	120		
F'ercent		57.9%	100.0%	48.3%	100.0%	58.1%	100.0%		
Frequency	. 20	20	0	0	٥	0	O		
Fiercent		.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	- 20	20	0	C	0	٥	٥		
Flencent		.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Firequency	. 20	20	0	D	Ð	Ω	δ		
Fiercent		.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Frequency	420	380	0	0	0	40	Ð		
FiercentCDL.ORRDO	4.3%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	6.5%	0.0%		
Firequency	. 40	40	0	٥	บ	0	0		
Fiercent	.4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Firequency	. 40	40	0	Ð	0	0	0		
Flersent	.4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%		
Firequency	. 80	60	Ð	20	D	0	0		
Flersent	.8%	- 8%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Firequency		200	D	D	0	0	0		
Fierzent	2.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Firequency		20	Ð	20	0	8	0		
Flerzent	. 4%	.3%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%		
Firequency		0	0	0	0	120	0		
F'erzent	1.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	19.4%	0.0%		



able 80 23 (Females,	, Cont.)						
	_	White		Blac		Other	
	All Females	Employed	Unemploy.	Employed	Unemploy.	Employed	i Unemploy.
PLACE OF HORK-STATE IDAHO							
Frequency	. 20	0	0	0	O	20	0
Percent		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	3.2% (	0.0%
Frequency	. 140	100	Ð	20	0	20	0
Percent		1.3%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	3.2% (	0.0%
INDIANA							
Frequency	<b>. 8</b> 0	80	0	0	0	0	0
Percent		1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	3.0%
Frequency	. 80	80	Ð	0	O	O	0
Percent		1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	_	_	0.0%
LOUISIANA				0.0%	0.0%	J. 0/.	. <b></b>
Frequency	. 20	20	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	2%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	0.0%
MAINE			•				
Frequency	. 0	Ð	O	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	0.0%
Frequency	. 40	40	Ð	Ð	Ð	Ð	0
Percent		.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	0.0%
Frequency	. 80	80	Ð	0	0	O	ស
Percent		1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	0.0%
MICHIGAN							
Frequency	. 40	40	0	0	Ð	O	Ð
Percent		.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	0.0%
MINNESOTA							
Frequency	. 20	20	0	0	0	0	0
Percent		.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	0.0%
MONTANA							
Frequency	. 20	20	Ð	O	0	O	Ð
Percent		.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	0.0%



Table 80 23 (Females,	, Cont	.)						
			White		Bla	ck		Other
DI DOE DE 11001/ CTOTE	All F	enales	Employed	Unemploy.	Employed	Unemploy.	Employer	d Unemploy.
PLACE OF HORK-STATE NEBRASKA				•				
Frequency	•	20	20	0	0	0	Ω	D
Percent		.2%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
NEVROR			•					
Frequency		220	180	0	40	0	0	0
Percent	. :	2.2%	2.3%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		120	120	0	0	O	O	Ð
Percent		1.2%	1.5%	0.0%	0.0%	_	-	0.0%
Frequency		480	440	0	40	Ð	O	D
Percent	. •	4.9%	5.6%	0.0%	6.9%	0.0%	-	2.0%
Frequency		60	20	O	40	٥	Ω	۵
Percent	•	.6%	.3%	0.0%	6.9%	_	•	0.0%
OHIO								
Frequency	•	140	140	0	Ð	0	0	0
Percent OREGON	. 1	1.4%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% (	0.0%
Frequency		40	20	0 .	20	0	0	0
Percent PENNSYLVANIA	•	-4%	. 3%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		20	20	0	0	0	Ð	0
PercentRHODE ISLAND	•	.2%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% (	0.0%
Frequency		20	20	0	0	٥	Ω	0
Percent		.2%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	•	_	0.0%
TENNESSEE					<del></del>			· · · · · ·
Frequency		20	20	0	0	0	٥	D
Percent		.2%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0%



Table 80 23 (Females,	Cont.)						
		White		Blad	ck		Other -
	All Females	Employed	Unemplay.	Employed	Unemploy.	<b>Employ</b>	ed Unemploy.
PLACE OF HORK-STATE TEXAS							
Frequency	220	200	Ð	20	0	0	0
Percent		2.6%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	40	40	Ð	0	0	Ð	0
Percent VERHONT	.4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	20	20	8	O	0	0	0
Percent VIRGINIA	.2%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	100	Ð	0	O	0	0
Percent		1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Firequency	60	60	0	0	Ð	Ð	Ð
Percent HEST VIRGINIA	.6%	.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	20	Ð	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	. 2%	0.0%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	20	20	0	0	0	0	O
Percent	.2%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	20	20	0	0	O	Ð	O
Percent	.2%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	680	560	O	60	0	60	Ð
Percent	6.9%	7.1%	0.0%	10.3%	0.0%	9.7%	0.0%
Total Frequency	9860	7840	540	580	160	620	120



# TABLE 80 -- 24 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS --- PLACE OF NORK BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

		Males					
		Whit			ack		Other
51 00F 0F 115511 555	All Males	Employed	Unemploy.	. Employed	Unemplo	y. En	ployed Unemploy.
PLACE OF HORK-STATE							
•••	50500	20240					
Frequency	<b>5</b> 3580	39240	7520	3200	1080	2200	_340
Percent	55.5%	50.3%	100.0%	55.0%	100.0%	58.2%	100.0%
	400	200	•	40	_	_	_
Frequency Percent	400 • 4%	<b>36</b> 0	0	40	0	0	0
ALASKA	- 4%	.5%	0.0%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	140	140	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0,0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	500	440	Ω	40	0	20	O
Percent	.5%	.6%	0.0%	-7%	0. 0X	.5%	0.0%
ARKANSAS		5 5.0	0.0	• • • •	0.0%	. 0/2	0.0%
Frequency	200	200	0	0	0	O	0
Percent	.2%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
CALIFORNIA							
Frequency	<b>63</b> 80	5480	Ð	440	Ð	460	0
Percent	6.6%	7.0%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	12.2%	0.0%
Frequency	480	44B	ច	20	0	20	O
PercentCONNECTICUT	.5%	.6%	0.0%	. 3%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%
Frequency	440	380	O	60	Ð	O	0
Percent	.5%	.5%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0 0.0%
DELAHARE		. 0%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	100	80	0	20	Ð	Ω	O
Percent	.1%	. 1%	0.0%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HRSH, DC							
Frequency	200	200	Û	0	Ð	Q	0
Percent	.2%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FLORIDA	_						
Frequency	2180	2060	Ð	100	O	20	0
PercentGEORGIA	2.3%	2.6%	0.0%	1.7%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%
Frequency	660	<b>62</b> 0	O	40	ε	Ċı	0
Percent	.7%	.8%	0.0%	.7%	0.0.:	0.02	0.0%
HRHAII				<del>-</del>	· ·		= • • • •
Frequency	480	220	()	60	0	200	0
Percent	.5%	. Эх	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	5.3%	0.0%



Table 80--24 (Males, Cont.)

are our 24 theres, cont.		White		R1	ack	Other		
(	All Males		Unemploy.				-	
PLACE OF HORK-STATE			<b></b>	<b>p</b> ========				
Frequency	140	140	8	Û	O	0 0		
PercentILLINOIS	-1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	.0% 0.0%		
Frequency	1500	1420	0	60	0	20 <b>0</b>		
PercentINDIANA	1.6%	1.8%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0%	.5% 0.0%		
Frequency	580	560	0	0	0	20 0		
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.5% 0.0%		
Frequency	280	280	0	0	Ð	0 0		
Percent	. 3%	.4%	C.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	.0% 0.0%		
Frequency	240	220	0	0	O	20 0		
Percent	.2%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.5% 0.0%		
Frequency	600	600	0	0	0	0 0		
PercentLOUISIANA	.6%	. 8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	.0% 0.0%		
Frequency	300	240	0	60	O	0 0		
Percent	.3%	.3%	0.0%	1.0%	0.0% 0	.0% 0.0%		
Frequency	120	120	0	Ð	Ð	0 0		
Percent	.1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0	.0% 0.0%		
Frequency	420	380	0	40	0	0 0		
Percent	-4%	.5%	<b>0.</b> :	.7%	0.0% 0	.0% 0.0%		
Frequency	1040	968	0	40	0	40 0		
Percent	1.1%	1.2%	0.0%	.7%	0.0% 1.	.1% 0.0%		
Frequency	1020	940	8	80	Ð	0 0		
Percent MINNESOTA	1.1%	1.2%	0.0%	1.4%	0.0% 0.	.0% 0.0%		
Frequency	560	540	0	Ð	0	20 0		
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.5% 0.0%		
Frequency	240	240	O	0	0	0 0		
Percent	.2%	. 3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.	.0% 0.0%		
Frequency	600	580	£)	20	0	0 0		
Percent	. 6%	.7%	0.0%	.3%		.0% 0.0%		
Frequency	80	60	O	0	0	20 0		
Percent	.1%	. 1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.5% 0.0%		



Table 80 24 (Males,		Whit			lack		Other
	All Males	Employed	Unemploy.	Employed	Unemplo	y. En	ployed Unemploy
lrce of Hork-State Ebraska							
Frequency		120	0	0	0	Ð	0
Percent	.1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		440	O	0	0	40	0
Percent	. 5%	.6%	0.00	0.0%	0.0%	1.1%	0.0%
Frequency	20	20	0	9	0	0	0
Percent	.0%	.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		720	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	-7%	.9%	0.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	180	160	0	0	8	20	0
Percent NEW YORK	. 2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%
Frequency		3200	0	440	0	120	0
Percent	3.9%	4.1%	0.0%	7.6%	0.0%	3.2%	0.0%
Frequency		<b>46</b> D	0	0	0	20	0
Percent	.5%	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%
Frequency		<b>12</b> 0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent		.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency		1180	0	20	0	20	0
Percent OKLAHOMA		1.5%	0 <b>.0</b> %	.3%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%
Frequency	<b>34</b> 0	300	0	<b>2</b> 0	0	20	0
Percent	2	.4%	0.0%	. 3%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%
Frequency	460	440	0	20	0	Ŋ	_0
Percent PENNSYLVANIA		.6%	0.0%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %
Frequency		1300	0	140	0	20	0
Percent	1.5%	1.7%	0.0%	2.4%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%
Frequency	180	180	Cı	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	420	420	נו	0	Cı	0	0
Percent	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	40	<b>4</b> 0	CI	0	Çı	0	0
Percent TENNESSEE	. 0%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	<b>8</b> 6•0	760	(i	<b>6</b> 0	CI	20	0
Percent	. 9%	1.0%	0 <b>.0</b> %	1.4%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%
	• 21.	£ • U/•	0.0%	1-7/	J.U/.		<b>0.</b> 0%

Table 80 24 (Males,	Cont)	14.14					
	GIT Males	Whit		В.	lack	Other	
PLACE OF HORK-STATE TEXAS	nii naies	cwb103ea	unemploy.	rab1oAeq	Unemploy.	. Employed Unem	
Frequency	2020	1820	0	60	0	140 0	
Percent	2.1%	2.3%	0.0%	1.0%	-	3.7% 0.0%	
Frequency	<b>. 6</b> 0	60	0	0	0	0 0	
Percent VERMONT	.1%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0% 0.0%	
Frequency	40	40	0	0	0	0 0	
PercentVIRGINIA	.0%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	-	0.0% 0.0%	
Frequency	<b>58</b> 0	520	0	40	0	20 0	
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	.7%	0.0%	.5% 0.0%	
Frequency	720	660	0	20	0	40 0	
Percent	.7%	.8%	0.0%	.3%		0.0%	
Frequency	200	200	0.	O	0	0 0	
Percent	.2%	. 3%	0. ๆ%	0.0%	_	0.0% 0.0%	
Frequency	<b>60</b> 0	600	0	0	0	0 0	
Percent	.6%	. 8%	0.0%	0.0%		0.0%	
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	n n	
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	_	0.0% 0.0%	
Frequency	300	220	0	80	0	0 0	
Percent	.3%	. 3%	0.0%	1.4%		0.0% 0.0%	
Frequency	7640	6820	0	580	ũ	240 0	
Percent	7.9%	8.8%	_	10.0%	_	.3% 0.0%	
Frequency	96480	77940	<b>7520</b>	5820	1080 3	780 340	



# TABLE 80 -- 24 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- PLACE OF WORK BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

		' Whit	e	Ð	Other		
	Total			Employed		Employed	
PLACE OF HORK-STATE N/A			•	•			
Frequency	23060	19360	2000	860	360	420	60
Percent	<b>5</b> 6.3%	53.4%	100.0%	56.6%	100.0%	58.3%	100.0%
ALABAHA							
Frequency	140	140	0	0	a	0	0
Percerit	.3%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	O	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
ARIZONA .							
Frequency	180	180	0	8	0	0	0
Percent	. 4%	.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Arkansas							
Frequency	140	140	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 3%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1980	1800	0	120	0	60	0
Percent	4.8%	5.0%	:0.0%	7.9%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%
COLGRADO							
Frequency	200	200	Ð	0	0	0	0
PercentCONNECTICUT	.5%	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	200	200	ก	0	0	0	0
Percent	.5%	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	ถ. กะ	0.0%	0.0%
DELAHARE					20		
Frequency	60	60	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HASH, DC							
Frequency	80	80	0	Ð	0	0	0
Percent	.2%	. 2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FLORIDA							
Frequency	600	600	Ð	O	Ð	Ω	Ð
Percent	1.5%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
GEORGIA	_			_			
Frequency	460	440	J.	20	0	. 0	_ 0
Percent	1.1%	1.2%	0.0%	1.3%	, 0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HAWAII			_	_	_		_
Frequency	80	20	0	0	0	60	0
Percent	. 2%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	8.3%	0.0%



Table 80 24 (Females,	Cont.)						
	Total	Whit			lack		Other
PLACE OF WORK-STATE	ICTAL	Embroñea	unempi.	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.
Frequency	20	20	១	ប	0	0	0
PercentILLINOIS	.0%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	640	600	Ð	20	Ð	20	0
Percent INDIANA	1.6%	1.7%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	2.8%	0.0%
Frequency	280	290	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.7%	. 8%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	340	340	Đ	0	0	0	0
Percent KRNSRS	.8%	. 9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	160	160	0	0	0	0	0
Percent KENTUCKY	.4%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	320	320	0	O	0	0	0
Percent LOUISIANA	.8%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	240	200	Ð	40	0	0	0
Percent	.6%	.6%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	80	69	0	0	0	0	Ð
Percent	.2%	-2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%
Frequency	340	320	0	20	0	0	0
Percent MRSSACHUSETTS	.8%	.9%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	280	280	0	Ð	0	0	0
Percent	.7%	.8%	0.0%	<b>0.</b> , <b>%</b>	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	600	560	Ð	40	0	0	Ð
Percent MINNESOTA	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	2.6%	0.0%	0.9%	0.0%
Frequency	240	240	Ð	0	0	0	0
Percent	.6%	.7%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%
Frequency	80	60	O	0	û	ũ	Û
Percent	.2%	. 2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	240	220	Ð	20	0	0	0
Percent	.6%	. 6%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	20	20	Ð.	O	0	O	0
Percent	.0%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.</b> C%	0.0%	0.0%



Table 80 24 (Females,	Cont.)						
		Whit			lack		Other
PLACE OF HORK-STATE	Total	Employed	Unempil.	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unemp1.
TEXAS							
Frequency	700	680	0	20	0	0	0
Percent UTAH	1.7%	1.9%	0.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	60	60	0	0	0	0	0
Percent VERMONT	. 1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	20	20	0	0	0	0	0
Percent VIRGINIA	.0%	.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	490	400	0	0	0	0	O
Percent	1.0%	1.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.6%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	<b>36</b> 0	360	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.9%	1.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	60	60	0	0.	0	0	0
Percent	.1%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0. OX	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	460	460	0	8	0	0	0
Percent	1.1%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	60	60	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	. 1%	.2%	r.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	80	80	0	0	0	0	0
PercentSTATE NOT IDENTIFIED	.2%	.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	1740	1480	0	180	0	80	0
Percent	4.3%	4.1%	0.0%	11.8%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%
Total Frequency	40940	36280	2000	1520	360	720	60
• =							



PLRCE OF WORK-STATE   PLRCE OF WORK-STATE	Unemp1.  0.0%  0.0%  0.0%  0.0%  0.0%
NEBRRSKA         Frequency.       200       200       0       0       0       0         Percent.       .5%       .6%       0.0%       0.0%       0.0%       0.0%         NEVADR       80       60       0       20       0       0         Percent.       .2%       .2%       0.0%       1.3%       0.0%       0.0%         NEW HAMPSHIRE       140       140       0       0       0       0       0	0.0%
Percent       .5%       .6%       0.0%       0.0%       0.0%       0.0%         NEVRDR       80       60       0       20       0       0         Percent       .2%       .2%       0.0%       1.3%       0.0%       0.0%         NEW HAMPSHIRE       140       140       0       0       0       0	0.0%
NEVRDR  Frequency	0.0%
Percent	0.0%
NEW HAMPSHIRE Frequency 140 140 0 0 0	0.0%
	0.0%
Perce :	0.0%
NEW JERSEY	0.0%
Frequency 340 340 0 0 0	0
Percent	_
Frequency 120 120 0 0 0 0	0.0%
Percent	
Frequency 1720 1620 0 60 0 40	0
Percent 4.2% 4.5% 0.0% 3.9% 0.0% 5.6% NORTH CAROLINA	0.0%
Frequency 460 460 0 0 0	0
Percent 1.1% 1.3% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% NORTH DAKOTA	0.0%
Frequency: 80 90 0 0 0	0
Percent	0.0%
Frequency 840 780 0 60 0 0	0
Percent 2.1% 2.1% 0.0% 3.9% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0% 0.0%	0.0%
Frequency 180 180 0 0 0	0
Percent	0.0%
Frequency 200 180 0 0 0 20	0
Percent	0.0%
Frequency 1000 960 0 20 0 20	0
RHODE ISLAND	0.0%
Frequency 20 20 0 0 0	0
Percent	0.0%
Frequency 200 180 0 20 0 0	0
Percent	0.0%
Frequency 40 40 0 0 0	0
TENNESSEE	0.0%
Frequency 320 320 0 0 0	0
Na canal	0.0%

ERIC

## TABLE 80 -- 25 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENDER, BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1980

Males

		Whi	te	81	ack	Other		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	<b>Employed</b>	Unempl.	
HEEKS HORKED IN 79		, ,			-			
13 HEEKS OR LESS								
Frequency	<b>3</b> 560	1480	1560	220	100	<b>6</b> 0 ·	140	
Percent	7.9%	4.1%	30.6%	10.1%	22 <b>.7</b> %	7.0%	53.8%	
14 TO 26 WEEKS								
Frequency	4500	<b>276</b> 0	<b>126</b> 0	120	<b>18</b> 0	1 <b>8</b> 0	0	
Percent	10.0%	7.6%	24.7%	5.5%	40.9%	20.9%	0.0%	
27 TO 39 WEEKS								
Frequency	4360	<b>316</b> 0	<b>84</b> 0	200	<b>6</b> 0	<b>8</b> 0	20	
Percent	9.7%	B. <b>7</b> %	16.5%	9.2%	13.6%	9.3%	7.7%	
40 TO 47 HEEKS							_	
Frequency	3860	3080	<b>5</b> 00	220	0	60	_0	
Percent	8.6%	<b>8.</b> 5%	9.8%	10.1%	0.0%	7.0%	0.0%	
48 TO 49 WEEKS								
Frequency	1540	1340	<b>6</b> 0	100	0	20	20	
Percent	3.4%	3.7%	1.2%	4.6%	0.0%	2.9%	7.7%	
50 TO 52 WEEKS								
Frequency	25900	23700	<b>5</b> 60	1200	0	400	40	
Percent	57.5%	65.5%	11.0%	55.0%	0.0%	46.5%	15.4%	
NOT APPLICABLE								
Frequency	1300	<b>6</b> 60	<b>3</b> 20	120	100	<b>6</b> 0	40	
Percent	2.9%	1.8%	6.3%	5.5%	22 <b>.7</b> %	7.0%	15.4%	
Total								
Frequency	<b>45</b> 020	36180	5100	2180	440	<b>8</b> 60	260	



## TABLE 80 -- 25 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENDER, WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1980

#### Females

		М	hite		Black		Other
	Total	Employ	Unemp1.	Employ		Employ	Unempl.
HEEKS HORKED IN 79		, ,		- (			
13 HEEKS OR LESS							
Frequency	2680	1080	1400	60	60	20	60
Percent	11.8%	6.5%	35.4%	5.4%	18.8%	3.7%	37.5%
Frequency	3500	2060	1100	120	100	80	40
Percent	15.5%	12.5%	27.8%	10.7%		14.8%	25.0%
Frequency	2660	2080	400	80	60	20	20
Percent	11.7%	12.6%	10.1%	7.1%	18.8%		
Frequency	2760	2240	320	100	0	80	20
Percent	12.2%	13.5%	8.1%	8.9%			
Frequency	1020	880	100	40	0	0	0
Percent	4.5%	5.3%	2.5%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	9040	7660	340	700	0	320	20
Percent	39.9%	46.3%	8.6%	62.5%	0.0%	59.3%	12.5%
Frequency	980	540	300	20	100	20	0
Percent Total	4.3%	3.3%	7.6%	1.8%		-	0.0%
Frequency	22640	16540	3960	1120	320	540	160



# TABLE 80 -- 26 DANCERS -- MEEKS HORKED IN 1979 BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1980

### Males

		Hhi	Hhite Black			Other		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	Employe		
HEEKS HORKED IN 79		, ,	•	. , . ,				
13 WEEKS OR LESS								
Frequency	400	120	100	20	60	60	40	
Percent	12.5%	5.5%	23.8%	11.1%	60.0%	23.1%	66.7%	
14 TO 26 HEEKS					00.0%	LJ. 17.	00.17.	
Frequency	360	240	80	0	0	40	0	
Percent	11.3%	11.0%	19.0%	U. 0%	0.0%	15. 4%	0.0%	
27 TO 39 HEEKS	11.00		15.0%	0.0%	0.0%	13.4%	0.0%	
Frequency	600	460	100	20	0	20	0	
Percent	18.8%	21.1%	23.8%	11.12	0.0%	7. <b>7</b> %	0.0%	
40 TO 47 HEEKS	10.0%	21-1/-	23.0%	11.1%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	
Frequency	<b>5</b> 20	400	<b>6</b> 0	20	O	20	20	
Percent	16.3%	18.3%	14.3%	11.1%	0.0%	7. <b>7</b> %		
48 TO 49 HEEKS	10.5%	10.3%	14.5%	11.1%	0.0%	1.1%	33.3% <sub>,</sub>	
Frequency	180	60	<b>C</b> O	40	0	20	•	
Percent	5.6%		60	40	0	20	0	
50 TO 52 WEEKS	3.6%	2.8%	14.3%	22.2%	0.0%	7. <b>7</b> %	0.0%	
Frequency	1000	780	20	60	40	100	0	
Percent	31.3%	35.8%	4.8%	33.3%		38.5%	0.0%	
NOT APPLICABLE	01.0%	00.0%	-1.0%	33.3%	40.0%	30.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	140	120	0	20	0	٥	0	
Percent	4.4%	5.5%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total					<del>-</del>	<b>-</b>		
Frequency	3200	2180	420	180	100	260	60	



TABLE 80 -- 26
DANCERS -- WEEKS WORKED IN 1969 BY GENOER, WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1980

### Females

		Whi	te	8	lack	Other		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unemp1.	
HEEKS HORKED IN 79					•		-	
13 <b>HEEKS OR LESS</b>								
Frequency	940	<b>6</b> 20	60	60	80	120	0	
Percent	9.5%	7.9%	11.1%	10.3%	50.0%	19.4%	0.0%	
14 TO 26 HEEKS								
Frequency	1440	1160	100	40	40	80	20	
Percent	14.6%	14.8%	18.5%	6.9%	25.0%	12.9%	16.7%	
27 TO 39 HEEKS								
Frequency	1520	1180	120	100	20	80	20	
Percent	15.4%	15.1%	22.2%	17.2%	12.5%	12.9%	16.7%	
40 TO 47 HEEKS								
Frequency	1640	1400	140	60	0	20	20	
Percent	16.6%	17.9%	25.9%	10.3%	0.0%	3.2%	16.7%	
48 TO 49 HEEKS								
Frequency	600	<b>58</b> 0	0	20	0	0	0	
Percent	6.1%	7.4%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
50 TO 52 HEEKS								
Frequency	3060	2380	60	300	0	300	20	
Percent	31.0%	30.4%	11.1%	51.7%	0.0%	48.4%	16.7%	
NOT APPLICABLE								
Frequency	660	520	60	0	20	20	40	
Percent	6.7%	6.8%	11.1%	0.0%	12.5%	3.2%	33.3%	
Total								
Frequency	<del>9</del> 860	<b>784</b> 0	5 <b>4</b> 0	580	160	620	120	



# TABLE 80 --27 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- HEEKS WORKED IN 1979 BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER 1980

Males

		H	hite		Black				
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed		Employed	Other Unempl.		
HEEKS WORKED IN 79		•	•		•				
13 HEEKS OR LESS									
Frequency	7000	4760	1320	340	140	360	80		
Percent	7.3%	6.1%	17.6%	5.8%	13.0%	9.5%	23.5%		
14 TO 26 HEEKS									
Frequency	13480	9400	2120	1080	320	480	80		
Percent	14.0%	12.1%	28.2%	18.6%	29.6%	12.7%	23.5%		
27 TO 39 HEEKS									
Frequency	11980	9140	1420	700	140	540	40		
Percent	12.4%	11.7%	18.9%	12.0%	13.0%	14.3%	11.8%		
40 TO 47 HEEKS									
Frequency	15440	13340	820	640	120	500	20		
Percent	16.0%	17.1%	18.9%	11.0%	11.1%	13.2%	5.9%		
48 TO 49 HEEKS									
Frequency	5900	5160	200	260	Ð	260	20		
Percent	6.1%	6.6%	2.7%	4.5%	0.0%	6.9%	5.9%		
50 TO 52 HEEKS									
Frequency	38440	3 <b>3</b> 820	760	2300	160	1320	80		
Percent	39.8%	43.4%	10.1%	39.5%	14.8%	34.9%	23.5%		
NOT APPLICABLE									
Frequency	4240	2320	880	500	200	320	20		
Percent	4.4%	3.0%	11.7%	8 5%	18.5%	8.5%	5.9%		
Total									
Frequency	96480	77940	<b>7</b> 520	5820	1080	3780	340		



# TABLE 80 --27 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- WEEKS WORKED IN 1979 BY GENDER, WHITE, AND OTHER 1980

### Females

		White	Þ	Blac	sk	ε	)ther
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unempl.	_	
HEEKS HORKED IN 79		• -	-	• •		; · · · a	Jan
13 WEEKS OR LESS							
Frequency	3860	2980	520	200	100	60	0
Percent	9.4%	8.2%	26.0%	13.2%	27.8%	8.3%	0.0%
14 TO 26 HEEKS				·		<b></b>	J. 0,,
Frequency	4580	3920	448	140	20	40	20
Percent	11.2%	10.8%	22.0%	9.2%	5.6%	5.6%	33. 3%
27 TO 39 HEEKS					· · · · ·	· · · · ·	JJ. J/.
Frequency	5420	4760	320	180	80	80	o
Percent	13.2%	13.1%	16.0%	11.8%	22.2%	11.1%	0.0%
40 TO 47 HEEKS					<b>Late</b> + 1-7-	11.1.	0.0%
Frequency	6840	<b>538</b> 0	260	240	20	120	20
Percent	14.8%	14.8%	13.0%	15.8%	5.6%	16.7%	33.3%
48 TO 49 HEEKS					· · · · ·	10.17.	Ju. J/.
Frequency	2720	2520	60	80	20	40	0
Percent	6.6%	6.9%	3.0%	5.3%	5.6%	5.6%	0.0%
50 TO 52 HEEKS				••••	0.0	J. U	<b>0.</b> 0%
Frequency	16500	15400	140	560	40	360	0
Percent	4D.3%	42.4%	7.0%	36.8%	11.1%	50.0%	0.0%
NOT APPLICABLE		. —		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •		00.0	0.0%
Frequency	1820	1320	260	120	80	20	20
Percent	4.4%	3.6%	13.0%	7.9%	22.2%	2.8%	33.3%
Total					6-6 t-/-	£	JJ. 3/.
Frequency	40940	36280	2000	1520	360	720	60



## ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- INCOME GENDER BY ROE 1980

					Male: RGE	3					
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979 ZERO	Total	16-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-41	45-49	50-54	55-59	60-64	65 <del>1</del>
Frequency	180	0	40	40	20	20	0	20	O	40	0
PercentFRON 001 TO 999	.42	0.02	.4%	.4%	.32	.62:	0.02	.72	0.02	3.52	0.02
Frequency	1500	500	360	160	160	120	20	60	60	40	20
Percent	3.32	8.02	3.82	1.7%	2.72	3.42	.62	2.02	3.02	3.52	1.72
Frequency	<del>431</del> 0	2100	1090	780	320	100	260	100	120	. 0	80
Percent	11.02	33.82	11.5%	8.4%	5.3z	2.82	8.02	3.42	5.92	0.02	6.82
Frequency	7500	1760	2140	1660	460	260	260	300	240	160	260
Percent	16.72	28.32	22.92	17.8%	7.72	7.32	8.02	10.12	11.92	14.02	22.02
Frequency	13680	1540	3940	3200	1940	880	620	520	480	200	360
Percent	30.42	24.82	<b>42.1</b> 2	34.3%	32.32	2 <b>4.9</b> 2	19.02	17.62	23.82	17.52	<b>30.5</b> 2
Frequency	7340	280	1260	2020	1320	620	560	600	320	260	100
Percent	16.32	4.52	13.52	21.6%	22.0%	17.52	17.22	20.3%	15.8z	22.82	8.5z
Frequency	<b>34</b> 20	20	240	540	760	500	360	<b>16</b> 0	340	120	60
Percent	7.62	.32	2.62	5.8%	12.72	14.12	11.02	16.2%	16.82	10.52	5.12
Frequency	1780	0	80	290	260	340	320	300	140	40	20
Percent	4.02	0.02	.92	3.0%	1.3%	9.62	9.82	10.12	6.92	3.52	1.72
Frequency	1120	0	120	220	140	200	220	60	100	20	40
Percent	2.52	0.02	1.32	2.4%	2.32	5.62	6.72	2.02	5.02	1.82	3.42
Frequency	3560	20	100	440	620	500	640	520	220	260	240
Percent Total	7.92	.32	1.12	4.7%	10.32	14.12	19.62	17.62	10.92	22.82	20.32
Frequency	45020	6220	9360	9340	6000	3540	3260	2960	2020	1140	1 160



#### ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- AGE BY GENDER BY INCOME 1980

Fenales AGE Total 30-34 16-24 25-29 35-39 40-44 45-49 50-54 55-59 60-64 65t INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979 ZERO 20 Frequency..... 60 0 0 0 20 3 20 0 0 0 Percent..... .32 0.02 .4% 0.02 0.02 1.0% 0.02 0.02 2.02 0.02 0.02 FROM 001 TO 999 Frequency..... 1560 620 60 200 20 160 180 100 60 120 40 Percent..... 6.92 14.92 3.02 10.0% 7.92 5.02 4.0% 2.62 5.42 12.02 8.72 FROM 1000 TO 4999 860 360 360 Frequency..... 4100 1140 480 240 180 240 140 100 Percent..... 18.12 27.4% 16.02 10.62 15.42 18.0% 19.02 16.12 24.02 30.42 25.02 FROM 5000 TO 9999 1200 1400 860 400 360 Frequency..... 5140 240 300 200 60 120 Percent..... 22.72 28.87 26.12 18.92 17.12 18.0% 19.02 26.82 20.02 13.0% 30.02 FROM 10000 TO 19999 Frequency..... 7380 980 760 460 2100 1800 440 460 160 120 100 Percent..... 32.62 23.62 39.22 39.62 32.5% 23.0% 34.92 16.02 26.1% 25.02 41.12 FROM 20000 TO 29999 Frequency..... 254U 120 500 780 420 360 100 60 100 60 40 Percent..... 11.22 2.9% 9.32 18. 6% 7.92 10.02 17.22 17.92 10.02 13.02 5.42 FROM 30000 TO 39999 Frequency..... 680 0 160 140 180 40 63 20 80 0. 0 Percent.... 3.02 0.0% 3.02 3.12 7.72 2.0% 0.02 4.82 1.82 8.02 0.02 FROM 40000 TO 49999 Frequency..... 400 20 40 120 20 20 40 0 100 40 Ω Percent..... 1.82 .5% .72 2.62 .92 5.0% 3.22 1.82 4.02 0.02 8.02 FROM 50000 TO 59299 Frequency..... 340 40 40 20 120 40 40 20 ß 20 Ω Percent.... 1.52 1.0% .72 2.62 1.72 2.0% 0.02 5.02 1.82 0.02 4.32 60000 + 440 Frequency..... 40 90 60 100 60 40 ß 40 20 0 Percent..... 1.0% 3.0% 0.02 1.9% 1.52 1.32 4.3% 3.22 0.02 4.02 4.32 Total Frequency..... 22640 1160 5360 1510 2310 2000 1260 1120 1000 460 100



## TABLE 80 -- 29 DANCERS -- INCOME BY AGE 1980

					Male AGE	\$					
	All Males	16-24	25-29	30-34	35-39	40-44	4549	50-54	55-59	60-64	65+
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979				•					•	•	•
ZERO		_	_	_	_						
Frequency	20	. 0	0	. 0	. 0	0	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	.6z	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.02	167z	0.0%	0.0%	0.02
Frequency	260	140	40	60	0	0	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	8.12	13.72	4.12	10.02	0.0%	ين.0	0.132	1672	0.02	0.0%	0.02
Frequency	700	360	220	100	٥	0	0	0	0	0	20
FROM 5000 TO 9999	21.92	35.32	22.4%	16.72	0.02	0.0%	0.132	C1.02	0.02	0.0%	25.02
Frequency	760	260	180	160	60	20	0	20	٥	٥	40
Percent	23.82	25.5%	18.4%	30.02	37.5%	25.02	30.0	167%	0.0%	30.0	50.02
Frequency	1040	220	460	160	40	20	:20	60	20	0	20
Percent	32.5%	21.62	46.92	30.02	25.0%	25.02	33.32	501.02	33.32	0.0%	25.02
Frequency	240	20	60	40	60	0	0	0	20	40	0
Percent	7.52	2.02	6.12	6.72	37.5%	0.02	8.02	(1.02		100.0%	0.02
Frequency	100	8	20	40	0	0	:20	0	20	0	0
Percent	3.12	0.02	2.0%	6.72	0.0%	0.0%	33.32	C1.02	33.32	80.0	0.02
Frequency	60	20	0	0	0	20	20	0	0	٥	0
Percent	1.92	2.02	0.0%	20.0	0.0%		33.32	C1-02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Frequency	6	0	0	0	Ω	0	0	0	0	Ω	0
Percent	0.02	0.02	80.0	20.0	0.0%	0.02	0.02	(1.02	0.02	0.02	0.02
Frequency	20	0	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	.62	0.02	80.0	2.02	0.0%	25.0%	0.02	C1.02	0.02	0.0%	0.02
Frequency	3200	1020	980	600	160	80	60	120	60	40	80



1980

Females RGE Total 16-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 60-64 40-44 45-49 50-51 55-59 65+ INCOME FROM ALL **SOURCES 1979** ZERO 20 Frequency..... 0 J 0 0 20 0 0 0 0 0 Percent.... .2z 0.02 0.02 0.0% 0.02 5.02 0.02 0.0% 0.02 0.02 0.02 FROM 001 TO 999 Frequency..... 1300 680 220 160 120 100 ß 20 0 0 0 Percent.... 13.22 13.92 8.12 14.5% 30.02 25.02 0.02 0.**0**% 20.02 0.02 0.02 FROM 1000 TO 4953 Frequency..... 3340 1860 940 420 20 60 0 0 0 0 Percent..... 33.92 38.02 38.2% 34.8% 5.02 15.02 33.32 \$0.0 0.0% 0.02 0.0% FROH 5000 TO 9999 Frequency..... 2780 1430 840 260 60 20 40 20 20 20 20 Percent.... 28.22 30.22 31.12 23.6% 15.02 5.02 100.02 50.02 33.3% 20.02 25.02 FROM 10000 TO 19999 Frequency..... 1820 740 620 180 40 100 20 40 60 0 20 Percent..... 19.52 15.12 23.02 10.02 16.4% 25.02 0.0% 16.72 40.02 75.0x 50.0x FROM 20000 TO 29999 Frequency..... 360 100 40 60 120 20 20 20 0 0 Percent..... 3.92 2.02 1,52 5.5% 30.02 5.02 16.72 20.02 30.0 0.0% 0.02 FROM 30000 TO 39999 Frequency..... 40 0 0 ٥ 0 10 0 0 0 0 0 Percent.... .42 0.02 גט.0 0.02 0.02 10.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.0% 0.02 FROM 40000 TO 49999 Frequency..... 60 20 20 Ω 0 20 0 0 Ω 0 Percent.... .42 .72 -62 0.02 0.0% 5.02 0.02 0.02 0.02 0.0% 0.02 FROM 50000 TO 59999 Frequency..... 20 Ω 0 20 0 0 0 Ω 0 Percent..... .22 0.02 0.02 8.0% 5.0% 0.02 0.02 0.0% 0.02 0.02 0.02 **60000 +** 100 20 Frequency..... 20 20 20 20 Ω 0 0 0 0 Percent..... 1.02 .4x .7% 1.8% 5.02 5.0% 0.02 0.02 \$0.0 80.0 Ú.Oz



Total

Frequency.....

9060

4900

2700

1100

100

400

120

100

êÛ

40

2Û

### TABLE 80 -30 HUSTCIANS AND COMPOSERS -- AGE BY GENDER BY INCOME

	Hales AGE										
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979 ZERO	Total	16-24	25-29	30-34	35~39	40-44	45-49	50~54	55-59	60-64	65+
Frequency	960 1.02	140 .62	460 1.62	180 1.12	100 1.22	40 .8%	40 1.02	0.0x	0 \$0.0	0 \$0.0	0.0æ
FROM 001 TO 999 Frequency Percent	6780 7.02	3200 14.72	1560 5.52	980 5.62	440 5.52	300 3.3	120 2.9%	60	140	40	40
FROM 1000 TO 4999 Frequency	24340	9500	7340	3420	1380	660	420	1.62 <del>11</del> 0	4.32 600	1.6% 240	1.02 340
Percent FROM 5000 TO 9993 Frequency	25.2% 25560	43.5x 5400	25.82	21.62	17.22	13.82	10.22	12.0%	18.52	9.82	8.42
FROM 10000 TO 19999	26.5%	24.72	9420 33.12	4580 28.92	1640 20.42	760 15.92	740 18.02	780 21.32	620 19.12	600 24.42	1020 25.22
Frequency	25680 26.6%	2920 13.42	<b>79</b> 60 <b>27.9</b> 2	4780 30.22	2780 34.62	1560 32.6%	1240 30.12	. 1180 32.22	840 25.92	760 % <b>.9</b> %	1660 41.12
Frequency Percent	7460 7.72	<b>4</b> 60 2.12	1080 3.82	1080 6.82	1100 13.72	720 15.1%	920 22.32	500 13.7x	480 14.82	<b>4</b> 80 19.52	640 15.82
FROM 30000 TO 39999 Frequency	2780 2.92	100 .52	340 1.22	380 2.42	320 4.02	360 %3:5	340 8.3z	220 8.0x	280 8.6%	240 9.8%	200 5.02
FROM 40000 TO 49999 Frequency	860	20	100	160	100	100	60	160	60	20	5.UZ 60
FROM 50000 TO 59999 Frequency	.92 740	.1% 0	.42: 80	1.02 160	1.2%	2, 1z 120	1.5z 60	1.94 100	1.9% 100	.8z 0	1.5%
Percent	.82	0.02	.32	1.02	1.2%	2.5%	1.5%	2.72	3.12	0.02	.52
Frequency Percent Total	1320 1.4%	.4%	140 .52	220 1.4%	80 1.02	160 3.3%	180 4.4%	200 5.5%	120 3.7%	80 3.3≿	60 1.5≿
Frequency	96460	21820	28480	15840	8040	4780	4120	3660	3240	2460	40-10



## TABLE 80-30 MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- AGE BY GENDER BY INCOME 1980

Females AGE Total 16-24 25-29 30-34 35-39 40-44 45-49 50-54 55-59 65+ 60-64 INCOME FROM ALL **SOURCES 1979** LESS THAN ZERO Frequency..... 260 60 40 20 60 0 0 40 0 20 20 Percent..... .7% .62 .5% .4% 1.52 0.02 \$0.0 1.42 0.02 1.12 .52 FROM ZERO TO 999 Frequency..... **\$400** 2520 980 680 600 320 280 480 300 140 100 Percent..... 15.62 29.0% 13.32 12.82 14.72 10.72 11.92 17.1% 16.72 7.4% 2.72 FROM 1000 TO 4999 Frequency..... 17220 4320 2600 2060 1800 1460 1220 1200 740 700 1120 Percent..... 42.12 49.8% 35.32 38.72 44.12 48.72 51.72 42.9% 41.12 36.82 30.82 FROH 5000 TO 9999 Frequency..... 8760 1280 2080 1100 820 600 360 440 360 400 1320 Percent.... 21.42 28.32 14.7% 20.72 20.12 20.02 15.32 15.7% 20.02 21.1% 36.32 FROM 10000 TO 19999 Frequency..... 6080 420 1400 960 480 480 340 420 280 460 840 Percent..... 14.92 4.8% 19.02 18.0% 11.8% 16.0% 14.42 15.0% 15.62 24.22 23.12 FROM 20000 TO 29999 Frequency..... 1540 80 180 360 260 60 60 180 80 80 200 Percent..... 3.82 .9% 2.4% 6.82 6.42 2.02 2.52 6.4% 4.42 4.2% 5.52 FROM 30000 TO 39999 Frequency..... 420 O 80 80 40 28 80 20 20 60 20 Percent..... 1.02 \$0.0 1.12 1.52 1.02 .72 3.4% .72 1.12 3.22 .52 FROM 40000 TO 49999 Frequency..... 120 0 0 20 Ω 40 n 20 Ð 20 20 Percent.... .32 0.02 0.02 .4% 0.02 1.32 30.0 0.0% 1.12 1.12 .5% FROM 50000 TO 59999 Frequency..... 100 Ω ٥ 20 20 Ω 20 20 20 0 0 Percent..... -22 0.0% 30.0 .4% 0.02 .72 .82 .7% 0.02 1.12 30.0 60000 + Frequency..... 40 0 0 20 20 Ω 0 0 0 Ω 0 Percent..... . 12 0.0x 0.02 .42 .52: 30.0 جن.0 0.0% 0.02 0.0% 0.02 Total Frequency..... 10910 8680 0355 5320 4080 3000 2360 2800 1800 1900 3640



## ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY HEEKS WORKED IN 1979 1980

HEEKS HORKED

	13 or less				14-26 27			27-39	27-39			40-47	
	<b>A</b> 11	Malar	Fame	les All	Malag	Familia	61.1		Saus1	61.1	Malaa	Countag	
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979 ZERO	ull	Males	Fena:	162 111	Hales	Fenales	A1 1	Hales	Fenales	A11	Males	Females	
Frequency	20	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	SE.	.62	0.0%	0.02	30.0	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.0%	0.0x	0.0%	
Frequency	1120	<b>5</b> 20 `	600	240	100	140	60	20	60	0	0	0	
Percent	17.92	14.62	22.4%	3.0%	2.2%	4.02	1.12	.5%	2.32	\$0.0	0.02	א0.0	
Frequency	2040	1060	960	2480	1260	1220	1140	680	460	1100	620	480	
Percent	32.7x	30.32	35.8%	31.02	28.02	34.92	16.2%	15.62	17.32	16.6%	16.1%	17.42	
Frequency	1200	<b>86</b> 0	340	1960	1180	760	2300	1360	940	1960	1000	960	
Percent	19.2%	24.2%	12.7%	24.5%	26.22	22.3%	32.82	31.2%	35.32	29.62	25.92	34.8%	
Frequency	1120	680	440	1920	1040	880	1960	1220	748	2040	1240	800	
Percent	17.92	19.12	16.4%	24.02	23.12	25.12	27.9%	26.0%	27.82	30.82	32.1%	29.0%	
Frequency	420	200	220	500	360	140	580	340	240	640	340	300	
Percent	6.72	5.6%	8.2%	6.32	8.02	4.0%	8.32	7.82	9.02	9.72	8.82	10.9%	
Frequency	100	40	60	260	140	120	240	190	60	300	220	80	
Percent	1.62	1.1%	2.2%	3.3 <b>2</b>	3.12	3.4%	3.42	4.1%	2.32	4.5%	5.72	2.92	
Frequency	20	0	20	120	100	20	160	140	20	220	160	60	
Percent	.32	20.0	.7%	1.5%	2.2%	.6%	2.3%	3.2%	.02	3.3%	4.1%	2.2%	
Frequency	80	60	20	200	140	60	180	120	60	60	20	40	
Percent	1.32	1.7%	. אל	2.5%	3.12	1.72	2.6%	2.82	2.32	.92	.5%	1.42	
Frequency	120	100	20	320	180	140	360	300	90	300	260	40	
Percent	1.92	2.8%	. 7አ	4.02	4.72	4.0≈	5.4%	6.9%	3.02	4.5%	6.7%	1.42	
Frequency ont.)	6240	3560	2680	8000	4500	<b>35</b> 00	7020	4360	2660	6620	3860	2760	

## TABLE 80 -- 31 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY HEEKS WORKED IN 1979 1980

	HEEKS MORKED (Continued)								
		48-49			50-52			Not App	licable
	A1 1	Hales	Fend	iles Ali	Hales	Females	A11	Males	Femeles
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979									
2ER0									
Frequency	0	0	0	220	160	60	0	0	0
Percent	0.02	0.02	۵.0٪	.62	23.	.72	30.0	80.0	0.0%
FROH 001 TO 999	0.00	0.0	0.0	750		•••	0.01.	0.0	0.00
Firequency	20	0	20	260	100	160	1340	760	580
Percent	.8%	0.0%	2.0%	.72	.4%	1.82	58.8%	58.5%	59.2%
FRON 1000 TO 4999									
Frequency	280	140	140	1600	940	660	400	220	180
Percent	10.9%	9.1%	13.7%	4.62	3.62	7.32	17.5%	16.92	18. <b>4</b> %
FROH 5000 TO 9999									
Frequency	680	340	340	4280	2620	1660	260	170	120
Percent	26.62	22.1x	33.3%	12.2%	10.12	18.42	11.42	10.82	12.22
FROH 10000 TO 19999	040	<b>4</b> C 0	300	43000	0040	406.0	100		
Frequency	940 32.82	460	380	13000	8910	4060	180	100	80
FROM 20000 TO 29999	32.8%	29.9%	37.3%	37.2%	34.5%	44.92	7.92	7.72	8.22
Frequency	300	240	60	7400	5840	1560	40	30	20
Percent	11.72	15.62	5.9%	21.22	22.5%	17.32	1.82	1.52	2.0%
FROM 30000 TO 39999		20.00	J. Jr.	E- 4 - E- fo	EE.JA	11.56	1.06	1.46	2.0%
Frequency	80	20	60	3100	2600	300	20	20	0
Percent	3.12	1.32	5.9%	8.92	10.82	3.32	.92	1.52	0.02
FROH 40000 TO 49999			~~~		2000				••••
Frequency	60	60	0	1600	1320	280	0	0	0
Percent	2.3%	3.92	0.0%	4.6%	5.12	3.1%	0.02	\$Q.0	0.0%
FROK 50000 TO 59999									
Frequency	40	20	20	900	760	140	0	0	0
Percent	1.62	1.3%	2.0%	2.6%	2.9%	1.52	0.02	30.0	0.02
Frequency	250	260	0	2580	2420	160	40	40	0
Percent	10.2%	16.9%	0.0%	7.42	9.3%	1.6%	1.8x	3.12	0.0x
Total									
Frequency	2560	1540	1020	34940	25900	9040	2280	1300	980



## TABLE 80 -- 32 DANCERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY NEEKS HORKED IN 1979 1980

į		13 or	· less		HEEKS' HORKED 14-26 27-					40-47		
	A11	Hales	Fend	les All	Heles	Females	A1 1	Heles	Fenales	A11	Hales	Females
INCOME FROM MLL SOURCES 1979 ZERO	•											
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	0	20	•	•	•
Percent	0.02	0.02	8.02	0.02	0.0%	0.0z	-92	u %0.0		0 0.02	0 %0.0	0
FROM 001 TO 999								0.0%	1.32	0.02	U.U%	0.02
Frequency	560	140	420	160	20	140	80	0	80	60	20	60
Percent	41.82	<b>35.</b> 0x	44.7%	8.92	5.6%	9.72	3.82	0.02	5.3z	3.72	3.82	3.7%
Frequency	620	180	440	980	180	800	820	120	700	580	100	480
Percent	46.32	<b>45.0</b> %	46.8%	54.4%	50.02	55.62	38.72	20.0%	46.12	26.92	19.2%	29.32
Frequency	100	60	40	400	20	380	680	200	480	800	240	560
Percent	7.58	15.02	4.3%	22.2%	5.62	26.42	32.12	33.3%	31.62	37.02	46.22	34.12
FROM 10000 TO 19999						. 200		00000		0	~	V
Frequency	60	20	40	220	140	80	410	240	200	520	120	460
Percent FROM 20000 TO 29999	4.52	5.0x	4.3%	12.2%	38.92	5.62	20.8%	40.0%	13.22	24.1%	23.12	24.4%
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	0	40	140	20	120
Percent FROM 30000 TQ 39999	30.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.02	1.92	0.0%	2.62	6.5%	3.8%	7.3%
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	20	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.02	0.0z	0.0%	80.0	0.02	0.02	.9%	3.3%	0.0%	0-0x	0.02	0.0%
Frequency	0	0	٥	0	0	0	20	20	0	40	20	20
Percent	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.02	0.02	0.02	.92	3.3%	0.0%	1.92	3.82	1.22
Frequency	0	0	0	0	0	O	0	0	0	0	0	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	80.0	0.0%	0.0%	0.02	0.02	0.0%	0.0%	30.0	0.02	0.02
Frequency	0	0	0	40	0	40	8	0	0	0	0	۵
Percent	0.0x	0.0x	0.0%	2.2%	0.0x	2.82	0.02	0.0x	0.02	0.0x	0.0x	0.02
Total		- 3 - 10	- 7-10		2300			2.01.			V.U.	U-1/A
Frequency (Cont.)	1340	400	940	1900	360	1440	2120	600	1520	2160	520	1640

TABLE 80 -- 32
DANCERS -- INCOME 84' GENDER 84' HEEKS HORKED IN 1979
1980

		48-49			HEEKS HORI	KED (Conti	Not Applicable		
	<b>A</b> 11	Hales	Fens	eles All		Fenales	Al 1	Males	Females
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979		*****	·		*****	Feneres	114 4	1141.47	Lassara
<b>ZERO</b>									:
Frequency	0	0	0	20	20	0	۵	٥	0
FROM OCI TO 999	0.02	0.02	0.0%	.5%	2.0%	0.0z	0.02	80.0	0.02
Frequency	0	0	0	80	0	80	600	80	520
FROM 1000 TO 4999	0.02	0.02	0.0%	2.02	0.0%	2.6z	75.02	57.1%	78.82
Frequency	160	0	160	760	120	540	120	0	120
Percent FROM 5000 TO 9999	20.5x	0.02	26.7%	18.72	12.02	20.9z	15.0%	0.0%	16.22
Frequency	220	80	140	1320	160	1160	20	0	20
Percent	28.2%	44.42	23.3%	32.5z	16.0%	37.92	2.52	0.0%	3.02
Frequency	300	60	240	1320	460	860	0	0	0
FROM 20000 TO 29999	<b>3</b> 8.52	33.3%	40.0%	32.5%	46.02	28.12	20.3	0.0%	0.02
Frequency	90	40	40	320	140	180	40	40	0
FROM 30000 TO 39999	10.32	22.22	6.7%	7.9%	14.0%	5.92	5.02	28.62	0.02
Frequency	0	0	0	100	60	40	20	20	0
Percent	0.02	0.02	0.0%	2.5%	\$0.8	1.32	2.52	14.3%	0.02
Frequency	0	8	0	60	20	40	0	0	0
Percent FROM 50000 TO 59999	30.0	8.02	0.0%	1.52	2.0%	1.32	0.0%	0.0%	0.02
Frequency	0	0	0	20	0	20	0	0	0
Percent	9.9x	%O.0	0.0%	.5x	30.0	.72	30.0	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	20	0	20	60	20	40	0	0	0
Percent	2.6%	80.0	3.32	1.52	2.0%	1.32	%0.0	0.0%	0.02
Frequency	780	190	600	4060	1000	3060	800	140	660



## TABLE 80 -- 33 MUSICIAMS AND COMPOSERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY HEEKS HORKED IN 1979 1980

HEEKS HUDKEN 13 or less 14-26 27-39 40-47 A11 Hales A1 1 Hales **A11** Fenales Fenales Heles Fenales A11 Hales Fenales THOOHE FROM ALL SOURCES 1979 2FR0 200 160 40 200 Frequency..... 200 n 100 80 20 180 120 60 1.82 2.32 1.02 1.12 0.02 Percent. 1.52 .62 .72 .42 .82 .92 1.02 FROM 001 TO 999 3860 2060 1000 2300 1180 Frequency..... 1120 920 200 720 720 200 520 Percent 35.72 29.72 46.62 12.7% 8.82 24.52 5.32 1.72 3.42 13.32 1.32 8.62 FROM 1000 TO 4999 4780 3220 1560 8120 5900 Frequency..... 2220 6660 4280 2380 6060 3490 2580 Percent. 44.02 46.02 40.42 45.02 43.82 48.52 35.72 43.92 38.32 28.22 22.52 42.72 FROM 5000 TO 9999 920 Frequency..... 1160 240 4440 3680 760 5520 4180 6660 5160 1340 1500 Percent..... 10.72 13.12 6.22 24.6% 27.32 31.02 16.62 31.72 34.9% 24.72 33.42 24.82 FROM 10000 TO 19999 Frequency..... 700 520 180 1960 300 3200 1660 2500 700 5640 4540 1100 7.42 6.62 Percent..... 6.42 4 72 10.92 12.32 18.42 20.92 12.92 26.32 29.42 18.22 From 20000 TO 29999 traquencu..... 20 20 640 560 O RC: 640 1320 460 180 1120 200 Parcent..... .2z .32 0.02 3.52 4.2% 1.72 3.72 3.82 3.32 6.12 7.32 3.32 FROM 30000 TO 39999 Frequency.... 40 20 20 120 20 140 300 320 220 RΩ 280 40 Percent.... .42 .32 .52 .8% .92 .42 1.72 1.82 1.52 1.52 .72 1.82 FROM 40000 TO 49999 20 20 Frequency n 100 60 40 n n n 200 180 20 Percent.... -22 .32 0.02 .62 .4% -92 50.0 \$0.0 0.02 -92 1.22 .32 FROM 50000 TO 59999 Frequency..... 20 Ω 20 60 20 40 40 40 O 200 180 20 Percent..... .22 0.02 .52 .3% .9% . 12 .22 .92 1.2% .32 SE. 0.02 £ 00003 40 40 Frequency..... 180 Ω 100 100 0 20 20 Ω 100 Ω Parcent..... .42 .62 \$0.0 .72 .62 30.0 . 12 .2x 0.02 .ex 0.02 1.22 Total 10860 7000 Frequency..... 3060 18060 13480 4580 17400 11980 5420 21460 15440 6040



224

## TABLE 80 -- 33 HUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INCOME BY GENDER HEEKS HORKED IN 1979 1980

		40.44			HEEKS HORKEO (Continued)				
	A11	48-49		-1	50-52				licable
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979 ZERO	uii	Meles	ren	eles All	Heles	Fenales	A11	Hales	females
Frequency	80	80	0	320	180	140	140	140	0
PercentFROH 001 TO 999	.92	1.42	8.0%	.62	.52	.02	2.3%	3.32	0.02
Frequency	260	100	160	1400	600	800	3700	2420	1290
Percent	3.02	1.72	5.9%	2.5%	1.62	1.82	61.1%	57.12	70.32
Frequency	1900	940	960	12840	5660	7180	1200	<b>86</b> 0	340
Percent	22.02	15.9%	35.3%	23.42	14.72	43.52	19.82	20.32	16.72
Frequency	2500	1820	680	13620	9460	4160	428	340	80
Percent	29.02	30.82	25.0%	24.82	24.62	25.22	8.9%	8.02	4.42
Frequency	5600	2000	600	17240	14160	3080	420	300	120
Percent FROM 20000 TO 29999	30.22	33.9%	22.1%	31.42	36.82	18.72	6.92	7.12	6.62
Frequency	820	560	260	5480	4669	820	80	80	0
Percent	9.52	9.5%	9.6%	10.02	12.12	5.02	1.32	1.92	0.02
Frequency	260	200	60	2100	1900	200	40	40	0
Percent	3.02	3.42	2.2%	3.82	1.9%	1.22	.7አ	.92	0.02
Frequency	40	40	0	620	560	60	0	0	0
Percent	.52	.72	0.0%	1.1%	1.52	.42	0.0%	\$0.0	0.02
Frequency	60	60	0	440	420	20	20	20	0
Percent	.72	1.02	א0.0	.82	1.12	.12	.32	.52	0.02
Frequency	100	100	0	880	840	40	40	40	0
Percent	1.2%	1.7%	0.0%	1.62	2.2%	.22	.7%	.9x	0.02
Frequency	9620	5900	2720	54940	39440	16500	6060	4240	1920



# ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

#### Males

		White		B1:	eck	0t.her		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed		Employ.	Unemp1	
INCOHE FROM ALL SOURCES 1979 ZERO	•	, 2	·		·		·	
Frequency	180	140	20	(C)	0	20	0	
Percent	. 4%	.4%	.4%	0.0%	0.0%	2.3%	0.D%	
FROM 001 TO 999								
Frequency	1500	920	280	<b>8</b> 0	80	<b>10</b> 0	40	
Percent	3.3%	2.5%	5.5%	3.7%	18.2%	11.6%	15.4%	
FROM 1000 TO 4999	4040	3300	060	200	160	200	40	
Frequency Percent	4940 11.0%	9.1%	860	380 1 <b>7.</b> 4%	160	200	40	
FROM 5000 TO 9999	11.0%	J. 1%	16.9%	17.4%	36.4%	23.3%	15.4%	
Frequency	7500	5500	1260	<b>4</b> 80	80	<b>12</b> 0	60	
Percent	16.7%	15.2%	24.7%	22.0%	18.2%	14.0%	23.1%	
Frequency	13680	11100	1540	620	120	220	80	
Percent	30.4%	30.7%	30.2%	28.4%	27.3%	25.6%	30.8%	
Frequency	7340	6420	<b>5</b> 00	300	0	100	20	
Percent	16.3%	17.7%	9.8%	13.8%	0.0%	11.6%	7.7%	
Frequency	3420	3160	80	120	0	<b>4</b> 0	20	
Fercent	7.6%	8.7%	1.6%	5.5%	0.0%	4.7%	7.7%	
Frequency	1780	1500	140	120	0	<b>2</b> 0	0	
Fercent	4.0%	4.1%	2.7%	5.5%	0.0%	2.3%	0.0%	
Firequency	1120	1020	100	٥	0	0	0	
Fercent	2.5%	2.8%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	3560	3120	320	8CI	Ð	40	0	
Fercent	7.9%	8.6%	6.3%	3.7%	0.0%	4.7%	0.0%	
Frequency	45020	36180	5100	2180	440	<b>8</b> 60	<b>2</b> 60	



# TABLE 80 -- 34 ACTORS AND DIRECTORS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

#### Females

			B1ac	:k	Other		
	Total	Employed	d Unempl		yed Unempl.		loyed Unempl
INCOME FROM ALL		.,			J 0		
<b>50URCE</b> 5 1979							
ZERO			•				
Frequency	60	60	0	0	O	Ω	O
Percent	. 3%	. 4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 001 TO 999							
Frequency	1560	900	44^	40	120	40	20
Percent	6.9%	5.4%	11.1%	3.6%	37.5%	7.4%	12.5%
FROM 1000 TO 4999							
Frequency	4100	2780	1020	140	40	40	80
Parcent	18.1%	16.8%	25.8%	12.5%	12.5%	7.4%	50.0%
FROM 5000 TO 9999							•
Frequency	5140	3820	900	240	20	140	20
Percent	22.7%	23.1%	22.7%	21.4%	6.3%	25.9%	12.5%
FROM 10000 TO 19999							
Frequency	7380	5620	920	460	60	280	40
Percent	32.6%	34.0%	23.2%	41.1%	18.8%	51.9%	25.0%
FROM 20000 TO 29999			_				
Frequency	2540	2020	280	200	40	0	0
Percent	11.2%	12.2%	7.1%	17.9%	12.5%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 30000 TO 39999	400	4420			_		
Frequency	680	480	160	20	20	0	0
Percent	3.0%	2.9%	4.0%	1.8%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%
FROM 40000 TO 49999	400	0120		_			_
Frequency Percent	400	320	40	0	20	2.0	0
FROM 50000 TO 59999	1.8%	1.9%	1.0%	0.0%	6.3%	3.7%	0.0%
Frequency	340	220	100	20	•	_	•
Percent	1.5%	220 1.3%	100	20	0	0	0
60000 +	1.5%	1.3%	2.5%	1.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Frequency	449	3:50	100	O	O	20	0
Percent	1.9%	1.9%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	3.7%	0.0%
Total							
Frequency	22640	16540	3960	1120	320	540	160



# TABLE 80 -- 35 DANCERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

#### Males

		White		81	B1ack		Other	
	Tot-a1	Employed	Unemp1.	Emple red	Unempl.			
INCOME FROM ALL		, -	•	r · <b>,-</b> -			J. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	
SOURCES 1979								
ZERO								
Frequency	. 20	20	0	0	0	0	Ω	
Percent	6%	.9%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
FROM 001 TO 999				0 - 2.0		0.000		
Frequency	. 260	1 <b>0</b> 0	40	0	20	<b>8</b> 0	20	
Percent	8.1%	4.6%	9.5%	0 <b>.0</b> %	20.0%	30.8%	33.3%	
FROM 1000 TO 4999					_ = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = = =			
Frequency	. 700	<b>54</b> 0	<b>6</b> 0	0	40	60	0	
Percent	. 21.9%	24.8%	14.3%	0.0%	40.0%	23.1%	0.0%	
FROM 5000 TO 9999								
Frequency		<b>48</b> 0	120	40	40	<b>4</b> 0	40	
Percent	23.8%	22.0%	28.6%	22.2%	40.0%	15.4%	66.7%	
FROM 10000 TO 19999								
Frequency		<b>?</b> 20	200	60	0	60	0	
Fercent	32.5%	33.0%	47.6%	33.3%	0.0%	23.1%	0.0%	
FROM 20000 TO 29999								
Frequency		<b>18</b> 0	0	<b>4</b> 0	0	20	0	
Percent	7.5%	8.3%	0.0%	22.2%	0.0%	7.7%	0.0%	
FROM 30000 TO 39999			_					
Frequency		80	0	20	. 0	0	. 0	
Percent	3.1%	3.7%	0.0%	11.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
FROM 40000 TO 49999			_	_	_	_	_	
Frequency		<b>6</b> 0	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	1.9%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	_	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
60000 +	0.0%	0.0%	U. U/.	0.0%	U. U/.	0.0%	U. U.	
Frequency	20	0	0	20	0	0	0	
Percent	.6%	0.0%	0.0%	11.12	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total								
Frequency	3200	2180	420	180	100	260	60	



# DRNCERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS 1980

#### Females

		Whit	<b>.e</b>	B1ac	:k	Other		
	Total	Employed	Unempl.	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unemp1.	
INCOME FROM ALL			•		•		•	
SOURICES 1979								
LESS THAN ZERO								
Frequency	20	20	0	0	0	8	0	
Percent	. 2%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	1300	1000	60	20	60	120	40	
Percent	13.2%	12.8%	11.1%	3.4%	37.5%	19.4%	33.3%	
FROM 1000 TO 4999					3	<b>.</b>	JJ. J/.	
Frequency	3340	2520	220	260	40	280	20	
Percent	33.9%	32.1%	40.7%	44.8%	25.0%	45.2%	16.7%	
FROM 5000 TO 9999							200775	
Frequency	2780	2160	160	160	40	200	60	
Percent	28.2%	27.6%	29.6%	27.6%	25.0%	32.3%	50.0%	
FROM 10000 TO 19999								
Frequency	1820	1580	100	100	20	20	0	
Percent	18.5%	20.2%	18.5%	17.2%	12.5%	3.2%	0.0%	
FROM 20000 TO 29999								
Frequency	380	380	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	3.9%	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	<b>0.</b> 0%	0.0%	
FROM 30000 TO 39999								
Frequency	40	20	0	20	0	0	0	
Percent	- 4%	, 3%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
FROM 40000 TO 49999								
Frequency	60	<b>4</b> CI	0	20	0	0	0	
Percent	. 6%	•5%	0.0%	3.4%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
FROM 50000 TO 59999								
Frequency	20	201	0	0	0	0	0	
Percent	. 2%	.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
60000 +								
Frequency	100	100	O.	0	0	0	0	
Percent	1.0%	1.3%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	
Total								
Frequency	9660	784CI	540	580	160	620	120	



# MUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS -- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE, BLACK AND OTHER AND EMPLOYMENT STATUS

#### Males

		W!	ite	8	lack	Other		
	Totals	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unemp1.	Employed	Unemp1.	
INCOME FROM ALL			·					
SOURCES 1979								
ZERO								
Frequency	. <b>9</b> 60	640	140	60	20	100	Ø	
Percent	. 1.0%	.8%	1.9%	1.0%	1.9%	2.6%	0.0%	
FROM 001 TO 999								
Frequency		4500	1120	620	180	340	20	
Percent	. 7.0%	5.8%	14.9%	10.7%	16.7%	9.0%	5.9%	
FROM 1000 TO 4999					<u>:</u>			
Frequency		18920	2440	1400	320	1160	100	
Percent	. 25.2%	24.3%	32.4%	24.1%	29.6%	30.7%	29.4%	
FROM 5000 TO 9999		20.110						
Frequency		20440	2040	1420	300	1180	180	
Percent		26.2%	27.1%	24.4%	27.8%	31.2%	52.9%	
FROM 10000 TO 19999		2222				400	4.00	
Frequency		22000	1300	1480	180	680	40	
Percent		28.2%	17.3%	25.4%	16.7%	18.0%	11.8%	
FROM 20000 TO 29999		4540		400	40	460	•	
Frequency		6560	220	480	40	160	0	
Percent		8.4%	2.9%	8.2%	3.7%	4.2%	0.0%	
FROM 30000 TO 39999		2360	180	140	20	80	O	
Frequency Percent		25/6U 3.0%	2.4%	2.4%	1.9%	2.1%	-	
FROM 40000 TO 49999		÷. 0%	2.4%	Z. <del>4</del> /.	1. 7%	2.1%	0.0%	
Frequency		760	20	20	20	<b>4</b> D	O	
Percent		1.0%	.3%	.3%	1.9%	1.1%	0.0%	
FROM 50000 TO 59999		1.0%	. 3/-	. 5%	1. 7%	1.1%	0.0%	
Frequency		680	20	20	O	20	O	
Percent	• • • • •	•9%	.3%	.3%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%	
60000 +		• 3/.	• J/•	. 3%	0.0%	.0%	0.0%	
Frequency	. 1320	1080	40	180	0	20	0	
Percent	1.4%	1.4%	.5%	3.1%	0.0%	.5%	0.0%	
Total								
Frequency	. <del>96</del> 480	77940	<b>75</b> 20	5820	<b>10</b> 80	<b>3780</b>	340	



## ACTORS AND DIRECTORS --- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS 1980

		Male		Femal		
	Total	White	Minority	Total	White	Minority
INCOME FROM ALL	IOCAT	MITCE	IIII Di TUG	10041	MIILE	minority
SOURCES 1979						
ZERO	•					
Frequency	180	160	20	60	60	n ·
Percent	.4%	.4%	.5%	. 3%	.3%	0.0%
FROM 001 TO 999	. 47.	6 -476		- 5/-		o. <b></b>
Frequency	1500	1200	390	1560	1340	220
Percent	3.3%	2.9%	8.0%	6.9%	6.5%	10.3%
FROM 1000 TO 4999			•••			2272
Frequency	4940	4160	780	4100	3800	300
Percent	11.0%	10.1%	20.9%	18.1%	18.5%	14.0%
FROM 5000 TO 9999						
Frequency	<b>75</b> 00	6760	740	5140	4720	420
Percent	16.7%	16.4%	19.8%	22.7%	23.0%	19.6%
FROM 10000 TO 19999						
Frequency	13680	12640	1040	7380	6540	840
Percent	30.4%	30.6%	27.8%	32.6%	31.9%	39.3%
FROM 20000 TO 29999						
Frequency	7340	6920	420	2540	2300	240
Percent	16.3%	16.8%	11.2%	11.2%	11.2%	11.2%
FROM 30000 TO 39999						
Frequency	3420	3240	180	680	640	40
Percent	7.6%	7.8%	4.8%	3.0%	3.1%	1.9%
FROM 40000 TO 49999						
Frequency	1780	1640	140	400	360	40
Percent	4.0%	4.0%	3.7%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%
FROM 50000 TO 59999			_			
Frequency	1120	1120	0	340	320	20
Percent	2.5%	2.7%	0.0%	1.5%	1.6%	. 9%
60000 +			400			
Frequency	3560	3440	120	440	420	20
Flercent	7.9%	8.3%	3.2%	1.9%	2.0%	. 5%
Total	45030	41305	27.40	226.40	20500	21.40
Frequency	45020	4128D	3740	22640	<b>205</b> 00	2140

## ACTORS AND DIRECTORS --- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS 1980

		Male		Female		
	Total	White	Minority	Total	White	Minority
INCOME FROM ALL	IOCAT	MITCE	iiiiioi itg	10041	MIILE	minority
SOURCES 1979						
ZERO	•					
Frequency	180	160	20	60	60	n ·
Percent	.4%	.4%	.5%	. 3%	.3%	0.0%
FROM 001 TO 999	. 47.	6 -476		- 5/-		o. <b></b>
Frequency	1500	1200	300	1560	1340	220
Percent	3.3%	2.9%	8.0%	6.9%	6.5%	10.3%
FROM 1000 TO 4999			•••			2272
Frequency	4940	4160	780	4100	3800	300
Percent	11.0%	10.1%	20.9%	18.1%	18.5%	14.0%
FROM 5000 TO 9999						
Frequency	<b>75</b> 00	6760	740	5140	4720	420
Percent	16.7%	16.4%	19.8%	22.7%	23.0%	19.6%
FROM 10000 TO 19999						
Frequency	13680	12640	1040	7380	6540	840
Percent	30.4%	30.6%	27.8%	32.6%	31.9%	39.3%
FROM 20000 TO 29999						
Frequency	7340	6920	420	2540	2300	240
Percent	16.3%	16.8%	11.2%	11.2%	11.2%	11.2%
FROM 30000 TO 39999						
Frequency	3420	3240	180	680	640	40
Percent	7.6%	7.8%	4.8%	3.0%	3.1%	1.9%
FROM 40000 TO 49999						
Frequency	1780	1640	140	400	360	40
Percent	4.0%	4.0%	3.7%	1.8%	1.8%	1.9%
FROM 50000 TO 59999			_			
Frequency	1120	1120	0	340	320	20
Percent	2.5%	2.7%	0.0%	1.5%	1.6%	. 9%
60000 +						
Frequency	3560	3440	120	440	420	20
Flercent	7.9%	8.3%	3.2%	1.9%	2.0%	. 5%
Total	45000	4120-	22.42	226.46	20500	21.40
Frequency	45020	4128D	3740	22640	<b>205</b> 00	2140

## TABLE 80 --38 DANCERS --- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS 1980

		Male		Female		
	Total	White	Minority	Total	White	Minority
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979		,,,,,,,,,			7.172.00	
ZERO						
Frequency	20	20	0	20	20	ស
PercentFROM 001 TO 999	.6%	.8%	0.1%	.2%	.2%	0.0%
Frequency	260	140	120	1300	1060	240
Percent	8.1%	5.4%	20.0%	13.2%	12.6%	16.2%
Frequency	700	600	100	3340	2740	600
Percent	21.9%	23.1%	16.7%	33.9%	32.7%	40.5%
Frequency	760	600	160	2780	2320	460
Percent	23.8%	23.1%	26.7%	28.2%	27.7%	31.1%
Frequency	1040	920	120	1820	1680	140
Percent	<b>3</b> 2.5%	35.4%	20.0%	18.5%	20.0%	9.5%
FROM 20000 TO 29999						
Frequency	240	180	60	380	380	Ð
Percent	7.5%	6.9%	10.0%	3.9%	4.5%	C.0%
Frequency	100	80	20	40	20	20
Percent	3.1%	3.1%	3.3%	.4%	.2%	1.4%
Frequency	60	60	O	60	40	20
Percent	1.9%	2.3%	0.0%	.6%	.5%	1.4%
Frequency	Ð	Ð	0	20	20	0
Percent	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	.2%	.2%	0.0%
Frequency	20	0	20	100	100	۵
Percent	.6%	0.0%	3.3%	1.0%	1.2%	0.0%
Frequency	3200	2600	600	9860	6380	1480



## HUSICIANS AND COMPOSERS --- INCOME BY GENDER BY WHITE/MINORITY STATUS 1980

•		Male		Female		
	Total	White	Minority	Total	White	Minority
INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979						•
ZERO						
Frequency	960	780	180	260	200	60
PercentFROM 001 TD 999	1.0%	.9%	1.6%	.6%	-5%	2.3%
Frequency	6780	5620	1160	6400	5920	480
Percent	7.0%	6.6%	10.5%	15.6%	15.5%	18.0%
FROM 1000 TO 4999						
Frequency	24340	21360	2980	17220	16400	820
PercentFROM 5000 TO 9999	25.2%	25.0%	27.0%	42.1%	42.8%	<b>30.8</b> %
Frequency	<b>25</b> 560	22480	3080	<b>876</b> 0	8200	560
Percent	26.5%	26.3%	27.9%	21.4%	21.4%	21.1%
Frequency	25680	23300	2380	6080	5500	580
Percent	26.6%	27.3%	21.6%	14.9%	14.4%	21.8%
FROM 20000 TO 29999			_			
Frequency	7460	6780	680	1540	1480	60
Percent	7.7%	7.9%	6.2%	3.8%	3.9%	2.3%
Frequency	2780	2540	<b>24</b> 0	420	380	40
Percent	2.9%	3.0%	2.2%	1.0%	1.0%	1.5%
FROM 40000 TO 49999						
Frequency	860	780	80	120	100	20
Percent	.9%	. 9%	.7%	.3%	. 3%	.8%
Frequency	740	700	40	100	80	20
Percent	.8%	.8%	. 4%	.2%	. 2%	.8%
Frequency	1320	1120	200	40	20	20
Fercent	1.4%	1.3%	1.8%	.1%	.1%	.8%
Frequency	96480	<b>854</b> 60	11020	<b>4</b> 0940	38280	2660



### 80-40 ACTOR/DIRECTORS, DANCERS, AND MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS -- INCOME FROM ALL SOURCES 1979

### INCOME

	MEAN	STANDARD DEVIATION	MEDIAN
ACTOR/DIRECTORS	18463.30	17872.60	13005.0
DANCERS		9634.25	5805.0
MUSICIAN/COMPOSERS	9423.02	10825.60	6255.0

