

AFTER THE BRACERO:

An Inquiry into the Problems of Farm Labor Recruitment.

✓
Supplemental Report,

By

Fred H. Schmidt //

Institute of Industrial Relations (Los Angeles)

[California University]

Los Angeles December, 1964

INSTITUTE OF INDUSTRIAL
RELATIONS LIBRARY

MAR 31 1965

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
BERKELEY

FINAL SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESULTS

By agreement with the Department of Employment, the Institute of Industrial Relations has submitted its report on farm labor recruitment in two stages: the first report, which was submitted on October 21, 1964, contained a preliminary summary of survey findings plus the results of all other research conducted, and the present report merely summarizes the final survey tabulation. A brief summation of important findings is presented, followed by a series of tables duplicating the form of the tables contained in the earlier report but revised to include the newer figures. A technical note on sampling procedures is also appended.

As indicated, the initial report on this study contained a preliminary summary of a survey among a sample of persons residing in the areas of highest unemployment and lowest income in Los Angeles. The summary was preliminary because the number of persons interviewed had not then reached the full number specified in the research contract between the University of California, Los Angeles and the Department of Employment of the State of California. That contract called for approximately 1,000 interviews. At the time the preliminary summary was made, approximately 664 interviews had been completed, but only 564 of these were available for analysis in the report. The present summary is based on the full 1,000 interviews.

The focus of this inquiry is on a subject that is presently the center of much public interest, one that bears directly on the economic interests and well-being of many persons associated with a great industry. This concern, of course, is not limited to the growers and workers in the industry itself, but includes many others who also feel themselves

affected by the problem under discussion. Perhaps because of this, it was not unusual that the report should be received with quite spirited and mixed reactions from many quarters, some of which sought to criticize the methods and discredit the findings and recommendations of the study. It is not necessary here to describe or respond to these reactions, for the report must speak for itself and stand on its own merits.

However, one point of response was reserved at the outset, having to do with the adequacy of the sample and the further examination of the preliminary findings from that sample. It was previously indicated that this would be done, and fortunately so, for some critics of the study seem to have questioned the size of the sample, pointing to this as inadequate and a possible source of error in the findings.

Although it was felt that the methods used in drawing the sample were proper and accurate and the 564 completed interviews sufficient to project preliminary findings, this could not be known with any certainty until these had been more fully tested. They have now been so tested.

The interviews have been almost doubled since the initial report. This has produced no change of any substance in the earlier findings. Variations in cross tabulations of the selected characteristics used in the report are limited to minor percentage point differences, indicating that this sample if further enlarged would not produce any change of consequence. Such differences as appeared are recorded here and examined in closer detail wherever they suggest any modification whatsoever in the preliminary summary. None of them are of such scope or nature to alter the basic findings summarized in the earlier report.

The responses of males who were unemployed at the time of the interview were given particular emphasis in the preliminary report, as they

are in this one. However, it should be borne in mind that in the recruitment of farm labor the industry does not necessarily have to limit its appeals to males alone, or to unemployed alone. It is obvious that there have always been sizable numbers of females, and also minors, employed in agricultural field work. It is also clear from the study of employment histories of those accepted for interviews in this study that "employment" is often an uncertain, casual and impermanent status which the respondents enter and leave with considerable frequency. The "employed" persons accepted for interviews were those who have had several jobs in the past three years and have experienced recurring periods of unemployment during those years. The respondent who states he is employed on the day he is interviewed may well be unemployed again in the near future, as he has in the past, in which case it is presumed that he joins that same body of respondents whose replies were isolated for special study because of their immediate availability for jobs. This point is important, for there have been some who felt the significance of the earlier findings should be minimized on the assumption that they applied only to the presently unemployed males. This view fails to comprehend the nature of unemployment and employment as it is experienced by large numbers of urban workers. Often the employed person is markedly underemployed, in that his job of the moment is inadequate to sustain the elemental needs of himself and family. It was pointed out in the earlier report that it is not unusual for even a person receiving public assistance to have some minimum job income which is then supplemented by the Bureau of Public Assistance. Such a person would be classified as employed for purposes of this study, but realistically might be as responsive to economically

rewarding farm or other employment offers as would his totally unemployed neighbor. This may be one explanation of the fact that 31 percent of the "employed" males expressed a willingness to do farm work, though, of course, only under specified conditions.

Of the 342 men who were unemployed on the day of the interview, 154, or 45.0 percent, said they would do farm work, and 41.8 percent of the 342 said they had previously worked as farm laborers. The wage expectations of those willing to consider farm labor can be seen from the following: 13.6 percent said they would do so for weekly wages below \$55 per week; 27.8 percent for less than \$70 per week; 36.2 percent for less than \$75 per week; 45.3 percent for less than \$80 per week; and 61.5 percent for less than \$85 per week. The use of these wage brackets when the original coding of the responses was made is somewhat unfortunate, for they appear to overstate the wage expectations of the respondents. For example, when the dividing point for coding purposes is placed at "under \$55 per week," this actually should suggest \$50 per week, since respondents almost invariably listed their wage expectations in amounts that could be arrayed in even increments of \$5 from the high to the low. Thus, the phrase "less than \$70 a week" is for all practical purposes inclusive of those who stated they would work for \$65, or less, per week. These percentages are presented here in this form so as to be consistent with the preliminary report and to permit comparisons with it.

Perhaps the most significant change from findings described in the preliminary report comes in the increased receptiveness registered by unskilled unemployed to the possible performance of farm labor. Whereas it was previously reported that a higher percentage of semi-skilled men were agreeable to doing farm work than was the case with unskilled men,

this order was reversed in the enlarged sample. Of the unskilled, 53.5 stated they would consider doing farm work, and 40.7 percent of the semi-skilled made this statement. The only major changes in the composition of the enlarged sample over the previous one were found to be the introduction of a higher percentage of Anglo and Mexican-American respondents and persons who had exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits or were recipients of public assistance. It appears that this change in composition produced this reversal, making it clear that unskilled workers generally are more likely to consider doing farm work.

Among the unemployed males who would consider doing farm labor, 79.1 percent said they would consider moving their families to a new location to get the type of work they wanted, and 81.8 percent said they would be willing to go back to school to learn how to do another job, slightly higher than the 76.1 percent among those who would not consider doing farm work. The need for remedial or basic education is very great among this group of unemployed males. Of those who expressed a willingness to do farm labor, 28.4 percent had completed no more than the 5th grade, while only 8.5 percent were in this category among those who were unwilling to do farm labor. This would confirm that the level of educational achievement is a strong factor in determining the willingness to do this work.

Those who had their childhood on the farm tend to be disinclined to take farm work, as are those who had their childhood in the city. The percentages of those willing to do farm labor were 46.7 percent and 39.7 percent, respectively. However, those who had their childhood in a small town are agreeable to doing farm labor by 52.9 percent.

Understandably, those in Los Angeles who have come to California most recently register the greatest reluctance to now accept farm work, especially those with less than five months' residence in the state, for 75.9 percent of these said no to this question. After the first year's residence here the proportions answering "yes" and "no" to this question begin to balance, and between two and four years' residence a strong majority state their willingness to do farm labor. After four years there is a return to a fifty-fifty balance, and the unwillingness increases with longer residence. This is suggestive of a situation where those who have recently moved to the city have hopes of establishing themselves in a rewarding job and are unprepared to move again until those hopes are fully tested.

In the total group of unemployed males there were 41.8 percent who said they had previously held a job as a farm laborer. There is a high willingness to consider doing it again among those who have done farm labor, for 63.6 percent said they would do so, while only 36.4 percent said they would not. If their work just before coming to California was in agriculture this ratio becomes very high, with 83.3 percent expressing a willingness to return to farm work and only 16.7 percent opposed to doing so. The opposite is the case if they were engaged in service type work before coming to California, for here only 29.2 percent are willing and 70.8 percent are unwilling.

Once the decision has been made to accept farm labor, it does not appear that the length of the workday is a major deterrent, for 91.6 percent said they would be willing to work ten hours a day if necessary. However, the possible lengths to which the workday might extend could be a strong factor in determining the unwillingness of some to consider

doing this work. Over three-fourths (76.6 percent) of those who said they would not consider doing farm labor also stated they would not be willing to work ten hours a day.

There is no significant difference in the willingness to do farm labor between those who own or rent their homes. Among those who own their home, 52.9 percent are willing to do it, while 47.4 percent of the renters are willing. A slight majority, 52.3 percent, of those who say "yes" to the question on willingness to do farm work do not own an automobile. Among those who do own an automobile, 40.1 percent say they are willing to do farm work.

In this group of unemployed men, 64.6 percent are not getting any unemployment insurance benefits. Of these, 42.5 percent said they would do farm labor, whereas 49.6 percent of those who are getting unemployment insurance benefits said they would do such work. Almost two-thirds of those who are getting unemployment insurance benefits are receiving amounts over \$40 per week, but less than \$55 per week. A third (33.8 percent) of those who are not getting any unemployment insurance benefits stated that they have exhausted the benefits to which they were entitled. This exhaustion of benefits did not increase their willingness to consider doing farm work, since 48.6 percent of these said they were willing, while 51.4 percent were unwilling. Among those men who are getting public assistance, 55.6 percent said they will do farm work, while 44.4 percent said they will not.

The amount of wages received on last job does not appear to have a clear influence on the willingness to do farm work. An irregular pattern develops in the responses of persons arrayed by the amounts of their last wages earned.

There is a clear reluctance to consider doing farm labor among unemployed men below the age of 35 years. There is also no indication of a willingness in the oldest age brackets. Between 35 and 59 years of age there is a majority which agrees to consider farm work. Married men are more agreeable to acceptance of farm work than are those unemployed who are single, divorced, or separated. Their percentage of willingness is 49.5, followed by those who are divorced with a percentage of 45.0. Single men, with 34.8 percent, are least willing. The number of dependents affects the response to doing farm work, in that those with two dependents under sixteen years of age are most reluctant to consider doing it. The greatest willingness is shown by those with three to five dependents under sixteen years of age.

There is not a great difference between Negro and Mexican-American men in their willingness to consider farm work, for 44.1 percent of the former and 49.1 percent of the latter said they would consider it. However, this willingness is lowest among the Anglo men, where it is only 31.3 percent.

TABLES

Tables 1 through 10 summarize responses to the identified questions by all respondents, both male and female, to the survey.

Tables 11 through 35 summarize responses by currently unemployed males only.

Table 1

Responses to Question 35

("Have you ever had a job as a farm laborer?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	339 _____	34.00
No _____	657 _____	65.90
No Codable Response _____	1 _____	0.10
	_____	_____
Total	997	100.00

Table 2

Responses to Question 36

("Would you work out of Los Angeles as a farm laborer for fixed periods if housing were free and free transportation were provided so you could return home regularly for a couple of days at a time?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	290 _____	29.09
No _____	704 _____	70.61
Don't Know _____	1 _____	.10
No Codable Response _____	2 _____	.20
	_____	_____
Total	997	100.00

Table 3

Responses to Question 37

("How much would you have to be paid
each week to take this kind of work?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
\$39 a week or less _____	18 _____	4.05
\$40 - \$50 a week _____	31 _____	6.99
\$51 - \$60 _____	44 _____	9.91
\$61 - \$70 _____	30 _____	6.75
\$71 - \$75 _____	31 _____	6.99
\$76 - \$80 _____	71 _____	15.99
\$81 - \$90 _____	30 _____	6.77
\$91 - \$99 _____	6 _____	1.36
\$100 and over _____	183 _____	41.22
	_____	_____
Total	444	100.00

Note: This number is smaller than the total sample because most of the persons answering "No" to the previous question would not give a response to this question, and for other reasons.

Table 4

Responses to Question 38

("Would you do farm work for as long as ten hours
a day if necessary?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	359 _____	38.40
No _____	570 _____	60.96
No Codable Response _____	6 _____	.64
	_____	_____
Total	935	100.00

Note: This table should not be interpreted to mean that 359 persons would actually accept farm work at the indicated hours. A significant number of persons who answered "Yes" to the above question have elsewhere expressed an unwillingness to do such work, and their inclusion in the "Yes" column here merely means that their objection to it is based on factors (such as the nature of the work itself, low status of farm labor, low pay) other than the longer hours that might be required.

Table 5

Responses to Question 8

("Would you consider moving yourself
and family to a new location?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	662 _____	66.47
No _____	323 _____	32.43
No Codable Response _____	11 _____	1.10
	_____	_____
Total	996	100.00

Table 6

Responses to Question 3.1

("What kind of work did you do in the
past three years?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Agriculture _____	18 _____	1.88
Unskilled _____	332 _____	34.76
Semi-skilled _____	460 _____	48.17
Skilled _____	45 _____	4.71
Service _____	97 _____	10.16
No Codable Response _____	3 _____	.31
	_____	_____
Total	955	100.00

Table 7

Responses to Question 10

("In past three years, have you found
any jobs through the SES?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	840 _____	84.34
No _____	154 _____	15.46
No Codable Response _____	2 _____	.20
	_____	_____
Total	996	100.00

Table 8

Responses to Question 13

("Would you consider going back to school to learn
how to do another job?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	749 _____	75.05
No _____	246 _____	24.65
No Codable Response _____	3 _____	.30
	_____	_____
Total	998	100.00

Table 9

Responses to Question 21

("What is the highest grade of school that
you completed?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Grades 1-5 _____	153 _____	15.49
6th Grade _____	59 _____	5.97
7th Grade _____	50 _____	5.06
8th Grade _____	93 _____	9.40
9th Grade _____	108 _____	10.92
10th Grade _____	110 _____	11.12
11th Grade _____	141 _____	14.26
12th Grade _____	275 _____	27.81
	_____	_____
Total	989	100.00

Table 10

Responses to Question 50

("Do you own a car?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	463 _____	46.44
No _____	534 _____	53.56
No Codable Response _____	0 _____	.00
	_____	_____
Total	997	100.00

Table 11

Willingness of Unemployed Men to Do Farm Work

("Would you work out of Los Angeles as a farm laborer for fixed periods if housing were free and free transportation provided so you could return home regularly for a couple of days at a time?")

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	154 _____	45.0
No _____	188 _____	55.0
Don't Know _____	0 _____	0
No Codable Response _____	0 _____	0
	_____	_____
Total	342	100.0

CROSS-TABULATIONS

Table 12

Wage Expectations of Unemployed Males Willing
to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
\$54 a week and less	21	13.6
\$55 - \$59	1	.6
\$60 - \$64	18	11.7
\$65 - \$69	3	1.9
\$70 - \$74	13	8.4
\$75 - \$79	14	9.1
\$80 - \$84	25	16.2
\$85 - \$89	6	3.9
\$90 - \$94	12	7.8
\$95 - \$97	2	1.3
\$98 - \$99	0	0
\$100 and over	39	25.3
Total	154	100.0

Table 13

Willingness to Move of Unemployed
Males Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	121 _____	79.1
No _____	32 _____	20.9
Don't Know _____	0 _____	0
No Codable Response _____	0 _____	0
	_____	_____
Total	153	100.0

Table 14

Willingness to Return to School of Unemployed
Males Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	126 _____	81.8
No _____	27 _____	17.5
Don't Know _____	1 _____	.6
No Codable Response _____	0 _____	0
	_____	_____
Total	154	100.0

Table 15

Grades Completed in School by Unemployed Males
Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
No Schooling_____	5_____	3.2
Grades 1 - 5_____	39_____	25.2
Grades 6 - 7_____	18_____	11.7
8th Grade_____	25_____	16.2
9th Grade_____	13_____	8.4
10th Grade_____	12_____	7.8
11th Grade_____	19_____	12.3
12th Grade_____	23_____	14.9
Total	154	100.0

Table 16

Location of Childhood Residence
of Unemployed Males Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Farm_____	21_____	13.7
Small Town_____	55_____	35.9
City_____	75_____	49.0
Mixed_____	2_____	1.3
Total	153	100.0

Table 17

Willingness to Do Farm Labor, by Location of
Childhood Residence

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Farm_____	46.7_____	53.3_____
Small Town_____	52.9_____	47.1_____
City_____	39.7_____	60.3_____
Mixed (3 persons only)_____	66.7_____	33.3_____

Table 18

Length of Time in California of
Unemployed Males Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0 - 5 months_____	13_____	8.5_____
6 - 11_____	3_____	2.0_____
12 - 23_____	4_____	2.6_____
24 - 35_____	5_____	3.3_____
36 - 47_____	11_____	7.2_____
48 - 59_____	6_____	3.9_____
60 - 119_____	27_____	17.6_____
120 and more_____	84_____	54.9_____
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	153	100.0

Table 19

Willingness of Unemployed Males to Do Farm
Work, By Length of Time in California

<u>Months</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
0 - 5	24.1	75.9
6 - 11	37.5	62.5
12 - 23	50.0	50.0
24 - 35	55.6	44.4
36 - 47	61.1	38.9
48 - 59	50.0	50.0
60 - 119	37.5	62.5
120 and more	52.8	47.2

Table 20

Type of Work Before Coming to California of
Unemployed Males Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Agriculture	15	12.8
Unskilled	44	37.6
Semi-skilled	44	37.6
Skilled	5	4.3
Service	7	6.0
No Codable Response	2	1.7
<hr/>		
Total	117	100.0

Table 21

Willingness to Do Farm Work, By Type
of Work Before Coming to California

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Agriculture _____	83.3 _____	16.7 _____
Unskilled _____	57.1 _____	42.9 _____
Semi-skilled _____	50.0 _____	50.0 _____
Skilled _____	35.7 _____	64.3 _____
Service _____	29.2 _____	70.8 _____

Table 22

Most Recent Job of Unemployed Males Willing
to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Agriculture _____	2 _____	1.4 _____
Unskilled _____	68 _____	47.2 _____
Semi-skilled _____	59 _____	41.0 _____
Skilled _____	5 _____	3.5 _____
Service _____	10 _____	6.9 _____
Total	144	100.0

Table 23

Willingness of Unemployed Males
Willing to Do Farm Work
Ten Hours a Day

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	141 _____	91.6 _____
No _____	13 _____	8.4 _____
Don't Know _____	0 _____	0 _____
No Codable Response _____	0 _____	0 _____
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	154	100.0

Table 24

Housing Status of Unemployed Males
Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Own _____	18 _____	11.8 _____
Rent _____	127 _____	83.6 _____
Share Ownership _____	1 _____	.7 _____
Share Rent _____	1 _____	.7 _____
Contribute _____	5 _____	3.3 _____
No Codable Response _____	0 _____	0 _____
	<hr/>	<hr/>
Total	152	100.0

Table 25

Willingness of Unemployed Males to Do Farm
Work, By Housing Status

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Own _____	52.9 _____	47.1 _____
Rent _____	47.4 _____	52.6 _____
Share Ownership _____	50.0 _____	50.0 _____
Share Rent _____	12.5 _____	87.5 _____
Contribute _____	25.0 _____	75.0 _____
No Codable Response _____	0 _____	0 _____

Table 26

Receipt of Unemployment Insurance by Unemployed Males
Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Yes _____	60 _____	39.0 _____
No _____	94 _____	61.0 _____
Don't Know _____	0 _____	0 _____
No Codable Response _____	0 _____	0 _____
Total		
	154	100.0

Table 27

Wage on Last Job Held by Unemployed Males
Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
0 - \$49 a week	17	12.0
\$50 - \$69	32	20.7
\$70 - \$79	22	14.3
\$80 - \$89	18	11.6
\$90 - \$99	19	12.3
\$100 - \$109	18	11.7
\$110 and over	28	18.1
Total	154	100.0

Table 28

Ages of Unemployed Males
Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
20 - 29	34	22.2
30 - 39	48	31.3
40 - 49	40	26.2
50 - 59	31	20.3
Total	153	100.0

Table 29

Willingness of Unemployed Males to Do Farm Work,
By Age

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
20 - 29 _____	35.1 _____	64.9 _____
30 - 39 _____	46.6 _____	53.4 _____
40 - 49 _____	52.6 _____	47.4 _____
50 - 59 _____	53.4 _____	46.6 _____

Table 30

Marital Status of Unemployed Males
Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Married _____	110 _____	71.4 _____
Single _____	23 _____	14.9 _____
Separated _____	9 _____	5.8 _____
Divorced _____	9 _____	5.8 _____
Widowed _____	2 _____	1.3 _____
No Response _____	1 _____	.65 _____
Total	154	100.00

Table 31

Willingness of Unemployed Males to Do Farm Work,
By Marital Status

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Married_____	49.5_____	50.5_____
Single_____	34.8_____	65.2_____
Separated_____	39.1_____	60.9_____
Divorced_____	45.0_____	55.0_____
Widowed_____	25.0_____	75.0_____

Table 32

Number of Dependents 16 Years or Less
of Unemployed Males Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1 dependent_____	20_____	23.5_____
2_____	13_____	15.3_____
3_____	21_____	24.7_____
4_____	12_____	14.1_____
5_____	7_____	8.2_____
6_____	6_____	7.1_____
7_____	2_____	2.4_____
8 or more_____	3_____	3.5_____
No Response_____	1_____	1.2_____
Total		85
		100.0

Table 33

Willingness of Unemployed Males to Do Farm Work,
By Number of Dependents

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
1 dependent _____	44.4 _____	55.6 _____
2 _____	44.8 _____	55.2 _____
3 _____	53.8 _____	46.2 _____
4 _____	54.5 _____	45.5 _____
5 _____	50.0 _____	50.0 _____
6 _____	46.2 _____	53.8 _____
7 _____	50.0 _____	50.0 _____
8 or more _____	60.0 _____	40.0 _____

Table 34

Race of Unemployed Males Willing to Do Farm Work

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Negro _____	64 _____	41.8 _____
Mexican American _____	78 _____	51.0 _____
Oriental _____	0 _____	0 _____
Anglo _____	10 _____	6.5 _____
Others _____	0 _____	0 _____
No Codable Response _____	1 _____	.7 _____
No Response _____	1 _____	.35 _____
<hr/>		
Total	153	100.00

Table 35

Willingness of Unemployed Males to Do Farm Work,
By Race

<u>Answer</u>	<u>Percent</u>	
	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>
Negro _____	44.1 _____	55.9 _____
Mexican American _____	49.1 _____	50.9 _____
Oriental _____	0 _____	100.0 _____
Anglo _____	31.3 _____	68.8 _____
Others _____	0 _____	0 _____

Technical Note on Survey Sampling Procedure
(Prepared by UCLA Survey Research Center)

I. Introduction:

The individuals interviewed in the study were selected by a probability sample of clusters of housing units in Los Angeles County. The housing unit was utilized as the elementary unit in the study because it was felt that an area sample with houses defined as the elementary units would best adapt to probability sampling. Furthermore, since available data from other sources are generally provided on a housing unit basis, comparison with the population of the whole area would be facilitated.

The sampling procedure actually was multistage. The Census Tracts to be sampled were arbitrarily selected inside of the study area for practical reasons:

The 1960 Census counted 24,966 unemployed (male and female, 14 years and over) in the study area. Of these, an estimate of 21,000 unemployed were 20 years and over. The number of households in the study area was about 200,000. These figures show that in order to get 1,000 interviews from unemployed people, we would have to contact approximately 10,000 households.¹ This is why the Census Tracts chosen were those with the highest

¹The unemployment figure is for all unemployed. An estimate of "hard-core" unemployment (over 6 months) can be derived from national figures. The Manpower Report of the President, March 1964, shows that the number of persons unemployed 27 weeks and over varies between 11.5 and 16.7% of the total unemployed (Table A-12) between 1960 and 1963. Using an even more generous estimate of the percentage of hard-core unemployed--namely, 25%--we would have a total of 5,000 hard-core unemployed in the study area. In order to contact 1,000 of this group of 5,000, we would be required to contact a fifth of the households in the area--in other words, 40,000 contacts.

unemployment rate, thereby reducing costs and time spent.

A second practical consideration arose from the fact that we would mainly be interviewing Negroes and Mexican-Americans, utilizing Negro interviewers for the Negro areas and Spanish-speaking interviewers for the Mexican-American areas. In order to keep down costs and amount of time spent, it was therefore decided to select Census Tracts with the heaviest concentrations of either Negroes or Spanish-speaking minorities.

II. Selection of Census Tracts:

Two criteria were thus concurrently used in the selection of census tracts:

1. High unemployment rate.
2. High minority group population.

Using the 1960 data, 10 Census Tracts for each minority group were selected. These tracts, in order to be selected, had to rank highest in unemployment rate and have the heaviest rate of minority group population. The downtown areas (tracts 2071 to 2079), as well as Census Tract 2242, were excluded at Mr. Bullock's request. On the other hand, in each of the subdivisions of the study area where no tracts were selected according to the procedure described above, one census tract was chosen applying the same criteria to the subdivision. This increased the number of census tracts selected from 20 to 26.

III. Selection of Blocks:

It had been originally decided that 10 blocks would be selected from each census tract so that we would have a total of 200 blocks. In each of these blocks 5 households would then be obtained which would result in 1,000 households. However, it can be seen that this would result in too many households

since 120 interviews were previously obtained through the use of the original lists. Furthermore, the addition of 6 census tracts provided us with 300 more household units. It was then decided to decrease the number of blocks in each Census Tract and to keep the number of blocks proportional to the number of household units in the Census Tract: One block per 100 household units in the Census Tract as indicated in the 1960 Census. Some departure from this rule was forced by changes in the household unit number which took place since 1960, especially along the freeways.

The method of selection originated with the enumeration of the blocks. The respective number of housing units in each block was then included in a listing of the blocks. By the method of systematic sampling, a random number table was used to select block one of a given tract and then every $N_i/100$ th number was added to the starting number to designate the proper blocks to include in the sample (N_i was the number of housing units in tract i).

IV. Selection of Housing Units:

Having selected the blocks included in the sample, phase two of the sampling procedure involved the selection of the elementary units of households within the blocks.

The second phase of the study consisted of the selection of a cluster sample of five housing units from each of the blocks in the sample. No information was available on the location of the housing units on the respective blocks. In order to select the cluster sample of housing units on the blocks in a probabilistic manner, it was necessary to cruise each block and take a visual census of the location of units. Cruising merely consisted of driving around each block and enumerating the units on each side of the block. Having made the listing, the cluster of units could be selected. A random number

table was used to obtain a number corresponding to one of the enumerated housing units. This unit and the four succeeding units served as the cluster. If any of the units did not contain individuals eligible for inclusion in the study, they were omitted; the interviewer proceeded to the adjoining housing unit on the block moving in a clockwise manner around the block. If five interviews were unattainable from the block selected, the interviewer proceeded to the next block on the original block-enumeration list and continued interviewing.

V. Summary:

A summary of the sampling procedure may be beneficial at this time. A number of census tracts in Los Angeles County were chosen for the study because they all exhibited a high incidence of unemployment. A two-phase sampling procedure was utilized in selecting a number of clusters of housing units to be sampled. The residents of the housing units were the individuals included in the study. The process of selection of clusters utilized the statistical concept of probability sample to the maximum extent within the limitations of funds and data available.