

Their per capita income is parallel—\$670.

Most of the families report having one or more children (age 5-18) living at home.

The majority of families are fully formed—with both parents present in the household.

However, some differences exist which set them apart from the total "affected poor":

A high proportion are Negro (3 out of 4)—as compared to the Negro distribution of about half in the nine areas as a whole.

They are not as well-educated as the total "affected" group—2 out of 10 have completed a high school education as compared to 3 out of 10, on the average, in the nine communities.

4. The critical needs reported by the "affected poor" interviewed in Cincinnati follow the same pattern as those expressed in the nine communities in aggregate. These needs revolve around three basic issues—their children, their finances and their health. Of lesser importance in both Cincinnati and the total poverty population studied are those factors relating to education, job opportunities and material benefits.

5. The most widely used program, among those who were eligible² in Cincinnati, is Head-Start. In about 2 out of 3 of the families eligible, the head of household reported that one or more of their children has participated in the Head-Start program. Interestingly, this incidence of participation is on a lower level than was reported by the nine communities in total—where participation was almost universal (99%). Considering the other programs available in Cincinnati, participation by eligible families varied significantly—from 1 out of 2 heads of households reporting participation in Health Programs to less than 1 out of 10 heads of households reporting participation in Household Management (administered through the Neighborhood Centers). Another difference between Cincinnati and the nine areas combined is the high reported utilization of Education Help for Grade School Children (believed principally to reflect the Lighted Schools program)—by a 4 to 1 ratio.

6. In almost all (9 out of 10) of the households, in Cincinnati, where a child was enrolled in the Head-Start program, the head of household reports that a change, primarily for the better, has taken place in their children.

Indirect benefits—such as more interested in school, eager to learn and gets along better with children—are reported in more than 9 out of 10 households. Direct effects—reported by somewhat fewer than 9 out of 10 households—include benefits such as doing better school work, speaks better and learned to read and write.

Both direct and indirect benefits are on a par with those reported by the total "affected poor" in the nine communities.

Heads of households in Cincinnati attribute essentially the same benefits for themselves, as was reported by the total "affected" group—with about half reporting that they have been positively affected by the child's participation in the Head-Start program. The majority of benefits are indirect (at about the 50% level), e.g., child getting more attention, get more done around the house, nicer to child, etc.—rather than direct (at the 15% level)—e.g., able to shop better, get work, and take courses.

In general, the participants in other programs in Cincinnati, aside from Head-Start, also reported major benefits. The number of participants in these programs, however, are too few to permit separate reporting for Cincinnati. The quality of the benefits of each of the programs is described in the volume entitled "Detailed Findings of Study to Determine Effects of CAP Programs on Selected Communities and Their Low-Income Residents" where data are presented for all nine communities in aggregate.

Chairman PERKINS. The committee will be in recess until 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, at 5:20 p.m., the committee was recessed, to be reconvened at 9 a.m., Friday, July 28, 1967.)

² Eligibility is defined as those families who meet the requirement for participation (e.g., for Headstart—the presence of a child).