Youth in Poor Neighborhoods

Report No. 121-A

By

RALPH UNDERHILL

With the assistance of

ROBERT RICHARD
ELAINE EL-KHAWAS

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER · THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

The research reported herein
was supported by contract OEO–1416
of the Office of Economic Opportunity

Cover photo by James H. Underhill
Printed in the United States of America

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The research reported herein was supported by the Office of Economic Opportunity under contract OEO-1416. Among the many individuals who offered help and encouragement I am particularly indebted to NORC's former director, Peter Rossi, NORC's current director, Norman Bradburn, and to Seymour Sudman. Others at NORC who offered valuable suggestions include Robert Crain, John Johnstone, Robert McNamara, and Paul Siegel. Outstanding field supervision was provided by Eve Weinberg, Brenda Lefebvre, and Suzanne Gillette. Coding was ably supervised by Frances Harris. Frank Bamberger provided valuable advice on data processing problems. Typing was nicely accomplished against difficult deadlines by NORC's typing pool under the supervision of Toshiko Takahashi. Special thanks go to typists Mary Doi and Rose Thomas. Bonnie McKeon did an excellent job of editing the report.

Finally, I am indebted to research assistants Paul Chummers, Elaine el-Khawas, and Robert Richard who did much of the actual work. Robert Richard deserves special thanks for preparing all the tables. Elaine el-Khawas and Robert Richard did the analysis and writing of that section of Chapter V dealing with the experiences of Neighborhood Youth Corps participants. Any deficiencies of the report are, of course, the responsibility of the senior author.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This report covers the first phase of a pilot study of poor youth conducted for the Office of Economic Opportunity by the National Opinion Research Center. The study has two immediate objectives: first, to provide a firm methodological basis for a subsequent large-scale evaluation of federal anti-poverty programs aimed at young people and, second, to gather substantive information on the young people who are the target population for Jobs Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, and Manpower Development and Training Act programs. The ultimate objective is a larger study of program effectiveness.

The pilot study consists of two stages. The analysis of an initial set of interviews with a sample of poor youths, on which this report is based, will be followed by a second set of interviews with the same respondents (a second "wave" of the study) and by analysis of the resulting longitudinal data. A report on the second stage is scheduled for completion in October, 1967.

We began with two methodological aims. The first was to determine the feasibility of studying over time a national sample of youths living in an environment of poverty. The second was to refine measurements of teenagers' situations and attitudes, and correlates of their success, for use in program evaluation.

We found the process of locating a sample and then relocating the same respondents six months later to be easier than we had expected. Many anticipated problems failed to materialize. Respondents were, for example, quite willing to be interviewed

and spoke freely to our interviewers about their hopes, experiences, and problems. They were also easier to relocate for a second interview than we had expected; our completion rate for the reinterviews was 91.6 per cent. There were, however, a few unexpected problems that should be taken into account in a full-scale evaluation. Our sample procedures, for example, appear to have underrepresented older youths and whites. But this is a minor problem compared with those we had expected.

In the second methodological effort, too, our results are encouraging. We hoped to develop interview schedules that would provide us with data for our sample that could be compared with data for participants in government programs for youth. We have devised a number of usable indicators of background, experience, ability, self-conception, and attitudes. These will be refined further as analysis of the second wave provides further evidence on their reliability and validity.

Our findings will aid in dealing with future measurement problems by narrowing the range of factors to be taken into account. Many factors that previous studies suggested to be important correlates of success in school and in the labor market, or of participation in antipoverty programs, were relatively unimportant for our sample. Other factors appear to be sufficiently important to concentrate on developing more refined measures of them.

The substantive objective of the pilot study is the collection of data on poor youths. We will report here a large number of preliminary findings based on a relatively small sample in four selected areas. These findings are not intended to be definitive. They are, rather, hypotheses to be tested in the larger study. They also provide an indication of the range of information that will emerge from continued analysis. Our

findings fall into the following areas:

1. A profile of poor youths: Information on the background, experiences, attitudes, and current situations of poor youths;

2. Evidence on the values systems of poor youths: Information on whether their values are the result of culture or environment, with a view to the attention currently given the concept of a "culture of poverty";

3. A description of the correlates of success: Information on the factors associated with remaining in school and, for those who have left school, on factors associated with having a job;

4. An analysis of exposure to and interest in antipoverty programs for youth: Information on the images of government programs and the extent to which they reach their target populations;

5. An analysis of factors associated with joining the Neighborhood Youth Corps: Preliminary information on the sort of young person who enters the Neighborhood Youth Corps and a comparison of those who join with those who do not;

6. Data on Neighborhood Youth Corps participation: Information in the program experience of the Neighborhood Youth Corps participants in our sample; and

7. Illustrative material on the problem of assessing program effectiveness. The association between Neighborhood Youth Corps participation and employment that appears in our data will be used as an example of problems and tentative solutions in measuring program effectiveness.

Not covered in this report is a longitudinal analysis of improvement over time in degree of educational and occupational

success, and of the sources of variance in this improvement. The forthcoming report on the second wave of this study will include preliminary analysis of factors related to changing degrees of success. Such analysis is necessary to proper evaluation of the effects of programs.

Rationale of the Study

This pilot study does not permit inferences concerning the effectiveness of federal antipoverty programs for youth--the ultimate objective of the research. It does, however, provide substantive and methodological information necessary to further research and program evaluation. The character of the pilot study is defined by our long-range objectives and our proposed strategy for a full-scale evaluation study. A rationale for the present study, then, should begin with a brief outline of that strategy and comments on how the pilot study's objectives were defined in terms of long-range plans.

Our proposal for a full-scale evaluation is essentially a classic experimental design. We envision a comparison of two samples: (1) a large sample of program participants obtained through lists of program enrollees; and (2) a large control group representative of youths living in poor neighborhoods obtained through the block sampling techniques employed in the pilot study. "Before" measurements of both samples would be made at the time the participants enrolled, and "after" measurements made one year and then two years later.

The limitations of such a design make it impossible to isolate the effects of program participation completely. Program entrants might differ from the control sample in ways that cannot be measured and that are related to successful outcomes. A "drive to succeed," for example, might cause some individuals both to enter a program and to get good jobs later. In this

case the program itself would have no effect. If we had a measure that tapped such a drive perfectly, we could hold it constant statistically to determine whether the apparent program effect was real. The experimental design, in other words, substitutes statistical controls that depend on how precisely complex factors can be measured for the carefully controlled conditions of a laboratory experiment.

No measure of something like a "drive to succeed," is completely valid, however--that is, perfectly correlated with the underlying trait in question. Even if we control for a measure of achievement motivation, we have controlled only in part for the underlying "drive," and spurious effects still might appear. The problem cannot be solved completely by "matching" procedures or other statistical controls, but only by designing an experiment that assigns individuals to the experimental and control groups randomly. Only if we were to draw a very large sample and compel half of it, selected at random, to participate in a program could we duplicate laboratory experimental conditions.

We can nonetheless make reasonable inferences about the effectiveness of programs. If, for example, we find no differences whatever between Job Corps entrants and non-entrants on the "before" measures, we can reasonably attribute differences in "after" measures of success in finding jobs to the Job Corps program. If, as a second example, we find that Job Corps entrants differ from the control group on "before" measures of an attitude and, further, that this attitude is related to employment two years later, then we might introduce a control by standardizing the Job Corps sample on this attitude measure. This would have the effect of equalizing measured attitudes between the two samples. Such a statistical control procedure would be preferable to "matching" respondents in the two

samples, since it does not involve discarding large numbers of cases and destroying the representativeness of the sample. The result of standardization in this example would be a reduced apparent effect of Job Corps on employment.

Suppose further that the effect of Job Corps membership, although reduced, still appeared substantial. We might construct a hypothetical latent structure model, assuming that the relationship between our measure and the latent "true" attitude being measured was less than perfect, and that the latent characteristic was indeed producing the apparent Job Corps effect. If this model reasonably accounted for the observed effect, we would have to suspend judgment on whether the observed effect was real or spurious; if the model did not reasonably explain the effect we could justifiably infer that the effect of the Job Corps was genuine.

To make reasonable inferences we must identify and accurately measure those factors related to increasing occupational and educational success, and to program participation. We must then identify critical variables requiring statistical control. A major focus of the pilot study, therefore, is the identification and measurement of factors related, first, to educational and occupational success and, second, to joining antipoverty programs. This is the central point of our rationale: to identify factors in success and to refine techniques of measurement.

The pilot study provides information on factors related to program participation only for Neighborhood Youth Corps, since numbers of participants in other programs in the sample are too small for analysis. We do, however, have data on program exposure and interest for all respondents and for two other programs. We might assume that many factors that predict interest also predict participation. This assumption can be tested in future research.

A Definition of Poverty

The literature has defined poverty in an impressive variety of ways. Definitions have been constructed in terms of personal income, family income, family income in relation to family size, unemployment, neighborhood or area, culture, and presumed effects such as "undermotivation," "language problems," and social adjustment or school adjustment problems. In one sense the definition does not matter--at least to the extent that the various indicators are correlated with one another. (They are correlated, but not perfectly.) There is a "hard core" group of the poor who would be included in any definition. Other groups would be included under one definition and excluded under another--for example, people in poor neighborhoods whose own incomes are above a "poverty line." In this case an "areal" definition is less than perfectly correlated with one based on family income. Such groups are of special interest in this study.

Before constructing our own definition, two more points should be made clear. The first is that "poverty lines" are arbitrary. There is little justification--theoretical or actual --for drawing a line below which people are poor and above which they are not. Such lines are useful only for compiling statistics in discrete rather than continuous form.

The second point concerns instability. Research has shown that the marginally employable move very frequently in and out of employment, that lower class families are less stable than middle class families, that the poor move very frequently, that their children change schools often. Research in recent years even suggests that the I.Q. of a culturally deprived child is capable of substantial change. Individual and social characteristics seem to be less stable in the lower socioeconomic classes than elsewhere in the society.

We should expect, then, a state of flux. Over short periods of time, people will move across poverty lines, in and out of jobs, in and out of schools, into new family circumstances, and in and out of eligibility for antipoverty programs. We felt, therefore, that the definition in the pilot study should be an inclusive one. Although it has the drawback of excluding those poor who live in well-to-do neighborhoods, a neighborhood or areal definition has many advantages. First, it includes a group of "near poor" who in the state of flux we have described are likely to become poor. Second, it includes not only many of those who would be defined as poor by family income criteria, but also those who, although not themselves poor, live in an environment of poverty. Third, it does not bias the sample by excluding those who have achieved a modest degree of success. Since analysis of success is a major objective of the study, it was essential that the youth sample not be selected on the basis of lack of success. If, in other words, we had selected the sample on an income criterion, we would have excluded youths who have made good even though they were raised in a poor environment. We would then have been unable to compare these youths with the less successful poor.

Having decided on an areal definition of poverty for the pilot study, we established as the universe for our sample those poor youths aged sixteen through nineteen living in census tracts where the median family income is below $4,000.

The Sample Design

A search of the literature suggested that it would be important to control sex, age, race, region, and type of place in drawing a sample from the universe of poor youths defined above. We decided on the following controls:

1. Sex: In order to allow more detailed analysis of males the sample was 60 per cent male.

2. Age: The range established (sixteen through nineteen) was a compromise. On the one hand, the fewer age groups the better, from the point of view of controlling age in the analysis. On the other hand, the cost of locating a sample rises rapidly as the range of eligible ages narrows.

3. Region and type of place: Basing our estimates on 1960 census data, we decided that poor families were distributed approximately as indicated in Table I.1.[1] Since we lacked the funds to sample each type of place we omitted "other urban"

TABLE I.1

APPROXIMATE PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF POOR FAMILIES BY REGION, RACE, AND TYPE OF PLACE, 1960

Region	Race	Type of Place			Total
		Urban-ized	Other Urban	Rural	
North	White	16.3%	7.7%	15.4%	39.4%
North	Non-white . .	6.8	.9	2.4	10.1
South	White	7.0	5.3	15.4	27.7
South	Non-white . .	5.8	4.4	12.6	22.8
Total		35.9%	18.3%	45.8%	100.0%

areas (towns of 2,500 to 25,000 population) and sampled at the extremes--that is, large urban and rural areas. About 82 per cent of the poor live in these two types of communities. We decided further to sample the extremes among urban areas and

[1] It should be pointed out that these census data are based on a family income definition of poverty rather than an areal definition such as the one used in this study.

limited ourselves to the largest cities only. On this basis, we chose a factorial design: a large northern city, a large southern city, a northern rural area, and a southern rural area. A representative of each type of place was selected at random from among locations in NORC's regular national sample. The selections were the Bronx, Baltimore, Jackson County, Kansas, and Jasper County, South Carolina.

4. Race: Although about two-thirds of poor youths are white, we sampled equal numbers of Negroes and whites in order to assure sufficient Negro cases for analysis. In the analysis, each white youth is given a weight of two in order to restore approximately correct population proportions.

This procedure did not, however, give correct population proportions. Within our sample, based on an areal definition of poverty, race is strongly related to individual poverty level. If individual poverty is measured by the index defined in detail at the beginning of Chapter II, the segment of our weighted sample classified as "poor" is 52 per cent Negro. The segment of the weighted sample above this "poverty line" is only 26 per cent Negro. This occurred despite the fact that the proportion of Negroes in the weighted sample matches the population proportion as defined by the census data. In other words, a Negro living in a poor neighborhood is more likely to be poor himself than is a white living in the same neighborhood.

Table I.2 shows the distribution of the sample by type of community, region, and race. The last column is taken from Table I.1 and gives the distribution of poor families in the 1960 census data, repercentaged to exclude the "other urban" category. In addition to oversampling Negroes we also oversampled, by design, the urban areas--particularly northern. Our sample is 64 per cent urban, compared with 45 per cent urban among all poor persons living in large urban or rural areas.

TABLE I.2

DISTRIBUTION OF POOR YOUTH SAMPLE AND APPROXIMATE 1960 DISTRIBUTION OF POOR FAMILIES BY TYPE OF PLACE, REGION, AND RACE

Place	Region	Race	Actual N	Weighted N	Weighted Per Cent	Poor Families (Per Cent)
Urbanized	North	White	128	256	31.3%	20.0%
Urbanized	North	Negro	111	111	13.6	8.3
Urbanized	South	White	36	72	8.8	8.6
Urbanized	South	Negro	88	88	10.8	7.1
Rural	North	White	49	98	12.0	18.8
Rural	North	Negro	-	-	-	2.9
Rural	South	White	48	96	11.7	18.8
Rural	South	Negro	97	97	11.9	15.4
Subtotal.			557[a]	818[a]	100.1%	99.9%
Excluded (Indians). .			4	4	-	-
Total.			561	822	100.1%	99.9%[b]

[a]Includes two (weighted = four) Orientals classified as white.

[b]Based on 81.7 per cent of poor families, namely those living in urbanized or in rural areas, the remainder (18.3 per cent) live in "other urban" areas.

But it is not our intention in the pilot study to make precise estimates of any population parameters. Since we intend only to gain preliminary and approximate information, the sample is adequate.

The Control Group

One major purpose of the preliminary analysis is to construct a profile of poor youths. Who are they? What is their

situation? What are their values and aspirations? What experiences are they subject to? To make this information more meaningful, a group of youths who do not live in poor environments was sampled for comparison. The sample was drawn from youths aged sixteen through nineteen in census tracts in the Bronx and Baltimore where median family income is over $4,000. Ninety respondents were interviewed--sixty-seven in the Bronx and twenty-three in Baltimore--to make up this control group.

This sample is not representative of American youth living in well-to-do neighborhoods, but rather represents only white youths in these two cities. Nonetheless, the control group gives us some basis for distinguishing the characteristics of poor youths from those of youths in general.

Our interview schedule contained, for example, several items measuring negative self-image. One such item is the self-descriptive adjective, "mean." Twenty-six per cent of poor youths in poor neighborhoods said they had felt they were "mean" at some time during the previous few weeks. One might be tempted to view this as a high incidence of negative self-image were it not for the fact that 28 per cent of non-poor youths in the control group gave the same response. (As we shall see in Chapter III, the incidence of negative self-image is no higher among poor youths than among non-poor youths in our samples. This suggests that the level of self-evaluation, whether it be considered high or low, is a characteristic of youth in general and not of the poor alone.)

Sampling Techniques

The samples drawn for the pilot study were modified block samples. Within our locations, census tracts (rural counties) meeting the income criteria were selected at random, and within census tracts blocks were selected at random for screening by

our interviewers. Interviewers, beginning at randomly selected locations in the block, proceeded from house to house according to a set pattern, with instructions to interview any youth meeting the age, sex, and race criteria established by the sample design. "Call-backs" were used when necessary in order to interview all youths thus located. Interviewers were permitted to fill their quotas through continued screening only if it seemed unlikely that an interview could be secured after one call-back. Interviewing was begun in November, 1966, and completed early in January, 1967.

Interview Schedule

The interview schedule was designed to elicit a wide variety of information, much of it concerning variables that previous studies have shown to be related to staying in school or having a job and that speculative writers have suggested to be related to school attendance or employment. A copy of the interview schedule is shown in Appendix I.

The Findings

In Chapter II, the profile of poor youths is presented. The background, socioeconomic characteristics, and experiences of poor youths are described in detail. Chapter III compares the values of poor and more well-to-do youths and considers evidence on whether the concept of a "culture of poverty" is meaningful. In Chapter IV we examine the factors that are related to staying in school and having a job. In Chapter V materials pertaining directly to the federal antipoverty programs for youth are presented, including information on exposure, interest, and Neighborhood Youth Corps participation.

CHAPTER II

A PROFILE OF POOR YOUTH

The Measurement of Poverty

In this chapter and in the one to follow respondents are classified in two ways--according to whether they live in poor or in more well-to-do environments, and according to whether they themselves are poor. The purpose of this dual classification is to make some preliminary assessment of the effects of living in an environment of poverty as distinct from the effects of simply being poor. On the one hand, it may be the case that, given sufficient income, the debilitating aspects of an environment of poverty can be overcome. On the other hand, it is often argued that living in an environment of poverty is debilitating regardless of whether one is individually poor or not. By looking at the simultaneous effects of individual level and environmental level characteristics, we hope to provide preliminary clarification of this question.

Our sample of youths living in census tracts or rural counties where the median family income is below $4,000 was considered to be living in poor neighborhoods, while our sample of white urban youths living in census tracts where the median family income is above $4,000 was considered to be living in more well-to-do neighborhoods.

Although we think that "poverty lines" are arbitrary, if convenient, fictions, we shall nonetheless use one to define individual poverty. The precise level at which such a line is drawn has no substantive importance, but poverty lines are convenient for compiling statistics in discrete rather than con-

tinuous form. We can anticipate that people located just above the line will be very similar to people just below it. However, those at some distance above the line may be expected to differ considerably (in unspecified ways) from those at some distance below it. Poverty in short, is a matter of degree rather than discrete state.

We employ a poverty index involving family income in relation to family size. The rationale for such indexes is that a larger family needs a greater income in order to avoid poverty. One person is considered to be poor if he has less than $1,500 annual income. Two persons are considered to be poor if they have less than $2,000 annual income. We continue adding $500 per person up to eight persons with less than $5,000. Above $5,000, no family is considered to be poor regardless of size.

We shall make comparisons among three groups: (1) youths living in poor neighborhoods who are poor (i.e., who are classified below the poverty line); (2) youths living in poor neighborhoods who are not poor; and (3) youths living in well-to-do neighborhoods who are not poor. The fourth logical group, youths living in well-to-do neighborhoods who are poor, contains too few cases (seventeen) to permit comparisons and has been omitted from the tables.

Interpretations of differences (or lack of differences) among the three groups must be made cautiously because our measures of neighborhood and individual poverty are rather crude. We have not controlled completely for individual level of poverty by using the poverty index. Thus "neighborhood" differences may, to some extent still be due to individual level of poverty. Conversely, a census tract or county may be an imperfect indication of neighborhood or environment. Thus "individual level" differences may be partly due to environmental differences not reflected by our crude measure.

Demographic Characteristics

The reader will recall that location, sex, race, and age were controlled in whole or in part, in the study design. Results for these variables are reported in Table II.1. Among those living in poor neighborhoods, those who are below the "poverty line" are more likely to be located in the South (Baltimore or Jasper County) than are those who are not poor. Since the sample of those living in more well-to-do neighborhoods was restricted to urban youths only, these youths are all located in the Bronx or in Baltimore. The overall proportions in each location are a function of the sample design. Thus, the only substantive finding is that, for those who live in poor neighborhoods, living in the South increases the risk of individual poverty.

Table II.1 also gives the sexual composition of our samples. At the neighborhood level, we oversampled males intentionally. (The sample proportions were 60 per cent male and 40 per cent female.) But sexual composition is still free to vary with individual level of poverty. While 65 per cent of the non-poor in poor neighborhoods are males, only 51 per cent of the poor in poor neighborhoods are males. The reason for this difference is most probably due to the fact that males living in poor neighborhoods are more likely to be employed than are either females or those living in well-to-do neighborhoods. Being employed, the males are less likely to be classified as individually poor.

The sample in well-to-do neighborhoods was limited to whites, as is shown in the third column. Among those in poor neighborhoods, individual level of poverty is strongly related to race; 52 per cent of the poor are Negro, as compared to only 26 per cent Negro in the non-poor group. Thus, even with neighborhood poverty controlled, Negroes are much more likely to be poor than are whites.

TABLE II.1

SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC TRAITS BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL[a]

(Percentage Distribution)

Demographic Trait	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual[b]		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Location:			
Bronx, New York	44%	44%	72%
Baltimore, Maryland	24	18	28
Jackson Co., Kansas	3	18	-
Jasper Co., S.C.	29	20	-
Total	100%	100%	100%
Sex:			
Male	51%	65%	63%
Female	49	35	37
Total	100%	100%	100%
Race:			
White	46%	73%	100%
Negro	52	26	0
Oriental, American Indian	2	0	0
Total	100%	99%	100%
Age:			
16	40%	38%	47%
17	31	32	29
18	16	18	12
19	12	13	12
Total	99%	101%	100%
N = 100%	304	464	68

Total N 836
NA (all on poverty index questions) . 59
Total 895

[a]The sample for this and subsequent tables in this chapter does not include seventeen respondents living in middle class neighborhoods but falling in the "poor" category on the individual poverty index. This "not poor neighborhood/poor individual" category has been omitted because the subsample is too small for percentages to be meaningful. The total N for these tables therefore is 912 - 17, or 895 cases.

[b]Individual poverty level was determined by a combination of family size and income (see text).

Among the poor, 40 per cent are age sixteen, 31 per cent age seventeen, 16 per cent age eighteen, and 12 per cent age nineteen. The age distributions for the other sample groups are not very different from the distribution for the poor. The sample of youths in well-to-do neighborhoods is slightly younger. Apparently, our sampling procedures underrepresent those in the older age groups in all samples. The reasons for this are not completely clear.

In sum, the poor, as compared to the non-poor living in poor environments, are more likely to be southern, to be female, and to Negro. Other location, sex, race, and age characteristics of our samples are specified by the study design.

Socioeconomic Characteristics

Table II.2 gives the percentage distributions of the three samples by family income and family size. Family income and family size are the variables that were used in constructing the index of individual level of poverty. Two points are worthy of note in these tables. First, the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods are somewhat more well-to-do than are the non-poor in poor neighborhoods. In other words, our crude dichotomy into poor and non-poor groups does not completely control for the effects of individual level of poverty. Thus, when we consider neighborhood differences in subsequent analysis, the reader is cautioned that these differences may in part be a function of incompletely controlled individual-level differences. In particular, if we find a fairly large individual difference and a small neighborhood difference, we might expect that the small neighborhood difference would disappear with a better control for individual poverty.

The second point worthy of note is that while both family income and family size contribute to the poverty index, income

TABLE II.2

INCOME AND FAMILY SIZE BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL[a]

(Percentage Distribution)

Family Income and Size	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Current annual family income:			
Under $3,000	67%	4%	0%
$3,000 - 4,999	33	24	18
$5,000 - 6,999	0	34	28
$7,000 and over	0	38	54
Total	100%	100%	100%
N = 100%	276	464	68
Total N	808		
NA	87		
Total	895		
Current family size including respondent:			
0 - 3	10%	23%	29%
4 - 5	30	42	60
6 - 7	30	22	9
8 or more	30	13	2
Total	100%	100%	100%
N = 100%	304	464	68
Total N	836		
NA	59		
Total	895		

[a]It should be noted that family size and income enter into the determination of the individual poverty index.

is by far the more important of the two factors. This is shown by the fact that family income is much more strongly related to the poverty index than is family size. In other words, the poverty index weights income much more heavily than it does family size.

Table II.3 shows the employment and labor force status of the fathers of youths in our samples. Among the poor in poor neighborhoods, 74 per cent have fathers who are employed, 10 per cent have fathers who are unemployed, and 15 per cent have fathers who are not in the labor force because of illness, disability, or for other reasons. The non-poor in poor neighborhoods are considerably more likely to have employed fathers (94 per cent) and correspondingly less likely to have unemployed fathers (2 per cent) or fathers who are out of the labor market (4 per cent).

Surprisingly, non-poor youths in non-poor neighborhoods are somewhat less likely to have fathers who are employed than are non-poor youths in poor neighborhoods. In view of the relatively small number of cases (sixty-three) upon which this percentage is based, it is quite possible that this unexpected finding is due to sampling error.

About half of the poor youths are in families currently receiving public assistance; only about one-third (36 per cent) have never received it. This experience differs markedly from that of the non-poor. Among those non-poor in poor neighborhoods, only 8 per cent are currently receiving assistance, and 79 per cent have never received it. Those non-poor who do not live in poor neighborhoods are least likely to have public assistance experience. Only 3 per cent of this group report currently receiving assistance, and the overwhelming majority (94 per cent) report never having received it. It thus appears that those living in an environment of poverty are more likely to have received assistance at one time or another, regardless of whether they are

TABLE II.3

FATHER'S EMPLOYMENT AND WELFARE STATUS BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Father's Employment and Welfare Status	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Father's current activity:			
At work	74%	94%	84%
Unemployed	10	2	6
Other	15	4	10
Total	99%	100%	100%
N = 100%	239	399	63
Total N	701		
NA, DNA	194		
Total	895		
Father's welfare history:			
Never on aid	36%	79%	94%
Have been on aid	15	13	4
On aid now	48	8	3
Total	99%	101%	101%
N = 100%	298	460	68
Total N	826		
NA	69		
Total	895		

currently poor or not. This suggests that those non-poor who live in poor neighborhoods are more likely to have experienced poverty at some time in the past than are their non-poor counterparts in well-to-do neighborhoods.

Further indicators of family socioeconomic status are shown in Table II.4. Among the poor youths in our sample, a third (32 per cent) have fathers who did not go beyond fifth grade. The comparable proportion for non-poor in poor neighborhoods is 10 per cent, and in non-poor neighborhoods 4 per cent. Among the poor, only 19 per cent have fathers who are high school graduates, while among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods 36 per cent have fathers who are high school graduates, and among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods 59 per cent have fathers who completed high school.

A further indication of substantial socioeconomic status differences among the samples is given by the data on father's occupation. The poor and, to a lesser extent, the non-poor living in poor neighborhoods, are relatively more likely to have fathers employed in semiskilled or unskilled labor, farm labor, or service occupations, and relatively less likely to have fathers employed in any of the white collar occupations. Only 13 per cent of fathers of the poor are white collar workers, while 21 per cent of fathers of non-poor in poor neighborhoods and 33 per cent of fathers of non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods are white collar workers. All this suggests that poor youths and, to a lesser extent, non-poor youths living in poor environments, suffer a substantial disadvantage in terms of family socioeconomic status.

Ethnic and Religious Background

The ethnic and religious composition of our samples is in large part of function of the particular neighborhoods and areas

TABLE II.4

FATHER'S OCCUPATION AND EDUCATION BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INVIDIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Father's Occupation and Education	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Father's education:			
5th grade or less	32%	10%	4%
6th - 8th grade	25	28	18
Some high school	24	25	20
High school graduate	16	25	38
Some college or more	3	11	21
Total	100%	99%	101%
N = 100%	179	351	56
Total N	586		
NA, DNA	309		
Total	895		
Father's occupation:			
Professional, technical	1%	4%	13%
Farmers, farm managers	5	6	-
Managers, proprietors	1	8	7
Clerical	5	5	6
Sales	6	4	7
Craftsmen, foremen	26	26	33
Operatives	14	12	9
Private household	28	27	20
Service	0	0	0
Farm labor	4	1	-
Labor	11	7	4
Total	101%	100%	99%
N = 100%	192	369	54
Total N	615		
NA, DNA	280		
Total	895		

where we did our sampling. These distributions should not be taken as estimates of the ethnic composition of groups in areas of the country other than our sample places. Nonetheless, differences that appear between samples give some indication of the differences that may be anticipated in future studies with more widely representative samples.

Table II.5 gives the ethnic composition, measured using mother's ethnicity, for the white respondents in our samples. Keeping in mind that 44 per cent of our poor neighborhood samples are obtained from the Bronx and that almost three-quarters of our non-poor neighborhood sample are also from the Bronx, we note that among the poor youths, two-thirds (66 per cent) of the white respondents are of Spanish-American background (largely Puerto-Rican). This figure drops to 41 per cent among the non-poor in the same neighborhoods, and to 26 per cent among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods. It is apparent that Spanish-Americans, like Negroes, are much more likely to suffer poverty than are those of other white ethnic backgrounds. Other categories with sufficient case bases to allow separate tabulation are Anglo-Saxon, Irish, and German. The samples do not differ greatly in the proportions in these categories. The sample of non-poor youths in non-poor neighborhoods is, however, disproportionately likely to be classified "other white." This is because of a large number of Jews in non-poor neighborhoods in the Bronx.

Table II.5 also gives the religious composition of the samples. Keeping in mind that the poor living in poor neighborhoods are largely Negroes and Spanish-Americans, we note that 35 per cent of this sample are Baptists, 34 per cent Roman Catholics, 25 per cent belong to other Protestant denominations, 5 per cent report other sects or no religious preference, and none are Jewish.

TABLE II.5

ETHNIC AND RELIGIOUS BACKGROUND BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Ethnic and Religious Background	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Mother's ethnicity:			
Anglo-Saxon	8%	15%	9%
Irish	6	15	9
German	9	16	15
Spanish-American	66	41	26
Other white	11	13	40
Total	100%	100%	99%
N = 100%	106	262	53
Total N	421		
NA, DNA	474		
Total	895		
Religion:			
Baptist	35%	26%	0%
Other Protestant	25	31	18
Roman Catholic	34	38	46
Jewish	0	1	33
Other, none	5	5	3
Total	99%	101%	100%
N = 100%	302	457	67
Total N	826		
NA	69		
Total	895		

Comparing the samples, we note that the poor and those in poor neighborhoods are disproportionately likely to be Protestants, particularly Baptists, and relatively unlikely to be Jewish or Catholic. Two additional points are worth noting. First, if we were to remove the Negroes from the sample, the remainder of the poor sample would be largely Spanish-American and hence Catholic, and Catholics would then tend to be located poor neighborhoods.

Second, fully one-third of the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods are Jewish. Again, this is because this sample is largely from the Bronx. The large proportion of this sample which is Jewish explains why there are fewer Anglo-Saxons, Germans, and Irish than one might have expected in the well-to-do neighborhoods.

Findings on ethnic and religious background should probably be viewed together and taken with extreme caution because of the particular locations from which the samples are drawn. Keeping this limitation in mind, it appears that Negroes, who are almost entirely Protestant, and Spanish-Americans who are almost all Roman Catholic, are especially likely to be poor. Jews are especially unlikely to be poor. Other religious-ethnic combinations are not represented in sufficient numbers in our samples to permit firm assertions about their relative chances of poverty.

Family Structure

Much has been written, mostly of a speculative nature, about the role played by family disorganization in creating or maintaining poverty. We shall see in the present chapter that family structure and relationships are indeed strongly related to poverty and to its environment. In a later chapter we shall consider what relation, if any, family disorganization has to school dropout or employment prospects.

Table II.6 reports the current family composition of youths in our samples. Since less than 4 per cent of youths living in poor neighborhoods, and only 2 per cent of youths living in non-poor neighborhoods, have established their own households, these figures reflect almost entirely the family composition in respondents' families of origin. There are drastic differences in family composition among the samples. Among the poor, less than half (45 per cent) are living in intact families, i.e., in families where both the mother and the father are present. Among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, 68 per cent are living in intact families, and among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods, 81 per cent are living in intact families.

Where the family is not intact, the most common arrangement is for the mother to head the household. Other arrangements are less frequent in all samples. Among the poor youths, 45 per cent are living in intact families, 38 per cent are living with their mothers, and 17 per cent are living in some other arrangement.

Although the relation to individual poverty is stronger, it appears that family composition is related not only to individual poverty but also to living in poor neighborhoods when individual poverty is held constant. The nature of the causal relationship at the neighborhood level is unclear. It may be that living in an environment of poverty causes family disruption even though the family is not itself poor. On the other hand, there is evidence that non-poor families in poor neighborhoods are likely to have been poor at some time in the past; for example, they are more likely to have received public assistance than are those in more well-to-do neighborhoods. Thus, past family disruption and poverty may have forced the family to live in a poor neighborhood.

Even at the individual level, the direction of cause and effect is not completely clear. On the one hand, if the father

TABLE II.6

FAMILY STRUCTURE BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Family Structure	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Per cent currently living with:			
Mother and father	45%	68%	81%
Mother only	38	21	15
Other	17	10	4
Total	100%	99%	100%
N = 100%	304	464	68
Total N	836		
NA	59		
Total	895		
Perceived dominant parent:[a]			
Father	52%	66%	69%
Mother	43	29	21
Other, don't know	5	5	10
Total	100%	100%	100%
N = 100%	304	464	67
Total N	835		
NA	60		
Total	895		
Respected parent:[a]			
Father	23%	33%	54%
Mother	54	41	21
Other, don't know	23	26	25
Total	100%	100%	100%
N = 100%	304	462	67
Total N	833		
NA	62		
Total	895		

[a]"Father" and "mother" categories include substitute-parents such as step-parents and foster parents.

has left the family, it seems likely that the family will be poorer as a result. On the other hand, if the father is not earning a good living and as a result the family is poor, he may leave for that reason. It is entirely possible that family disorganization is both a cause and an effect of poverty. Our present cross-sectional data are insufficient to disentangle these various possibilities.

Table II.6 also presents respondents' perceptions of the dominant parent in their households when they were growing up. For those who lived with a family other than their own parents, the answer refers to the persons who acted as father and mother.

Among the poor youths, 52 per cent report that the father (or father-substitute) was the dominant figure. The comparable proportions for non-poor youths in poor neighborhoods and non-poor youths in non-poor neighborhoods are 66 per cent and 69 per cent, respectively. It thus appears that those who are individually poor are less likely to perceive their fathers as the dominant figure, but that living in a poor environment has no effect, in itself, upon this perception.

The parent or parent-substitute respected most by the respondent is also related to poverty at both the individual and the neighborhood levels. Among the poor, 23 per cent respect their fathers most, while among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods 33 per cent respect their fathers most. Among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods 54 per cent respect their fathers most. Although the data are not presented, answers to the questions on perceived dominant parent and on respected parent are not related to sex. Thus, females are about as likely to respect their fathers as are males, and a control for sex would not appreciably affect the findings.

Is the greater degree of family disorganization among the poor due to the fact that the poor are likely to be Negro with

the crucial factor in family disorganization being race rather than poverty? Or is family disorganization among Negroes due simply to the effects of poverty, with the crucial factor in family disorganization being poverty and not race? Table II.7 helps to clarify this question. Family composition is cross-tabulated simultaneously by poverty level and by race for youths living in poor neighborhoods. The result is more complicated than either of the above simple formulations would suggest. It appears that both race and poverty level are relevant to family composition but only under specific circumstances. First, among the poor, race appears to have no effect on family structure. Poor white families are as likely to be disorganized as are poor Negro families. Among the non-poor, however, race does appear to have an effect, with white families more likely to be intact than Negro families.

TABLE II.7

FAMILY STRUCTURE BY POVERTY LEVEL AND RACE AMONG YOUTHS IN POOR NEIGHBORHOODS

(Per Cent Currently Living with Both Father and Mother)

Individual Poverty	Race	
	White	Negro
Not poor	76 (340)	47 (122)
Poor	43 (140)	48 (158)

Another way to put the finding is to note that there is a statistical interaction or "specification" in the effects of race and poverty level upon family structure. Well-to-do whites appear very likely to have intact families (76 per cent), while

all the other three groups appear about equally disorganized, with from 43 to 48 per cent reporting families intact. In still other words, the effects of race and poverty upon family structure are not independent, nor do the effects of one explain the effects of the other. Rather, the only combination of characteristics that provides any protection against family disorganization is being both non-poor and white. These data suggest that explanations of family disorganization as caused by Negro culture or Negro family experience during slavery are wrong, and that the causes are of a socioeconomic nature and rather complex character.

These data provide some support for the notion that poor families are more likely to have a matriarchical structure than are well-to-do families. Fathers are more likely to have left the families among the poor and, when they have not left, they are somewhat less likely to be seen as the dominant figure and are considerably less likely to be respected. These tendencies also characterize to some extent those living in poor neighborhoods who are not poor. Further research is needed to specify the reasons for this substantial degree of family disorganization among the poor.

Educational Experiences

Table II.8 shows the educational status and level of the youths in our samples. Among poor youths in poor neighborhoods 71 per cent are currently attending school, 9 per cent are out of school after completing high school, and 20 per cent have dropped out of high school. The non-poor in poor environments are not very different in these respects. They are slightly less likely to have dropped out of high school, but not by much. The non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods differ considerably from those living in poor neighborhoods. Among these young people, 85 per

TABLE II.8

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Educational Level	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
In school	71%	74%	85%
Finished 8th grade or less	9	3	6
9th grade	19	12	10
10th grade	25	28	24
11th grade	16	21	30
12th grade or in college	2	10	15
Dropped out	20	16	7
After 8th grade or less	10	5	0
9th grade	4	5	7
10th grade	3	3	0
11th grade	3	3	0
Out of school, finished high school or some college	9	10	7
Total	100%	100%	99%
N = 100%	298	460	67

Total N 825

NA 70

Total 895

cent are in school, 7 per cent are out after high school completion, and only 7 per cent have dropped out of high school. Differences in educational status thus appear to be largely an effect of neighborhood environment rather than individual poverty. It may well be that the crucial environmental unit is the school. Those who are attending schools in poor neighborhoods are more likely to drop out of school, regardless of individual level of poverty, while those living in more well-to-do neighborhoods are more likely to remain in school. The reasons are unclear but could stem simply from differences in the quality of the schooling or perhaps from differing school policies concerning dropouts.

Two additional points regarding educational level are worth noting. First, the poor and, to a lesser extent the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, have not attained as high an educational level as the more well-to-do in better neighborhoods. This is not due to age differences, since those in well-to-do neighborhoods are actually somewhat younger, but rather, as we shall see, to the fact that the poor experience failure more often. Second, it appears that the poor not only drop out of school more often but also drop out earlier (notably at eighth grade or below) than do the more well-to-do.

Table II.9 shows marked differences among the samples in the type of educational program pursued in high school. Only 19 per cent of the poor report a college preparatory program, while 32 per cent of the non-poor in poor neighborhoods report college preparation, and fully 60 per cent of the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods report a college preparatory program. It is notable that the neighborhood difference is considerably stronger than the difference by individual level of poverty. The crucial environmental unit again may be the school. The poor report a trade course of study more often than does any other group. It

TABLE II.9

TYPE OF EDUCATION BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Type of Education	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
High school courses:			
General	26%	28%	15%
College prep	19	32	60
Trade	34	17	3
Business	21	21	16
Other	2	2	6
Total	102%[a]	100%	100%
N = 100%	269	440	67
Total N	776		
NA	119		
Total	895		
Per cent having received some vocational education	26 (304)	27 (464)	22 (68)
Total N	836		
NA	59		
Total	895		

[a]Greater than 100 per cent because of rounding.

may well be that schools in poor neighborhoods function primarily to prepare students for blue collar occupations, while schools in more well-to-do neighborhoods function primarily to prepare students for college. We underline again that these differences in educational experience are primarily neighborhood differences and not differences in the individual poverty level of the young people involved.

Table II.9 also shows that the samples do not differ substantially in the proportions who report having received some vocational education or trade training. Among the poor 26 per cent report such training, among non-poor in poor neighborhoods 27 per cent, and among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods 22 per cent. While this may appear to contradict the findings of the previous table, it is important to note that the vocational education received can be for a wide variety of jobs, including white collar, and need not have been received in high school.

Table II.10 reports, for the combined sample of all those living in poor neighborhoods, the sources of vocational education reported by those who had received some vocational education. The most common source is vocational or trade school. This source is mentioned by 41 per cent of the respondents. The next most frequent source is high school (33 per cent), followed by on-the-job training (13 per cent), business or commercial school (8 per cent), government manpower training programs (3 per cent), and colleges (2 per cent). A variety of other sources are reported by 8 per cent of the respondents having received training. By far the most important sources of vocational training are thus schools--primarily vocational schools, but also vocational programs in high schools.

Table II.11 reports the results of a ten-item vocabulary test used to assess the "general intelligence" of our sample

TABLE II.10

SOURCES OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FOR YOUTH LIVING IN POOR NEIGHBORHOODS

(Per Cent of Those Who Have Received Some Vocational Training)

Source of Training	Per Cent
Vocational or trade school	41%
High school	33
On-the-job training program	13
Business or commercial school	8
Government manpower training program	3
College	2
Company training course	0
Other	8
Total	108%[a]
N	213
DNA	682
Total	895

[a]Percentages total more than 100 due to multiple answers.

groups.[1] The term "general intelligence" is used here in a technical sense. Specifically, we mean the "general factor" in an intelligence test. Since intelligence tests are heavily verbal in content, the technically best short test one can use is a vocabulary test. It has been shown that a vocabulary test is more highly correlated with scores on the general factor than is any alternative short test.

[1]This test is adapted from John B. Miner, Intelligence in the United States (New York: Springer Publishing Company, 1957).

TABLE II.11

ACADEMIC SUCCESS BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Academic Success	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
General intelligence (10-item vocabulary test score):			
0-2	18%	11%	3%
3-4	40	24	13
5	22	22	12
6-7	17	37	57
8-10	4	6	15
Total	101%	100%	100%
Usual grades in school:			
F	4%	4%	0%
D	10	4	6
C	38	34	32
B	40	48	52
A	8	10	10
Total	100%	100%	100%
Per cent having failed one or more grades	49	30	19
N = 100%	304	464	68

Total N 836
NA 59
Total 895

Neither this, nor any other vocabulary test, can be construed as measuring innate intelligence. Moreover, there is little if any justification for viewing it as a test of aptitude rather than one of achievement or past learning. While such a test in part measures aptitude, it also measures past learning experience. Past learning experience, in turn, is in part a product of formal education and in part a product of cultural experience.

Table II.11 shows sizable differences among the samples in the distribution of scores on this test. On a scale from zero through ten, 21 per cent of the poor score six or higher, while 43 per cent of the non-poor in poor neighborhoods and 72 per cent of the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods score six or higher. These large score differences by sample are in some part due to the fact that there are more Spanish-American youths among the poor. Since English may not be a native language for many of these young people, the test is clearly "culturally biased" against them.

Nonetheless, the differences at both the individual and the environmental levels appear to be substantial. One possible explanation for the environmental difference may be a lower quality of education in schools located in poor neighborhoods, which could lead to lower vocabulary test scores for young people there, quite apart from the effects of being poor.

Results for two indicators of success in school--self-reported grades and experience of failing one or more grades--are also shown in the table. Grades appear to be related to poverty at the individual level, although there is by no means a large relation, and there is almost no relation at the neighborhood level once individual poverty is controlled. Among the poor, 48 per cent report usually having received A's or B's. The comparable proportion for the non-poor in poor neighborhoods is 58

per cent, and for the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods it is 62 per cent.

There is a substantial relation between experiences of failure and both individual and neighborhood poverty. About half (49 per cent) of the poor report failing at least one grade while about one-third (30 per cent) of non-poor in poor neighborhoods and only one-fifth (19 per cent) of the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods report this experience. In general, these findings show what has long been known--that the poor, and to a lesser extent the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, fare substantially less well in the educational system than do the more well-to-do.

Table II.12 presents results for two indicators of social adjustment to school life. These are participation in extracurricular activities and perceived closeness to the center of student activities. The differences among our samples are not very large on either of these indicators. There is a slight relation between extracurricular activities and poverty at the individual level, with the more well-to-do more likely to report participation. The poor in poor neighborhoods and the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods appear equally likely to perceive themselves as being close to the center of activities, while the non-poor in poor neighborhoods appear more likely to perceive themselves as close to the center of activities than do either of the other groups.

Table II.13 presents data on the educational aspirations of our respondents and on the aspirations that they perceive certain relatives and acquaintances to have for them. Respondents were asked, "How far would you like to go in school (if you could go back)?" In an earlier part of the interview they were asked, with respect to a list of five relevant persons, "How far does (he/she) want you to go in school?" Although the

TABLE II.12

PARTICIPATION IN EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Extracurricular Participation	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Per cent belonging to one or more clubs or athletic teams while in school	47 (304)	58 (464)	56 (68)
Total N	836		
NA	59		
Total	895		
Perceived relation to "center of student activities":			
Pretty close	41%	51%	42%
A little outside	36	32	37
Completely outside	21	17	21
Don't know	1	0	0
Total	99%	100%	100%
N = 100%	304	464	67
Total N	835		
NA	60		
Total	895		

TABLE II.13

EDUCATIONAL ASPIRATIONS OF RESPONDENT AND THOSE AROUND HIM BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Per Cent Wanting Respondent at Least To Complete College)

Educational Aspiration	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Respondent	39% (297)[a]	55% (456)	66% (67)
Father	35 (216)	52 (377)	66 (62)
Mother	33 (287)	54 (449)	65 (65)
Older sibling	28 (142)	49 (209)	79 (24)
Admired acquaintance	36 (229)	56 (366)	75 (59)
Best friend	30 (224)	52 (362)	76 (41)

[a] ( ) = Base N for percentage. Total base N varies for each row because of exclusion of "does not apply" and "no answer" codes.

results are not reported here, the answers to all these questions are extremely highly correlated with one another, suggesting a single dimension of psychological reality.

The answers to these questions differ substantially by poverty at both the individual and the neighborhood levels. For example, 39 per cent of the poor respondents report that they would like to complete college while 55 per cent of the non-poor in poor neighborhoods and 66 per cent of the non-poor in

non-poor neighborhoods report this level of aspiration. Differences of similar magnitude appear for the respondents' perceptions of fathers' and mothers' attitudes. Even larger differences appear at the neighborhood level, along with differences of similar magnitude at the individual level for perceptions of the attitudes of older siblings, admired acquaintances, and best friends.

Comparing across rows in Table II.13 we see that in general the level of aspiration does not vary by the person whose attitude is being considered, i.e., the respondent's levels of aspiration are not much higher or lower than those that he perceives parents, siblings, and acquaintances as having for him. The non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods may provide an exception to this generalization. There is some suggestion, although the case bases are small, that this group perceives higher aspirations for them among siblings, admired acquaintances, and friends, than they do among parents.

The relation of aspirations (and other values) to poverty level will be further explored in a subsequent chapter. For the present, it is worth noting the high degree of perceived consistency among the several relevant persons in the youth's environment and the strong relation this has to his own level of aspiration. It is impossible to tell from our present data whether these findings reflect an objective assessment by a young person of others' aspirations for him or whether the findings are simply a matter of distortion of perception. In any event, these matters ought to be explored further in the larger study to follow.

In summary, our findings suggest substantial differences in educational experience between the poor and the more well-to-do. These differences generally are as strong or stronger at the neighborhood or environmental level than they are at the

individual level. Poor youths and those in poor environments are more likely to have dropped out of high school, less likely to be currently attending school, less likely to have had a college preparatory course of study, and more likely to have had trade training instead. They score lower on a test of general intelligence, are more likely to have experienced failure in the educational system, and have lower educational aspirations.

Little originality is claimed for these findings; they have been documented in many previous studies. Two points, however, seem worthy of special attention. First, the differences in type of course pursued in high school are drastic. The implication that youths in poor neighborhoods are being funneled into vanishing blue collar jobs while youths in well-to-do neighborhoods are being funneled into colleges is a matter for serious policy consideration at the level of the school system.

The second point, which is related to the first, concerns the substantial neighborhood differences in educational experience which appear with individual poverty level controlled. A likely explanation is that attending school in a poor neighborhood is a debilitating experience regardless of what individual social characteristics the young person may bring with him to that school. Although we have no direct data on school variations in the quality of educational experiences, our indirect data suggest that the effects upon educational experience of attending an inferior school are more pervasive than are the effects of coming from a poverty-stricken background.

Employment Experiences

Table II.14 shows the current labor force and employment status of the young people in our samples. Among the poor 26 per cent are currently in the labor force (i.e., either employed or not employed and looking for work), 61 per cent are in school

TABLE II.14

LABOR FORCE PARTICIPATION AND UNEMPLOYMENT BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Labor Force Participation and Unemployment	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Labor force membership:			
In school and not working . . .	61%	55%	68%
Not in school, not in labor force (housekeeping, other) .	13	8	3
In labor force	26	37	29
Total	100%	100%	100%
N = 100%	304	464	68
Total N 836			
NA 59			
Total 895			
Per cent of those in labor force who are unemployed	16 (79)	9 (172)	5 (20)
Total N 271			
DNA 565			
NA 59			
Total 895			

and not working, and 13 per cent are neither in school nor in the labor force. The non-poor in poor neighborhoods differ from the poor in that they are more likely to be in the labor force (37 per cent) and less likely to be either in school without working (55 per cent) or out of both school and the labor force (8 per cent). The greater labor force participation of this group helps to explain why they are not poor--their earnings help to place the family above the poverty line. The non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods have about the same proportion (29 per cent) in the labor force as do the poor, but more are in school without working (68 per cent), and fewer are neither in school nor in the labor force (3 per cent). It is apparent that the sources of family income for the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods differ somewhat from the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, with youths in poor neighborhoods contributing a relatively greater share of the family income. The unemployment rates for those in the labor force are 16 per cent among the poor, 9 per cent among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, and 5 per cent among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods.

Table II.15 shows that three-fourths of the poor have had a job at some time. Among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods a similar proportion (74 per cent) have had jobs. The non-poor in poor neighborhoods, however, are more likely (85 per cent) to have had a job than either of the other groups. Those living in poor neighborhoods received their initial employment experience at an earlier age than those living in more well-to-do neighborhoods. Economic necessity probably forces those in a poor environment to seek work at an earlier age. Within the poor neighborhoods, however, those who are not individually poor are likely to have started work at an earlier age than those who are poor. Earlier labor market entry for this group has probably helped to put their families above the poverty line. Among the

TABLE II.15

JOB EXPERIENCE BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Job Experience	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Per cent ever employed	75 (304)	85 (464)	74 (68)
Total N	836		
NA	59		
Total	895		
Age at time of first employment (per cent of those ever employed):			
13 or younger	16%	25%	12%
14	13	18	14
15	18	19	14
16	31	26	40
17 - 19	22	12	40
Total	100%	100%	100%
N = 100%	228	393	50
Total N	671		
NA, DNA	224		
Total	895		

non-poor in poor neighborhoods, 62 per cent of those ever employed had first worked before they were sixteen; for the poor 47 per cent held their first job before they were sixteen; among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods with employment experience, only 20 per cent had worked before they were sixteen.

Table II.16 gives information on the earning and employment stability experience of our samples. Among those poor who are currently working, less than a third (31 per cent) report earning as much as sixty dollars per week. Curiously enough, the non-poor in poor neighborhoods who are currently working are not earning any more than the poor. Of this group only 27 per cent report earning as much as sixty dollars per week. There are two few working among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods to yield reliable earning distribution figures for this group.

While they do not appear to earn more when working, the non-poor in poor neighborhoods work more weeks in a year than do the poor. Among the poor who have had employment experience, 62 per cent worked less than thirteen weeks in the past year and only 19 per cent worked more than twenty-six weeks, while for the non-poor in poor neighborhoods with employment experience, 45 per cent worked less than thirteen weeks and 30 per cent worked more than twenty-six weeks. The non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods who have employment experience fall between the other two groups with respect to number of weeks worked. Of these, 58 per cent worked less than thirteen weeks and 28 per cent worked more than twenty-six weeks.

Considering the total income of the respondents themselves, 79 per cent of the poor youths reported earning less than $500 in the past year, and only 10 per cent reported earning more than $1,000. The non-poor in poor neighborhoods earned slightly more, as a result of working more, with 67 per cent earning less than $500 and 15 per cent earning more than $1,000. The non-

TABLE II.16

CURRENT EARNINGS AND YEARLY INCOME BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INVIDIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Current Earnings and Yearly Income	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Current weekly earnings (per cent of those now employed):			
$ 0 - $20	18%	29%	[16%][a]
$20 - $40	22	24	[26]
$40 - $60	29	20	[16]
$60 - $80	29	16	[21]
$80 - $100	2	4	[11]
Over $100	0	7	[11]
Total	100%	100%	101%
N = 100%	65	153	19
Total N	237		
NA, DNA	658		
Total	895		
Total weeks worked last year (per cent of those ever employed):			
None	8%	8%	8%
1 - 13	54	37	50
14 - 26	20	25	14
27 - 39	9	10	2
39 - 52	10	20	26
Total	101%	100%	100%
N = 100%	228	393	50
Total N	671		
NA, DNA	224		
Total	895		
Total yearly income of respondent (per cent of all respondents):			
Under $500	79%	67%	78%
$500 - $999	12	18	9
$1,000 - $1,999	7	8	4
$2,000 - $3,999	3	4	7
Over $4,000	0	3	2
Total	101%	100%	100%
N = 100%	297	452	68
Total N	817		
NA	78		
Total	895		

[a]Base N insufficient to support these percentages.

poor in non-poor neighborhoods did not, personally, have as high incomes as the non-poor in poor neighborhoods. In fact, the income distribution for this group is much like the income distribution for the poor.

The explanation for our findings on employment and earnings experience is probably that those living in well-to-do neighborhoods are less likely to need, and hence to seek, employment because they are adequately supported by their parents. In the poor neighborhoods, however, young people probably are more often forced to seek employment out of economic necessity. Those living in poor neighborhoods who are not poor tend to be above the poverty line in part because of their own success in finding employment. These young people thus contribute a larger proportion of the total family income than do either the poor or the non-poor in well-to-do neighborhoods.

Table II.17 shows the occupation of most recent employment for those in our samples who have employment experience. Among the poor, 35 per cent were employed in white collar occupations and 65 per cent in blue collar occupations. The white collar employment was largely clerical (24 per cent), followed by sales (9 per cent). The most common blue collar employment was service (20 per cent), followed by semi-skilled operatives (15 per cent), and unskilled labor (12 per cent). The occupational distribution of the non-poor in poor neighborhoods is practically identical to that of the poor. Occupational experience thus does not seem to differ for these two groups.

However, the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods do differ in their occupational experience from those living in poor neighborhoods. These young people were much more likely to be employed in white collar occupations (71 per cent), notably clerical (42 per cent), and less likely to be employed in any of the blue collar occupations. It should be noted that this environmental

TABLE II.17

MOST RECENT OCCUPATION BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Per Cent of Those Ever Employed)

Most Recent Occupation	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Professional, technical	3%	5%	14%
Farmer, manager	0	1	0
Manager, proprietor	1	1	2
Clerical	24	29	42
Sales	9	4	16
Craftsman, foreman	7	7	0
Operative	15	16	8
Private household	6	1	0
Service	20	21	14
Farm labor	4	6	0
Labor	12	10	4
Total	101%	101%	100%
N = 100%	217	378	50

Total N 645
NA, DNA 250
Total . . . 895

difference is not due to race, since both whites and Negroes living in poor neighborhoods have about the same occupational distributions. It is clear from this and indications previously mentioned that the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods are higher in socioeconomic status than are the non-poor in poor neighborhoods.

How do young people find their jobs? Table II.18 gives the source from which the respondent reported first hearing about his most recent job. The most frequent source was friends, mentioned by 35 per cent of the sample. Next was relatives mentioned by 26 per cent, followed by direct application (14 per cent), and teachers (12 per cent). On the whole, these results are not surprising, since many past studies have shown that most jobs are obtained through friends and relatives and that next to friends and relatives, direct application is the most common source. The fact that teachers are mentioned as the job source by 12 per cent of our sample is somewhat unexpected. Teachers appear to

TABLE II.18

SOURCES OF JOBS FOR YOUTH LIVING IN POOR NEIGHBORHOODS
(Per Cent of Those Ever Employed)

Job Source	Per Cent Poor Sample
Heard of from relative	26%
Heard of from friend	35
Applied directly	14
Public employment office	3
Private employment agency. . . .	1
Heard of from newspaper.	2
Heard of from teacher.	12
Heard of from union.	0
Other.	14
Total	107%[a]
Total N.	662
NA, DNA.	158
Total	820

[a]Totals more than 100 per cent because of multiple answers.

play a fairly important role in finding jobs. They are mentioned far more often than employment agencies or newspapers, for example.

Further information on the job-seeking activities of our respondents is provided in Table II.19. Of those who are not working full time (the overwhelming majority of our samples), including those in school, 20 per cent among the poor say they are looking for a job or for a different job. A comparable proportion (18 per cent) among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods are currently seeking work, but far fewer (5 per cent) of those non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods are seeking work.

While the poor are the most likely to be seeking work, they are the least likely to know where it can be found. Only 15 per cent of the poor say that they know of an available job, while 35 per cent of the non-poor in poor neighborhoods and 38 per cent of the non-poor in well-to-do neighborhoods know of a job opening. These findings provide preliminary support for the notion that while the poor are most in need of information about where there are available jobs, they are least likely to have access to such information. It is often argued that one reason why the poor have difficulty finding work is that they have inadequate information about the characteristics of the labor market. In an effort to obtain a crude measure of information on labor market characteristics we constructed a three-item index of "labor market savvy." The index score consists of the sum of correct answers to the following three questions:

1. In which of these jobs would a person earn closest to $40 a week?

   House painter
   Dish washer
   Auto mechanic
   Policeman

TABLE II.19

SELECTED JOB-SEEKING DATA BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Job-seeking Data	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Per cent of those not working full time but currently looking for a job	20 (259)	18 (388)	5 (58)
Total N	705		
NA, DNA	190		
Total	895		
Per cent of all respondents who know of a job opening right now	15 (302)	35 (464)	38 (68)
Total N	834		
NA	61		
Total	895		
Score on "labor savvy" index (see text):			
0	2%	0%	0%
1	17	13	10
2	34	35	29
3	48	52	60
Total	101%	100%	99%
N = 100%	296	457	68
Total N	821		
NA	74		
Total	895		

2. For which of these jobs must a person be a college graduate?

   Auto salesman
   Bricklayer
   High school teacher
   Insurance agent

3. In which of these jobs is the work most steady?

   Mail carrier
   Coal miner
   Factory laborer
   Machine operator in a factory

Table II.19 shows that among youths living in poor neighborhoods about half answered all three questions correctly regardless of whether they were individually poor or not. However, the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods score slightly higher on the labor market savvy index than do the other two groups. Among these young people, 60 per cent answered all three questions correctly. The differences in labor market savvy from one sample to another could hardly be called impressive, and knowledge about gross labor market characteristics appears to be almost as widespread among the poor as it is among the well-to-do.

The young people in our samples were asked to indicate the occupations that they really expected to be their life's work. Table II.20 reports the distribution of these occupational expectations by poverty of individual and neighborhood. Of those among the poor who expressed a definite expectation, 59 per cent expected to obtain white collar jobs, largely professional and technical (29 per cent) or clerical (26 per cent). The remainder of the poor expected to obtain blue collar occupations, largely skilled labor (16 per cent), semi-skilled work (12 per cent), and service work (10 per cent). It is notable that none of the poor expected to be farmers, and only 2 per cent expected to be unskilled laborers or farm laborers.

TABLE II.20

OCCUPATIONAL EXPECTATION BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Expected Occupation	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Professional, technical	29%	48%	52%
Farmer, manager	0	1	0
Manager, proprietor	2	3	5
Clerical	26	18	26
Sales	2	1	2
Craftsman, foreman	16	16	3
Operative	12	6	9
Private household	2	0	0
Service	10	4	2
Farm labor	1	0	0
Labor	1	2	2
Total	101%	99%	101%
N = 100%	258	415	58

Total N 731
No Response 164
Total 895

On the one hand, these expectations appear to be unrealistically high, in the sense that not as many of these young people will ultimately obtain high status jobs as expect to obtain them. On the other hand, compared to the non-poor, the expectations of

the poor are relatively low. Among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, 70 per cent expect white collar jobs, including 48 per cent professional and technical, and among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods, fully 85 per cent expect white collar jobs, including 52 per cent professional or technical. Thus, while the occupational expectations of all groups appear unrealistically high, the poor, and to a lesser extent the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, have substantially lower expectations than do the non-poor in well-to-do neighborhoods. We shall discuss occupational expectations in more detail in a later chapter which deals with the values of poor youths.

Leisure Time Activities

We attempted to measure the character of leisure time activities through the following item:

> We'd like to know about some of the ways young people spend their free time. Here is a list of things that some young people do. I'd like you to tell me for each thing whether you have done that in the last few weeks. Never mind if people think it's good or bad. We just want to know what you really do and we aren't going to tell anyone at all.

There followed a list of twenty-four leisure activities. The respondent was asked simply to indicate "yes" or "no" to each item. This procedure gave the incidence of each activity over a subjectively-defined unit of time in the recent past. No attempt was made to ascertain the frequency or amount of time spent in various activities. Results are not to be interpreted as estimates of the incidence of these activities in any particular population group. We expect, for example, that the subjective time unit, as well as memory, will vary from person to person. We also expect that, for socially disapproved activities, some respondents who report not participating in the specified activity will actually have done so. That is, there

will be some underreporting. Nevertheless, the results will be useful for examining variations from one group to another, or from one time to another, in general patterns of leisure time activity.

In order to increase reliability of measurement and to obtain a better understanding of the social meaning of the various leisure activities, we decided to rely primarily on results for empirically-related clusters of activities rather than results for individual activities considered separately. Clusters are defined by high associations within the cluster and low associations between clusters. They have been named "disapproved activities" (e.g., gamble, night out, smoke), "social activities" (e.g., dance, party), and "athletic activities" (e.g., basketball). Table II.21A reports the associations among the various activities and gives an empirical basis for arranging the activities into clusters or groups of related activities. For example, the association between "gambled" and "stayed out all night" is very high ($\underline{Q}$ = +.74). This means that those who report gambling also tend to report staying out all night. What these items have in common is probably that they are both socially disapproved activities. It is reasonable to assume that a person who reports both these activities has a higher propensity toward disapproved activities than one who reports one only. One who reports one activity only has, in turn, a higher propensity than one who reports none. This type of rationale underlies the construction of the three indexes measuring three different types of activities.

While the clusters are not completely independent of one another, the structure is fairly satisfactory in the sense that almost all associations within clusters are higher than almost any of the associations between clusters. The average associations within the clusters are +.597, +.543, and +.551 for disapproved, athletic, and social activities, respectively. The

TABLE II.21A

MATRIX OF ASSOCIATIONS (Q) AMONG SELECTED LEISURE ACTIVITIES

	Gamble	Night Out	Smoke	Get Drunk	Loiter	Fight	Dance	Party	Date	Go Steady	Basketball	Baseball	Swimming
Disapproved:													
Gamble . .		.74	.60	.70	.67	.51	.08	.15	.34	.41	.11	.38	.32
Night out.			.65	.64	.62	.44	.35	.37	.42	.26	-.01	.03	.08
Smoke . .				.68	.59	.59	.29	.18	.19	.28	-.05	-.16	.06
Get drunk.					.47	.53	.57	.33	.26	.29	-.14	-.09	-.01
Loiter . .						.53	.12	.40	-.04	.31	.31	.22	.21
Fight . .							.53	.32	.18	.27	.03	.26	.45
Social:													
Dance . .								.87	.57	.38	.21	.25	.26
Party . .									.53	.27	.16	.20	.29
Date . . .										.69	-.02	.10	.22
Go steady.											.03	.05	.28
Athletic:													
Basketball												.73	.48
Baseball .													.42
Swimming .													

Average Q among disapproved activities = .597.

Average Q among athletic activities = .543.

Average Q among social activities = .368.

Average Q between social activities and disapproved = .278.

Average Q between social and athletic activities = .169.

Average Q between athletic and disapproved activities= .111.

average association between the disapproved and social clusters is +.278, between the social and athletic clusters +.169, and between the athletic and disapproved activities +.111. Thus, the athletic cluster is practically independent of the other two clusters. There is some tendency, though not a large one, for those who report disapproved activities also to report social activities.

Table II.21B gives the incidence of reported leisure activities by poverty of individual and neighborhood. The results, in general, suggest that leisure activity patterns do not vary substantially by poverty or its environment. Considering, first, the athletic activities: on the average, about a third of each sample group report participating in each sport. Swimming, however, is slightly less popular than basketball or baseball and football. Basketball appears to be somewhat more popular in poor neighborhoods than in non-poor neighborhoods, but this difference is compensated for by the greater popularity of baseball and football in non-poor neighborhoods. The net result is a roughly equal reported incidence of athletic activities from sample to sample. The differences that do appear are probably due to space limitations in poor neighborhoods. Basketball is more suitable in poor neighborhoods since it does not require a large playing area.

The differences from group to group in social activities are minor. For two of the four activities, "party" and "date," the non-poor in poor neighborhoods are slightly more likely to report the activity than either of the other groups. On the average, however, social activities do not differ by poverty or its environment.

The differences from group to group in socially disapproved activities are again minor. Getting drunk and loitering appear to be slightly more popular in well-to-do neighborhoods than they

TABLE II.21B

SELECTED LEISURE ACTIVITIES BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Per Cent Who Have Participated in Specified Activity during Previous Few Weeks)

Leisure Activity	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Athletic:			
Basketball	43%	47%	32%
Baseball	37	43	48
Swimming	20	17	22
Cluster average	33	36	34
Social:			
Went to dance	66	64	68
Went to party	47	57	48
Went on a date	40	58	48
Went steady	34	36	32
Cluster average	47	53	49
Disapproved:			
Gambled	11	8	13[a]
Night out	10	13	18
Smoked	42	43	38
Got drunk	9[a]	10[a]	19
Loitered	13	17	34
Fought	9	12	12
Cluster average	16	17	22
N = 100%	304	464	68
Total N	836		
NA	59		
Total	895		

[a]Because of a few additional "no responses" on these items, the percentages are based on slightly smaller N's than the ones given.

are in poor neighborhoods, the opposite of what one might expect on the basis of stereotypes. Nonetheless, the average result should be considered more reliable, and, in general, the reported incidence of disapproved activities does not vary by poverty of individual or neighborhood.

In sum, patterns of reported leisure time activities appear to be much the same among the poor as they are among the non-poor. These activity patterns do not appear to vary except in minor ways by poverty or its environment.

Self-reports of Health and Medical Care

Table II.22 reports results for three rather crude indicators of medical care and health condition. Respondents were asked when they had most recently seen a doctor for a checkup. Among the poor, 48 per cent report having had physical checkups within the past six months. The non-poor are more likely to report a recent checkup, but the difference is not as large as we expected it to be. Among the non-poor about 60 per cent claim to have had checkups within the past six months. Living in a poor, as opposed to a non-poor neighborhood makes no difference once individual poverty is controlled.

In contrast to the small differences by poverty in recency of reported physical examinations, differences among the three samples are substantial in recency of dental examinations. Only 28 per cent of the poor report having had a dental examination within the past six months, while 44 per cent of the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, and fully 61 per cent of the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods report having had examinations within this period. Over a fifth (22 per cent) of the poor have not seen a dentist for three years or more. Comparable proportions in the other samples were 9 per cent for the non-poor in poor neighborhoods and 6 per cent for the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods.

TABLE II.22

SELECTED ASPECTS OF MEDICAL CARE AND HEALTH BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Medical Care and Health Indicator	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Last physical checkup:			
Less than 6 months ago	48%	60%	59%
6 months - 1 year	25	20	19
1 to 3 years	18	14	19
3 or more years	8	4	3
Never	1	1	0
Total	100%	99%	100%
N = 100%	304	463	68
Total N	835		
NA	60		
Total	895		
Last dental examination:			
Less than 6 months ago	28%	44%	61%
6 months - 1 year	23	25	16
1 to 3 years	18	21	16
3 or more years	14	6	6
Never	8	3	0
Total	101%	99%	99%
N = 100%	304	464	67
Total N	835		
NA	60		
Total	895		
Self-description of health:			
Very good	52%	66%	62%
Pretty good	42	32	35
Not too good	6	3	3
Total N	100%	101%	100%
N = 100%	301	464	68
Total N	833		
NA	62		
Total	895		

Somewhat fewer of the poor see themselves as healthy than do the non-poor. Living in a poor neighborhood, however, does not seem to make any difference in health perception once individual poverty is taken into account. Among the poor, 52 per cent describe their health as "very good," while the comparable proportions among the other groups are 66 per cent and 62 per cent for the non-poor in poor neighborhoods and the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods, respectively.

The reader is cautioned that these crude measures are inadequate to indicate the actual conditions of physical health among the poor. The data do suggest that the poor feel somewhat less healthy and receive somewhat less frequent physical examinations. Moreover, differences in frequency of dental care are marked.

Selective Service Status

Most of the young men in our samples are too young to be registered with the draft. Table II.23 shows that among the poor, 30 per cent of the males are registered. Among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, 28 per cent are registered, and among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods, 23 per cent are registered. Among the poor, the most common draft classification is 1A (including 1A0 and 10), indicating young men who are liable to be inducted. The next most frequent classifications are physically or otherwise unfit for service and student deferment. Among the poor, unfitness and student deferments appear in about equal numbers.

Although the numbers of cases involved are rather small and hence the results are likely to be unreliable, two comparisons among the samples seem noteworthy. First, the non-poor in poor neighborhoods do not appear to differ drastically in their classifications from the poor, although they may be slightly less

TABLE II.23

DRAFT STATUS BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Draft Status	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Not registered with selective service	71%	72%	76%
Registered	30	28	23
Classified 1A, 1A0, 10	10	13	5
Classified 1Y, 4F	7	4	2
Classified 1S, 2S	7	6	12
Classified other	3	2	2
Classified don't know	3	3	2
Total	100%	100%	99%
N = 100%	153	303	42

Total N. 498
NA 397
Total 895

likely to be classified as unfit. Second, those living in non-poor neighborhoods appear to differ from the other groups in that they are more likely to have student deferments and less likely to be classified as either unfit or as immediately liable to induction. The most common classification for these young people is student deferment, in contrast to those in poor neighborhoods who are most commonly immediately liable to induction.

Contact with Police

Table II.24 gives self-reported incidence of being picked up by the police and of appearing in court for our sample groups. It is likely that these self-reports are highly inaccurate reflections of the actual police and court experiences of these young people. Specifically, it is reasonable to assume that all those who report having been picked up actually were picked up, but there may be a number among those who said they were not picked up who actually were picked up. Among the poor, 9 per cent report having been, at some time, picked up by the police. Included among these are 5 per cent who report having appeared before a judge and 4 per cent who said that they did not see a judge.

TABLE II.24

REPORTED CONTACT WITH POLICE BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Contact with Police	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Never picked up by police	91%	84%	94%
Picked up (not appearing before judge)	4	5	6
Appearing before judge	5	11	0
Total	100%	100%	100%
N = 100%	304	464	68

Total N 836
No Response . . . 59
Total . . . 895

Surprisingly, the incidence of reported trouble with the law appears slightly higher among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods than it does among the poor of this group, 16 per cent were picked up, including 11 per cent who saw a judge.

The non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods do not differ much from the poor in reported incidence of being picked up (6 per cent), but they do differ from both of the other groups in that none of the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods reported having appeared before a judge.

On the whole, the differences among sample groups in reported trouble with the law appear to be small, but the reader is again cautioned that unknown amounts of underreporting affect these figures.

Role Models

It is sometime argued that one reason for lack of success among the poor is a lack of successful persons with whom a young person can identify. There are, it is argued, too few models of successful behavior upon which the youth can pattern his own behavior.

Accordingly, we hoped to find some measure of role models used by the young people in our samples. Respondents were asked an open-ended question, "Thinking about people whom you know or whom you've heard about, what person would you most like to be like?" Responses were coded into twenty categories which have been collapsed into eight categories for presentation. Table II.25 gives the results.

Among the poor, the most common role models appear to be relatives (usually parents). Next most frequent are celebrities (excluding athletes and entertainers), followed by entertainers (e.g., pop singers), acquaintances, teachers, athletes, the

TABLE II.25

ROLE MODELS BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Percentage Distribution)

Respondent's Selection of Role Model	Neighborhood		
	Poor		Not Poor
	Individual		
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor
Relative	30%	21%	18%
Acquaintance	10	15	22
Teacher	9	9	5
Athlete	9	12	8
Entertainer	13	11	7
Other celebrity	19	20	32
Myself	6	7	3
Other	4	5	5
Total	100%	100%	100%
N = 100%	267	390	60

Total N. 717
NA 178
Total 895

respondent himself, and other responses, in that order. Relatives (30 per cent) and "other celebrities" (19 per cent) account for about half of the responses among the poor, with the remainder of the responses spread among the other six categories.

A number of notable differences appear when comparisons are made from one sample to another:

1. The poor are more likely than are the non-poor to select relatives as role models. Among the non-poor, the neighbor-

hood does not appear to make a difference. While 30 per cent of the poor select relatives, 21 per cent of the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, and 18 per cent of the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods do so.

2. The poor are least likely to select acquaintances (10 per cent), the non-poor in poor neighborhoods slightly more likely to do so (15 per cent), and the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods most likely (22 per cent) to select acquaintances.

3. Those living in poor neighborhoods are more likely to select entertainers, such as pop singers or movie stars, than are those living in non-poor neighborhoods. Among the poor, 13 per cent, among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, 11 per cent, and among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods, 7 per cent select entertainers.

4. Those living in poor neighborhoods are less likely to select celebrities (other than athletes and entertainers) than are those living in well-to-do neighborhoods. Among the poor, 19 per cent, among the non-poor in poor neighborhoods, 20 per cent, and among the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods, 32 per cent select such celebrities.

The practical importance, if any, of these differences in role model selection cannot be assessed from these data alone. We need to know, for example, whether selecting a parent as a role model has any relation to a young person's degree of success, or,similarly, whether choosing a celebrity other than an entertainer is related to a higher degree of success than is choosing an entertainer. These questions will be considered further in another chapter.

One way to summarize these results might be to note that if selections are made among those the respondent has known personally, the poor, and to a lesser extent those in poor neighbor-

hoods who are not poor, pick relatives at the expense of acquaintances, while the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods pick acquaintances at the expense of relatives. It may be that those in well-to-do neighborhoods have a wider circle of acquaintances and hence are less likely, on a probability basis, to pick relatives, i.e., perhaps the poor do not know so many people who are not relatives.

If, on the other hand, selections are made among those not personally known to the respondent, it appears that those in poor neighborhoods are more likely to select entertainers and less likely to select other celebrities than are those in well-to-do neighborhoods. We shall see later that this difference is also strongly related to being in school and to having a job.

Effects of a Poverty-stricken Environment

One of the objectives of this chapter has been to make a crude and preliminary assessment of whether an environment of poverty seems to have debilitating effects in and of itself, once the poverty level of individuals is held constant. While our data do not allow a definitive answer to this question, they do strongly suggest that environment does make a difference. This is true most notably for those variables that measure the nature of young people's educational experiences. Compared to those in non-poor neighborhoods, those in poor neighborhoods are more likely to experience failure in the educational system, including dropping out of high school; they score less well on verbal tests; they are much less likely to receive college preparatory educations; and they are less likely to indicate that they expect or aspire to college educations, even though they are not themselves poor.

Differences at the neighborhood or environmental level also appear for a number of other important variables, including

family structure indicators, receipt of public assistance, experience of unemployment, level of occupational experience, and need or desire to find work.

Our findings also suggest, however, that considerable caution is necessary in interpreting neighborhood differences. It is apparent that those in poor neighborhoods differ from those in more well-to-do neighborhoods in individual characteristics other than poverty. Thus, it could be these other individual level factors that produce "neighborhood effects," rather than some aspect of the neighborhood environment itself. For example, those in poor neighborhoods are more likely to be rural, to be Negro or Spanish-American; their fathers are less well educated, and their families are more likely to have been poor at some time in the past. Inasmuch as these factors are also associated with poverty at the individual level, it is probable that the non-poor in poor neighborhoods are also more likely to become poor in the future than are the non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods.

These considerations complicate the effort to separate environmental effects from individual level effects and underline the tentative nature of our suggestion that living in a poor environment, per se, appears to have debilitating effects.

Summary of Characteristics of the Poor

In this chapter we have examined a large number of background and experience characteristics of the poor youths in our sample and compared these characteristics with those of non-poor both in poor neighborhoods and in non-poor neighborhoods. The poor as compared to the non-poor are more likely to be southern, rural, female, and Negro. The poor appear to be at a substantial disadvantage in terms of any measure one wishes to use of family socioeconomic status. Fathers, where they are present, are

likely to be unemployed or out of the labor market. Among the poor, only about three-quarters have fathers who are employed. When fathers are employed, they hold relatively low status jobs. For example, only 13 per cent of the poor have fathers who hold white collar jobs. The level of fathers' education among the poor is very low. Only 19 per cent have fathers who are high school graduates. Roughly half of the poor youths are in families currently receiving public assistance, and fully 63 per cent have received public assistance at some time. The contrast with non-poor in non-poor neighborhoods is particularly marked since only 7 per cent of these young people are in families which have ever received assistance.

Negroes, who are almost entirely Protestant, and Spanish-Americans, who are almost all Roman Catholic, are especially likely to be poor, while Jews are especially unlikely to be poor. Other ethnic and religious combinations may differ in the experience of poverty, but they do not appear in sufficient numbers in our samples to permit comparisons.

The families from which poor youths originate are much less likely to be intact than are the families of the well-to-do. Moreover, they are more likely to be dominated by the mother when they are intact. Among the poor youths, less than half are living in intact families, about half report that the father was the dominant family figure, and less than one-fourth report that they respected their fathers more than their mothers.

The educational experiences of the poor differ drastically from those of the more well-to-do. While the well-to-do prepare primarily for college when in high school, the poor prepare primarily for blue collar jobs. The poor are much more likely to drop out of high school or otherwise experience failure with lower grades, lower verbal test scores, and higher incidences of repeating grades.

Our data suggest that those living in well-to-do neighborhoods are less likely to need and hence to seek employment, being adequately supported by their parents. In the poor neighborhoods, however, young people are probably more often forced to seek employment out of economic necessity. Those in poor neighborhoods who are not poor tend to be above the poverty line in part because of their own success in finding work. These young people thus contribute a larger proportion of the total family income than do either the poor or the non-poor in well-to-do neighborhoods. The summary distribution of activities for poor youths aged sixteen through nineteen in our sample shows that 61 per cent are in school and not working, 26 per cent are in the labor force (including some still in school), and 13 per cent are neither in school nor in the labor force. In all, 71 per cent are in school including those working, 20 per cent are high school dropouts, and 9 per cent have completed high school. Of those in the labor force, 16 per cent are unemployed.

When the poor youths are employed, they tend to be employed in low status, low paying jobs. Among poor youths with work experience, the most recent job was blue collar for 65 per cent. Most commonly it was service, semi-skilled or unskilled labor. Less than a third of currently employed poor youths earn as much as sixty dollars per week. Employment experience over the course of a year is very unstable.

While the poor are the most likely of the three samples studied to be seeking work they are least likely to know where it can be found, i.e., to know of any available jobs. Also they seem to know slightly less, though not a great deal, about general characteristics of the labor market.

Our findings suggest, surprisingly, that the leisure time activity patterns of the poor do not differ greatly from the

leisure time activity patterns of the more well-to-do. It remains to be seen in a later chapter, however, whether leisure time activities are related to being in school or to having a job.

Further bits of our profile suggest that the poor suffer somewhat in terms of health care, particularly dental care, that they are less likely to have student draft deferments, that they model themselves on relatives or entertainers at the expense of a broader circle of acquaintances or non-entertainment celebrities.

The picture of the poor youths that emerges from these findings is not a new one. Many of these findings, particularly on the background characteristics of poor youths, have been documented in many previous studies. The picture is also not a sanguine one. Poor youths suffer from cumulative disadvantages --minority group status, location in a poor environment, family disorganization, low socioeconomic status, restricted educational opportunities in inferior schools and aimed at vanishing blue collar jobs, failure in the school system, failure in the labor market, and so on. These various factors tend to be correlated with one another. This means that a young person who suffers disadvantage by one criterion is likely to suffer disadvantage by other criteria as well. Disadvantages thus tend to be cumulative, with the result that there is a "hard core" of young people living in poverty who experience virtually all of these problems. For such a young person, the opportunities for material success or a good life offered by his environment are not very great. In the following chapter, we shall consider how a young person evaluates his opportunities and what he wants and expects to secure from his environment.

CHAPTER III

THE VALUES OF POOR YOUTH

One of the important traditions of sociological thought about poverty is that it is sustained, in part, by a cultural heritage among the poor of low desire for material success. The poor are thought to learn from their parents and associates a "value system" that devalues high status and the means to high status. This value system, it is argued, inhibits the chances of the poor for upward mobility in society.

In other words lower class children are thought to be socialized in such a way that they have little motivation to achieve or succeed in society. Lacking the motivation, the argument continues, they in fact do not succeed, and this is an important factor explaining why the children of low status people tend also to have low status. The cultural heritage of low desire for success among the poor is thought to explain in part why poverty is transmitted from one generation to the next.

A proponent of this position is Herbert Hyman.[1] In his view, the lower class value system is an intervening variable between the low status of parents and the low status of their children. It is an important mechanism causing the attainments of persons of humble origin to be modest. It is, Hyman tells us, a "self-imposed barrier to success." Hyman presented data on the occupation, education and income aspirations of different social status groups from a 1947 national sample survey

---

[1] Herbert H. Hyman, "The Value Systems of Different Classes," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour Martin Lipset (eds.), Class, Status, and Power (2d. ed., New York: The Free Press, 1966), pp. 488-99.

conducted by NORC. He found that high status people, both young and old, were more likely to aspire to college educations, professional jobs, and high income levels than were low status people. This, he argued, was evidence that lower class people had lower levels of motivation to succeed. The fact that differences appeared among both young and old suggested to him that values were transmitted from one generation to the next.

Hyman argues flatly that low status people do not care so much for success as high status people, and because they do not care so much they do not try as hard to succeed.

The data, however, leave several perplexing questions unanswered:

1. At all status levels the aspirations are higher than the attainments. Does this not suggest at least that relative to social origins all groups want to advance in material terms? People are starting out at different status levels. They all appear to want to travel some distance. Should we not look at that distance as an indicator of willingness to try rather than simply looking at the desired destination?

2. It has been experimentally demonstrated that "level of aspiration" can vary as a result of past experience of success or failure.[2] If a low status person experiences a greater degree of failure in competition with those of higher status, say in school, might that lead to lower levels of aspiration quite apart from any cultural influences? Even if there were no cultural influences at all, people of lower talents should have lower aspirations. Similarly, people who are denied oppor-

---

[2] K. Lewin, T. Dembo, C. Festinger, and P. S. Sears, "Level of Aspiration," in J. McV. Hunt (ed.), Personality and the Behavior Disorders (New York: Ronald, 1944), pp. 333-78.

tunities to experience success should have lower aspirations, cultural influences notwithstanding.

3. It has yet to be established that high occupation, education, or income aspirations actually lead to a greater degree of success than low aspirations. What we have is a correlation between aspirations and social class. The direction of cause and effect underlying the correlation has not been established. While high aspirations may be a cause of success, they may also be an effect of success, or perhaps both aspirations and experiences influence one another. Finally, the correlation may be totally spurious, caused by some other factor such as inequality of opportunity. It is apparent that several different kinds of research activity would be required to answer all these questions and they will certainly not be answered within the scope of one paper. In any case, the implication of Hyman's paper is that we can find a lower class culture involving, among other things, lack of desire for success.

Hyman is by no means alone in holding the views that he does. One hears a good deal these days about the "culture of poverty." This is a more extreme version of the notion that values, culturally determined, sustain low status from one generation to the next. Those who live in the culture of poverty are thought to be apathetic or hostile to success in the major culture and are supposed to have largely given up hope for achievement.

The anthropologist, Oscar Lewis, who coined the term "culture of poverty," sees those who inhabit it as negativistic about success, about themselves, and about the larger society. They show, ". . . a high incidence of maternal deprivation, of orality, of weak ego structure, confusion of sexual identification, a lack of impulse control, a strong present time orienta-

tion with relatively little ability to defer gratification and to plan for the future, a sense of resignation and fatalism, a widespread belief in male superiority, and a high tolerance for psychological pathology of all sorts."[3] In their attitudes toward themselves, they show ". . . marginality, hopelessness, dependence, and inferiority." Toward the larger society, they exhibit ". . . a critical attitude to basic institutions of dominant classes, hatred of police, mistrust of government and those in high position, and a cynicism which extends even to the church."[4]

Oscar Lewis does not think that all poor people share in the culture of poverty, but only some discrete segment, perhaps 20 per cent of those below the "poverty line." This is very similar to David Matza's idea about the "disreputable poor."[5] For Matza there are two kinds of poor. First, there are the poor who accept the values of the major culture, and there are, in addition, the "disreputable poor" who reject society's values and have a hopeless and apathetic view of the world. For Lewis and Matza, lower class culture, or some segment of it, does not just devalue success, but also causes people to dislike themselves and dislike society as well.

There are two aspects of the general concept of lower class culture that we shall try to clarify here. First, how pervasive is the influence of poverty upon values? That is, what sorts of values does it affect? Are low aspirations the only result or are desire for success and willingness to try

---

[3]Oscar Lewis, La Vida (New York: Random House, 1966), p. xlviii.

[4]Ibid., p. xlvii.

[5]David Matza, "The Disreputable Poor," in Bendix and Lipset, op. cit., pp. 289-302.

for success also involved? Does the value system extend, as Lewis' ideas would suggest, to a person's self-image and his feelings toward society at large, or are differences found only where the question concerns material success? Second, can we find evidence that the values of poor youths are in fact culturally shared rather than just held by those who are individually poor? That is, will those living in an environment of poverty be affected by the presumed culture if they are not themselves poor? If an environment of poverty shows no effect in itself--on those who are not poor--it is difficult to believe that these values are culturally caused, and we might have reason to doubt that there really is a lower class or poverty culture.

Value Measures

We attempted to measure values of the following kinds:

1. Educational and occupational expectations,
2. Educational and occupational aspirations,
3. Evaluation of success,
4. Values involving success striving or work, delayed gratification, and optimism,
5. Attitudes toward the self, and
6. Attitudes toward (perceived empathy of) persons who represent major institutions of middle class society.

Educational and occupational expectations were measured by the following items:

> Looking ahead to the future how far do you really think you will get in school?
>
> What kind of work do you really think you will get for your life's work?

Responses to the education item were dichotomized as "complete college" versus "less than complete college." Responses to the occupation item were dichotomized "white collar" versus "blue

collar." An alternative dichotomization, "professional, technical, and kindred" versus "all other" does not lead to any different conclusions than the ones we shall report for "white collar" versus "blue collar."

Educational and occupational aspirations were measured by the following items:

> How far would you <u>like</u> to go in school altogether (if you could go back)?
>
> Looking ahead to the future, if you could choose any kind of work you liked for your life's work what job would you choose?

Responses were dichotomized as for the expectation items. The two education questions were separated from the two occupation questions in their placement in the interview schedule. We asked, in each case, first for the aspiration and then for the expectation.

The expressed evaluation of success by the respondent was measured by the following item:

> How important is it to you personally to be a success in life? Would you say very important, pretty important, or not too important?

Since the overwhelming majority of respondents say "very important," responses have been dichotomized "very important" versus "other."

Measures of values involving success striving or work, delayed gratification and optimism were adapted with modifications and additions from Strodtbeck,[6] Srole,[7] and Struening

---

[6]Fred Strodtbeck, "Family Interaction, Values and Achievement," in David McClelland (ed.), <u>Talent and Society</u> (Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1958).

[7]Leo Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," <u>American Sociological Review</u>, 21 (1956), 709-16.

and Richardson.[8] We decided to use a forced-choice format rather than the usual "agree-disagree" scale. This was done in order to minimize response set due to repeated agreement or disagreement without regard to item content. The respondent may still show a set of conventional responses to these items but at least he will have responded to the content and not just the form. The questions are as follows:

> People have very different ideas about some things in life. Here are some questions that people often argue about. I'd like to know what you think about them.
>
> a. In school, should a person try to get about the same grades as the other students or should he try to get better grades than the other students? (Better grades)
>
> b. Would you say that you can't trust most people or that you can trust most people? (Trust people)
>
> c. If things go bad can a person usually make them better, or isn't there too much he can do about it? (Improve)
>
> d. When a person makes plans, do the plans mostly work out, or do they hardly ever work out? (Plans work out)
>
> e. Will a smart person think about tomorrow or live for today? (Think ahead)
>
> f. Which would you rather have, five dollars today and no more, or nine dollars two weeks from now? (Money later)
>
> g. Do most people know what they want out of life or don't they? (Know)
>
> h. Should a person wait a while for a good thing or should he take what he can get right away? (Wait)

---

[8] Elmer L. Struening and Arthur H. Richardson, "A Factor Analytic Exploration of the Alienation, Anomia, and Authoritarianism Domain," American Sociological Review, 30 (1965), 768-76.

i. When a person is born, is his success already in the cards or can he fight hard and make his own success? (Make success)

j. Is it better to work as hard as you can or to do just enough to get by? (Work hard)

Nine of the ten items form three empirical clusters. The tenth item, "Do most people know what they want out of life?" is not substantially related to any of the other items and has been omitted here. Table III.1 shows the associations (Yule's Q) among the remaining nine value items for the sample of youths living in poor neighborhoods. Lines have been drawn in the table to set off each cluster from the others.

TABLE III.1

MATRIX OF ASSOCIATIONS (Q) AMONG SELECTED VALUE MEASURES

	Make Own	Better Grades	Think	Wait	Money Later	Can Improve	Trust	Plans Work
Striving:								
Work hard. .	.66	.51	.46	.31	.50	.28	.22	.29
Make success		.41	.54	.17	.26	.41	.03	.15
Better grades . .			.19	-.03	.22	.22	.08	.36
Delayed gratification:								
Think ahead.				.51	.38	.46	.42	.39
Wait					.41	.31	.15	.08
Money later.						.39	.19	.16
Optimism:								
Can improve.							.36	.58
Trust people . .								.41
Plans work .								

There is considerable noise in these data. Some associations between items which have been grouped in different clusters are higher than some associations between items in the

same cluster. Moreover, the three clusters are not totally independent of one another. Between the "striving" items and the "delayed gratification" items the average association is +.291. Between the "striving" items and the "optimism" items the average association is +.227. Finally, between the "delayed gratification" and the "optimism" items the average association is .227. Thus, there are mild positive associations between clusters. Nonetheless, the average association within a cluster is +.470, while between clusters it is only +.267. While the structure is noisy, we do have some empirical justification for viewing these items as measuring three underlying attitudes or value orientations.

Attitudes toward the self were measured by a self-descriptive adjective checklist administered as follows:

> People feel different ways about themselves. Sometimes they feel pretty good, other times they feel pretty bad. Here is a list of words that people sometimes use to say how they feel about themselves. In the last few weeks have you ever felt that you were:
>
> | | | | |
> |---|---|---|---|
> | A. | Tough | I. | Good |
> | B. | Unfriendly | J. | Smart |
> | C. | Rude | K. | Lazy |
> | D. | Weak | L. | Obedient |
> | E. | Successful | M. | Mean |
> | F. | Religious | N. | Troublesome |
> | G. | Truthful | O. | Ambitious |
> | H. | Polite | P. | Intelligent |

Many of these items have been adapted from Strodtbeck's study of teenage gangs.[9] Table III.2 gives the associations (Yule's Q) among fourteen of the sixteen adjectives. Two adjectives, "polite" and "tough," were omitted in order to give

---

[9]Fred Strodtbeck and James Short, Group Process and Gang Delinquency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965).

TABLE III.2

MATRIX OF ASSOCIATIONS (Q) AMONG SELECTED SELF-DESCRIPTIVE ADJECTIVES

	Lazy	Trouble-some	Rude	Un-friendly	Weak	Truth-ful	Obed-ient	Good	Reli-gious	Intel-ligent	Smart	Success-ful	Ambi-tious
Negative:													
Mean . . .	.63	.55	.65	.58	.38	-.04	-.03	-.21	-.02	.15	.21	.05	.17
Lazy . . .		.58	.45	.38	.41	-.07	-.10	-.35	-.01	.06	.06	.14	.17
Troublesome			.51	.47	.43	-.41	-.19	-.32	.00	-.22	-.21	-.03	.26
Rude . . .				.51	.11	-.26	-.29	-.43	.03	.02	.03	.09	.10
Unfriendly					.31	-.08	-.21	-.17	.00	-.03	-.07	-.09	.02
Weak . . .						.06	-.15	-.21	.17	-.19	-.14	-.06	-.06
Positive:													
Truthful .							.45	.59	.46	.37	.33	.35	.17
Obedient .								.49	.48	.28	.29	.34	.47
Good . . .									.28	.31	.50	.38	.07
Religious.										.23	.22	.45	.38
Talented:													
Intelligent											.84	.67	.46
Smart . .												.63	.32
Successful													.48
Ambitious.													

a clearer structure. The remaining adjectives form three empirical clusters which we have called "negative self-image," "positive self-image," and "talented self-image."

The average association within the "negative" cluster is +.463, within the positive cluster +.458, and within the talented cluster it is +.567. The average association between the positive and talented clusters is +.321, indicating that these two dimensions are not totally independent. However, the within-cluster associations are considerably higher than the between-cluster associations, so that a positive self-image is not the same thing as a "talented" self-image.

The average association between the negative and the "talented" clusters is +.020, indicating that these clusters are independent of one another. Substantively, this means that a respondent may see himself both as talented and as possessing negative attributes at the same time. For example, the adjectives "lazy" and "ambitious" are practically independent, the association being only +.17. There thus exists a type of young person who sees himself as both "lazy" and "ambitious." This may mean that he feels that he is at times lazy and at times ambitious.

Finally, the "positive" and "negative" clusters are practically independent of one another. The average association between these clusters is only -.139. This finding is quite similar to Norman Bradburn's finding that positive and negative feelings about one's experiences in life are independent of one another.[10] Bradburn shows that the difference between positive and negative feelings provides a very good indication of a person's psychological well-being.

---

[10]Norman Bradburn and David Caplovitz, Reports on Happiness (Chicago: Aldine, 1965).

That positive and negative self-images are independent of one another in our poor neighborhoods means that the same person may hold simultaneously a positive and negative view of himself or that he may sometimes view himself positively and at other times negatively. For example, the association between "troublesome" and "obedient" is only -.19, indicating that these two adjectives are practically independent. This means that there is a type of person who thinks that he is at the same time both troublesome and obedient or else feels that he is at times troublesome and at times obedient.

In any case we are justified in treating the adjectives as three different dimensions of attitude toward the self.

Attitudes toward persons representing major middle class institutions were measured by items designed specifically to test the notion of Lewis and others that the poor are alienated from teachers, police, and other figures representing middle class power. We have called these items "perceived empathy." The questions was asked as follows:

> Now I'll read a list of different kinds of people. Thinking about people like that whom you've met or heard about, I'd like you to tell me for each kind if you feel that they are really interested in helping you, are a little interested in helping you, or just don't care about you.
>
> A. Employment counselors
> B. The president of the United States
> C. Factory managers
> D. Preachers or priests
> E. Policemen
> F. School counselors
> G. Doctors
> H. Welfare caseworkers
> I. Social workers
> J. Teachers

Since a large majority of responses fell, for most titles, in the "really interested in helping" category, the responses

have been dichotomized as "really interested in helping" versus "other."

Measurement of Poverty

In this chapter, as in the last, we shall classify respondents in two ways--first, according to whether they live in a poor or in more well-to-do environments and, second, according to whether they themselves are poor. If there is, within a poor environment, a lower class culture, it ought to affect to some extent the values of those living in that environment regardless of whether they are individually poor or not. In other words, we should be able to show a neighborhood effect over and above the effect of simply being poor.

Our sample of youths living in census tracts or rural counties where the median family income is below $4,000 is considered to be living in poor neighborhoods, while our sample of white urban youths living in census tracts where the median family income is above $4,000 is considered to be living in more well-to-do neighborhoods. Regarding the poverty of individuals, we repeat that "poverty lines" are arbitrary if convenient fictions. More precisely, poverty lines are convenient for compiling statistics in discrete rather than continuous form. The precise level at which such a line is drawn has no substantive importance. We may anticipate that people who are just above the line will be very similar to people who are just below it. However, those at some distance above the line may be expected to differ considerably (in unspecified ways) from those at some distance below it.

Our poverty index involves family income in relation to family size. The rationale is that a larger family needs more income in order to avoid poverty. One person is considered poor with less than $1,500 annual income. Two persons are

considered poor with less than $2,000. Continue adding $500 per person up to eight persons with less than $5,000. Above $5,000, no family is considered poor regardless of size.

We shall make comparisons among three groups: (1) youths living in poor neighborhoods who are poor (i.e., below the poverty line); (2) youths living in poor neighborhoods who are not poor; and (3) youths living in well-to-do neighborhoods who are not poor. The fourth logical group, youths living in well-to-do neighborhoods who are poor, contained too few cases (seventeen) to permit comparisons and has been omitted from the tables.

Results

Since Tables III.3 - III.7 all have the same format, we will explain the format of Table III.3 at the outset and trust that the explanation will suffice for the other tables as well. Each row of Table III.3 refers to a particular measure, in this case, the expectation and aspiration measures. The first column contains poor living in poor neighborhoods, the second column contains non-poor living in poor neighborhoods, and the third column contains non-poor living in well-to-do neighborhoods.

The percentages in the first three columns are the percentages of the column total who have answered the row item in the specified way. The "individual difference" in Column 4 is obtained by subtracting Column 1 from Column 2. The "neighborhood difference" in Column 5 is obtained by subtracting Column 2 from Column 3. Where the sign of these differences is positive the direction of the relation is such as to support the lower class culture notion. Where the sign is negative, the direction is contrary to the lower class culture notion.

TABLE III.3

EXPECTATIONS AND ASPIRATIONS BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Per Cent Endorsing Specified Item)

Expectation and Aspiration	Neighborhood			Individual Differences	Neighborhood Differences
	Poor		Not Poor		
	Individual				
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor		
Per cent expecting to complete college . .	22	36	54	+14	+18
Per cent expecting white collar jobs .	49	63	72	+14	+09
Per cent aspiring to complete college . .	38	55	65	+17	+10
Per cent aspiring to white collar jobs .	62	71	82	+09	+11
Smallest weighted N	303	462	68		

1. Expectations. The top panel of Table III.3 gives the results for two expectation measures, the percentage expecting to complete college and the percentage expecting to secure white collar jobs for their life's work. Among those living in poor neighborhoods, 22 per cent of the poor expect to complete college, while 36 per cent of those who are not poor expect to complete college. Similarly, 49 per cent of the poor youths expect white collar jobs, while 63 per cent of the non-poor living in poor neighborhoods expect them. These differences are as expected on the basis of Hyman's 1947 data.

At the neighborhood level, it appears that those living in poor neighborhoods have lower expectations, at least with respect to college, regardless of whether they are poor or not. In other words, there is a neighborhood effect over and above the individual effect. The neighborhood difference is 18 percentage points for college completion and 9 percentage points for job expectation. These findings are not inconsistent with a culture of poverty conception although they might also be explained in other ways. We shall discuss this further later.

2. Aspirations. The culture of poverty conception predicts lower aspirations for the poor and for those living in poor neighborhoods. The findings, shown in the lower panel of Table III.3, support these predictions. In poor neighborhoods, the non-poor are more likely to aspire to finish college than are the poor. The neighborhood effect also appears. Among the non-poor, those who live in well-to-do neighborhoods are more likely to want to finish college. Job aspirations also show small differences in the expected direction of 9 percentage points at the individual level and 11 percentage points at the neighborhood level.

For both aspirations and expectations, we have found the expected differences. Moreover, if one compares the poor with the non-poor in well-to-do neighborhoods, thus adding together the individual and neighborhood differences, the total range for each measure is substantial. Poverty and its environment are thus good predictors of aspirations and expectations. The reader is again cautioned, however, that more than one interpretation is possible.

3. Evaluation of success. Our respondents were asked how important it was to them personally to be a success in life. Table III.4 shows that the answers to this question are unrelated to poverty or to its environment. Almost 90 per cent of

our sample rate success as "very important," and level of poverty does not seem to make any difference. While it is conceivable that poor youths define success differently than well-to-do youths, still this finding appears inconsistent with what Hyman, Lewis, et al. would argue in the sense that success appears to be just as important to the poor as it does to anyone else.

TABLE III.4

EVALUATION OF SUCCESS BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Per Cent Saying Success Is "Very Important")

Poverty	Per Cent	Weighted N
Poor individual in poor neighborhood	89	304
Non-poor individual in poor neighborhood . .	90	464
Non-poor individual in non-poor neighborhood.	85	68

Individual differences = +.01; neighborhood differences = -.05.

4. "Striving," "delayed gratification," and "optimism." The culture of poverty or lower class culture conception leads us to expect that the poor and those subjected to poor environments will be less likely to endorse "striving" values, less willing to "delay gratification," and less "optimistic." Table III.5 gives the results for the nine items making up the three value-orientation clusters. We regard differences of less than 10 percentage points as too small to matter. By this criterion,

TABLE III.5

VALUE ORIENTATIONS BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Per Cent Endorsing Specified Item)

Value Orientation	Neighborhood			Individual Differences	Neighborhood Differences
	Poor		Not Poor		
	Individual				
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor		
Striving:					
Work hard	82	90	85	+08	-05
Make success . . .	88	96	96	+08	00
Better grades . . .	90	94	84	+04	-10
Average				+06	-05
Delayed gratification:					
Think ahead	73	88	73	+15	-15
Wait	59	68	66	+09	-02
Money later	48	67	66	+19	-01
Average				+14	-06
Optimism:					
Can improve	73	87	91	+14	+03
Trust people . . .	42	53	68	+11	+15
Plans work	56	74	65	+18	-09
Average				+14	+03
Smallest weighted N.	303	462	67		

the striving items appear unrelated to poverty or to a poverty environment. The poor are as likely as the more well-to-do to emphasize the importance of hard work, to feel that a person can make his own success, and to say that one should try to make better school grades than others. These measures show no

difference between the poor and more well-to-do in their expressed willingness to strive for success.

The delayed gratification measures appear to be related to individual poverty but not to neighborhood poverty. In fact, for one of the items, "think ahead," if we look at the non-poor, those who live in poor neighborhoods are more likely to be delayed gratifiers than those who live in well-to-do neighborhoods. Optimism, similarly, appears to be related to individual poverty but not to neighborhood poverty, although one of the three items, "trust people," is also related to neighborhood poverty.

As near as we can tell with our rough and imperfect measures, a propensity for immediate gratification and a pessimistic outlook on life may be characteristic of individual poor or possibly particularly of poor families, but they do not appear to arise as the product of living in a poor environment per se. If propensity for immediate gratification or pessimism are generated from a culture of poverty, those who are not themselves poor appear immune even though they live in proximity to that culture.

5. Self-image: negative, positive, talented. The lower class culture concept predicts that poor youths will express more negative and less positive self-images than more well-to-do youths. (The reader will recall that for our poor neighborhood sample "negative" and "positive" self-image measures are relatively independent of one another.) Poor youths should also see themselves as less talented.

Table III.6 gives the results. In the last two columns a positive sign has been used to indicate a predicted difference and a negative sign to indicate a difference opposite to prediction. We consider differences of less than 10 percentage points unworthy of note.

TABLE III.6

SELF-IMAGES BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Per Cent Choosing Each Adjective)

Self-image	Neighborhood: Poor; Individual: Poor	Neighborhood: Poor; Individual: Not Poor	Neighborhood: Not Poor; Individual: Not Poor	Individual Differences	Neighborhood Differences
Negative:					
Mean	26	29	28	-03	+01
Lazy	38	53	65	-15	-12
Troublesome	23	28	34	-05	-06
Rude	23	30	44	-07	-14
Unfriendly	28	34	32	-06	+02
Weak	30	35	26	-05	+09
Average				-07	-03
Positive:					
Truthful	83	88	87	+05	-01
Obedient	80	81	79	+01	-02
Good	90	85	85	-05	00
Religious	54	55	49	+01	-06
Average				00	-02
Talented:					
Intelligent	69	77	76	+08	-01
Smart	51	69	68	+18	-01
Successful	50	62	65	+12	+03
Ambitious	64	79	80	+15	+01
Average				+13	00
Smallest weighted N	303	462	67		

On the average, items measuring negative self-image are unrelated to poverty. The single adjective, "lazy," is related

to poverty at both the individual and the neighborhood levels, but the difference is in the direction opposite to what one would expect. Only 38 per cent of the poor say they are "lazy," while among the non-poor in well-to-do neighborhoods, 65 per cent say that they are lazy. The adjective, "rude," is related at the neighborhood level only, but again in the wrong direction. Those living in richer neighborhoods are more likely to say that they are rude. The general finding, however, is that the negative self-image measures are unrelated to poverty, whether at the individual or at the neighborhood level. Examination of the positive self-image items leads to a similar conclusion. None of these four adjectives is related to poverty at either level.

For a talented self-image, however, differences do appear. The adjectives, "smart," "successful," and "ambitious," are related in the expected way to individual poverty but not to neighborhood poverty. To see oneself as successful, for example, may be a product of individual or family financial well-being but does not appear to be an aspect of neighborhood milieu.

6. Perceived empathy of institutional representatives. Lewis has argued that those living in the culture of poverty are hostile and mistrustful toward the "basic institutions of dominant classes."[11] In Table III.7 we have tried to present a rough test of this idea. Listed are ten representatives of basic societal institutions, including the president, teachers, policemen, preachers, and others.

The result is that perceived empathy of these power figures does not in general vary by poverty of individuals or of neighborhoods. There are a couple of minor exceptions. Among the

---

[11] Oscar Lewis, op. cit.

TABLE III.7

PERCEIVED EMPATHY OF PERSONS REPRESENTING MAJOR SOCIETAL INSTITUTIONS BY POVERTY OF NEIGHBORHOOD AND INDIVIDUAL

(Per Cent Saying Each Person Is "Really Interested in Helping")

Perceived Empathy Of:	Neighborhood			Individual Differences	Neighborhood Differences
	Poor		Not Poor		
	Individual				
	Poor	Not Poor	Not Poor		
School counselors . . .	78	71	66	-07	-05
Preachers or priests .	72	80	70	+08	-10
Teachers	69	72	65	+03	-07
President of the U.S. .	58	46	48	-12	+02
Doctors	56	54	50	-02	-04
Social workers	50	52	57	+02	+05
Employment counselors .	45	41	40	-04	-01
Welfare caseworkers . .	40	38	53	-02	+15
Policemen	38	39	40	+01	+02
Factory managers . . .	12	11	12	-01	+01
Average				-01	00
Smallest weighted N . .	303	462	67		

non-poor, preachers or priests are somewhat better regarded by those living in poor neighborhoods. The president is slightly better regarded by the poor. At the neighborhood level only, caseworkers are slightly less well regarded in poor neighborhoods. Since two of these exceptions were in the wrong direction, we can safely say that we found no evidence that poor

youths are less favorably inclined toward institutional figures than well-to-do youths.

We can summarize the findings so far by arranging them in a Guttman scale. This may also help our thinking about lower class culture a little. There are three types of value measures:

1. Those measures which are related to individual poverty and also to neighborhood poverty.
2. Those measures which are related to individual poverty but not to neighborhood poverty.
3. Those measures which are related neither to individual poverty nor to neighborhood poverty.

A fourth logical type has not actually occurred, namely measures related to neighborhood but not to individual poverty.

Table III.8 shows the typology of measures. For measures of the first type--the aspiration and expectation measures--the lower class culture argument seems tenable. The values clearly have something to do with poverty and they are also influenced by an environment of poverty over and above the effect of individual level poverty.

For measures of the second type--the value clusters, "delayed gratification" and "optimism," and the self-image cluster, "talented"--the lower class culture argument is not so tenable. These have something to do with individual or family poverty but appear unaffected by the general milieu of poverty once the individual level is controlled.

Finally, the third type of measure contradicts the lower class culture notion for two reasons. First, these measures do not differ by neighborhood and, second, they have nothing to do with poverty. Included in this type are the importance of success to the person, the value cluster, "striving," the "negative" and "positive" self-image clusters, and perceived empathy of institutional representatives.

TABLE III.8

TYPOLOGY OF VALUE MEASURES

Measure	Individual Poverty	Poor Neighborhoods
Educational and occupational expectations . .	Yes	Yes
Educational and occupational aspirations . .		
Value: "delayed gratification"	Yes	No
Value: "optimism" . . .		
Self-image: "talented" .		
Evaluation of success	No	No
Value: "striving" . . .		
Self-image: "negative" .		
Self-image: "positive" .		
Perceived empathy of institutional representatives		

Discussion

The discussion is best begun with a note of caution. Our findings are not yet ready to enter the body of established empirical fact. We should like them to be treated tentatively--that is, as hypotheses for which there is preliminary empirical justification. There are several reasons for this caution:

1. This is a small pilot study. It is not representative of the nation's poor youth as a whole but rather is limited to four select locations. In addition, the sample of youths living in well-to-do neighborhoods is very small and subject to sampling error fluctations.
2. Our value measures are rough, their reliability is unknown, and their validity--what it is that

they measure--is not completely clear. We are especially troubled with the validity of the three value-orientation clusters.

3. A number of control variables ought to be introduced against the possibility that something is obscuring real relations between the various value measures and poverty. Most notably sex, race, region, and rural versus urban controls ought to be tried.

With these limitations in mind what do our data suggest? I think two things:

1. The culture of poverty, if it exists, does not appear to be nearly so pervasive in its effect upon values as Oscar Lewis or even Herbert Hyman would have us believe. We found no evidence that poor youths are critical of or hostile toward society's basic institutions. We found no evidence that poor youths view themselves in more negative or less positive terms than those who are better off, although they do see themselves as less talented or successful. We found no evidence that poor youths consider success to be unimportant or that they are unwilling to work hard for it.

The effect of poverty on values for youths in our sample seems to be limited to rather specific areas and does not appear to constitute a pervasive system of alienation from the values of society at large. Specific values affected by poverty may involve, first, a youth's assessment of his endowments or his chances of making it in the world. For example, more of the well-to-do see themselves as smart and successful. Similarly, the poor seem less optimistic about their chances of manipulating the environment. For example, they are less likely to feel that they can improve unpleasant circumstances and less likely to feel that their plans will work out.

Perhaps because of pessimism over endowments and chances to manipulate the environment, or perhaps because of inequality of

opportunity, the poor have lower educational and occupational expectations. Poor youths also have lower educational and occupational aspirations. These may be partly a function of realistically low expectations. A person who has little chance of going to college would experience, from one theoretical perspective, "cognitive dissonance" if he consciously expressed the desire to complete college. It is certainly possible that through processes of dissonance avoidance or ego defense aspirations become adjusted toward expectations.

Finally, the poor youths in our sample score lower on delayed gratification measures. I have never had a good intuitive appreciation of what it is that this kind of questionnaire item measures. Half of our poor youths say that they would sooner take five dollars today than nine dollars two weeks from now. The comparable proportion among the more well-to-do is one-third. Does this really mean that the well-to-do are better at getting along without present gratifications? Or does it mean, perhaps, that they do not need five dollars today?

In sum, our general and speculative impression on the nature of value differences between the poor and the more well-to-do is that they do not indicate a lack of desire for material success so much as they indicate a low assessment of the chances for attaining material success.

2. We have been hard put to produce any evidence that there is a culture of poverty. Five of the ten measures we used to look for it showed no relation to poverty. Of the five that did show a relation only two, aspirations and expectations, showed any relation to living in a poor neighborhood once individual level poverty was controlled. Is there then a culture of poverty which affects only the aspiration and expectation measures?

One can think of aspects of a poor environment other than cultural that might produce lower expectations and aspirations.

Suppose for example, that high schools in poor neighborhoods are considerably inferior to those in rich neighborhoods and that this inferiority lessens one's chances to get into college. A youth living in a poor neighborhood who did not expect to complete college would thus be making a realistic appraisal of his chances, and the observed neighborhood effect would appear even if there were no cultural influences at all.

Finally, it appears to us that the values that characterize middle class culture are largely shared by the poor youths in our sample as well. The poor do not seem to us to have a very deviant subculture. If there are a few who are alienated from society and its values they must be a very few--fewer than Oscar Lewis thinks. The idea that the poor are poor because they want to be poor has not been empirically supported by this study.

CHAPTER IV

LEAVING SCHOOL AND FINDING A JOB

This chapter is concerned with the process by which young people in poor neighborhoods leave school and find jobs. More specifically, we will examine the factors associated with staying in school, as opposed to dropping out, and, for those who have left school, the factors associated with having a job, as opposed to not having one. Broadly, we are interested in success. What are the conditions of relative success among youths in poor environments? Who are the young people who achieve some degree of material success despite their living in an environment of poverty? How do these youths differ from those who are not so successful? What factors appear to be most important to success for these young people?

Success in School and in the Labor Market

The indicators of success employed in the present analysis are simple and minimal. A minimal definition of academic success is that a young person be in school. Accordingly, we shall examine factors associated with being in school as opposed to having dropped out. High school graduates are excluded from this analysis inasmuch as they have left school by a successful route. We assume that once youths leave school very few of them return. Subsequent longitudinal data on those who do return will enable us to determine just how often this happens, but for the purposes of the present analysis we conceive of leaving school as basically a one-way step. Minimal success at this stage of the process involves simply staying in school until graduation.

A minimal indication of success in the labor market, for those who have left school, is holding a job, as opposed to

being unemployed. We have chosen not to preserve the distinction as to whether or not a young person is in the labor market. The usual definition depends on his own classification of whether or not he is seeking work. We preferred to include those who say they are not seeking work with those who are unemployed and seeking work. In fact, they may be the least successful, since many of them have given up hope of finding a job.

It might be argued that for young women marriage represents a successful alternative to a job. However, almost none of the young women in our poor neighborhoods are married, so a separate definition of success for women seemed unwarranted. Our analysis of factors related to having a job thus includes all those who are out of school, regardless of why they are out or whether or not they classify themselves as being in the labor market.

With these qualifications in mind, we will examine, first, the correlates of remaining in high school for non-high school graduates in poor neighborhoods and, second, the correlates of having a job for those in poor neighborhoods who are out of school.

Remaining in High School

Background Characteristics

Table IV.1 shows the relation of selected background characteristics to school attendance for youths, both poor and non-poor, living in poor neighborhoods. There are substantial variations in school attendance from one location to another. While 96 per cent of those in Jasper County, South Carolina, remained in school, only 58 per cent of those in Baltimore remained in school. It appears that youths in rural areas are more likely to remain in school than are those in urban areas. Moreover, the difference between the two urban areas is substantial, with

TABLE IV.1

SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE[a]

(Per Cent Now in School)

Background Characteristic	School Attendance
Location:	
Bronx, New York	79 (299)[b]
Baltimore, Maryland	58 (145)
Jackson County, Kansas	89 (72)
Jasper County, South Carolina	96 (165)
Age:	
16	93 (324)
17	79 (235)
18	51 (80)
19	31 (42)
Race:	
White	79 (414)
Negro	80 (260)
Oriental, American Indian	[86][c] (7)
Ethnic background:	
Spanish-American	81 (156)
Other white	83 (156)[d]
Total N	681
NA	0
Total	681

[a]The subsample for tables in this series, IV.1 through IV.10, are those respondents from poor neighborhoods who have not graduated from high school. The weighted N for this subsample is 681.

[b]( ) indicates base N for percentage throughout tables in this chapter.

[c]Base N too small for percentage to be meaningful.

[d]Total N for this subtable smaller than 681 because of exclusion of Negroes and of "no answer" code on ethnicity questions.

79 per cent of the Bronx sample remaining in school, as opposed to 58 per cent of the Baltimore sample.

The explanation for these large differences by location is not completely clear. One possibility is that the nature of the local school system is the crucial factor. Some local school systems may encourage or enable young people to remain in school, while others fail to do this.

Apart from being in school in the past, age is the best single predictor of staying in school. The proportion who remain in high school declines from 96 per cent of those aged sixteen to 31 per cent of those aged nineteen. The risk of dropping out thus increases markedly as one grows older.

While location and age are very strongly related to being in school, race and ethnic background are, surprisingly, not related. Negroes, Spanish-Americans, and whites all appear about equally likely to remain in school. The reader is cautioned that the sample is limited to those living in poor neighborhoods. A representative sample of all youths would show at least a spurious correlation between race or ethnic background and school attendance. An additional caution is the possibility that differences in location may be masking small racial or ethnic differences.

Socioeconomic Background

Table IV.2 gives the relation of selected family poverty and socioeconomic status indicators to school attendance. Again we have the rather surprising finding that within our poor neighborhoods degree of poverty or level of family socioeconomic status appears to be largely unrelated to whether a youth remains in school or drops out. Percentage differences are only 3 percentage points for the family's current welfare status, 5 percentage points for family income, and 5 percentage points for

TABLE IV.2

SELECTED SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

(Per Cent Now in School)

Socioeconomic Characteristic		School Attendance
Individual poverty level:		
Poor		77 (266)
Not poor		80 (368)
	Total N	634
	NA	47
	Total	681
Family welfare status:		
On welfare now		77 (173)
Not on welfare		80 (498)
	Total N	671
	NA	10
	Total	681
Family income:		
Under $5,000		77 (359)
$5,000 and over		82 (252)
	Total N	611
	NA	70
	Total	681
Father's occupation:[a]		
High status		87 (220)
Low status		77 (263)
	Total N	483
	NA, DNA	198
	Total	681
Father's education:		
Non-high school graduate		80 (326)
High school graduate		85 (127)
	Total N	453
	NA, DNA	228
	Total	681

[a]High status includes white collar workers (including farmers and farm managers) and craftsmen and foremen. Low status includes other blue collar workers, including farm labor.

father's education. The only indicator that is related to remaining in school is father's occupation. Among the children of fathers in relatively high status occupations (white collar or skilled labor) 87 per cent remained in school, while among the children of low status fathers, 77 per cent remained in school. This 10 percentage point difference is quite modest. The general finding remains that for those in poor neighborhoods, poverty or socioeconomic status has little effect upon remaining in school.

The reader will recall from Chapter II that, while individual level of poverty is not related to dropping out of high school for our sample, neighborhood poverty is related. The crucial factor may again be the nature of the local school. High dropout rates probably occur in schools located in poor neighborhoods. Once the student is attending such a school, his chances of dropping out do not seem to be further exacerbated by his being from a poor or low status family.

Family Structure

Table IV.3 gives the relation of four indicators of family structure to remaining in school among the non-high school graduates in poor neighborhoods. In general, we regard differences of less than 10 percentage points as too small to be of any practical importance even though they may be statistically significant. By this criterion only one of the measures of family structure, current family composition, is related to being in school. Among those living in families where the father is present, 84 per cent remained in school, while among those living in families where the father is absent, 72 per cent remained in school. Thus, an intact family modestly increases a youth's chances of staying in school. Interestingly, the relation of current family composition is stronger than the relation of

earlier family composition to staying in school. It thus appears that the effects of prolonged experience of a broken home upon staying in school are less important than are the effects of recent family breakup.

TABLE IV.3

FAMILY STRUCTURES CHARACTERISTICS BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

(Per Cent Now in School)

Family Structure	School Attendance
Early family composition:	
Father present	81 (498)
Father absent.	75 (183)
Present family composition:	
Father present	84 (413)
Father absent.	72 (268)
Perceived dominant figure:	
Father	80 (396)
Other.	79 (285)
Respected parent:	
Father	74 (186)
Other.	82 (493)

Smallest total N . . . 679

NA 2

Total 681

While the difference is not large enough to matter, it is notable that youths who did not choose their fathers as the respected parent were more likely to be in school than those who did choose their fathers. Those who did not choose their fathers include a substantial number who could not decide which parent they respected the most, so they do not necessarily respect their mothers more. In sum, there is a modest relation between living in an intact family and staying in school.

Past Activities

Our respondents were asked to recall what they were doing six months before the interview and one year before the interview. Were they in school, working, doing both, or what? Table IV.4 gives the relation of these past activities to currently being in school (at the time of interview). The time reference of the point six months prior to the interview varies through May and June. Thus, some of the young people were on summer vacation from school six months prior to the interview. Since we did not

TABLE IV.4

PAST ACTIVITIES BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

(Per Cent Now in School)

Past Activity	School Attendance	
	Six Months Ago	One Year Ago
In school	95 (434)	90 (525)
In school and working	96 (71)	83 (77)
Working	35 (109)	5 (43)
Other	35 (65)	9 (34)

Total N. 679
NA 2
Total 681

expect interviewing to continue as long as it did, we neglected to include a question on whether the respondent was on summer vacation. Thus, those who were on vacation are classified either as working or "other" six months ago. These problems do not affect the current activity nor the activity one year prior to the interview.

As a result of this, activity one year prior appears to be a better predictor of school attendance than does activity six months prior. Ninety per cent of those who were in school and not working one year prior to the interview were in school at the time of interview. Slightly fewer of those who, one year before, combined school with work (83 per cent) were in school at the time of interview. Very few of those who were out of school one year before have since returned. Only 5 per cent of those out of school with a job returned, and 9 per cent of those out of school and out of work returned.

Regarding activity six months prior to interview, the only distinction that matters is whether or not the respondent was in school at that time. Having or not having a job made no apparent difference in returning to school. Ninety-five per cent of those in school six months prior were in school at the time of interview, while 35 per cent of those out of school (including vacationers) returned to school. In general, having or not having a job does not appear to have much effect upon staying in or returning to school, but few of those who have left school then return.

School Experiences

Table IV.5 shows the relation of certain additional measures of school success to staying in school. Included are participation in extracurricular activities, self-reported grades,

experience of failing one or more grades, and "general intelligence."[1]

TABLE IV.5

SCHOOL EXPERIENCE BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

(Per Cent Now in School)

School Experience	School Attendance
Extracurricular activities:	
In one or more activities . . .	85 (357)
In no activities.	73 (324)
Usual grades:	
Honors (A-B).	88 (344)
Non-honors.	72 (337)
Failures:	
Ever failed a grade	67 (282)
Never failed a grade.	88 (399)
General intellegence:[a]	
0- 5.	76 (478)
6-10.	87 (203)
Total N. 681	
NA 0	
Total 681	

[a]Score on ten-item vocabulary test.

[1]The reader is reminded that "general intelligence" is the score on a vocabulary test that reflects not only innate intelligence, but also past learning and cultural bias.

Each of these factors is related, at least modestly, to staying in school. Most strongly related is experience of failing one or more grades. Of those who had not failed, 88 per cent stayed in school, while of those who had failed, 67 per cent stayed in school, a difference of 21 percentage points. The next best predictor appears to be self-reported grades with those reporting A's or B's more likely to remain in school by 16 percentage points. Participation in extracurricular activities and "general intelligence" have only a modest relation to staying in school.

Role Models

We turn now from a consideration of relatively objective background and experience characteristics to more subjective and social psychological factors as they relate to staying in school. Table IV.6 reports variations in school attendance according to the person selected by the respondent as his role

TABLE IV.6

ROLE MODELS BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

(Per Cent Now in School)

Role Model	School Attendance
Relative	78 (159)
Acquaintance	73 (66)
Teacher	100 (49)
Athlete	93 (72)
Entertainer	60 (73)
Other celebrity	88 (121)
Myself	68 (34)
Other	82 (22)
Total N	586
NA	95
Total	681

model--that is, the person he would most like to be like. The variations are substantial. Among those who chose teachers as role models, 100 per cent remained in school, while among those who chose entertainers such as pop singers, only 60 per cent remained in school. The probability of remaining in school is highest for those choosing teachers, athletes, or celebrities other than entertainers. It is lowest for those choosing acquaintances, themselves, or entertainers, and it is intermediate for those choosing relatives or some other role model not previously mentioned.

A word of caution is in order in the interpretation of these findings. Although the association between role model choice and staying in school is substantial, the direction of cause and effect is not clear. It is not clear whether, for example, a person first chooses a teacher as a role model and as a result decides to stay in school or whether, on the other hand, once he has left school he cannot very well choose a teacher as a role model. Subsequent longitudinal data will help to clarify these questions.

Activities of Peers

It seems likely that a person's decision to remain in school might be influenced by his older siblings or by his friends. Accordingly, respondents were asked what their best friend and the older sibling to whom they felt closest were currently doing. Were they working, going to school, or what? Table IV.7 gives the relation of school attendance on the part of best friend and older sibling to the respondent's current school attendance. In each case, the relation is substantial, although the best friend's activity makes more of a difference than does the older sibling's activity. For those who reported that their best friends were in school, 90 per cent were themselve

TABLE IV.7

ACTIVITIES OF FRIENDS AND SIBLINGS BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

(Per Cent Now in School)

Activity of Friends	School Attendance
Best friend's activity:	
In school	90 (497)
Out of school	52 (173)
Total N.	670
NA	11
Total	681
Older sibling's activity:	
In school	97 (67)
Out of school	79 (309)
Total N.	376
DNA, NA	305
Total	681

in school, while for those who reported that their best friends were out of school only 52 per cent were in school, a difference of 42 percentage points. Reporting an older sibling in school makes a difference of 18 percentage points.

In the case of best friend's activity the direction of cause and effect is not clear. It could be that the respondent was influenced to drop out of school because his friend was out of school. On the other hand, it could be that having dropped out of school, the respondent then chose friends who were also out of school. By contrast, it seems more reasonable to assume that an older sibling's activity probably influences the respondent.

Leisure Time Activity Patterns

We turn next to our three clusters of leisure time activities. Chapter II showed that within clusters specific activities are highly associated with one another, but between clusters the associations tend to be small. While there is a modest positive association between "vices," or socially disapproved activities, and social activities, athletic activities appear to be independent of the other two clusters.

An index was created to measure the extent to which a respondent participated in the three different types of activities. The "vices" or socially disapproved activities index consists of the items: "gambled," "stayed out all night," "smoked," and "got drunk." The social activities index consists of the items, "danced," "went to a party," "had a date," and "went steady." The athletic activities index consists of the items, "played basketball," "played baseball or football," and "went swimming." A respondent was assigned a score on each index by simply summing the number of activities he reported. Thus, for example, scores on the social activities index range from four points for a respondent who reported all four social activities to zero for a respondent who reported none of them. For the purposes of the present analysis, each index has been dichotomized as close as possible to the median in order to give two groups of roughly equal size.

Table IV.8 gives the relation of each leisure activity index to being in school. There is a substantial negative relation between socially disapproved activities ("vices") and being in school. Among those who scored low (zero points) on socially disapproved activities, 94 per cent remained in school, while among those who scored "high," only 62 per cent were in school. By contrast, social activities appear to be unrelated to staying in school. Those who scored high on this index were about as

TABLE IV.8

LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE[a]

(Per Cent Now in School)

Leisure Time Activity	School Attendance
Leisure "vices" reported:	
Low.	94 (357)
High	62 (317)
Leisure:	
Low.	82 (398)
High	77 (282)
Leisure athletic:	
Low.	69 (249)
High	86 (432)
Smallest total N. .	674
NA.	7
Total.	681

[a]See text for the derivation of these indexes. The clusters (social, athletic, "vices") are those defined in Table II.20, except that "vices" here includes "gambled," "night out," "smoked," and "drank" and excludes "loitered" and "fought."

likely to be in school as were those who scored low. Athletic activities are positively related to being in school although the relation is not as strong as for socially disapproved activities. Among those with high participation in athletic activities 86 per cent are in school, while among those with low participation only 69 per cent are in school.

Thus, two of the three activity indexes are good predictors of staying in school. Are we to conclude that gambling, drinking, and such are causes of dropping out, while basketball and baseball help young people to stay in school? Again, we are faced with the problem of direction of cause and effect. It might be that after a young person leaves school his exposure to opportunities for athletic participation is reduced, while his exposure to socially disapproved activities is increased. Thus, leisure activity patterns may be an effect of school attendance rather than a cause. In addition, exposure to opportunities for various leisure activities is probably in part simply a function of age.

We can conclude for the present only that leisure activities are a good predictor of staying in school. Until longitudinal data are available, we must reserve judgment on the nature of the causal relation.

Values, Aspirations, and Self-concepts

Chapter III considered in some detail the measurement of a variety of value, aspiration, self-conception, and attitude items. In review, basically nine different attitudinal measures were considered. Three of them are measured each with a single item. These are the importance of success to the respondent (how important he says success is to him), his occupational aspiration (the job he would like to have for his life's work), and his educational aspiration (how far he would like to go in school). The remaining six attitudinal measures are composites or indexes. They are derived from cluster analysis, reported in Chapter III, of a list of self-descriptive adjectives which resulted in three dimensions of self-conception, and cluster analysis of a series of value questions which resulted in three value dimensions called "striving," "delayed gratification," and "optimism."

The individual items entering into the six composite indexes are as follows:

1. "Striving" is composed of the value items, "work hard," "make success," and "better grades."

2. "Delayed gratification" is composed of the value items, "think ahead," "wait," and "money later."

3. "Optimism" is composed of the value items, "can improve," "trust people," and "plans work."

4. "Talented self-concept" consists of the self-descriptive adjectives, "intelligent," "smart," "successful," and "ambitious."

5. "Negative self-concept" consists of the self-descriptive adjectives, "mean," "lazy," "troublesome," and "rude."

6. "Positive self-concept" consists of the self-descriptive adjectives, "truthful," "obedient," "good," and "religious."

For each of the six composite indexes, each respondent was assigned an index score by simply summing the number of value items (or adjectives) that he endorsed. For example, scores on the talented self-concept index range from zero through four. A respondent received four points if he endorsed all four of the self-descriptive adjectives. He received three points for endorsing any three of these, and so on down to zero points if he chose none of the four. For the purposes of the present analysis each value measure has been dichotomized into "high" and "low" groups. The cutting points were made, in each case, as close as possible to the median.

Table IV.9 gives the relation of seven of the nine attitudinal measures to staying in school. Results for two measures, negative self-concept and positive self-concept, have been omitted since they are unrelated to being in school. Each of the seven remaining attitude measures is related, at least

TABLE IV.9

SELECTED VALUE MEASURES BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

(Per Cent Now in School)

Value Measure	School Attendance
Importance of success:	
Very important	81 (604)
Pretty important or not important	66 (77)
Striving:[a]	
Low	70 (172)
High	83 (504)
Delayed gratification:[a]	
Low	75 (428)
High	88 (253)
Optimism:[a]	
Low	70 (215)
High	84 (465)
Self-concept: talented:[a]	
Low	70 (296)
High	87 (382)
Occupational aspiration:	
White collar	84 (447)
Blue collar[b]	69 (192)
Educational aspiration:	
Complete college	93 (299)
Not complete college	70 (369)
Smallest total N	639
NA	42
Total	681

[a]See text for the derivation and interpretation of these indexes.

[b]Includes both "farmers, farm managers" and "farm labor" census categories.

modestly, to staying in school. The single best predictor is educational aspiration. Among those who would like to complete college, 93 per cent remained in school, while among those with lower aspirations, 70 per cent remained in school, a difference of 23 percentage points. Percentage differences for the remaining items range from 17 percentage points for talented self-concept to 13 percentage points for striving and for delayed gratification.

Another way to express these findings would be to note that those who remain in school are likely to have high educational aspirations, to see themselves as talented, to emphasize the importance of success, to aspire to white collar jobs, to be generally optimistic about success and about other people, and to endorse values of striving and delayed gratification. With the exception of educational aspirations, these associations are generally modest. This does not mean, however, that values or aspirations are not good predictors of being in school. With the exception of educational and occupational aspirations, which are highly related, the various value and aspiration measures tend to be relatively independent of one another. Thus their cumulative predictive power is substantial.

Again, however, we are faced with the familiar problem of direction of cause and effect. Does a respondent first have a relatively low educational aspiration and then drop out of high school, or does he first drop out of high school and subsequently adjust his aspirations to fit the reality of the situation? Either or both of these processes could occur and, for the present, we cannot tell which it is.

Perceived Aspirations of Others Regarding Respondents' Education

We have noted previously that aspirations that a respondent perceives other relevant persons in his environment to have

toward his own education are very strongly correlated with his aspirations. Since a respondent's own aspirations are more strongly related to his staying in school than are the perceived aspirations of others for him, it is probable that most of the effect of the perceived aspirations of others is an indirect one. That is, the respondent's school attendance might be affected only insofar as his aspirations were affected by those of others for him. Problems of direction of cause and effect are particularly complex. It could be the case, for example, that a respondent lowers his own aspirations as a result of leaving school and, moreover, lowers his perception of what others' attitudes are about the situation.

In any case, the results are reported in Table IV.10. The relevant persons about whom we inquired are father, mother, an

TABLE IV.10

PERCEIVED ASPIRATIONS OF OTHERS REGARDING RESPONDENT'S EDUCATION BY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

(Per Cent Now in School)

Perceived Aspiration Of:	Respondent's Education	
	Complete College	Not Complete College
Father	94 (225)[a]	76 (292)
Mother	92 (290)	73 (363)
Older sibling. . .	94 (122)	77 (199)
Best friend. . . .	95 (197)	78 (306)
Admired acquaintance . .	93 (229)	76 (280)

[a]Total N's for each row vary because of exclusion of "no answer" and "does not apply" codes.

older sibling, best friend, and an acquaintance whom the respondent admires. The perceived aspirations of each of these persons are related to staying in school, and the correlations are all of about equal magnitude. For example, among those who said that their father wanted them to complete college, 94 per cent were in school, while among those who said that their father had a lesser aspiration for them, 76 per cent were in school. The difference is 18 percentage points. Comparable differences for the other persons all lie within the narrow range of 17 to 19 percentage points.

In sum, respondents who perceived that relevant persons in their environment want them to go far in school are more likely to be in school. However, the predictive contribution of this factor is probably small, once we take into account the respondent's own educational aspirations.

Who Stays in School?

The above analysis can be briefly summarized by considering what characteristics are associated with staying in school. For the young people who are not high school graduates in the poor neighborhoods in our sample, the list of correlates of school attendance provides a sort of profile of those who remain in school.

The best predictor of being in school is not having dropped out previously. This trivial point is no more than to say that once a young person leaves school he is unlikely to return, and that those who in school have remained in school right along. Next is age. The risk of dropping out increases drastically with age beyond sixteen. Thus, those in school tend to be young. Location is next. Rural youths are most likely to be in school, and youths in Baltimore least likely. The young person who is in school, moreover, tends to have friends who are in school,

tends to choose teachers, or athletes, or non-entertainment celebrities as role models, tends to avoid socially disapproved leisure time activities, hopes to complete college, and has not had the experience of failing a grade in school.

These are the most important factors. Other factors which are not so strongly related follow in approximate order of importance: The young person in school tends to have an older sibling in school, to participate in athletic activities, and to view himself as talented. He reports high grades in school, aspires to a white collar job, emphasizes the importance of success, and is optimistic about his life and chances for success. He endorses values of striving and delayed gratification. He tends to participate in extracurricular activities, to score relatively high on verbal tests, and to have a father who is present and has a relatively high status job.

Notably not related to staying in school for these young people are race, ethnic background, and most indicators of family socioeconomic status, including poverty.

While these findings tell us what the young person who stays in school is like, they do not tell us what causes him to stay in school. This is because, for many of the characteristics mentioned and in particular for attitude characteristics, it is unclear whether they are causes or effects of staying in school. Causal analysis, which we shall attempt later using longitudinal data, may give a rather different picture of what it is that causes young people to stay in school or to drop out.

Finding a Job

In all, 221 of the total weighted sample of 822, or 27 per cent, are out of school. Of those who are out of school, 36 per cent are high school graduates and 64 per cent are dropouts.

One-half have jobs and the rest are either unemployed or out of the labor market altogether.

Background Characteristics

Table IV.11 shows the relation of four interrelated background characteristics to having a job. First, the probability of employment varies by location. There are too few out of school in Jasper County to permit reliable computations, but in the other locations those in New York are most likely to be employed (54 per cent), and those in Jackson County, Kansas, and Baltimore are less likely to be employed (42 per cent and 38 per cent, respectively). It is worth noting that Baltimore has the highest incidence of school dropouts as well as the lowest incidence of employment. It may be that high dropout rates increase the supply of labor in the low skilled labor market and thus contribute to the relatively bleak employment picture for those in Baltimore. In this sense, high dropout rates themselves are one cause of high unemployment for those who are out of school.

Age is one of the best predictors of employment. Among those who are sixteen years old, only 17 per cent are working, while among those who are nineteen years old, 63 per cent are working. It appears that exposure to the labor market over a longer period of time markedly increases the chances that a young person will find work.

Sex is also a strong predictor of employment, with 63 per cent of the males employed and only 33 per cent of the females employed. Part of the reason for this difference is that many of the females are keeping house, either for their families of orientation (in some cases) or for their families of origin (in most cases), and thus are out of the labor market. One would not, however, wish to classify a young woman who is caring

TABLE IV.11

SELECTED BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS[a]

(Per Cent Currently Employed)

Background Characteristic	Employment Status
Location:	
Bronx, New York	54 (112)
Baltimore, Maryland	38 (68)
Jackson County, Kansas	42 (24)
Jasper County, South Carolina	[76][b] (17)
Age:	
16	17 (24)
17	40 (62)
18	57 (72)
19	63 (63)
Sex:	
Male	63 (122)
Female	33 (99)
Ethnic background:	
White	45 (44)
Spanish-American	48 (58)
Negro	54 (78)[c]
Total N	221
NA	0
Total	221

[a]The subsample for tables in this series, IV.11 through IV.19, are those respondents living in poor neighborhoods who are not currently in school. This subsample includes 221 cases.

[b]Base N is too small for the percentage to be meaningful.

[c]Total N for this subtable is smaller than 221 due to the exclusions of "no answer" codes on ethnicity questions.

for siblings as successful, since the constraints upon her freedom to operate in her environment are severe under these circumstances.

Ethnic background, including race, surprisingly does not appear to be related to having a job among the young people in poor neighborhoods who are out of school. If anything, Negroes appear to be employed slightly more often than whites or Spanish-Americans. It may be that once a person is suffering the handicaps of being young, of living in a poor environment, and of having dropped out of school, the additional factor of race or ethnic background does not make finding a job any more difficult than it already is. The reader is cautioned that even if Negroes are as likely to be employed as whites, they may not have as high status jobs, nor jobs that are as secure, nor jobs that pay as well as do whites.

In sum, employment prospects appear strongly related to age and sex, modestly related to location, and unrelated to race or ethnic background.

Socioeconomic Status

Table IV.12 shows the relation of five indicators of family poverty and socioeconomic status to being employed. The results are quite surprising. The three measures of poverty, namely, the poverty index, current receipt of public assistance, and family income are each related in the expected direction to employment. However, the other measures of family socioeconomic status, namely, father's occupation and father's education, are related in the direction opposite to what one would expect. The children of fathers in high status occupations (skilled or white collar) are less likely to be employed (43 per cent) than are the children of fathers in low status occupations (56 per cent). Similarly, the children of fathers who have completed

TABLE IV.12

SELECTED SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(Per Cent Currently Employed)

Socioeconomic Characteristic	School Attendance
Individual poverty level:	
Poor	42 (93)
Not poor	54 (116)
Total N	209
NA	12
Total	221
Family welfare status:	
On welfare now	41 (56)
Not on welfare	52 (164)
Total N	220
NA	1
Total	221
Family income:	
Under $5,000	41 (120)
$5,000 or over	63 (83)
Total N	203
NA	18
Total	221
Father's occupation:[a]	
High status	43 (69)
Low status	56 (87)
Total N	156
DNA, NA	65
Total	221
Father's education:	
Non-high school graduate	56 (105)
High school graduate	36 (39)
Total N	144
DNA, NA	77
Total	221

[a]High status and low status defined as in Table IV.2.

high school are substantially less likely to be employed (36 per cent) than are the children of fathers who have not completed high school.

The case bases are small enough that these findings should be viewed with extreme caution until they are replicated. Two explanations are possible. It may be that fathers in relatively low status jobs are in a better position to assist their children in finding low status jobs, since they may have contacts that a higher status father would lack. Another possibility is that the children of higher status fathers have higher aspirations and, as a result, will not accept the kind of low skill, low paying jobs that may be available to them. In addition their economic compulsion to accept such jobs may not be as great.

Regarding the measures of family poverty, it must be noted that direction of cause and effect is complicated. In part at least, families may be above the poverty line because the respondent has a job and is contributing to the family income. On the other hand, coming from a poverty-stricken background may inhibit the youths' chances of finding a job.

To summarize, poverty level, non-receipt of public assistance, and family income are positively related to employment, while father's occupation and father's education, contrary to expectations, are negatively related to employment.

Family Structure

Table IV.13 reports the relation, for four measures of family structure, to being employed. Having lived in an intact family while growing up appears to be unrelated to current employment. Currently living in a family which is intact may be of some slight advantage, but again the difference is too

TABLE IV.13

FAMILY STRUCTURE CHARACTERISTICS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(Per Cent Currently Employed)

Family Structure	Employment Status
Early family composition:	
Father present	49 (152)
Father absent.	46 (69)
Present family composition:	
Father present	54 (103)
Father absent	46 (118)
Perceived dominant figure:	
Father	52 (135)
Other.	47 (86)
Respected figure:	
Father	37 (73)
Other.	56 (148)

Total N 221
NA. 0
Total. 221

small to be of any practical importance. Perceiving the father as the dominant parent is also unrelated to employment status. Finally, choosing the father as the most respected parent is related to employment, but in a negative direction. Among those who respect their fathers, only 37 per cent are employed, while among those who respect their mothers or who cannot decide which parent to respect, 56 per cent are employed.

It may be that among youths living in poor neighborhoods, those who do not identify with their relatively unsuccessful fathers are more likely to be successful. On the other hand Strodtbeck's investigations of Jewish family structure provide some evidence that children in families where the father is not dominant are more likely to be successful, and this is another possible explanation. In any event, in poor neighborhoods, intact families appear to have little importance when it comes to finding employment.

Past Activities:

What are the effects of the respondent's activity six months before the interview and one year before the interview upon his employment at the time of the interview? Sixty-four per cent of those who were out of school and working six months previously were employed at the time of interview. Forty-two per cent of those who, six months earlier, were in school and not working were employed at the time of interview, and only 33 per cent of those who were out of school and out of work months earlier, were later employed.

The picture is somewhat different, however, if we examine activity one year before the interview. The principle difference is that, of those who were out of school and out of work six months earlier, only a third found jobs, but of those who were out of school and out of work one year earlier, over half (53 per cent) had found jobs at the time of interview. This is consistent with the notion that finding jobs for these young people is in large part a function simply of the passage of time and exposure to the labor market. This was also suggested by our findings on age. If this model of the situation is correct, a curious implication follows. Other things being equal, the sooner one drops out of school the better his chances are of finding a job by a particular age. Other things, of course, are not equal, and over the long run the advantages of further education soon outweigh the advantages of greater exposure to the labor market,

particularly since finding a job does not necessarily imply that one can hold it for any length of time.

There is another striking implication of Table IV.14. We can ignore the top two rows and focus only on those who were out of school both at the prior time as well as at the time of interview. We are then considering young people who were exposed to the labor market for periods of six months and one year. The stability of employment experience over the six-month period is much greater than it is over the one-year period. While being employed six months ago increases the chances of current employment by 31 percentage points (63 - 33 = 31), being employed one year ago increases the changes of current employment by only 9 percentage points (62 - 53 = 9). It appears that stability of employment deterioriates markedly as a longer time span is taken. To check this, we also examined the relation of employment one

TABLE IV.14

PAST ACTIVITIES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(Per Cent Currently Employed)

Past Activity	Employment Status	
	Six Months Ago	One Year Ago
In school	42 (66)	42 (105)
In school and working	[60]a (10)	52 (23)
Working	64 (91)	62 (55)
Other	33 (54)	53 (38)
Total N	221	
NA	0	
Total	221	

[a]Base N too small for percentage to be meaningful.

year ago to employment six months ago. The stability over that six-month span appeared comparable to stability over the more recent six-month span.

One might ask whether stability over the one-year period is totally explained by stability over the two six-month periods subsumed by the longer time span. This, in fact, appears to be the case. Percentage differences in each of the two six-month intervals are approximately 30 percentage points. The product of two 30 point differences is 9 percentage points, which is exactly equal to the percentage difference obtained over the one-year period.

What this means, in effect, is that controlling for employment status six months previous to interview completely explains the effects of employment status one year previous to interview upon current employment ("current" at the time of interview). Employment status six months ago is thus an "intervening variable" between employment one year ago and current employment. Moreover, employment one year ago has no direct effect upon current employment. The only effects employment one year ago have are transmitted through the intervening variable of employment six months ago. Having had a job one year ago is no help in having a job now except insofar as having a job one year ago helped in having a job six months ago, which, in turn, helped in having a job now. On the other hand lacking a job one year ago is no hindrance to getting one now except insofar as lacking a job one year ago hindered getting one six months ago, which, in turn, hinders getting one.

The reader is cautioned again that these data are preliminary. The case bases are small and the time dimension is introduced through the use of retrospective questions. However, if these results can be replicated with genuine longitudinal data, the findings suggest an extraordinary amount of instability

in the employment experiences of young people living in poor neighborhoods.

Being employed appears to be a probabilistic event which, if the time span is long enough, will be independent of having been employed in the past. A time span of one and one-half to two years might be sufficiently long so that current employment would be totally independent of earlier employment. Under such circumstances, being employed approaches the quality of a random event. If we wait for a while, poor youths will have circulated sufficiently in and out of employment so that we will be unable to predict from their present state what their future state will be.

Educational Experiences

Table IV.15 gives, first, the relation of selected indicators of success in school to being employed and, second, the relation of vocational training experience to employment. Neither general intelligence nor reported grades in school appear to be related to employment. This suggests that success while in school has little to do with having a job once one is out of school. However, completing high school does appear to increase the chances of having a job. Among those who have their high school diplomas, 58 per cent are employed, while among those who dropped out before finishing high school, only 42 per cent are employed.

Having received some vocational training appears to be related to having a job. Among those who report vocational training, 60 per cent are employed, while among those who report no such training, only 44 per cent are employed. It is encouraging that vocational training apparently confers at least some benefits.

TABLE IV.15

SELECTED EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(Per Cent Currently Employed)

Educational Experience	Employment Status
General intelligence:[a]	
1 - 5	48 (157)
5 - 10	53 (64)
Usual grades:	
A, B	49 (100)
C, D, F	50 (121)
Highest grade completed:	
High school graduate or some college	58 (76)
Some high school or less	42 (137)
Had some vocational training:	
Yes	60 (83)
No	44 (138)
Smallest total N	213
NA	8
Total	221

[a]Score on ten-item vocabulary test.

Occupation, Labor Market Savvy, and Perceived Health

Table IV.16 shows the relation of three additional factors to employment status. First, for those respondents who have had work experience, the level of the occupation in which they most recently worked makes some difference in current employment prospects. Of those employed most recently in white collar jobs, 66 per cent are currently employed, while among those whose most recent job was blue collar, 54 per cent are currently employed.

TABLE IV.16

MISCELLANEOUS CHARACTERISTICS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(Per Cent Currently Employed)

Characteristics	Employment Status
Occupation:	
White collar	66 (73)
Blue collar[a]	54 (105)
Labor-market savvy index:[b]	
High	60 (107)
Low	40 (109)
Perceived health:	
Very good	54 (124)
Pretty good or not too good	45 (95)
Smallest total N	178
NA	43
Total	221

[a]Includes "farmers and farm managers" and "farm labor."

[b]A scaled index composed of answers to the questionnaire items described in the text.

The labor market savvy index was discussed in some detail in Chapter II. It represents our attempt to measure respondents' knowledge of general characteristics of the labor market. Scores on this index bear a fairly substantial relation to being employed. Among those who score high, 60 per cent are employed, as opposed to 40 per cent among those who score low. There is thus some support for the notion that inadequate information about general labor market characteristics (such as the educational requirements for particular jobs, or the salary of particular jobs) reduces a young person's chances of finding a job.

Finally, Table IV.16 suggests that poor health, or the perception that one is in poor health, slightly reduces the chances that one will be employed.

Role Models

We turn now to more social-psychological aspects of being employed. Table IV.17 shows the relation of choice of role model to employment status. For three of the role model categories, "athlete," "myself," and "other," there are two few cases for reliable percentaging. Case bases are also rather small for the remaining categories, so results must be considered as highly tentative. There do appear to be large variations by role model in the probability of employment. Those who choose celebrities other than entertainers have the highest chance of being employed, with 80 per cent currently working. Those who choose entertainers are least likely to be employed, with only 23 per cent working. Those who choose relatives or acquaintances are intermediate, with 50 per cent and 49 per cent employed, respectively.

While these differences are large, we face the familiar problem of what is cause and what is effect. Longitudinal data

TABLE IV.17

ROLE MODELS BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(Per Cent Currently Employed)

Role Model	Employment Status
Relative	50 (40)
Acquaintance	49 (35)
Athlete	[80][a] (10)
Entertainer	23 (31)
Other celebrity	80 (28)
Myself	[47][a] (19)
Other	[50][a] (8)
Total N	171
NA	50
Total . . .	221

[a]Base N too small for percentage to be meaningful.

will help to clarify whether role model selection is a cause or a result of having a job.

Leisure Time Activities

Turning next to our three leisure time activity indexes, we see from Table IV.18 that participation in socially disapproved activities ("vices") is not related to being employed. Among those who do report such participation, 51 per cent are employed, while among those who report no participation in socially disapproved activities, 48 per cent are employed.

Social activities, by contrast, appear to be strongly related to employment status. Among those who are high on the social activities index, 61 per cent are employed, while among

TABLE IV.18

LEISURE TIME ACTIVITIES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS[a]

(Per Cent Currently Employed)

Leisure Time Activity	Employment Status
Number of "vices" reported in two weeks prior to interview:	
Low	48 (50)
High	51 (170)
Number of social activities:	
Low	40 (115)
High	61 (105)
Number of athletic activities:	
Low	44 (121)
High	58 (92)
Smallest total N	220
NA	1
Total	221

[a]See text for the derivation of these indices.

those who are low, only 40 per cent are employed, a difference of 21 percentage points.

Athletic activities are also related to employment, though not as strongly as are social activities. Among the athletically inclined, 58 per cent have jobs, as compared to 44 per cent among the non-athletes, amounting to a modest 14 percentage point difference.

Once again it is not clear whether leisure activity patterns are a cause or an effect of employment status, and we must limit ourselves to calling them predictors.

Values, Aspirations, and Self-concepts

Table IV.19 presents results for eight attitudinal measures designed to measure certain values, attitudes toward the self, and aspirations. The construction and nature of these items have been previously explained in the present chapter and in Chapter III. A ninth value measure, "importance of success," has been omitted from the table. It is unrelated to employment status.

Only three of the eight remaining attitude measures are strongly enough related to employment status to be of any importance. These are negative self-concept, talented self-concept, and occupational aspiration. Of these, occupational aspiration, interestingly, is related in the direction opposite to what one would expect.

Among those who score low on the index of negative self-concept, i.e., those who do not view themselves in negative terms, 56 per cent are employed. Among those who score high, i.e., those who do view themselves in negative terms, 40 per cent are employed. Thus, a negative self-image is associated with being unemployed.

Among those who see themselves as being talented, 63 per cent are employed, while among those who do not see themselves as talented, 47 per cent are employed. Among those who aspire to white collar jobs, 46 per cent are employed. Those who aspire to blue collar jobs are actually more likely to be employed, with 57 per cent working. Although this finding is opposite to what one would normally expect, it is consistent with previously reported findings on fathers' occupation and fathers' education. Together, these findings suggest the possibility that young men with high occupational aspirations, perhaps using their fathers as a social reference point, are less willing to accept low status, low skill jobs which might be

TABLE IV.19

SELECTED VALUE MEASURES BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(Per Cent Currently Employed)

Value Measure	Employment Status
Striving:[a]	
Low	51 (67)
High	50 (153)
Delayed gratification:[a]	
Low	48 (159)
High	55 (62)
Optimism:[a]	
Low	49 (93)
High	50 (128)
Self-concept: negative:[a]	
Low	56 (136)
High	40 (85)
Self-concept: positive:[a]	
Low	48 (143)
High	55 (77)
Self-concept: talented:[a]	
Low	47 (117)
High	63 (103)
Occupational aspiration:	
White collar	46 (127)
Blue collar[b]	57 (82)
Educational aspiration:	
Complete college	54 (65)
Not complete college	48 (149)
Smallest total N	209
NA	12
Total	221

[a]See text for the derivation and interpretation of values. Cf. also Table IV.9.

[b]Includes both "farmers, farm managers" and farm labor" categories.

available to them. Hence they are more likely to be out of work. They may be waiting for something better. The differences on these items are all rather small, so that if this phenomenon does occur, it is relatively unimportant compared to many of the other aspects of employment that we have been discussing.

In sum, the only value measures that appear to be relevant to having a job are negative self-image, talented self-image, and occupational aspiration. Self-images, however, may well be an effect rather than a cause of being employed.

Perceived Aspirations of Others Regarding Respondent's Education

While it may seem curious to examine the relation of others' attitudes concerning a respondent's education to his employment status, the fact is that for at least two of the relevant persons, the relation is quite substantial. We inquired as to how far in school the respondent thought his father, mother, an older sibling, his best friend, and an admired acquaintance wanted him to go. Table IV.20 gives the results. For the older sibling, there are not enough cases to permit reliable comparisons. For the father and mother, the perceived aspirations regarding the respondent's education are not strongly enough related to his employment status to be of any importance. However, such aspirations on the part of friends and admired acquaintances do appear to be substantially positively related to having a job.

It is difficult to explain these findings, particularly in view of the fact that respondents' own educational aspirations are not appreciably related to their employment status. In view of the small case bases, we shall, for the present, simply report the findings and defer attempts at explanation until some sort of replication appears.

TABLE IV.20

PERCEIVED ASPIRATIONS OF OTHERS REGARDING RESPONDENT'S EDUCATION BY EMPLOYMENT STATUS

(Per Cent Currently Employed

Perceived Aspiration Of:	Respondent's Education	
	Complete College	Not Complete College
Father	58 (33)[a]	50 (112)
Mother	58 (45)	47 (150)
Older sibling	71[b] (14)	46 (69)
Best friend	73 (33)	46 (110)
Admired acquaintance .	66 (41)	45 (110)

[a]Total N's for each row vary because of exclusion of "no answer" and "does not apply" codes.

[b]Base N insufficient for meaningful percentages.

Who Gets a Job?

How does a youth living living in a poor neighborhood get a job? We noted in Chapter II that friends and relatives are by far the most important sources of information about where jobs are to be had. Direct application at a personnel office is the next most important method of finding a job. Our findings suggest that there are a few qualifications that help to secure the job once one gets to the personnel office. Being a high school graduate makes some difference, as does having had some vocational training, and knowing a thing or two about jobs in general. Does past employment experience help? Probably, but perhaps less than we might have thought. Most youths in our sample have had past experience, so the question does not arise very often. Getting good grades in school or scoring high on verbal tests does not seem to matter much.

What about motivation or aspirations? There are some hints in our data that for those who have set their sights high, the kind of low skill, low paying jobs that are available are not acceptable. In these cases, high aspirations lessen the changes for employment rather than increase them. Values that emphasize hard work, striving, delayed gratification, getting ahead, and so on do not appear to make any difference. If a young person sees himself as talented, he is more likely to have a job, but this could be a realistic assessment rather than a value, or it could be an effect of getting a job and not a cause. Negative attitudes toward the self are related to employment, but probably as an effect rather than a cause. In general the various attitude measures are not very good predictors of employment.

The findings for role models, however, are an exception to this, since choice of role model is substantially related to employment. The high unemployment rate among those who choose entertainers as role models is notable. It may be that the choice of an entertainer is a form of wishful thinking, an expression of a desire to be rich and successful through a means which the young person perceives as easy or lucky.

But the most striking of our findings concerns the extent to which the employment experiences of youths in poor neighborhoods who are out of school resembles a stochastic or probability process. Over a long enough period of time, finding or holding a job is nearly a random event. This is further supported by and related to our findings on age. The older one is, probably because of greater length of exposure to a fairly constant chance of finding employment, the more likely it is that one will find a job.

All this suggests considerable instability in the employment experiences of these young people. From the point of view of a young person who has a job, this is a discouraging state

of affairs, since the implication is that before long he will lose it. His work experience will be chaotic and unpredictable. On the other hand, from the point of view of a young person who is unemployed, the situation may be encouraging in the sense that his chances of being employed before long are rather good. From either point of view, the situation is unpredictable and chaotic, and the prospects are for alternating successes and failures. While this is less desirable than predictable success it is probably preferable to predictable failure.

Thus, instability of employment among youths in poor neighborhoods cuts two ways. While few can look forward to a stable and secure successful future, there are also few who are doomed to a stable state of failure. It is this latter fact which may well prevent the development of a "culture of poverty" or of substantial hard core groups who are totally alienated from society and its values.

Do the Same Factors Predict Success in School and in the Labor Market?

Finally, we want to consider the extent to which the same factors that predict staying in school also predict having a job once one is out of school. In this connection it is important to remember that we are talking about a low skill, primarily blue collar labor market. In other words, we are talking about the sorts of jobs that are available to young people who are not college educated.

Our findings suggest that, on the whole, success in school and the factors that predict it are independent of success at obtaining a job once one is out of school and the factors related to that. This is not to suggest that completing high school does not help in finding a job. High school graduates do somewhat better than dropouts. However, first of all, such

indicators of success in school as verbal intelligence, high grades, and experience of failure appear to be unrelated to getting a job once one is out of school. Second, remaining in school may in itself hinder a young person from finding a job, in the sense that finding a job is perhaps best predicted simply by the passage of time in exposure to the labor market. Those in school are prevented from looking for work. This is counterbalanced, however, by the fact that a high school diploma helps in obtaining a job, and a vocational education appears to be of some help in obtaining blue collar jobs. Third, there are two or three factors that are apparently related in one direction to staying in school and in the opposite direction to having a job. Age is most notable. Chances of remaining in school decrease markedly with age, while chances of finding a job increase markedly with age. Additional factors appear to be father's occupational level and respondent's occupational aspirations. Those whose fathers have white collar jobs or who themselves aspire to white collar jobs, while more likely to remain in school, are less likely to have a job once they are out of school than are those with lower aspirations or with blue collar fathers. The The explanation may be that those with high aspirations tend to wait for something better rather than take what is available.

Finally, and most importantly, we made a simple tally of the variables that were not related to school attendance and employment status in opposite directions--those that appeared in affect both remaining in school and having a job once one is out of school. Of twenty-seven variables which were considered in both contexts, six predicted both school attendance and employment status, nine predicted school attendance only, seven predicted employment status only, and five predicted neither. It appears that, if anything, there is a negative association between the factors that predict school attendance

and the factors that predict employment status, i.e., there is some tendency for completely different factors to predict employment status and school attendance. In any case, the factors that predict school attendance do not tend to predict employment status.

What are the six factors which are effective predictors in both contexts? Location is a good predictor. In Baltimore, for example, where dropout rates are highest, employment chances are also lowest. Role model selection choosing a non-entertainment celebrity rather than an entertainter--is related both to staying in school and to having a job. Participation in athletic activities is more frequent both among those who stay in school and among those who have jobs. Talented self-conception is related to success in either context. Finally, the educational aspirations of friends and of admired acquaintances for the respondent are related in both contexts.

In sum, it appears that remaining in school is not the same sort of phenomenon as is finding a job once one is out of school. Moreover, what promotes success in one area does not necessarily promote success in the other. Success in education and employment can thus be viewed as a two-stage process, with different sets of influences entering at the different stages of the process.

CHAPTER V

ORIENTATION TO PROGRAMS

An understanding of the forces that generate interest in federal antipoverty programs among youths will help to explain who enters the programs and why they do so. Accordingly, we shall consider the nature and correlates of program interest in the present chapter. In addition, we shall consider, for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, preliminary data on who actually enters the programs, why they enter them, and the nature of their experience in the programs.

Degree of exposure to programs varies according to the program considered. Limiting the analysis to those youths who are living in poor neighborhoods, we find that only 14 per cent had ever heard of the MDTA, while 49 per cent had heard of the Neighborhood Youth Corps, and fully 70 per cent had heard of the Job Corps. (See Table V.1.) These differences in exposure are not simply a matter of the size of the program. While the Job Corps is considerably smaller than the Neighborhood Youth Corps, it evidently enjoys a substantially larger recognition among youths in poor neighborhoods. The MDTA is the smallest and least well known of the three programs.

Table V.1 also reports the sources of program information for those who have heard of the programs. For the MDTA and the NYC the most common source of information is by word of mouth from friends. While friends are mentioned as a source of information as often for the Job Corps as for the other programs, a more important source for the Job Corps is television (or radio) advertising. It is probably because of such advertising that the Job Corps is the best known of the programs.

TABLE V.1

PROGRAM EXPOSURE[a]

	Program		
	MDTA	NYC	Job Corps
Per cent who heard of program . .	14% (815)[b]	49% (742)	70% (804)
Source of exposure (per cent who first heard of program from specified source):[c]			
Friend	23%	30%	30%
TV, radio	18	21	39
Newspaper, poster	19	9	14
Teacher	12	17	10
Recruiter	4	12	9
Youth employment center	9	4	2
Employment counselor	4	1	1
Relative	7	2	7
Parent	1	0	1
Other	21	17	8
Total	118%[d]	113%	121%
N = 100%	111	362	564

[a]Tables V.1 through V.13 are based on those respondents living in poor neighborhoods who have never been in the program specified by the column heading. Sizes for these subsamples are as follows:

	MDTA	NYC	Job Corps
Total N	817	742	804
Program participants . . .	5	80	18
Total	822	822	822

Base N for a given percentage in these tables may vary slightly from the total N's shown here due to exclusion of "no answer" codes.

[b]( ) indicates base N for percentage.

[c]Limited to those who have heard of each program.

[d]Percentages total more than 100 per cent because of multiple answers.

Television and radio are also common sources of information for the MDTA and NYC, but they are not as frequently mentioned as are friends. Other important sources of information for all programs include newspaper advertising (or employment office posters), teachers, and, particularly for the NYC, program recruiters. Employment counselors, either at regular employment offices or at youth employment centers, also play some role. They are relatively more important sources for the MDTA and relatively unimportant for the Job Corps.

Table V.2 reports the function of the programs as perceived by those who have heard of them. Interviewers recorded verbatim answers to the question. The answers were later coded into the eleven response categories shown in the table. The MDTA is viewed by most respondents as a vocational training program. Vocational or job training was mentioned by 56 per cent. In addition, 36 per cent said that the MDTA provides jobs or helps people to get better jobs without explicitly mentioning job training aspects of the program. Another 18 per cent said that they did not know what the MDTA was or what it did even though they had heard of it. No other responses to the MDTA occurred in sufficient number to be of importance.

The Job Corps, like the MDTA, is viewed as primarily a vocational training program, although this is not true to the same extent as it is for the MDTA. Vocational training was mentioned by 49 per cent of the respondents, and jobs or better jobs were mentioned by 40 per cent. Other views of the Job Corps were much less common. Non-specific references to "helping people" were given by 8 per cent of the respondents, and 8 per cent mentioned that the Job Corps involves going away from home. These and other answers appear relatively unimportant compared to vocational training and job provision.

Respondents viewed the NYC in somewhat different ways from the MDTA and NYC. For one thing, a greater variety of responses was given to the NYC, suggesting that its functions do not

TABLE V.2

UNDERSTANDING OF PROGRAMS[a]

(Per Cent Who Feel Program Performs Specified Function)

Function	Program		
	MDTA	NYC	Job Corps
Provides vocational training	56%	17%	49%
Gets better jobs	36	35	40
Helps people in a general way . . .	3	21	8
Reduces delinquency, provides activity	1	12	3
Provides general education	4	5	5
Involves service to others	2	3	5
Is source of income	3	1	5
Involves going away from home . . .	0	3	8
Other specific answers	3	11	3
Vague, uncodeable	4	4	3
Don't know	18	14	4
Total	130%[b]	126%	133%
N = 100%	111	362	564

[a]Limited to those who have heard of each program.

[b]Percentages total more than 100 per cent because of multiple answers.

appear so clear cut. The most frequent response was that the NYC provides work or helps young people to find work. It is unfortunate that we were not able to separate responses involving the idea that the program provides temporary work from responses implying that the program will lead to some better future job. In many cases, we simply could not tell which of these things the respondent meant, and he may not have had a more specific idea himself. This ambiguity forced us to use only one category for all responses mentioning work or a job as a program function.

Other common responses to the NYC were that it helps people in some general or unspecific way (21 per cent), that it provides vocational training (17 per cent), and that it prevents delinquency or gives young people something to do (12 per cent). Fourteen per cent said they did not know what the NYC's function was. Other responses were not given often enough to be of importance.

Thus, the extent to which a program is viewed as providing vocational training varies considerably by program. This function is emphasized most for the MDTA and least for the NYC. The extent to which programs are viewed as providing work or as a means to future work seems to be about the same for each of the three programs. The NYC is not viewed primarily as a vocational training program, as are the other two programs, but is rather viewed as performing a variety of functions.

Questions on the popularity of the programs among those who had heard of them showed that the overwhelming majority of our respondents in poor neighborhoods expressed favorable impressions of each of the programs. Respondents were asked the extent to which they thought each program was a good idea for young people like themselves. Table V.3 shows that 75 per cent thought the MDTA a good idea, 83 per cent thought the NYC a good idea, and 77 per cent thought the Job Corps a good idea. It thus appears that the programs are viewed with about equal favor. This is not to suggest that respondents would be equally interested in entering the three programs; as we shall see subsequently, respondents are somewhat less interested in the Job Corps than in the other two programs.

Table V.3 also shows respondents' reasons for thinking that a particular program is a good idea. While the incidence of favorable reactions, given exposure, is about the same for the three programs, the reasons given for favorable reactions vary

TABLE V.3

IMPRESSION OF PROGRAMS

Impression	Program		
	MDTA	NYC	Job Corps
Per cent judging favorably[a] . .	75% (111)	83% (362)	77% (564)
Reasons for favorable impression[b] (per cent giving reason specified):			
Provides vocational training	46%	12%	30%
Gets better jobs	37	19	32
Helps people generally . . .	8	26	13
Reduces delinquency, provides activity	8	23	9
Provides general education .	7	5	5
Involves service to others .	0	3	6
Source of income	4	5	6
Involves going away from home	0	0	3
Other specific answers . . .	6	15	11
Vague, uncodeable	8	12	13
Don't know	0	0	0
Total	124%[c]	120%	128%
N = 100%	83	299	435

[a]Limited to those who have heard of each program.

[b]Limited to those favorably impressed.

[c]Percentages total more than 100 per cent because of multiple answers.

from program to program. On the whole, it appears that the reasons for viewing the programs favorably closely parallel the views, described above, of the perceived functions of the programs. For the MDTA the most frequently mentioned reason is that it provides vocational training, followed by emphasis on its providing work or leading to better jobs. These are the only two reasons mentioned with any great frequency. For the Job Corps, respondents also mention vocational training and work provision most often as reasons for favorable reactions, and the two reasons are given about equally frequently. Thirteen per cent were favorably impressed by the Job Corps because they thought that it helped people in some general or unspecific way. Other reasons were not so important, each being mentioned by fewer than 10 per cent of the respondents.

While vocational training and work provision are the most important reasons given for liking the MDTA and the Job Corps, somewhat different reasons are given for liking the NYC. Most frequently mentioned for the NYC is that it helps people in a general way. This is followed by a category of reasons involving delinquency avoidance or sheer activity--for example, "It keeps kids off the street," or, "It gives kids something to do." In addition, 19 per cent mention work provision, and 12 per cent mention vocational training. Other reasons are not given often enough to be of importance.

Another way to express these findings is to note that vocational training is mentioned most often for the MDTA, next most often for the Job Corps, and least often for the NYC. Work provision is also mentioned most often for the MDTA, next for the Job Corps, and least often for the NYC. Help of some general or unspecified sort is mentioned most often for the NYC, next for the Job Corps, and least often for the MDTA. Delinquency avoidance or sheer activity is mentioned most often for

the NYC, and is not mentioned very often for either the Job Corps or the MDTA.

These findings might be summarized by noting that the young people react favorably to the MDTA and Job Corps in terms of job-related benefits, while they react favorably to the NYC not so much in terms of job-related benefits but in terms of its general social usefulness. These findings closely parallel our previous findings on perceived functions of the programs. It appears that the nature of the benefits of the NYC does not appear so clear cut to our respondents as does the nature of the benefits of the MDTA or the Job Corps.

Interest in the Programs

Until now, we have been concerned with the general reactions of youths in poor neighborhoods to various antipoverty programs without considering the youths' personal interest in entering these programs. It is obvious that if a young person has not heard of a program, he cannot be interested in entering it. Thus the proportion of youths in the population who are interested in a program is a product of two factors--the proportion who have heard of the program, and the proportion among those who have heard of it who are in turn interested. Either or both of these factors can be involved.

In order to obtain a complete picture of variations in program interest, we shall make use of three probability measures:

1. The probability of exposure: The percentage among all respondents who have heard of the program

2. The probability of interest given exposure: The percentage among those who have heard of the program who are interested in it

3. Net interest: The product of the above two probabilities (the probability of exposure times the probability of

interest). This, of course, is equivalent to the percentage among all respondents who are interested in the program.

By examining variations in each of these measures, we shall be able to determine whether differences in net interest in a program are due to differences in exposure or rather to differences in interest once one has been exposed. Table V.4 reports exposure, interest given exposure, and net interest for each of the three programs. As noted previously, there are wide differences in exposure among the programs. While fully 70 per cent have heard of the Job Corps, only 14 per cent have heard of the MDTA. Interest given exposure does not vary as much from program to program as does exposure. Interest given exposure in the MDTA and in the NYC is the same (61 per cent and 60 per cent respectively). Somewhat fewer, 45 per cent, say they are interested in entering the Job Corps. These results suggest a high degree of interest in all the government programs among those who have been exposed.

The net result of the degree of exposure and degree of interest given exposure is that interest in the NYC and the Job Corps are roughly the same, with 29 per cent of the respondents interested in the NYC and 32 per cent interested in the Job Corps. Because the MDTA has little exposure, there is little net interest in it. Only 8 per cent say they are interested in entering. If, however, the MDTA were to do a more effective job of advertising, such as has been done by the Job Corps, interest in it would be very high indeed.

While the NYC and the Job Corps command about equal net interest, the process generating the net interest is somewhat different for the two programs. The Job Corps enjoys greater exposure but relatively less interest among those exposed. The NYC has less exposure but generates greater interest among those exposed. Since only half the respondents have heard of the NYC,

TABLE V.4

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST[a]

Program Exposure and Interest	Per Cent
Exposure	
(Per cent having heard of program):	
MDTA	14 (815)
NYC	49 (742)
Job Corps	70 (804)
Interest given exposure	
(Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):	
MDTA	61 (107)
NYC	60 (352)
Job Corps	45 (555)
Net interest	
(Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):	
MDTA	8 (813)
NYC	29 (732)
Job Corps	32 (795)

[a]See Table V.1, ftn. a for an explanation of the sample on which tables in this series (V.4 through V.13) are based. Note that program participants are excluded from the figures for each program.

[b]"Net interest" in these tables measures "interest given exposure" times "exposure." For the MDTA, for example, 8 per cent = 61 per cent of 14 per cent. This is equivalent to re-percentaging the raw numbers for interest given exposure on the base N's for exposure, which is the method used here.

Base N's for net interest percentages are slightly smaller than those for exposure percentages due to the exclusion of no answer codes on the interest questions.

we might expect twice as much interest, or 60 per cent, if everyone were exposed to it. If the NYC were to do only as effective a job of advertising as the Job Corps does (that is, if it had a 70 per cent exposure rate), net interest in it would rise from 29 per cent to 42 per cent.

These results suggest a substantial untapped "market" for the services and the programs, especially for the MDTA and the NYC. Let us examine the nature of that market in more detail. In other words, let us see who has been exposed to the programs and, among those who have been exposed, who is interested in them.

Table V.5 breaks down exposure, interest given exposure, and and net interest by location. Each of these measures varies to some extent by location. It appears that exposure to each of the programs is higher in our sample cities than in the rural areas. Exposure to the NYC and to the Job Corps is also higher in Baltimore than it is in the Bronx. Baltimore, in fact, has the highest exposure for each of the programs. This seems appropriate in the sense that school dropout and unemployment rates are highest in Baltimore (among the cities in our sample). Thus high program exposure answers to a need for program services in that city. Lowest program exposure is in Jackson County, Kansas, for the MDTA and NYC, and in Jasper County, South Carolina, for the Job Corps. A fair summary of findings for the MDTA and NYC is simply to note that exposure is higher in the urban areas. For the Job Corps, however, exposure is highest in Baltimore, lowest in Jasper County, South Carolina, and roughly equal in the Bronx and Jackson County, Kansas.

Although exposure is generally lower in rural areas, interest given exposure, is surprisingly as high or higher in rural areas as it is in urban areas. This indicates one untapped source of program interest. Advertising in the rural areas would generate much more interest and program entry there.

TABLE V.5

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST BY LOCATION

Program Exposure and Interest	Location			
	Bronx	Baltimore	Kansas	South Carolina
Exposure				
(Per cent having heard of program):				
MDTA	16 (362)	17 (161)	4 (101)	10 (191)
NYC	51 (321)	62 (142)	32 (101)	44 (128)
Job Corps	67 (355)	94 (156)	70 (101)	58 (192)
Interest given exposure				
(Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):				
MDTA	61 (57)	46 (28)	[50][a] (4)	80 (20)
NYC	56 (154)	51 (88)	56 (32)	78 (78)
Job Corps	53 (230)	28 (144)	50 (70)	48 (110)
Net interest				
(Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):				
MDTA	10 (360)	8 (161)	2 (101)	8 (191)
NYC	28 (312)	32 (142)	18 (101)	34 (177)
Job Corps	35 (348)	27 (154)	35 (101)	28 (191)

[a]Base N too small for percentage to be meaningful.

Interest given exposure in the MDTA and in the NYC is especially high in Jasper County, South Carolina, and appears somewhat low in Baltimore. Interest given exposure in the Job Corps is low in Baltimore and about equally high in the other three locations.

There appears to be some tendency for interest given exposure to be high in the very locations where exposure is low, a rather paradoxical state of affairs. The net effect is to cause the variations in net interest to be relatively minor from one location to another. In this regard, the only difference worthy of mention is that net interest in the MDTA and NYC is relatively low in Jackson County, Kansas.

Table V.6 reports results on exposure and interest by age. Exposure to the MDTA and the Job Corps appears to increase with age, while exposure to the NYC does not. If anything, exposure to the NYC decreases with increasing age. Although there are a couple of reversals, it appears that interest given exposure declines as age increases for all programs. There is probably less need for the programs among older youths. They are much more likely to be employed, and this probably accounts for their lesser interest in the programs.

The net result of these variations is that net interest decreases with increasing age for the NYC. For the MDTA and Job Corps, however, exposure increases with age while interest given exposure declines. These two tendencies largely cancel one another out, leaving little variation by age in net interest. These findings suggest that a relatively untapped source of program interest is among those sixteen and seventeen years old, who are either just entering or are soon to enter the labor market.

Table V.7 breaks down results by sex. For the MDTA and Job Corps, males are more likely to have heard of the program than

TABLE V.6

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST BY AGE

Program Exposure and Interest	Age			
	16	17	18	19
Exposure				
(Per cent having heard of program):				
MDTA	10 (324)	16 (252)	15 (139)	19 (100)
NYC	50 (300)	51 (224)	47 (122)	43 (96)
Job Corps	66 (322)	72 (244)	70 (139)	79 (99)
Interest given exposure				
(Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):				
MDTA	73 (30)	55 (40)	43 (21)	[72][a] (18)
NYC	69 (144)	60 (144)	42 (55)	49 (39)
Job Corps	47 (209)	49 (172)	40 (95)	38 (78)
Net interest				
(Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):				
MDTA	7 (323)	9 (252)	6 (139)	13 (99)
NYC	34 (295)	30 (223)	19 (120)	20 (94)
Job Corps	31 (318)	35 (240)	28 (137)	30 (99)

[a]Base N too small for percentage to be meaningful.

TABLE V.7

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST BY SEX

Program Exposure and Interest	Sex	
	Male	Female
Exposure		
(Per cent having heard of program):		
MDTA	16 (481)	10 (334)
NYC	48 (436)	50 (306)
Job Corps	73 (472)	66 (332)
Interest given exposure		
(Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):		
MDTA	58 (76)	67 (33)
NYC	54 (205)	68 (147)
Job Corps	43 (340)	49 (214)
Net interest		
(Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):		
MDTA	9 (479)	7 (334)
NYC	25 (432)	33 (300)
Job Corps	31 (468)	32 (326)

females. For the NYC, men and women are equally likely to have been exposed. While women are less likely to have been exposed to programs (except for the NYC), they are, surprisingly, more interested in the programs once they have been exposed. This may be partly due to the fact that women in our sample are less likely to be employed than are men and thus may be more in need of program services.

It is once more the case that the effects of exposure and interest given exposure tend to cancel one another out, with the result that sex differences in net interest are minor for each of the programs. It appears that women are another relatively untapped source of program interest.

Table V.8 gives results by race. The table shows that Negroes are substantially more likely to be exposed to the programs

TABLE V.8

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST BY RACE[a]

Program Exposure and Interest	Race	
	White	Negro
Exposure		
(Per cent having heard of program):		
MDTA	9 (516)	22 (291)
NYC	38 (494)	70 (240)
Job Corps	63 (506)	83 (290)
Interest given exposure		
(Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):		
MDTA	61 (46)	60 (63)
NYC	48 (180)	71 (165)
Job Corps	41 (312)	51 (238)
Net interest		
(Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):		
MDTA	5 (516)	13 (289)
NYC	18 (488)	50 (236)
Job Corps	26 (500)	43 (286)

[a]Eight Orientals and American Indians are excluded from this table.

than are whites. Differences are largest for the NYC. Fully 70 per cent of the Negroes have heard of NYC while only 38 per cent of the whites have been exposed. Differences also appear for the other two programs but are not as large as for the NYC. Not only are Negroes more likely to be exposed to the programs than are whites, they are also more likely to be interested once they have been exposed. This, however, is not true for the MDTA, where interest given exposure is equal for whites and Negroes. Differences again are largest for the NYC. While 48 per cent of exposed whites are interested, 71 per cent of exposed Negroes (almost three-quarters) are interested. The net results of these processes are cumulative. Net interest is much higher among Negroes than among whites for all programs. While half of the Negro respondents say that they are interested in entering the NYC, less than a fifth of the white respondents (18 per cent) are interested. Substantial differences appear also for the MDTA and Job Corps.

Although the differences are not as large, findings on individual level of poverty resemble those for race. Table V.9 shows that those respondents who are classified below the poverty line are somewhat more likely to be exposed to the MDTA and the NYC than are those above the poverty line. This is not true for the Job Corps. Poor and non-poor appear equally likely to hear of the Job Corps. Interest in each of the programs, given exposure, is higher among the poor than among the non-poor. Net results by poverty level are thus cumulative, and net interest is higher among the poor than among the non-poor for all programs.

Table V.10 reports results by current activity. For the MDTA and the Job Corps, it appears that exposure is somewhat greater among those who are out of school than among those who are in school. This does not appear to be the case for the NYC.

TABLE V.9

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST BY INDIVIDUAL POVERTY LEVEL

Program Exposure and Interest	Poverty Index	
	Poor	Not Poor
Exposure		
(Per cent having heard of program):		
MDTA	17 (303)	11 (459)
NYC	56 (257)	46 (435)
Job Corps	71 (294)	71 (456)
Interest given exposure		
(Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):		
MDTA	76 (52)	48 (48)
NYC	66 (141)	54 (190)
Job Corps	50 (206)	42 (317)
Net interest		
(Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):		
MDTA	13 (303)	5 (457)
NYC	36 (255)	24 (427)
Job Corps	35 (290)	29 (451)

For this program, exposure appears unrelated to current activity. Having a job does not seem to make much difference in exposure. The greater exposure to the MDTA and the Job Corps among those out of school may be due to the fact that those out of school are somewhat older (and are therefore more likely to have been exposed, as shown in Table V.6).

TABLE V.10

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST BY CURRENT ACTIVITY

Program Exposure and Interest	Current Activity							
	Work-School		School		Work		Other	
Exposure								
(Per cent having heard of program):								
MDTA	9	(128)	12	(469)	24	(108)	15	(110)
NYC	49	(117)	50	(426)	43	(93)	47	(106)
Job Corps	65	(125)	67	(466)	81	(109)	78	(104)
Interest given exposure								
(Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):								
MDTA	[50][a]	(12)	70	(56)	40	(25)	[69][a]	(16)
NYC	68	(57)	62	(209)	55	(38)	44	(48)
Job Corps	44	(79)	46	(307)	38	(88)	51	(80)
Net interest								
(Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):								
MDTA	5	(128)	8	(468)	9	(107)	10	(110)
NYC	33	(117)	31	(420)	23	(91)	20	(104)
Job Corps	28	(123)	31	(459)	30	(107)	40	(103)

[a]Base N too small for percentage to be meaningful.

The relation between current activity and interest given exposure is not simple. Moreover, caution must be exercised because several cells contain small numbers of cases. There is some tendency for those who are in school to be more interested in the programs than those who are out of school. However, for the Job Corps, those who are out of school and out of work are especially likely to be interested. This may also be the case for the MDTA, but there are too few cases to permit a reliable statement. It thus may be the case that interest in the MDTA and the Job Corps is relatively low only among those who are out of school and employed. It remains relatively high among those who are not employed. This is not the case for the NYC, where interest given exposure seems lowest among those out of school and not employed.

The net results of these differences are that net interest does not vary greatly by current activity for the MDTA. For the NYC, net interest is relatively low among those out of school, and for the Job Corps net interest is relatively high among those out of school and out of work.

Table V.11 reports results by activity one year prior to the interview. Comparisons here are complicated by the fact that many of the cells in the table showing interest given exposure contain too few cases to permit reliable comparisons. So far as exposure is concerned, the variations by activity one year prior are not impressive. On the whole, it does not make much difference what the young people were doing one year prior. There is one exception to this. Those who were out of school and working one year before the interview were relatively unlikely to have heard of the NYC. As a result of all this, net interest on the whole does not vary by activity one year before. However, those who were out of school and employed are unlikely to be interested in the NYC, probably because of low exposure.

TABLE V.11

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST BY ACTIVITY ONE YEAR AGO

Program Exposure and Interest	Activity							
	Work-School		School		Work		Other	
Exposure								
(Per cent having heard of program):								
MDTA	19	(100)	11	(612)	23	(60)	24	(41)
NYC	55	(85)	49	(566)	32	(53)	50	(36)
Job Corps	73	(96)	68	(609)	86	(56)	80	(41)
Interest given exposure								
(Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):								
MDTA	[50][a]	(18)	69	(67)	[57][a]	(14)	[30][a]	(10)
NYC	62	(47)	60	(270)	[33]	(15)	[67]	(18)
Job Corps	50	(68)	45	(405)	40	(48)	42	(33)
Net interest								
(Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):								
MDTA	9	(99)	8	(611)	13	(60)	7	(41)
NYC	34	(85)	29	(558)	10	(51)	33	(36)
Job Corps	36	(94)	31	(601)	34	(56)	34	(41)

[a]Base N too small for percentage to be meaningful.

Table V.12 gives comparisons by educational level, i.e., comparisons between high school graduates and non-high school graduates. It appears that those who have not graduated from high school are slightly more likely to have been exposed

TABLE V.12

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

Program Exposure and Interest	Education	
	Non-High School Graduate	High School Graduate
Exposure (Per cent having heard of program):		
MDTA	15 (514)	11 (299)
NYC	50 (464)	46 (276)
Job Corps	69 (503)	54 (299)
Interest given exposure (Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):		
MDTA	66 (76)	48 (33)
NYC	62 (227)	55 (125)
Job Corps	47 (343)	43 (209)
Net interest (Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):		
MDTA	10 (513)	5 (298)
NYC	31 (457)	25 (273)
Job Corps	32 (498)	30 (294)

to programs and to be interested in them given exposure than are high school graduates. The differences are in the same direction for all three programs but are in most comparisons too small to

be of much importance. Moderately large differences do occur in two instances. Non-high school graduates are more likely to be exposed to the Job Corps than are graduates, and non-graduates are more likely to be interested in the MDTA given exposure than are graduates. Differences in net interest are not large enough to be of much importance.

It should be noted that non-high school graduates include both those who are currently attending school and those who have dropped out while high school graduates include both those who are currently employed and those who are not. It is likely that much of the difference between graduates and non-graduates in interest given exposure to the programs comes about because of high interest among unemployed dropouts and low interest among employed graduates. However, since we have too few cases for more elaborate cross-tabulations, this explanation must be viewed as a likely hypothesis rather than an established fact.

Table V.13 reports results from the "vices" or socially disapproved leisure time activities index. This index contains such items as "drank," "gambled," and "stayed out all night." It appears that those who score high on the "vices" index are substantially more likely to have heard of the Job Corps than those who score low. While differences for the other two programs are in the same direction, they are too small to be of any importance. It may be that teachers, recruiters, and counseling personnel are especially likely to mention the Job Corps to young people whom they consider hard to reach or difficult cases.

Regarding interest given exposure, those who score high on the "vices" index show less interest in the MDTA and NYC than those who score low. For the Job Corps, the difference is in the same direction but too small to matter. Participation in socially disapproved leisure activities may be one indication of a "self-selection" factor at work. Those who participate in

TABLE V.13

PROGRAM EXPOSURE AND INTEREST BY LEISURE ACTIVITES--"VICES"

Program Exposure and Interest	"Vices" Index	
	Low	High
Exposure (Per cent having heard of program):		
MDTA	13 (420)	15 (387)
NYC	46 (396)	52 (338)
Job Corps	60 (420)	82 (376)
Interest given exposure (Per cent of those exposed who would be interested in joining):		
MDTA	67 (52)	54 (57)
NYC	70 (177)	48 (171)
Job Corps	48 (245)	43 (308)
Net interest (Per cent of non-participants who would be interested):		
MDTA	8 (419)	8 (386)
NYC	32 (390)	25 (334)
Job Corps	29 (413)	35 (374)

disapproved activities may be less desirous of program help than others, even though in the judgment of social workers or other counseling personnel, they may be more in need of it.

It should be pointed out that the "vices" index is the only indication we found of this sort of phenomenon. Several of the variables already discussed, such as race and poverty level,

can be interepreted as indicating need for program services. By any of these other indicators, those who are more "in need" of services are not only more likely to be exposed to the programs but also are more likely to be interested in them.

This latter view of the matter, in fact, provides a good summary of the results of this analysis. Based upon our present preliminary analysis of youths living in poor neighborhoods, there is a great demand for the federal antipoverty programs. One-third of this group say they are interested in entering the Job Corps, almost one-third are interested in entering the NYC, and 8 per cent are interested in entering the MDTA. More striking than this is the finding that if the young people were fully informed about the existence and functions of the programs, fully 60 per cent would be interested in entering the NYC, 61 per cent would be interested in entering the MDTA, and 45 per cent would be interested in entering the Job Corps.

Interest is not only generally high but it is highest among those who appear most in need of program services. Accordingly, Negroes exhibit greater interest than whites, the poor are more interested than the non-poor, the young are more interested than those slightly older, and non-high school graduates are more interested than graduates. Need, in short, is the best predictor of program interest.

Our analysis has also revealed certain groups where interest given exposure is relatively high but exposure itself is relatively low. These young people are an untapped source of program interest. They include those living in rural areas, the youngest groups in the sample, and females.

What Sort of Program Would Youths in Poor Neighborhoods Like?

It is apparent from the previous analysis that young people in the poor neighborhood sample respond favorably to almost

any sort of government program whether it is the MDTA, NYC, or the Job Corps. Although interest given exposure is somewhat lower for the Job Corps than for the other two programs, this is probably due to the fact that most young people would prefer to live at home rather than in a camp and does not reflect any hostility toward the Job Corps or its objectives. Nonetheless, we felt it would be useful to examine the structure of young people's preferences between different sorts of hypothetical programs. Our purpose was to discover what elements of program activity poor youths favor most and whether particular combinations of program activities aroused special favor or antipathy.

Respondents were asked to express their preferences among a list of seven different hypothetical programs. The seven programs consist of the logical combinations of three program elements--school, work, and job training. For example, one possibility is, "You work full time." Another possibility is, "You work part time and train for a job part time." Each of the hypothetical alternatives was to involve $30 weekly pay. Respondents were first asked to evaluate each alternative separately. Then they were asked to select the one alternative they liked best. Since results for these two different ways of putting the question lead to the same conclusions, we shall report here only the results for the one best liked program.

It is apparent from Table V.14 that school is by far the most popular program element. Fully 75 per cent of the respondents chose a program involving school as one of its elements. Next most popular is work. About half (51 per cent) chose a program involving work. Least popular is vocational training. Only 38 per cent chose a program involving job training.

Of the preferences among the seven combinations of program elements, the most popular program is school alone, chosen by a third of the respondents. Next most popular is school in

TABLE V.14

PREFERENCES FOR HYPOTHETICAL GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS

(Percentage Distribution)

Program Involves:			Per Cent
School	Work	Job Training	
Yes	No	No	32%
Yes	Yes	No	24
No	Yes	Yes	12
Yes	No	Yes	11
Yes	Yes	Yes	8
No	Yes	No	7
No	No	Yes	7
	Total		101%

N 815
NA 7
Total . . 822

combination with work. This program is chosen by 24 per cent. School combined with job training and work combined with job training follow next. These two combinations are about equally popular, chosen by 11 per cent and 12 per cent, respectively. The three remaining combinations are about equally unpopular. They are all three elements in combination, work alone, and job training alone, chosen by 8 per cent, 7 per cent, and 7 per cent, respectively.

Although most of the story can be told by simply noting that school is most popular, work next, and job training least popular, one notable finding emerges from looking at combinations of program elements. Respondents seem to avoid the combination of all three elements more than we would have expected

by simply knowing the relative popularity of the program elements considered separately. There is, so to speak, an "interaction effect." It may be that having to go to school, plus working, plus undergoing job training appears to be too much sheer activity for many of the respondents. In any case, the major finding in Table V.14 may come as a surprise to many. Young people in poor neighborhoods would like to be paid to go to school. They would prefer this to any other type of government program.

Entry into the Neighborhood Youth Corps

In our poor neighborhood sample, there were too few cases of participation in the Job Corps or the MDTA programs to permit any analysis of entry into or experience in these programs. However, 10 per cent of the respondents in poor neighborhoods reported participation in one or another of the NYC programs. We considered this a sufficient number to permit some preliminary analysis of factors associated with entry into the NYC and experience within it.

The NYC actually includes three different types of programs. These are a summer program, an in-school program, and an out-of-school program. About half of our participants were in the summer program, and the rest were divided between the in-school and out-of-school programs.

Table V.15 tabulates NYC participation by a number of selected background and socioeconomic characteristics of our respondents. First, NYC participation varies by location. Those living in the cities are much more likely to participate than those living in rural areas. While 13 per cent in the Bronx and 12 per cent in Baltimore have participated in one or another of the NYC programs, only 8 per cent of those in Jasper County, South Carolina, have participated, and no one in Jackson

TABLE V.15

SELECTED BACKGROUND AND SOCIOECONOMIC CHARACTERISTICS BY NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PARTICIPATION

(Per Cent Who Have Been in the NYC)

Background and Socioeconomic Characteristic	Per Cent
Location:	
Bronx, New York	13 (367)
Baltimore, Maryland	12 (161)
Jackson County, Kansas	0 (101)
Jasper County, South Carolina	8 (193)
Age:	
16	8 (325)
17	11 (252)
18	14 (142)
19	7 (103)
Sex:	
Male	10 (485)
Female	9 (337)
Race:	
White	5 (518)
Negro	19 (296)
Oriental, American Indian	0 (8)
Individual poverty level:	
Poor	15 (304)
Not poor	6 (464)
Current family composition:	
Father present	9 (499)
Father absent	11 (323)

Smallest total N . . . 768
NA 54
Total 822

County, Kansas, reports participation. This is probably a function of availability of the programs since, as we noted previously, interest in programs among those who have heard of them is as high or higher in rural areas as it is in urban areas.

There is some suggestion of a curvilinear relation between age and NYC participation. Participation seems somewhat lower for those who are sixteen and nineteen years old than it is for those who are seventeen and eighteen. It may be that participation is low for those who are sixteen years old because of a high level of school attendance, and for those who are nineteen years old because of relatively high employment rates.

While sex appears unrelated to NYC participation, race and poverty level are strongly related. Negroes are almost four times as likely to enter the NYC as whites. Among the Negroes living in poor neighborhoods, 19 per cent have participated in the NYC while among the whites in poor neighborhoods, only 5 per cent have participated. Poverty level is also strongly related to NYC participation, although it is less strongly related than race. While 15 per cent of the poor have participated, only 6 per cent of the non-poor report participation. Since poverty level is less strongly related to NYC entry than is race, it is apparent that greater poverty among Negroes does not explain why they are so likely to enter the NYC. It may be that Negroes perceive a greater need for NYC services because of discrimination in the labor market or for other reasons, or it may be that recruiting efforts are disproportionately aimed at Negroes. Our previous analysis of exposure and interest suggests that both of these phenomena are probably at work. Negroes are more likely to be interested in the antipoverty programs once they have heard of them, and they are also more likely to have heard of them. The result is a much higher net interest of Negroes, especially in the NYC. Race and poverty level together go a

long way toward explaining entry into the NYC; they are clearly the most important predictors.

It will be noted from the final panel of Table V.15 that family structure appears to be largely unrelated to NYC participation. Whether the father is present or absent makes little difference in entry rates.

In Table V.16, the relation of a number of experience characteristics to NYC participation is considered. When we compare results on the relation of current activity to NYC participation with results on the relation of activity one year prior to the interview, there is evidence of a substantial effect of participation in the NYC on employment for young people out of school. While 17 per cent of those who are currently working report NYC participation, only 4 per cent of those out of school but not currently working report such participation. In other words, those who are working are four times as likely to have been in the NYC as those who are not working. Among those who are in school, 10 per cent report NYC participation.

Not only is there a substantial relation between NYC participation and current employment, but there is reason to believe that the differential in employment prospects did not exist prior to NYC entry. We note from Table V.16 that NYC participation among those out of school is not related to employment one year prior to the interview. Although this is only a weak analogy to an actual before-and-after measurement, the suggestion is that an employment advantage which did not exist one year prior to the interview has developed over the course of the year for those who participated in the NYC. The NYC, in other words, appears in these very preliminary data to increase substantially the employment chances of participants.

The reader is cautioned that at least part of this NYC effect is only apparent. For one thing, a number of NYC partici-

TABLE V.16

SELECTED EXPERIENCE CHARACTERISTICS BY NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PARTICIPATION

(Per Cent Who Have Been in the NYC)

Experience Characteristic	Per Cent
Current activity:	
In school and at work	9 (128)
In school	10 (471)
At work	17 (112)
Other	4 (111)
Activity one year ago:	
In school and at work	15 (100)
In school	8 (616)
At work	13 (61)
Other	16 (43)
Educational level:	
Finished high school	9 (302)
Not finished high school	10 (518)
Had vocational training:	
Yes	13 (213)
No	9 (609)
Vocabulary test score:	
High	11 (456)
Low	8 (366)
Labor market savvy:	
High	12 (409)
Low	8 (398)
Leisure activities--"vices":	
High	14 (392)
Low	6 (422)
Leisure activities--"social":	
High	12 (345)
Low	8 (476)

Smallest total N 807
NA 15
Total 822

pants are currently participating in the programs. Thus the employment which they report is nothing other than their NYC job. However, if these people were removed from the sample, the apparent effect of the NYC, although reduced, would still be substantial. A second reason for caution is that the small size of our samples does not permit us to introduce controls for other factors associated with NYC entry, such as age, which might further reduce the apparent NYC effect. While the finding of an apparent program effect is encouraging, it is also obvious that we are at present unable to determine whether the effect is due to some aspect of the NYC program or whether it is due to other factors associated with program entry. This is the sort of question that we expect to be able to answer in the larger study to follow the pilot.

An additional point concerning activity one year prior to the interview also emerges from Table V.16. It appears that those who were in school and not working at that time are the group least likely to enter the NYC. The other three groups appear about equally likely to have participated. Being out of school or working while in school apparently predisposes young people to enter.

Of the remaining factors considered in Table V.16, educational level and "general intelligence" appear to be unrelated to NYC participation, while "labor market savvy" (knowledge of pay, educational requirements, and security characteristics of jobs), participation in social activities, participation in socially disapproved leisure activities, and experience of vocational training appear to be modestly related.

For the factors which appear to be related, there is no way to tell from present data whether they are causes of program entry, effects of program experience, or merely spurious correlates of program participation. Vocational training and labor

market savvy, for example, might well be effects of program experience. We shall see later that about one-third of NYC participants report receiving vocational training while in the program. On the other hand, those who have had vocational training or know something about the labor market might have a higher predisposition to enter NYC. Thus these factors also could be causes of participation rather than effects.

Social activities and socially disapproved activities could possibly be results of program participation, or they could be factors predisposing young people to enter, or they could be spuriously related. We know, for example, that young people who are out of school are more likely to participate in socially disapproved activities and are also slightly more likely to enter the NYC than those who are in school. Thus the crucial factor producing the association between higher "vices" and NYC participation could be simply the fact of having left school. We expect to be able to sort out these various possibilities in the large-scale longitudinal study.

Table V.17 reports the relation of selected value and self-concept measures to NYC participation. On the whole, these attitude measures appear to be unrelated to program entry. "Delayed gratifiers," for example, are no more or less likely to enter the NYC than "immediate gratifiers." Those who score high on the "striving" index (i.e., endorse values having to do with hard work) are no more likely to enter the NYC than those who score low.

The one self-concept measure which does appear to predict NYC participation is "negative self-concept." Those who view themselves in negative terms (for example, see themselves as "mean" or "troublesome") are more likely to participate in the NYC than those who do not view themselves this way. Again, it is not possible to explain this association empirically, with

TABLE V.17

SELECTED VALUE MEASURES BY NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PARTICIPATION

(Per Cent Who Have Been in the NYC)

Value Measure	High	Low
Self-concept: negative	15 (315)	7 (507)
Self-concept: positive	8 (333)	11 (486)
Self-concept: talented	10 (477)	9 (343)
Striving	10 (624)	8 (193)
Delayed gratification	10 (324)	10 (498)
Optimism	9 (571)	10 (250)

Smallest total N . . . 817
NA 5
Total 822

our present data. It will be recalled that negative self-concept is also related to having a job, but in the opposite direction. Those who view themselves in negative terms tend to be unemployed. It could be that the NYC appears to some young people as an employer of last resort. Those who are unemployed and view themselves in negative terms may be likely to enter the NYC because they have not succeeded in finding a job elsewhere. This explanation is offered only as a possibility worthy of further empirical exploration and not as a finding.

In sum, the data suggest that entry into the NYC can be explained in part by program availability and youths' need for program services. Where the program is not available, young people obviously cannot enter it. Apart from this, race, poverty level, and past activities appear to be the best indicators

of entry. Negroes and the poor are highly likely to enter, while young people who were in school and not working one year before the interview are especially unlikely to enter. There are some hints in the data that the NYC serves as a functional alternative to a job, that is, as an employer of last resort. Thus those who are out of school and out of work, especially those who are seventeen and eighteen years old, are likely to make use of program services.

Additional factors which are good predictors of NYC participation are negative self-conception and participation on socially disapproved leisure activities. However, in the absence of longitudinal analysis, it is difficult to tell whether these factors are causes, effects, or merely spurious correlates of program participation.

If, as the data suggest, need is the best predictor of entry, the problem of future assessment of program effects is considerably simplified. The present data give us little reason to suspect any strong self-selection effects such that a young person who is likely to be a success in any case enters the program because of some sort of desire to succeed. In other words, we have not identified any motivational factors which, statistically controlled, would reduce apparent effects of program experience. If anything, we might expect the opposite. If we were to control for poverty level or negative self-concept, for example, apparent program effects upon employment would be increased rather than reduced. Since the program appears to be serving a segment of the population which is worse off than average, any apparent employment advantage gained through program participation is, to that extent, all the more impressive.

Neighborhood Youth Corps Participants

Of the total weighted sample of 912 respondents, 99 or 11

per cent, said they had been in one of the three programs.[1] Seventy-six were in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, thirty-nine of them in summer programs. Seven were in the Job Corps, and three in MDTA programs. With such small numbers for the latter two programs, we cannot say anything in detail about participants' experiences in them. Nor can we compare programs. This analysis, then, will concentrate on the weighted total of the seventy-six NYC participants.

Participants were asked where they had first heard of the NYC. The same question had been asked of those non-participants who had heard of the program. Table V.18 compares sources of first exposure for the two groups. The figures for non-participants repeat those for the NYC in Table V.21.

Participants mentioned personal sources far more often than did non-participants. Most (43 per cent) cited teachers and other school personnel, and another 23 per cent cited friends. Non-participants were more likely to cite radio or television (21 per cent) or friends (30 per cent) than teachers (17 per cent). It would seem that school teachers and administrators are especially effective "recruiters" for the program, possibly even acting as an entree into the application process.

However, a partial explanation for the data in Table V.18 is apparent when source of information is broken down by location. All the participants in rural Jasper County (N = 19) cited teachers as their source, while 25 per cent of the urban participants (N = 57) cited teachers. This suggests that recruitment into the NYC unit to which the nineteen Jasper County respondents belong is an atypical process, based perhaps on the effectiveness of one individual in the school system. Further, 15 per cent of all

---

[1] An inspection of supplementary questionnaires indicated that thirteen respondents who said they had participated in one of the programs actually had not done so. They were excluded from the analysis.

TABLE V.18

SOURCE OF EXPOSURE TO NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS BY PARTICIPATION[a]

(Per Cent Hearing of the NYC from Specified Source)

Source	Participants	Non-participants
Teacher, other school personnel	43%	17%
Friend	22	30
TV, radio	8	21
Recruiter	5	12
Youth opportunity center	4	4
Employment counselor	4	1
Relative	4	2
Newspaper, poster	3	9
Other	9	17
Total	102%[b]	113%
N = 100%	76	362

Total N 438

NA 0

Total 438

[a]Based on those respondents living in poor neighborhoods who have been in or have heard of the NYC.

[b]Percentages total more than 100 because of multiple answers.

Jasper County respondents named a teacher as the person they know or have heard about that they would most like to be like (N = 176). Only 6 per cent of respondents in the other three locations (N = 525) named a teacher as their role model.[2]

If the hypotheses that recruitment in the Jasper County sampling area is atypical is correct, we can account for most of the difference noted in Table V.18. Seventeen per cent of all non-participants, urban and rural, cite teachers, compared with 25 per cent of urban participants.

Figures on duration of membership reflect the fact that about half the NYC participants were in the summer program. Seventy per cent were in the program less than three months, another 15 per cent three to six months. About three out of four were no longer in the program when they were interviewed. The participants' program experiences were no doubt shaped in part by the fact that few were members longer than three months.

Sixty participants said they had jobs in the program. As Table V.19 shows, 53 per cent of these jobs were clerical, another 25 per cent service jobs. Negroes were somewhat less likely to get clerical work and more likely to get jobs in the service and labor categories, although the number of white participants involved was small and the percentages for whites are therefore somewhat unreliable.

The majority of participants who had jobs held them on a full-time basis. Twenty-eight per cent worked thirty to forty hours a week, another 35 per cent, twenty-six to thirty hours. About half the participants reported earning $30 to $40 a week. Another 21 per cent earned $40 to $50 a week. These earnings reflect the predominantly full-time character of their jobs.

---

[2] For other role model data, see Tables II.24, IV.6, and IV.17.

TABLE V.19

TYPE OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS JOB BY RACE

(Per Cent Holding Specified Job)

Occupational Category	Race of Participant		All Participants
	Negro	White	
Clerical	41%	[88%][a]	53%
Service	30	[12]	25
Labor	18	0	13
Craftsman	2	0	2
Operative	2	0	2
Don't know	7	0	5
Total	100%	100%	100%
N = 100%	44	16	60

Total N	60
No job	13
NA	3
Total	76

[a]Base N too small for percentages to be reliable. See text for discussion.

We asked participants if they had received any vocational training in the program. Twenty-four (or 32 per cent) said they had, primarily on an on-the-job basis, and therefore primarily in clerical skills. Some participants (18 per cent) reported having basic education courses in the program. These participants, then, typically experienced the program as a full-time or nearly full-time job, most often during the summer.

We also asked if the program had provided any counseling. Sixty-four per cent said they had seen a counselor some time during their tenure in the program. Contact with counselors

was rather frequent (see Table V.20). Fifteen per cent talked with a counselor every day, another 36 per cent at least once a week, another 15 per cent less often than that. Thirty-six per cent reported having received no counseling.

TABLE V.20

CONTACT WITH COUNSELORS FOR NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS PARTICIPANTS

(Per Cent Reporting Specified Frequency of Contact)

Frequency of Contact	Per Cent
Had some contact	64%
Every day	15
Two or three times a week	16
About once a week	20
One to three times a week	4
Less than once a month	3
One time only	6
No contact	36
Total	100%

N 75
NA 1
Total . . . 76

Of the participants who did see counselors, an overwhelming majority (90 per cent) said they felt they had been helped by it. Thirty-five per cent said they got advice concerning their jobs. Others reported a variety of modes of assistance, including help with personal problems, educational advice, advice on getting jobs, encouragement of their ambitions. While the number of cases in the group with counseling experience is

too small for detailed analysis, there seemed to be no difference between the experiences of whites and Negroes.

In summary, then, this was the experience of the NYC participants in our sample: 70 per cent were in the program less than three months, but nearly four-fifths had jobs, generally full time. Few received any general education; a larger proportion had some job training. Just about two-thirds received some counseling, most of these quite frequently.

A major function of the supplementary questionnaire was to find out how participants evaluate their program experience. We asked several types of questions: why they entered the program, what they liked and disliked, why they left, whether they felt the NYC had helped or hurt them, whether they felt it was a good idea for teenagers. As Table V.21 shows, a large majority said that they were quite satisfied with their experience. Eighty-six per cent said that the program had helped them; only 5 per cent said that it had hurt them in some way. Participants were also more likely than non-participants to think the program an especially good idea. The comparison is shown in the second part of Table V.21. While 95 per cent of the participants were favorably impressed (felt the program was either a "very good idea" or a "pretty good idea"), 88 per cent of the non-participants felt this way. The biggest difference was in the most favorable category--65 per cent for participants versus 47 per cent for non-participants.

Those participants and non-participants who seemed favorably impressed with the program were questioned further about their reasons for thinking it a good idea. The results are reported in the third part of Table V.21; the information on non-participants repeats the information for the NYC in Table V.3. The most frequent response from participants was that the NYC is a source of income. Thirty-six per cent gave this reason; its

TABLE V.21

EVALUATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS BY PARTICIPATION[a]

Evaluation	Participants	Non-participants
General effect (per cent "yes" answers):		
Did the NYC help in any way? . . .	86%	--
Did the NYC make things harder?. .	5	--
Evaluation of whether the program was a good idea "for people like yourself":		
Very good idea	65%	49%
Pretty good idea	30	39
Not too good an idea	5	12
Total	100%	100%
N = 100%	76	348
Reasons for favorable impression:[b]		
Source of income	36%	5%
Avoids delinquency, provides sheer activity	24	23
Provides a job	19	19
Provides job training	12	12
Provides general education	6	5
Helps people generally	2	26
Involves service to others	0	3
Other specific answers	15	15
Uncodeable answers	0	12
Total	114%[c]	120%
N = 100%	67	299
Total N	424	
NA	14	
Total	438	

[a]Based on those respondents in poor neighborhoods who have heard of or have been in the NYC.

[b]Limited to those judged favorably impressed.

[c]Percentages total more than 100 because of multiple answers.

importance can best be seen, perhaps, in these specific responses:

"It helps the income of the house."
"It gives a lot of people a chance to do part-time work and earn some money."
"Many . . . needed the money."
"We can get our own money and stop being so dependent."
"You get the opportunity to earn some money while you're out of school."
"I needed the money very badly."
"I don't even have to worry my parents for an allowance."

Another 19 per cent of the responses referred to the program's value in providing jobs for teenagers, also suggesting an element of economic need. An additional 12 per cent saw the program as a valuable chance for training in a skill or trade.

The second largest category of participants' responses, however, was the one we have labelled "delinquency avoidance or sheer activity." As vague as it might seem, it indicates precisely the type of response made. Fourteen of the sixteen participants' responses in this category contain the phrases "keeps kids off the streets" and/or "keeps kids out of trouble." This is perhaps an echo of parental evaluations or perhaps participants' candid recognition of their situation:

"Better than being out on the street."
"Keeps youngsters off the street so they won't be bored in the summer."
"I guess I'll get into less trouble that way."
"To get teen-agers off the streets, and working."
"Most of the kids before the program started used to hang around in the street and do bad things."

We asked participants why they entered the NYC; the responses are reported in Table V.22 with separate tabulations for whites and Negroes. The great majority of responses were "to earn money" or "to have a job" (38 per cent and 36 per cent, respectively). Negroes were much more likely to mention earnings, less likely to refer to job training (a reason mentioned by 27

TABLE V.22

REASONS FOR ENTERING NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS BY RACE

(Per Cent Citing Reason Specified)

Reason	Race of Participant		All Participants
	White	Negro	
To earn money	18%	46%	38%
To have a job	27	39	36
To get job training	27	9	15
Sheer activity, avoid delinquency	9	9	9
General education, information.	0	2	1
Other specific answers	18	4	8
Vague, uncodeable	0	6	4
Total	99%	115%[a]	111%
N = 100%	22	54	76

N 76
NA 0
Total 76

[a]Percentages total more than 100 because of multiple answers.

per cent of the whites). Eighty-five per cent of the Negroes cited earnings or employment, compared with 45 per cent of the whites. About a tenth of the participants got into the NYC simply to have something to do or to "avoid delinquency." There was no differentiation by race in this category, although 15 per cent of the girls and only 6 per cent of the boys gave this as a reason for entering.

A word of caution is in order about comparisons of whites and Negroes among the NYC participants. The number of Negro

participants (fifty-four) is sufficient for percentages to be fairly trustworthy. But since the weighted number of whites is small (twenty-two), there is a good chance that some of the percentages reported here are unreliable.

Another question asked what participants especially liked about the NYC. This was quite similar to the question asking why the program might be "a good idea for teenagers like yourself." The responses to this question, presented in Table V.23, should be compared with the earlier, more general question discussed above. (Compare Table V.23 with the figures for participants in Table V.21.) The second question reflected participants' subjective experiences and elicited a greater variety of responses.

Again, a sizable proportion of the responses fell into the "money" and "job" categories. Again, there was a racial difference: 32 per cent of the Negroes cited one of these reasons, while 9 per cent of the whites mentioned jobs, and none mentioned money explicitly. In contrast, however, the most frequent personal reason for liking the program was one not mentioned in response to the earlier question. One-fourth of the participants said they enjoyed personal relationships with other participants or co-workers, with little difference by race. A third of the girls gave answers fitting this category, but only a fifth of the boys. An important but unanticipated function of the program, then, is the promotion of friendships and camaraderie among participants. In addition, another 10 per cent of the participants mentioned personal relationships with supervisors or administrators as an aspect of the program they especially liked.

Another difference between responses to the general question and the personal one was the virtual absence in the latter responses of reference to "avoiding delinquency" or "sheer activity." Only one respondent gave an answer of this type here, compared with sixteen in response to the earlier question.

TABLE V.23

PARTICIPANTS' REASONS FOR LIKING NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS BY RACE

(Per Cent Citing Specified Reason)

Reason	Race of Participant		All Participants
	White	Negro	
Personal relationships with other participants or co-workers	27%	24%	25%
Source of income	0	20	14
Provides a job	9	12	11
Personal relationships with supervisors or administrators	9	10	10
Provides job training	18	4	8
General work experience	0	10	7
General education, information	18	0	6
Sheer activity, avoids delinquency	0	2	1
Other	18	31	27
Don't know	0	6	4
Total	99%	119%[a]	113%
N = 100%	22	51	73

Total N 73
NA 3
Total 76

[a]Percentages total more than 100 because of multiple answers.

Other personal likes were quite evenly distributed among several categories: job training (8 per cent), general work experience (7 per cent), general education or information (6 per cent), and miscellaneous responses (27 per cent), many of which referred to improving the lot of the Negro.

We also asked all seventy-six participants what they disliked about the program (see Table V.24). Thirty-nine per cent didn't know or had no specific dislikes. Eighteen per cent,

TABLE V.24

PARTICIPANTS' REASONS FOR DISLIKING NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

(Per Cent Citing Specified Reason)

Reason	Per Cent
Pay is too low	18%
Nothing to do or not enough to do	13
Training or education aren't worthwhile	4
Undesirable jobs	3
Poor administration of program	3
Other specific responses	21
Don't know, or uncodeable response	39
Total	101%

N 75
NA 1
Total . . 76

however, complained about their earnings, either in terms of the pay scale or of limitations on the number of hours they could work. Another 13 per cent said there was not enough to do in

the NYC. Both these sources of dissatisfaction relate to economic aspects of the program, at least to some extent.

The fifty-six participants who had left the program were asked why they did so. The responses appear in Table V.25. The most frequent response was that they returned to school (35 per cent), followed by the response that the program ended (30 per cent). These responses reflect the fact that over half

TABLE V.25

REASONS FOR LEAVING NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS

(Per Cent Citing Specified Reason)

Reason	Per Cent
Went back to school	35%
Job or program ended	30
Ineligible for program	7
Got another job	6
Dissatisfied with job	6
Dissatisfied with administration of program	4
Dissatisfied with training program	2
Other specific response	13
Vague, uncodeable	2
Total	105%[a]
N	54
Still in program	20
NA	2
Total	76

[a]Percentages total more than 100 because of multiple answers.

the participants were in the summer program. Of participants in the summer program, 51 per cent left the program because they were returning to school, and 38 per cent because the program was ending. Only 11 per cent of the fifty-six said they left the program because of dissatisfaction with it. Six per cent were dissatisfied with their jobs and another 4 per cent with the organization or administration of the program. One person said he was disappointed in the training program.

The pattern of responses represented in these questions in many ways complements the pattern reflected in the questions we had asked on what these youths had liked about the program, and why they thought it was a good idea for other teenagers. They entered the program primarily for "economic" reasons; in this sense, then, the program was successful, for 36 per cent of these thought it a good idea for its providing a source of income, and another 19 per cent of the youths gave the related "economic" answer of its providing them with a job.

Thus, the overall pattern seems to reflect a favorable experience with the program for these participants. The majority (86 per cent) told us they thought the program had helped them, and apparently it did, for their expectations of the program at the time they entered--that it would provide money (38 per cent), or a job (36 per cent) and to a lesser extent work training (15 per cent)--seem to have been met: 83 per cent did have a job and 32 per cent mention that they got some work training.

Summary

In this chapter, we have considered a variety of aspects of orientations toward and participation in federal antipoverty programs for youths. While exposure to the programs varies from 14 per cent of the sample having heard of the MDTA to 70 per cent having heard of the Job Corps, reactions to the programs

among those exposed are uniformly very favorable. The image held by youths in poor neighborhoods of what functions the programs perform corresponds closely to the reasons young people gave for favorable impressions of the programs. The MDTA and the Job Corps are viewed and evaluated primarily in terms of job-related benefits, first vocational training and then job provision. The NYC is viewed in a greater variety of ways with particular emphasis on its general social usefulness, e.g., in providing young people with something to do and keeping them out of trouble.

Not only are programs viewed in a highly favorable light but there also appears to be a great demand among youths in poor neighborhoods for program participation. One-third of our sample say they are interested in entering the Job Corps, about one-third are interested in entering the NYC, and 8 per cent are interested in the MDTA. Moreover, if more youths were informed about the existence and functions of the programs, net interest would be much higher than it is. Among those who are informed, about 60 per cent are interested in the NYC, 61 per cent in the MDTA, and 45 per cent in the Job Corps.

Interest is higher among some groups than among others, and it appears that interest is highest among those who are most in need of program services. Thus, Negroes, the poor, the young, and non-high school graduates are especially interested. Certain groups are a relatively untapped source of program interest in the sense that, although a few of them have been exposed to the programs, those who have been exposed show high interest. These include rural youths, the young, and females.

While interest is very high in all government antipoverty programs, young people like some elements of program activity better than others. Respondents were asked to choose among a variety of hypothetical government programs. The major finding

may come as a surprise to many. Young people in poor neighborhoods would like to be paid to go to school and would prefer this to any other type of government program.

Findings on factors associated with interest in programs are in large part confirmed by findings on entry in the NYC. The data suggest that the most important factors are program availability and youths' need for program services. Negroes and the poor are very likely to enter, while those who were in school and not working one year before the interview are unlikely to have participated. It may be that participants view the NYC as a functional alternative to a job, a sort of employer of last resort. For additional attitude and leisure activity correlates of NYC participation, it is impossible to tell from present data whether they are causes, effects, or merely spurious correlates. Since those who enter the NYC appear to be worse off than average, any apparent employment advantage gained through program participation (and our data tentatively suggest such an advantage) is, to that extent, all the more impressive.

Young people who participated in NYC viewed their experience in highly favorable terms. Fully 86 per cent reported that the program had helped them. Consistent with the finding that need is the best predictor of program entry are the reports of participants on the reasons why they entered NYC and on the nature of the benefits that they received from participation. The emphasis is strongly on economic motivations. Money and provision of a job are the primary reasons given for entry and are perceived with a high degree of approval as the major ways in which the program was of help.

Whether or not the NYC or the other programs actually provide more benefits to a poor youth than he could receive through alternative courses of action cannot, of course, be determined by his own impression of program benefits. Nor can it be

determined from any of the data presented in this chapter. In other words, the findings presented here are not to be mistaken for an evaluation of program effectiveness. What we hope has been accomplished is the laying of a firm, substantive and methodological foundation for program evaluation in the future.

APPENDIX

Budget Bureau No. 116-6640
Expires 6-30-67

513
Oct., 1966

NATIONAL OPINION RESEARCH CENTER
University of Chicago

_____
ID #

SURVEY 513

Hello, I'm _____ from the National Opinion Research Center. We are conducting a national survey of young people and I'm here to interview a young (man/woman) who is between the ages of 16 through 19. Is there anayone here in that age group?

IF YES, PROCEED WITH INTERVIEW.

IF NO, RECORD CALL ON SURS AND GO ON TO NEXT DU.

TIME BEGAN:	_____ AM PM

1. First let's talk about your friends. Do you have a lot of friends or only a few friends?

   A lot of friends 1
   A few friends 2
   No friends 3

---

2. Thinking of people including relatives who are really good friends--people you can really talk to--about how many of those friends would you say you have?

   Number of friends _____

---

3. Do most of your friends know each other?

   Yes 4
   Some do, some don't . . 5
   No 6

---

4. Do you belong to any clubs or organizations outside of school?

   Yes . . . (ASK A) . . . 7
   No 8

   A. IF YES: How many do you belong to?

   _____
   (Number of organizations)

---

5. Do you belong to a gang?

   Yes 9
   No 0

---

6. Now let's talk about your family. Who are the people who acted as your mother and father while you were growing up? I mean, what people had the most to do with bringing you up?

   Mother and father together . .(GO TO Q. 7)). . . 1
   Mother . . . .(ASK A) 2
   Father . . . .(ASK B) 3
   Other . . . .(ASK A & B) . . . 4

   A. IF MOTHER OR OTHER: Who acted as your father? CIRCLE ONLY ONE CODE.

   Stepfather 1
   Foster father 2
   Grandfather 3
   Older brother 4
   Other male relative . . . 5
   Male non-relative 6
   No male (R. non-institutionalized) . . . 7
   R. institutionalized (SKIP TO Q. 12) 8

   B. IF FATHER OR OTHER: Who acted as your mother? CIRCLE ONLY ONE CODE.

   Stepmother 1
   Foster mother 2
   Grandmother 3
   Older sister 4
   Other female relative . . . 5
   Female non-relative 6
   No female (R. non-institutionalized) 7
   R. institutionalized (SKIP TO Q. 12) 8

7. Who was the main wage earner in the family you grew up in, that is, who earned the most money (most of the time)?

Self	1
Spouse	2
Father (or father substitute)	3
Mother (or mother substitute)	4
Other relative (SPECIFY)_____	5
Other (SPECIFY) _____	6
No one	7
Don't know	X

---

8. Who was the boss in your family? I mean who made most of the important decisions?

Father (father substitute) .	0
Mother (mother substitute) .	9
Other male	8
Other female	7
Don't know or can't decide .	X

---

9. What person in your family did you respect the most?

Father (father substitute) .	1
Mother (mother substitute) .	2
Other male	3
Other female	4
Don't know or can't decide .	X

---

10. ASK EVERYONE WHO GREW UP WITH A MOTHER OR MOTHER SUBSTITUTE.
On the whole how did you get along with your mother (mother substitute) while you were growing up? Would you say you got along very well, pretty well, or not too well.

Very well	5
Pretty well	6
Not too well	7

11. ASK EVERYONE WHO GREW UP WITH A FATHER OR FATHER SUBSTITUTE.
On the whole, how well did you get along with your father while you were growing up? Would you say you got along very well, pretty well, or not too well?

Very well	1
Pretty well	2
Not too well	3

ASK EVERYONE:

12. A. How many older brothers do you have? (COUNT STEP AND HALF BROTHERS)

_____

B. How many older sisters do you have? (COUNT STEP AND HALF SISTERS)

_____

C. How many younger brothers do you have? (COUNT STEP AND HALF BROTHERS)

_____

D. How many younger sisters do you have? (COUNT STEP AND HALF SISTERS)

_____

---

13. Are your (real) mother and (real) father living together now, are they divorced, or separated or what?

Together	1
Divorced	2
Separated	3
Father dead	4
Mother dead	5
Both dead	6
Other (SPECIFY) _____	7

---

14. Who are you living with now? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE CODE)

Mother and father together . .	0
Mother	1
Father	2
Other relative (SPECIFY) _____	3
Foster parent	4
Friend(s)	5
Spouse	6
Alone	7
Other (SPECIFY) _____	8

15. Who is the main wage earner in your household, that is, who earns the most money?

Self	1
Spouse	2
Father (or father substitute)	3
Mother (or mother substitute)	4
Other relative (SPECIFY)_____	5
Other (SPECIFY) _____	6
No one	7

---

16. Who is the head of the household? (What relation is (he/she) to you?)

Self	1
Spouse	2
Father	3
Mother	4
Other (SPECIFY) _____	5
Unrelated	6

---

17. How many people live in your household altogether? Did we miss anyone--like you yourself, new babies, a roomer, or someone who lives with you but is away right now?

Number in household _____

---

18. How many of those people are related to you in any way? (INCLUDE THE RESPONDENT)

Number related _____

---

19. Thinking back over the last two years, how many times have you moved? (COUNT GOING TO LIVE WITH OTHER RELATIVES AS MOVING UNLESS IT IS ONLY FOR A BRIEF VISIT OF THREE MONTHS OR LESS.)

_____
(Number of times)

---

20. Have you ever had any children of your own?

Yes . . . (ASK A)	1
No	2

A. IF YES: How many?

_____
(Number of children)

Now I'd like to ask you some more about your family and friends. First about (Now about): (ASK Q's 21-26 FOR COLUMN A; THEN FOR COLUMN B, ETC. DO NOT ASK ACROSS)

		A. Your father (father substitute) IF R. HAS NO FATHER (SUBSTITUTE), GO TO B.	B. Your mother (mother substitute) IF R. HAS NO MOTHER (SUBSTITUTE), GO TO C.
21.	What is (s)he doing right now? Is (s)he working, going to school, or what?	Working only . . . . 1 School only . . . . . 2 Working and school. . 3 Keeping house (female) 4 Unemployed or looking for work . . . 5 Other (SPECIFY) . . . 6	Working only . . . . 1 School only . . . . 2 Working and school . 3 Keeping house (female) 4 Unemployed or looking for work . . . 5 Other (SPECIFY) . . . 6
22.	What work does (s)he usually do? Occupation		
23.	In what business or industry is that? Business or industry		
24.	What was the highest grade (s)he completed in school?	5th grade or less . . 0 6th - 7th grade . . . 1 8th grade . . . . . 2 9th grade . . . . . 3 10th grade . . . . . 4 11th grade . . . . . 5 12th grade . . . . . 6 Some college . . . . 7 Complete college . . . 8 Graduate school or more . . . . . 9 Don't know X	5th grade or less . . 0 6th - 7th grade . . . 1 8th grade . . . . . 2 9th grade . . . . . 3 10th grade . . . . . 4 11th grade . . . . . 5 12th grade . . . . . 6 Some college . . . . 7 Complete college . . 8 Graduate school or more . . . . . 9 Don't know X
25.	How far does (s)he want you go go in school?	5th grade or less . . 0 6th-7th grade . . . . 1 8th grade . . . . . 2 9th grade . . . . . 3 10th grade . . . . . 4 11th grade . . . . . 5 12th grade . . . . . 6 Some college . . . . 7 Complete college . . 8 Graduate school or more 9 Don't know or doesn't care X	5th grade or less . . 0 6th-7th grade . . . . 1 8th grade . . . . . 2 9th grade . . . . . 3 10th grade . . . . . 4 11th grade . . . . . 5 12th grade . . . . . 6 Some college . . . . 7 Complete college . . 8 Graduate school or more 9 Don't know or doesn't care X
26.	How important to (him/her) is it for you to get ahead in life?	Very important . . . 1 Pretty important . . 2 Not too important . . 3 Don't know X	Very important . . . 1 Pretty important . . 2 Not too important . . 3 Don't know X

C. Your older brother (FEMALES: older sister) (IF MORE THAN ONE: The one you feel closest to.) IF R. HAS NO OLDER BROTHER/SISTER, GO TO D.	D. Your best friend (MALE FRIEND FOR MALES, FEMALE FRIEND FOR FEMALES)	E. A man (FEMALES: woman) who you know personally that you admire very much.
Working only 1	Working only 1	Working only 1
School only 2	School only 2	School only 2
Working and school . 3	Working and school . 3	Working and school . 3
Keeping house (female) 4	Keeping house (female) 4	Keeping house (female) 4
Unemployed or looking for work . . . 5	Unemployed or looking for work . . . 5	Unemployed or looking for work . . . 5
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 6	Other (SPECIFY) _____ 6	Other (SPECIFY) _____ 6
5th grade or less . . 0	5th grade or less . 0	5th grade or less . 0
6th - 7th grade . . 1	6th - 7th grade . . 1	6th - 7th grade . . 1
8th grade 2	8th grade 2	8th grade 2
9th grade 3	9th grade 3	9th grade 3
10th grade 4	10th grade 4	10th grade 4
11th grade 5	11th grade 5	11th grade 5
12th grade 6	12th grade 6	12th grade 6
Some college 7	Some college 7	Some college 7
Complete college . . 8	Complete college . . 8	Complete college . . 8
Graduate school or more 9	Graduate school or more 9	Graduate school or more 9
Don't know X	Don't know X	Don't know X
5th grade or less . . 0	5th grade or less . 0	5th grade or less . 0
6th - 7th grade . . . 1	6th - 7th grade 1	6th - 7th grade . . 1
8th grade 2	8th grade 2	8th grade 2
9th grade 3	9th grade 3	9th grade 3
10th grade 4	10th grade 4	10th grade 4
11th grade 5	11th grade 5	11th grade 5
12th grade 6	12th grade 6	12th grade 6
Some college 7	Some college 7	Some college 7
Complete college . . 8	Complete college . . 8	Complete college . . 8
Graduate school or more 9	Graduate school or more 9	Graduate school or more 9
Don't know or doesn't doesn't care . . . X	Don't know or doesn't doesn't care . . . X	Don't know or doesnt doesn't care . . . X
Very important . . . 1	Very important . . . 1	Very important . . . 1
Pretty important . . 2	Pretty important . . 2	Pretty important . . 2
Not too important . . 3	Not too important . 3	Not too important . 3
Don't know X	Don't know X	Don't know X

27. Thinking about the people you know or that you've heard about, what person would you most like to be like?

A. (ASK UNLESS OBVIOUS) Who is that?

B. Why would you like to be like him (her)?

Now let's talk about something else.

28. A. Were you ever in the MDTA manpower training program?

Yes (ADMINISTER SUPPLEMENT, THEN GO TO Q. 29) . . 1
No . . . . (ASK B) 2

B. IF NO TO A: Have you ever heard of the MDTA program?

Yes . . . . (ASK C-H) . . . 3
No . . . (GO TO Q. 29) . . 4

IF YES TO B:

C. Where did you hear about it?

D. As far as you know, what is the MDTA? (PROBE: What do they do?)

E. From what you have heard about MDTA, do you think it is a very good idea, a pretty good idea, or not too good an idea for people like yourself?

Very good idea 5
Pretty good idea 6
Not too good an idea . . . 7

F. Why do you say that? (PROBE: Any other reason?)

G. Have you ever considered entering the MDTA manpower training prograr

Yes 8
No 9

H. Would you be interested in entering MDTA if you could?

Yes 1
No 2

29. A. Were you ever in the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

Yes	(ADMINISTER SUPPLEMENT, THEN GO TO Q. 30)	3
No	. . . . (ASK B)	4

B. IF NO TO A: Have you ever heard of the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

Yes	. . . (ASK C-H)	5
No	. . (GO TO Q. 30) . . .	6

IF YES TO B:

C. Where did you hear about it?

D. As far as you know, what is the Neighborhood Youth Corps? (PROBE: What do they do?)

E. From what you have heard about the Neighborhood Youth Corps, do you think it is a very good idea, a pretty good idea, or not too good an idea for people like yourself?

Very good idea	7
Pretty good idea	8
Not too good an idea	9

F. Why do you say that? (PROBE: Any other reason?)

G. Have you ever considered entering the Neighborhood Youth Corps?

Yes	1
No	2

H. Would you be interested in entering the Neighborhood Youth Corps if you could?

Yes	3
No	4

30. A. Were you ever in the Job Corps?

Yes, (ADMINISTER SUPPLEMENT, THEN GO TO Q. 31) . . .	1
No . . . . . (ASK B)	2

B. IF NO TO A: Have you ever heard of the Job Corps?

Yes . . . . (ASK C-H)	3
No . . (GO TO Q. 31) . . .	4

IF YES TO B:

C. Where did you hear about it?

D. As far as you know, what is the Job Corps? (PROBE: What do they do?)

E. From what you have heard about the Job Corps, do you think it is a very good idea, a pretty good idea, or not too good an idea for people like yourself?

Very good idea	5
Pretty good idea	6
Not too good an idea	7

F. Why do you say that? (PROBE: Any other reason?)

G. Have you ever considered joining the Job Corps?

Yes	8
No	9

H. Would you be interested in joining the Job Corps if you could?

Yes	1
No	2

31. The government is thinking about different kinds of programs for young people who could use them. Here is a card (HAND RESPONDENT CARD 1) with a list of programs. Each one would pay $40 per week. Now I'll read the same list that is on your card. Please tell me for each one when I read it if it would be a very good idea, a pretty good idea, or not too good an idea for you.

	Very Good Idea	Pretty Good Idea	Not too Good an Idea	Best Liked Program
A. You train for a skill or trade full time	1	2	3	1
B. You work on a job full time	4	5	6	2
C. You work on a job part time and train for a skill or trade part time	1	2	3	3
D. You work on a job part time and go to school part time	4	5	6	4
E. You train for a skill or trade part time and go to school part time	1	2	3	5
F. You go to school full time	4	5	6	6
G. You work on a job part time and train for a skill or trade part time and go to school part time	1	2	3	7

32. Now I'd like you to read back over all the programs on your card again and pick the one program you like best of all. Then tell me which one it is. (CIRCLE CODE ON APPROPRIATE LINE IN LAST COLUMN OF TABLE ABOVE.)

33. If everything else is the same, which do you think is a better idea--a program where you live at home or one where you live in a camp with other young people?

Live at home 1
Live in camp 2
Don't know X

---

34. Suppose the government started a program where you could be paid $40 a week for 30 hours of time. Let's say they let you split the time any way you like between working on a job and going to school. Would you work the whole time,or go to school the whole time,or mostly work,or mostly go to school, or split your time about half and half?

Work the whole time 3
Go to school the whole time . . 4
Mostly work 5
Mostly go to school 6
Split half and half 7

---

35. Now let's talk about you. Taking everything together, how would you say things are these days? Would you say that you are very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?

Very happy 8
Pretty happy 9
Not too happy 0

---

36. People feel different ways about themselves. Sometimes they feel pretty good, other times they feel pretty bad. Here is a list of words that people sometimes use to say how they feel about themselves. In the last few weeks have you ever felt that you were:

	Yes	No		Yes	No
A. Tough?	1	2	I. Good?	5	6
B. Unfriendly? . . .	3	4	J. Smart?	1	2
C. Rude?	5	6	K. Lazy?	3	4
D. Weak?	1	2	L. Obedient?	5	6
E. Successful? . . .	3	4	M. Mean?	1	2
F. Religious?	5	6	N. Troublesome? . . .	3	4
G. Truthful?	1	2	O. Ambitious?	5	6
H. Polite?	3	4	P. Intelligent? . . .	1	2

37. Now I'll read a list of different kinds of people. Thinking about people like that whom you've met or heard about, I'd like you to tell me for each kind if you feel they are really interested in helping you, are a little interested in helping you, or just don't care about you.

	Really Interested in Helping	A Little Interested in Helping	Just Don't Care	Don't Know
A. Employment counselors	1	2	3	X
B. The President of the United States	4	5	6	X
C. Factory managers	1	2	3	X
D. Preachers or priests	4	5	6	X
E. Policemen	1	2	3	X
F. School counselors	4	5	6	X
G. Doctors	1	2	3	X
H. Welfare caseworkers	4	5	6	X
I. Social workers	1	2	3	X
J. Teachers	4	5	6	X

38. We'd like to know about the ways young people spend their free time. Here is a list of things that some young people do. I'd like you to tell me for each thing whether you have done that in the last few weeks. Never mind if people think it's good or bad. We just want to know what you really do and we aren't going to tell anyone at all.

	Yes	No
A. Played basketball	1	2
B. Smoked cigarettes	3	4
C. Played baseball or football	5	6
D. Stayed out all night	1	2
E. Got drunk	3	4
F. Went riding around in cars	5	6
G. Went to a party	1	2
H. Gambled	3	4

Continued on next page.

38. Continued.

	Yes	No
I. Skipped school	5	6
J. Worked on a car	1	2
K. Went to church	3	4
L. Danced with a girl (boy)	5	6
M. Went to the movies	1	2
N. Was in a fight	3	4
O. Went steady	5	6
P. Drank beer or wine	1	2
Q. Went to the "Y" or the Boys' Club	3	4
R. Played cards	5	6
S. Hung around the street	1	2
T. Talked big to the girls (boys)	3	4
U. Went swimming	5	6
V. Went to the employment office	1	2
W. Played pool	3	4
X. Had a date	5	6

Now let's talk about last week.

	Q. 39 Last week: (ASK A)	Q. 40 Now think back to six months ago. That would be last (name of month.) (ASK A)	Q. 41 And how about one year ago. (ASK A)
A. Were you going to school, working, or just what were you doing then?			
Going to school and working (ASK B-D)	1	1	1
Going to school only. (ASK B & E)	2	2	2
Working only . . . . (ASK C-D).	3	3	3
Keeping house only. . (ASK E) .	4	4	4
Looking for work only (ASK E) .	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____ (ASK E) .	6	6	6
B. IF GOING TO SCHOOL: Were you in school full time or part time?			
Full time	7	7	7
Part time	8	8	8
C. IF WORKING: Were you working full time or part time?			
Full time . . . . . (ASK D) .	9	9	9
Part time . . . . . (ASK D-E).	0	0	0
D. IF WORKING: About how much a week were you earning then before taxes (from all jobs)?			
Weekly earnings	$ _____	$ _____	$ _____
E. ASK EVERYONE NOT WORKING FULL TIME: Were you looking for (full time) work then?			
Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2
	GO TO Q. 40 IN NEXT COLUMN.	GO TO Q. 41 IN NEXT COLUMN.	GO TO Q. 42 ON NEXT PAGE.

IF RESPONDENT WAS WORKING AT ALL AT ANY OF THE THREE TIMES (Q. 39-41) SKIP TO QUESTION 45.
IF RESPONDENT WAS NOT WORKING AT ALL AT ANY OF THE THREE TIMES ASK QUESTION 42.

42. Have you ever worked at a job? (INCLUDE PART-TIME WORK, IRREGULAR WORK, AND UNPAID FAMILY WORK IF IT IS ON A FARM; BUT EXCLUDE HOUSEWORK AND UNPAID WORK THAT IS NOT ON A FARM.)

Yes . . (ASK 43 AND 44) 1
No . . (SKIP TO Q. 57) 2

---

43. Was your last job full-time or part-time work?

Full time 3
Part time 4

---

44. About how much were your earnings then before taxes?

Weekly earnings $ _____

IF RESPONDENT HAS EVER WORKED, ASK Q's 45-56; ASK IN TERMS OF CURRENT OR MOST RECENT JOB. IF RESPONDENT NEVER WORKED, SKIP TO Q.57.

45. What kind of work (do/did) you do on your (last) job?

OCCUPATION: _____

---

46. In what business or industry is that?

BUSINESS OR INDUSTRY: _____

---

47. (Do/Did) you work for yourself or for someone else?

Self employed 5
Work for someone else 6

---

48. How many hours a week (do/did) you usually work on this job, not counting overtime?

1 - 14 1
15 - 34 2
35 - 48 3
49 - 59 4
60 or more 5

49. How did you first hear about (this/that) job? (DO NOT READ CATEGORIES; RECORD VERBATIM AND CIRCLE ANY WHICH APPLY.)

Relative	1
Friend	2
Applied directly	3
Public employment office	4
Private employment agency	5
Newspaper ad	6
Teacher or counselor at school	7
Labor union	8
Other (SPECIFY) _____	9

50. How long have (you been working/did you work) at this place?

Less than 1 week	(SKIP TO Q. 52)	1
1 week to 4 weeks	(SKIP TO Q. 52)	2
1 to less than 2 months	(SKIP TO Q. 52)	3
3 to less than 6 months	(ASK Q. 51)	4
6 to less than 12 months	(ASK Q. 51)	5
1 to less than 2 years	(ASK Q. 51)	6
2 to less than 3 years	(ASK Q. 51)	7
3 to less than 4 years	(ASK Q. 51)	8
4 years or more	(ASK Q. 51)	9

51. (IF RESPONDENT WORKED AT PLACE THREE MONTHS OR MORE) At (this/that) place (have they moved/did they move) you up at all, or move(d) you down, or (have you stayed/did you stay) at the same job the whole time?

Moved up	4
Moved down	5
Stayed the same	6

52. Do you happen to belong to a labor union?

Yes	7
No	8

53. How satisfied (are/were) you with (ASK A-D)? Would you say you (are/were) very satisfied, somewhat satisfied, somewhat dissatisfied, or very dissatisfied? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD 2.)

	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
A. Your pay?	1	2	3	4
B. The kind of work you (do/did)	5	6	7	8
C. Your boss or employer?	1	2	3	4
D. Taking all things together, how (do/did) you feel about your job as a whole?	5	6	7	8

54. Thinking back to the first job you ever had, how many different employers have you worked for in all, counting the (current/last) one?

Number of Employers _____

---

55. How old were you when you got your first job?

10 or younger	0
11	1
12	2
13	3
14	4
15	5
16	6
17	7
18	8
19	9

56. Thinking back over the last year, how many weeks did you work in all?

Did not work in last year	1
1 - 13 weeks	2
14 - 26 weeks	3
27 - 39 weeks	4
40 - 49 weeks	5
50 - 52 weeks	6

ASK EVERYONE:

57. Looking ahead to the future, if you could choose any kind of work you liked for your life's work what job would you choose?

OCCUPATION: _____

---

58. What kind of work do you really think you will get for your life's work?

OCCUPATION: _____

59. Different people look for different things in a job. I'll read a list of things people sometimes look for in their jobs and you tell me for each one if it would be very important to you, pretty important to you, or not too important to you.

	Very Important	Pretty Important	Not too Important	Most Important
A. A job where you can speed up or slow down according to how you feel	1	2	3	0
B. A job where you get a chance to try out your own ideas	4	5	6	1
C. A job where your boss is nice	7	8	9	2
D. A job where you do a lot of different things	1	2	3	3
E. A job that pays a lot of money	4	5	6	4
F. A job where the work is clean	7	8	9	5
G. A job where your family and friends look up to you.	1	2	3	6
H. A job where the other workers are friendly to you.	4	5	6	7
I. A job where you know you won't be laid off	7	8	9	8
J. A job where you get to run big machines or heavy equipment	1	2	3	9
K. A job where you work in an office	4	5	6	S

60. Here is a card with the same list. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD 3.) Which one thing would be the most important to you? (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE CODE in TABLE ABOVE.)

61. Can you think of a particular employer or company where you could get a (another) job right now?

Yes	(ASK A-D)	1
No	(GO TO Q. 62)	2

IF YES:

A. What employer or company is that?

B. How did you first hear about that job? (DO NOT READ CATEGORIES: CIRCLE ANY WHICH APPLY.)

Relative	1
Friend	2
Applied directly	3
Public employment office	4
Private employment agency	5
Newspaper ad	6
Teacher or counselor at school	7
Labor union	8
Other (SPECIFY) _____	9

C. Why haven't you taken that job?

D. Can you think of another employer or company, besides that one, where you could get a job right now? (PROBE: What employer or company is that? Any others?) (RECORD THE NAME OF EACH ADDITIONAL EMPLOYER OR COMPANY MENTIONED.)

---

62. Suppose you wanted to get a (another) job. How would you go about it? (PROBE: What else would you do?) (CONTINUE PROBING AND RECORD VERBATIM; CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY.)

Ask relatives	1
Ask friends	2
Apply directly	3
Visit public employment office	4
Visit private employment agency	5
Consult newspaper ads	6
Consult teachers or counselor at school	7
Consult labor union	8
Other (SPECIFY) _____ _____	9

63. On a job the boss usually has a certain idea of what he likes workers to do and not do. How important is it to a boss for a worker . . . (ASK A-K)

	Very Important	Pretty Important	Not Too Important
A. To be on time every morning--very important, pretty important, or not too important?	1	2	3
B. To be very polite?	4	5	6
C. To get along with the other workers? .	7	8	9
D. Not to steal tools or supplies?	1	2	3
E. To do what they tell him and not ask questions?	4	5	6
F. To wear the right clothes?.	7	8	9
G. To work as hard as he can?	1	2	3
H. Not to be sick too often?	4	5	6
I. To speak good English?	7	8	9

---

64. In which one of these jobs would a person earn closest to $40 a week? (READ CATEGORIES)

House painter 1
Dish washer 2
Auto mechanic 3
Policeman 4

---

65. For which one of these jobs must a person be a college graduate? (READ CATEGORIES)

Auto salesman 5
Bricklayer 6
High school teacher . . . 7
Insurance agent 8

---

66. In which one of these jobs is the work most steady? (READ CATEGORIES)

Mail carrier 1
Coal miner 2
Factory laborer 3
Machine operator in a factory 4

IF CURRENTLY ATTENDING SCHOOL (Q. 39-A), SKIP TO Q. 69.
IF NOT CURRENTLY ATTENDING SCHOOOL, ASK Q's 67 & 68.

67. How old were you when you left school?

_____ Age

68. Why did you leave school? Any other reason? (DO NOT READ CATEGORIES; CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY.)

Graduated from high school	1
Wanted to go to work	2
Needed money	3
(FEMALE ONLY) Pregnant	4
(FEMALE ONLY) Children to care for	5
Other family responsibilities (SPECIFY) _____	6
Did not like or tired of school	7
Trouble with teachers or school authorities	8
Low grades or low ability	9
Expelled	0
Other reason (SPECIFY) _____	S

ASK EVERYONE: Q's 69 - 83. IF NOT CURRENTLY ATTENDING SCHOOL, ASK IN TERMS OF LAST SCHOOL YEAR ATTENDED.

69. What kind of school (do you/did you) go to? (Is it/Was it) a grade school, a high school, a college, a vocational school, a business school, or what?

Grade school	1
Junior high school	2
Regular high school	3
Junior college	4
College or university	5
Vocational or trade school	6
Business or commercial school	7
Other (SPECIFY) _____	8

70. A. IF IN SCHOOL: What grade are you in school? CODE BELOW.

B. IF NOT IN SCHOOL: What was the last grade that you went to in school?

5th grade or less	0
6th - 7th grade	1
8th grade	2
9th grade	3
10th grade	4
11th grade	5
12th grade	6
Some college	7
Completed college	8
Graduate school or more	9

C. ASK ONLY IF NOT NOW IN SCHOOL: Did you finish that grade?

Yes	1
No	2

71. (IF ATTENDED HIGH SCHOOL) What kind of course (do you/did you) take in high school? (READ CATEGORIES)

General	3
College preparatory	4
Trade, vocational, or industrial arts.	5
Business or commercial	6
Other (SPECIFY) _____	7

72. How far would you <u>like</u> to go in school altogether (if you could go back)?

5th grade or less	0
6th - 7th grade	1
8th grade	2
9th grade	3
10th grade	4
11th grade	5
12th grade	6
Some college	7
Complete college	8
Graduate school or more	9
Don't know	X

73. Looking ahead to the future, how far do you really think you will get in school?

5th grade or less	0
6th - 7th grade	1
8th grade	2
9th grade	3
10th grade	4
11th grade	5
12th grade	6
Some college	7
Complete college	8
Graduate school or more	9
Don't know	X

74. I'd like to know how you feel about school. If you had your choice would you rather be in school or would you just as soon be out?

Rather be in	5
As soon be out	6
Don't know	X

75. How important is it to have a high school education in order to get a good paying job around here? (READ CATEGORIES)

Absolutely necessary	1
It helps, but isn't necessary	2
Doesn't matter one way or the other	3
You're better off without it	4
I don't know	X

76. How close (are/were) you to the center of student activities that (go/went) on at your school? (Are/Were) you pretty close to the center, a little on the outside, or completely outside of things?

Pretty close to the center .	5
A little on the outside . . .	6
Completely outside	7
Don't know	X

---

77. (Do/Did) you belong to any clubs, organizations, or athletic teams in school?

Yes. . (ASK A) . . .	8
No	9

IF YES:

A. How many (do/did) you belong to? _____

---

78. Thinking back over your last year in school, about how often did you and your (parents/parent substitutes) talk about your schoolwork? Would you say just about every day, once or twice a week, once or twice a month, or hardly ever?

Just about every day . . .	1
Once or twice a week . . .	2
Once or twice a month . . .	3
Hardly ever	4
Never	5

---

79. In your last year in school, what kind of grades did you usually get? (CIRCLE ONLY ONE. IF NECESSARY PROBE: What did you get most often?)

A (or highest)	6
B (or next highest)	7
C (or third highest) . . .	8
D (lowest passing grade) .	9
E or F (failing)	0

---

80. In your last year in school, how were your grades compared to most other students in your school? Would you say you did better than most other students, about the same as most other students, or not as well as most of the other students?

Better than most others . .	1
About the same	2
Not as well as most others.	3
Don't know	X

---

81. Did you ever fail a grade (not a class) in school?

Yes . . . (ASK A & B)	4
No	5

IF YES:

A. How many grades did you fail? _____

B. What was the (last) grade you failed? _____

82. Have you ever had any vocational education or job training?

Yes . . . (ASK A & B) . . .	1
No	2

IF YES:

A. What kind of job was that for?

B. Where did you get that training? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY

Vocational or trade school	1
Business or commercial school	2
Apprentice program	3
Armed forces	4
On-the-job training program	5
Company training course	6
High school	7
College	8
Government manpower training program.	9
Other (SPECIFY) _____	0

---

83. Thinking back, how many different schools have you gone to since you started the first grade?

_____
(NUMBER OF SCHOOLS)

ASK EVERYONE:

Has anyone ever given you help or advice about...

	Q.84 ...staying in school or leaving school?	Q. 85 ...finding a job?	Q. 86 ...personal problems?
Yes . . .	(ASK A) . . 1	(ASK A) . . 1	(ASK A) . . 1
No . . .	(GO TO Q. 85) 2	(GO TO Q. 86) 2	(GO TO Q.87) 2
A. IF YES: Who was that? Anyone else? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY)			
Parents	1	1	1
Relatives or friends . . .	2	2	2
School counselor	3	3	3
Welfare caseworker	4	4	4
Employment counselor . . .	5	5	5
Teacher	6	6	6
Psychiatrist or psychologist	7	7	7
Minister or priest	8	8	8
Doctor	9	9	9
Other (SPECIFY)_____	0	0	0

87. Is there anyone--like a counselor, social worker, minister, or someone else--who has talked to you more than once about yourself and your problems?

Yes . . . (ASK A) . . . 1
No. . .(GO TO Q. 88) . . 2

A. IF YES: Who was that? Anyone else? (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY.)

School counselor 3
Welfare caseworker 4
Employment counselor 5
Teacher 6
Psychiatrist or psychologist . . 7
Minister or priest 8
Doctor 9
Other (SPECIFY)_____ 0

88. Now I'd like to ask you a few questions about your health. Have you been sick at any time in the last few weeks?

Yes . . . (ASK A) . . .	1
No . (GO TO Q. 89) .	2

A. IF YES: Did you have to cut down on the things you usually do because of it?

Yes	3
No	4

---

89. Do you have any serious physical handicap or disability?

Yes . . . (ASK A) . . .	5
No . (GO TO Q. 90) . .	6

A. IF YES: What is that?

---

90. Is there any sickness that you have had for a long time--one that won't seem to go away?

Yes . . (ASK A & B) .	7
No . .(GO TO Q. 91) .	8

IF YES:

A. What is that?

B. Have you seen a doctor about it?

Yes	9
No	0

---

91. When was the last time you . . . .

	A. . . . saw a doctor for a check up?	B. . . . had your teeth checked by a dentist?
Less than 6 months ago	1	1
6 months to less than 1 year ago	2	2
1 year to less than 2 years ago	3	3
2 years to less than 3 years ago	4	4
3 years to less than 4 years ago	5	5
4 years to less than 5 years ago	6	6
5 years ago or more	7	7
Never	8	8

---

92. On the whole how good would you say your health is--very good, pretty good, or not too good?

Very good	1
Pretty good	2
Not too good	3

Now let's talk about something else.

IF FEMALE SKIP TO Q. 96.

93. (IF MALE) Have you ever served in the armed forces?

Yes . . . (ASK A)	1
No . . (GO TO Q. 94) . .	2

A. IF YES: Are you still in?

Yes	3
No	4

---

94. (IF MALE) Have you ever taken the armed forces physical examination?

Yes . . . (ASK A)	6
No . . (GO TO Q. 95) . .	7

A. IF YES: Did you pass all of it, part of it, or what?

Passed mental and physical	1
Passed mental but not physical . .	2
Passed physical but not mental . .	3
Failed both mental and physical . .	4
Failed, don't know why	5
Don't know	X

---

95. (IF MALE) Are you registered with the draft?

Yes . . . (ASK A)	6
No . . (GO TO Q. 9) . .	7

A. IF YES: Do you happen to know your draft classification? I mean are you 1A, 1Y, 4F, or what?

1A, 1AO, 10	0
1Y	1
2A, 2C	2
1D	3
3A	4
4C	5
4F	6
1S, 2S	7
4A	8
Other (SPECIFY)_____	9
Don't know	X

ASK EVERYONE:

96. Have you ever been picked up by the police for any reason? I mean picked up and taken to the station?

Yes . . . (ASK A & B)	1
No . . . (GO T Q. 96) . .	2

IF YES:

A. Why were you picked up?

B. Did you ever have to see a judge because of a charge against you?

Yes . . . (ASK C & D) . . .	3
No . . . (GO TO Q. 97) . .	4

IF YES TO B:

C. What was that about?

D. Have you ever been in reform school or in jail for more than a day or two?

Yes . . . (ASK E)	5
No . . . (GO TO Q. 97) . .	6

E. IF YES TO D: How long were you in altogether?

1 month or less	1
More than 1 month to 3 months . . .	2
More than 3 months to 6 months . . .	3
More than 6 months to 1 year	4
More than 1 year to 2 years	5
More than 2 years	6

ASK EVERYONE:

People have very different ideas about some things in life. Here are some questions that people often argue about. I'd like to know what you think about them.

97. In school, should a person try to get about the same grades as the other students or should he try to get better grades than the other students?

Same grades	1
Better grades . . .	2
Don't know	X

---

98. Would you say you can't trust most people or that you can trust most people?

Can't trust most people .	3
Can trust most people . .	4
Don't know	X

---

99. If things go bad can a person usually make them better, or isn't there too much he can do about it?

Can make them better . .	5
Isn't much he can do . .	6
Don't know	X

100. When a person makes plans, do the plans mostly work out or do they hardly ever work out?

Mostly work out	7
Hardly ever work out	8
Don't know	X

---

101. Will a smart person think about tomorrow or live for today?

Think about tomorrow	9
Live for today	0
Don't know	X

---

102. Which would you rather have, five dollars today and no more, or nine dollars two weeks from now?

Five dollars today and no more	1
Nine dollars two weeks from now	2
Don't know	X

---

103. Do most people know what they want out of life or don't they?

Know what they want	3
Don't know what they want	4
Don't know	X

---

104. Should a person wait a while for a good thing or should he take what he can get right away?

Wait for a good thing	5
Take what he can get	6
Don't know	X

---

105. When a person is born, is his success already in the cards or can he fight hard and make his own success?

Success is in the cards	7
Can make his own success	8
Don't know	X

---

106. Is it better to work as hard as you can or to do just enough to get by?

Work as hard as you can	9
Do just enough to get by	0
Don't know	X

---

107. How important is it to you personally to be a success in life? Would you say very important, pretty important, or not too important?

Very important	6
Pretty important	7
Not too important	8

108. Another thing we would like to find out is how people go about guessing words that they do not know. HAND RESPONDENT CARD 4 . On this card are some words -- you may know some of them and you may not know quite a few of them.

On each line there is a word in capital letters -- like BEAST. Then there are five other words. Tell me the number of the word that comes closest to the meaning of the word in capital letters. For example, the first word in capital letters is BEAST. You would say "4" since "animal" comes closer to "beast" than any of the other words. If you wish, I will read the words to you. These words are difficult for almost everyone -- give me your best guess if you are not sure of the answer. CIRCLE THE ANSWER GIVEN.

SPACE	1. school	2. noon	3. captain	4. room	5. board
ACCUSTOM	6. disappoint	7. customary	8. encounter	9. get used to	0. business
ALLUSION	1. reference	2. dream	3. eulogy	4. illusion	5. aria
CLOISTERED	6. miniature	7. bunched	8. arched	9. malady	0. secluded
EDIBLE	1. auspicious	2. eligible	3. fit to eat	4. sagacious	5. able to speak
BROADEN	6. efface	7. make level	8. elapse	9. embroider	0. widen
CONCERN	1. see clearly	2. engage	3. furnish	4. disturb	5. have to do with
PACT	6. puissance	7. remonstrance	8. agreement	9. skillet	0. pressure
EMANATE	1. rival	2. come	3. prominent	4. free	5. populate
GARNISHEE	6. damage	7. quash	8. envisage	9. cloth	0. attach

INTERVIEWER: DID RESPONDENT SEEM PARTICULARLY NERVOUS WHILE ANSWERING THIS QUESTION?

Yes, particularly nervous . . . 1
No, not particularly nervous . . 2
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 3

DID RESPONDENT READ THE WORDS HIMSELF OR DID HE ASK YOU TO READ THEM?

Read them himself 4
Asked to have them read 5

Now just a few more questions.

109. Where were you born? _____

IF U.S., NAME OF STATE: _____

(IF FOREIGN BORN, SKIP A & B)

A. Where were your mother and father born?

Mother_____

Father_____

(IF NEGRO OR IF BOTH PARENTS FOREIGN BORN, SKIP TO Q. 110. FOR EVERYONE ELSE, ASK B.)

B. What country (countries) did your (mother's/father's) people originally come from?

Mother's people_____

Father's people_____

---

110. Were you brought up mostly on a farm, in a town, in a small city, or in a large city?

Farm 1
Town 2
Small city . . 3
Large city . . 4

---

111. How many rooms are there in your house (apartment), not counting bathrooms?

_____
(Number of rooms)

---

112. Do you share a kitchen with any other families (outside of this household)?

Yes, share . . . 1
No, don't share . 2

---

113. Do you share the toilet with other families (outside of this household)?

Yes, share . . . 3
No, don't share . 4

---

114. How old were you on your last birthday?

_____
(Age)

---

115. What is your marital status right now?

Married and together 5
Separated . . . . . (ASK A) . 6
Divorced . . . . . (ASK A) . 7
Widowed . . . . . (ASK A) . 8
Never married (GO TO Q.116). 9

A. IF EVER MARRIED OR WIDOWED: I'd like to know how you (feel/felt) about your marriage. Taking all things together, would you say that your marriage (is/was) very happy, pretty happy, or not too happy?

Very happy 1
Pretty happy . . . 2
Not too happy . . 3

116. What is your religion?

Protestant . . . . (ASK A) . 5
Catholic 6
Jewish 7
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 8
None 9

A. IF PROTESTANT: What denomination is that? _____ (Denomination)

---

117. Did you ever participate in a civil rights rally or a demonstration?

Yes, participated 9
No, didn't participate . . . 0

---

118. What do you think of the civil rights movement--are you very much in favor of it, partly in favor of it, or not at all in favor of it?

Very much in favor 1
Partly in favor 2
Not at all in favor 3

---

119. Has your (present) family ever received public assistance or welfare?

Yes . . . . (ASK A) 1
No . . . (GO TO Q. 116) . . 2

A. IF YES: Is your family receiving public assistance right now?

Yes 3
No 4

---

120. What was your own total income in the last year? (HAND RESPONDENT CARD 5.) Just tell me the letter on this card.

A.	Under $500 1	J.	$ 4,500- 4,999 10
B.	$ 500- 999 2	K.	$ 5,000- 5,999 11
C.	$1,000-1,499 3	L.	$ 6,000- 6,999 12
D.	$1,500-1,999 4	M.	$ 7,000- 7,999 13
E.	$2,000-2,499 5	N.	$ 8,000- 8,999 14
F.	$2,500-2,999 6	O.	$ 9,000- 9,999 15
G.	$3,000-3,499 7	P.	$10,000-14,999 16
H.	$3,500-3,999 8	Q.	$15,000 or over . . . 17
I.	$4,000-4,499 9	R.	Don't know X

---

121. What would you say is your own main means of support? I mean where do you get most of the money for your food, clothing, housing and the other things you need? (DON'T READ CATEGORIES. CIRCLE ONE.)

Own job 1
Parents 2
Spouse 3
Other relative or friend 4
Savings 5
Unemployment compensation 6
Public Assistance (Welfare) 7
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 8

122. What was the total income in your family last year? I mean, the income from wages from everyone in the family and from anything else. (HAND RESPONDENT CARD 5.) Just tell me the letter on this card.

A.	Under $500 1	J.	$ 4,500- 4,999 10
B.	$ 500- 999 2	K.	$ 5,000- 5,999 11
C.	$1,000-1,499 3	L.	$ 6,000- 6,999 12
D.	$1,500-1,999 4	M.	$ 7,000- 7,999 13
E.	$2,000-2,499 5	N.	$ 8,000- 8,999 14
F.	$2,500-2,999 6	O.	$ 9,000- 9,999 15
G.	$3,000-3,499 7	P.	$10,000-14,999 16
H.	$3,500-3,999 8	Q.	$15,000 or over . . . 17
I.	$4,000-4,499 9	R.	Don't know (ASK Q. 123) X

IF DON'T KNOW TO Q. 122:

123. Would you mind asking your father or mother (or other adult) what it is?

Would mind .. . . . . (ASK Q. 124). . . 1
Would not mind (ENTER INCOME ABOVE) . . 2

IF WOULD MIND TO Q. 123:

124. May I have your permission to ask your father or mother (or other adult) what the total family income is?

Yes (ENTER INCOME ABOVE) 1
No (GO TO INSTRUCTION BELOW) . . 2

INTERVIEWER: DO NOT ESTIMATE INCOME. USE INCOME CARD TO OBTAIN FROM PARENT IF PERMISSION IS GRANTED.

That is the end of the interview. I would like to thank you very much. You have been most helpful. We would like to talk to you again in about five months. May I ask your name and where you expect to be living five months from now?

Name: _____

Address five months from now: _____

_____

And what is your present address? _____

_____

What is your telephone number? _____

Can you tell me the name and address of two relatives or friends who would know where you are in case you move?

A. _____

_____

B. _____

_____

IF RESPONDENT IS NOT EMPLOYED AND NOT IN SCHOOL, SKIP TO BOTTOM OF PAGE.

We have found that people sometimes move and their friends and relatives don't know where they have moved.

IF EMPLOYED: (Q. 39) Sometimes a person's employer will know where he moved. May I ask the name and address of the company you work for? What is your supervisor's name?

Company name: _____

Address: _____

Supervisor: _____

Do you have a social security number? (IF YES:) What is it?

Social Security Number: _____

IF IN SCHOOL: (Q. 39) Sometimes a person's school will know where he moved. May I ask the name of your school? What town is that in?

School: _____

Location: _____

Thank you again for your help.

INTERVIEWER REMARKS:

1. Time interview ended: _____ A.M. P.M.

2. Total length of interview: _____hr. and _____min.

3. Race of respondent:
   - White 1
   - Negro 2
   - Oriental 3
   - Indian 4

4. Sex of respondent:
   - Male 5
   - Female 6

5. Was anyone else present during any part of the interview?
   - Yes . . . . . (ASK A) 7
   - No 8

   A. IF YES: Who was it?
   - Spouse 1
   - Child 2
   - Parent 3
   - Sibling 4
   - Other (SPECIFY) _____ 5

6. Cooperativeness of respondent:
   - Very cooperative 6
   - Somewhat cooperative 7
   - Not cooperative (ANSWER A) . . . 8

   A. IF NOT COOPERATIVE: What seemed to be the trouble?

7. Respondent's ability to express himself:
   - Expresses himself very well . . . 1
   - Expresses himself fairly well . . 2
   - Does not express himself well . . 3

8. How often did respondent make mistakes in grammar?

Never or almost never . . . 4
Sometimes 5
Often 6

---

9. Respondent's use of dialect (regional or racial accent):

No dialect 7
Modest dialect 8
Heavy dialect 9

---

10. Try to rate the respondent's appearance from the point of view of a prospective employer. For a job the respondent--

Would definitely be considered 1
Would probably be considered 2
Would probably not be considered 3

---

11. Did respondent have any annoying or distracting personal habits or mannerisms?

Yes 7
No 8

---

12. Respondent's dwelling unit:

Single family dwelling (detached house) 1
Duplex or row house 2
Apartment house with six or fewer units 3
Apartment house with more than six units 4
Apartment house with partial commercial uses . . . 5
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 6

---

13. Dwelling unit is on:

Major traffic artery 7
Side street 8
Open country 9
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 0

---

14. Immediate neighborhood is:

Mostly houses or duplexes or row houses 1
Mostly apartment houses 2
A mixture of apartments and houses 3
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 4

15. In the neighborhood are: (CIRCLE AS MANY AS APPLY.)

Retail stores 9
Taverns or bars 8
Industrial or warehouse structures . . . 7
Schools, churches, or hospitals 6
Park or open land 5
None of these 4

---

16. Compared with the area (PSU) as a whole, the housing in this neighborhood is:

More deteriorated 3
About average 2
Less deteriorated 1

---

17. Compared to the other houses or apartments in this neighborhood the R's housing is:

More deteriorated 4
About average 5
Less deteriorated 6

---

18. Where did the interview take place?

Respondent's home 7
Office or room selected by interviewer . 8
Other (SPECIFY) _____ 9

---

19. Did respondent have siblings who are included in the sample?

Yes . . (ANSWER A) 1
No 2

A. IF YES:

Name of Sibling: _____

Case Number: _____

Name of Sibling: _____

Case Number: _____

INTERVIEWER'S SIGNATURE: _____ DATE: _____