### TRANSACTIONS OF SOCIETY OF ACTUARIES 1980 REPORTS

### II. GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY INSURANCE

HIS is the thirty-third annual report on the continuing study of the morbidity experience of Group Weekly Indemnity insurance. In compiling this report, the Committee has included the available experience of employer/employee groups and has excluded the experience of trusteeships and association cases insuring employees of the member employers and the experience of union cases, whether or not insurance depends on continued employment. The experience of plans written under State Cash Sickness Laws and the experience of insured groups outside the United States also have been excluded.

#### RATIO OF ACTUAL TO TABULAR CLAIMS

Experience in this report is presented in the form of ratios of actual to tabular claims. The tabular claims used in this report are those derived from the 1947–49 weekly indemnity nonmaternity tabulars and 40 percent of the 1947–49 weekly indemnity maternity tabulars as shown in last year's report. Up until the 1978 report, the full 1947–49 weekly indemnity tabulars were used for both maternity and nonmaternity claims. For this reason, except for nonmaternity-only experience, actual-to-tabular ratios shown in this report are not comparable to those shown in prior reports. Caution must be used in interpreting the data contained in this report because, among other reasons, the 1947–49 tabulars may not reflect accurately the current claim patterns. The tabulars also do not reflect certain factors, such as age distribution, industry classification, or size of case, that may have a relevant effect on the experience results.

### CONTRIBUTING COMPANIES

The Committee wishes to express its gratitude to the companies that generously contributed data to this study. The report contains experience for the years 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, and 1979. Nine companies contributed data for some or all of these years. The results generally reflect the composite effect of variations in company practice in administration and claim procedures, as well as variations in experience among groups.

The majority of companies contribute exposures and claims based upon policy years ending in the calendar year designated. If the renewal dates for all cases were distributed uniformly over the year, then the central point of exposure for each policy year would be approximately January 1 of that

year. However, this assumption may not be very precise because of a concentration of policy renewals in January and July.

The following companies contributed experience for the study:

Aetna Life Insurance Company
Connecticut General Life Insurance Company
Continental Assurance Company
Equitable Life Assurance Society
The Hartford Insurance Group
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company
Occidental Life Insurance Company of California
Prudential Insurance Company of America
The Travelers Insurance Company

### ANALYSIS OF EXPERIENCE

Federal maternity legislation effective on April 1, 1979, imposed on all groups with more than fifteen lives the requirement that, in any benefit program, maternity must be treated the same as any other illness. This year the impact of that legislation affects this report for the first time. Contributing companies were instructed to code as having a full maternity benefit any experience unit that had such a benefit at any time during the experience period. Cases so coded were then withheld from the report. Some companies may have had difficulty responding to this request. Approximately 7 percent of the 1979 contribution was eliminated from the tables for this reason. The Committee is currently taking steps to construct a full maternity tabular that can be used in the analysis of this experience. Until that time, the experience under plans with full maternity benefits will be excluded from the report.

Table 1 shows the experience for the period 1977–79 for each of eight plans (four different elimination periods; two different maximum benefit periods), all of which provide a six-week maternity benefit. All size groups are included. Table 2 shows the experience of nonjumbo groups only (units with less than 1,000 insured employees) for each of four plan combinations. For those nonjumbo units for which the data were available, Table 2 separates the combined experience into its nonmaternity and maternity segments. Also included in Table 2 is the nonjumbo experience for the period 1977–79 of plans that do not provide a maternity benefit. Table 3 is a five-year trend analysis of the Table 2 experience for each year 1975–79 inclusive. Care should be exercised in analyzing the year-by-year experience, because several of our contributors have been unable to participate since 1977, and the 1979 experience may have felt the impact of the federal maternity leg-

islation. Table 4 is an analysis of experience by size of experience unit. Results are shown separately for plans with and without maternity benefits. Table 5 analyzes the nonjumbo experience of plans with no maternity benefit by the female percentage composition of the experience units. Experience for the years 1975–79 is displayed in Table 6 by standard industrial classification. Results are shown separately for jumbo and nonjumbo experience units. This information was last presented in the 1975 Reports.

The actual-to-tabular ratios shown in Table 1 indicate continued deterioration in the results under both thirteen-week and twenty-six-week plans. All plans combined had a ratio of 143 percent compared with 134 percent last year. The actual-to-tabular ratio for thirteen-week plans continues to be lower than that for twenty-six-week plans. The most notable deterioration is evident under the eighth-day-accident, eighth-day-sickness, thirteen-week plan. Table 2 shows that plans with no maternity benefit maintained stable results and that the deterioration was limited to plans with maternity benefits. Each actual-to-tabular ratio for plans with maternity benefits is higher than the corresponding ratio in last year's report. Table 3 verifies the results

TABLE 1

GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY EXPERIENCE
WITH SIX WEEKS' MATERNITY BENEFIT
ALL SIZE GROUPS
COMBINED 1977-79 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN
NONMATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY
NONMATERNITY TABULARS; MATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 40 PERCENT
OF 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY MATERNITY TABULARS

Plan	No. Experience Units	Weekly Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims Including Maternity (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1947–49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular
1-4-13	246 25 723 91	2,660 343 8,843 1,202	2,262 361 6,667 1,205	1.26 1.66 1.26 1.55
Total, 13-week plans	1,085	13,048	10,494	1.30
1-4-26	550 16 941 132	16,617 433 19,370 2,266	22,020 412 19,780 1,989	1.56 1.13 1.40 1.19
Total, 26-week plans	1,639	38,686	44,201	1.46
Total, all plans	2,724	51,734	54,695	1.43

120

TABLE 2

### GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY EXPERIENCE GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED 1977-79 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN

### NONMATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY NONMATERNITY TABULARS; MATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 40 PERCENT OF 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY MATERNITY TABULARS

	Z	Nonmaternity and Maternity Combined Experience*			Normalernity and Maternity Suparate Experience*								
Plan	No.	ience Indemnity Cla	Actual	Ratio of Actual to	No.	Weekly	Actual Claims		Ratio of Actual to 1947-49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular				
	Experience Units		Claims (000)	Weekly		Indemnity Exposed (000)	Non- maternity (000)	Maternity (000)	Non- maternity	Maternity	Combined		
		Plans with 6 Weeks. Maternity Benefit											
13-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	262 800	1,971 7,647	1,416 6,064	1.12	260 787	1.959 7.534	1,372 5,599	39 385	1.12 1.28	1.21 1.34	1.13 1.29		
Total	1,062	9,618	7,479	1.25	1,047	9,493	6.970	424	1.25	1.33	1.25		
26-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	534 1,051	10.240 17.243	11,736 17,003	1.37 1.34	530 1,048	10,168 17,153	11,298 16,264	340 637	1.37 1.34	1.19 1.33	1.37 1.34		
Total	1,585	27,483	28,738	1.35	1,578	27,321	27.562	977	1.35	1.28	1.35		

<sup>\*</sup> The separate experience exposure is less than the combined experience exposure because separate experience is not available for all groups.

TABLE 2—Continued

	NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY COMBINED EXPERIENCE*				Nonmalernity and Maternity Separate Experience*								
PLAN	I No I		Weekly Actual	Ratio of Actual to	No.	Weekly	Actual	Claims	Ratio of Actual to 1947–49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular				
	Experience Units	Indemnity Exposed (000)	Claims (000)	1947–49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular	Experience Units	Indemnity Exposed (000)	Non- maternity (000)	Maternity (000)	Non- maternity	Maternity	Combined		
		Plans with No Maternity Benefits											
13-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness					132 1,585	937 12,149	615 7.161		1.01				
Total					1,717	13,086	7,776		1.02				
0.1 1 2 1		ł			263 2,790	3,380 28,597	2.590 20,224		0.97 0.99				
Total					3,053	31,977	22,814		0.99				

TABLE 3

## GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY EXPERIENCE GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1,000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED 1975–79 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY PLAN

### NONMATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY NONMATERNITY TABULARS; MATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 40 PERCENT OF 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY MATERNITY TABULARS

PLAN		RATIOS OF AC	TUAL TO 194 ICY YEAR EN		
	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979
		Plans with 6	Weeks' Mate	rnity Benefit	
Nonmaternity and maternity combined experience: 13-week:					
4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	1.04 1.12	1.02	1.13 1.18	1.04 1.29	1.22 1.37
Total	1.11	1 ()9	1.17	1.24	1.34
26-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	1.35 1.37	1.36 1.35	1.30 1.37	1.23 1.33	1.57 1.33
Total	1.37	1.35	1.35	1.28	1.42
Nonmaternity and maternity separate experience:* Nonmaternity: 13-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	1.08 1.08	1.02	1.13	1.04 1.30	1.22
Total	1.08	1.12	1.17	1.24	1.33
26-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	1.38 1.25	1.31	1.29	1.25 1.34	1.57 1.32
Total	1.28	1.32	1.34	1.29	1.42
Maternity (all plans)	1.01	0.93	1.28	0.98	1.61
Combined: 13-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	1.08	1.01	1.14 1.18	1.04 1.29	1.22 1.38
Total	1.08	1.12	1.17	1.24	1.35
26-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	1.36 1.24	1.28 1.30	1.29 1.37	1.23 1.33	1.54 1.33
Total	1.27	1.30	1.34	1.28	1.42

<sup>\*</sup> The nonmaternity and maternity separate experience is also included in the non-maternity and maternity combined experience.

TABLE 3—Continued

Plan	Ratios of Actual to 1947-49 Tabular for Policy Year Ending in:										
	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979						
	Plans with No Maternity Benefits										
13-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	1.35 1.04	1.04 1.00	1.00 1.00	0.89 0.97	1.11 1.08						
Total	1.05	1.00	1.00	1.97	1.08						
26-week: 4th-day sickness 8th-day sickness	1.13 0.98	1.46 0.99	1.24 1.04	1.17 0.98	0.69 0.97						
Total	1.00	1.04	1.06	1.00	0.93						

TABLE 4

# GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY EXPERIENCE ALL SIZE GROUPS COMBINED 1977-79 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY SIZE OF EXPERIENCE UNIT

## NONMATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY NONMATERNITY TABULARS; MATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 40 PERCENT OF 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY MATERNITY TABULARS

Size	No. Experience Units	Weekly Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actual Claims Including Maternity (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1947–49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular
	Р	lans with Six Week	s' Maternity Bene	fit
<50 lives 50–99 100–249 250–499 500–999	689 617 766 382 193	1,361 3,426 10,140 11,286 10,888	1,158 2,612 9,080 11,397 11,970	1.17 1.06 1.24 1.36 1.49
Total <1,000	2,647	37,101	36,218	1.39
1,000 or more	77	14,633	18,478	1.66
Grand total	2.724	51,734	54,695	1.43
		Plans with No M	Maternity Benefit	
<50 lives 50-99 100-249 250-499 500-999	1,669 1,330 1,194 412 165	3,501 7,566 13,872 10,106 10,018	1,923 4,512 10,307 7,622 6,226	0.81 0.90 1.10 1.11 0.89
Total < 1,000	4.770	45,064	30,590	1.00
1.000 or more	96	24,656	18,486	1.00
Grand total	4,866	69,720	49,076	1.00

of Table 2, showing higher actual-to-tabular ratios for nearly all plans except those with no maternity benefits. The maternity results in Table 3 suggest that some experience under a full maternity benefit has crept into the experience base. This is further suggested by the relatively low proportion of 1979 experience that was coded as having full maternity benefits and therefore excluded from the data base.

Table 4 shows that experience generally worsens as the size of the group increases. Notable exceptions are the results for small groups with maternity benefits and the larger nonjumbo groups with no maternity benefits. Ratios for the former are much higher than expected, those for the latter much lower. Another apparently unusual result is that for jumbo cases. The experience for jumbo cases with maternity benefits has worsened when compared with both last year's results and the experience for nonjumbo cases with maternity benefits. On the other hand, the experience for jumbo cases with no maternity benefits has improved relative to the corresponding measures. The possible miscoding of benefits referred to above would create similar results, considering that the potential for miscoding is greater for cases with maternity benefits than for those without maternity benefits.

TABLE 5

GROUP WEEKLY INDEMNITY EXPERIENCE.
GROUPS WITH LESS THAN 1.000 EMPLOYEES EXPOSED
1977-79 POLICY YEARS' EXPERIENCE, BY FEMALE PERCENT
PLANS WITH NO MATERNITY BENEFIT, ALL BENEFIT PERIODS COMBINED
NONMATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 1947-49 WEEKLY
INDEMNITY NONMATERNITY TABULARS

Female Percent	No. Experience Units	Weekly Indemnity Exposed (000)	Actuai Claims (000)	Ratio of Actual to 1947-49 Weekly Indemnity Tabular
Less than 11%	2,053	19,572	13,508	1.08
11–21%	753	7,312	4,112	0.87
21–31%	500	4,748	2,807	0.85
31–41%	444	3,837	2,861	1.05
41–51%	275	2.045	1.493	1.03
51–61%	222	2,082	1.731	1.09
61–71%	205	2.057	1.802	1.11
71–81%	146	2,364	1,533	0.78
81–91%	109	861	599	0.87
91–100%	63	186	144	0.94
Total	4.770	45.064	30,590	1.00

TABLE 6

### COMBINED 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, AND 1979 POLICY YEARS EXPERIENCE INDUSTRY ANALYSIS JUMBO AND NONJUMBO EXPERIENCE UNITS, ALL PLANS, COMBINED NONMATERNITY AND MATERNITY EXPERIENCE

### NONMATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY

### NONMATERNITY TABULARS; MATERNITY TABULAR CLAIMS = 40 PERCENT OF 1947-49 WEEKLY INDEMNITY MATERNITY TABULARS

Industry	Industry Description	No. Experi Uni	ENCE	ACTUAL WEEKLY INDEMNITY EXPOSED (000)		RATIO OF EXPOSURE FOR INDUSTRY TO TOTAL		Ratio of Actual to Tabular		RATIO OF INDUSTRY A/T TO AGGREGATE A/T	
Code	INDUSTRY DESCRIPTION	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives
Total	All industries	15,635	331	\$143,872	\$62,335	100.0%	100.0%	114%	121%	100%	100%
01 02 07 08	Agriculture, forestry, and fisheries: Agricultural production Agricultural—livestock Agricultural—services, hunting Forestry Fisheries Mining:	42 29 16 1 3	1	\$ 319 298 118 3 14	\$ 85	0.2% 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.0	0.1%	110% 54 91 87 41	75%	96% 47 80 76 36	62%
10 11 12 13 14	Metal mining Anthracite mining Bituminous coal and lignite mining Oil and gas extraction Nonmetallic mineral fuels, etc. Contract construction:	34 14 56 79 99	2  2 2	286 27 931 459 847	229 151 62	0.2 0.0 0.7 0.3 0.6	0.4  0.3 0.1	92 193 73 65 109	63 113	81 169 64 57 96	119  52 93
5 6 7	General building contractors Heavy construction contractors Special trade contractors Manufacturing:	69 121 212	2 5	368 1,039 943	265 574	0.3 0.7 0.7	0.4 0.9	112 75 90	180 119	98 66 79	149 98
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27	Ordnance and accessories Food and kindred products Tobacco manufacture Textile mill products Apparel and other textiles Lumber and wood products Furniture and fixtures Paper and allied products Printing and publishing Chemicals and allied products	4 560 11 304 245 323 271 778 565 340	15 15 3 6 9 24 10 12	5,240 124 2,696 1,245 2,429 2,709 8,591 5,812 3,927	2,243 2,530 187 567 1,090 3,407 903 1,844	0.0 3.6 0.1 1.9 0.9 1.7 1.9 6.0 4.0 2.7	3.6  4.1 0.3 0.9 1.8 5.5 1.4 3.0	141 109 160 116 106 106 121 134 93 102	88  90 59 159 111 173 158 88	124 96 140 102 93 93 106 118 82 89	73  74 49 131 92 143 131 73

Industry	Industry Description	No. Experi Uni	ENCL	ISDES	WEEKLY 0811 Y - D (000)	RATE Exposu Industry	RL FOR	RATIO OF ACTUAL TO TABULAR		l	O OF TRY A/T EGATE A/T
Cone	INDUSTRY DESCRIPTION	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under E000 Lives	Ove: 1,000 Lives	Under 1,000 Lives	Over E000 Lives	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives
29 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39	Manufacturing—Continued Petroleum and coal production Rubber and miscellaneous plastics products Leather and leather products Stone, clay and glass products Primary metal industries Fabricated metal products Machinery except electrical Electric and electronic equipment Transportation equipment Instruments and related products Miscellaneous manufacturing industries Transportation, communication, electric, gas,	65 507 159 718 632 1,392 1,429 706 559 245 293	29 15 15 15 31 30 29 5	\$ 496 5.022 1.361 8.468 7.098 13.794 15.786 8.894 7.431 2.775 2.807	\$ 696 5.606 7.643 1.764 3.994 3.737 4.892 888 12	0.3% 3.5 1.0 5.9 4.9 9.6 11.0 6.2 5.2 1.9 2.0	9.0 12.2 2.8 6.4 6.0 7.8 1.4 0.0	83% 133 114 144 129 126 121 127 136 118	153% 178 134 134 139 164 113 112 94	73% 117 100 126 113 111 106 111 119 104 98	126% 147 111 111 115 136 93 93 78
40	and sanitary services: Railroad transportation Local and interurban passage transit Trucking and warehousing Postal services Water transportation Transportation by air Transportation services Communication Electric, gas and sanitary services	7 89 199 1 43 29 50 79 86	1 2 4	631 267 228 603 534	652 216 2.493	0.0 0.5 0.9  0.4 0.2 0.2 0.4 0.4	1.0 0.4 4.0  0.5	151 172 90 347 105 67 100 68 88	26 81 71  167	132 151 79 304 92 59 88 60 77	21 67 59  138
50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59	Wholesale and retail trade: Wholesale trade—durable goods Wholesale trade—nondurable goods Building materials and garden supplies General merchandise stores Food stores Automotive dealers and service stations Apparel and accessory stores Furniture and home furnishings stores Eating and drinking places Miscellaneous retail	851 234 86 117 160 527 94 81 147 118	7 2  5 1 1 3 3	5,343 1,546 686 850 1,538 2,321 504 298 581 603	659 214 7,266 26 164 809 659	3.7 1.0 0.4 0.6 1.0 1.6 0.4 0.2 0.4 0.4	1.1 0.3 11.6 0.0 0.3 1.3 1.1	77 81 106 90 97 71 72 87 97	140 59  76 179 53 75 190	68 71 93 79 85 62 63 76 86	63 148 44 62 157

Industry	Industry Description	No. Experi Uni	ENCE	INDEM	WEEKLY INITY ED (000)	Exposi	10 OF URE FOR TO TOTAL	RATIO OF ACTUAL TO TABULAR		RAH Indusi to Aggre	RY A/T
Code	INDUSTRI DESCRIPTION	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under L000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under 1.000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives	Under 1,000 Lives	Over 1,000 Lives
60	Finance, insurance, and real estate: Banking Credit agencies other than banks Security and commodity brokers and services Insurance carriers Insurance agents, brokers, and service Real estate Combined real estate, insurance, etc. Holding and other investment offices Services: Hotels and other lodging places Personal services Business services Business services Auto repair services and garages Miscellaneous repair services Motion pictures Amusement and recreation services Health services	81 33 14 38 19 87 11 56 66 90 297 66 58 6	2	\$ 438 148 74 242 72 454 45 379 398 268 1.297 527 286 66 135 3.005	\$ 60 357 91 808 2,582	0.3% 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.3 0.0 0.3 0.2 0.9 0.4 0.2 0.1	0.1%	64% 48 41 127 55 62 63 104 90 120 75 134 143 120 159 75	84% 148 181 72	56% 42 36 111 48 54 55 91 79 105 66 118 125 105 139 66	69% 
81	Legal services Educational services Social services Museums, botanical and zoological gardens Membership organizations Miscellaneous services Government:	15 60 45 2 82 104	1	63 421 252 33 631 911	48 534	2.1 0.0 0.3 0.2  0.4 0.6	0.1	27 69 62 129 77 156	33	24 61 54 113 68 137	27
91 92 93 94 95 96	Executive, legislative, and general Justice, public order, and safety Finance, taxation, and monetary policy Administration of human resources Environmental quality and housing Administration of economic programs Nonclassifiable establishment	120 22 130 9 1 6 23	2 2 3 	1,190 279 1,039 35 30 146	76 50 608	0.8 0.2 0.7 0.0  0.0 0.1	0.1 0.1 1.0	72 37 75 26 69 159	63 67 73	63 32 66 23 61 139 69	52 55 60
Total .	All industries listed above All other industries	15,626 9	330	\$143,819 \$ 53	\$62,315 \$ 20	100.0%	100.0%	114% 169%	121% 182%	100% 148%	100% 150%

The analysis by percent female in Table 5 shows actual-to-tabular ratios that tend to increase as the female percentage increases. The actual-to-tabular ratio for cases with less than 11 percent female is higher than would be expected given the results for other female percentages. This has been observed in earlier reports and has been attributed to either the miscoding of cases where the female percentage is unknown or the tendency of occupations with such low female percentages to be more hazardous than those with higher female percentages. At both the higher and lower female percentages, actual-to-tabular ratios are much improved over those for previous years. This has also been evident in earlier reports, although not quite so dramatically. The results of Table 5 must be interpreted with caution, however, since the experience for all waiting periods and benefit durations has been combined.

Table 6 presents actual-to-tabular ratios by industry based on experience from the years 1975-79 inclusive. This table is published only once every five years. The table has been changed slightly from previous reports in that jumbo and nonjumbo experience are separate throughout. In general, results of this analysis are quite similar to results for the period 1970-74. Among those industries with significant exposure (arbitrarily defined as at least 0.3 percent of the total), the highest actual-to-tabular ratios occur in furniture and home furnishing stores among jumbo cases and in local and interurban transit among nonjumbos. The lowest actual-to-tabular ratios were in railroad transportation for jumbo cases and in real estate for nonjumbos. The range of ratios extends from 62 percent to 172 percent for nonjumbo cases and from 26 percent to 190 percent for jumbos. The experience of several industries showed significant levels of deterioration since the 1970-74 experience. Most noticeable among these are local and interurban transit, furniture and home furnishing stores, building material and garden supply stores, and agricultural services. Improvement in experience was noticeable in real estate, automobile dealers and service stations. Caution must be observed in interpreting the results of this table especially because of the lack of recognition of such key variables as plan type and age and sex distributions.