

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF DISADVANTAGED PERSONS, BASED ON
INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TEXAS EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION
OPPORTUNITY CENTER IN HOUSTON

A Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
The University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Joanne Louise Dunn

May 1969

501245

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF DISADVANTAGED PERSONS, BASED ON
INFORMATION AVAILABLE AT THE TEXAS EMPLOYMENT COMMISSION
OPPORTUNITY CENTER IN HOUSTON

An Abstract of a Thesis
Presented to
the Faculty of the Department of Psychology
The University of Houston

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
Joanne Louise Dunn

May 1969

ABSTRACT

Despite the increased emphasis on disadvantaged individuals and their educational, occupational, financial, and related problems, there is still a lack of descriptive information available on this group of people. This descriptive study undertook to provide such information on the sample group of six hundred individuals. All of the information used in this study was taken from closed case records at the Houston Opportunity Center of the Texas Employment Commission, in Houston, Texas. There were eleven factors used to describe these individuals: sex, race, age, marital status, education, number of children, usual occupation before receiving service at the Houston Opportunity Center, the G-score from the General Aptitude Test Battery, if administered, the individual's handicap status, his veteran status, and his Military Service Rejection status. The total sample of 600 individuals was divided into three groups of 200 each. Group I was a random selection of both males and females; Group II consisted only of females; and Group III consisted only of males. For each factor in all three groups, the actual number of persons listed for that factor, and the percentage of that number of the total sample (200) was provided. Each segment was further divided by racial characteristics.

On the basis of this study, the following conclusions seem justified:

1. The majority of the disadvantaged in the Houston area, who apply at the Houston Opportunity Center, are Negro.

2. The majority of these disadvantaged individuals are female (55.37%).
Group I was 66.0% female, with Negro disadvantaged females comprising 70.95% of the Negro segment in Group I.
3. The majority of the disadvantaged are single youth, with no children.
4. A large majority of Negro disadvantaged individuals have completed 10 to 12 grades in school; and more individuals have completed more than 12 grades, i.e., have some college or university education, than have completed 6 grades or less.
5. The large majority of disadvantaged workers in the Houston area are employed in service occupations, followed by those in unskilled occupations, and those with no work experience at all.
6. G-scores, from the GATB, indicate that, while the mean score for this test is 100, the majority of the Negro disadvantaged had scores that fell between 60 and 89, with a mean of 78.86. The mean score of the White-Spanish individuals was 82.75, while the mean score of the White persons tested was 92.73. Judging from these results, there appears to be definite racial differences in performance on this test, even within the disadvantaged population.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Need for Study	3
Limitations of the Study	3
II. THE SAMPLE GROUPS AND VARIABLES USED	5
The Sample Groups	5
Variables Used	7
III. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	11
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	37
Summary	37
Conclusions	40
Recommendations	41
BIBLIOGRAPHY	44

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Sex Characteristics of Sample	12
II. Racial Characteristics of Sample	13
III. Age Characteristics of Sample	14
IV. Educational Characteristics of Sample	18
V. Marital Status Characteristics of Sample	20
VI. Number of Children	23
VII. Usual Occupation	25
VIII. G-Scores	29
IX. Handicap Factor	33
X. Veteran Status	34
XI. Military Service Rejectee Status	36
XII. Adult Aptitude or Standard Scores and Corresponding Percentiles of the General Aptitude Test Battery	43

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

In the past, descriptive studies of the group of people termed collectively as "disadvantaged" have been largely unavailable. There is an increasing awareness of this group's existence, and an increasing effort to remedy or relieve the conditions conducive to their poverty; but there still remains a lack of clear-cut description of these people, in terms of the factors used in this study. The term "disadvantaged" is used here primarily in an economic sense. Lack of education, lack of occupational skills, and problems stemming from racial or cultural conditions will be considered as associated factors in this study. There will be no hypothesis proved, nor conclusions drawn, as such. This study will be concerned only with descriptions in terms of the various individual factors available; and it will try to provide general concepts of the sample group by presenting various combinations of these factors. There are a total of nine factors or variables involved for the female members of the sample, and eleven variables involved for the male members. The information presented on the sample group is available exclusively from case records at the Houston Opportunity Center of the Texas Employment Commission, in Houston, Texas.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is two-fold: (1) To collect and present descriptive data on "disadvantaged" clients of the Texas Employment Commission Opportunity Center in Houston, Texas, and (2) To collate and analyze these data.

It would be helpful to those who work with disadvantaged persons to have a working knowledge of the various educational, occupational, and cultural problems that usually affect this group as a whole.

Evolving from the growing awareness of the problems of the disadvantaged are the many different programs being made available to these people through various agencies and organizations. In Houston, the Opportunity Center provides vocational counseling and testing, with these programs in mind, to those persons who apply and qualify. These programs are usually associated with the federal government and/or the state government. The state Employment Service in Texas provides many different programs, such as the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, Concentrated Employment Program, and Manpower Development Training, to enable people to learn new skills or improve old ones. These opportunities are usually limited to the economically disadvantaged person. Non-disadvantaged persons are also accepted for the counseling and testing service, but since they are not qualified for the training programs, their vocational plans are usually more concerned with immediate and long-term job placement than with long-range counseling and training.

Counseling a disadvantaged person involves knowledge both of individual factors and of generalized environmental and cultural factors

and conditions. Individual factors are those that become apparent in the interview: his own educational and occupational background, his financial situation, and any family or personal problems that may be evident. The generalized factors, however, must be learned by the professional person involved in this type of work through experience, by talking and working with many different types of persons within the disadvantaged class. These common problems and conditions can be significant in dealing with each individual.

Need for Study

There have been few clear-cut descriptions available of the economically deprived person up until now, at least in terms of the variables being used here. Specifically, there have been none on those disadvantaged persons in the Houston area. To the beginning counselor, or any professional worker involved in this type of work, information available from such a study would be very useful. An even more extensive study along these same lines could prove to be invaluable.

The generalized factors should provide a background against which the individual factors can be considered and dealt with. Various conditions and deficiencies that usually plague an economically disadvantaged person can be assigned varying amounts of importance and urgency in counseling a person toward realistic and fulfilling goals.

Limitations of the Study

The individuals comprising the sample group are persons who have voluntarily come to the Opportunity Center to apply for training,

and/or to seek help in overcoming obstacles to employment. Also, each of the applicants must necessarily have some kind of employment problem. That is, if he is accepted for the services offered by the Opportunity Center, he will fall into one of the following categories: (1) the applicant has limited or no previous work experience and no vocational choice; (2) the applicant has limited or no previous work experience and his stated choice seems questionable; (3) the applicant is experienced in a particular occupation but desires and/or needs to change his occupation and has no vocational choice, or the choice is questionable; (4) the applicant desires or needs training and requires assistance in evaluating the need for and type of training, or the choice of occupation for which to be trained; (5) the applicant needs the service of another community agency (school, welfare, medical, etc.) to improve his employability; (6) the applicant has an adjustment problem related to finding or holding a job; or, (7) the applicant desires to work in another geographical area and needs assistance in determining the validity of the move.

The fact that each of the applicants comes into the Opportunity Center voluntarily, on his own initiative, and that they always fall into one of the above employment-problem categories, limits the scope or extent of the total population of poor or disadvantaged people in Houston that are included in the sample group.

CHAPTER II

THE SAMPLE GROUPS AND VARIABLES USED

The Sample Groups

The information presented in this study on the sample group of disadvantaged persons was taken from case records in the closed files at the Houston Opportunity Center. These files contain case records on all those who receive any counseling service at the Opportunity Center. All of the case records used had been closed or inactive for periods of time varying from one to twelve months. Closed records at the Opportunity Center are always kept one year after they are admitted to these files, and then destroyed. The sample was drawn during the months of November and December, 1968. Each case record used was selected randomly from the alphabetically arranged files. There are approximately 11,250 case records in these closed files.

All of the information and facts on each individual used in the study were obtained from his case record, and recorded on a prepared chart. Each individual remained anonymous, and the factors themselves constituted the focal point of the study.

The study was divided into three sections, each section consisting of 200 disadvantaged individuals. In all there were 600 persons considered in this study. Even though the files contain case records of both disadvantaged and non-disadvantaged individuals, only disadvantaged persons were considered. Group I in this study consisted of 200 randomly

selected disadvantaged persons, both male and female. Group II was made up of 200 randomly selected disadvantaged females. Group III comprised 200 randomly selected disadvantaged males.

To be included as disadvantaged an individual had to be classified in one of the following categories: A disadvantaged individual was a poor person who did not have suitable employment and who was either (1) a school dropout, (2) a member of a minority group, (3) under 22 years of age, (4) 45 years of age or older, or (5) handicapped. In other words, the five basic combinations of the categories are: (1) poor school dropout without suitable employment; (2) poor minority member without suitable employment; (3) poor youth without suitable employment; (4) poor older worker without suitable employment; and (5) poor handicapped worker without suitable employment. Clearly, any one individual might be classified in more than one of the categories, e.g., the poor, unemployed, teenage Negro dropout. A person was deemed "poor" for purposes of the definition of disadvantaged if he was a member of a family that received cash welfare payments, or whose net annual income, in relation to family size and location, did not exceed the following criteria:

FAMILY SIZE	INCOME NONFARM	INCOME FARM
1	\$1,600	\$1,100
2	2,100	1,500
3	2,600	1,800
4	3,300	2,300
5	3,900	2,800
6	4,400	3,100
7	4,900	3,400
8	5,400	3,800
9	5,900	4,100
10	6,400	4,500
11	6,900	4,800
12	7,400	5,200
13	7,900	5,500

A family consists of one or more persons living in a single household who are related to each other by blood, marriage, or adoption. All persons living in one household who are related to each other are regarded as one family.

Farm or nonfarm income is determined by location of residence as determined by the 1960 census definition.

Variables Used

In Group I there were a total of eleven variables used in describing the sample group; in Group II there were eight variables, and in Group III, ten variables. The common factors used in all three groups were age, race, education level, marital status, number of children, the usual occupation of the individual before he applied for service at the Opportunity Center, whether or not the individual was handicapped, and the G-score from the General Aptitude Test Battery, if available. In Group I, the extra factor of sex was considered, since both males and females were chosen randomly for this section. Also, the factors indicating veteran or military service rejectee status were used in Groups I and II. For Group II the factors were the same as listed above.

For Group I, sex and the year of birth of each individual were listed. Persons given service at the Opportunity Center fall into one of three age categories: youth, 16 to 22; adult, 23 to 44; or older worker, 45 and older. The racial designations involved in the study include Negro, White, and White-Spanish. Educational level was recorded as the grade completed by the individual. If the person was a dropout, only the highest grade level actually completed was used.

The marital status of the individual was listed as either married, single, separated, widowed, or divorced. The number of children counted for each individual included only those still living with the family, and economically dependant on the family. Older children, grandparents, and other relatives and dependants were not considered, as consistent information was not available on this.

The usual occupation of the individual before he applied at the Opportunity Center was listed as one of the following: skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled, service, clerical and sales, professional and technical, farm, or none. Skilled occupations are those that require considerable skill and/or responsibility and more than six months on-the-job training or classroom instruction to perform satisfactorily. Examples are baker, plumber, carpenter, milliner. Semi-skilled occupations are those that require some skill but only from two weeks to six months on-the-job training or classroom instruction. Examples are baker's assistant, truck loader, service station attendant, sewing machine operator. Unskilled occupations are those that are menial in nature and/or require less than two weeks on-the-job training or classroom instruction. Examples are car washer, messenger, cleaning woman. Service occupations are those concerned with performing services for persons that require predominately either direct contact or close association with the individual. Examples are barber, waiter, bootblack, practical nurse. Clerical occupations are those involved with the preparation, transcribing, transferring, systematizing, or preserving written communications and records in offices, shops, and other places of work where such functions are

performed. Most of these occupations are performed by mental and manual processes. Examples are bookkeeper, cashier, general office clerk, office machine operator, stock clerk. Professional occupations are those that require a high degree of mental activity by the worker and are concerned with theoretical or practical aspects of complex fields of human endeavor. Such occupations require either extensive and comprehensive academic study, or experience of such scope and character as to provide an equivalent background. Examples are doctor, architect, chemist, astronomer, accountant. Also included in this group are the semi-professional occupations, such as draftsman, aviator, or lab technician, and managerial occupations. Farm occupations are those directly associated with the processes of growing and harvesting vegetables, fruits, grains, and other farm crops; in the raising of poultry, livestock and other animals and fowls; and in the various phases of horticultural activities.

In cases where the individual has done several different types of work, the longest held area of employment was considered.

The handicap factor was listed on the charts simply as being yes or no. There was no breakdown of type or extent of the handicap involved. In cases where the General Aptitude Test Battery had been administered to the individual, the G-score from this battery was listed. This G-score gives an indication of general learning ability, the ability to "catch on" or understand instructions and underlying principles; and the ability to reason and make judgments. It is measured by parts involving arithmetic reasoning, vocabulary, and three-dimensional spatial relations.

The veteran and military service rejectee factors used in Groups I and III indicated whether the individual had served in the Armed Forces; or whether the individual was a military service rejectee. Neither the branch of the service involved, nor the reason for the applicant's rejection was available.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

A total sample of six hundred individuals was used for this study. They were divided into three groups, two hundred in each. Group I was comprised of both males and females, Group II only of females, and Group III only of males.

In Group I, the random selection yielded 132 females, or 66% of the total (200), and 68 males, or 34% of the total. Females clearly comprised the majority of disadvantaged individuals in this study. The sex characteristics of the three groups, separately and combined, are shown in Table I.

The racial characteristics of the sample were as follows: in Group I, there were 148 Negroes, 74% of the sample; 27 Whites, 13.5% of the sample; and 25 White-Spanish, 12.5% of the sample. Group II included 162 Negroes, 81%; 16 Whites, 8.0%; and 22 White-Spanish, 11%. Group III had 119 Negroes, 59.5%; 55 Whites, 27.5%; and 26 White-Spanish, 13% of the total. Female Negroes outnumbered male Negroes, and disadvantaged White-Spanish females were more numerous than White-Spanish males; but there were more White disadvantaged males than White females. The racial characteristics of the three groups are shown in Table II.

Age, as a factor in the study, was shown in Table III, and consisted of four groups: (1) youth, born between the years of 1953 and 1947, or from 16 through 21 years of age; (2) adults, born between the

TABLE I
SEX CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

	FEMALE				MALE			
	White	White-Spanish	Negro	Total	White	White-Spanish	Negro	Total
Total Sample (N=600)	27	38	267	332	71	35	162	268
Percent	4.50	6.33	44.50	55.33	11.84	5.83	27.00	44.67
Group I (N=200)	11	61	105	132	16	9	43	68
Percent	5.50	8.00	52.50	66.00	8.00	4.50	21.50	34.00

NOTE: Group II - 100% Female

Group III - 100% Male

TABLE II
RACIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

	WHITE			WHITE-SPANISH			NEGRO		
	Male	Female	Percent	Male	Female	Percent	Male	Female	Percent
Total Sample (N=600)	71	27	16.33	35	38	12.17	162	267	71.50
Group I (N=200)	16	11	13.50	9	16	12.50	43	105	74.00
Group II (N=200)	--	16	8.00	--	22	11.00	--	162	81.00
Group III (N=200)	55	--	27.50	26	--	13.00	119	--	59.50

TABLE III
AGE CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

		WHITE		WHITE-SPANISH		NEGRO	
AGE RANGE		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
TOTAL SAMPLE (N=600)	16-21	44	7.33	36	6.00	228	38.00
	22-44	51	8.50	36	6.00	197	32.83
	45 and older	3	.50	1	.17	4	.67
Group I (N=200)	16-21	13	6.50	13	6.50	86	43.00
	22-44	13	6.50	12	6.00	61	30.50
	45 and older	1	.50	0	.00	1	.50
Group II (N=200)	16-21	6	3.00	12	6.00	73	36.50
	22-44	8	4.00	9	4.50	86	43.00
	45 and older	2	1.00	1	.50	3	1.50
Group III (N=200)	16-21	25	12.50	11	5.50	69	34.50
	22-44	30	15.00	15	7.50	50	25.00
	45 and older	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00

years of 1946 and 1925, or 22 through 44 years of age; (3) older workers, born in 1924 and before, or 45 years of age or older. In Group I there were 86 Negroes in the youth group (43%), 13 White-Spanish youth (6.5%), and 13 White youth (6.5%); in the adult group there were 61 Negroes (30.5%), 12 White-Spanish (6.0%), and 13 Whites (6.5%); and there was one Negro older worker (.5%), no White-Spanish older workers, and 1 White older worker (.5%).

In Group II there were 73 Negro youth (36.5%), 12 White-Spanish youth (6.0%), and 6 White youth (3.0%); 86 Negroes (43.0%), 9 White-Spanish (4.5%), and 8 Whites (4.0%) comprised the adult group; and in the older worker category, there were 3 Negroes (1.5%), 1 White-Spanish (.5%), and 2 Whites (1.0%). In Group III there were 69 Negro youth (34.5%), 11 White-Spanish youth (5.5%), and 25 White youth (12.5%). The adult males were comprised of 50 Negroes (25.0%), 15 White-Spanish (7.5%), and 30 Whites (15.0%); and there were no older worker members of this group.

The Negro population of Group I was comprised of 86 youth (58.11%), 61 adults (41.22%), and 1 older worker (.67%); the White-Spanish population consisted of 13 youth (52.0%), 12 adults (48.0%), and no older workers. In the White group there were 13 youth (48.15%), 13 adults (48.15%), and 1 older worker (3.7%).

In Group II the Negro population consisted of 73 youth (45.06%), 86 adults (53.09%), and 3 older workers (1.85%); the White-Spanish group had 12 youth (54.55%), and 9 adults (40.91%), and 1 older worker (4.54%); and the Whites were comprised of 6 youth (37.50%), 8 adults

(50.0%), and 2 older workers (12.5%).

The Negro population of Group III included 69 youth (57.98%), 50 adults (50.0%), and no older workers; the White-Spanish group had 11 youth (42.31%), 15 adults (57.69%), and no older workers; and the White group, 25 youth (45.45%), 30 adults (54.55%), and no older workers.

The Education factor in the study was broken down into four groups: those who completed the 6th grade or less, those who completed 7 through 9 grades of schooling, those who completed 10 through 12 grades, and those who had more than 12 years of schooling. These data are presented in Table IV. In Group I there were 3 Negroes (1.5%), 2 White-Spanish (1.0%), and 2 Whites (1.0%) who fell into the first category of 6 grades or less; 30 Negroes (15.0%), 16 White-Spanish (8.0%), and 13 Whites (6.5%) completed 7 through 9 grades. 106 Negroes (63.0%), 6 White-Spanish (3.0%), and 10 Whites (5.0%) completed 10 through 12 grades; and 9 Negroes (4.5%), 1 White-Spanish (.5%), and 2 Whites (1.0%) had more than 12 years of education.

In Group II, there were 6 Negroes (3.0%), 6 White-Spanish (3.0%), and no Whites who had completed 6 grades or less. 36 Negroes (18.0%), 8 White-Spanish (4.0%), and 7 Whites (4.5%) had 7 through 9 years of schooling. 104 Negroes (52.0%), 8 White-Spanish (4.0%), and 8 Whites (4.0%) completed 10 through 12 grades of schooling, and 16 Negroes (8.0%), no White-Spanish, and 1 White (.5%) had more than 12 years of schooling.

Group III had 4 Negroes (2.0%), 6 White-Spanish (3.0%), and 4 Whites (2.0%) with 6 grades or less; 37 Negroes (18.5%), 17 White-Spanish (8.5%), and 19 Whites (9.5%) with 7 through 9 grades. 71 Negroes (35.5%),

2 White-Spanish (1.0%), and 27 Whites (13.5%) completed 10 through 12 grades of school; and 7 Negroes (3.5%), 1 White-Spanish (.5%), and 5 Whites (2.5%) had more than 12 years of schooling.

The Negro members of Group I included 3 who had 6 or less years of schooling (2.03%), 30 who had 7 through 9 years (20.27%), 106 who had 10 through 12 years (71.62%), and 9 who had more than 12 years of schooling (6.08%). The Negro members of Group II had 6 with 6 or less grades (3.70%), 36 with 7 through 9 grades (22.22%), 104 with 10 through 12 grades (64.20%), and 16 with more than 12 grades (9.88%). In Group III there were 4 Negroes with 6 grades or less (3.36%), 37 with 7 through 9 grades (31.09%), 71 with 10 through 12 grades (59.67%), and 7 with 12 or more grades (5.88%).

The White-Spanish members of Group I included 2 with 6 grades or less (8.0%), 16 with 7 through 9 grades (64.0%), 6 with 10 through 12 grades (24.0%), and 1 with 12 grades or more (4.0%). In Group II, the White-Spanish individuals included 6 with 6 grades or less (27.28%), 8 with 7 through 9 grades (36.36%), 8 with 10 to 12 grades (36.36%), and none with more than 12 grades. Group III included 6 White-Spanish with 6 grades or less (23.08%), 17 with 7 through 9 grades (65.38%), 2 with 10 through 12 grades (7.69%), and 1 with more than 12 grades (3.85%).

White individuals in Group I included 2 with 6 grades or less (7.41%), 13 with 7 through 9 grades (48.15%), 10 with 10 through 12 grades (37.04%), and 2 with more than 12 grades (7.40%). In Group II there were no Whites with 6 grades or less, 7 with 7 through 9 grades (43.75%), 8 with 10 through 12 grades (50.0%), and 1 with more than 12

TABLE IV
EDUCATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

		White		White-Spanish		Negro	
Grade Level		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Total Sample (N=600)	6th and less	6	1.00	14	2.33	13	2.17
	7 - 9	39	6.50	41	6.84	103	17.17
	10 -12	45	7.50	16	2.67	281	46.83
	12 +	8	1.33	2	.33	32	5.33
Group I (N=200)	6th and less	2	1.00	2	1.00	3	1.50
	7 - 9	13	6.50	16	8.00	24	15.00
	10 -12	10	5.00	6	3.00	106	53.00
	12 +	2	1.00	1	.50	9	4.50
Group II (N=200)	6th and less	0	.00	6	3.00	6	3.00
	7 - 9	7	3.50	8	4.00	36	18.00
	10 -12	8	4.00	8	4.00	104	52.00
	12 +	1	.50	0	.00	16	8.00
Group III (N=200)	6th and less	4	2.00	6	3.00	4	2.00
	7 - 9	19	9.50	17	8.50	37	18.50
	10 -12	27	13.50	2	1.00	71	35.50
	12 +	5	2.50	1	.50	7	3.50

grades (6.25%). Group III included 4 Whites with 6 grades or less (7.27%), 19 with 7 through 9 grades (34.55%), and 27 with 10 through 12 grades (49.09%), and 5 with 12 grades or more (9.09%).

In regard to the marital status factor (see Table V), each individual was listed as being either single, married, separated, widowed, or divorced. In Group I there were 85 single Negroes (42.5%), 13 single Whites (6.5%), and 14 single White-Spanish (7.0%); 32 married Negroes (16.0%), 6 married Whites (3.0%), and 8 married White-Spanish (4.0%). There were 20 Separated Negroes (10.0%), 2 separated Whites (1.0%), 2 separated White-Spanish (1.0%); and 10 divorced Negroes (5.0%), 5 divorced Whites (2.5%), and 1 divorced White-Spanish (.5%). There was 1 widowed Negro (.5%), 1 widowed White (.5%) and no widowed White-Spanish.

In Group II there were 65 single Negroes (32.5%), 7 single Whites (3.5%), and 9 single White-Spanish (4.5%); 53 married Negroes (26.5%), 4 married Whites (2.0%), and 7 married White-Spanish (3.5%); 34 separated Negroes (17.0%), 2 separated Whites (1.0%), and 2 separated White-Spanish (1.0%); 5 widowed Negroes (2.5%), 2 widowed Whites (1.0%), and 1 widowed White-Spanish (.5%); and 5 divorced Negroes (2.5%), 1 divorced White (.5%), and 3 divorced White-Spanish (1.5%).

Group III included 87 single Negroes (43.5%), 37 single Whites (18.5%), and 14 single White-Spanish (7.0%); 28 married Negroes (14.0%), 14 married Whites (7.0%), and 11 married White-Spanish (5.5%); 1 separated Negro (.5%), 1 separated White (.5%), and 1 separated White-Spanish (.5%); no widowed individuals; and 3 divorced Negroes (1.5%), 3 divorced Whites (1.5%), and no divorced White-Spanish.

TABLE V
MARITAL STATUS CHARACTERISTICS OF SAMPLE

		WHITE		WHITE-SPANISH		NEGRO	
MARITAL STATUS		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Total Sample (N=600)	Single	57	9.50	37	6.16	237	39.50
	Married	24	4.00	26	4.33	113	18.83
	Divorced	9	1.50	4	.66	18	3.00
	Separated	5	.83	5	.83	55	9.17
	Widowed	3	.50	1	.16	6	1.00
Group I (N=200)	Single	13	6.50	14	7.00	85	42.50
	Married	6	3.00	8	4.00	32	16.00
	Divorced	5	2.50	1	.50	10	5.00
	Separated	2	1.00	2	1.00	20	10.00
	Widowed	1	.50	0	.00	1	.50
Group II (N=200)	Single	7	3.50	9	4.50	65	32.50
	Married	4	2.00	7	3.50	53	26.50
	Divorced	1	.50	3	1.50	5	2.50
	Separated	2	1.00	2	1.00	34	17.00
	Widowed	2	1.00	1	.50	5	2.50
Group III (N=200)	Single	37	18.50	14	7.00	87	43.50
	Married	14	7.00	11	5.50	28	14.00
	Divorced	3	1.50	0	.00	3	1.50
	Separated	1	.50	1	.50	1	.50
	Widowed	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00

The Negro segment of Group I included 85 single (57.43%), 32 married (21.62%), 20 separated (13.51%), 1 widowed (.68%), and 10 divorced persons (6.76%). In Group II there were 65 single Negro females (40.12%), 53 married (32.71%), 34 separated (20.99%), 5 widowed (3.09%), and 5 divorced (3.09%). In Group II there were 87 single Negro males (73.11%), 28 married (23.53%), 1 separated (.84%), none widowed, and 3 divorced (2.52%).

The White population of Group I included 13 single persons (48.15%), 6 married (22.22%), 2 separated (7.41%), 1 widowed (3.70%), and 5 divorced (18.52%). In Group II were 7 single White females (43.75%), 4 married (25.0%), 2 separated (12.5%), 2 widowed (12.5%), and 1 divorced (6.25%). Group III included 37 single males (67.27%), 14 married (25.46%), 1 separated (1.82%), none widowed, and 3 divorced (5.45%).

The White-Spanish population of Group I was comprised of 14 single persons (56.0%), 8 married (32.0%), 2 separated (8.00%), none widowed, and 1 divorced (4.00%). In Group II there were 9 single White-Spanish females (40.91%), 7 married (31.82%), 2 separated (9.09%), 1 widowed (4.54%), and 3 divorced (13.64%). Group III included 14 single White-Spanish males (53.85%), 11 married (42.31%), 1 separated (3.84%), and none widowed or divorced.

The Number of Children factor (Table VI) was divided into 4 groups: none, 1, 2-4, and 5 or more. Group I included 75 Negroes (37.50%), 12 White-Spanish (6.0%), and 17 Whites (8.50%) with no children; 21 Negroes (10.50%), 2 White-Spanish (1.0%) and 3 Whites (1.50%) with

1 child; 41 Negroes (20.50%), 9 White-Spanish (4.5%), and 4 Whites (2.0%) with 2-4 children; and 11 Negroes (5.5%), 2 White-Spanish (1.0%), and 3 Whites (1.5%) with 5 or more children.

Group II had 50 Negro females (25.0%), 8 White-Spanish (4.0%), and 8 Whites (4.0%), with no children; 32 Negroes (16.0%), 3 White-Spanish (1.5%), and 4 Whites (2.0%), with 1 child; 67 Negroes (33.5%), 9 White-Spanish (4.5%), and 3 Whites (1.5%) with 2 to 4 children; and 13 Negroes (6.5%), 2 White-Spanish (1.0%), and 1 White (.5%) with 5 or more children. Group III males included 92 Negroes (46.0%), 15 White-Spanish (7.5%), and 44 Whites (22.0%) with no children; 10 Negroes (5.0%), 7 White-Spanish (3.5%), and 4 Whites (2.0%) with 1 child; 16 Negroes (8.0%), 3 White-Spanish (1.5%), and 7 Whites (3.5%) with 2 to 4 children; and 1 Negro (.5%), 1 White-Spanish (.5%), and no Whites with 5 or more children.

The Negro population of Group I included 75 (50.68%) with no children, 21 (14.19%) with 1 child, 41 (27.70%) with 2 to 4 children, and 11 (7.43%) with 5 or more children. In Group II, there were 50 Negro females (30.86%) with no children, 32 (19.75%) with 1 child, 67 (41.36%) with 2 to 4 children, and 13 (8.03%) with 5 or more children. The Group III males included 119 (77.31%) with no children, 10 (8.40%) with 1 child, 16 (13.45%) with 2 to 4 children, and 1 (.84%) with 5 or more children.

The White population of Group I included 17 (62.96%) with no children, 3 (11.11%) with 1 child, 4 (14.82%) with 2 to 4 children, and 3 (11.11%) with 5 or more children. In Group II there were 8 (50.0%)

TABLE VI
NUMBER OF CHILDREN

		WHITE		WHITE-SPANISH		NEGRO	
# Children		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Total Sample (N=600)	0	69	11.50	35	5.83	217	36.17
	1	11	1.83	12	2.00	63	10.50
	2-4	14	2.33	21	3.50	124	20.67
	5+	4	.67	5	.83	25	4.17
Group I (N=200)	0	17	8.50	12	6.00	75	37.50
	1	3	1.50	2	1.00	21	10.50
	2-4	4	2.00	9	4.50	41	20.50
	5+	3	1.50	2	1.00	11	5.50
Group II (N=200)	0	8	4.00	8	4.00	50	25.00
	1	4	2.00	3	1.50	32	16.00
	2-4	3	1.50	9	4.50	67	33.50
	5+	1	.50	2	1.00	13	6.50
Group III (N=200)	0	44	22.00	15	7.50	92	46.00
	1	4	2.00	7	3.50	10	5.00
	2-4	7	3.50	3	1.50	16	8.00
	5+	0	.00	1	.50	1	.50

White females with no children, 4 (25.0%) with 1 child, 3 (18.75%) with 2 to 4 children, and 1 (6.25%) with 5 or more children. In Group III there were 44 (80.0%) White males with no children, 4 (7.27%) with 1 child, 7 (12.73%) with 2 to 4 children, and none with 5 or more children.

The White-Spanish members of the sample in Group I included 12 (48.0%) with no children, 2 (8.0%) with 1 child, 9 (36.0%) with 2 to 4 children, and 2 (8.0%) with 5 or more children. The Group II White-Spanish females included 8 (36.36%) with no children, 3 (13.64%) with 1 child, 9 (40.91%) with 2 to 4 children, and 2 (9.09%) with 5 or more children. In Group III there were 15 (57.69%) White-Spanish males with no children, 7 (26.92%) with 1 child, 3 (11.54%) with 2 to 4 children, and 1 (3.85%) with 5 or more children.

As shown in Table VII, the Usual Occupation factor was comprised of eight groups: skilled, semi-skilled, unskilled, service, clerical and sales, professional and technical, farm occupations, and none. In Group I the skilled group included 8 Negroes (4.0%), 5 White (2.5%), and 2 White-Spanish (1.0%); the semi-skilled group included 12 Negroes (6.0%), 3 White (1.5%), and 3 White-Spanish (1.5%); the unskilled workers included 13 Negroes (6.5%), 4 White (2.0%), and 3 White-Spanish (1.5%). Those involved in service occupations were 87 Negroes (43.5%), 7 White (3.5%), and 8 White-Spanish (4.0%); in clerical and sales occupations were 8 Negroes (4.0%), 2 Whites (1.0%), and 4 White-Spanish (2.0%). Professional and technical workers included 1 Negro (.5%), no Whites, and no White-Spanish. Farm workers included no Negroes, no Whites, and 2 White-Spanish (1.0%). Those who had no previous work experience included 19 Negroes

TABLE VII
USUAL OCCUPATION

		WHITE		WHITE-SPANISH		NEGRO	
Occupational Classifications		N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Total Sample (N=600)	Skilled	13	2.17	5	.83	16	2.67
	Semi-skilled	21	3.50	14	2.33	24	4.00
	Unskilled	22	3.67	11	1.33	52	8.67
	Service	18	3.00	29	4.83	253	42.17
	Clerical & Sales	9	1.50	6	1.00	34	5.67
	Professional & Technical	2	.33	1	.17	2	.33
	Farm	0	.00	2	.33	0	.00
	None	13	2.17	5	.83	48	8.00
Group I (N=200)	Skilled	5	2.50	2	1.00	8	4.00
	Semi-skilled	3	1.50	3	1.50	12	6.00
	Unskilled	4	2.00	3	1.50	13	6.50
	Service	7	3.50	8	4.00	87	43.50
	Clerical & Sales	2	2.00	4	2.00	8	4.00
	Professional & Technical	0	.00	0	.00	1	.50
	Farm	0	.00	2	1.00	0	.00
	None	6	3.00	3	1.50	19	9.50
Group II (N=200)	Skilled	1	.50	1	.50	0	.00
	Semi-skilled	0	.00	2	1.00	0	.00
	Unskilled	1	.50	1	.50	1	.50
	Service	7	3.50	14	7.00	116	58.00
	Clerical & Sales	3	1.50	2	1.00	21	10.50
	Professional & Technical	1	.50	0	.00	1	.50
	Farm	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
	None	3	1.50	2	1.00	23	11.50
Group III (N=200)	Skilled	7	3.50	2	1.00	8	4.00
	Semi-skilled	18	9.00	9	4.50	12	6.00
	Unskilled	17	8.50	7	3.50	38	19.00
	Service	4	2.00	7	3.50	50	25.00
	Clerical & Sales	4	2.00	0	.00	5	2.50
	Professional & Technical	1	.50	1	.50	0	.00
	Farm	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
	None	4	2.00	0	.00	6	3.00

(9.5%), 6 Whites (3.0%), and 3 White-Spanish (1.5%).

Group II workers included no skilled Negroes, 1 skilled White (.5%), and 1 skilled White-Spanish (.5%); no semi-skilled Negroes, no semi-skilled Whites, and 1 semi-skilled White-Spanish (.5%); 1 unskilled Negro (.5%), 1 unskilled White (.5%), and 1 unskilled White-Spanish (.5%); 116 Negroes who were service workers (58.0%), 7 Whites (3.5%), and 14 White-Spanish (7.0%); 21 Negroes who worked in clerical and sales occupations (10.5%), 3 Whites (1.5%), and 2 White-Spanish (1.0%); 1 Negro who was a professional and technical worker (.5%), 1 White (.5%), and no White-Spanish; no females involved in farm work; and 23 Negroes (11.50%), 3 Whites (1.5%), and 2 White-Spanish (1.0%) who had no previous work experience.

In Group III were 8 skilled Negroes (4.0%), 7 skilled Whites (3.5%), and 2 skilled White-Spanish (1.0%); 12 semi-skilled Negroes (6.0%), 18 semi-skilled Whites (9.0%), and 9 semi-skilled White-Spanish (4.5%); 38 unskilled Negroes (19.0%), 17 unskilled Whites (8.5%), and 7 unskilled White-Spanish (3.5%); 50 Negroes (25.0%), 4 Whites (2.0%), and 7 White-Spanish (3.5%) were service workers. Those in clerical and sales occupations included 5 Negroes (2.5%), 4 Whites (2.0%), and no White-Spanish; there were no Negroes, 1 White (.5%), and 1 White-Spanish (.5%) in professional and technical positions. There were no farm workers in this group; and 6 Negroes (3.0%), 4 Whites (2.0%), and no White-Spanish individuals who had no previous work experience.

The Negro population of Group I included 8 skilled workers (5.41%), 12 semi-skilled (8.11%), 13 unskilled (8.78%), 87 service

workers (58.78%), 8 in clerical and sales (5.40%), 1 professional and technical (.68%), none in farm occupations, and 19 who had never worked (12.84%). The Negroes in Group II included no skilled workers, no semi-skilled, 1 unskilled (.62%), 116 in service occupations (71.60%), 21 in clerical and sales (12.96%), 1 professional and technical (.62%), none in farm occupations, and 23 who had never worked (14.20%). Group III Negroes included 8 skilled workers (6.72%), 12 semi-skilled (10.09%), 38 unskilled (31.93%), 50 in service occupations (42.02%), 5 in clerical and sales (4.20%), none professional and technical, none in farm occupations, and 6 who had never worked (5.04%).

The White population of Group I included 5 skilled workers (16.51%), 3 semi-skilled (11.11%), 4 unskilled (14.81%), 7 service workers (25.94%), 2 in clerical and sales (7.40%), none professional and technical, none in farm occupations, and 6 who had never worked (22.23%). In Group II, there were 1 skilled worker (6.25%), none semi-skilled, 1 unskilled (6.25%), 7 in service occupations (43.75%), 3 in clerical and sales (18.75%), 1 professional and technical (6.25%), none in farm occupations, and 3 who had never worked (18.75%). The White population of Group III was comprised of 7 skilled workers (12.73%), 18 semi-skilled (32.73%), 17 unskilled (30.91%), 4 in service occupations (7.27%), 4 in clerical and sales (7.27%), 1 professional and technical (1.82%), none in farm occupations, and 4 with no previous work experience (7.27%).

The White-Spanish population of Group I included 2 skilled workers (8.0%), 3 semi-skilled (12.0%), 3 unskilled (12.0%), 8 in service

occupations (32.0%), 4 in clerical and sales (16.0%), none professional and technical, 2 farm workers (8.0%), and 2 with no work experience (8.0%).

In Group II were 1 skilled White-Spanish (4.54%), 2 semi-skilled (9.09%), 1 unskilled (4.54%), 4 service workers (63.65%), 2 in clerical and sales (9.09%), non professional and technical, none in farm work, and 2 with no work experience (9.09%). Group III included 2 skilled White-Spanish (7.69%), 9 semi-skilled (34.62%), 7 unskilled (26.92%), 7 service workers (26.92%), none in clerical and sales, 1 professional and technical (3.85%), none in farm occupations, and none without work experience.

The G-Score factor in this study indicates the number of disadvantaged individuals in each group that fall into various ten-point ranges. The G-Score is one of the nine scores derived from the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB), administered as part of the vocational counseling process at the Opportunity Center. This particular score indicates general learning ability, the ability to reason and make judgments. The norms set up by the United States Employment Service (USES) for this test battery set the mean at 100. A score of 145 would fall at the 99th percentile, while a score of 55 would fall at the 1st percentile. (See Table XII.) G-Scores were not available on all members of the sample groups. Group I had 106 individuals with G-Scores (53.0% of the total), Group II had 113 available (56.50% of the total), and Group III had 78 scores available (38.50% of the total). The scores in all three groups ranged from 40 to 129. Ten-point ranges were used in indicating

TABLE VIII

G-SCORES

		WHITE		WHITE-SPANISH		NEGRO		TOTAL	
SCORE RANGE		f	Percent	f	Percent	f	Percent	f	Percent
Total	40 - 49	0	.00	0	.00	1	.34	1	.34
Sample	50 - 59	1	.34	1	.34	15	5.06	17	5.74
(f=296)	60 - 69	2	.68	5	1.68	51	17.23	58	19.59
	70 - 79	6	2.03	10	3.38	61	20.61	77	26.02
	80 - 89	9	3.04	4	1.35	55	18.58	68	22.97
	90 - 99	7	2.36	3	1.01	32	10.82	42	14.19
	100-109	7	2.36	4	1.35	11	3.72	22	7.43
	110-119	8	2.70	0	.00	0	.00	8	2.70
	120-129	2	.68	0	.00	1	.34	3	1.02
								296	100.00
Group I	40 - 49	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
(f=106)	50 - 59	1	.94	0	.00	4	3.78	5	4.72
	60 - 69	0	.00	2	1.89	20	18.86	22	20.75
	70 - 79	3	2.83	5	4.72	22	20.75	30	28.30
	80 - 89	3	2.83	1	.94	21	19.81	25	23.58
	90 - 99	2	1.89	1	.94	9	8.50	12	11.33
	100-109	2	1.89	1	.94	6	5.67	9	8.50
	110-119	1	.94	0	.00	0	.00	1	.94
	120-129	1	.94	0	.00	1	.94	2	1.88
Group II	40 - 49	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
(f=113)	50 - 59	0	.00	1	.88	9	7.97	10	8.85
	60 - 69	1	.88	3	2.65	25	22.13	29	25.66
	70 - 79	2	1.77	3	2.65	23	20.36	28	24.78
	80 - 89	1	.88	2	1.77	23	20.36	26	23.01
	90 - 99	0	.00	0	.00	13	11.51	13	11.51
	100-109	3	2.65	2	1.77	2	1.77	7	6.19
	110-119	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
	120-129	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Group III	40 - 49	0	.00	0	.00	1	1.30	1	1.30
(f=77)	50 - 59	0	.00	0	.00	2	2.60	2	2.60
	60 - 69	1	1.30	0	.00	6	7.79	7	9.09
	70 - 79	1	1.30	2	2.60	16	20.77	19	24.67
	80 - 89	5	6.49	1	1.30	11	14.29	17	22.08
	90 - 99	5	6.49	2	2.60	10	12.99	17	22.08
	100-109	2	2.60	1	1.30	3	3.89	6	7.79
	110-119	7	9.09	0	.00	0	.00	7	9.09
	120-129	1	1.30	0	.00	0	.00	1	1.30
Total		42		27		227		296	

each score, for example, 40 to 49, 50 to 59, etc. (See Table VIII.)

In Group I there were 86 G-Scores for Negroes available; none fell in the 40 to 49 range, 4 fell in the 50 to 59 range (3.78%), 20 in the 60 to 69 range (18.86%), 22 in the 70 to 79 range (20.76%), 21 in the 80 to 89 range (19.82%), 9 in the 90 to 99 range (8.49%), 6 in the 100 to 109 range (5.66%), none in the 110 to 119 range, and 1 in the 120 to 129 range (.94%). The mean score for this group was 79.96, and the range was 54 to 122.

The 95 scores for the Negro females in Group II included none in the 40 to 49 range, 9 in the 50 to 59 range (9.47%), 25 in the 60 to 69 range (26.32%), 23 in the 70 to 79 range (24.21%), 23 in the 80 to 89 range (24.21%), 13 in the 90 to 99 range (13.68%), 2 in the 100 to 109 range (2.11%), and none in the 110 to 119 or 120 to 129 ranges. The mean score for this group was 76.38, and the range was 50 to 106.

The 49 scores for Negro males in Group III included 1 in the 40 to 49 range (2.04%), 2 in the 50 to 59 range (4.08%), 6 in the 60 to 69 range (12.24%), 16 in the 70 to 79 range (32.65%), 11 in the 80 to 89 range (22.45%), 10 in the 90 to 99 range (20.41%), 3 in the 100 to 109 range (6.13%), and none in the 110 to 119 range or in the 120 to 129 range. The mean score for this group was 80.24, and the range was 47 to 110.

There were 13 G-Scores available on White individuals in Group I. These included none in the 40 to 49 range, 1 in the 50 to 59 range (.94%), none in the 60 to 69 range, 3 in the 70 to 79 range (2.83%), 3 in the 80 to 89 range (2.83%), 2 in the 90 to 99 range (1.89%), 2 in the 100

to 109 range (1.88%), 1 in the 110 to 119 range (.94%), and 1 in the 120 to 129 range (.94%). The mean score for this group was 90.97, and the range was 56 to 122.

The G-Scores available for the White females in Group II numbered 7. There were none in the 40 to 49 range, or in the 50 to 59 range, 1 in the 60 to 69 range (14.29%), 2 in the 70 to 79 range (28.57%), 1 in the 80 to 89 range (14.29%), none in the 90 to 99 range, 3 in the 100 to 109 range (42.85%), and none in either the 110 to 119 range or the 120 to 129 range. The mean score for this group was 87.86, and the range was 64 to 109.

There were 22 scores available on the White males in Group III. These included none in the 40 to 49 range, none in the 50 to 59 range, 1 in the 60 to 69 range (4.55%), 1 in the 70 to 79 range (4.55%), 5 in the 80 to 89 range (22.72%), 5 in the 90 to 99 range (22.72%), 2 in the 100 to 109 range (9.09%), 7 in the 110 to 119 range (31.82%), and 1 in the 120 to 129 range (4.55%). The mean score for this group was 99.36, and the range was 67 to 123.

In Group I, there were 10 scores available for the White-Spanish individuals in the sample. These included none in the 40 to 49 range, none in the 50 to 59 range, 2 in the 60 to 69 range (1.89%), 5 in the 70 to 79 range (4.73%), 1 in the 80 to 89 range (.94%), 1 in the 90 to 99 range (.94%), 1 in the 100 to 109 range (.94%), and none in the 110 to 119 or 120 to 129 ranges. The mean score for this group was 79.84, and the range was 60 to 108.

The scores available for the White-Spanish females in Group II

numbered 11. These included none in the 40 to 49 range, 1 in the 50 to 59 range (9.10%), 3 in the 60 to 69 range (27.27%), 3 in the 70 to 79 range (27.27%), 2 in the 80 to 89 range (18.18%), none in the 90 to 99 range, 2 in the 100 to 109 range (18.18%), and none in the 110 to 119 range, or in the 120 to 129 range. The mean score for this group was 83.73, and the range was 57 to 108.

In Group III there were 6 available scores on the White-Spanish males. There were none in the 40 to 49 range, none in the 50 to 59 range, none in the 60 to 69 range, 2 in the 70 to 79 range (33.33%), 1 in the 80 to 89 range (16.67%), 2 in the 90 to 99 range (33.33%), 1 in the 100 to 109 range (16.67%), and none in either the 110 to 119, or the 120 to 129 ranges. The mean score for this group was 87.67, and the range was 71 to 105. (See Table VIII.)

The Handicap factor provided information on the number of persons in the sample groups with any physical or mental disability. (See Table IX.) In Group I there were a total of 29 handicapped persons, 14.50% of the total sample of 200. This included 19 males (65.52%), and 10 females (34.48%). 17 of the handicapped were Negro (58.62%), 9 were White (31.04%), and 3 were White-Spanish (10.34%). Group II included 47 handicapped persons, 23.50% of the total sample. 20 of these were Negro (42.55%), 23 were White (48.94%), and 4 were White-Spanish (8.51%). Group III had a total of 15 handicapped males, 7.50% of the total sample of 200. 8 of these were Negro (53.33%), 4 were White (26.67%), and 3 were White-Spanish (20.00%).

As shown in Table X, there was a total of 11 veterans in Group I,

TABLE IX
HANDICAP FACTOR

	WHITE		WHITE-SPANISH		NEGRO	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Total Sample (N=91)	36	39.56	10	10.99	45	49.45
Group I (N=29)	9	31.03	3	10.35	17	58.62
Group II (N=15)	4	26.67	3	20.00	8	53.33
Group III (N=47)	23	48.94	4	8.51	20	42.55

TABLE X
VETERAN STATUS

	WHITE		WHITE-SPANISH		NEGRO	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Total Sample (N=50)	18	36.00	5	10.00	27	54.00
Group I (N=50)	5	45.45	1	9.10	5	45.45
Group II (N=0)	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Group III (N=39)	13	33.33	4	10.26	22	56.41

5.05% of the total sample of 200. 5 were Negro (45.45%), 5 were White (45.45%), and 1 was White-Spanish (9.10%). The five Negro Veterans comprised 3.38% of the total Negro population in Group I; the 5 White veterans, 18.52% of the total White population, and the 1 White-Spanish veteran, 4.00% of the total White-Spanish population of Group I. There were no veterans in Group II. In Group III there were 39 veterans, 19.50% of the total sample of 200. 22 of these were Negro (56.41%), 13 were White (33.33%), and 4 were White-Spanish (10.26%). The 22 Negro veterans comprised 18.49% of the total Negro population of Group III; the 13 White veterans comprised 23.64% of the total White population of Group III; and the 4 White-Spanish veterans comprised 15.38% of the total White-Spanish population of Group III.

The Military Service Rejectees (MSR's) were those who have been excluded from military service for some physical or mental reason. (See Table XI.) In Group I there were 4 Negro MSR's, 100% of the total MSR's in this group; there were no White or White-Spanish MSR's in Group I. These 4 Negro MSR's comprised 2.70% of the total Negro population of Group I. In Group III there were 35 MSR's, 17.5% of the total sample of 200. There were 21 Negro MSR's (60.0%), 8 White MSR's (22.86%), and 6 White-Spanish (17.14%). The 21 Negroes comprised 17.65% of the total Negro population of Group III; the 8 White MSR's, 14.55% of their population, and the 6 White-Spanish MSR's, 23.08% of their population in Group III.

TABLE XI
MILITARY SERVICE REJECTEE STATUS

	WHITE		WHITE-SPANISH		NEGRO	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Total Sample (N=39)	8	20.52	6	15.38	25	64.10
Group I (N=4)	0	.00	0	.00	4	100.00
Group II (N=0)	0	.00	0	.00	0	.00
Group III (N=35)	8	22.86	6	17.14	21	60.00

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

Despite the increased emphasis on disadvantaged individuals and their educational, occupational, financial, and related problems, there is still a lack of descriptive information available on this group of people. This descriptive study undertook to provide such information on the sample group of six hundred individuals. All of the information used in this study was taken from closed case records at the Houston Opportunity Center of the Texas Employment Commission, in Houston, Texas. There were eleven factors used to describe these individuals: sex, race, age, marital status, education, number of children, usual occupation before receiving service at the Houston Opportunity Center, the G-score from the General Aptitude Test Battery, if administered, the individual's handicap status, his veteran status, and his Military Service Rejection status. The total sample of 600 individuals was divided into three groups of 200 each. Group I was a random selection of both males and females; Group II consisted only of females; and Group III consisted only of males. For each factor in all three groups, the actual number of persons listed for that factor, and the percentage of that number of the total sample (200) was provided. Each segment was further divided by racial characteristics.

The results of this study show that 71.5% of the total population of 600 disadvantaged individuals were Negro. This percentage varied for

Groups I, II, and III. For example, in Group I, 74.0% were Negro; in Group II, 81.0% were Negro; and in Group III, 59.5% were Negro. The total number of White individuals in the total population of 600 was 16.33%, which varied from 8.0% in Group II to 27.5% in Group III. White-Spanish individuals accounted for 12.17% of the total population of 600, and this was consistent throughout the three Groups.

55.33% of the total population of disadvantaged individuals (600) were female. In Group I, there were 132 females (66.0%), and 68 males (34.0%). Group II and Group III were totally female and male, respectively.

The age characteristics of the sample show the majority of the disadvantaged Negroes fell in the 16 to 21 age bracket. This was true in all Groups, except Group II, in which the majority were in the 22 to 44 bracket. The majority of White individuals fell in the 22 to 44 age bracket. In the total population of White-Spanish individuals, there were equal numbers of youth (16 to 21) and adults (22 to 44); this varied only slightly throughout Groups I, II, and III.

The educational characteristics show that the large majority of disadvantaged Negroes completed 10 to 12 grades in school. A slight majority of White individuals had completed 10 to 12 grades in school; and the majority of White-Spanish individuals had completed 7 to 9 grades.

The majority of Negro individuals in the total sample were single (39.5%), while 18.83% were married; the majority of White individuals were also single, as were the majority of White-Spanish individuals.

This was consistent throughout Groups I, II, and III.

The majority of Negro, White, and White-Spanish individuals had no children, while those with 2 to 4 children comprised the second largest segment in all three racial groups.

The usual occupation of most of the Negro population was in the service area. The White population had no clear majority in any of the fields; they all varied only slightly from each other. White-Spanish individuals had a slight majority in the field of service occupations, with semi-skilled workers comprising the second largest percentage in their group.

The G-scores of the Negro population ranged from 47 to 122, with a mean of 78.86. The largest percentage of individuals scored in the 70 to 79 bracket. The G-scores of the White individuals ranged from 56 to 123, with a mean of 92.73. The majority of these individuals fell evenly in the 70 to 119 area. In Group II, there was a clear majority in the 100 to 109 bracket, and in Group III, there was a majority in the 110 to 119 range. The range of the White-Spanish individuals was 57 to 108, with a mean of 82.75. The majority of the White-Spanish population fell in the 70 to 79 range, except in Group III, where there was an equal number in the 70 to 79 and the 90 to 99 brackets.

Handicapped individuals totaled 91 in the total sample of 600. 49.45% of these were Negro, 39.56% were White, and 10.99% were White-Spanish. This order was held throughout the three Groups, except in Group III, which consisted of 42.55% Negroes, 48.94% Whites, and 8.51% White-Spanish individuals.

There were a total of 50 veterans in the total sample of 600. 54.0% of these were Negro, 36.0% were White, and 10.0% were White-Spanish. In Group I there were equal numbers of Negro and White veterans, while in Group III, Negroes again comprised the majority. The Military Service Rejectees consisted of 64.10% Negro, 20.52% White, and 15.38% White-Spanish individuals. Negroes comprised the majority of MSR's throughout the sample.

Conclusions

1. The majority of the disadvantaged in the Houston area, who apply at the Houston Opportunity Center, are Negro.
2. The majority of these disadvantaged individuals are female (55.37%). Group I was 66.0% female, with Negro disadvantaged females comprising 70.95% of the Negro segment in Group I.
3. The majority of the disadvantaged are single youth, with no children.
4. A large majority of Negro disadvantaged individuals have completed 10 to 12 grades in school; and more individuals have completed more than 12 grades, i.e., have some college or university education, than have completed 6 grades or less.
5. The large majority of disadvantaged workers in the Houston area are employed in service occupations, followed by those in unskilled occupations, and those with no work experience at all.
6. G-scores, from the GATB, indicate that, while the mean score for this test is 100, the majority of the Negro disadvantaged had scores that fell between 60 and 89, with a mean of 78.86. The mean score of the

White-Spanish individuals was 82.75, while the mean score of the White persons tested was 92.73. Judging from these results, there appears to be definite racial differences in performance on this test, even within the disadvantaged population.

Recommendations

For counselors and other professional workers who deal with the disadvantaged, it is helpful to have detailed, descriptive information available. Every such professional worker quickly forms his own concepts about this economically deprived class of persons; thus, carefully researched information on this subject would prevent many misconceptions, in addition to being extremely helpful in working with each individual.

In further studies of this type, a larger a larger sample group would give more conclusive evidence for any hypothesis involved. Another improvement would be to use additional factors in such a study, so that more extensive information would be gathered on each individual, thus more extensive information would be available on the group. For example, the area of the disadvantaged person's residence in the city would be of interest and importance. This has already become a consideration in the organization of at least one training program in our area for the disadvantaged (the Concentrated Employment Program). The length of time that the person has been unemployed within a given time period, as the last twelve months, would be another possible factor. It would also be interesting and helpful to know how many disadvantaged applicants are eventually enrolled in any one of the training programs available to

them; and if so, what type of training it is, whether the course was successfully completed, and whether this person was able to find higher skilled or more satisfactory employment as a result of this training.

In this area of research, it is important that information and facts included in such studies be as up-to-date as possible. A project involving extensive studies on this subject, done every six to twelve months, would be ideal. Done on a local basis, such a project would clearly show what results and trends are growing out of the various poverty programs now in progress in our area. In any case, additional and more extensive research on this topic can only add to the efficiency and effectiveness of efforts now being made to help the economically problem-ridden people known collectively as the Disadvantaged.

TABLE XII
ADULT APTITUDE OR STANDARD SCORES AND CORRESPONDING
PERCENTILES OF THE GENERAL APTITUDE TEST BATTERY¹

Adult aptitude or standard scores		Percentile
145	99
140	98
135	96
130	93
125	89
120	84
115	77
110	69
105	60
100	50
95	40
90	31
85	23
80	16
75	11
70	7
65	4
60	2
55	1

¹Manual for the General Aptitude Test Battery, Section II: Norms.
United States Department of Labor, June, 1966, p. 4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Hume, Laurabell N. "Is There A Typical Employment Counselee?", Journal of Employment Counseling, IV, No. 4 (December, 1967), 127-131.

Job Corps Office of Economic Opportunity. Job Corps Admission Manual.

United States Department of Labor. Manual for the General Aptitude Test Battery. Section II: Norms. June, 1966.

United States Employment Service. Dictionary of Occupational Titles. Vol. II, Second Edition, prepared by the Division of Occupational Analysis. March, 1949.