

ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1967 1315

TABLE 3.—Selected data on title V trainees in Cleveland, eastern Kentucky, and St. Paul projects

|                                                                 | Cleveland            | Eastern Kentucky      | St. Paul         |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Total terminations to September 1966.....                       | 1,613                | 1,936                 | <sup>1</sup> 471 |
| Employment:                                                     |                      |                       |                  |
| Total trainees employed.....                                    | 734                  | 640                   | 330              |
| Percent employed.....                                           | 45.5                 | 33.1                  | 70.1             |
| Local labor market conditions: Unemployment rate (percent)..... | <sup>2</sup> 2.8-3.5 | <sup>3</sup> 7.2-31.4 | 2                |
| Participant characteristics: <sup>4</sup>                       |                      |                       |                  |
| Percent male.....                                               | 71.6                 | 100.0                 | 100.0            |
| Percent white.....                                              | 20.0                 | 99.5                  | 87.9             |
| Average age (median):                                           |                      |                       |                  |
| Male.....                                                       | <sup>5</sup> 36      | 39                    | 35               |
| Female.....                                                     | <sup>5</sup> 31      |                       |                  |
| Services:                                                       |                      |                       |                  |
| Percent in adult basic education.....                           | 22.5                 | 86.0                  | 13.5             |
| Percent in high school equivalency.....                         | 12.5                 | 8.0                   | 33.0             |
| Percent in vocational instruction.....                          | 25.5                 | 2.5                   | 63.5             |
| Average health expenditures per case month.....                 | \$10.46              | \$7.17                | \$6.18           |
| Total day care expenditures.....                                | \$70,537             | 0                     | 0                |

<sup>1</sup> Group II male trainees only for period Oct. 1, 1965, to Oct. 31, 1966.

<sup>2</sup> Range from low of 2.8 percent unemployment rate in April 1965 to high of 3.5 percent in July 1966.

<sup>3</sup> 1966 annual average unemployment rates for 19 eastern Kentucky counties:

|                |      |                |      |             |      |
|----------------|------|----------------|------|-------------|------|
| Bell.....      | 15.5 | Letcher.....   | 11.4 | Martin..... | 20.4 |
| Breathitt..... | 31.3 | Knott.....     | 18.3 | Morgan..... | 8.0  |
| Clay.....      | 15.6 | Harlan.....    | 12.6 | Owsley..... | 31.4 |
| Floyd.....     | 14.2 | Knox.....      | 20.7 | Perry.....  | 18.3 |
| Elliott.....   | 7.2  | Maggoffin..... | 23.9 | Pike.....   | 14.5 |
| Jackson.....   | 29.4 | Manifer.....   | 7.5  | Wolfe.....  | 18.3 |
| Leslie.....    |      |                |      |             |      |

<sup>4</sup> Data on participant characteristics and services derived on basis of average number enrolled: (1) in Cleveland project from Mar. 1, 1965, to Aug. 31, 1966; (2) in eastern Kentucky project from July 1, 1966, to Dec. 31, 1966; (3) in St. Paul project from Oct. 1, 1965, to Oct. 31, 1966.

<sup>5</sup> Mean age in years.

Source: Based on data prepared by the Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Percent employed is a relatively narrow criterion because some proportion of trainees go on to other training at the time of Title V termination and others, who may not be employed immediately, have typically upgraded their education level and job skills and hence their capability.

Analyses over the past year have shown that nearly 50 percent of the variation in project effectiveness from place to place, when measured in terms of the proportion of trainees employed, can be explained by differences in the prevailing economic conditions and characteristics of the group served in terms of age, educational level, sex, race, previous work experience, and so on. Assuming that the target population is not to be "creamed" and that high, as well as low, unemployment areas are to be served, these factors are beyond the control of the particular agency responsible for program administration and content.

The importance of these factors, which operate independently of Program management, is illustrated in Table 3 which shows a comparison between one of the largest rural projects (19 counties in Eastern Kentucky) and one of the largest urban projects (Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Ohio). Also included are data on 471 Group II males terminated from the Ramsey County (St. Paul), Minnesota, project from November 1965 through October 1966. These afforded comparisons of an all-male group in an urban area with a low unemployment rate and the Eastern Kentucky all-male group located in a rural economically depressed area. The men in both localities are unemployed heads of families not receiving assistance under the AFDC Program (Group II cases).

Other things equal, projects operating in areas of high unemployment would be expected to be less successful than those operating in areas of high labor demand. Similarly, projects in which participants have a higher proportion of females, a lower average level of educational attainment, a higher proportion of non-whites, and a higher average age will probably be less successful in ultimately achieving the objectives of greater earnings of its trainees. We know this *a priori* from studies of the labor force participation, employment, and earnings history of females in relation to males, whites in relation to non-whites,