

**Second Interim Report
of the
Oakland Adult Project Follow-up Study**

Second interim report...

Prepared By

WILLIAM B. WOODSON, Ph.D.

and **SUSAN S. SHEFFIELD**

**Institute of Industrial Relations
University of California, (Berkeley)**

For

**The Department of Human Resources
Oakland, California**

December, 1966

SECOND INTERIM REPORT
OF THE
OAKLAND ADULT PROJECT FOLLOW-UP STUDY

Prepared By

William B. Woodson, Ph.D.
Susan S. Sheffield

Institute of Industrial Relations
University of California, Berkeley

For

The Department of Human Resources
Oakland, California

December, 1966

The study reported herein was financed
through an authorized program of the
Office of Manpower, Automation and Training
United States Department of Labor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1 INTRODUCTION	1
2 PLACEMENT	3
Introduction	3
Data Presentation	5
Discussion	16
Concluding Comments	19
Tables	21
3 JOBS AVAILABLE	75
Introduction	75
Data Presentation and Discussion	76
Final Discussion	93
Tables	95
4 TRAINING	145
Introduction	145
Data Presentation	150
Discussion	159
Tables	161
5 THE PROJECT - AN OVERVIEW	177
Discussion	191
6 CONCLUDING STATEMENT	193
 APPENDICES	
A NARRATIVE SUMMARY OF EXECUTION OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING COURSE	197
B LISTS OF TRAINING COURSES	201
C RESPONSIBILITIES OF NEW SUBCOMMITTEES OF OAKLAND ADULT PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE	208

SECTION 1

INTRODUCTION

The first interim report evaluating the activities and results of the Oakland Adult Project (hereafter referred to as, the "Project") was distributed in June 1966. The first report covered the period from the opening of the Project in September 1964 to December 1965. This report covers the months November and December 1965 in greater detail, and continues the coverage up through November 1966.

In this latter period, there have been important changes in the structure of the Project. In January 1966, the Project began offering its services as one of the agencies located at the Fruitvale Service Center. Since the Fruitvale branch office located at the neighborhood center serviced basically the same geographical area as the 35th Avenue branch office, the latter office was closed at the end of November 1966, after gradually phasing out its services during the previous three months.

In July 1966, a branch office of the Project went into full operation at the North Oakland Service Center. The East and West Oakland offices were moved to the neighborhood service centers in their respective areas. The first move occurred in April, and the most recent one occurred in August of 1966.

It was also in April 1966 that the East Bay Training Center (more commonly referred to as the Skills Center) began its operations. A number of Project applicants have been referred there for training, and members of the Project staff have been used to help set up and administer the Skills Center's programs.

As projected in the first report, this report contains more extensive analyses of placement, job development, and training data, and the approach used is closer to the one outlined in the Study Plan for the follow-up Study. Originally, the investigators were not able to compare Project applicants with Main Office applicants on the basis of personal characteristics or placement rates. In this report, Section 2, the personal characteristics and placement experience of Project minority and Main Office minority and non-minority applicants of both sexes have been evaluated.

More detailed data collection methods on the parts of the Project and the Follow-up Study staff have made possible more complete analyses of the job orders available to the Project. Section 3 includes a comprehensive comparison of the characteristics of job openings obtained directly and indirectly. In contrast with the procedure used during the period covered by the first report, data were kept consistently on the solicitor responsible for each job order made available directly to the Project, and information on the source of orders is also given.

In this report, the investigators have also been able to examine more closely the training available to Project applicants. Data and discussion on the types of courses offered, the characteristics of the trainees, and, so far as possible, the post-training employment results, are given in Section 4.

As in the first report, an attempt has been made to describe both external and internal changes which have affected the Project. These areas are examined in Section 5.

In general, by using more detailed methods of data collection and more refined analyses in the present report, the staff has been able to more closely evaluate the effectiveness of the Project.

SECTION 2

PLACEMENT

Introduction

The stated objectives for placement activities of the Project were contained in the following excerpts from the California State Employment Service proposal (the underlining is ours):

"To place eligible unemployed workers;

"To upgrade underemployed workers;¹

"... the primary objective of improving the employment conditions of adult members of minority group and others of the hard-core unemployed throughout the city of Oakland.²

"... The demonstration area concerns the training and placement in employment of adult members of minority groups and other disadvantaged persons, with particular emphasis on employment of male heads of households, in the community of Oakland, California."³

Our plan for evaluation of the Project's placement activity was based on a series of decisions which were the outgrowth of interpretation and delineation of the objectives set forth in the proposal. The following decisions were made:

1. As a result of the concerns expressed in the proposal, data on the placement and upgrading⁴ of the following groups of Project applicants would be analyzed:

¹California State Employment Service, Application for a Demonstration Adult Training Program under the Manpower Development and Training Act with special emphasis on Minority Group and other disadvantaged applicants. (Oakland, California State Employment Service, January, 1964), p. 2.

²Ibid., p. 14.

³Ibid., p. 1.

⁴It should be noted that analysis of upgrading is not restricted to the "underemployed". This is true partly because of the Project's failure to define what underemployed meant for it, and partly because this study could not arrive at an effective operational definition by use of the data normally collected by the Employment Service.

- a. All minority group applicants.
 - b. Unemployed minority group applicants who could be labeled "qualified" or "eligible".¹
 - c. Minority group persons who were "hard-core" or "long-term" unemployed.²
 - d. Minority group applicants who were adult (22 years or older), heads of household, and residents of Oakland. These applicants would be called "target" persons.
2. In addition, the following steps were deemed necessary:
- a. Separate analyses would be conducted to control for:
 - 1. length of work experience
 - 2. education
 - 3. age
 - 4. ethnic group
 - b. Analyses would be conducted separately for males and females.
 - c. Data for Project minorities would be compared with data for applicants to the main Oakland Employment Office (referred to hereafter as "Main Office"). Two comparison groups would be used — (1) Main Office minority group applicants and (2) Main Office non-minority group applicants.
 - d. Data analysis for this report would be restricted to the period of time from November 1, 1965 to March 31, 1966.
3. With the foregoing as guidelines, the analysis was conducted in an effort to answer the following major questions:
- a. Were there differences in the results of service provided at the Project and at the Main Office?
 - b. Were there differences in the anticipated length of jobs which were obtained?
 - c. Were there differences in the degree to which upgrading occurred? (Upgrading has been defined in two ways: (1) the difference between the socio-economic status level of the job obtained and the last job held, and (2) the difference between the socio-economic level of the job obtained and the applicant's primary occupational code).
 - d. Was there a difference in the speed with which placement occurred?

¹These two terms were interpreted to have the same meaning and were operationally defined as persons receiving a non-entry level occupational classification. For further discussion of this, see page 7.

²These two terms were interpreted to have the same meaning and were operationally defined as persons out of work for 15 or more weeks. For further discussion of this, see page 7.

Data Presentation

Comparison of New Applications

During the period November 1965 to March 1966, the Project registered approximately one-quarter as many new applicants as did the Main Office.¹ Supporting data are presented in Table 1, which also reveals that nearly nine-tenths (88.8 per cent) of the new applicants to the Project were minority group persons, as compared to just slightly more than one-third (36.4 per cent) of the Main Office applicants. The high proportion of minority group applicants to the Project was fairly consistent from one office to another, although West Oakland's 96.8 per cent is considerably higher than Fruitvale's 71.5 per cent. The latter office opened in January 1966 in a location only three or four blocks from the 35th Avenue office and in a section of the city not as densely populated by minority group persons as those serviced by either the East or West Oakland offices.

At the Main Office, the situation was quite different. There, where white collar workers applied at the Commercial and Professional Section and blue collar workers applied at the Industrial and Service Section, only one-fifth of the white collar applicants, but nearly one-half of the blue collar applicants were minorities.

It is informative to note, however, that during the five month period under investigation, there was a slight variation in the percentage of applicants entering the Project offices who were minority group persons. In general, there was a small percentage decrease from November to January, followed by a gain during the next two months. It was at the Fruitvale office that this increase was most marked (Table 2).

Comparison of New Applications and Placements

The remaining data concerning placement² are based on random samples of three groups: (1) minority group applicants to the Project, (2) minority group applicants to the Main Office, and (3) non-minority group applicants to the Main Office. A sample of 200 persons per month was drawn from each of these groups. Records were located for 97 per cent of the first two groups and 91 per cent of the third.

During the months of November 1965 through March 1966, slightly more than half of the new applicants in each category were males (Table 3). However, the distribution of placements was not consistent with the distribution of new applications. The discrepancy was most evident in the case

¹The count of new applicants to the Project and the Main Office was obtained from data cards, provided by the Follow-up Study, and filled out by applicants at the time of registration. The samples were later drawn from these cards.

²Technically, the placement data refers only to the first job obtained within three months following registration. This method of counting should not seriously affect the results, however, because the average number of jobs obtained during the three month period was 1.23.

of minority group persons applying to the Project, where males represented half of the new applicants but nearly three-fourths of those placed. At the Main Office, on the other hand, the percentage of jobs started by males was slightly less than the percentage of male applicants. This difference was most obvious for non-minority persons where roughly 54 per cent of the applicants were male but only 46 per cent of the placements went to males.

The percentage of men among minority group applicants fluctuated only slightly during the five month period (Table 4). The percentage of men among non-minority group applicants to the Main Office, however, decreased from 61 per cent in November to 45.8 per cent in February. There was only a slight increase in March. The situation was different for placements. The percentage of males among the minority group people placed increased at the Project, but tended to decrease at the Main Office during the five month period.

East Oakland was the only Project Office which had less than 50 per cent male applicants during the five month period (Table 5). It was also the office which had the least favorable relationship between male placements and applications (61.8 per cent placements, 46.2 per cent applications). West Oakland, the office where almost half of the applications were made, effected the most placements. Of those placed through that office, 80 per cent were males, a figure larger than that found at any other office.

More detailed distributions of applications and placements are presented in the tables which follow. Occupational classifications are recorded in Table 6. Considering only the three highest occupational levels (Professional-Managerial, Clerical-Sales, and Skilled), it is possible to determine that the percentage of non-minority males seeking jobs at those levels (59.8) was more than twice that of minority males at the Main Office (27.3) and almost three times that of Project minority males (21.1). At the three lower levels, on the other hand, the percentage of non-minority group applicants seeking jobs (38.8) was approximately half that of minority group males at both the Project and the Main Office.

When the percentage distributions of placements are compared with those of applications, the proportion of minority group males placed by the Project was usually higher than the percentage of applications at that level, but at the Main Office, the reverse tended to be true for minority group males, while no consistent pattern emerged for non-minority men. The most striking contrast occurred for service occupations. While a considerably smaller percentage of minority group men at the Project were placed (11.3) in service jobs than made application for such jobs (21.6), just the opposite was true for minority group men at the Main Office (service job placements: 35.1 per cent; applications: 21.8 per cent).

As would be expected, female applications and placements were consistently concentrated in clerical-sales and service occupations. These two categories accounted for nearly three-fourths of all female applications, and from three-fourths (for minority group Project women) to 95 per cent (for non-minority group Main Office women) of all female placements. For both groups of minority applicants, however, a larger percentage of the total applicants were women seeking service jobs than were women classified for clerical-sales jobs. Quite the reverse was true for non-minority applicants. At the Main Office, 56.9 per cent of the non-minority group women were looking for clerical-sales jobs as compared with 16.4 per cent who were

classified for service occupations. The percentage of women placed at these two occupational levels was always higher than the percentage of applications except in the case of service jobs for minority group females at the Project. In this instance, results for minority group women were similar to results for minority group men.

The occupational classification system used by the Employment Service required that a distinction be drawn between those persons who (on the basis of past work experience, training, and certain personal characteristics) are deemed capable of obtaining an entry level job, and those qualified for a regular (non-entry level) job. Although most of the applicants coded for entry level jobs are expected to be "young people who lack significant work experience or who have not reached occupational maturity, this group also includes experienced workers who are barred from their former occupations because of technological developments, economic changes, physical handicaps, age, or disuse of skills."¹ On the other hand, the non-entry level coding "is intended for the classification of applicants who are already fully qualified to perform in specific occupations."¹

Table 7 contains data for the three groups of applicants divided into the above categories and then subdivided into categories based on employment status. It is apparent that the largest percentage of applications for both males and females was from persons not working who were classified for non-entry level jobs. The proportion of males seeking entry level jobs was consistently low for all three groups although it was highest (7.6) for Project minority group men and lowest (3.7) for the Main Office non-minority group. A similar but stronger tendency was seen for women (17.7 as compared to 5.2 per cent).

Placement percentages differed little from application percentages for the non-entry, non-working level group of men and women. The pairs of percentages are approximately equal for each group of men, accounting for about four-fifths of the minority group men at the Project (as the low) and about nine-tenths of the non-minority men at the Main Office (as a high). In the case of women, however, the variation was greater—from a low of two-thirds for Project minorities to a high of nine-tenths for Main Office minorities.

When the distributions are arranged according to employment status (Table 8), it becomes clear that, while the vast majority of applicants in each group were out of work when they applied, the percentage was slightly larger for Main Office applicants than for Project minority group persons. Since it is difficult to determine with certainty by using Employment Service records periods when the person may have been out of the labor force, the more technical term "unemployed" (those persons who are not at work but who are looking for work) was not used in this table nor in Table 7. It is apparent that the largest percentage of applications and placements occurred within the group of persons not working for 14 weeks or less. Comparison of the percentage of applications (53.0) and the percentage of placements (63.8) which went to men who had not worked for 14 weeks or less was much more favorable for Project minority group men than for both minority and non-minority

¹U. S., Bureau of Manpower Utilization, in cooperation with the War Manpower Commission, Dictionary of Occupational Titles, Part IV, Entry Occupational Classification, prepared by the Division of Occupational Analysis (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1944), p. vi.

groups at the Main Office. For those males out of work for longer periods of time, however, no discernible pattern emerged.

At the Main Office, the percentage of placements and the percentage of applications were virtually the same for women who had not worked for 14 weeks or less, but at the Project, this group accounted for less than one-third (30.3 per cent) of the applications, but more than half (54.8 per cent) of the placements. Minority women at the Project who had not been working for 27 or more weeks were a much smaller percentage of the placements (12.9) than of the applications (36.5). In the case of both minority and non-minority women at the Main Office, the two percentages were equivalent.

When application and placement distributions according to months of work experience in the occupational classification assigned to the applicant are presented (Table 9), we can see that roughly half of all applicants had two years or more work experience. Both for men and women, Project minorities had somewhat smaller percentages than did non-minorities. In addition, both for men and women, the percentage of placements for this experience group was 39 per cent, somewhat lower than the application percentage.

Distributions according to educational background (Table 10) are of interest because they reveal that the highest (or virtually the highest) percentage of male and female applications was from high school graduates and the lowest was from applicants who had completed eight grades or less. Both at the Project and at the Main Office, close to four-tenths of the applicants were high school graduates, and close to one-tenth had left school before the ninth grade. Consistency did not exist in the remaining categories, however. The second largest proportion of minority group applicants (to both the Main Office and to the Project) was composed of high school drop-outs but the second largest proportion of non-minority applicants to the Main Office consisted of people with post-high school education.

With one outstanding exception, high school graduates and post-high school applicants were a larger percentage of placements than of applications. In addition, with one exception, the 0 - 8 year group was a smaller percentage of the placements than it was of the applications. The exceptions were always found within the group of minority women at the Project. High school graduates were a noticeably smaller percentage of the placements (25.8) obtained by that group than they were of the applications (37.6), and the applicants with less than ninth grade education constituted a larger percentage of the placements (16.1) than of the applications (10.0). High school drop-outs, by contrast, obtained a considerably smaller proportion of the minority group placements at the Project as compared to the percentage of applications they represented. High school drop-outs were slightly more than one-third of the male minority group applications to the Project, but slightly less than one-fourth of the placements. They were 37.6 per cent of the female minority group applications to the Project, but only 22.6 per cent of the placements. At the Main Office, high school drop-outs were a larger percentage of male placements than of applications with the most striking situation present for non-minority men where they comprised only one-fifth of the applications, but one-fourth of the placements. They were, however, a smaller percentage of Main Office female placements than they were of applications.

Distributions according to age are presented in Table 11. Approximately half of the male applicants in each group were adults between 25 and 44 years old, and roughly one-fifth were between 22 and 24. There were

notable differences however, at these age levels between the three main groups under examination. Proportionately, almost three times as many minority group youths made application to the Project (18.5 per cent) as non-minority group youths made to the Main Office (6.7 per cent). On the other hand, proportionately more than twice as many non-minority group adults 45 or over (26.8 per cent) made application to the Main Office as minority group adults in the same age group (12.5 per cent) made to the Project.

The most interesting comparisons of placement percentages with application percentages occur between minority group males at the Project and non-minority group males at the Main Office. At the Project, placement percentages were larger than application percentages at every age category until the 25 - 44 year one. From that point on, the reverse was true. At the Main Office, however, the percentage of placements was larger than the percentage of applications only between the ages of 22 and 44, with the reverse situation existing for the younger and older groups.

The most notable results concerning women seem to be that, although their distribution of applications was not markedly different from the one for men, the placement distribution is quite dissimilar. At the Project, older women obtained a larger percentage of the jobs (19.4) than did older men (8.8). At the Main Office, however, older applicants obtained a smaller percentage of non-minority female placements (9.8) than of non-minority male placements (17.3), and in addition, youths obtained a larger percentage of the female placements (18.0) than they did of the male (5.8).

Those applicants who were Oakland residents, heads of household and 22 years of age or older, have been designated "target" persons. Target persons comprised approximately one-half of the minority group male applicants at both the Project and the Main Office, but just slightly more than one-quarter of the non-minority group male applicants to the Main Office (Table 12). In the case of females, target persons comprised from nearly one-fourth to nearly one-third of minority group women but only one-tenth of non-minority Main Office women. In all cases, the major reason that an individual could not be considered a target person was that he or she was not head of a household. This was particularly the case with women.

With two exceptions, target persons received a percentage of the placements equivalent to their percentage of applications. Target men, however, received only 13.5 per cent of the jobs that went to non-minority group applicants to the Main Office, but they constituted 27.2 per cent of the applications. A similar situation existed at the Project where target women were only 16.1 per cent of the minority group women, but 31.7 per cent of the applications.

Table 13 reveals that Negroes and Spanish speaking persons are virtually the only minority group persons entering the Project, but that a small percentage (10) of the minority group persons entering the Main Office are from other ethnic groups. Negroes not only made from 70 to 80 per cent of the applications at each operation but their percentage of the placements was sometimes greater. At the Main Office, Negroes obtained a larger proportion of the placements than they were of the applications. This was true for both males and females. At the Project, however, Negroes were a smaller percentage of the placements than they were of the applications. This contrast was inconsequential for men but of sizeable magnitude for women.

Results of Service

In the last eight tables we have compared distributions of applications with distributions of placements. Although these comparisons are helpful, the direct relationship between the two variables is obscured. The proportion of persons who, within three months of registrations were referred to a job which they subsequently started, did not exceed 13 per cent (Table 14). The placement ratios for men were not sufficiently different to attain statistical significance.¹ For females, however, the difference between the placement ratio for minority group applicants to the Project and all applicants to the Main Office was statistically significant at the .05 level.²

In order to obtain the most complete information about the differential results of service provided to the three groups during the five month period under examination, more than placement proportions are needed. Four distinctive types of results may be identified to pinpoint what we consider the most crucial results of service during the three months immediately following an applicant's registration. First, the person may have been referred to an employer and subsequently "started work" for him. Second, the person may have been referred to one or more employers but none of the referrals led to his starting a job; according to our definition, he was "not hired". Third, the applicant may never have been referred to an employer, but instead, have received such service as counseling, testing, and/or training; in other words, he received "service only". Finally, according to their records, some applicants had no further contact with the office after the day of registration and "no action" had been taken on that day.

Utilizing these four "result of service" categories in the analysis, it becomes clear that, although there was no statistically significant difference between the proportions of male applicants who "started work" there were significant differences in the three other categories (Table 15). In each instance, the male minority group applicants to the Project differed significantly from the Main Office applicants. A larger proportion of the Project men were referred but not hired, and a larger percentage received service only, but a smaller percentage received no action. All differences were statistically significant at the .05 level. This general pattern existed at all occupational levels except two, in spite of the fact that, at no single level did all three results attain the statistical significance which was evident for the total group.

¹The difference between two values is statistically significant when, after subjecting them to an acceptable statistical test, it can be determined that the difference is sufficiently large to reasonably assume that it is not merely a result of chance factors.

²Statistical significance was determined by use of post hoc procedures for X^2 tests of significance. The post hoc procedures used were designed by Leonard Marascuilo, Ph.D., of the Department of Educational Psychology, University of California, Berkeley. Statistical significance at the .05 level indicates that there is a 95 per cent chance that the difference is not merely a result of chance factors.

For clerical-sales occupations, although there was a statistically significant difference between the pattern of results obtained by the three groups, post hoc procedures did not reveal where the specific differences existed. The way in which the result pattern for Main Office men differed from that for Project men is evident, however. In all three groups, the largest percentage of applicants received "no action" but the men who fell into that category constituted a smaller percentage of the clerical-sales group of minority men at the Project (38.6 per cent) than they did of either the minority or non-minority group at the Main Office (57.4 and 64.7 per cent respectively). In addition, approximately the same percentage of Project men were referred but not hired (22.7) as those who started work (27.3). These two percentages were roughly equal for non-minority men at the Main Office, although the figures themselves were considerably smaller than Project figures (i.e., 16.8 and 12.6, respectively). For Main Office minority group men, on the other hand, two and one-half times as many applicants were referred but not hired (26.2) as were hired (9.8).

Service was the only occupational level at which the proportion of minority group placements at the Project did not exceed those at the Main Office. There were so few people at this level who received only counseling, testing, or training, that data for those persons had to be combined with data for those who had no post-registration service. When this combination was made, percentages of each group were found to be somewhat uniform for all three groups.

The types of non-employment ("service only") referrals made are presented in Table 16. It is obvious that referrals to training courses constituted a sizeable proportion of such referrals only at the Project. Results in this area, as well, were more impressive for men than for women: while 56.7 per cent of the male referrals were to training courses, only 42.6 per cent of the female referrals were. In both cases, the percentages were vastly larger than those for Main Office applicants.

Too few women obtained jobs to permit a statistical analysis by occupational classification. Consequently, the female applicants were divided into two groups in accordance with the socio-economic status rating associated with the jobs they obtained (Table 17). The classification system used is basically the one devised by Otis Dudley Duncan, which uses data concerning income, educational attainment, and occupation.¹ When the results of service were compared for women in the three groups who were coded for high status jobs, the difference between the patterns for the three groups were statistically significant at the .05 level, but the specific differences in the patterns could not be isolated by use of post hoc procedures. The differences appeared to be due to the fact that, although 40 to 50 per cent of the females received some type of service, the type differed for the three groups. At the Main Office, the percentages of minority group women hired, not hired and given service only differed but slightly from each other (all three approximate 15 per cent). For non-minority group women, however, the percentage hired and the percentage not hired were equivalent (16 per cent), but a smaller percentage (9.2) obtained non-employment service only. By comparison, only 7.8 per cent of the minority women at the Project started work, while roughly twice as many received service only, and three times as many were referred but not hired.

¹Albert John Reiss, Jr., et al., Occupations and Social Status, (New York: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1961), Ch. 6-7.

The only finding that was statistically significant for the lower status jobs was that more minority group females at the Project received service only than did all of the females at the Main Office.

When data for those persons not working at the time they applied and who were seeking non-entry level jobs were analyzed separately, the results were so similar to those just discussed that no tables are presented. The only overall difference in the results for this somewhat smaller group was that minor changes in the percentages of men receiving service only eliminated significant differences in that category.

When distributions according to employment status are examined for males (Table 18), the only statistically significant differences found were for men out of work for (1) less than 15 weeks, and (2) seven months or more. Significantly more Project minority men who had been out of work for the shorter period started work and significantly fewer received no service than did men who applied to the Main Office. For those men out of work seven months or more, a significantly larger proportion of Project minorities were referred but not hired than were Main Office minorities, and a significantly larger proportion of Project minorities received service only than did non-minority males at the Main Office. Minority group women at the Project who had been out of work seven months or more obtained significantly fewer jobs than did female applicants to the Main Office (Table 19).

When differential lengths of work experience are examined (Table 20), it may be seen that statistically significant differences between groups occurred only in the no action category. A smaller percentage of Project minority group persons received no action than did Main Office applicants. This was true for all men¹ except those who had work experience ranging from seven to twelve months.

A significantly larger proportion of persons receiving service only was found among minority group women with six months or less work experience than among those non-minority group women with the same amount of experience (Table 21). By contrast, a significantly smaller percentage of women with two years or more work experience was hired at the Project than at the Main Office.

The proportion of minority group male high school graduates who received no service after registering with the Project was significantly smaller than the corresponding proportion of those who registered at the Main Office (Table 22). The proportion of minority group persons starting jobs tended to increase as education increased. This relationship did not exist for Main Office non-minority group applicants, however. For them, the highest proportion of placements occurred for high school drop-outs (12.9 per cent) and decreased for higher educational groups.

For non-minority females at the Main Office, the percentage of placements increased as educational attainment increased (Table 23). At the Project, the percentage of minority group women who had started work was more than three times higher for those who had more than a high school education than it was for those who had not completed high school and for those who had graduated from high school.

¹It should be noted that, due to the small number of men who obtained service only in the 0 - 6 month category, the service only and no action categories were combined.

At the Project, age was inversely related to the percentage of placements and directly related to the proportion of "no actions" for minority group men (Table 24). At the Main Office, these relationships did not exist among minority group males, but they did among adult non-minority group men. At each age level, a larger or equal percentage of Project minority group men got jobs than did Main Office men. For the women, however, except for those 45 or over, the percentage of women placed was always smallest for Project minorities and largest for Main Office non-minorities (Table 25). Only in the case of the 25 - 44 year age group, however, were the differences statistically significant.

Data for target persons is presented in Table 26. Minority group males coded for low status occupations obtained significantly more jobs than did the correspondingly coded non-minority males at the Main Office. Project minority males, however, had significantly more referrals which did not lead to a job, and significantly fewer instances of no action and/or service only than did the Main Office applicants. For males seeking high status jobs, the percentage of minority group applicants to the Project who obtained either no service or only counseling, testing and training was significantly smaller than that for Main Office applicants. Although the placement percentages for total target women did not differ to a significant degree, the relationship between the three percentages was approximately the same as for total women.

In general, Negro males at the Project received a slightly larger percentage of referrals not leading to jobs as well as placements than did the Main Office Negro males (Table 27). In addition, a significantly larger percentage of the former group received service only, and a significantly smaller percentage obtained no service at all. Although the numbers are too small at the higher occupational levels to permit valid statistical analyses, the results were consistent for the most part regardless of occupational level. The exception in this case (as it was in the case when all minority group men were analyzed as a group) was service occupations: proportionately fewer Project men obtained jobs in those occupations.

Results for Mexican-American and Spanish-speaking men differed only slightly (Table 28). The statistically significant differences found among these men indicated that more Project men were hired and that fewer received no service at all.

A larger number of Negro women sought low status jobs than high status ones (Table 29). This disparity was more pronounced at the Project than at the Main Office. Although at both levels a smaller percentage of Project applicants than Main Office applicants got jobs, the difference was statistically significant only at the lower status level. A larger proportion of applicants coded for low status jobs received "no action" than did the high status group, especially in the case of Project applicants. The number of placements of Mexican Americans and Spanish-speaking women was so small that no analysis was possible.

Anticipated Duration of Jobs Started

Although the proportional differences do not reach statistical significance, Table 30 indicates that approximately three-fourths of the jobs obtained by minority group men were slated to be full time, and were expected to last three days or more, while closer to one-half of the jobs obtained by non-minority applicants to the Main Office were of this type. A considerably larger percentage of non-minority men at the Main Office obtained three day or more part-time jobs than did minority group men at the Project. It is clear that the percentage of jobs slated to last only one or two days fairly consistently accounted for one-fourth of the jobs started by minority group applicants to the Project. At the Main Office, however, there was a striking difference which was related both to sex and to minority group status. The percentage of minority group females (34.0) who obtained one or two day jobs was nearly three times larger than that for males (12.5), while the percentage for non-minority group females (11.9) was almost half that for males (21.2).

When data for those unemployed persons deemed fully qualified for employment are examined (Table 31), the findings are only slightly dissimilar from those in the last table. Because of the small number of part-time jobs obtained by this group, all three-day-or-more jobs were combined in the analysis. No statistically significant differences emerged in the case of men, but a significantly larger proportion of one and two day jobs went to both groups of minority women than to the non-minority women studied. Examination of these tables should make it obvious that statistical analyses of jobs started could not be accomplished in the detailed manner that was possible when we considered results of service.

Time Required for Placement

The length of time required to make a referral which subsequently led to a person's starting work was recorded and analyzed. In this section, we shall discuss the time elapsed between the day the applicant registered and the day he was referred to a job that he subsequently started.¹ As for other variables, these data were limited to the three month period which followed an applicant's registration.

This analysis was so limited by the small numbers of applicants who obtained jobs that no tables could be presented with distributions according to occupational classification. The results presented in Table 32 indicate that no statistically significant differences exist for males or females. It should be noted that, although the results for women do not reach statistical significance, the actual difference in the average time required to place a non-minority woman at the Main Office (roughly two weeks) and a minority group woman at the Project (approximately four weeks) may be quite a real one to the unemployed woman.² Therefore, the absence of a statistically significant difference does not at all eliminate the possibility of the presence of differences meaningful to the individual.

¹In the event that a person started more than one job within a three-month period, data was consistently collected on only the first job.

²It must be remembered that the table indicates number of "working days", not simply the number of calendar days.

Upgrading of Applicants

Two types of analyses were made in an attempt to determine whether applicants were upgraded. First of all, it was determined whether the jobs obtained were at a higher, lower, or the same status level as that of the last job held by the applicant. Secondly, a similar comparison was made between the status level of the new job and the primary occupational code assigned by the interviewer. Regardless of the criterion used, no statistically significant differences were found in regard to the percentage of males or females who were upgraded (Tables 33 and 34). More than one-third of all minority group males at the Main Office who obtained jobs got one which was at a higher level than their last, whereas the percentage for minority group males at the Project and non-minority group males at the Main Office was closer to one-fourth (Table 33). As would be expected, the percentages were smaller at the higher status level jobs, and larger at the lower level. It was in the area of "down-grading" that the only statistically significant differences occurred. A larger percentage of both minority group Project and non-minority group Main Office men received lower status jobs than did Main Office minority group men. The same trend existed whether the comparison was between the job obtained and (1) the last job held or (2) the primary job classification, but the difference was statistically significant only in the former case.

In general, a larger proportion of women were upgraded, and the results for Project minority group women were the most favorable. However, there was also a slight tendency for Project women to be down-graded more frequently than the other two groups. None of these differences reach the .05 level of statistical significance, however.

There are only a few cases where analyses of personal characteristics were possible, and where statistically significant differences were revealed. When those persons who obtained jobs are divided into youth and adult groups, it can be observed that female minority group adults, regardless of place of application, received proportionately more jobs at a status level lower than their last job than did non-minority female applicants to the Main Office (Table 35). Negro men who applied to the Project received a significantly higher proportion of jobs at a level lower than their last job than did Main Office Negroes (Table 36), and also a significantly higher proportion of jobs at a lower status level than their primary code (Table 37). Although there was no statistically significant difference in the proportion of Negro males receiving higher level jobs, Main Office Negroes received significantly more jobs at the same level than did Negro men at the Project.

In an attempt to obtain a clearer picture of the overall quality of jobs obtained, Table 38 was constructed. It is apparent that, when people who obtained jobs which were expected to last less than three days, and which involved downgrading, were subtracted from all people who obtained jobs, an extremely small percentage remains. The patterns for both men and women, however, were the same as the ones which have occurred throughout the data: minority group men at the Project fared better (7.0 per cent) than minority group (6.5 per cent) and non-minority group (3.5 per cent) men at the Main Office, but exactly the reverse was true for women. (Project minorities - 2.5 per cent, Main Office minorities - 6.0 per cent, and Main Office non-minorities - 10.0 per cent). None of these differences appear to be statistically significant at the .05 level.

Discussion

Results of Service

Differences in the results of service provided at the Project and the Main Office during the November 1965 to March 1966 period are evident in the data studied. Some differences noted tend to indicate that the results obtained at the Project were more favorable for certain minority group applicants than were the results at the Main Office. This is generally true for men but not for women. Such a finding does not necessarily carry with it a criticism of the Project because the Project was originally designed to give preferential treatment to adult men (although this emphasis was officially abandoned more than a year ago).

The following pattern of results emerged for men: (1) a larger proportion (but one not statistically significant at the .05 level) of Project minority men started jobs than did Main Office men, (2) a significantly larger proportion was referred for work but not hired, (3) a significantly larger proportion received intra-agency referrals not directly related to placement, and (4) a significantly smaller proportion received no post-registration service at all. These findings, with minor variations, were consistent for all occupational levels. The variations noted generally resulted either because there were too few males classified at a particular occupational level or because statistical significance had not been attained.

That the Project referred a larger percentage of minority group applicants who were not hired than did the Main Office is extremely difficult to evaluate. Four possible explanations come to mind, however. First, this finding could reflect less selectivity on the part of Project personnel making the referrals; second, it could reflect the fact that Project minorities were being referred to jobs which had been taken by the time they reported for an interview; third, it could be a reflection of a more favorable ratio of placement personnel to applicants at the Project than at the Main Office; or fourth, it could be related to the fact that the Project receives more job orders per applicant than is the case at the Main Office. It is conceivable that all of these factors have been operating to some degree, but the records kept by the Employment Service are not detailed enough to enable further clarification of this point and the study has not been able to look more deeply into the matter. The fact remains, however, that the Project referred a higher percentage of its applicants than did the Main Office, and that the proportions of both its "successes" and "failures" were greater.

The overall results might reflect a concentration within the Project of more intense efforts directed toward placing persons in jobs which do not fall in the categories traditionally occupied by Negroes and other minority group persons. On the other hand, the results might simply be related to a greater availability of jobs in these categories. Although we will not attempt to draw conclusions as to causes at this point, it is true that men at the three highest occupational levels were a larger percentage of placements for minority group Project men than they were of applications, while the reverse was true for Main Office minority group men. It is also true that minority group men classified for service and for unskilled jobs constituted a smaller percentage of the placements than of the applications at the Project, but that the reverse was true at the Main Office. This pattern was the opposite of what happened at every other occupational level except professional-managerial, a category which accounted for very few people.

The overall results just mentioned held, with little variation, for: (1) "qualified" persons not working when they applied, (2) persons who had not been working for 15 weeks or longer, and (3) target applicants. In the introduction to this section of the report, reasons were given as to why special attention was paid to these groups. Certain variations in results for the not working group should be emphasized. The proportion of people placed was significantly better for those men who had not been working for one to fourteen weeks. For those not working for a longer period, the group which most closely approximates the "hard-core unemployed", no significant differences were found among the three groups studied. More favorable results occurred for Project minority persons in this category than for Main Office minorities, but results for Main Office non-minorities were either the same or better than the ones for Project minorities. It is fair to say that results for Project minority group men out of work for fifteen weeks or more, were less impressive than were those for (1) men as a whole, (2) "qualified" men not working, or (3) "target" males.

The Project was less effective in placing minority group women than was the Main Office in placing its female applicants, regardless of their ethnic group. As occurred during early months of the Project, placements for women were primarily concentrated at two levels, clerical-sales and service. There was also some indication, as in the case of men, that the Project obtained more favorable results with applicants for higher level jobs. This was evidenced both by the fact that the most favorable relationship between placements and applications existed at the clerical-sales level and by the fact that a noticeably larger percentage of women at the lower levels obtained no service at all.

A very interesting result emerged in regard to the relationship between educational attainment and placement of males. Being a high school drop-out seemed to be much more of a handicap to placement for minority group men than for non-minorities. Unlike the situation for minorities both at the Project and at the Main Office (where placement success varied directly with educational attainment), high school drop-outs had the greatest placement success of all non-minority male applicants to the Main Office. Although an explanation of this finding cannot be obtained from our data, we assume that such other hiring criteria as "motivation", police records, "personal appearance", and "attitude" might be the important variables involved.

Anticipated Length of Jobs

In this report, as in the last, the "anticipated duration of job" analyses were restricted to a distinction between jobs expected to last either three days or more, or less than three days. Approximately one-fourth of all the jobs obtained by Project men were expected to last only one or two days. The percentage for Main Office minorities fairly consistently averaged half that, whereas the percentage for non-minorities was roughly the same. No follow-up data has yet been collected by this study on the actual length of time the jobs lasted, but data collected by the Project staff indicate that only 40.7 per cent of those applicants who obtained three-day-or-more jobs, and from whom follow-up information had been obtained, were still working at the end of one month. The period during which these data were collected was January to August, 1966; a period slightly different from the one used for the remaining data in this section.

Although a larger percentage of minority women at the Project obtained

three-day-or-more jobs in the higher socio-economic status occupations than at the lower, no significant differences were found.

Time Required for Placement

Very small numbers prevented refined analyses for either men or women, but the Project took (on the average) over three weeks to place those minority group men for whom it did obtain jobs. As in other areas, Project results were virtually the same as those at the Main Office. The average "wait" for Project women was longer - slightly more than four weeks.

Upgrading

Regardless of the method used to measure the extent and types of upgrading, we found that only about one-quarter of the Project men were upgraded. These results were not significantly different from those obtained at the Main Office. We did discover, however, that considerable downgrading occurred among Project minority group men and Main Office non-minority group men. When compared with Main Office minority group men, the differences were found to be statistically significant when downgrading was defined in terms of differences between the job obtained and the last job held. These and other findings indicate that the quality of jobs obtained by Project men is poor in comparison to that of jobs obtained by minorities at the Main Office.

Concluding Comments

In general, the picture which emerged from the placement data illustrates that, during the period studied, the Project was as successful in placing minority group men as the Main Office was in placing both minority and non-minority group men. In fact, the Project tended to be more successful. In addition, it also made more employment and service referrals than did the Main Office. Such was not the case with women, however. For them, the Project located considerably fewer jobs, and it also devoted less attention to those persons who did not obtain jobs.

The finding which completely overshadows the fact that Project results are as good and in some ways better than Main Office results is that such a small percentage of new applicants obtained jobs at either place. If the overall criterion of success for the Project was that it place a larger¹ percentage of minority group persons than the Main Office, the criterion was not met during this study period. What is far more disturbing to the evaluators, is the finding that an extremely small percentage of the applicants obtained jobs that appear to have even minimally acceptable characteristics. When those people who received jobs expected to last less than three days and which involved downgrading were eliminated from those who obtained any job at all, we find that only seven per cent of the minority group men and two and one-half per cent of the minority group women who applied to the Project during this period remain. In terms of people, this means that only 90 out of the 1,235 minority men who applied to the Project for the first

¹to a statistically significant degree.

time between November 1, 1965 and March 31, 1966 obtained a job¹ within three months which fulfilled these criteria of minimal acceptability. For minority group women, the figure is 32 out of 1,265. But, in addition, it is important to remember that follow-up data will show that some, if not a sizeable proportion, of these people will not be working at the end of 30 days.

In light of the severe problem which exists concerning employment of minority group persons and of the hard-core unemployed, there is little in the analysis of placement results presented here that encourages one to believe that the Project is making a measurable dent in solving the problem. On the whole, it is doing no better and no worse than the main Oakland Employment Office against which its success must be measured. They both have very unimpressive records.

¹Again, it should be noted that, technically, the data refers only to the first job obtained within three months following registration.

TABLES 1 - 38

PLACEMENT

TABLE 1. --Percentage distribution of new applicants at the Project and the Main Office by office of application and minority group status; November 1965 - March 1966

Minority Group Status	Project				Main Office		
	Total	East Oakland	West Oakland	35th Avenue	Fruitvale ^a	Total	
						Clerical & Professional	Industrial & Service
Total Number	100.0 2871	100.0 872	100.0 1206	100.0 424	100.0 369	100.0 5261	100.0 6642
Minority	83.3	87.8	96.8	83.0	71.5	20.8	48.8
Non-Minority	11.2	12.2	3.2	17.0	28.5	79.2	51.2

^aThis office opened in January 1966.

TABLE 2. --Proportion of minority group new applicants to the Project by month and office of application; November 1965 - March 1966

Month of Application	Total		East Oakland		West Oakland		35th Avenue		Fruitvale	
	Number	Per cent ^a	Number	Per cent ^a	Number	Per cent ^a	Number	Per cent ^a	Number	Per cent ^a
November - March	2550	88.8	766	87.8	1168	96.8	352	83.0	264	71.5
November	402	92.6	148	91.9	181	96.8	73	84.9
December	290	87.9	96	83.5	137	97.2	57	77.0
January	550	87.6	189	87.5	238	96.4	84	81.6	39	62.9
February	567	87.9	154	87.5	267	96.7	60	81.1	86	68.8
March	741	89.5	179	87.7	345	97.2	78	89.7	139	76.4

^aThe per cent that minority group applicants are of all applicants.

TABLE 3. --Percentage distribution^a of new applicants registered with and hired through the Project and the Main Office by minority group status and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^b

Sex	Project		Main Office			
	Minority		Minority		Non-minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
Total Number	100.0 966	100.0 111	100.0 968	100.0 111	100.0 912	100.0 113
Male	50.4	72.1	57.2	51.4	53.0	46.0
Female	49.6	27.9	42.8	48.6	46.1	54.0

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

TABLE 4.--Proportion^a of males among new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project and the Main Office by minority group status and month of application; November 1965 - March 1966.

Month of Application	Project		Main Office			
	Minority		Minority		Non-minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
November - March	50.4	72.1	57.2	51.4	53.9	46.0
November	47.7	63.0	54.2	51.9	61.0	45.8
December	51.5	75.0	61.9	46.4	60.4	50.0
January	52.5	70.6	61.3	73.7	53.2	54.5
February	53.4	76.2	51.5	44.4	45.8	37.5
March	46.7	77.8	57.1	42.1	48.6	40.0

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

TABLE 5.--Percentage distribution^a of minority group new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project by sex and office of application; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Sex	Total		East Oakland		West Oakland		35th Avenue		Fruitvale		Transfers ^d	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work						
Total Number	100.0 966	100.0 111	100.0 290	100.0 34	100.0 452	100.0 41	100.0 137	100.0 22	100.0 72	100.0 13	100.0 15	100.0 1
Male	50.4	72.1	46.2	61.8	52.9	80.5	50.4	72.7	51.4	..	53.3	..
Female	49.6	27.9	53.8	38.2	47.1	19.5	49.6	27.3	48.6	..	46.7	..

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThese persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cPercentage distribution for categories containing less than 15 cases is not reported in this table.

^dThese applicants were transferred from one Project Office to another one.

TABLE 6.--Percentage distribution^a of new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project and the Main Office by occupational classification, minority group status, and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Occupational Classification	Project		Main Office			
	Minority		Minority		Non-minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
Males						
Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 80	100.0 554	100.0 57	100.0 492	100.0 52
Professional & Managerial	3.5	3.8	4.7	7.0	18.1	15.4
Clerical & Sales	9.0	15.0	11.0	10.5	24.2	28.8
Skilled	8.6	11.3	11.6	5.3	17.5	21.2
Semiskilled	24.6	30.0	22.4	19.3	19.7	17.3
Services	21.6	11.3	21.8	35.1	9.8	7.7
Unskilled	30.4	27.5	28.2	22.8	9.3	9.6
Agricultural	2.3	1.1	0.4	0.0	1.4	0.0
Females						
Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 31	100.0 414	100.0 54	100.0 420	100.0 61
Professional & Managerial	14.6	3.2	5.8	3.7	11.4	1.6
Clerical & Sales	28.4	35.4	31.2	38.9	56.9	77.0
Skilled	1.3	.0	1.0	.0	1.0	.0
Semiskilled	8.8	9.7	8.9	5.6	9.3	1.6
Services	45.1	38.7	41.1	50.0	16.4	18.0
Unskilled	14.8	12.9	1.2	1.9	4.3	1.6
Agricultural	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration, were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 7.--Percentage distribution^a of new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project and the Main Office by type of job classification, employment status, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Status	Project		Main Office			
	Minority		Minority		Non-minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
Males						
Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 80	100.0 554	100.0 57	100.0 492	100.0 52
Entry Level	7.6	12.5	4.0	0.0	3.7	5.8
Employed	1.2	.0	.0	.0	1.2	1.9
Not Working	6.4	12.5	4.0	.0	2.4	3.8
Non-entry Level	92.4	87.5	96.0	100.0	96.3	94.2
Employed	14.5	7.5	6.1	8.8	10.8	9.6
Not Working	77.8	80.0	89.9	91.2	85.6	84.6
Females						
Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 31	100.0 414	100.0 54	100.0 420	100.0 61
Entry Level	17.7	19.4	9.2	9.3	5.2	4.9
Employed	4.2	3.2	1.7	1.9	.5	.0
Not Working	13.6	16.1	7.5	7.4	4.8	4.9
Non-entry Level	82.3	80.6	90.8	90.7	94.8	95.1
Employed	17.5	12.9	10.4	11.1	5.0	6.6
Not Working	64.7	67.7	80.4	79.6	89.7	88.5

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 8. Percentage distribution^a of new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project and the Main Office by employment status, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Employment Status	Project		Main Office			
	Minority		Minority		Non-minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
Males						
Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 80	100.0 554	100.0 57	100.0 492	100.0 52
Employed	15.8 ⁷⁷	7.5	6.1 ³⁴	8.8	12.0 ⁵⁹	11.5
Not working	84.3 ⁴¹⁰	92.6	93.9 ⁵²⁰	91.2	88.0 ⁴³³	88.5
1 - 14 weeks	53.0 ²³⁸	63.8	67.7 ¹⁷⁵	73.7	67.1 ⁷⁷⁰	55.8
15 - 26 weeks	11.3 ⁵⁵	12.5	9.2 ⁵¹	3.5	9.1 ⁴⁵	13.5
27 weeks or more	20.0 ⁹⁷	16.3	17.0 ⁹⁴	14.0	11.8 ⁵⁸	19.2
Females						
Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 31	100.0 414	100.0 54	100.0 420	100.0 61
Employed	21.7 ¹⁰⁴	16.1	12.1 ⁵⁰	13.0	5.5 ²³	6.6
Not working	78.3 ³⁷⁵	83.8	87.9 ³¹⁴	87.1	94.6 ³⁹⁷	93.4
1 - 14 weeks	30.3 ¹⁴⁵	54.8	52.7 ²¹⁸	50.0	57.9 ²⁴³	55.7
15 - 26 weeks	11.5 ⁵⁵	16.1	8.2 ³⁴	9.3	11.2 ⁴⁷	8.2
27 weeks or more	36.5 ¹⁷⁵	12.9	27.0 ¹¹²	27.8	25.5 ¹⁰⁷	29.5

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 9.--Percentage distribution^a of new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project and the Main Office, by length of work experience in primary occupational code, minority group membership, and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Months of Work Experience	Project		Main Office			
	Minority		Minority		Non-minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
Males						
Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 80	100.0 554	100.0 57	100.0 492	100.0 52
Less than 1	3.7	7.5	3.1	0.0	1.6	1.9
1 - 6	17.7	20.0	11.2	10.5	17.1	21.2
7 - 12	12.3	13.8	12.3	12.3	6.7	11.5
13 - 24	15.8	20.0	17.1	17.5	12.8	11.5
25 or more	50.5	38.8	56.3	60.0	61.8	53.8
Females						
Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 31	100.0 414	100.0 54	100.0 420	100.0 61
Less than 1	13.6	6.5	9.2	5.6	3.1	4.9
1 - 6	17.7	22.6	15.5	14.8	21.7	13.1
7 - 12	11.5	22.6	13.0	11.1	8.1	11.5
13 - 24	12.7	9.7	11.8	20.4	13.3	6.6
25 or more	44.5	38.7	50.5	48.1	53.8	63.9

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 10.--Percentage distribution^a of new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project and the Main Office by education, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Years of Education	Project		Main Office			
	Minority		Minority		Non-minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
Males						
Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 80	100.0 554	100.0 57	100.0 492	100.0 52
0 - 8	13.1	8.8	18.4	10.5	9.6	5.8
9 - 11	34.1	23.0	27.1	28.1	20.5	25.0
12	41.2	53.0	37.5	42.1	37.0	38.5
13 or more	11.5	16.2	17.0	19.3	32.9	30.8
Females						
Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 31	100.0 414	100.0 54	100.0 420	100.0 61
0 - 8	10.0	16.1	13.3	11.1	8.3	1.6
9 - 11	37.6	22.6	26.3	24.1	19.3	16.4
12	37.4	25.8	39.4	42.6	43.6	44.3
13 or more	15.0	35.5	21.0	22.2	28.8	37.7

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE II.--Percentage distribution^a of new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project and the Main Office by age, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Age in Years	Project		Main Office			
	Minority		Minority		Non-minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
Males						
Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 80	100.0 554	100.0 57	100.0 492	100.0 52
Youths	18.5	26.3	10.4	5.3	6.7	5.8
Less than 20	7.8	11.3	2.5	0.0	1.6	0.0
20 - 21	10.7	15.0	7.9	5.3	5.1	5.8
Adults	81.5	73.9	89.5	94.7	93.3	94.2
22 - 24	20.1	23.8	21.8	26.3	17.7	25.0
25 - 44	48.9	41.3	52.0	50.9	48.8	51.9
45 and over	12.5	8.8	15.7	17.5	26.8	17.3
Females						
Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 31	100.0 414	100.0 54	100.0 420	100.0 61
Youths	18.6	25.8	8.3	9.3	16.2	18.0
Less than 20	8.6	12.9	1.5	1.9	5.0	1.6
20 - 21	10.0	12.9	6.8	7.4	11.2	16.4
Adults	81.4	74.3	91.8	90.7	83.8	81.9
22 - 24	15.2	19.4	18.6	22.2	16.7	24.6
25 - 44	54.1	35.5	56.8	48.1	41.4	47.5
45 and over	12.1	19.4	16.4	20.4	25.7	9.8

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 12.--Percentage distribution^a of new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project and the Main Office by target group membership, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Target Group Status	Project		Main Office			
	Minority		Minority		Non-minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
Males						
Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 80	100.0 554	100.0 57	100.0 492	100.0 52
Target	48.5	43.8	50.7	49.1	27.2	13.5
Non-target	51.5	56.3	49.3	50.9	72.8	86.5
Residence (1)	9.9	8.8	10.5	14.0	24.2	30.8
Family Status (2)	20.3	20.0	24.5	29.8	30.5	38.5
Age (3)	6.6	8.8	4.0	.0	1.0	.0
(1) + (2)	2.9	1.3	3.8	1.8	11.4	11.5
(1) + (3)	.6	1.3	.2	.0	1.0	1.9
(2) + (3)	9.9	13.8	5.6	3.5	3.3	1.9
(1) + (2) + (3)	1.4	2.5	0.7	1.8	1.4	1.9
Females						
Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 31	100.0 414	100.0 54	100.0 420	100.0 61
Target	31.7	16.1	24.6	20.4	10.7	8.2
Non-target	68.3	83.9	75.4	79.6	89.3	91.8
Residence (1)	3.3	.0	4.6	5.6	2.9	3.3
Family Status (2)	40.5	54.8	53.4	50.0	49.5	50.8
Age (3)	5.0	3.2	.5	.0	.2	1.6
(1) + (2)	5.8	3.2	9.2	14.8	20.7	19.7
(1) + (3)	1.0	6.5	.5	3.7	1.7	1.6
(2) + (3)	11.9	16.1	6.3	3.7	8.6	11.5
(1) + (2) + (3)	0.6	0.0	1.0	1.9	5.7	3.3

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 13.--Percentage distribution^a of new applicants registered with and hired^b through the Project and the Main Office by ethnic group, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Ethnic Group	Project		Main Office	
	Minority		Minority	
	Applied	Started Work	Applied	Started Work
Males				
Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 80	100.0 554	100.0 57
Negro	78.6	76.3	72.4	86.0
Mexican American & Spanish Speaking	20.9	22.5	13.5	5.3
Other	0.5	0.0	13.2	7.0
Females				
Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 31	100.0 414	100.0 54
Negro	83.3	74.2	79.2	83.3
Mexican-American & Spanish Speaking	15.7	25.8	10.6	3.7
Other	1.0	0.0	10.2	13.0

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 14.--Proportion^a of new applicants hired^b through the Project and the Main Office, by minority group status and sex; November 1965 - March 1966.

Sex	Project	Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
	Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)	
	All Jobs			
Total	11.5	11.5	12.4	not significant
Males	16.4	10.3	10.6	not significant
Females	6.5	13.0	14.0	1 < 2 + 3

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bThose persons who, within three months of their registration, were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

TABLE 15. -- Percentage distribution^a of male new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by occupational classification result of service and minority group membership: November 1965 - March 1966^b

Occupational Classification	Result of Service	Project			Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)			
Total	Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 554	100.0 492			
	Started Work	16.4	10.3	10.6			not significant
	Not Hired	27.1	19.5	17.3			1 > 2 * 3
	Service Only	10.9	5.1	4.9			1 > 2 * 3
	No Action	45.6	65.2	67.3			1 < 2 * 3
Professional & Managerial	Total Number	100.0 17	100.0 26	100.0 89			
	Started Work	17.6	15.4	9.0			
	Not Hired	23.5	15.4	15.7			c
	Service Only	5.9	.0	3.4			
	No Action	52.9	69.2	71.9			
Clerical & Sales	Total Number	100.0 44	100.0 61	100.0 119			
	Started Work	27.3	9.8	12.6			
	Not Hired	22.7	26.2	16.8			significant
	Service Only	11.4	6.6	5.9			
	No Action	38.6	57.4	64.7			

TABLE 15. --Continued

Skilled	Total Number	100.0 42	100.0 64	100.0 86	
	Started Work	21.4	4.7	12.8	not significant
	Not Hired	35.7	25.0	15.1	not significant
	Service or No Action	42.9	70.3	72.1	$i < 2 + 3$
Semiskilled	Total Number	100.0 120	100.0 124	100.0 97	
	Started Work	20.0	8.9	9.3	not significant
	Not Hired	26.7	19.4	17.5	not significant
	Service Only No Action	5.8 47.5	4.0 67.7	3.1 70.1	not significant $i < 2 + 3$
Service	Total Number	100.0 105	100.0 121	100.0 48	
	Started Work	8.6	16.5	8.3	
	Not Hired	25.7	22.3	27.1	
	Service or No Action	65.7	61.2	64.5	not significant
Unskilled	Total Number	100.0 148	100.0 156	100.0 46	
	Started Work	14.9	8.3	10.9	not significant
	Not Hired	28.4	12.8	17.4	$i > 2$
	Service Only No Action	11.5 45.3	5.8 73.1	2.2 69.6	not significant $i < 2 + 3$

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^cA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 16. Percentage distribution^a of service received by those new applicants at the Project and Main Office who received service referrals^b only, by type of referral and sex; November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Service	Project	Main Office	
	Minority	Minority	Non-minority
	Service Referrals Only	Service Referrals Only	Service Referrals Only
Males			
Total Number	100.0 60	100.0 28	100.0 24
Training	56.7	3.6	0.0
Counseling	36.7	64.3	75.0
Testing	6.6	32.1	25.0
Family Service	0.0	0.0	0.0
Females			
Total Number	100.0 68	100.0 40	100.0 36
Training	42.6	2.5	0.0
Counseling	22.1	37.5	33.3
Testing	35.3	57.5	66.7
Family Service	0.0	2.5	0.0

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bThe distributions are given for referrals, not for people. Some applicants received multiple referrals.

TABLE 17. --Percentage distribution^a of female new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by occupational status, result of service, and minority group membership; November 1965 - March 1966

Occupational Status	Result of Service	Main Office			Statistical Difference (4)
		Project Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)	
Total	Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 414	100.0 420	
	Started work	6.5	13.0	14.5	1 < 2 • 3
	Not Hired	16.7	15.0	18.1	not significant
	Service Only	12.5	8.7	7.4	not significant
	No Action	64.3	63.3	60.0	not significant
High	Total Number	100.0 153	100.0 173	100.0 306	
	Started work	7.8	13.9	16.0	
	Not Hired	24.2	17.3	16.7	significant
	Service Only	17.6	14.5	9.2	
	No Action	50.3	54.3	58.2	
Low	Total Number	100.0 326	100.0 241	100.0 114	
	Started work	5.8	12.4	10.5	not significant
	Not Hired	13.2	13.3	21.9	not significant
	Service Only	10.1	4.6	2.6	1 > 2 • 3
	No Action	70.9	69.7	64.9	not significant

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 18. --Percentage distribution^a of male new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by employment status, result of service, and minority group membership; November 1965 - March 1966

Employment Status	Result of Service	Main Office			Statistical Difference (4)
		Project minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)	
Total	Total Number	100.0 497	100.0 554	100.0 492	
	Started Work	16.4	10.3	10.6	not significant
	Not Hired	27.1	19.5	17.3	1 > 2 * 3
	Service Only	10.9	5.1	4.9	1 > 2 * 3
	No Action	45.6	65.2	67.3	1 < 2 * 3
Employed	Total Number	100.0 77	100.0 34	100.0 59	
	Started work	7.8	14.7	10.2	
	Not Hired	24.7	26.5	10.2	not significant
	Service or No Action	67.5	58.8	79.7	
Not Working 1 - 14 weeks	Total Number	100.0 258	100.0 375	100.0 330	
	Started Work	19.8	11.2	8.8	1 > 2 * 3
	Not Hired	29.1	20.3	17.9	not significant
	Service Only	7.4	3.7	6.7	not significant
	No Action	43.8	64.8	66.7	1 < 2 * 3

TABLE 18.--Continued

15 - 26 weeks	Total Number	100.0 55	100.0 51	100.0 45	
	Started Work	18.2	3.9	15.6	
	Not Hired	25.5	17.6	15.6	
	Service or No Action	56.4	78.4	68.9	not significant
7 months or more	Total Number	100.0 97	100.0 94	100.0 58	
	Started Work	13.4	8.5	17.2	not significant
	Not Hired	24.7	14.9	22.4	1 > 2
	Service Only	16.5	9.6	1.7	1 > 3
	No Action	45.4	67.0	58.6	not significant

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 19 --Percentage distribution^a of female new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by employment status, result of service, and minority group membership; November 1965 - March 1966^b

Employment Status	Result of Service	Project			Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)			
Total	Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 414	100.0 420			
	Started Work	6.5	13.0	14.5			1 < 2 * 3
	Not Hired	16.7	15.0	18.1			not significant
	Service Only	12.5	8.7	7.4			not significant
	No Action	64.3	63.3	60.0			not significant
Employed	Total Number	100.0 104	100.0 50	100.0 23			
	Started Work	4.8	14.0	17.4			
	Not Hired	17.3	10.0	8.7			
	Service Only	18.3	22.0	8.7			c
	No Action	59.6	54.0	65.2			
Not Working 1 - 14 weeks	Total Number	100.0 145	100.0 218	100.0 243			
	Started Work	11.7	12.4	14.0			
	Not Hired	17.9	15.1	20.2			
	Service Only	6.9	5.0	4.1			not significant
	No Action	63.4	67.4	61.7			

TABLE 19. --Continued

15 - 26 weeks	Total Number	100.0 55	100.0 34	100.0 47	
	Started Work	9.1	14.7	10.6	
	Not Hired	10.9	14.7	17.0	
	Service Only No Action	20.0 60.0	5.9 64.7	10.6 61.7	not significant
7 months or more	Total Number	100.0 175	100.0 112	100.0 107	
	Started Work	2.3	13.4	16.8	1 < 2 * 3
	Not Hired	17.1	17.0	15.9	not significant
	Service Only No Action	11.4 69.1	10.7 58.9	13.1 54.2	not significant not significant

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^cA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 20.--Percentage distribution^a of male new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office by length of work experience in primary occupational code, result of service, and minority group membership; November 1965 - March 1966 b

Months of Work Experience	Result of Service	Main Office			Statistical Difference (4)
		Project Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)	
Total	Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 554	100.0 492	
	Started Work	16.4	10.3	10.6	not significant
	Not Hired	27.1	19.5	17.3	1 > 2 • 3
	Service Only	10.9	5.1	4.9	1 > 2 • 3
	No Action	45.6	65.2	67.3	1 < 2 • 3
0 - 6	Total Number	100.0 104	100.0 79	100.0 92	
	Started Work	21.2	7.6	13.0	not significant
	Not Hired	21.2	11.4	8.7	not significant
	Service or No Action	57.7	81.0	78.3	1 < 2 • 3
7 - 12	Total Number	100.0 60	100.0 68	100.0 33	
	Started Work	18.3	10.3	18.2	
	Not Hired	30.0	13.2	18.2	
	Service or No Action	51.7	76.5	63.6	not significant

TABLE 20. --Continued

13 - 14	Total Number	100.0 77	100.0 95	100.0 63	
	Started Work	20.8	10.5	9.5	not significant
	Not Hired	35.1	28.4	25.4	not significant
	Service Only	10.4	5.3	6.3	not significant
	No Action	33.8	55.8	58.7	< 2 + 3
25 or more	Total Number	100.0 246	100.0 312	100.0 304	
	Started Work	12.6	10.9	9.2	not significant
	Not Hired	26.4	20.2	18.1	not significant
	Service Only	10.6	4.8	5.6	not significant
	No Action	50.4	64.1	67.1	< 2 + 3

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 21. --Percentage distributions^a of female new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by length of work experience in primary occupational code, result of service, and minority group membership; November 1965 - March 1966^b

Months of Work Experience	Result of Service	Project			Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)			
Total	Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 414	100.0 420			
	Started Work	6.5	13.0	14.5			$1 < 2 < 3$
	Not Hired	16.7	15.0	18.1			not significant
	Service Only	12.5	8.7	7.4			not significant
	No Action	64.3	63.3	60.0			not significant
0 - 6	Total Number	100.0 150	100.0 102	100.0 104			
	Started Work	6.0	10.8	10.6			not significant
	Not Hired	10.0	5.9	6.7			not significant
	Service Only	16.0	14.7	2.9			$1 < 2 > 3$
	No Action	68.0	68.6	79.8			not significant
7 - 12	Total Number	100.0 55	100.0 54	100.0 34			
	Started Work	12.7	11.1	20.6			
	Not Hired	12.7	16.7	20.6			not significant
	Service Only	14.5	9.3	14.7			
	No Action	60.0	63.0	44.1			

TABLE 21.0--Continued

13 - 14	<p>Total Number</p> <p>Started Work Not Hired Service Only No Action</p>	<p>100.0 61</p> <p>4.9 16.4 13.1 65.6</p>	<p>100.0 49</p> <p>22.4 14.3 6.1 57.1</p>	<p>100.0 56</p> <p>7.1 32.1 19.6 41.1</p>	c
25 or more	<p>Total Number</p> <p>Started Work Not Hired Service Only No Action</p>	<p>100.0 213</p> <p>5.6 22.5 9.4 62.4</p>	<p>100.0 209</p> <p>12.4 19.1 6.2 62.2</p>	<p>100.0 226</p> <p>17.3 19.5 5.3 58.0</p>	<p>1 < 2 + 3 not significant not significant not significant</p>

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^cA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 22. -- Percentage distribution^a of male new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by education, result of service, and minority group membership; November 1965 - March 1966

Years of Education	Result of Service	Project		Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Minority (3)	Non-minority (4)	
Total	Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 554	100.0 492	100.0 492	
	Started Work	15.4	10.3	10.6	10.6	not significant
	Not Hired	27.1	19.5	17.3	17.3	1 > 2 + 3
	Service Only	10.9	5.1	4.9	4.9	1 > 2 + 3
	No Action	45.6	65.2	67.3	67.3	1 > 2 + 3
0 - 8	Total Number	100.0 64	100.0 102	100.0 47	100.0 47	
	Started Work	10.9	5.9	6.4	6.4	
	Not Hired	23.4	10.8	6.4	6.4	
	Service Only	23.4	4.9	4.3	4.3	c
	No Action	42.2	78.4	83.0	83.0	
9 - 11	Total Number	100.0 166	100.0 150	100.0 101	100.0 101	
	Started Work	10.8	10.7	12.9	12.9	
	Not Hired	25.9	17.3	18.8	18.8	significant
	Service Only	12.0	5.3	4.0	4.0	
	No Action	51.2	66.7	64.4	64.4	

TABLE 22. -- Continued

12	Total Number	100.0 201	100.0 208	100.0 182	
	Started Work	20.9	11.5	11.0	not significant
	Not Hired	29.9	22.6	16.5	not significant
	Service Only	7.5	5.3	5.5	not significant
	No Action	41.8	60.6	67.0	1 < 2 + 3
13 or more	Total Number	100.0 56	100.0 94	100.0 162	
	Started Work	23.2	11.7	9.9	
	Not Hired	25.0	25.5	20.4	not significant
	Service or No Action	51.8	62.8	69.8	

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^cA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 23. --Percentage distribution^a of female new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by education, result of service, and minority group membership; November 1965 - March 1966^b

Years of Education	Result of Service	Project			Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)			
Total	Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 414	100.0 420	100.0		
	Started work	6.5	13.0	14.5	14.5		$t < 2 + 3$
	Not Hired	16.7	15.0	18.1	18.1		not significant
	Service Only	12.5	8.7	7.4	7.4		not significant
	No Action	64.3	63.3	60.0	60.0		not significant
0 - 8	Total Number	100.0 48	100.0 55	100.0 35	100.0		
	Started work	10.4	10.9	2.9	2.9		
	Not Hired	12.5	5.5	11.4	11.4		c
	Service Only	12.4	5.5	5.7	5.7		
	No Action	66.7	78.2	80.0	80.0		
9 - 11	Total Number	100.0 180	100.0 109	100.0 81	100.0		
	Started work	3.9	11.9	12.3	12.3		
	Not Hired	11.7	17.4	18.5	18.5		significant
	Service Only	12.8	4.6	3.7	3.7		
	No Action	71.7	66.1	65.4	65.4		

TABLE 23. --Continued

12	Total Number	100.0 179	100.0 163	100.0 183	
	Started Work	4.5	14.1	14.8	significant
	Not Hired	20.7	14.1	21.3	
	Service Only	15.1	10.4	10.9	
	No Action	59.8	61.3	53.0	
13 or more	Total Number	100.0 72	100.0 87	100.0 121	
	Started Work	15.3	13.8	19.0	not significant
	Not Hired	22.2	19.5	14.9	
	Service Only	6.9	12.6	5.0	
	No Action	55.6	54.0	61.2	

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^cA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 24. --Percentage distribution^a of male new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by age, result of service, and minority group membership; November 1965 - March 1966^b

Age in Years	Result of Service	Project			Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)			
Total	Total Number	100.0 487	100.0 554	100.0 492			
	Started Work	16.4	19.3	10.6		not significant	
	Not Hired	27.1	19.5	17.3		1 > 2 * 3	
	Service Only	10.9	5.1	4.9		1 > 2 * 3	
	No Action	45.6	65.2	67.3		1 < 2 * 3	
Less than 22	Total Number	100.0 90	100.0 58	100.0 33			
	Started Work	23.3	5.2	9.1			
	Not Hired	30.0	19.0	30.3			
	Service Only	10.0	6.9	3.0			c
	No Action	36.7	69.0	57.6			
22 - 24	Total Number	100.0 98	100.0 121	100.0 87			
	Started Work	19.4	12.4	14.9			
	Not Hired	28.6	24.0	16.1			
	Service Only	9.2	4.1	6.9			not significant
	No Action	42.9	59.5	62.1			

TABLE 24. --Continued

25 - 44	<p>Total Number</p> <p>Started Work</p> <p>Not Hired</p> <p>Service Only</p> <p>No Action</p>	<p>100.0 283</p> <p>13.9</p> <p>26.1</p> <p>11.3</p> <p>48.7</p>	<p>100.0 288</p> <p>10.1</p> <p>19.4</p> <p>5.6</p> <p>64.9</p>	<p>100.0 240</p> <p>11.2</p> <p>19.6</p> <p>4.2</p> <p>65.0</p>	<p>not significant</p> <p>not significant</p> <p>not significant</p> <p>$1 < 2 \cdot 3$</p>
45 or more	<p>Total Number</p> <p>Started Work</p> <p>Not Hired</p> <p>Service Only</p> <p>No Action</p>	<p>100.0 61</p> <p>11.5</p> <p>24.6</p> <p>13.1</p> <p>50.8</p>	<p>100.0 87</p> <p>11.5</p> <p>13.8</p> <p>3.4</p> <p>71.3</p>	<p>100.0 132</p> <p>6.8</p> <p>10.6</p> <p>5.3</p> <p>77.3</p>	<p>not significant</p> <p>not significant</p> <p>not significant</p> <p>$1 < 2 \cdot 3$</p>

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^cA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 25. --Percentage distribution^a of female new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by age, result of service, and minority group membership; November 1965 to March 1966^b

Age of Years	Result of Service	Project			Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)			
Total	Total Number	100.0 479	100.0 414	100.0 420			
	Started Work	6.5	13.0	14.5		1 < 2 • 3	
	Not Hired	15.7	15.0	18.1		not significant	
	Service Only	12.5	8.7	7.4		not significant	
	No Action	64.3	63.3	60.0		not significant	
Less than 22	Total Number	100.0 89	100.0 34	100.0 68			
	Started Work	9.0	14.7	16.2			
	Not Hired	15.7	23.5	13.2			
	Service Only	18.0	8.8	13.2		not significant	
	No Action	57.3	52.9	57.4			
22 - 24	Total Number	100.0 73	100.0 77	100.0 70			
	Started Work	8.2	15.6	21.4			
	Not Hired	28.8	14.3	25.7			
	Service Only	15.1	13.0	7.1		not significant	
	No Action	47.9	57.1	45.7			

TABLE 25. --Continued

	Total Number	100.0 259	100.0 235	100.0 174	
25 - 44	Started Work Not Hired Service Only No Action	4.2 14.3 12.0 69.5	11.1 14.0 8.9 66.0	16.7 19.0 5.7 58.6	$1 < 2 + 3$ not significant not significant not significant
45 or more	Total Number Started Work Not Hired Service or No Action	100.0 58 10.3 13.8 75.9	100.0 68 16.2 14.7 69.1	100.0 198 5.6 14.8 79.6	not significant

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 26. -- Percentage distribution^a of target new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by occupational status, result of service, minority group membership, November 1965 - March 1966

Occupational Status	Result of Service	Males				Statistical Difference (4)
		Project Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Main Office Non-minority (3)		
Total	Total Number	100.0 236	100.0 281	100.0 134		
	Started Work Not Hired Service Only No Action	14.8 30.9 13.1 41.1	10.0 16.7 5.7 67.6	5.2 17.2 5.2 72.4		not significant 1 > 2 + 3 not significant 1 < 2 + 3
	Total Number	100.0 52	100.0 74	100.0 73		
High	Started Work Not Hired Service or No Action	23.1 32.7 44.2	8.1 21.6 70.3	6.8 13.7 79.5		not significant not significant 1 < 2 + 3
	Total Number	100.0 184	100.0 207	100.0 61		
	Started Work Not Hired Service or No Action	12.5 30.4 57.1	10.6 15.0 74.4	3.3 21.3 75.4		1 • 2 > 3 1 > 2 • 3 1 < 2 • 3
Low	Total Number	100.0 184	100.0 207	100.0 61		
	Started Work Not Hired Service or No Action	12.5 30.4 57.1	10.6 15.0 74.4	3.3 21.3 75.4		1 • 2 > 3 1 > 2 • 3 1 < 2 • 3
	Total Number	100.0 184	100.0 207	100.0 61		

TABLE 26. --Continued

	Females			
Total	Total Number	100.0 152	100.0 102	100.0 45
	Started Work	3.3	10.8	11.1
	Not Hired	16.4	21.5	24.4
	Service Only No Action	14.5 65.8	8.9 58.8	13.3 51.1
				not significant
High	Total Number	100.0 30	100.0 33	100.0 33
	Started Work	6.7	15.2	12.1
	Not Hired	26.7	27.3	15.2
	Service or No Action	66.7	57.6	72.7
				c
Low	Total Number	100.0 122	100.0 69	100.0 ^d 12
	Started Work	2.5	8.7	..
	Not Hired	13.9	18.8	..
	Service or No Action	83.6	72.5	..
				c

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^cA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

^dDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

TABLE 27. --Percentage distribution^a of male Negro new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by occupational classification and result of service; November 1965 - March 1966^{bc}

Occupational Classification	Result of Service	Project (1)	Main Office (2)	Difference (3)
Total	Total Number	100.0 383	100.0 401	
	Started Work	15.9	12.2	not significant
	Not Hired	27.2	20.2	not significant
	Service Only	10.7	5.2	$t > 2$
	No Action	46.2	61.8	$t < 2$
Professional & Managerial	Total Number	100.0 20	100.0 13	
	Started Work	23.1	..	
	Not Hired	30.8	..	d
	Service or No Action	46.2	..	
Clerical & Sales	Total Number	100.0 34	100.0 47	
	Started Work	29.4	8.5	
	Not Hired	23.5	34.0	
	Service Only	11.8	8.5	d
	No Action	35.3	48.9	
Skilled	Total Number	100.0 30	100.0 40	
	Started Work	23.3	7.5	
	Not Hired	43.3	22.5	not significant
	Service Only	3.3	2.5	
	No Action	30.0	67.5	

TABLE 27. --Continued

Semiskilled	Total Number	100.0 95	100.0 97	
	Started Work	16.8	10.3	
	Not Hired	27.4	21.6	not significant
	Service Only	6.3	4.1	
	No Action	49.5	63.9	
Service	Total Number	100.0 85	100.0 89	
	Started Work	7.1	20.2	$I < 2$
	Not Hired	24.7	22.5	not significant
	Service Only	15.3	5.6	not significant
	No Action	52.9	51.7	
Unskilled	Total Number	100.0 119	100.0 115	
	Started Work	15.1	9.6	not significant
	Not Hired	26.1	13.0	$I > 2$
	Service Only	11.8	6.1	not significant
	No Action	47.1	71.3	$I < 2$

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^cDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

^dA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 28. --Percentage distribution^a of male Mexican American and Spanish-speaking new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by occupational status and result of service; November 1965 - March 1966^{bc}

Occupational Status	Result of Service	Project (1)	Main Office (2)	Statistical Difference (3)
Total	Total Number	100.0 102	100.0 75	
	Started Work	17.6	4.0	$ > 2$
	Not Hired	27.5	13.3	not significant
	Service Only No Action	11.8 43.1	6.7 76.0	not significant $ < 2$
High	Total Number	100.0 29	100.0 14	
	Started Work	12.0	..	
	Not Hired	16.0	..	
	Service or No Action	72.0	..	d
Low	Total Number	100.0 73	100.0 61	
	Started Work	20.5	4.9	
	Not Hired	31.5	13.1	d
	Service or No Action	47.9	82.0	

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^cDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

^dA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 29. --Percentage Distribution^a of female Negro new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by occupational status and result of service; November 1965 - March 1966

Occupational Status	Result of Service	Project (1)	Main Office (2)	Statistical Difference (3)
Total	Total Number	100.0 395	100.0 328	
	Started Work	5.8	13.7	$t < 2$
	Not Hired	16.5	16.2	not significant
	Service Only	11.5	8.8	not significant
	No Action	66.2	61.3	not significant
High	Total Number	100.0 123	100.0 134	
	Started Work	7.3	12.7	
	Not Hired	23.6	20.1	
	Service Only	14.6	13.4	not significant
	No Action	54.5	53.7	
Low	Total Number	100.0 276	100.0 194	
	Started Work	5.1	14.4	$t < 2$
	Not Hired	13.4	13.4	not significant
	Service Only	10.1	5.7	not significant
	No Action	71.4	66.5	not significant

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 30. --Percentage distribution^a of new applicants hired^b through the Project and the Main Office, by occupational status, anticipated duration of job, minority group membership, and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Occupational Status	Anticipated Duration of Job	Project			Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)			
Males							
Total	Total Number	100.0 78	100.0 56	100.0 52			
	Three or More Days-Full Time	71.9	78.6	55.8			not significant
	Three or More Days-Part Time Less Than Three Days	2.6 25.6	8.9 12.5	23.1 21.2			$t < 3$ not significant
High	Total Number	100.0 24	100.0 13	100.0 35			
	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	75.0 25.0	•• ••	77.2 22.9			e
	Total Number	100.0 54	100.0 43	100.0 17			
Low	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	74.1 25.9	83.7 16.3	82.3 17.5			e

TABLE 30. --Continued

		Females		
Total	Total Number	100.0 31	100.0 53	100.0 59
	Three or More Days--Full Time	64.5	54.7	72.9
	Three or More Days--Part Time Less Than Three Days	12.9 22.6	11.3 34.0	15.3 11.9
High	Total Number	100.0 31	100.0 53	100.0 59
	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	83.3 16.7	62.5 37.5	87.2 12.8
				e
Low	Total Number	100.0 19	100.0 29	100.0 12
	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	73.7 26.3	69.0 31.0
				e

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.
^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.
^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.
^dDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.
^eA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 31. --Percentage distribution^a of qualified unemployed new applicants hired^b through the Project and the Main Office by occupational status, anticipated duration, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Occupational Status	Anticipated Duration of Job	Project			Main Office		Statistical Difference
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)	Minority (4)		
Males							
Total	Total Number	100.0 62	100.0 51	100.0 44	100.0 44	100.0 44	
	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	75.8 24.2	86.3 13.7	77.3 22.7	77.3 22.7	77.3 22.7	not significant
High	Total Number	100.0 18	100.0 13	100.0 29	100.0 29	100.0 29	e
	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	77.8 22.2	72.9 27.6	72.9 27.6	72.9 27.6	e
Low	Total Number	100.0 44	100.0 38	100.0 15	100.0 15	100.0 15	e
	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	75.0 25.0	81.6 18.4	86.7 13.3	86.7 13.3	86.7 13.3	e

TABLE 31. --Continued

		females	
Total	Total Number	100.0 21	100.0 42
	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	76.2 23.8	64.3 35.7
High	Total Number	100.0 5	100.0 18
	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	66.7 33.3
Low	Total Number	100.0 16	100.0 24
	Three or More Days Less Than Three Days	66.8 31.3	62.5 37.5
			100.0 54
			88.9 11.1
			not significant 1 + 2 > 3
			100.0 42
			88.1 11.9
			100.0 12
		
		
			e

a This table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three groups.

b Those persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

c Columns may not add exactly because of rounding.

d Distributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

e A valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 32.--Average number of working days required for placement of new applicants hired^a through the Project and the Main Office by sex and minority group membership; November 1965 - March 1966^b.

Sex	Project		Main Office		Statistical		
	Minority (1)		Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)	Difference (4)		
	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	Number	Mean	
Total	107	17.9	106	15.2	108	12.6	not significant
Males	76	16.7	53	17.5	49	13.0	not significant
Females	31	21.0	53	12.8	59	12.2	not significant

^aThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^bThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of the three offices.

TABLE 33. Percentage distribution^a of new applicants hired^b through the Project and the Main Office, by occupational status, congruence between job obtained and last job held, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^{cd}

Occupational Status	Congruence	Project			Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)			
Males							
Total	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0			
	Number	77	52	47			
	Higher	26.0	36.5	23.4			not significant
	Same	40.3	50.0	36.2			not significant
	Lower	33.8	13.5	40.4			1 > 2, 3 > 2
High	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0			
	Number	24	13	31			e
	Higher	12.5	. .	16.1			
	Same or Lower	87.5	. .	83.9			
Low	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0			
	Number	53	39	16			not significant
	Higher	32.1	38.5	37.5			
	Same or Lower	67.9	61.5	62.5			
Females							
Total	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0			
	Number	29	54	58			
	Higher	41.4	33.3	31.0			not significant
	Same	31.0	42.6	58.6			
	Lower	27.6	24.1	10.3			
High	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0			
	Number	11	24	47			e
	Higher	. .	45.8	34.0			
	Same or Lower	. .	54.2	66.0			
Low	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0			
	Number	18	30	11			e
	Higher	27.8	23.3	. .			
	Same or Lower	72.2	76.6	. .			

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^dDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

^eA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 34. Percentage distribution^a of new applicants hired^b through the Project and the Main Office, by occupational status, congruence between status level of job obtained and occupational classification assigned, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^{cd}

Occupational Status	Congruence	Project	Main Office		Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)	
Males					
Total	Total Number	100.0 77	100.0 51	100.0 47	not significant
	Higher	26.0	25.5	14.9	
	Same	36.4	54.9	40.4	
	Lower	37.7	19.6	44.7	
High	Total Number	100.0 24	100.0 13	100.0 31	e
	Higher	8.3	••	9.7	
	Same or Lower	91.7	••	90.3	
Low	Total Number	100.0 53	100.0 38	100.0 16	e
	Higher	34.0	31.6	25.0	
	Same or Lower	66.0	68.4	75.0	
Females					
Total	Total Number	100.0 29	100.0 54	100.0 58	not significant
	Higher	27.6	20.4	19.0	
	Same	44.8	55.6	69.0	
	Lower	27.6	24.1	12.1	
High	Total Number	100.0 11	100.0 24	100.0 47	e
	Higher	••	25.0	21.3	
	Same or Lower	••	75.0	78.7	
Low	Total Number	100.0 18	100.0 30	100.0 11	e
	Higher	22.2	16.7	••	
	Same or Lower	77.8	83.3	••	

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^dDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

^eA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 35. Percentage distribution^a of new applicants hired^b through the Project and the Main Office, by age, congruence between status level of job obtained and last job held, minority group membership and sex; November 1965 - March 1966^{cd}

Age in Years	Congruence	Project			Main Office			Statistical Difference (4)
		Minority (1)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)	Minority (2)	Non-minority (3)	Non-minority (3)	
Males								
Total	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0				
	Number	77	52	47				
	Higher	26.0	36.5	23.4				not significant
	Same	40.3	50.0	36.2				not significant
	Lower	33.8	13.5	40.4				1 > 2, 3 > 2
Less than 22	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0				
	Number	20	3	3				
	Higher	35.0				e
	Same or Lower	65.0				
22 or more	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0				
	Number	57	49	44				
	Higher	22.8	36.7	25.0				not significant
	Same	43.9	49.0	36.4				
	Lower	33.3	14.3	38.6				
Females								
Total	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0				
	Number	29	54	58				
	Higher	41.4	33.3	31.0				not significant
	Same	31.0	42.6	58.6				
	Lower	27.6	24.1	10.3				
Less than 22	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0				
	Number	8	5	11				
	Higher				e
	Same or Lower				
22 or more	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0				
	Number	21	49	47				
	Higher	28.6	32.7	27.7				not significant
	Same	33.3	44.9	66.0				not significant
	Lower	38.1	22.4	6.4				1 + 2 > 3

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bThose persons who within three months of their registration were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^dDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

^eA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 36.--Percentage distribution^a of male Negro new applicants hired^b through the Project and the Main Office, by occupational status, and congruence between status level of job obtained and last job held; November 1965 - March 1966^c

Occupational Status	Congruence	Project (1)	Main Office (2)	Statistical Difference (3)
Total	Total Number	100.0 58	100.0 44	not significant
	Higher	25.9	31.8	not significant
	Same	37.9	56.8	not significant
	Lower	36.2	11.4	1 > 2
High	Total Number	100.0 19	100.0 8	d
	Higher	15.8	. .	
	Same & Lower	84.2	. .	
Low	Total Number	100.0 39	100.0 36	not significant
	Higher	30.8	33.3	
	Same & Lower	69.2	66.7	

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bThose persons who, within three months of their registration, were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

^dA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 37.—Percentage distribution^a of male Negro new applicants hired^b through the Project and the Main Office, by occupational status, congruence between status level of job obtained and occupational classification assigned; November 1965–March 1966^c

Occupational Status	Congruence	Project (1)	Main Office (2)	Statistical Difference (3)
Total	Total	100.0	100.0	
	Number	58	43	
	Higher	25.9	23.3	not significant
	Same	32.8	60.5	1 < 2
	Lower	41.4	16.3	1 > 2
High	Total	100.0	100.0	
	Number	19	8	
	Higher	5.3	. .	d
	Same & Lower	94.7	. .	
Low	Total	100.0	100.0	
	Number	39	35	
	Higher	35.9	25.7	not significant
	Same & Lower	64.1	74.3	

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bThose persons who, within three months of their registration, were referred to a job which they subsequently started.

^cDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

^dA valid test of significance was impossible because of small cell frequencies.

TABLE 38. Percentage distribution^a of new applicants served at the Project and the Main Office, by result of service and sex; November 1965 - March 1966

Result of Service	Project	Main Office	
	Minority	Minority	Non-minority
Males			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	487	554	492
Started Work	16.4	10.3	10.5
Less than 3 Days Duration	4.5	1.4	2.2
3 or More Days Duration	13.9	8.8	8.3
Downgraded	4.9	2.3	4.8
Not Downgraded	7.0	6.5	3.5
Did Not Start Work	83.6	89.7	89.5
Females			
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	479	414	420
Started Work	6.5	13.0	14.5
Less than 3 Days Duration	1.5	4.6	2.1
3 or More Days Duration	5.0	8.4	12.3
Downgraded	2.5	2.4	2.3
Not Downgraded	2.5	6.0	10.0
Did Not Start Work	93.5	87.0	85.5

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

SECTION 3

JOBS AVAILABLE

Introduction

The data found in this section differ considerably from those in the preceding. These data concern the number and types of jobs (as well as certain specifications required by employers) which were available to Project applicants during the period studied. In discussion, attention will be devoted to comparisons of "direct" openings (jobs submitted to the Oakland Adult Minority Project) with "indirect" openings (jobs submitted to the main Oakland Employment Service office).¹ We emphasize that jobs from both sources are available to all applicants to the employment service; however, (1) at least a one day delay is entailed in interoffice transmission of the indirect orders to Project offices (and direct orders to the Main Office), and (2) employers who placed orders at one office are usually unaware that they will be transmitted to the others. Since such a large proportion of the orders are placed indirectly, the delay entailed has more serious consequences for the Project than for the Main Office.

Direct orders are considered the concrete result of the Project's job development efforts, which were discussed at length in the first interim report. It is assumed that (1) the existence and purpose of the Project must be known to an employer who has contact with it, and (2) an employer's use of the Project represents his expressed willingness to hire minority group applicants. Little change has taken place in either the direction or extent of the Project's job development efforts since the last report. The major participants in the program are the California State Employment Service (CSES) staff and the two "Directors of Industry and Labor Liaison" (here termed "Specialists").²

The CSES staff of the Project deviates little from general CSES policies and procedures; therefore, job orders credited to its members have resulted either from an attempt to obtain a job for a particular applicant,

¹Domestic jobs and jobs scheduled to last less than three days (casual labor) are not forwarded to the Project.

²Although the Specialists' contracts, and hence their activities for the Project, were terminated in November 1966, they were employed during the period we studied.

A third component, the members of the Advisory Committee, seems to have been involved only indirectly since, again, there is no evidence to indicate that their efforts elicited a single job order. (The CSES staff has been asked to note, on each order, its "solicitor". These records show that no member of the Advisory Committee was mentioned by an employer as being responsible for his contacting the Oakland Adult Minority Project.)

or from an employer's phone call to a person on the staff with whom he usually deals. The Specialists, on the other hand, send quarterly letters to most employers in the Oakland area, visit individual firms, speak before groups of employers, and work with established agencies of the city, state, and federal governments, attempting to convince employers to use the Project services whenever they should need employees.

Data in this report, being more detailed than those in the last, required elaborate collection procedures and processing, which precluded study of each indirect job order (approximately 3,425) placed with the Project during the November 1965 to March 1966 period. For this reason, it was decided to analyze every third order placed, a total of 1,142. On the other hand, we were unable to sample direct orders because there were so few (338). Therefore, it is impossible to use tests of statistical significance in analyzing the data, although meaningful comparisons may be made using other methods. The reader must bear in mind as he reads this section that a sample of indirect orders is being compared with the universe of direct orders.¹

On the basis of data from the first report, some analyses originally planned appear unwarranted. Since the Project is a demonstration one, research and evaluation should consider: (1) what is being accomplished; (2) how it is being accomplished; and (3) what factors serve to enhance or to diminish the efficient accomplishment of stated goals. In line with the above aims, it was thought that considerable research activity would be devoted to study of one of the unique aspects of the Project: Job Development. When the preliminary evidence indicated that both the Advisory Committee and The Specialists it hired (with funds provided by the Economic Development Administration) had little measurable impact on the number of jobs that were found for Project applicants, it was decided to conduct intensive analyses of the job orders received by the Project, rather than to chronicle meticulously the activities of various persons who seemed unable to achieve meaningful results.

Most of the data in this section have been tabulated in terms of job openings rather than orders, since actual jobs were considered to be most relevant to the applicants. Were we focusing on evaluation of solicitation results, orders would be given more weight, since some argue that the most important aspect of the Project is to influence an employer regardless of the number of persons he employs.

Data Presentation and Discussion

Number of jobs

In general, it appears that, although there were many more jobs available to those seeking work at the Employment Services in Oakland during this report period than during the last, (monthly averages: April to July 1965: 605; November 1965 to March 1966: 1,370), the Project itself obtained a smaller proportion (Table 39). The proportion of openings obtained

¹Orders originating at offices other than the Main Office (termed "clearance orders" - sent from Sacramento to every Employment Service office in the state) have not been included in the indirect order category for this study.

directly dropped from almost 17 per cent (during Report Period I) to 12 per cent (during Report Period II). The proportion of three-or-more-day openings obtained directly also dropped relative to similar indirect openings. Ninety-three per cent of the Project openings were of this type, whereas, during the previous reporting period, only 87 per cent had been:

	Number of Openings		
	<u>Total</u>	<u>Three or more days</u>	<u>Per Cent</u>
Period I	405	352	86.9
Period II	820	765	93.3

Advisory Committee Firms

Openings have been analyzed in terms of many variables, some of which warrant close attention, while others merely bear mentioning. The first to be considered, Advisory Committee membership, belongs to both categories at once - that is, no extensive analysis is warranted, but, because of the theoretically extensive part the committee plays in the Project, the findings must be emphasized. Orders placed by firms who were represented on the Advisory Committee¹ accounted for 3.6 per cent of the orders and 2.8 per cent of the openings. Only 16 per cent of these orders and 32 per cent of these openings were placed at the Project; that is, when they used the Employment Service, Advisory Committee member firms placed most of their orders at the Main Office.

It has been assumed that these firms send representatives to the Advisory Committee as an expression of their sincere commitment to making attempts to solve minority employment problems, and having such a commitment, would attempt to hire a large number of employees through the Project. However, the fact that the Project is notified only indirectly of 84 per cent of the Advisory Committee company orders, leads one to question both the extent of the actual commitment of these firms, and the amount of influence exerted by the Committee members within their own firms.

Solicitation

In Table 40, the "solicitation" of direct orders is detailed. This term is used because, theoretically, each Project order is due to some special effort: direct solicitation or publicity. The largest proportion of the openings (46 per cent) was received when an employer called the Project and placed an order. However, approximately two-thirds of these were placed with a person at the Project for whom the employer asked specifically (termed "personal contacts"). Close to 30 per cent of the openings resulted from Project interviewers soliciting jobs for particular applicants, but only 11 per cent were traced to the efforts of the two full-time job development

¹A firm was placed in this category if it had, at the time the order was placed, or ever had had, a representative who was a member of the Committee.

Specialists. It is notable that almost an equal proportion of jobs resulted from referrals from the staff of the On-the-Job Training Project which is only peripherally connected with the Project. On the basis of these data, it appears that the proportion of Project openings due to the Specialists' efforts is only half of that credited to them at the time of the last report.

Time of Placement

When the openings are examined with respect to the month the order was placed, Table 41, the data are seen to be interesting, but confusing. The most even distribution of orders over the five-month period is found for Project orders specifying women. The range is from a high of 26 per cent of the openings occurring in November to a low of 15 per cent in February. This distribution pattern was not common to all openings requiring females; in fact, the distributions for the Main Office and Project openings vary inversely (Main Office: November, 13 per cent; January, 32 per cent). There was also considerable variation in patterns for jobs specifying males and for those open to both sexes; it seems that the influence of the general labor market does not play a major role in causing the fluctuations noted in Project orders.

Location of Employer

Most employers who placed orders with an Oakland employment office were located in Alameda County, and the majority in Oakland proper (Table 42). That this is true for both types of openings may be seen immediately from the data, but it should be noted that the Project does not confine itself to the city to the same extent as does the Main Office.

Type of Employer

There is considerable variation in the types of employers using the two facilities (Table 43). Whereas, 30 per cent of the direct openings were offered by government and non-profit agencies, only about 12 per cent of the indirect openings were. A greater proportion of direct rather than indirect openings were for private household positions, but this is, no doubt, a reflection of the fact that domestic and casual labor orders are not forwarded to the Project. It is interesting to note that unions do not use the state employment service at all. Most hiring of members of organized labor (or members-to-be) is done by employers in accordance with agreements made with the locals involved or through union hiring-halls. Unions do have jobs to offer, however, chiefly in clerical fields. One of the Specialists was to solicit jobs from unions by encouraging use of the Project when openings arose in their apprenticeship programs, and so forth. Very early in their careers with the Project, however, the Specialists began a policy of making calls jointly. The labor expert explained that his presence was necessary because many employers tried to excuse their policies on the basis of restrictive union agreements. Since most of their calls were to employers, unions (and union policies) were neglected; the explanation provided was a weak one, unable to account for what was, in essence, duplication of effort.

Number of employees

In Table 44, employers are categorized by the number of people whom they employ. Notice that almost half of the direct openings were in large firms while this type accounts for less than a quarter of indirect openings. Although openings from both sources are concentrated in very small and very large firms, the indirect distribution is far more even ("small" - 37 per cent, "medium" - 25 per cent, "large" - 23 per cent) than that of direct openings ("small"- 29 per cent, "medium" - 16 per cent, "large" - 49 per cent).

Union Membership

The jobs that required union membership within a certain period after starting work were tabulated; it was found that, whereas 13 per cent of the indirect openings required it, less than half as many (5.5 per cent) of those that were direct did. Although the percentages of both are low, the data seem to indicate that firms with union agreements tend to use the Main Office more frequently than the Project. No attempt was made to differentiate such firms further.

Education

Although about three quarters of all employers did not specify the amount of education they felt their jobs required¹, there seems to have been significant variation between direct and indirect openings in this respect (Table 45). Where education was specified, 90 per cent of the indirect openings required a high school education, as opposed to only 58 per cent of direct openings; of the remainder of the direct openings, 25 per cent required more, 15 per cent, less. For indirect openings, the percentages were 10.0 and 0.4. Thus, although the Project offered a greater proportion of jobs not requiring high school skills than did the Main Office, it also offered a greater proportion that necessitated some college attendance. Because educational attainment was not specified for such a large percentage of the openings, it is difficult to assess the significance of these findings. As will be seen later, a greater proportion of Main Office jobs are "white collar"; therefore, a considerable portion of the differences noted in educational requirements may be related to differences in occupational characteristics.

Experience

Examination of Table 46 shows that minimum experience also was seldom specified by employers. Again, it must be emphasized that this should not be interpreted to mean that such requirements do not exist. The fact that experience is required for more than half of the indirect openings, as

¹The fact that most firms did not specify minimum educational requirements does not necessarily imply that they have no minimum requirements. Many have tests in general knowledge, aptitude, and proficiency that are administered at the time of referral, as well as educational requirements which may not have been specified at the time the order was placed.

opposed to only about one-quarter of those placed directly, does seem significant. However, when the median of the years specified is calculated, it appears that, when specified, the length of experience required by "Project employers" is slightly greater than that required by those using the Main Office.¹

Duration of job

Analyses were also made with respect to the anticipated duration of jobs. That most jobs were, in fact scheduled to last three days or more, and that no major differences were found between those offered by the Project and by the Main Office, is apparent in Table 47. It should be noted, however, that these few short term jobs accounted for about one-quarter of the jobs obtained by "Project minorities" (page , Table).

Sex

Most of the analyses in this report have been done separately for each sex. Although the necessity for this decision may be obvious, the most important reasons should be mentioned.

1. Among urban people, women are employed primarily in professional, clerical-sales, and service positions, while men are found to be fairly evenly distributed among all occupational categories. The proportion of all minority group people employed at the professional-managerial and clerical-sales levels is far smaller than the corresponding proportions of the total population. This has graver implications for minority group women than for men, since many of them are left with only one occupational field, service, within which they have been able to find work.² One of the implications of this state of affairs is that, since far more "doors" have been closed to women (especially non-white women), many potential "new doors" exist for Project efforts to unlock.
2. It was only recently that laws designed to end employment discrimination against women were enacted nationally, and, as in the case of the racial aspects of the 1965 Civil Rights Bill, they have not yet been widely implemented.
3. In general, wages in clerical-sales and service occupations are low compared with those offered for skilled and some semiskilled occupations. Whether this is due to (1) the prevailing belief that women need less money than men because

¹The number of cases (41) upon which the direct median was computed, although small, was judged sufficient.

²In 1960, 45 per cent of non-white women in Oakland were so employed. (U.S. Bureau of the Census. U. S. Census of Population and Housing: 1960. Census Tracts. Final Report PHC (1)-137. U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 1962).

they have only themselves to support¹, (2) the fact that so few of these workers belong to labor unions (either through failure to organize themselves, or through the neglect of Labor), or (3) is a consequence of both of these as well as other factors, is not at issue here.

In other words, the data were analyzed separately for each sex and by minority group status because different employment patterns and differential wage rates for each of these two variables are associated with the traditional division of labor patterns.

That data on sex are available in the case of the applicants is hardly surprising. However, although more than a year has elapsed since the passage of the bill, the California State Employment Service shows no evidence of changing its practices drastically, and the few modifications it has made in its procedures imply that the model for its behavior is not the legislation (which is oriented toward erasing sex distinctions in employment), but rather, the status quo. For example, it is conceivable that females could be employed as truck drivers (indeed, many were during World War II); however, the Employment Service explicitly cites this job as one which it considers exempt from prohibition of sex specifications because there is virtually no competition from females for the job.²

On the basis of the data in Table 48, the question arises as to whether, during the period studied, a greater proportion of the employers who placed direct orders discriminate on the basis of sex. Only ten per cent of direct and seventeen per cent of indirect openings appeared available to both sexes, either because of a failure to fill in the "sex specified" box on the order form or because the jobs were truly open to members of either sex (Direct: 9.6 per cent; Indirect: 15.0 per cent). Examination of the table also may explain to some extent why so large a proportion of those placed by the Project are males: 70 per cent of the openings it received directly were open only to males, as opposed to 44 per cent of those at the Main Office.

The proportion of the jobs specifying females is almost twice as large for those obtained by the Main Office as compared to those obtained by the Project (39 per cent and 20 per cent, respectively). Clerical and sales positions offered to women accounted for close to 30 per cent of the Main Office indirect jobs, but only 10 per cent of Project direct jobs. The largest proportion of Main Office jobs consisted of these female clerical-sales positions; male clerical-sales constituted 12 per cent, while male semiskilled and unskilled positions account for approximately 10 per cent

¹This belief conflicts not only with philosophy (equal pay for equal work) behind the recent legislation, but also with fact. Especially among minority group women, the majority of employed females work either because they are heads of household, or because their husbands are unable to earn enough money to support their families. (U. S. Department of Labor, Office of Planning and Research, The Negro Family: A Case for National Action, U. S. Government Printing Office: Washington, D.C., 1965).

²Newsletter, Vol. 20, No. 1, September 1966, California Department of Employment, Sacramento, California.

each. For Project jobs, the corresponding proportions for males are: clerical-sales, 7 per cent; semiskilled, 18 per cent; and unskilled, 30 per cent.

To sum up the differences between the two, not only is the majority of jobs obtained by the Project for males, but also, the jobs themselves are predominantly lower-skilled, blue-collar types. When it is remembered that about 25 per cent of the applicants to the Project are males seeking such jobs, it would appear that such a distribution is desirable. However, one must consider that the total number of these jobs was extremely small in relation to those available through other channels (Project: 395; Main Office: 1143¹) during the study period.

Wages

In Table 49, wages offered by employers are presented. It may be seen that, up to a point, as the wage offered increased, the proportion of openings available only to males increased. This trend is evident regardless of where the order was placed. The only three "wage levels" where a greater proportion of direct than indirect jobs required women were those involving a commission (although only two jobs were available), those where room and board were offered as part of the wage, and those paying less than \$1.00 per hour. In Table 50, median wages offered for each occupational category are presented in the first two columns. From the third column, where the difference between these medians has been computed, it may be seen that the wages offered males are generally higher (on the average, 21 cents per hour) for direct openings than those offered by the Main Office (indirect). In only two categories (Skilled and Semiskilled) was the situation reversed, but these are very important. Males in these two categories constituted 30 per cent of all applicants who started work during the study period, and jobs in these categories represent 28 per cent of the Project's direct openings and 41 per cent of the openings restricted to males. The opposite is true for jobs where females were required. For all categories (except clerical and sales where pay was identical at both offices); the indirect openings offered higher pay.²

The figures in the last two columns are a rough indication of the lack of progress of attempts to obtain higher pay for women. In no category, and at neither facility, did wages offered females approach those offered males. The smallest difference (17 cents per hour) was found in the clerical and sales category (usually "female occupations"); the largest (\$1.34 per hour) in that of skilled labor (usually "male occupations"). Although the range of differences was widest at the Main Office, the average difference there was "only" 56 cents per hour, as opposed to 85 cents at the Project. Again, it must be remembered that the data are not refined in

¹Figure derived from expansion of the sample data.

²It must be remembered that these categories are quite gross. Were we able to match closely actual occupations rather than large categories containing a wide variety of jobs, comparisons would be more meaningful. However, other measures such as, socio-economic status, discussed later, lend support to the argument that direct (Project) jobs seem to be less desirable than those from the Main Office.

terms of actual occupational matching.

To sum up, it appears as if the openings for men solicited by the Project were fewer but more lucrative¹ than those transferred from the Main Office. In addition, a far greater proportion of the openings the Project provided were earmarked for men, and the few jobs, obtained through its own efforts, that it was able to offer women were financially¹ inferior to those available elsewhere.

Action taken by Agency

The phrase, "action taken by the agency", may be considered roughly equivalent to our earlier use of "result of service". Since we deal here with the "histories" of job orders, rather than of applicants, "action" refers to steps taken by the interviewers at the Project with regard to each order. For each opening, one of three possible "actions taken" was recorded:

1. No recorded attempt was made by the Project to refer applicants to the employer (No Action);
2. the Project referred one or more applicants to the employer (Referral), and
3. the Project attempted to refer applicants, who either refused referral or did not report for a scheduled interview (Referral Attempted).

The openings available to the Employment Service during the study period, classified as outlined above, appear in Table 51. It may be seen immediately that Project applicants very seldom refused referral when it was offered. (This figure is slightly misleading, since referral refusals were not tabulated as such when at least one "successful" referral per order was made). Furthermore, the Project took action on a greater proportion of its own orders (56 per cent) than on those transferred from the Main Office (23 per cent). Although the volume differential and the fact that some Main Office orders were already filled by the time they were received by the Project may be the most relevant factors, it does not appear as if they can totally explain the findings. Data concerning openings show that there appeared to be a tendency to concentrate on the larger orders as well as to differentiate on the basis of sex required, since a greater proportion of openings for females was neglected in both cases (Direct: 36 per cent; Indirect: 80 per cent). In the following table (52), the openings are further classified by occupational category. The largest proportion of direct no action openings (23 per cent) consisted of skilled jobs for males (referrals were made to only 28 per cent of the direct skilled openings). Twenty-five per cent were clerical-sales jobs (12 per cent for males, 13 per cent for females). The latter category was also that most neglected among the indirect orders, i.e., these constituted almost half (46 per cent) of the openings on which no action was taken, and 72 per cent of these specified females. Failure to take action on these orders may be due in part to the relative scarcity of male applicants considered qualified to hold such positions; however, there was no corresponding lack of qualified females.

Socio-economic Status

In Table 53, the pattern of the relationship between occupation and socio-economic status may be noted visually without the help of graphic representation. It may be roughly summarized thusly: if occupations are

¹Again, it is important to remember that the wage data were analyzed for gross occupational categories and, therefore may be of limited value.

ranked according to socio-economic status, the following scale is produced:

1. professional, managerial
2. clerical, sales
3. skilled labor
4. semiskilled labor
5. service
6. unskilled labor

Since positions within each category tend to vary considerably, the relationship is not perfect.

The chief differences in the occupational distributions of direct and indirect openings are illustrated below:

Percentage distributions of job openings^a

Occupational Category	Males Specified		Females Specified	
	Direct	Indirect	Direct	Indirect
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	570	878	167	786
Professional & Managerial	2.5	3.9	5.9	1.5
Clerical and Sales	9.6	27.1	49.1	74.7
Skilled	14.4	12.9	0.0	1.1
Semiskilled	26.3	21.9	1.8	2.7
Service	4.2	12.4	38.3	17.5
Unskilled	42.9	21.4	4.8	2.4
Unknown	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0

^aColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

The following points should be noted: (1) among Project openings specifying males, a greater proportion (88 per cent) were found to be blue collar jobs than was the case for openings from the Main Office (69 per cent), and (2) among openings specifying females, there were fewer service than clerical-sales jobs, but a far greater proportion of the female indirect (75 per cent) than direct (49 per cent) jobs were clerical-sales; the corresponding proportions of service jobs were 18 and 38 per cent.

There are vast discrepancies in the socio-economic status accorded the jobs available to men only (Table 54). On direct openings more so than on indirect ones, the jobs available were, predominantly those of low socio-economic status (46 per cent direct as compared with 24 per cent indirect). In addition, only 20 per cent of the direct openings were found to be in the

two highest quintiles, but the figure was 40 per cent for indirect openings. When the median status ranks¹ of all jobs were computed for each group, jobs open to both sexes were found to have highest status (direct, 1.6; indirect, 2.2). Main Office jobs specifying females were also very high (2.2)², followed by Main Office male and Project female (2.9); the rank of Project male jobs was lowest (3.9).

Target Industries and Occupations - Definition

Preliminary to an attempt to discover which "new doors" had been opened, and to what extent they were open, it was decided to use 1960 Census data as a base line from which comparisons would be made. The Census uses neither the Dictionary of Occupational Titles nor the Standard Industrial Classification systems used by the California State Employment Service, although the systemic disparities were not insurmountable. Analyses were made in terms of per cent Negro of total employed, rather than per cent non-white of total labor force, since data were only available for the San Francisco-Oakland Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area, within which the composition of the non-white population varies considerably.

The usable categories were rank ordered separately for occupation and for industry for each sex in terms of per cent of the employed who were Negro. The lowest two quintiles were designated as "target". This method pinpoints the most severe instances of under-representation. The second quintile was chosen in preference to the first, in order to guarantee that there would be sufficient number of "non-esoteric" jobs included.

N.B. The classifications which were used were the only ones available, and were especially deficient for female occupations. That is, we do not have information concerning every occupation, since the Census relied heavily on grouped data. Therefore, the quintiles are derived from "those occupations mentioned in the Census" and not "those occupations in which people are engaged in the Bay Area".

Unfortunately, it is impossible to determine what proportion of all firms or jobs in the Bay Area are target. However, we do know the number of people employed in all industries and occupations in 1960, so we are able to calculate the proportion of those employed (and of Negroes employed) who were in target industries or in target occupations. The most pertinent data are presented in Tables 55 - 59 solely as reference for the reader. Included are lists of the occupations and industries designated "target". It must be emphasized that a "male target" occupation or industry is not necessarily one where males are seldom employed, but one where when males are employed, Negro males are under-represented in that work force. Similarly, an industry designated "target" for both sexes is one wherein Negroes as a group are under-represented.

¹These figures do not appear in tables, but were computed from the raw data.

²This is obviously due to the large percentage of clerical-sales jobs at the Main Office, which were also accorded higher socio-economic status (2.3) than were those at the Project (2.6).

Target Industries

From Table 60, it may be seen that proportionately fewer of the direct than the indirect openings were in target industries (43 per cent and 63 per cent, respectively). However, it was only among orders specifying males that this difference appeared; one-quarter of the openings at the Project, and almost half from the Main Office, were target. Target industries employ about 36 per cent of the male population (Table 59), so that they may be said to be under-represented in direct and over-represented in indirect openings. Since one of the Project's primary goals is to solicit job orders from these industries, we can only conclude that attempts to do so are either relatively unsuccessful or actually serve to alienate "target employers".¹

Since the Project has been seen to concentrate both its job soliciting and client-serving aspects on males, it is especially disturbing to note that only with respect to the male target firms do direct openings differ from indirect ones, i.e., female target industries specifying females for their job openings are under-represented in both type openings to about the same degree.

The vast majority of openings for which either sex is considered eligible by the employer is with target industries. Almost all of these jobs (direct: 99 per cent, indirect, 94 per cent) are of the white collar type—fully 60 per cent of those at the Project are at the professional-managerial level.² Remembering that these jobs also carried extremely high socio-economic status (page 84), a plausible explanation is the following: These are jobs for which extensive education and training is required; since these are relatively hard to fill, employers have dropped all discriminatory requirements of sex and race in attempts to fill them. In Table 61, the occupational categories of the jobs available are detailed.

In Table 62, differences between the jobs offered by various industries may more readily be seen. The industries that most frequently offer male jobs to the Project are: Government, Transportation, Service, and Manufacturing, while for the Main Office they are: Manufacturing, Service, Wholesale Trade, and Retail Trade. As would be expected from prior evidence, the "industry" offering the highest number of jobs directly to Project females is Private Household Service, followed closely by Retail Trade, and Service, whereas, in openings arriving from the Main Office, the number of jobs classified in the first category is negligible; 60 per cent of indirect female jobs are in the latter two categories.

¹Although the actual openings made available to the applicants by the Specialists were few in number, 68 per cent of them were in jobs in target industries.

²It may be seen in Table 62 that the positions open to either sex are offered, for the most part, by "service industries". This is a slightly misleading term because the category includes medical, legal, educational, and business services, as well as non-profit, welfare, and religious organizations.

Target Occupations

Turning to occupations (Table 63), a similar and even stronger trend is seen. It is obvious that the majority of the openings are non-target; the gap is larger at the Project where male target openings are extremely scarce. Immediately, one notices that only four per cent of the male jobs available directly to the Project were for male target occupations. The distribution is unlike the one for target industries where, although Project target jobs were under-represented in terms of their distribution in the total employed labor force, the percentage was about twice that of working Negro males in 1960 (12 per cent employed by target industries). According to the Census, 36 per cent of all employed males, and five per cent of employed Negro males in the area, worked in target occupations (Table 59).

The situation for females is again almost identical on both type openings: female target jobs (as well as indirect male jobs) are about equally under-represented with reference to Census figures. Again, a great many jobs open to both sexes are in target occupations.

In view of the emphasis placed in the proposals on "opening new doors", certain analyses with respect to target industries were made.¹ The most important question would seem to be: What is the relationship (if any) between target industries and target occupations? Disregarding the anomalous openings available to both sexes, 27 per cent (16.6 plus 9.0) of direct and 29 per cent (16.1 plus 12.6) of indirect jobs in target industries that specified sex were for target occupations (Table 64). More impressive is the fact that such large proportions of the few jobs available in target occupations were offered by target industries:

Job Openings for Target Occupations

Sex Specified	Direct			Indirect		
	Total	For Target Industries	Per Cent of Total	Total	For Target Industries	Per Cent of Total
Male	66	59	89.4	228	206	90.4
Female	45	32	71.1	202	161	79.7

Since there are no large discrepancies between the figures for direct and indirect orders, it would seem that any tendency to hire Negroes in a capacity that is "non-traditional" is due, not to a Project effort, but to a more pervasive trend.

When analyzed in terms of the expected duration of target and non-target jobs, no major differences are apparent (Table 65). Since most of the Project jobs specified males, it is no surprise that about 76 per cent of the non-target jobs were permanent and for males. However, it should be

¹Since so few jobs in target occupations were found to have been available to employment service applicants, it was decided that extensive analyses of these would not be worthwhile.

pointed out that most of the temporary Project jobs (86 per cent) were in target industries, and that 12 per cent of the Project target industry jobs were temporary (as opposed to six per cent of Main Office target jobs). Most of these specified males. Employers in target industries who used the Project had a greater tendency than those in non-target industries to offer only temporary jobs.

It will be recalled that openings obtained by the Project required more experience than those obtained by the Main Office (page 80). That target firms are more prone not only to specify the amount of experience and to require experience when they place orders at the Project, but also to require more experience (in the case of male jobs) may be seen from Table 66.

Although the lack of refined wage occupation data required that extreme caution be exercised in interpretation, comparisons of the wages offered on orders to the two facilities by various industries may be made from Table 67. We see that for indirect openings the median wage offered males by both target and non-target firms is lower than for direct openings, and for both kinds of openings, male target industries offer lower wages. Considering female jobs, again we see that wages are relatively low but that the reverse of the male situation is true. That is, target firms offer higher wages, and wages are lower on direct openings.

Socio-economic status is essentially a measure of prestige. Although we don't have enough data to definitely establish the inference, from the data in Table 68, it appears that the industries we classified as non-target may have had a relatively high proportion of Negroes in their work forces because they had a relatively high number of low prestige jobs, not because they had a more enlightened employment policy. Jobs with target firms carry more prestige than those with non-target firms regardless of sex, and regardless of where the order was placed. Among target firms, the only status differential was one based on sex, reflecting the high incidence of white collar jobs for females. It seems that the Specialists' plea, "Call the Project when you need to hire minority group employees", was well-heeded by firms who have employed minority group persons in traditional capacities, because (for both sexes) the non-target Project jobs were more than one quintile lower in the status hierarchy than were those obtained from the Main Office. Remembering that the Project has been seen to be oriented in all matters to males, the fact that it took no action on more than half of the direct openings for males in target industries (30 per cent of its total target openings) is surprising (Table 69). Seventy-three per cent of the jobs for males on which Project personnel took no action were in target industries. Possibly, a tendency exists for Employment Service employees to refrain from referring minority group persons to industries that have traditionally not hired such people.

Referral and Placement

1. Introduction

From data recorded on the job order forms, we were able to compare the characteristics and qualifications of jobs that were directly submitted, as well as those submitted indirectly to the Project. We shall proceed to examine differences that exist between the two groups of orders with respect to the number and types of people who were referred to jobs and who were offered jobs. Unfortunately, certain technical aspects of the method of data processing used precluded our examining differences based on sex within

ethnic groups; although separate analyses by sex and ethnic group membership were possible.

For each job order it received, the Employment Service kept a record of certain characteristics of the people referred to that employer. Since a single applicant may have been referred to more than one job, it is possible that some have been counted more than once. Variations in total numbers that occur in these data are due to missing information or to coding error.

It will be remembered that the Project referred people to a much larger proportion of the direct jobs than of the indirect jobs. The terms used here are defined as follows:

- referred only: those people who attempted to or did attend an interview with an employer and who were not offered a job.
- offered jobs: those people who were hired and began work, who were offered a job but refused it, or who were hired and failed to report for work.
- referred: all people who attempted to or did attend an interview with an employer, whether or not they were offered a job, i.e., the total of the above groups.

In this section, target industries and occupations will be discussed as a group, disregarding the specific sex for which they are target.

Table 70, to a great extent, summarizes the data following. It appears that the Project staff has reason to concentrate on orders that come to it directly. In every case, regardless of controls made for sex, age, or ethnic group membership, Project applicants were offered proportionately twice as many jobs when they were referred to employers who had placed their orders with the Project as when they were referred to employers who placed their orders with the Main Office. That is, nearly half (47 per cent), of the people referred to direct jobs were offered work as opposed to less than one-fifth (19 per cent) of those who were referred to indirect jobs.

Numerous factors are probably involved here; unfortunately, we are neither able to isolate those which are most relevant nor to state conclusively which are actually operating. As has been mentioned, a considerable proportion of the jobs (but, by no means, half) were solicited by Project staff for specific clients. One would expect that these would tend to be filled by applicants. Another element is simply that of time: in many cases, the day or more lost in transmission of the order is crucial. Often a notice that the job has been filled accompanies the order, and sometimes, an applicant finds that the job has been filled by the time the agency was able to refer him.¹ Another possibility, one that was raised in the first report and was mentioned again in an earlier section, is that since employers who use the Project tend to offer jobs that are less desirable, these employers expect to fill them with minority group people.

¹The CSES accounting system, upon which this study is dependent, classifies such an attempted interview as "result: not hired". There is no way to distinguish this type from one resulting from an actual job interview where the employer preferred not to hire the applicant.

2. Target Industries

In Table 71, the data are presented by sex. The well-documented staff concentration on males is again apparent. For both sexes, a slightly larger proportion of unsuccessful referrals on direct orders were to firms in target industries, and a higher proportion of job offers were from firms in non-target industries. The latter was not true for those referred on indirect orders; the larger proportion of jobs offered came from firms in target industries. It will be seen that this pattern exists for each ethnic group (Table 72) and for people of all ages (except 22-24 years old) (Table 73). Such variations among the data for target industries may be explained as follows:

- a. The Project took no action on a greater proportion of target than of non-target jobs; and
- b. Most of the indirect openings were with target industries. Therefore, in spite of a possible staff reluctance to refer to firms in target industries, referrals to indirect openings would tend to be to target jobs.

Such an explanation, although plausible, cannot account for the trends that are evidenced in Table 74. For most of the categories studied (excepting Mexican-American and people 22-45), the proportion of the total referred that was offered jobs was highest for direct jobs, when referral was to non-target industries and for indirect jobs, when referral was to target industries. In all cases, the "rate of acceptance" (the proportion offered jobs) was higher for direct target jobs than for indirect target jobs, which is in keeping with the overall trends seen in Table 70, the difference pointed out above is the pattern of target-non-target acceptance rates within the source categories.

3. Target Occupations¹

Tables 75-77 are concerned with the percentage distributions of those referred only and those offered jobs, with respect to target occupation. From Table 75, it appears that the distributions reflect the scarcity of openings for target occupations. The majority of the applicants and of those referred were Negroes (Table 76). Twenty per cent of the people unsuccessfully referred to direct openings were Negroes who had been interviewed for target occupations; but Negroes accounted for only ten per cent of those who failed to obtain jobs from indirect orders. Negroes who were offered target jobs account for four per cent of those offered direct jobs, and sixteen per cent of those offered indirect jobs. No relevant patterns are evident from studying the distribution by age (Table 77).

When the acceptance rates are examined, (Table 78), it may be seen that, in all but one group, (those aged 22-24), the rate for indirect target jobs is not only higher than that for indirect non-target jobs (as was true for target industry) but also (in most cases) was higher than that for direct

¹There is danger in placing undue emphasis on these data. Recall that 35 per cent of the employed population of this area is employed in target occupations. During the period studied (expanding the sample data), we calculate that the Employment Service received approximately 1,940 openings for these positions. The Project staff made referrals to only 14 per cent of these jobs, and only 60 applicants were actually offered work. The numbers we must work with are small, but their significance precludes ignoring them.

target jobs. Note also that non-minorities referred to target occupation openings were about equally as likely to have been offered a job regardless of its source, whereas Negroes' chances were twice as good if the job was indirect, and were, in fact, equal to those of non-minorities. Females, too, seemed more able to obtain target jobs that had been received indirectly.

To summarize the placement data derived from job order records:

- (1) The Project had access to 6,853 job openings during the period studied;
- (2) It made 2,159 referrals; 450 applicants were offered jobs;
- (3) About half of the applicants who were referred to employers that had direct contact with the Project were offered jobs; four-fifths of those referred to indirect jobs were not;
- (4) Most direct job openings were with non-target industries-- for indirect jobs, the opposite was true;
- (5) If the job to which an applicant was referred was one with a target industry, he had a better chance of being offered employment if it was a "direct job" and his chances of getting it were better than if it had been an indirect one with a non-target industry;
- (6) If the job was in a target occupation, and if it was from the Main Office (indirect), an applicant's chances of getting it were usually better than if it had been sent directly to the Project, or if it had been a non-target Main Office job.

4. Discussion

It is extremely difficult even to attempt to explain these placement and referral data. The classification of industries and occupations based on discrimination by color as "target" or "non-target" was made by the Follow-up Study staff; the Project staff was unaware that it had been done. However, although derived from Census data, firms and occupations classified as target are probably known to hire few minority group persons by anyone familiar with the minority employment situation. Earlier we stated that some evidence indicated the possibility of bias on the part of the staff, since orders on which no action was taken tended to be for target positions; but the existence of such bias alone cannot account for the patterns evident in the placement data. Whether the motive was to please an employer or to protect an applicant, it seems ridiculous to suggest that staff members would reserve their most qualified applicants for jobs which originated at another office.

It appears then, that a good deal of the explanation must lie with the employers themselves. In the first interim report, we suggested that the Project was not serving the purpose for which it was planned, i.e., furthering the employment of minority group persons, but appeared instead to serve as a "clearing house" for employers who wanted to hire people for jobs traditionally held by Negroes. The more detailed data now available seem to strengthen this allegation.

With the passage of Civil Rights legislation and the concomitant governmental demands that its contractors prove they maintain non-discriminatory employment policies, many firms have been forced to search for "qualified minority group persons". Regulations preclude discrimination on the basis of sex, race, color, or national origin, and often require or suggest

the contractor advertise that he is an "equal opportunity employer".¹ Oakland remains a city with a high unemployment rate, even in this period of war prosperity. Since so many people are available from which to choose, it is possible, in theory, for an employer to comply formally with government regulations by placing orders with the Project (thereby establishing his willingness not to discriminate), retain inflated requirements or unsuitable tests, and choose the "best qualified" from the pool of applicants. Inferior education, past discrimination which led to thwarted or lowered aspirations, and other socio-economic factors usually insure that employees chosen on this basis are seldom members of minority groups. In essence then, it is possible to continue to discriminate "legally", since employers are neither required nor asked to compensate those harmed by past openly discriminatory practices.²

It might be that some employers use the Project to prove compliance with the letter of the law with no intention of actually taking steps toward "affirmative employment policies". It must be emphasized, however, that no direct evidence supporting such contentions was provided by our study. That industries which have been known to hire few or no Negroes in the past (Target industries) may not have radically altered their employment practices, is evidenced by their lower "acceptance rate" of Project applicants. That there may be duplicity on the part of some employers who place orders with the Project is indicated by our finding that applicants have a better chance of obtaining jobs from which they have been excluded in the past (target occupations) if they, in essence, apply for the job through a facility other than the Project. In other words, since employers who place orders with the Main Office may not know that the orders will be passed to the Project, applicants who are referred to these jobs, in a sense, are using the resources of an agency other than the Project.

The Project has been in operation more than two years and, during most of that time, highly paid, full-time "job development specialists" have been assigned to it. They have been able to solicit very few job orders, relative both to the number of applicants and to the number of jobs placed with other agencies. Rather than the expected increase in job openings as the Project grew in experience and reputation, we have seen that the proportion of all orders placed with any Oakland office of the California State Employment Service that was attributable to Project efforts declined. Although employers who place direct orders seem less likely to hire minority group persons for jobs they have not held traditionally and are less likely to offer them prestigious jobs, they appear to be those most willing to hire Project applicants. The Project is able to offer its clients relatively and numerically fewer target jobs obtained directly than indirectly.

¹The Specialists, in their talks to employers, were known to have mentioned their knowledge of the existence of such compliance requirements, and suggested that the Project be used as a "source of the Negro employees you need".

²Most employers denounce suggestions of preferential hiring of minority group persons on the basis of their agreement not to discriminate because of race or color.

Final Discussion

The jobs made available directly and indirectly may be distinguished from one another on the basis of many criteria. Orders placed with the Project had a greater tendency to be "blue collar". Job orders, specifically for women, seemed to offer lower wages; those for men, although they generally appeared to offer higher wages, were seen to be for less prestigious jobs in terms of socio-economic status. Requirements for experience and educational attainment were more severe for Project jobs.¹ Relatively fewer target jobs of either type were made available to the Project. The firms of members of the Advisory Committee placed the majority of their orders at the Main Office. The Project has been unable to place a larger proportion of its minority group applicants than has the Main Office; both place less than one-fifth of those who apply. Although certain groups of Project applicants are given better service, others receive service inferior to that given similar groups at the Main Office.

Unfortunately, it seems as if the preliminary evidence that indicated the existence of trends contradictory to the Project goals among the employers who used the Project has been further substantiated by the more detailed data available during the second report period. That is, job orders submitted directly to the Project were for openings inferior to and were more rigorous in their requirements of potential employees than were those submitted to the Main Office. Although the employers who used the Project were generally more likely to hire Project applicants referred to them than were employers who used the Main Office, they seemed reluctant to hire applicants in industries and (especially) for occupations from which Negroes have been excluded in the past. There is no evidence to indicate that the Project has been instrumental in coaxing open "new doors"; on the contrary, it appears that, since it received relatively fewer target openings than did the Main Office, direct jobs representing new doors resulted from a more pervasive (but here unidentified) influence.

¹Again, statements referring to wage and educational data are based on gross occupational categories and, therefore, may be of limited value.

TABLES 39 - 78

JOBS AVAILABLE

TABLE 39.--Percentage distribution of total openings and openings for three or more days by source and reporting period.

Source of Order	Total Openings				Openings for 3 or more days			
	Report Period I		Report Period II		Report Period I		Report Period II	
	April-July 1965		November 1965 - March 1966		April-July 1965		November 1965 - March 1966	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	2419	100.0	6853	100.0	2320	100.0	6423	100.0
Indirect ^a	2014	83.3	6033	88.0	1968	84.8	5658	88.1
Direct	405	16.7	820	12.0	352	15.2	765	11.9

^aFigures for indirect openings for Report Period II are derived from expansion of the sample.

TABLE 40.--Percentage distribution of direct openings by sex specified, solicitation, and occupational category; November 1965 - March 1966

Occupational Category	Solicitor of Order							
	Total	Number	CSES Staff	Employer Initiative		Specialists	On the Job Training Staff	Other and Unknown
				CSES Personal Contact	Other			
Total	100.0	820	28.2	31.5	14.4	10.6	7.0	8.3
Male Specified								
Total	100.0	570	32.5	30.5	8.1	10.4	7.2	11.3
Professional & Managerial	100.0	1 ^a
Clerical & Sales	100.0	55	16.4	16.4	20.0	38.2	5.4	3.6
Skilled	100.0	82	43.9	11.0	4.9	21.9	18.3	0.0
Semiskilled	100.0	150	78.0	2.0	6.0	4.0	10.0	0.0
Services	100.0	24	20.9	37.5	25.0	8.3	.0	8.3
Unskilled	100.0	245	7.4	57.1	6.5	2.5	1.6	24.9
Female Specified								
Total	100.0	167	24.0	25.1	34.1	9.0	6.6	1.2
Professional & Managerial	100.0	10 ^b
Clerical & Sales	100.0	82	34.1	12.2	22.0	18.3	11.0	2.4
Skilled	100.0	0 ^a
Semiskilled	100.0	3 ^b
Services	100.0	64	14.0	34.4	51.6	.0	.0	0.0
Unskilled	100.0	8 ^b
Both Specified or Unknown								
Total	100.0	83	7.2	50.6	18.1	15.7	7.2	1.2

^aNo cases

^bDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

TABLE 41.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, month of placement and sex specified;
November 1965 - March 1966

Sex Specified	Month Order Placed							
	Total	Number	November	December	January	February	March	Unknown
Direct								
Total	100.0	820	36.1	13.9	16.0	19.7	14.3	0.0
Male	100.0	570	42.3	9.1	16.3	23.9	8.4	0.0
Female	100.0	167	26.3	20.4	15.6	15.0	22.7	0.0
Both	100.0	83	13.2	33.7	14.4	1.2	37.3	0.0
Indirect								
Total	100.0	2011	11.4	27.4	24.7	19.1	17.4	b
Male	100.0	878	12.2	14.5	23.3	28.5	21.3	0.2
Female	100.0	786	12.7	25.7	31.6	14.2	15.6	0.2
Both	100.0	347	6.3	64.0	11.8	6.6	11.0	0.3

^aData for indirect openings are based on a systematic one-third sample.

^bLess than 0.1 percent.

TABLE 42.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a and employer's location; November 1965 - March 1966

Location of Employer	Source of Order	
	Direct	Indirect
Total	100.0	100.0
Number	820	2011
Oakland	69.1	77.2
Remainder of Oakland Employment Service Area ^b	20.3	14.0
Remainder of Alameda County	4.0	.2
Outside Alameda County	6.6	8.6

^aData for indirect openings are based on a systematic one-third sample.

^bIncludes Emeryville, Alameda, San Leandro and Piedmont.

TABLE 43.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a and type of employer; November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Employer	Source of Order	
	Direct	Indirect
Total Number	100.0 820	100.0 2011
Private Firm	64.0	87.0
Governmental Agency	28.2	11.5
Union	.0	.0
Private Household	5.6	.6
Nonprofit Organization	2.2	0.9

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 44.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a and number employed by firm or agency; November 1965 - March 1966

Number of Employees	Source of Order	
	Direct	Indirect
Total	100.0	100.0
Number	820	2011
Alameda County	93.4	91.4
Small		
0 - 9	28.9	36.6
Medium		
10 - 24	4.0	4.7
25 - 49	2.8	4.1
50 - 99	3.8	9.4
100 - 249	5.4	7.0
Large		
250 - 499	14.0	5.0
500 and above	34.5	17.8
Unknown	.0	6.8
Not in Alameda County	6.6	8.6

^aData for indirect openings are based on a systematic one-third sample.

TABLE 45.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a and educational attainment specified by employer; November 1965 - March 1966

Educational Attainment	Source of Order	
	Direct	Indirect
Total	100.0	100.0
Number	820	2011
Specified	24.3	27.8
Total	100.0	100.0
Number	200	559
Less than high school graduate	17.5	0.4
High school graduate	57.5	89.5
Some college	16.5	7.2
College graduate or more	8.5	2.9
Unspecified	75.7	72.2
Total	100.0	100.0
Number	620	1452

^aData for indirect openings are based on a systematic one-third sample.

TABLE 46.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a and work experience specified by employer; November 1965 - March 1966

Work Experience	Source of Order	
	Direct	Indirect
Total Number	100.0 820	100.0 2011
Specified	5.0	16.6
Requested, not specified	20.2	34.7
Unknown	74.8	48.7
Median years, when preferred	1.91	1.75

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 47.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified and expected duration of job; November 1965 - March 1966

Sex Specified	Expected Duration of Job				
	Total	Number	Three Days or More	Less Than Three Days	Unknown
Direct					
Total	100.0	820	93.3	6.2	0.5
Male	100.0	570	92.8	7.2	0.0
Female	100.0	167	92.8	6.0	0.2
Both or Unknown	100.0	83	97.6	.0	2.4
Indirect					
Total	100.0	2011	93.8	4.9	1.3
Male	100.0	878	93.8	5.2	1.0
Female	100.0	786	94.1	5.4	0.5
Both or Unknown	100.0	347	93.1	3.2	3.7

^aData for indirect openings are based on a systematic one-third sample.

TABLE 4B.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, and occupational category; November 1965 - March 1966

Occupational Category	Source of Order	
	Direct	Indirect
Total Number	100.0 820	100.0 2011
Male Specified		
Total	69.5	43.7
Professional	1.7	1.7
Clerical	6.7	11.9
Skilled	10.0	5.6
Semiskilled	18.3	9.7
Service	2.9	5.4
Unskilled	29.9	9.3
Unknown	0.0	0.1
Female Specified		
Total	20.4	39.1
Professional	1.2	.6
Clerical	10.0	29.2
Skilled	.0	.4
Semiskilled	.4	1.0
Service	7.8	6.9
Unskilled	1.0	0.9
Unknown	0.0	b
Both Specified or Unknown		
Total	10.1	17.2

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bLess than 0.1 per cent.

TABLE 49.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified and wage offered; November 1965 - March 1966

Wage	Source of Order									
	Direct			Indirect						
	Total Number	Male Specified	Female Specified	Both Specified and Unknown	Total Number	Male Specified	Female Specified	Both Specified and Unknown		
Total	100.0	820	69.5	20.4	10.1	100.0	2011	43.7	39.1	17.2
\$0.00 - 0.99	100.0	18	5.6	94.4	.0	100.0	11 ^b	.0	.0	.0
1.00 - 1.49	100.0	77	37.9	35.1	27.0	100.0	112	21.4	74.1	4.5
1.50 - 1.99	100.0	188	46.8	37.8	15.4	100.0	775	25.4	58.1	16.5
2.00 - 2.49	100.0	123	61.0	23.6	15.4	100.0	373	41.6	46.6	11.8
2.50 - 2.99	100.0	234	94.4	1.8	3.8	100.0	349	55.9	9.4	34.7
3.00 - 3.49	100.0	36	91.7	2.8	5.5	100.0	71	81.7	4.2	14.1
3.50 and above	100.0	14 ^b	.0	.0	.0	100.0	54	77.8	.0	22.2
Wage Plus Live-in Benefits	100.0	12 ^b	.0	.0	.0	100.0	16	43.8	43.8	12.4
Commission only or Commission with Salary	100.0	10 ^b	.0	.0	.0	100.0	213	86.9	2.3	10.8
Unknown	100.0	111	95.5	4.5	0.0	100.0	37	37.8	55.5	2.7

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

TABLE 50.--Median wage offered for occupational category by source^a and sex specified; amount of difference between sources and sexes, specified; November 1965 - March 1966

Occupational Category	Median wage offered		Amount of Difference		
			Direct minus Indirect	Male minus Female	
	Direct	Indirect			Direct
Male Specified					
Total	\$2.57	\$2.36	\$.21	\$.85	\$.56
Professional & Managerial	3.24	3.15	.09	1.05	.50
Clerical & Sales	2.55	2.02	.53	.70	.17
Skilled	2.38	3.08	-.65	c	1.34
Semiskilled	1.98	2.21	-.33	.76	.84
Service	1.94	1.83	.11	.70	.36
Unskilled	2.66	2.53	.13	1.00	.88
Female Specified					
Total	\$1.72	\$1.80	\$.08		
Professional & Managerial	2.19	2.65	-.46		
Clerical & Sales	1.85	1.85	.00		
Skilled	b	1.74	c		
Semiskilled	1.12	1.37	-.25		
Service	1.24	1.47	-.23		
Unskilled	1.66	1.65	.01		
Both Specified and Unknown					
Total	\$1.85	\$2.29	\$.44		

^aData for indirect openings are based on a systematic one-third sample.

^bNo cases.

^cNot applicable.

TABLE 51.--Percentage distribution of orders by source^a and action taken by agency, percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, and action taken by agency; November 1965 - March 1966

Action taken by Agency	Orders		Openings					
	Direct	Indirect	Total	Direct		Total	Indirect	
	Total	Total		Male Specified	Female Specified		Male Specified	Female Specified
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	338	1142	820	570	167	2011	878	786
No Action	42.1	76.9	31.7	26.0	35.9	75.4	65.4	80.0
Referral	56.4	22.6	67.6	73.3	62.9	24.3	34.4	19.4
Referral Attempt	0.5	0.5	0.7	0.7	1.2	0.3	0.2	0.6

^aData for indirect openings are based on a systematic one-third sample.

TABLE 52.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, occupational category and action taken by agency; November 1965 - March 1966

Occupational Category	Source of Order							
	Direct				Indirect			
	Total	No Action	Referral	Referral Attempted	Total	No Action	Referral	Referral Attempted
Total Number	100.0 820	100.0 260	100.0 554	100.0 6 ^b	100.0 2011	100.0 1516	100.0 488	100.0 7 ^b
Male Specified								
Total	69.5	56.9	75.4	..	43.7	37.9	61.9	..
Professional & Managerial	1.7	2.7	.9	..	1.7	1.8	1.2	..
Clerical & Sales	6.7	12.3	4.2	..	11.9	13.0	8.6	..
Skilled	10.0	22.7	4.2	..	5.6	6.9	1.8	..
Semiskilled	18.2	11.9	21.3	..	9.7	5.7	21.5	..
Service	2.9	2.7	3.1	..	5.4	3.9	10.2	..
Unskilled	29.9	4.6	41.7	..	9.3	6.5	18.2	..
Unknown	0.1	0.0	0.0	..	0.1	0.1	0.2	..
Female Specified								
Total	20.4	23.1	18.9	..	39.1	41.5	31.0	..
Professional & Managerial	1.2	3.5	.2	..	.6	.7	.4	..
Clerical & Sales	10.0	13.1	8.5	..	29.2	32.5	19.0	..
Skilled	.0	.0	.0	..	.4	.5	.2	..
Semiskilled	.4	.0	.5	..	1.0	.7	1.8	..
Service	7.8	6.5	8.3	..	6.9	6.8	6.7	..
Unskilled	1.0	0.0	1.4	..	0.9	0.3	2.9	..
Both Specified or Unknown								
Total	10.1	20.0	5.7	..	17.2	20.6	7.3	..

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

TABLE 53.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, occupational category and quintile of socio-economic status; November 1965 - March 1966

Occupational Category	Direct						
	Total	1	2	3	4	5	Unknown
Total Number	100.0 820	100.0 117	100.0 169	100.0 72	100.0 142	100.0 319	100.0 1 ^b
Male Specified							
Total	69.5	30.9	47.4	83.3	92.2	82.1	..
Professional & Managerial	1.7	7.8	3.0	.0	.0	.0	..
Clerical & Sales	6.7	23.1	11.8	11.1	.0	.0	..
Skilled	10.0	.0	31.4	36.1	.0	.9	..
Semiskilled	18.3	.0	1.2	34.7	85.9	.3	..
Service	2.9	.0	.0	1.4	6.3	4.4	..
Unskilled	29.8	.0	.0	.0	.0	76.5	..
Unknown	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..
Female Specified							
Total	20.4	32.5	34.3	7.5	6.3	17.9	..
Professional & Managerial	1.2	6.8	1.2	.0	.0	.0	..
Clerical & Sales	10.0	22.2	33.1	.0	.0	.0	..
Skilled	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	..
Semiskilled	.4	.0	.0	4.7	.0	2.2	..
Service	7.8	2.6	.0	2.8	6.3	15.7	..
Unskilled	1.0	.9	.0	.0	.0	.0	..
Unknown	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..
Both Specified or Unknown							
Total	10.1	36.6	18.3	9.2	1.5	0.0	..

^aData for indirect openings are based on a systematic one-third sample.

^bDistributions involving numbers less than 15 were not computed.

TABLE 53.--Continued

Occupational Category	Indirect						
	Total	1	2	3	4	5	Unknown
Total Number	100.0 2011	100.0 439	100.0 815	100.0 211	100.0 254	100.0 260	100.0 32
Male Specified							
Total	43.7	32.8	25.4	86.6	43.4	80.0	..
Professional & Managerial	1.7	6.4	.9	.0	.0	.0	..
Clerical & Sales	11.7	26.0	10.0	18.9	.0	.0	..
Skilled	5.3	.0	7.7	18.9	1.2	.0	..
Semiskilled	9.6	.0	6.7	39.3	20.1	.8	..
Service	5.4	.0	1.1	9.5	19.7	14.6	..
Unskilled	8.7	.0	.0	.0	2.4	64.6	..
Unknown	1.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..
Female Specified							
Total	39.1	58.3	41.4	6.6	51.9	16.5	..
Professional & Managerial	.6	2.3	.2	.0	.0	.0	..
Clerical & Sales	29.2	55.6	41.6	2.8	.0	.0	..
Skilled	.4	.2	.0	3.3	.0	.0	..
Semiskilled	1.0	.2	.1	.5	7.0	.4	..
Service	6.9	.0	.0	.0	44.9	8.8	..
Unskilled	.9	.0	.0	.0	.0	7.3	..
Unknown	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	..
Both Specified or Unknown							
Total	1 .	8.9	33.2	6.8	4.7	3.5	..

TABLE 54—Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, and quintile of socio-economic status; November 1965–March 1966

Sex Specified	Socio-economic Status							
	Total	Number	1	2	3	4	5	Unknown
				(High)			(Low)	
Direct								
Total	100.0	820	14.3	20.6	8.8	17.3	38.9	0.1
Male	100.0	570	6.4	14.0	10.5	23.0	46.1	0.0
Female	100.0	167	22.3	34.7	3.0	5.4	34.1	0.0
Both or Unknown	100.0	83	51.9	37.3	8.4	2.4	.0	0.0
Indirect								
Total	100.0	2011	21.8	40.6	10.5	12.6	12.9	1.6
Male	100.0	878	16.4	23.6	20.8	12.5	23.7	3.0
Female	100.0	786	32.6	43.0	1.8	16.7	5.5	0.4
Both or Unknown	100.0	347	11.3	77.8	4.0	3.7	2.6	0.6

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 55.--Male target industries, number of employees, and per cent Negro, San Francisco - Oakland Standard Metropolitan Statistical area; 1960

Industry	Number of Employees	Per cent Negro
Footwear, excluding rubber (manufactured)	211	0.0
Banking, finance	11,738	.5
Electric and gas utilities	7,613	.8
Legal and miscellaneous professions	14,893	.9
Communications	8,961	1.2
Electrical machines (manufactured)	12,136	1.5
Food, dairy (retail)	18,150	1.5
Mining	1,469	1.6
Drug stores	3,001	1.6
Miscellaneous (retail)	10,113	1.6
Hardware, building materials (retail)	5,379	1.7
Furniture (retail)	6,605	1.8
Yarn, thread mills (manufactured)	211	1.9
Petroleum (manufactured)	10,017	2.2
Machinery, excluding electrical	13,733	2.3
Printing, publishing, and allied industries	18,577	2.3
Private education	4,469	2.4
All other durable goods (manufactured) ^a	3,426	2.5
Forestry and fisheries	616	2.7
Gasoline service stations	7,758	2.7
Miscellaneous repair service	5,195	2.8
Paper and allied products (manufactured)	6,750	3.0
Wholesale trade	35,157	3.1
General merchandise and variety stores (retail)	8,659	3.2
Apparel, accessories (retail)	4,423	3.3
Insurance and real estate	24,145	3.3
Bakery products (manufactured)	5,011	3.4
Apparel and other fabricated textiles	1,885	3.5
Total	250,178	2.2

^aIndicates manufacture of durable items not specified in census listing, not necessarily those not specified here.

TABLE 56.--Female target industries, number of employees and per cent Negro; San Francisco - Oakland Standard Metropolitan Statistical area; 1960

Industry	Number of Employees	Per cent Negro
Mining	319	0.0
Nonferrous metals	528	.0
Motor vehicle (retail)	1,526	.3
Electric and gas utilities	1,298	.4
Hardware, building materials	1,247	.6
Printing, publishing and allied industries	5,761	.8
Machinery, excluding electrical	3,234	.9
Petroleum (manufactured)	1,516	.9
Aircraft (manufactured)	330	1.0
Banking, finance	14,298	1.1
Electrical machinery	5,986	1.3
Trucking and warehousing	1,585	1.3
Miscellaneous transportation	939	1.3
Legal and miscellaneous professions	6,671	1.3
Wholesale trade	11,744	1.4
Water supply and sanitation	552	1.4
Air transportation	2,504	1.7
Construction	4,091	1.8
Yarn, thread, fabric mills	224	1.8
All other retail trade ^a	6,015	1.8
Fabricated metals	3,375	1.9
Education, private	7,343	1.9
All other durable goods (manufactured) ^b	1,597	2.0
Miscellaneous repair	601	2.0
Stone, clay, and glass products	1,887	2.1
Rubber and plastic products	523	2.1
Food, dairy (retail)	6,952	2.1
Business services	8,270	2.1
Total	100,916	1.5

^aIndicates retailing of all items not specified in census listing, not necessarily those not specified here.

^bIndicates manufacture of durable items not specified in census listing, not necessarily those not specified here.

TABLE 57.--Male target occupations, number of employees, and per cent Negro, San Francisco - Oakland Standard Metropolitan Statistical area; 1960

Occupation	Number of Employees	Per cent Negro
Locomotive firemen	262	0.0
Power station operators	304	.0
Spinners and weavers of textiles	24	.0
Artist, art teachers	1,631	.0
College presidents, professors, instructors	3,641	.2
Engineers	17,992	.3
Linemen, servicemen; telegraph, telephone and power	4,513	.3
Accountants, auditors	10,485	.5
Authors, editors, reporters	1,798	.5
Dentists	1,832	.6
Managers, officials, proprietors; salaried ^a	45,006	.6
Architects	1,184	.7
Pharmacists	1,526	.7
Foremen; non-durable goods	3,499	.7
Natural scientists	1,612	.8
Salesmen, clerks	40,732	.8
Tool and die makers	1,537	.8
Brakemen, Switchmen	1,101	.8
Meatcutters	3,746	.9
Farmers, farm managers	4,636	1.0
Designers, draftmen	5,162	1.0
Managers, officials, proprietors (specified) ^b	13,266	1.0
Teachers (not elsewhere classified)	1,078	1.1
Foremen; durable goods	4,339	1.1
Bookkeepers	2,394	1.2
Lawyers, judges	4,164	1.3
All other professionals and technicians ^c	20,282	1.3
Stationary engineers	4,540	1.3
Firemen, fire patrol	4,166	1.4
Physicians, surgeons	5,170	1.5
Officials and inspectors; state and local	2,318	1.5
Managers, officials, proprietors (self-employed) ^a	27,321	1.5
Compositors, typesetters	3,361	1.7
Printing (excluding compositors, typesetters)	2,956	2.3
Fishermen, oystermen	241	1.7
Teachers; secondary	4,367	1.9
Cabinetmakers, patternmakers	1,697	1.9
Tailors, furriers	658	2.0
Blacksmiths, forgemen, hammermen	338	2.1
Social scientists	1,195	2.2
Total	254,066	1.0

^aSince Dictionary of Occupational Titles does not differentiate between salaried and self-employed, all are included here since self-employed would not be expected to use employment service.

^bThose included in "specified" are unknown; all were included in target group.

^cIncludes all not specifically noted in list, with the exception of Chemists, Clergymen, Musicians and music teachers, Social and welfare workers, Teachers; primary school and kindergarten, Laboratory technicians and assistants, Technicians (except laboratory).

TABLE 58.--Female target occupations, number of employees, and per cent Negro, San Francisco - Oakland Standard Metropolitan Statistical area; 1960

Occupation	Number of Employees	Per cent Negro
Authors, editors, reporters	880	0.0
Spinners, weavers of textiles	28	.0
Farmers, farm managers	245	.0
College presidents, professors, instructors	956	.4
Secretaries	31,988	.7
Bookkeepers	15,853	1.0
Artists, art teachers	787	1.1
Designers, draftsmen	736	1.2
Physicians, surgeons	539	1.5
Managers, officials, proprietors (salaried) ^a	7,485	1.5
Salesmen, clerks	25,356	1.6
Student nurses (RN)	783	1.7
Stenographers	6,440	1.8
Salesworkers (except clerks), real estate, insurance brokers	1,333	1.9
Specified managers, officials ^b	4,444	2.0
Natural scientists	481	1.9
Actors, dancers, entertainers	609	2.1
Machinery (including electrical) operatives	2,245	2.1
Foremen	1,116	2.2
Telephone operators	7,197	2.3
Other professional and kindred workers ^c	6,286	2.5
Teachers (not elsewhere classified)	1,919	2.6
Social scientists	518	2.7
Accountants and auditors	2,931	2.8
Total	121,137	1.4

^aSince Dictionary of Occupational Titles does not differentiate between salaried and self-employed, all are included here since self-employed would not be expected to use employment service.

^bThose included in "specified" are unknown; all were included in target group.

^cIncludes all not specifically noted in list except: Dieticians, Lawyers and judges, Musicians and music teachers, Registered Nurses, Social and welfare workers, Teachers; primary school and kindergarten, Teachers; secondary school and principals, Laboratory technicians and assistants, Healers and medical service occupations (not elsewhere classified).

TABLE 59.--Employed Population of San Francisco - Oakland Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area by race, type of industries, and type of occupations; 1960

Item	Number	Per cent of Employed	Per cent of Negro Employed
Total employed	1,076,002	100.0	a
(1) In Target Industries	351,094	32.6	a
(2) In Target Occupations	375,203	34.9	a
Total Males Employed	699,777	65.0	59.6
Total Females Employed	376,225	35.0	40.4
Total Negroes Employed	75,405	7.0	100.0
(1) In Target Industries	7,056	.7	9.4
(2) In Target Occupations	4,193	.4	5.6
Total Males Employed	699,777	100.0	a
(1) In Target Industries	250,178	35.8	a
(2) In Target Occupations	254,066	36.3	a
Total Negro Males Employed	44,992	6.4	100.0
(1) In Target Industries	5,549	.8	12.3
(2) In Target Occupations	2,439	.3	5.4
Total Females Employed	376,225	100.0	a
(1) In Target Industries	100,916	26.8	a
(2) In Target Occupations	121,137	32.2	a
Total Negro Females Employed	45,238	12.0	100.0
(1) In Target Industries	1,507	.4	3.3
(2) In Target Occupations	1,754	0.5	3.9

^aNot applicable.

TABLE 60.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified and type of industry; November 1965 - March 1966

Source of Order	Type of Industry						
			Non-Target	Target			
	Total	Number	Total	Total	Male Specified	Female Specified	Both Specified
Total							
Direct	100.0	820	56.7	43.3	18.0	11.1	14.2
Indirect	100.0	2011	36.6	63.4	19.8	14.0	29.6
Male Specified							
Direct	100.0	570	74.6	25.5	16.7	b	8.7
Indirect	100.0	878	51.6	48.4	11.7	b	36.7
Female Specified							
Direct	100.0	167	77.4	22.6	b	6.6	16.2
Indirect	100.0	786	76.8	23.2	b	7.3	15.9
Both Specified and Unknown							
Direct	100.0	83	12.0	88.0	22.9	16.9	48.2
Indirect	100.0	347	11.8	88.2	40.4	4.9	42.9

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bOccupations which were only "target" for opposite sex were included with "total" when sex was specified.

TABLE 61.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, occupational category and type of industry; November 1965 - March 1966

Occupational Category	Source of Order											
	Direct						Indirect					
	Total	Non-Target	Total	Male Target	Female Target	Male & Female Target	Total	Non-Target	Total	Male Target	Female Target	Male & Female Target
Total Number	100.0 820	100.0 405	100.0 355	100.0 148	100.0 90	100.0 117	100.0 2011	100.0 736	100.0 1275	100.0 105	100.0 207	100.0 321
Male Specified												
Total	69.5	77.4	59.2	64.3	72.3	42.8	43.6	33.3	49.5	26.3	73.8	53.5
Professional & Managerial	1.7	.8	2.8	.7	2.2	6.0	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.5	2.9	1.5
Clerical & Sales	6.7	2.4	12.4	17.6	6.7	10.3	11.9	3.4	16.7	4.0	4.6	31.0
Skilled	10.0	7.3	13.5	23.0	6.7	6.8	5.6	3.9	6.6	2.3	15.0	5.5
Semiskilled	18.3	23.7	11.3	16.2	10.0	6.0	9.6	4.9	12.3	9.8	30.3	5.5
Service	2.9	3.4	2.3	.0	6.7	1.7	5.4	9.1	3.3	1.7	7.5	2.3
Unskilled	29.9	39.8	16.9	6.8	40.0	12.0	9.4	10.4	8.8	7.0	13.5	7.7

TABLE 61.--Continued.

	Female Specified											
	20.4	20.4	20.3	23.0	12.2	23.0	39.1	61.2	26.4	38.5	20.4	21.2
Total	20.4	20.4	20.3	23.0	12.2	23.0	39.1	61.2	26.4	38.5	20.4	21.2
Professional & Managerial	1.2	2.1	.0	.0	.0	.0	.6	1.4	.1	.0	.4	.2
Clerical & Sales	10.0	5.6	15.8	16.2	12.2	18.0	29.2	40.0	23.1	32.7	18.9	18.5
Skilled	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.5	.3	.5	1.5	.0	.2
Semiskilled	.4	.0	.8	2.0	.0	.0	1.0	.9	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.2
Service	7.8	12.5	1.7	1.4	.0	3.4	6.9	18.1	.4	.8	.0	.3
Unskilled	1.0	1.2	2.0	3.4	0.0	1.7	0.9	0.5	1.2	2.5	0.0	0.8
	Both Specified and Unknown											
Total	10.1	1.2	20.5	12.7	15.5	34.1	17.3	5.5	24.1	35.2	5.8	25.3

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 62.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified and industrial category;
November 1965 - March 1966

Industry	Sex Specified					
	Male Specified		Female Specified		Both Specified and Unknown	
	Direct	Indirect	Direct	Indirect	Direct	Indirect
Total Number	100.0 570	100.0 878	100.0 167	100.0 786	100.0 83	100.0 347
Construction	1.6	1.9	1.8	0.5	1.2	0.6
Manufacturing	12.8	24.8	10.2	7.8	1.2	6.6
Transportation	18.6	1.6	2.4	1.9	1.2	.3
Communication	6.7	1.8	.6	.5	2.4	.0
Utilities	1.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.3
Wholesale	1.4	19.0	2.4	7.5	1.2	3.5
Retail	7.0	15.0	22.7	29.9	12.0	40.9
Finance	4.6	1.4	5.4	5.5	10.8	2.3
Service	13.5	22.3	19.2	31.0	60.2	41.8
Private Household	.7	.9	25.7	.6	.0	.0
Government	31.7	11.2	9.6	4.8	9.6	3.7
Non-classifiable & Others	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 63.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, and occupation; November 1965 - March 1966

Source of Order	Type of Occupation						
			Non-Target	Target			
	Total	Number	Total	Total	Male Specified	Female Specified	Both Specified
Total							
Direct	100.0	820	80.4	19.6	1.5	6.6	11.5
Indirect	100.0	2011	70.6	29.4	1.4	4.7	23.3
Male Specified							
Direct	100.0	570	95.9	4.1	1.6	b	2.5
Indirect	100.0	878	76.7	23.3	1.8	b	21.5
Female Specified							
Direct	100.0	167	77.8	22.2	b	4.2	18.0
Indirect	100.0	786	75.3	24.7	b	8.5	16.2
Both Specified and Unknown							
Direct	100.0	83	31.3	68.7	2.4	4.8	61.5
Indirect	100.0	347	53.3	46.7	1.1	1.1	44.5

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bOccupations which were only "target" for opposite sex were included with "total" when sex was specified.

TABLE 64.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, type of occupation and type of industry; November 1966 - March 1966

Type of Occupation	Type of Industry											
	Direct			Indirect								
	Total	Non-Target	Target	Total	Non-Target	Target						
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent		
Total	820	100.0	465	100.0	355	100.0	2011	100.0	736	100.0	1275	100.0
	Male Specified											
Total	570	69.5	360	77.4	210	59.2	875	43.5	245	33.3	630	49.4
Non-Target	504	61.5	353	75.9	151	42.5	647	32.2	223	30.3	424	33.3
Target	66	8.0	7	1.5	59	16.6	228	11.3	22	3.0	206	16.1
	Female Specified											
Total	167	20.4	95	20.4	72	20.3	786	39.1	450	61.2	336	26.4
Non-Target	122	14.9	82	17.6	40	11.3	584	29.0	409	55.7	175	13.8
Target	45	5.5	13	2.8	32	9.0	202	10.1	41	5.5	151	12.6
	Both Specified and Unknown											
Total	83	10.1	10	2.1	73	20.5	350	17.4	41	5.5	309	24.2

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 65.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, type of industry, and expected duration of job; November 1965 - March 1966

Duration of Job	Source of Order					
	Direct			Indirect		
	Total	Non-Target	Target	Total	Non-Target	Target
Total Number	100.0 820	100.0 360	100.0 210	100.0 2011	100.0 736	100.0 1275
Male Specified						
Total	69.5	77.4	59.2	43.7	33.3	49.6
Three Days or More-Full Time	63.7	75.1	48.8	40.0	30.0	45.5
Three Days or More-Part Time	.8	1.5	.0	1.1	1.1	1.1
Less Than Three Days	5.0	.8	10.4	2.3	1.7	2.7
Unknown	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.5	0.3
Female Specified						
Total	20.4	20.4	20.3	39.1	61.2	26.4
Three Days or More-Full Time	13.1	12.7	13.5	32.9	53.7	20.9
Three Days or More-Part Time	5.9	6.7	4.8	4.0	6.5	2.5
Less Than Three Days	1.2	.6	2.0	2.0	.7	2.9
Unknown	0.8	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.1
Both Specified and Unknown						
Total	10.1	2.1	20.5	17.2	5.5	24.0

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 66.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, type of industry, and work experience; November 1965 - March 1966

Work Experience	Source of Order					
	Direct			Indirect		
	Total	Non-Target	Target	Total	Non-Target	Target
Total Number	100.0 820	100.0 465	100.0 355	100.0 2011	100.0 245	100.0 633
Male Specified						
Total	69.5	77.4	59.2	43.7	33.3	49.6
Experience Specified	2.3	2.4	2.3	12.0	11.7	12.2
Required; Not Specified	12.7	8.0	18.9	15.6	12.1	17.6
Not Mentioned	54.5	67.0	38.0	15.7	9.5	19.3
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	.4	0.0	0.5
Median	c	1 - 9	2 - 9	2 - 7	1 - 3	3 - 5 ^b
Female Specified						
Total	20.4	20.4	20.3	39.1	61.2	26.4
Experience Specified	1.5	.6	2.5	3.5	3.7	3.5
Required; Not Specified	.0	5.2	7.6	15.8	17.5	14.8
Not Mentioned	6.2	14.6	10.2	19.6	39.7	7.9
Other	12.7	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.2
Median	c	1 - 10	1 - 4	1 - 5	1 - 2	1 - 7
Both Specified or Unknown						
Total	10.1	2.1	20.5	17.2	5.5	24.0

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bDue to openings for 11 jobs requiring two years experience -- eliminating these as anomalous, median is 2 years, 3 months.

^cMedian for total openings would not be meaningful for analysis.

TABLE 67.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, type of industry and wage offered: November 1965 - March 1966^b

Wage	Source of Order					
	Direct			Indirect		
	Total	Non-Target	Target	Total	Non-Target	Target
	Male Specified					
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Number	570	425	145	878	452	426
\$.00 - .99	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2
1.00 - 1.49	4.9	4.9	4.8	2.7	2.7	2.8
1.50 - 1.99	15.4	14.6	17.9	22.4	19.0	26.1
2.00 - 2.49	13.2	4.2	39.3	17.7	14.0	20.7
2.50 - 2.99	37.9	42.1	25.5	22.2	30.5	13.4
3.00 - 3.49	5.8	5.8	2.8	6.6	10.0	3.0
3.50 and above	1.9	.9	4.8	4.8	5.1	4.5
Wage Plus Live-in Benefits	.9	1.2	.0	.8	1.1	.5
Commission Only or Commission with Salary	1.2	.5	3.5	21.1	21.1	28.1
Unknown	18.6	24.5	1.4	1.6	2.4	0.7
Median Wage for Known Wages	c	\$ 2.64	\$ 2.32	c	\$ 2.57	\$ 2.15

TABLE 67.--Continued.

	Female Specified					
	100.0 167	100.0 129	100.0 38	100.0 786	100.0 603	100.0 183
Total Number						
\$.00 - .99	10.2	13.2	0.0	0.8	0.8	0.6
1.00 - 1.49	15.6	16.3	13.2	9.9	11.5	4.9
1.50 - 1.99	42.5	41.9	44.7	57.6	65.3	32.2
2.00 - 2.49	17.3	12.4	34.2	22.7	14.3	50.3
2.50 - 2.99	2.4	3.1	.0	4.3	2.8	9.3
3.00 - 3.49	.6	.8	.0	.4	.3	.5
3.50 and above	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0
Wage Plus Live-in Benefits	7.2	9.3	.0	.9	1.2	.0
Commission Only or Commission with Salary	1.2	1.5	.0	.6	.8	.0
Unknown	3.0	1.5	7.9	2.8	3.0	2.2
Median Wage For Known Wages	c	\$ 1.66	\$ 1.87	c	\$ 1.76	\$ 2.11

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants from each of three groups.

^bTarget industries are sex specific.

^cMedian for total openings would not be meaningful for analysis.

TABLE 68.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, type of industry and socio-economic status of job; November 1965 - March 1966

Socio-economic Status Quintile	Source of Order					
	Direct			Indirect		
	Total	Non-Target	Target	Total	Non-Target	Target
Male Specified						
Total Number	100.0 569	100.0 424	100.0 145	100.0 853	100.0 436	100.0 417
1	6.3	1.2	21.4	16.9	3.7	30.7
2	14.1	7.3	33.8	24.1	27.3	20.9
3	10.5	7.1	20.7	21.5	21.8	21.1
4	23.0	28.8	6.2	12.9	18.3	7.2
5	46.1	55.6	17.9	24.6	28.9	20.1
Median	3.8	4.1	1.9	2.4	2.9	1.9
Female Specified						
Total Number	100.0 167	100.0 129	100.0 38	100.0 449	100.0 601	100.0 181
1	22.8	18.6	36.9	34.1	29.6	43.1
2	34.7	27.9	57.9	33.2	42.1	46.9
3	1.2	1.6	.0	1.1	1.8	1.7
4	7.2	8.5	2.6	25.8	20.3	5.0
5	34.1	43.4	2.6	5.8	6.2	3.3
Median	1.8	3.3	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.2

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 69.--Percentage distribution of openings by source^a, sex specified, type of industry, and action taken by agency; November 1965 - March 1966

Action Taken by Agency	Source of Order					
	Direct			Indirect		
	Total	Non-Target	Target	Total	Non-Target	Target
Total Number	100.0 820	100.0 465	100.0 355	100.0 2011	100.0 736	100.0 1275
Male Specified						
Total	69.4	77.4	58.9	43.7	33.3	49.6
No Action	18.0	8.6	30.4	28.5	21.3	32.7
Referral	50.9	68.6	27.6	15.1	12.0	16.7
Referral Attempt	0.5	0.2	0.9	0.1	0.0	0.2
Female Specified						
Total	20.4	20.4	20.3	39.0	61.2	26.3
No Action	7.4	7.5	7.0	31.2	54.1	18.2
Referral	12.8	12.7	13.0	7.6	6.9	7.9
Referral Attempt	1.2	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2
Both Specified and Unknown						
Total	10.2	2.1	20.8	17.3	5.5	24.1

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 70.--Result of Service^a for Project applicants, by source^b, sex, ethnic group, and age group, on orders placed during November 1965 - March 1966

Item	Source of Order					
	Direct			Indirect		
	Total Referred	Offered Jobs		Total Referred	Offered Jobs	
	Number	Number	Per cent	Number	Number	Per cent
Total	418	198	47.4	452	84	18.5
Sex						
Male	251	122	48.6	308	62	20.1
Female	167	76	45.5	145	22	15.2
Ethnic Group						
Non-Minority	37	15	40.5	98	17	17.3
Negro	304	141	46.4	276	46	16.7
Mexican-American	70	40	57.1	119	29	24.4
Age Group						
Less than 22 years	81	41	50.6	86	18	20.9
22 - 24 years	80	37	46.2	104	17	16.3
25 - 44 years	228	100	43.8	215	38	17.7
45 years and over	41	20	48.8	48	11	22.9

^aVariation in number is due to coding error or missing information

^bThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 71.--Percentage distribution of result of service for Project applicants, type of industry, and sex, on orders placed during November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Industry	Source of Order			
	Direct		Indirect	
	Referred Only	Offered Jobs	Referred Only	Offered Jobs
Total Number	100.0 230	100.0 198	100.0 369	100.0 84
Male				
Total	60.5	61.6	66.7	73.8
Non-Target	24.3	32.3	19.0	29.8
Target	36.2	29.3	47.7	44.0
Female				
Total	39.5	38.4	33.3	26.2
Non-Target	18.7	23.2	14.1	9.5
Target	20.8	15.2	19.2	16.7

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 72.--Percentage distribution of result of service for Project applicants^a, by source^b, type of industry, sex and ethnic group, on orders placed during November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Industry	Source of Order			
	Direct		Indirect	
	Referred Only	Offered Jobs	Referred Only	Offered Jobs
Total Number	100.0 232	100.0 198	100.0 379	100.0 94
Non-Minority				
Total	9.5	7.6	15.6	18.1
Non-Target	3.5	4.0	5.0	5.3
Target	6.0	3.6	10.6	12.8
Negro				
Total	74.6	71.2	67.3	59.6
Non-Target	29.8	40.4	22.2	19.2
Target	44.8	30.8	45.1	40.4
Mexican-American				
Total	12.9	20.2	14.7	19.1
Non-Target	8.6	10.6	6.3	8.5
Target	4.3	9.6	8.4	10.6
Other and Unknown				
Total	3.0	1.0	2.4	3.2
Non-Target	.9	.5	.3	2.1
Target	2.1	0.5	2.1	1.1

^aVariation in number is due to coding error or missing information.

^bThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 73.--Percentage distribution of result of service for Project applicants, by source^a, type of industry, and age group, on orders placed during November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Industry	Source of Order			
	Direct		Indirect	
	Referred Only	Offered Jobs	Referred Only	Offered Jobs
Total Number	100.0 233	100.0 198	100.0 369	100.0 84
Less than 22 Years				
Total	17.6	20.7	18.4	21.5
Non-Target	7.3	10.1	4.6	4.8
Target	10.3	10.6	13.8	16.7
22 - 24 Years				
Total	18.5	18.7	23.6	20.2
Non-Target	6.9	11.1	9.2	11.9
Target	11.6	7.6	14.4	8.3
25 - 44 Years				
Total	54.9	50.5	48.0	45.2
Non-Target	25.3	29.3	14.1	16.7
Target	29.6	21.2	33.9	28.5
45 Years and Over				
Total	9.0	10.1	10.0	13.1
Non-Target	3.9	5.6	5.1	6.0
Target	5.1	4.5	4.9	7.1

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 74.--Result of service for Project applicants, by source^a, sex, ethnic group^b, age group, and type of industry, on orders placed during November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Industry	Source of Order					
	Direct			Indirect		
	Total Referred	Offered Jobs	Per cent	Total Referred	Offered Jobs	Per cent
	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Per cent
Non-Target Target	Male					
	120 141	64 58	53.3 41.1	95 213	25 37	26.3 17.4
Non-Target Target	Female					
	89 78	46 30	51.7 36.5	60 85	8 14	13.3 16.5
Non-Target Target	Non-Minority					
	15 21	8 7	50.0 33.3	24 52	5 12	20.8 23.1
Non-Target Target	Negro					
	149 165	80 61	53.6 37.0	102 209	18 38	17.6 18.2

TABLE 74.--Continued

		Mexican-American					
Non-Target Target		41	2	51.2	32	8	25.0
		29	19	65.5	42	10	23.8
Less than 22 Years							
Non-Target Target		37	20	54.1	21	4	19.0
		45	21	46.7	65	14	21.5
22 - 24 Years							
Non-Target Target		38	22	57.8	44	10	22.7
		42	15	35.7	60	7	11.6
25 - 44 Years							
Non-Target Target		117	58	49.6	66	14	21.2
		111	42	37.8	149	24	16.1
45 Years and Over							
Non-Target Target		20	11	55.0	24	5	20.8
		21	9	42.8	24	6	25.0

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bNumber too small to compute other and unknown.

TABLE 75.--Percentage distribution of result of service for Project applicants, by source^a, type of occupation, and sex, on orders placed during November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Occupation	Source of Order			
	Direct		Indirect	
	Referred Only	Offered Jobs	Referred Only	Offered Jobs
Total Number	100.0 230	100.0 198	100.0 369	100.0 84
Male				
Total	60.5	61.6	66.7	73.8
Non-Target	52.2	57.1	60.7	66.7
Target	8.3	4.5	6.0	7.1
Female				
Total	39.5	38.4	33.3	26.2
Non-Target	24.3	35.4	25.2	15.5
Target	15.2	3.0	8.1	10.7

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 76.--Percentage distribution of result of service for Project applicants^a, by source^b, type of occupation, sex, and ethnic group, on orders placed during November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Occupation	Source of Order			
	Direct		Indirect	
	Referred Only	Offered Jobs	Referred Only	Offered Jobs
Total Number	100.0 232	100.0 198	100.0 379	100.0 94
Non-Minority				
Total	9.5	7.6	15.6	18.1
Non-Target	7.3	6.6	12.4	12.8
Target	2.2	1.0	3.2	5.3
Negro				
Total	74.6	71.2	67.3	59.6
Non-Target	54.8	67.2	57.5	43.6
Target	19.8	4.0	9.8	16.0
Mexican-American				
Total	12.9	20.2	14.7	19.1
Non-Target	11.2	17.7	13.9	14.8
Target	1.7	2.5	0.8	4.3
Other and Unknown				
Total	3.0	1.0	2.4	3.2
Non-Target	2.6	1.0	2.1	3.2
Target	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.0

^aVariation in number is due to coding error or missing information.

^bThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 77.--Percentage distribution of result of service for Project applicants, by source^a, type of occupation, and age group, on orders placed during November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Occupation	Source of Order			
	Direct		Indirect	
	Referred Only	Offered Jobs	Referred Only	Offered Jobs
Total Number	100.0 233	100.0 198	100.0 369	100.0 84
Less than 22 Years				
Total	17.6	20.7	18.4	21.5
Non-Target	15.9	20.2	16.0	14.4
Target	1.7	0.5	2.4	7.1
22 - 24 Years				
Total	18.5	18.7	23.6	20.2
Non-Target	14.6	17.7	19.8	19.0
Target	3.9	1.0	3.8	1.2
24 - 45 Years				
Total	54.9	50.5	48.0	45.2
Non-Target	39.4	46.0	41.2	38.1
Target	15.5	4.5	6.8	7.1
45 Years and Over				
Total	9.0	10.1	10.0	13.1
Non-Target	6.0	8.6	8.9	10.7
Target	3.0	1.5	1.1	2.4

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

TABLE 78.--Result of service for Project applicants, by source^a, sex, ethnic group^b, age group, and type of occupation, on orders placed during November 1965 - March 1966

Type of Occupation	Source of Order							
	Direct				Indirect			
	Total Referred	Offered Jobs	Per cent	Total Referred	Offered Jobs	Per cent	Total Referred	Offered Jobs
	Number	Number	Per cent	Number	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
	Male							
Non-Target	223	113	50.7	280	56	20.0		
Target	28	9	32.1	28	6	21.4		
	Female							
Non-Target	126	70	55.5	106	13	12.2		
Target	41	6	14.6	39	9	23.0		
	Non-Minority							
Non-Target	30	13	43.3	59	12	20.3		
Target	7	2	28.6	17	5	29.4		
	Negro							
Non-Target	250	133	53.2	259	41	15.8		
Target	54	8	14.8	52	15	28.8		

TABLE 78.--Continued

		Mexican-American			
Non-Target Target		61	35	57.4	20.9
		9	5	55.5	57.1
Less than 22 Years					
Non-Target Target		76	40	52.6	16.9
		5	1	20.0	40.0
22 - 24 Years					
Non-Target Target		69	35	50.7	18.0
		11	2	18.2	6.7
24 - 45 Years					
Non-Target Target		183	91	49.7	17.4
		45	9	20.0	19.3
45 Years and Over					
Non-Target Target		31	17	54.8	21.4
		10	3	30.0	33.3

^aThis table is based on a random sample of 200 applicants per month from each of three groups.

^bNumber too small to compute other and unknown.

SECTION 4

TRAINING

Introduction

The original application for MDTA funds proposed that 500 Project applicants would be trained. Certain circumstances which existed during the early months of the Project and subsequent developments in Oakland resulted in a situation in which considerably more than 500 Project applicants will have had some exposure to training during the life of the Project. In addition to the MDTA funds obtained specifically for the Project, training opportunities made available through four other types of federal funding are or have been used by the Project for its applicants. The applicants have been referred to (1) regular MDTA courses proposed for the Main Office, (2) courses proposed by the Main Office for the use of Redevelopment Area funds¹, (3) courses proposed for the East Bay Training Center (Skills Center), and (4) On-the-Job Training (OJT) opportunities with industry. Since the Project has had these resources available in addition to its own training funds, this section would be unrealistically restricted if it were confined only to an analysis of results of those courses funded especially for the Project. As a result, data will be presented on all institutional courses in which a substantial number of Project applicants have been involved, but, in addition, Project courses will be singled out for specific consideration. Minor attention will be devoted to OJT opportunities.

Project Funds

On February 7, 1964, an application was made for MDTA funds to train 500 persons in various occupations. The funds sought for training at that time were separate from funds requested for overall administration of the Project.² Although the application for training funds was approved by the regional Review Team³ four days later, funding by the Washington offices

¹The phrase "Redevelopment Area Funds" has been adopted in this report as a convenient reference to both (1) funds supplied by the Area Redevelopment Administration (ARA) prior to its demise and (2) the Redevelopment Area Residents (RAR) funds provided for in Section 241 of the 1965 amendment to the Manpower, Development and Training Act.

²Funds for the overall administration of the Project came from two sources, Bureau of Employment Security and the Ford Foundation. For further discussion of this, see the first Interim Report, Section 9.

³The Review Team is composed of regional representatives of the Bureau of Employment Security and the Department of Health Education and Welfare.

did not occur until June 16, 1964. These training funds became known as California Project 308 (Cal 308) for which \$1,027,485 was allocated--- \$327,668 in training costs, \$657,900 in allowances, and the remainder, \$41,917, for related administrative costs.

One of the major advantages of this multi-occupation training project (i.e., a training project within the Oakland Adult Project) was that the normal lengthy process of obtaining funds for regular MDTA courses¹ could be shortened by making it unnecessary for the state to submit each course to the Washington offices of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare and the Bureau of Employment Security for funding. The Review Team would be able to both approve and fund the individual Cal 308 courses until the allocation was used up.

Regular MDTA Courses for the Main Office

During the planning stages of the Project and later, as it became operative, proposals for training courses using regular MDTA funds were submitted by the Main Office for its applicants. The Main Office courses which began operation after the Project was in operation, served as a second potential source of training for Project applicants. In certain cases, these applicants went to the Main Office where the recruiting was being conducted, and subsequently became trainees. Our records indicate, however, that consistently only a very small percentage of trainees in these courses were persons who had previously registered with the Project.

A notable exception was a regular course originally slated for the Main Office that was completely turned over to the Project. The recruiting of trainees was handled by Project personnel instead of by Main Office personnel, and everyone who was referred to the course technically was a Project applicant. The reader must be alerted to the possibility that persons who became trainees in this course were sent from the Main Office (or, for that matter, from offices in other cities) to a Project office specifically for the purpose of enrolling in the course. In this sense they were Project applicants, but the term may be used here in a very different way than the reader had anticipated. It should, therefore, be made clear that, when the phrase "Project applicant" is used in this report, it has been assigned a very specific operational definition, i.e., a person who has registered at one of the Oakland Adult Project offices (regardless of whether he has also registered at the Main Office).²

Redevelopment Area Funds

As might be expected, regular MDTA courses established for the Main Office did not provide many training opportunities for Project applicants. Courses using Redevelopment Area funds created a somewhat larger number. These funds have been available because Oakland was designated as a redevelopment area in December of 1963. In addition, courses were proposed

¹For a description of how the MDTA funding process works, see Appendix A.

²Because of the volume of applicants, it would have been too time-consuming to determine which applicants registered both places, and to analyze the data for such a group separately.

at the Main Office which, when funded, were handled by the Project (i.e., screening of potential trainees was conducted by the Project). Five courses were handled in this manner. A sixth one, which used Redevelopment Area funds, was proposed only after the Skills Center came into operation and the Main Office was never involved with it.

East Bay Training Center (Skills Center)

In April 1966, the Skills Center began operating. This training facility, which is administered by the Peralta School District, has become closely identified with the Project. The link between the two seems to be three-fold: first, Project personnel have been assigned the responsibility of initiating proposals for those training courses which are to be funded out of the Skills Center allocation; second, the Project has been granted a quota of 55 per cent¹ of all the trainee openings which become available at the Skills Center; and third, the Project Director has been given the responsibility of over-seeing the placement of all Skills Center trainees.

The general purposes of the Skills Center seemed to be three-fold: (1) to provide a place where courses of various descriptions, especially those aimed at preparing applicants for entry into skilled and semi-skilled jobs, could be conducted, (2) to have a facility which could provide basic education as well as vocational training, and (3) to shorten the time required to get courses into operation by having a facility which would, theoretically, have none of the space limitations typical of other educational settings. The Skills Center has faced a series of crises since its inception, but an analysis or even a discussion of these is beyond the scope of this study. Vocational courses at the Skills Center are important to consider in connection with the training opportunities for Project applicants since the majority of trainees at the Skills Center are referred from the Project.

On-the-Job Training (OJT)

In the first Interim Report, it was noted that the Oakland Adult Project Advisory Committee was instrumental in initiating an OJT program in Oakland. Originally, the attempt was made to have the Advisory Committee as one of the parties to the contract, but this turned out to be impossible under MDTA policies. Instead, the City of Oakland became the contractor.

The Mayor's Committee for On-the-Job Training² went into full operation in January 1966. Funded to the amount of \$615,205 for activity to last 18 months, the contract between the City of Oakland and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the U. S. Department of Labor will terminate in August 1967. The contract (and, therefore, the activities of the OJT staff) is under the supervision of an Administrative Council of five members selected by the Mayor: two representing Labor, two representing Management, and one (the chairman) representing the public.

¹In practice, the quotas have been used as guidelines, and the actual percentage of trainees referred by the Project out of total trainees is probably close to, but not exactly, 55 per cent.

²The Mayor's Committee consists of a project director, three OJT developers, and two stenographers.

The stated purpose of the project was to develop a minimum of 800 OJT slots for unemployed workers living in or near Oakland's target area. Particular emphasis was to be placed on training "those whose education had been too limited or generalized to be of help in specific jobs, to train workers displaced or in danger of displacement by automation, to adapt to new job performances and techniques, and to find training and placement opportunities for those who have been functioning below their natural capacity level due to lack of opportunities because of discrimination."¹

OJT subcontracts authorize payment for certain training costs to the owners of establishments where training and employment take place, at the maximum rate of \$25.00 per week per trainee for four to twenty-six weeks. A training plan provides for the methods and content of instruction, scheduling of time within the requirement of a full work week, and progression of trainees sufficient for satisfactory performance in the occupation. Trainees are to be compensated at rates, including periodic increases, that consider such factors as industrial, geographical, union, and government standards and trainee proficiency. The Administrative Council has ruled that, by the end of OJT training, the trainee must be earning at least \$2.00 per hour, unless prevented by a collective bargaining agreement.

Pre-job orientation ("vestibule") training may be provided at employers' sites for an estimated 100 trainees for a maximum of two weeks, to prepare them for on-the-job training, during which they may learn skills peculiar to the firm or to the occupation, or be given instruction comparable to "basic education". During this training, employers are reimbursed a maximum of \$100 per week per trainee, and trainees, if qualified, may receive MDTA training allowances.

The contract requires that the recruitment and screening of potential OJT trainees be done by the California Department of Employment. It provides that trainees may be referred from any one of four sources. The Oakland Adult Project and the Oakland office of the Bay Area Urban League are each to provide a minimum of 200 of the 800 trainees, and other community agencies are to be used as a third possible source. Finally, a sub-contractor may refer candidates to be screened for training at his establishment. When this occurs, they are to be designated "preferred candidates". After the project was in operation, the Administrative Council agreed to set aside 150 of the slots for Mexican Americans, regardless of the source of the referrals.

Since there has been no systematic attempt to collect and analyze data on OJT, only a short overview of the progress of the program will be given at this point. All of the information reported was gathered from an interview with the OJT project director and the information is based on his impressions, not on firm data.

When the staff first started to develop OJT slots, openings were concentrated in Oakland, small firms, and low skilled jobs, and most of the trainees were non-minority males (estimated as 70 per cent non-minority, 90 per cent males). By November 1966, the picture had changed completely. The majority of the slots were in firms employing ten or more workers, and the

¹Negotiated Cost-Reimbursement On the Job Training Contract No. CAJ-76, between the United States of America, Department of Labor, Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training and the City of Oakland, signed June 30, 1961, p. 4.

training was in skilled occupations. To obtain the necessary industrial base, the staff went to firms in Emeryville, Berkeley, and Hayward. Oakland was used mainly for openings for office jobs for women. Approximately 90 per cent of the trainees were minority group members, and 80 per cent were Negro. The demand of the referral agencies for more openings for women shifted the staff's emphasis, so that only 65 per cent of the trainees were male. Again, it should be emphasized that the statistics cited here are based on the impressions of the OJT project director. Data were not analyzed by him nor by this staff to arrive at the figures cited.

The office of the California Department of Employment selected for recruitment and screening is the Oakland Adult Project, not the Main Office, and each office of the Project does the processing for firms in its geographic area. As it has worked out, the Project is not the major source of referrals, although it processes the forms of all trainees.¹ According to estimates of the OJT project director, 40 per cent of the trainees came from the Project, 20 per cent came from the Urban League, and 40 per cent from employer recommendations (individuals already employed by the employer or in his personnel files). A negligible number of the trainees came from the Bureau of Indian Affairs and from the Youth Opportunity Centers, none came from the Main Office. No records are kept by the OJT project staff or the Oakland Adult Project on the means by which each trainee learned of the OJT slot.

Not all of the OJT openings are directed to the Project in the form of a job order. The OJT developers may direct the openings to the Urban League or other agencies. When the Project is used for formal referrals, the Project Director (or sometimes, the OJT project director) tries to give the order first to the office in the firm's geographical area, and since the summer of 1966, also calls the Urban League to inform them of the nature of the openings. If the openings are hard to fill, the order will be transmitted to the three other Project offices.

According to a recap sheet compiled by the OJT project director, the experience up to November 29, 1966, was as follows:

Total training subcontracts developed	343
Total training slots developed	844
Total training slots-no contract written ²	55
Total training slots cancelled ³	163
Total trainees who completed training	146
Total trainees in training	440
Total training slots open ⁴	40

¹Trainees who are not referred, but only processed by the Project are not considered Project applicants. If they make out applications, the notation, "Preselected", is added.

²The OJT staff handled the referrals, but the employers were not reimbursed for any training costs.

³The training slots were cancelled because of situations or activities that ran counter to the training plan.

⁴The slots will remain open until business conditions improve.

Because the OJT project is only indirectly related to the Oakland Adult Project, the Follow-up Study staff does not expect to make a more detailed analysis of the results as such. This section was included only for informational purposes.

Data Presentation

Courses Primarily for Project Applicants

Data on the occupational characteristics of institutional training courses initiated by the California State Employment Service which have had a direct relationship with the Project are presented in Table 79. A number of problems arose in the attempt to establish the total number initiated since January 1964, but our final tabulation indicates that the figure is 91.¹ By far the largest percentage of these courses (39.6) have been directed toward skilled level occupations. It is important to note, however, that skilled level courses comprise a considerably smaller percentage of courses actually started or over (23.5) than of either those pending (42.1) or of those cancelled (44.4).

Equally as interesting are the percentages for clerical-sales and service courses. Clerical-sales courses constitute 29.4 per cent of the courses started (the largest single percentage of those courses), but only 23.7 per cent of those pending and a mere 5.6 per cent of those cancelled. Comparable figures for service courses indicate that they represent nearly one-quarter (23.5) of the courses which have started, only 13.2 per cent of those pending, but almost one-third (30.6) of those cancelled. These results seem to suggest that the staff responsible for developing training programs devoted most of its attention to these three occupational classifications. Together they comprise approximately three-fourths of the courses started and pending, while the skilled and service areas alone account for three-fourths of the courses cancelled. The predominant reasons for cancellations were not the same for each group; in fact, they were markedly different.

It should be noted that only a small percentage of courses considered had actually started by October 31, 1966. The following table documents this point.

Project-Related Training Courses as of October 30, 1966

	Total	Started or Over	Pending	Cancelled
Per cent	100.0	18.7	41.7	39.6
Number	91	17	38	36

A clearer picture of the distribution of courses which had started or were over by October 31 is presented in Table 80. Only five of the seventeen

¹A list of the names of all the courses is contained in Appendix B.

received funds from Cal 308, i.e., were actually Project courses. Equal numbers of courses were funded with (1) MDTA funds reserved for the Skills Center and with (2) Redevelopment Area funds allocated before the Skills Center was established. Only in the case of courses developed to use Skills Center funds did programs aimed at the skilled occupations emerge. The earlier courses--those written for Cal 308 and for the Main Office--were primarily aimed at clerical-sales and service level jobs (eight of eleven courses).

Of these 17 courses, nine were completed and the remainder had at least one section¹ still in progress as of October 31. The first of the 17 began on February 23, 1965, and the first section of the last one began on September 23, 1966. The five Cal 308 courses started between February 23, 1965 and June 20, 1966 and the final section of the last course is scheduled to end on August 4, 1967.

Information on courses either not funded or funded but not started by October 30 is presented in Table 81. Thirty-one of the total 38 were designed to use MDTA funds set aside for the Skills Center; four were written for RAR funds; and only three (all of which were at the clerical-sales level) were written for Cal 308 funds.

None of the four RAR courses pending had been presented to the MDTA Advisory Council as of October 30. Three of the four were proposed to train collectively 510 persons in connection with the special Oakland EDA project described in Section 5 of this report.

Of the three Cal 308 courses, one was funded in November; one is still apparently awaiting funding; and the third has never had a training plan written for it even though the original request was made of the State Department of Vocational Education in October 1965.

Half (19) of the courses pending were to be conducted by the schools. All of them had been assigned to the Skills Center where training plans were being prepared.

Information on courses which had been cancelled by October 31 is given in Table 82. Nearly one-third (11 out of 36) were cancelled before they were presented to the Advisory Council. This group was largely composed of courses tentatively proposed and quickly conceived when the Department of Employment was required to present a group of courses as part of the applications requesting funds for the two multi-occupational projects--Cal 308 and the Skills Center. The staff involved in preparing the original proposals for these projects have indicated that there was virtually no commitment to any of the tentative courses prepared. These "dummy" courses were apparently used only for the purpose of justifying the initial allocation of funds. As a result of the procedure adopted by the Employment Service, no firm conclusions can be drawn from the fact that a third of all cancellations occurred prior to a presentation before the MDTA Advisory Council.

The situation is not the same for courses cancelled by the MDTA Advisory Council, however. One-fourth of all cancellations were made by the Council and two-thirds of them were in skilled areas. Again, the number of cancellations is a bit deceiving because three were cancelled with the recommendation that they be incorporated in another package or rewritten for a related job title.

¹Courses discussed in this report are composed of from one to four sections. In some cases, the sections run concurrently; in other instances, they do not.

The eight courses cancelled at the State level had been submitted as a package which was referred to as Multi-Medical. This title was given even though one of the courses was for a Municipal Laborer. This package had a long history of submissions, changes and resubmissions. The final package was disapproved because sentiment had been expressed by minority group spokesmen that employment opportunities were available to minorities in those eight occupations without prior training, and that training courses were needed in occupations which had more status and which were closed to minority group persons.

Cal 308 Courses

Information on all of the courses that have been written in conjunction with Cal 308 is included in Table 83. There were ten "dummy" proposals in the original application for project training funds, but only one of the ten was subsequently funded from the money allocated for Cal 308. Four others have been funded, but two were granted Redevelopment Area funds and two obtained Skills Center funds. One course was still pending two and one-half after the overall project was approved, but it is awaiting Redevelopment Area funds and is not scheduled to use any of the remaining Cal 308 money. The remaining four have been cancelled.

In addition to the ten original courses, thirteen others were written later for the project. Four of these have been funded; two are pending; and seven (part of the Multi-Medical package) have been cancelled. The question which needs to be answered is: Why were four courses in the original proposal subsequently funded by a source other than Cal 308? This question will be discussed later.

Several important developments have occurred in the funding of Cal 308 courses. First of all, five courses were funded between February 1965 and February 1966; secondly, between January and May 1966, the State Department of Employment "de-obligated"¹ \$194,083 of the original \$657,900 allocated for allowance payments under Cal 308; and finally, two courses were funded much later in November 1966. When this series of events had been completed, the Department of Employment had a commitment for allowance payments which exceeded its newly-established ceiling by \$15,272.

The first five courses are listed below in the order in which they were funded. The figures given are amounts allocated, except in cases where actual expenditures were available for completed courses:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Training Cost</u>	<u>Allowances</u>	
		<u>Allocation</u>	<u>Expenditures</u>
Taxi Driver	\$ 17,045		\$33,499
Clerk General	49,862	\$112,800 ^a	
Assistant Jailer	9,451 ^a		11,411
Radio Dispatcher	8,989		4,828
Grocery Checker	<u>82,841^a</u>	<u>144,000</u>	
Totals	\$168,188	\$256,800	\$49,738

^aRevised quantities

¹"De-obligation" in this instance refers to the release by the state of funds previously committed to it by the federal government.

The two courses funded in November were:

<u>Title</u>	<u>Training Cost</u>	<u>Allocation</u>
Clerk Typist	\$ 49,098	\$69,063
Upholsterer	<u>46,560</u>	<u>103,488</u>
Totals	95,658	\$172,551

Therefore, as of December 1, 1966, the expenditures for completed courses, plus the allocations for those courses not completed, amounted to \$479,089:

Expenditures	\$ 49,738
Allocations:	
First five courses	256,800
Last two courses	<u>172,551</u>
Total	\$479,089

It has been very difficult to trace the series of events which led to the de-obligation of \$194,083. The following summary of events captures the highlights, however. A request for the return of \$175,000 was made to the Office of the Comptroller, Department of Employment, by the Office of the Manpower Administrator, Department of Labor, in January 1966. The actual de-obligation took place, in effect, in three phases--the last occurring in May 1966. The de-obligation involved both unexpended balances on completed courses or sections as well as funds not then allocated for specific courses. The de-obligation which when completed was almost \$20,000 more than the \$175,000 originally requested reduced the original ceiling for expenditure of allowance payments from \$657,900 to \$463,817.

Number of Trainees

The application for Cal 308 funds which was made in February 1964 called for the training of 500 people. As the table below reveals, it will be impossible to reach that goal under the current conditions:

Cal 308 Trainees as of October 30, 1966 ^a			
Occupational Classification	Funded	Pending	Cancelled
Total	207	100	400
Professional and Managerial	15	0	0
Clerical and Sales	95	100 ^a	0
Skilled	0	0	0
Semiskilled	81	0	50
Services	16	0	300
Unskilled	0	0	50

^aThis number is based on two courses, Clerk Typist and Central Office Operator, both of which were being planned for 50 trainees as of October 30. The Clerk Typist was subsequently funded for only 25 in November; the Central Office Operator is technically still pending.

Trainees involved in courses funded as of October 30 (207) plus the number scheduled for courses pending as of that date (100), amount to only 307. When the de-obligation and the November funding are considered, it becomes clear that not even 307 people will receive training under Cal 308. The maximum number will apparently be closer to 272:

Total Cal 308 Trainees

Total	272
First Five Courses	207
Courses Funded in November	65
Clerk Typist ^a	25
Upholsterer ^b	
Section 1	20
Section 2	20

^aThis course carried in the October 30 table as pending with 50 trainees. When funded in November, it was cut in half. -

^bThis course was funded in November (with two sections) from Cal 308 money although it had been written for Skills Center funds.

But, as has been pointed out, the ceiling for allowances already seems to have been exceeded by \$15,272. If the normal contingencies of course operation to not diminish this overcommitment by the time the second Upholsterer section begins, the Department of Employment might be forced to decrease the size of that section and thereby reduce the total number of Cal 308 trainees even more.

When we focus again on all courses primarily available to Project applicants, and not just to those written for Cal 308 (Table 84), we see that 604 Project applicants have been involved in courses already under way and that if all the courses pending as of October 30 are funded, more than two and one-half times that number will receive vocational training. It is virtually assured that one course (Central Office Operator) of 50 persons will not be funded, but the fate of others is not as clear at this time.

Course Completion

There was a very limited number of courses which had at least one section completed by October 30 and whose records were available for analysis. Our information is actually limited to ten courses (Table 85). It was generally true that fewer people were referred to programs than the number for which the course had been prepared. The most dramatic example of this was the last section of the Taxi Driver course, to which only eight applicants were referred, although the class had been scheduled to hold 25. For the entire ten courses, the number of persons referred (397) was 94.5 per cent

of the number of trainees anticipated (420).

As would be expected, not all of the applicants selected (referred) by the employment service to participate in the courses actually began training. Twenty-six of the 397 (6.5 per cent) who were referred failed to begin training. Because records kept by the schools were at times incomplete, and also because of possible coding errors, it is impossible to determine why 14 applicants did not start. Of the remaining 12, five refused referral, and seven did not appear when the course began. Five of the seven were scheduled for a single program--the Groundsman course funded with Redevelopment Area funds.

When all ten courses are considered, 62.5 per cent of the applicants referred to courses completed them. All trainees in two sections completed the course--one was the eight-man Taxi Driver section referred to earlier, and the other was a Working Housekeeper course. In general, clerical programs had the highest attrition, but there was no consistent pattern which might explain this. In one Spanish-speaking section, 30 per cent (8) of the trainees were transferred to the next section of that course in order to permit them to complete the course satisfactorily, and an equal number voluntarily withdrew. Most of the withdrawals tended to indicate dissatisfaction with the course, especially with the amount of allowances received while attending. In another section, 16 people (53.3 per cent) voluntarily withdrew, but nearly all of them (11) left the course because they obtained a training-related job before it was over. The third section had almost an equal number of voluntary (most as a result of training-related jobs obtained before the end of the course) and involuntary (two-fifths of which were because of illness) withdrawals.

Fifty-one per cent of the trainees selected for Cal 308 completed the training. The poorest performance was in the Radio Dispatcher course where five of the fifteen originally selected did not begin for reasons we have been unable to determine. Another five were dismissed because of lack of progress, and another involuntary withdrawal occurred for an unknown reason. After that many departures, the class was too small to warrant continuation and it was cancelled.

A second Cal 308 course which had poor results was the Assistant Jailer. Only one-quarter of the original trainees completed it. In this case, however, nearly all of the terminations were voluntary, and the majority of the trainees who withdrew had obtained a non-training-related job by the time they left.

If we extract certain data from Table 85, it will be possible to compare them with data presented in the 1966 report on training by the Secretary of Labor.¹ His report indicated that, "Since the beginning of the MDTA training program about 1 out of 3 of the trainees had failed to graduate with their classmates." In addition, there was reference to a study (presumably conducted in 1965) which indicated that 35 per cent of the trainees who did not complete left "either to take a job...or for health, family or financial reasons."

¹U.S. Department of Labor. Report of the Secretary of Labor on Manpower Research and Training under the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., March 31, 1966, p. 54.

Data extracted from Table 85 which seem relevant here are presented below:

Project applicants in ten selected courses

<u>Number Started</u>	<u>Number Completed</u>	<u>Per cent Completed</u>
371	248	66.8
<u>Total Withdrawals</u>	<u>Voluntary Withdrawals^a</u>	<u>Per cent Voluntary Withdrawals</u>
123	72	58.5

^aThose who left either to take a job, or for health, family or financial reasons.

It appears that the results available thus far on Project applicants compare favorably with the data reported by the Secretary of Labor. It is not possible to make any definite comparative statements at this time for a number of reasons. The information presented in the Secretary of Labor's Report is quite vague. Although the attrition and follow-up data were quoted in the same paragraph, there is reason to question whether the follow-up data is truly descriptive of the results of the nation as a whole, or of only one specific locale. It is, therefore, impossible to determine with certainty exactly to what our data is being compared. In addition, it is not possible to determine whether courses using Redevelopment Area funds were included in the data presented in the Secretary of Labor's Report. Data on such courses comprise the bulk of the information presently available on Project trainees.

Post-Training Employment

There were only six courses that had been over for three months or more and for which follow-up information had been collected by October 30. For these courses, some information is available about the employment condition of trainees, three, six or twelve months after completion of the course (Table 86). Unfortunately, in some cases, as many as one-third of the trainee records were unavailable either because no report had been completed by the Project staff or because the trainee could not be located. The results tend to indicate that the first and second sections of the Taxi Driver course were the most successful since eight of the eleven people that could be contacted had been employed more than half of the time which had elapsed since their course was over. But, there are at least two very important pieces of information which are missing. First, we have no way of determining what happened to two-thirds of the trainees, and second, it is not clear whether the jobs held by the eight were training-related or not. The information in this table simply does not answer the crucial questions which need to be answered. The final report will provide as many as possible.

Characteristics of Trainees

Although descriptive data are available on the personal characteristics of trainees who were members of sections which concluded before October 30, this information is of limited value also. The major limitation is that there have been so few courses (or even sections) completed that occupational groupings are not meaningful. Although, where more than one course has been completed at an occupational level, they have been combined, we realize that generalizations cannot be made about occupational levels in which only one course is represented. Table 87 is presented merely as a convenient organization of the data currently available.

Table 87 is based on the following courses:

<u>Occupational Classification</u>	<u>Title of Course</u>	<u>Number of Sections</u>
Professional and Managerial	(1) Radio Dispatcher	1
Clerical and Sales	(2) Clerk General (Spanish-speaking)	1
	(3) Clerk General (Spanish-speaking)	1
	(4) Bank Teller	1
	(5) General Salesperson	3
Semiskilled	(6) Taxi Driver	4
Services	(7) Assistant Jailer	1
	(8) Working Housekeeper	1
	(9) Ward Maid	2
Agricultural	(10) Groundsman	<u>1</u>
		18

When the results for the ten courses (eighteen sections) are taken as a whole, half of the individuals referred for training were men and half were women. This overall result in no way reflects the actual composition of the individual sections. Men were referred almost exclusively to the Radio Dispatcher, Taxi Driver, and Groundsman courses, while women obtained the majority of the referrals to clerical-sales and service courses. Since there were four clerical-sales and three service courses, and since the composition of the courses varied at both levels, further elaboration of the table is necessary at this point. At the clerical-sales level, the two Clerk General courses were mixed, but predominantly male (56 to 76 per cent). The Bank Teller and General Salesperson sections, on the other hand, were almost exclusively female (79 per cent or higher). At the service level, only single sex courses existed. The Assistant Jailer program contained only males, whereas the Working Housekeeper and Ward Maid¹ courses had only females. Target and non-target persons comprised virtually the same (roughly 45 per cent) overall percentage of trainees in the classes, but again, this overall picture was not mirrored in the composition of individual courses.

¹The records of one person omitted an indication of sex.

The Taxi Driver course had the highest percentage (81.5) of target persons, and the Clerical-Sales courses had the lowest. Only in the sections at the latter level did non-target persons consistently outnumber target persons.

Negroes accounted for more than two-thirds (68.5 per cent) of all trainees in the ten courses. When viewed from the perspective of ethnic group membership, courses could be considered either (1) regular or (2) Spanish-speaking. In all "regular" courses, except in the first section of the Taxi Driver course¹, Negroes comprised at least three-fourths of the membership. The generalization applies at the Clerical-Sales level, where the Bank Teller and the General Salesperson courses were "regular". The membership of the Clerk General courses, planned for Spanish-speaking persons, was in fact 100 per cent Mexican American or other Spanish-speaking persons.

Results concerning the age of trainees were not surprising. The majority of all trainees were between the ages of 25 and 44. The next largest group was 45 and over for Taxi Driver, Groundsman and the three Service courses, but 22 to 24 years for the Radio Dispatcher and the four Clerical-Sales courses.

Results in relation to educational attainment were also not surprising. The data tend to indicate that educational level is closely related to occupational level. The large percentage of people for whom educational attainment was unknown in the Service occupations can be traced primarily to the fact that none of the records for the Working Housekeeper course contained this information.

The long-term unemployed (persons out of work for 15 weeks or more) composed nearly half of the trainees in the Taxi Driver and Clerical-Sales courses. In other courses, this group constituted from approximate one-quarter to more than one-third of the total. The underemployed², were a sizeable proportion of the total only in the Radio Dispatcher course.

The following statements can be made about the completion rates given in Table 88. When the eighteen sections which had been completed by October 30 are considered as a group, women had a higher percentage of completions (79.7) than men (45.2),³ non-target persons had a slightly higher percentage (62.0) than target persons (57.8); and Negroes had a considerably higher percentage of completion (70.2) than either Mexican Americans (43.1) or non-minorities (55.6). In addition, people 45 and over, high school drop-outs, and individuals unemployed for 27 or more weeks had a higher percentage of completions than did trainees in other age, education, and employment-status categories.

¹In that section, Negroes were 58.6 per cent of the total.

²Defined, in this case, as persons working: (1) 35 - 39 hours per week and less than full time, (2) less than 35 hours per week, (3) under their skill level, or (4) facing impending technological layoff.

³The only exception was that 70.4 per cent of the men in the Taxi Driver course completed training.

Discussion

That there has been an effort on the part of the Employment Service to initiate training courses designed to prepare minority group persons for entry into skilled level jobs seems clear from the results already presented. There were no indications of this emphasis when the courses for Cal 308 were written, however; in fact, only one of the 22 courses which have been considered for Cal 308 was designed for a skilled occupation. That particular course was not subsequently funded with Cal 308 money—it was funded for the Skills Center when those funds were available.

The concentration on courses for skilled occupations did not begin until the Skills Center came into existence. In fact, one of the reasons for establishing the Center, a reason not mentioned earlier, seemed to be the desire on the part of the Employment Service to have a means by which courses at the skilled level could be given. Although there was not a large number of skilled level courses proposed by the Employment Service for Cal 308 which were turned down by labor unions, there was definitely the feeling by the staff involved in writing training courses that it would not be possible to obtain the approval of the Advisory Council for skilled level courses. This belief, which had been apparently established or reinforced by the positions union representatives had taken on courses designated for the Main Office, dictated that courses should be designed for the clerical-sales and service areas where union objection would not be anticipated. The result was that 15 out of the 22 courses considered for Cal 308 were in these two areas, and 3 of the first 5 courses funded on Cal 308 money were at these levels; also.

It is interesting to note that none of the clerical-sales courses proposed for Cal 308, and only two of the sixteen that have been connected with the Project in some way, have been cancelled. On the other hand, all eight service level courses that were proposed for Cal 308, and eleven of the twenty connected with the Project, have been cancelled. The cancellations of the service occupation courses was a direct response to arguments by minority group spokesmen that courses in service occupations were not needed because minority group persons did not have difficulty obtaining such jobs even without training.

Another factor which has had a great effect on the types of courses which have been approved at the local level is the change in the composition of the Alameda County MDTA Advisory Council. At approximately the same time that the Skills Center was being established, the composition of the Advisory Council was becoming tripartite. Whereas, since its inception it had been a committee composed of business and labor (but, primarily labor) representation, the Committee expanded to include minority group representatives. The impact of this new group in the Council has been felt. In a number of cases, the minority group members have been able to out-vote the opposition to a particular training course. It is important to keep in mind that, although regulations do not require the Advisory Council to vote on courses, this Council does, and the local Employment Service managers abide by the decisions of the Council. Therefore, the change in membership has been a very important factor.

Although there is still a great deal of information that is not available on results of the courses provided under Cal 308, those results which are known are disturbing. Due to a series of events, only a few courses have

been funded under Cal 308, the funding took place over an extended period of time, and a sum of nearly \$200,000 was returned to the Bureau of Employment Security because it had not been used by the Project. The overall result is that Cal 308, designed to train only 500 people, a number which seemed very small initially, will probably end up involving around 300 people in training courses. Not all of these will complete the training.

What appears to have happened is that the present Project Director and his most recent Training Analysts became so involved with training programs for the Skills Center that they were unable or simply neglected to keep track of the fate of Cal 308 courses. The loss of almost \$200,000 in allowances from Cal 308 was not known to the Project Director or his staff in December 1966, even though the de-obligation had been completed in May. Part of the explanation, undoubtedly, is the failure of the Project Director to keep himself aware of events occurring at the area and state level which have an impact on activities for which he should be ultimately responsible. Another reason would appear to be that there have been so many changes in the organization affecting the training programs of the Project that a lack of continuity is understandable, if not excusable. There have been three field supervisors and two Project Directors since the Project began in September 1964 and, it was not until October 1965 that the Project was assigned a full-time Training Analyst. The person given the assignment was the same one who had, prior to that time, been developing courses part-time for the Project, and part-time for the Main Office. However, his new assignment was made at the time that he was in the process of being transferred out of the Project. Between October 1965 and January 1966, inclusive, the Project obtained its second field supervisor, its second Director, was assigned a full-time Training Analyst, and had this person replaced by two new Training Analysts. It was also during this period that intensive discussions were conducted and preparations were made for the establishment of the Skills Center; and that the Bureau of Employment Security requested the state to de-obligate \$175,000 of allowance payments. When the new Training Analysts began developing courses, they were assigned to work on Skills Center courses, and had no involvement with the Cal 308 courses.

It seems fairly clear that minimal attention was given to Cal 308 once the possibility of the Skills Center emerged. Not only did the involvement in the establishment of the Center detract from concern for Cal 308, but there was no one remaining in the Project who assumed the responsibility of following through on the courses written for the Project. While close to 2,000 Project applicants may be trained during the life of the Project, it may well turn out that only 12.5 per cent of that number, or half of the original number proposed for training under Cal 308, will complete Cal 308 courses.

TABLES 79 - 88
TRAINING

TABLE 79.--Numerical and percentage distributions of training courses in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants, by occupational classification and status of training course; October 30, 1966^a

Occupational Classification	Total		Started or over		Pending		Cancelled	
	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent	Number	Per cent
Total	91	100.0	17	100.0	38	100.0	36	100.0
Professional & Managerial	10	11.0	2	11.8	4	10.5	4	11.1
Clerical & Sales	16	17.6	5	29.4	9	23.7	2	5.6
Skilled	38	39.6	4	23.5	16	42.1	16	44.4
Semiskilled	6	6.6	1	5.9	4	10.5	1	2.8
Service	20	22.0	4	23.5	5	13.2	11	30.6
Unskilled	2	2.2	0	.0	0	.0	2	5.6
Agriculture	1	1.1	1	5.9	0	0.0	0	0.0

^aColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 80.--Numerical distribution of training courses, in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants, that had started or were completed as of October 30, 1966, by occupational classification and type of funding

Occupational Classification	Total		Project			Main Office	
			MDTA Cal 308	MDTA Skills Center	RAFa Skills Center	MDTA Pro	RAFa Skills Center
	Number	Per cent					
Total	17	100.0	5	5	1	1	5
Professional & Managerial	2	11.8	1	1	0	0	0
Clerical & Sales	5	29.4	2	0	0	1	2
Skilled	4	23.5	0	3	1	0	0
Semiskilled	1	5.9	1	0	0	0	0
Service	4	23.5	1	1	0	0	2
Unskilled	0	.0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	1	5.9	0	0	0	0	1

^aRedevelopment area funds.

TABLE 81.--Numerical distribution of training courses, in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants, that were pending as of October 30, 1966, by occupational classification and pending status

Occupational Classification	Total		Net Presented to Advisory Council (1)	Net Presented to Schools (2)	At the Schools (3)	Awaiting Funding (4)	Funded But Not Started (5)
	Number	Per cent					
Total	38	100.0	5	5	19	5	4
Professional & Managerial	4	10.5	0	1	1	2	0
Clerical & Sales	9	23.7	2 ^a	2	3 ^b	2 ^c	0
Skilled	16	42.1	3 ^d	1	9	1	2
Semiskilled	4	10.5	0	0	3	0	1
Service	5	13.2	0	1	3	0	1
Unskilled	0	.0	0	0	0	0	0
Agriculture	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0

^aOne of these was written for RAR funds.

^bOne of these was written for Cal 308 funds.

^cTwo of these were written for Cal 308 funds.

^dAll were written for RAR funds.

TABLE 82.--Numerical distribution of training courses, in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants, that had been cancelled as of October 30, 1966, by occupational classification and point of cancellation^a

Occupational Classification	Total		Prior to Funding				After Funding
	Number	Per cent	Prior to Advisory Council	Advisory Council	Area Level	State Level	Before Class Began
Total	36	100.0	11	9	7	8 ^b	1
Professional & Managerial	4	11.1	1	1	1	1	0
Clerical & Sales	2	5.6	0	0	2	0	0
Skilled	16	44.4	7	6	2	0	1
Semiskilled	1	2.8	1 ^b	0	0	0	0
Service	11	30.6	1 ^b	2	2	6	0
Unskilled	2	5.6	1	0	0	1	0
Agriculture	0	0.0	0	0	0	0	0

^aColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

^bCal 308 courses.

TABLE 83.--Numerical distribution as of October 30, of training courses written for or funded under Cal 308, by occupational classification and status of training course

Occupational Classification	Total	Funded			Pending	Cancelled	
		Cal 308	Skills Center	RAF ^a	Before AC ^b	At State Level	
Original Proposal							
Total	10	1	2	2	1	2	2
Professional & Managerial	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Clerical & Sales	3	1	0	1	1 ^c	0	0
Skilled	1	0	1 ^d	0	0	0	0
Semiskilled	2	0	1 ^d	0	0	1	0
Service	2	0	0	0	0	1	1
Agriculture	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Subsequent Proposals							
Total	12	4	0	0	2	0	6
Professional & Managerial	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Clerical & Sales	3	1	0	0	2	0	0
Skilled	0	0 ^e	0	0	0	0	0
Semiskilled	1	1	0	0	0	0	0
Service	6	1	0	0	0	0	5
Unskilled	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

^aRedevelopment area funds.

^bAdvisory Committee.

^cPending as an RAR course.

^dFunded but not started.

^eUpholster course originally written for Skills Center was funded from Cal 308 funds in November, 1966.

TABLE 84.--Percentage distribution of Project applicants in training courses in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants^a by occupational classification and status of training course; October 30, 1966^b

Occupational Classification	Total	Started or Over	Pending	Cancelled
Total Number	100.0 2832	100.0 604	100.0 1515	100.0 713
Professional & Managerial	7.7	4.0	8.7	8.8
Clerical & Sales	26.4	43.2	30.3	3.8
Skilled	32.5	16.2	40.7	28.6
Semiskilled	7.7	13.4	5.8	7.0
Service	22.5	19.5	14.5	42.1
Unskilled	2.4	.0	.0	9.7
Agriculture	0.8	3.6	0.0	0.0

^aFor Skills Center courses, the actual number of Project trainees was used when known. In the case of pending or cancelled courses, an estimate of 55 per cent of the course size was used.

^bColumns may not add exactly because of rounding.

TABLE 85.--Numerical distribution of Project applicants in training courses completed as of October 30, 1966, in which at least a majority of trainees were Project applicants, by occupational classification training course, disposition of applicants, and type of funding

Occupational Classification	Proposed	Referred	Started	Completed	Per cent of Referrals Completed	Did Not Complete	
						Voluntary	Involuntary Transfers
Total	420	397	371	248	62.5	72	43
Total							
Cal 308 Funds							
Total	155	139	130	71	51.1	30	21
Professional & Managerial Radio Dispatcher	15	15	10	0	0.0	4	6
Clerical & Sales Clerk General (25) ^a	25	27	27	10	37.0	8	1
Semiskilled Taxi Driver	100	81	77	57	70.4	8	12
Section 1	25	29	25	22	75.9	0	3
Section 2	25	24	24	13	54.2	6	5
Section 3	25	20	20	14	70.0	2	4
Section 4	25	8	8	8	100.0	0	0
Service Assistant Jailer	15	16	16	4	25.0	10	2

TABLE 85.--Continued

	Redevelopment Area Funds									
	215	202	191	157	77.7	19	15	0		
Total	215	202	191	157	77.7	19	15	0		
Clerical & Sales	120	110	104	84	76.4	12	8	0		
Bank Teller										
Section 1	20	19	19	15	78.9	3	1	0		
Section 2	20	14	13	11	78.6	1	1	0		
Section 3	20	20	18	15	75.0	2	1	0		
General Salesperson										
Section 1	20	20	18	15	75.0	1	2	0		
Section 2	20	19	18	12	63.2	3	3	0		
Section 3	20	18	18	16	88.9	2	0	0		
Service	70	70	70	67	95.7	2	1	0		
Working Housekeeper	20	20	20	20	100.0	0	0	0		
Ward Maid										
Section 1	25	24	24	23	95.8	1	0	0		
Section 2	25	26	26	24	92.3	1	1	0		
Agriculture										
Groundsman	25	22	17	6	27.3	5	6	0		
Main Office MDTA Funds										
Clerical & Sales	50	56	50	20	35.7	23	7	0		
Clerk General (SS) ^a										
Section 1	25	30	25	7	23.3	16	2	0		
Section 2	25	26	25	13	50.0	7	5	0		

^aSpanish speaking.

TABLE 86.--Numerical distribution of Project applicants in training courses completed as of October 30, 1966 in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants, by post training experience, occupational classification, training course, and type of funding

Occupational Classification	Clerical & Sales			Semiskilled		Service	Agri- culture
	Clerk General ^a Sec. 1&2	Bank Teller Sec. 1	General Sales- person Sec. 1&2	Taxi- Driver Sec. 1&2	Taxi- Driver Sec. 3&4	Ward Maid Sec. 1&2	Grounds- man Sec. 1
Funding	Main Office	RAR	RAR	Cal 308	Cal 308	RAR	RAR
Total Completed	20	15	27	35	22	47	6
Post Training Experience Unknown	7	7	14	24	15	28	2
No Report Available	7	2	9	11	7	20	0
Trainee Could Not Be Located	0	5	5	13	8	8	2
Post Training Experience Known At End of Reporting Period	13	8	13	11	7	19	4
Employed	9	3	3	8	2	9	3
Unemployed	4	5	9	2	5	9	1
Not in Labor Force	0	0	1	1	0	1	0
Weeks Totally Employed Since End of Course ^b							
Total Known	13	8	13	11	7	19	4
0	3	4	7	2	2	6	0
1 - 4	1	0	3	0	1	1	4
5 - 13	4	4	3	1	2	2	..
14 - 26	5	0	2	2	..
27 - 52	8	..	5	..
52 +	3	..

^aSpanish speaking course.

^bBecause courses had been over far different lengths of time consistent data is not available.

TABLE 87.—Percentage distribution of Project applicants referred to training courses, in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants, as of October 30, 1966, by occupational classification and personal characteristics

Occupational Classification	Number of Courses	Number of Trainees	Total Per cent	Sex		Target Status		Ethnic Group					
				Male	Female	Unknown	Target	Non-Target	Unknown	Negro American	Mexican-American	Non-Minority	Other & Unknown
Total	10	397	100.0	49.6	49.6	0.8	48.4	43.1	8.6	68.5	25.7	4.5	1.3
Professional & Managerial	1	15	100.0	93.3	6.7	.0	60.0	40.0	.0	100.0	.0	.0	.0
Clerical & Sales	4	193	100.0	33.2	65.8	1.0	32.6	65.8	1.6	50.3	45.5	3.1	1.0
Semiskilled	1	81	100.0	100.0	.0	.0	81.5	13.6	4.9	75.3	11.1	13.5	.0
Service	3	86	100.0	18.6	80.2	1.2	46.5	22.1	31.4	93.0	4.6	1.2	1.2
Agriculture	1	22	100.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	63.6	36.4	.0	86.4	4.5	0.0	9.1

TABLE 87.--Continued

Occupational Classification	Number of Courses	Number of Trainees	Total Per cent	Age				Education				Employment Status					
				Less Than 21	22-24	25-44	45+	0-8	9-11	12	13	Unknown	Under-Employed	Unemployed <15	Unemployed 15-26	Unemployed 27+	Other & Unknown
Total	10	397	100.0	9.3	16.1	55.2	18.6	8.3	23.9	36.3	20.4	9.1	14.9	30.2	17.1	27.2	10.6
Professional & Managerial	1	15	100.0	13.3	26.7	60.0	.0	.0	13.3	80.0	6.7	.0	40.0	33.3	20.0	6.7	.0
Clerical & Sales	4	193	100.0	16.1	20.2	51.3	11.4	3.6	13.0	46.1	34.7	2.6	20.7	26.4	16.6	32.1	4.2
Semi-skilled	1	81	100.0	1.2	12.4	58.0	27.2	16.0	50.6	23.5	7.4	2.5	2.5	44.4	25.9	23.5	3.7
Service	3	86	100.0	3.5	11.6	55.8	29.1	9.3	19.8	31.4	7.0	32.5	9.3	20.9	10.5	26.7	32.6
Agriculture	1	22	100.0	.0	4.6	72.7	22.7	22.7	45.4	22.7	4.5	4.6	13.6	45.4	13.6	13.6	13.8

TABLE 88.--Percentage distribution of Project applicants who completed training courses, in which a majority of the trainees were Project applicants, as of October 30, 1966, by occupational classification and personal characteristics^a

Occupational Classification	Number of Courses	Disposition		Total	Sex		Target Status		Ethnic Group					
		Number Referred	Per cent Completed		Male	Female	Target	Non-Target	Negro	Mexican-American	Non-Minority	Other & Unknown		
Total	10	Number Referred	Per cent Completed	397	197	197	3	192	171	34	272	102	18	5
				62.5	42.5	79.7	..	57.9	62.0	91.2	70.2	43.1	55.6	60.0
Professional & Managerial	1	Number Referred	Per cent Completed	15	14	1	0	9	6	0	15	0	0	0
				.0	.00	.0	..	.0
Clerical & Sales	4	Number Referred	Per cent Completed	193	64	127	2	63	127	3	97	88	6	2
				59.1	34.4	70.9	..	54.0	62.2	..	79.4	37.5	33.3	..
Semiskilled	1	Number Referred	Per cent Completed	81	81	0	0	66	11	4	61	9	11	0
				70.4	70.4	88.2	81.8	..	72.1	66.7	63.6	..
Service	3	Number Referred	Per cent Completed	86	16	69	1	40	19	27	80	4	1	1
				82.6	25.0	97.1	..	70.0	84.2	100.0	81.3
Agriculture	1	Number Referred	Per cent Completed	22	22	9	0	14	8	0	19	1	0	2
				27.3	27.3	28.6	25.0	..	26.3	26.3

^aPercentages for numbers less than 5 were not computed.

TABLE 88.--Continued

Occupational Classification	Number of Courses	Disposition	Total	Age			Education			Employment Status							
				Less Than 21	22-24	25-44	45+	0-8	9-11	12	13	Unknown	Under- Employed	Unemployed <15	Unemployed 15-26	Unemployed 27+ Unknown	
Total	10	Number Referred Per cent Completed	397	37	64	219	74	33	95	152	81	36	59	120	68	108	42
			62.5	59.5	59.4	59.8	75.7	57.6	70.5	59.9	51.9	80.6	52.5	54.2	58.8	73.1	73.8
Professional & Managerial	1	Number Referred Per cent Completed	15	2	4	9	0	0	2	12	1	0	6	5	3	1	0
			.0000	20.0
Clerical & Sales	4	Number Referred Per cent Completed	193	31	39	99	22	7	25	89	67	5	40	51	32	62	8
			59.1	64.5	69.2	56.6	50.0	28.5	64.0	68.5	50.7	20.0	57.5	54.9	56.3	67.7	37.5
Semiskilled	1	Number Referred Per cent Completed	81	1	10	47	22	13	41	19	6	2	2	36	21	19	3
			70.4	. . .	70.0	66.0	77.3	69.2	73.2	68.4	66.7	72.2	66.7	78.9	. . .
Service	3	Number Referred Per cent Completed	86	3	10	48	25	8	17	27	6	28	8	18	9	23	28
			82.6	. . .	40.0	85.4	100.0	100.0	94.1	59.3	66.7	96.4	75.0	55.6	77.8	87.0	100.0
Agriculture	1	Number Referred Per cent Completed	22	0	1	16	5	5	10	5	1	1	3	10	3	3	3
			27.3	18.8	60.0	20.0	50.0	20.0	10.0

SECTION 5

THE PROJECT - AN OVERVIEW

In the preceding sections, successes and failures of the Oakland Adult Project, as were reflected in data gathered by this study, have been analyzed and discussed. Here, an attempt will be made to place these results in context - to relate them to activities within the Project and to the events in Oakland which seem relevant. Such an attempt was made in the first interim report; the section to follow, in essence, updates that information.

The reactions of members of the Advisory Committee to the first report were mixed. Some felt that it both clarified problems of which they had been aware (but which had not been formulated), and posed new ones. Others felt that criticism was out of place: "We're doing the best we can. Criticism is not only discouraging, but also gives us a bad name." In spite of the diverse reactions, the report served to stimulate what may have been already existing desires to re-evaluate the Advisory Committee role.

Advisory Committee Reorganization.

In August 1966, two essentially new subcommittees were formed as a direct response to the first Interim Report. The old Employment Development Subcommittee (EDS) was reconstituted in line with its original planned tripartite representation, and a new subcommittee, also tripartite in nature, was formed: Public Information and Education Subcommittee (PIES). In an outline designed by the chairman, the tasks of each committee were quite extensively delineated (See Appendix C). Together, they were to examine questions of philosophy, orientation, reorganization, and action. Each subcommittee was asked to meet at least twice before the September Advisory Committee meeting. Although EDS met once, PIES held no meeting until October, the month both subcommittees were directed to hold a joint meeting.

Although it appears that the Chairman intends that the newly established subcommittees assess and possibly reformulate the philosophy and policies of the Oakland Adult Project, few members seem to share his views or realize the extent to which he would like to see the reassessment occur. His outline of the subcommittees' tasks is broad enough to allow either drastic changes in orientation (which he would prefer) or a "surface evaluation" which seems more likely). The Chairman was not informed of the first meeting of the EDS and was unable to attend the joint session; since he has not made his views known at formal committee meetings, subjects he felt sure would arise at subcommittee meetings have not arisen.

In its first meeting (for which only half of its members were present), the EDS questioned the apparent allocation of many hours of the Project staff's time to activities connected with the Skills Center and resolved to probe the extent to which this continued. The specific tasks assigned to it were taken up point by point; no discussions concerning major reorientation occurred. Its chairman suggested that members of the Advisory Committee should devote

considerable efforts to assuming the role originally envisioned for them; that is, to attempt to convince others in business and organized labor to hire minority group persons and to reassess their employment policies. He stressed that the position of an "insider" was more powerful, in that his opportunity to use previously established amicable relationships and "unorthodox arguments" would probably yield greater probabilities of success than that of an outsider. The subcommittee's report failed to emphasize this aspect; it concentrated on California State Employment Service staff time allocation (matters that actually fall within the province of PIES) and proposed Specialist liaison with new industries.

The meeting of the PIES was devoted to an exploration of the methods the Project could use to publicize its existence. Although a number of imaginative suggestions were made (most of them by the Department of Human Resource's Public Information Officer) about ways of reaching both employers and the unemployed, the discussion concentrated on the latter considerations. The sub-committee never evaluated the validity of directing publicity toward the unemployed. In fact, no committee member or staff person reflected on the fact that the Project receives directly many more applicants than jobs. The sub-committee also neglected to discuss one of the points (3a)¹ in their guidelines which involved soliciting from the staff creative ideas for new approaches to the problems facing the Project.

The joint EDS-PIES sub-committee meeting was well attended. A considerable portion of it was devoted to questioning the Project Director about the past and present compositions of his staff, after which he was requested to seek Advisory Committee approval of any proposed changes instead of merely reporting them subsequently. The other major discussion revolved around the expiration of the Specialists' contracts, and rumors of the existence of unused funds sufficient to employ them for an additional period of time.

It is too early to assess the effectiveness of the new sub-committee. There is no doubt in our minds, however, that their mere existence is a step in the right direction. The chairman of the Advisory Committee, in his charges to the sub-committees, has highlighted the basic issues with which the Advisory Committee must grapple but which it has never faced head on. If the sub-committees, and then the entire Advisory Committee, will face these issues squarely and then act boldly and creatively themselves, great gains will have been made. If they permit themselves, or are permitted, to side-step the issues, the formation of the sub-committees will have been little more than a futile academic exercise.

Participation by Organized Labor

As noted in the first report, the majority of the representatives of Labor resigned from the Advisory Committee when the issue of policy-making versus advisory powers was forced to a head. Efforts on the part of the remaining committee members to persuade these representatives to return failed. The dissenting labor group (the Central Labor Council of Alameda County, representing AFL-CIO affiliated unions) attempted to set up an alternative project to be administered by the Bay Area Urban League. After a preliminary proposal had been drawn up, a meeting was held in May 1966 to which the minority and business members of the Advisory Committee, the local representative of the Economic Development Administration and other individuals

¹See Appendix C, p. 210.

interested in minority employment were invited. The members of the Advisory Committee seemed less than enthusiastic about the proposed project; in fact, they seemed to display considerable resentment when they were presented with what appeared to be a fait accompli. The EDA representative pointed out that he saw little chance of obtaining federal funds for the project because the only two governmental agencies dealing with similar projects (the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Department of Labor) had already committed funds to Oakland in the form of the Skills Center and the Oakland Adult Project. In spite of his objections, he was asked by those present to form a committee to study the feasibility of the proposed project. He very reluctantly consented to do so, saying that he was't sure that he would remain more than a few months longer in Oakland. To date, nothing further has been heard on the subject; the EDA representative concerned left Oakland in October.

The Job Specialists attempted, on their own initiative, to arrange "... a meeting with the heads of California State Employment Service to meet in the Governor's office in Sacramento to explore some avenues that might be available to the heads of CSES to come to some agreement that Labor would accept."¹ The chairman advised them that they "had no authority at this time and did not represent the feelings of the Committee,"² but did not forbid them to hold the proposed meeting. Nothing came of it, however, and it was determined at following meetings that the grievances which the Specialists had wished to discuss (which seemed to be their own rather than Labor's) either had been settled or were in the process of being settled.

In August, members of the Advisory Committee finally decided that there could be no reconciliation between the Central Labor Council and California State Employment Service, and authorized the chairman to invite representatives from other unions to join the committee. Invitations were issued to the four major labor groups in the area (including the Central Labor Council and the Building Trades Council). Both the Teamsters and the International Longshoremen's Warehousemen's Union accepted, sending representatives to the September Advisory Committee meeting. The Building Trades representative, who had never formally resigned, began to attend meetings again. Consequently, organized labor is once more participating in the Oakland Adult Project; however, the new representatives speak for a far smaller number of people and organizations than did those of the Central Labor Council.

¹Oakland Adult Minority Project Advisory Committee, minutes of meeting of May 18, 1966.

²Op. cit., OAMP minutes

Role of CSES

There has been a consistent expectation on the part of the Advisory Committee that the Project should arrive at creative and imaginative solutions to the problems facing it. To date, there are no conclusive indications that the expectations have been met. Some activities have been initiated at the Project offices which give evidence that the staff is trying, and the Employment Service, itself, has created a new job position which will permit the Project to perform activities previously beyond its scope. But, for each obvious innovation, there is a related difficulty which all but negates its value.

Group counseling was attempted in one of the Project offices during the summer, but low attendance and high drop-out rates soon discouraged the staff. Another office began conducting typing classes, counseling sessions, and basic education courses after regular hours, using volunteers. The office manager attributes a great deal of the favorable reception and high participation to the fact that the students were women, not men. He reported that he knows of no agency that has been able to "motivate" men in the same way.

The position of "Employment Community Worker" (ECW) was created in the winter of 1966 when four such positions were filled for the Project. The ECWs' activities are wide in scope and quite loosely defined. In essence, they are to link the unemployed in a community with the Department of Employment. Although the official job description stresses this liaison function, it also specifies that they are to "assess and keep(s) staff informed of feelings, attitudes, and activities in local areas." The Project Director described their function as follows: "They go to gathering places of people in need of our service and bring them in." This description obviously ignores the two-way communication component that seems so important. The office managers, at least in the early stages, permitted the community workers considerable latitude by allowing them to act according to the needs of the people in the community. There are recent indications that the activities of these men have been curbed. Two examples follow.

At the September Advisory Committee meeting, a minority representative complained that he had heard that the Community Workers had been told they were not allowed to attend Advisory Committee meetings. He understood that one of their chief functions was to attempt to break down the traditional suspicion of the Employment Service that is quite rampant among minority group persons; therefore, he felt they would be better equipped to do so if personal experience enabled them to attest to the commitment of the Advisory Committee members. A resolution was passed recommending that the community workers be encouraged to attend meetings. The field supervisor of CSES objected, saying that the Employment Service considered it desirable that communications between the Advisory Committee and the staff continue to fall within the jurisdiction of the Project Director, who attended all meetings and passed on to his staff such items of information as he felt necessary. The Committee chairman replied that the Advisory Committee was aware of CSES sentiments in the matter, but disagreed with them, which was why it had passed the resolution. The Advisory Committee decision seems to have prevailed.

Involved in the second instance were the procedures used by the Department of Employment to evaluate the efficacy of its various local offices. Monthly, each office reports the number of orders, referrals, and placements it has made. With the exception of special entities (such as the Project),

each office has a definitely assigned geographic jurisdiction. (For example, if an employer from another city places an order with a Project office, the order is credited to the office in the employer's city, in spite of the fact that it had nothing to do with its solicitation.) The Project offices share geographical jurisdiction with the Main Office; an order placed at the Project originating within the Oakland Employment Service area is credited to the Project; any others must be credited to the local office involved. It will be remembered that an important aspect of the Project was to persuade employers to place their orders directly with it. Consequently, minimization of competitive hostility between the Main Office and the Project should have been attempted by the Department of Employment.

In late summer, it came to the attention of one of the Project's Community Workers that a certain firm employed a personnel officer who, it is alleged, never hired minority group persons. Knowledge of the practice had become widespread in the community, and most minority applicants refused to attend interviews when referred to the firm. The ECW arranged an interview at a Project office with the allegedly biased person and his superior in the firm. Problems of minority employment were discussed and the function of the Project was explained. As a result of the conference, the representatives promised to end their discriminatory behavior and to place all subsequent orders directly. When this decision became widely known within CSES, the Project staff was informed by superiors that, in the future, they were to "refrain from stealing orders" from the Main Office. Such attitudes are contradictory to the philosophy of the Project; it cannot be expected to excel in such an atmosphere.

Only a few examples have been given and they can in no way be considered conclusive. While one gets the feeling that staff members at the individual offices are attempting to tackle the problems which they see, there is also the impression that certain prevailing attitudes or policies have limited at least some areas of innovation or some people who are being innovative. Since prevailing attitudes or policies of CSES supervisory personnel greatly affect the possibility of consistent creative problem-solving, and since the effectiveness of the subordinates who are affected by these attitudes and policies is relevant, the issue becomes both very important and quite complex. It shall be more fully investigated in the future.

Personnel Changes within the Project

Changes in CSES Project staff are continually taking place. Of special note, however, is the large-scale expansion of the staff which the Project Director announced in November 1965. A supplementary allocation of \$101,754 was made available to the Project largely as the Department of Labor's reaction to the previous summer's racial unrest in Los Angeles, and because of Oakland's explosive potential. The additional funds permitted the Project to more than double its existing staff. It was only in January 1966 that most of the new persons were actually assigned to Project offices, and it was not until March that the Project obtained its full new complement. The delays were caused by recruitment and training activities. The greater portion of the current Project staff consists of relatively inexperienced workers.

TABLE 89.--Number and classification of California State Employment Service staff at Project offices, by ethnic group; December 1, 1966.

Classification of Worker	Total	Negro	Mexican-American and Spanish Speaking	Other	Non-Minority
Total	43	14	8	2	19
Professional	38	13	7	0	18
High Experience ^a	17	2	4	0	11
Low Experience ^b	21	11	3	0	7
Non-Professional	5	1	1	2	1

^aCounselor, Employment Security Officers I - V.

^bEmployment Community Worker, Counselor Trainee, Employment Claims Assistant, and Employment Security Trainee.

Table 89 details its composition as of December 1, 1966¹. If the four clerks and the secretary, who are "non-professional" staff, are excluded, it can be seen that 21 of the professional staff of 38 (55 per cent) have very little experience in employment service operations. Seventeen hold the status of trainees; the other four (Employment Community Workers) hold the newly-created position. Of the remaining seventeen, only two have an Employment Service rating at the managerial level (ESO III or above).

The ethnic group composition of the staff as of December 1, 1966 is given in Table 90. It is interesting to observe that minority workers form the majority of the total staff (56 per cent), as well as the professional staff (53 per cent). A similar situation also existed during the period covered by the first interim report. Of special note is the fact that minority workers represent two-thirds of the total group of workers that deals most directly with the applicants—professional workers with little experience.

The Employment and Claims Assistant (ECA) positions are quite interesting. Because they are theoretically temporary (9 month) positions, the Project must get special permission for its ECAs to work the year out. The Project Director explained to one of the investigators that they are usually minority group people who lack the entry requirements to Employment Security Trainee (EST); they receive identical training and do the same work, and at the end of one year are eligible to become ESTs upon passing the examination.

Actually, to become an EST, an ECA must not only pass the test, but must have worked as an ECA 3400 hours (20 months full time) and have completed 15 semester hours of college within 5 years. The ECA entry wage is \$2.76 per hour, and after four and one-half years, he can earn a maximum of \$3.35 (which an EST earns after one year). These requirements are set up by the Civil Service; the Employment Service is not directly responsible. Since managers report that some of their best people are at this level, the situation seems to be one of extreme inequity in terms of financial criteria. Staff members are faced every day with this exploitative situation, yet, to our knowledge, no one has ever attempted to remedy it by demands for equal pay for equal work.

Other types of personnel changes have occurred. Project staff members have been transferred to the Skills Center, to the new State Multi-Service Center, and to offices in other geographical areas. The reasons for these moves have not been documented, but they seem quite varied. In certain instances, they have resulted from dissatisfaction with certain conditions in the Project; in other cases, the individuals have been reassigned because their skills have been requested elsewhere; and there has been at least one instance in which a person was removed from the Project for a number of months in order to acquire additional training relevant to personal advancement which, apparently, could not be obtained within the Project. At the November 1965 Advisory Committee meeting, the Department of Employment Coastal Area Director "... made it perfectly clear that the Advisory Committee was still in control of the Project and that movement of personnel from one location to another was in the province of the Committee."² The Advisory Committee passed a motion

¹It should be noted that the composition of the Project staff in December is different than it was in March. The most notable difference between the two months is the absence now of two occupational analysts.

²Minutes of the Advisory Committee, November 17, 1965.

TABLE 90.—Number and title of California State Employment Service staff at Project offices: December 1, 1966

Title of Worker ^a	Director's Office					
	Total	West	East	Fruitvale	North	
Total	43	12	13	9	6	
Professional						
Director (Employment Security Officer V)	1	1	1	1	1	1
Employment Security Officer III	1	1	1	1	1	1
Employment Security Officer II	4	1	1	1	1	1
Employment Security Officer I	6	1	1	3	2	2
Counselor	5	2	1	2	1	1
Employment Security Trainee	4	2	2	1	1	1
Employment Claims Assistant	8	3	3	1	1	1
Counselor Trainee	5	1	4	1	1	1
Employment Community Worker	4	2	1	1	1	1
Non-Professional						
Secretary	1	1	1	1	1	1
Clerk	4	1	1	1	1	1

^aCivil Service classifications based on a combination of tests and length of service.

of approval of the staff increase which was announced. At that point, however, no more extensive policy was established concerning the Advisory Committee's role in future personnel shifts. The Advisory Committee neither required that all personnel changes be brought before it for approval, nor specifically requested that it be notified of all changes. The practice which evolved was that the Project Director did not systematically notify the Advisory Committee of all personnel changes. When an announcement was made, it was done after the fact in the Project Director's Monthly Report to the Advisory Committee.

Relationship between Project and Skills Center

As plans for the Skills Center were being prepared, and during the early months of its operation, a considerable portion of some of the staff's time (especially that of the Project Director) was apparently diverted from the Project to the Center. When the Advisory Committee became aware of this, a good deal of investigation and discussion began. Two Project staff members (as occupational analysts) devoted full time to developing training proposals which would be funded for the Skills Center; when there was no longer a need for that service, they were reassigned. The Project Director, however, continues his involvement with the Skills Center, since he is responsible for the administration of the CSES staff (numbering 18, as of November) who are located there. This activity takes as much or more of his time as would a fifth Project office. The supervisors at each of the five installations are responsible to the Project Director. Until specifically requested, at no time did he attempt either to describe his relationship with the Skills Center or to clarify this dual role to the members of the Advisory Committee. These investigators have the impression that the Employment Service had not wanted the relationship to be spelled out for the Advisory Committee for fear that it would object to such a diversion of the scarce resources available to the Project. A considerable amount of the Advisory Committee time has been devoted to this matter recently, not only in full committee meetings, but also in meetings of the subcommittees whose guidelines are only peripherally related to this issue.

Communication between Project Staff and Advisory Committee

The complicated relationship between the Project and the Skills Center seems unclear to all concerned. Some of this unclarity appears to exist because difficulties and ambiguities have arisen as increasing attention has been paid to improving both employment and training possibilities in Oakland, just as difficulties and ambiguities arise when any new venture is attempted. The immediate situation has certainly not been helped by the fact that substantial and varied objection was voiced by organized labor during the developmental stages of the Skills Center. But another source of Advisory Committee unawareness and confusion over this matter, as well as over other matters, appears to be the result of inadequate communication between the Project Director and his "board". From the vantage point of these observers, it seems that the Project Director (whether on his own or as a matter of unwritten policy) informs the Advisory Committee only of what he wants it to know (a tendency which seems typical of many staff-board relationships and is, therefore, not peculiar to this one). The point is, however, that a great deal is not communicated by this Project Director to this Advisory Committee. Some examples have already been given; another

outstanding one will be cited now.

The Project Director's reports have been characterized by his pointing out the "improvements" evidenced during the past month. He has regularly reported the number of applicants registering and the number of placements made. Recently, after persistent requests from the Advisory Committee members, his statistics have been refined so that they are somewhat more meaningful, but the report still does not include data concerning the number or types of jobs made available to the Project. Surprisingly, the Advisory Committee has never requested such a tabulation. If there is to be an effort to clearly communicate the essential data which will give a capsule impression of Project's overall activity, the omission of such data is inexcusable. The style and content of the Project Director's report virtually ensures that the Advisory Committee will not obtain a realistic conception of the Project's operation. The fact that the Advisory Committee has continued to permit such reports is difficult to understand unless it really has no desire to see the total picture.

Job Development Specialists

In addition to changes already mentioned, the Project lost the services of the two job development specialists whose salaries for the past two years have been provided by an Economic Development Administration grant to the City of Oakland. They were, therefore, not employed by the California State Employment Service, although they were ostensibly responsible to the Project Director.

At the conclusion of their first year, EDA officials informed both the Specialists and the Director of the Department of Human Resources that EDA would prefer that another federal agency fund the Specialists, or that the EDA money be channeled to another Oakland agency (preferably, the Skills Center). For these reasons, the Administration was prepared to grant funds under the existing arrangements for only six months in order that the probable changes would be facilitated. When this period expired, another six-month grant was made, carrying the Specialists to November, 1966.

No serious thought was given by the Advisory Committee to the contract situation until September, 1966, when, upon the urging of the Director of the Department of Human Resources, a subcommittee was empowered to investigate the likelihood of the contracts being renewed. The chairman of this subcommittee reported that, in preliminary conversations, the Oakland representative of EDA "expressed surprise that many people are interested in retaining these positions."¹ In spite of discussions and negotiations, EDA was adamant in its refusal to continue supplying funds and in its desire to transfer the grant to another agency. EDA appeared to be interested, not only in not retaining the present Specialists, but also in changing or reformulating the job specifications themselves.

Questions of the Specialists' competence never actually arose (at least publicly), and the Advisory Committee, as a body, expressed satisfaction with the Specialists' performance. Although other potential sources of support have been explored, to date no concrete plans have been formulated to obtain funds elsewhere for these positions. Although the Advisory Committee seems to feel that the loss of these positions is a severe one for the Project, its

¹Advisory Committee minutes, September 1966.

concern must be based on other than measurable results, since such results have tended to indicate that the Specialists' contribution has been very minimal.

The Economic Development Administration Projects

"In January 1966 EDA selected Oakland, California as a city with persistent unemployment problems which qualified it for grants and loans under the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, for a massive experimental project designed to assist in solving unemployment problems in an urban area."¹

As described, the project would attack unemployment by means of grants and low interest loans to businesses, enabling them to expand, and hence to employ more people. To ensure that its goal, "...making available to the long-term unemployed who reside in Oakland...the maximum practicable number of permanent jobs"², would be accomplished, EDA created the "Employment Plan Review Board Committee" which is to examine (prior to release of funds, and periodically thereafter) the employment plan required of each firm seeking assistance from EDA.

One representative from each of the city's designated target areas, the Mexican-American community, Labor, Management, and the EDA make up the committee. This group has only the power to advise EDA; final decisions concerning a firm's eligibility are made by that agency. Although provisions for mediation have been made in the event that disputes between employers and EDA should arise, no similar arrangements for an independent third party judgment is available should a disagreement take place involving EDA and the Review Committee.

Most of the available funds have been granted or loaned to the Port of Oakland, a municipal agency administered by a board of commissioners appointed by the Mayor of Oakland. To date (December 1966), final arrangements have been made whereby it will receive \$14,719,500 as outright grants, and \$8,475,000 as loans at three and three-fourths per cent interest. Although five private firms have submitted employment plans (all of which have been approved), the actual amounts of EDA money, as well as the uses to which it will be put, are as yet unknown.

The largest single grant (\$10,000,000) is to finance construction of a hangar which will be leased (the terms of which have not been made public) to a private corporation whose business is maintenance of jet and super jet planes. The employment plan submitted by this firm involves training about 1,150 aircraft and sheetmetal mechanics (and the probable eventual hiring of about half of them) by 1971. "About two years of high school algebra"³ will be required of every entering trainee. The plan states that the firm will seek trainees at the Skills Center, but, since the Skills Center will be

¹U.S. Department of Commerce, Economic Development Act, "The EDA Employment Plan", September, 1966.

²Op. cit., U.S. Department of Commerce.

³Meeting of Employment Plan Review Board Committee, 12 November 1966.

able to provide only 35 weeks of training to its students (many of whom are functionally illiterate), it does not appear that it will become a fruitful source of trainees at the educational level demanded. Other employment plans approved have involved relatively small number of bakers, machinery operators, candy-makers, and car-wash attendants.

It appears that, although jobs will be provided by this project, most will involve only a few members of Oakland's severely disadvantaged group. The educational level demanded of trainees combined with the shortness of the training period should eliminate those people who have severe disadvantages in the labor market. It should be noted, however, that the requirements for this project may very well aid the "long-term unemployed" persons, since the official definition of that phrase is people out of work but looking for work for fifteen weeks or more.¹ Therefore, although this project may meet the technical requirements of its goal—making permanent jobs available to the long-term unemployed—it will not be useful in helping individuals with severe educational deficiencies who, in many people's minds, are the "hard-core"unemployed. Representatives of EDA have stated that the program is directed toward youth who, without such training, would probably become members of the hard-core unemployed within a few years. Regardless of the validity of this premise, the funds seem neither to have been widely dispersed among private businesses nor likely to affect the employment possibilities for the people in Oakland who will have severe difficulties obtaining jobs.

Oakland: Job Fair

At the end of September, the City of Oakland held a two-day "Job Fair". Although Job Fairs have been held in large cities throughout the nation for about the past five years, this was Oakland's first. It differed little in design or purpose from others and, in terms of numbers of "exhibitors", was far more successful than one held a few months earlier in San Francisco. Oriented toward members of minority groups, apparently, the purpose of a job fair is to acquaint people with employment opportunities available.

The Oakland Adult Project, although organized precisely to promote employment of minority group persons, was not consulted during the early planning stages. When this was brought to the new mayor's attention, he said that he had been unaware of the existence of the Project. Serious reservations about the proposed fair arose among the Advisory Committee members when they were finally asked to participate; these centered around the fact that any exhibitor was eligible to maintain a booth, regardless of whether or not he had or expected to have jobs available. Most of its minority group members felt there should be some sort of guarantee that an exhibitor had specific jobs to offer applicants. They were never able to convince the Mayor and his committee to request or require exhibitors to have specific jobs to offer at the Fair.

The Fair was well advertised; many spot announcements were made by local radio stations whose listeners are predominantly Negro or Mexican-American: "If you are looking for a job or a better job, visit the Job Fair." It was well attended; more than 15,000 people (an estimated two-thirds of

¹The common alternate definition is, people out of work but looking for work for 26 weeks or more.

whom were unemployed) were counted, and 121 exhibitors maintained booths. Private firms accounted for 64 per cent, government agencies (Federal, State and local) for almost 20 per cent, and the armed forces, for almost ten per cent. The Central Labor Council did not maintain a booth, in fact, only three unions were represented at the Fair.

The large number of booths maintained by agencies rather than business firms did not pass unnoticed by local "grassroots" organizations. In its review of what it termed the "Job Circus", The Flatlands, a local "poor peoples' paper", commented:

"Who had booths at the Job Fair? Nearly a third were for government or military agencies—including the Post Office, the cities of Oakland and Richmond, and the like. Several were groups involved in the problem of minority employment—The Skills Center, the Urban League, PACT /Plan of Action for Challenging Times/, Parks Job Corps Center... . Many of the booths had members of minority groups in them. FLATLANDS talked to one man and found he had nothing to do with hiring people, and second, that his company (a large one) has only one other Negro man working for it."¹

Although the City's attempts to follow up the Fair have not yet been completed, and some firms have complained that a large number of the employment interviews they scheduled failed to materialize, the most recent official report (November 15, 1966) stated that the Fair enabled 250 people to get jobs.² If this report is correct, then 1.7 per cent of those who attended the Fair obtained jobs.

The present Mayor apparently took a great deal of personal interest in the Job Fair, but the minority community reacted with suspicion and mistrust, based primarily on the belief that the Fair was designed more for propaganda purposes than for providing jobs. Although it is impossible to ascribe motivation to the Mayor's actions, it is true that the public statements he made after the Fair served only to increase the mistrust which already existed in many parts of the minority community.

In October 1966, the Mayor stated that "about ten per cent of the 9,000 appointments for followup (sic) interviews with companies which participated in the 'Job Fair' have been kept."³ His statement was apparently based on discussions that took place at follow-up seminars on the Fair and on tentative figures compiled by the Job Fair staff. Only 17 of the 108 participating employers appeared at the follow-up seminars. This figure represented only 15.7 per cent of the total, and there is no reason to believe

¹The Flatlands (Oakland, California), October 8, 1966, p. 21.

²Norvel Smith, "City of Oakland: The East Bay Job Fair", Oakland, Economic Development Council, Memorandum No. 17 (Oakland, California: Department of Human Resources, November 15, 1966), (Mimeographed).

³O.E.D.C. Reporter (Oakland, California), October 1966, p. 1.

it was a random sample. The latest official tally made by the city (December 1, 1966) based on the experience of only a slightly larger number of participating employers (33, or 30.6 per cent), reveals that of 2,723 appointments for interviews, only 431 (15.8 per cent) were kept. It should be noted that the total number of appointments was neither systematically documented nor verified.

The information of questionable validity released in October without apparent qualifications, was followed by a more serious act a month later. The Mayor drew conclusions which were publicized prior to the time that data had been formally analyzed. On November 27, he was quoted in Oakland's only daily newspaper as saying, "I am convinced that the jobs were there.... The plain fact is, not enough people went after them." Later in the article, the following paragraphs appear:

"...Reading said he felt the Job Fair was a success in that it did find jobs for people. 'But,' he added, 'the experience uncovered a different problem calling for a different approach.

'It indicated to me that we must attack this on a motivational approach,' the Mayor said.

'We have to teach youngsters, for example, that jobs are available and that they can get them if they would only try.

'Further', Reading said, 'any person who is receiving welfare payments and turns down job chances should be taken off welfare.'

He said he plans to discuss that proposal with Governor-elect Reagan."¹

The follow-up data that were available on November 27 do not support the Mayor's value judgments. The information that was collected does not permit an accurate determination of the number of appointments which were actually made. There is no accurate way of determining the number of specific appointments that were made as opposed to the number of people who were simply told to visit the personnel department for further investigation. No analysis had been made of the proportion of "appointments" made at firms not easily accessible for the poor—particularly those located outside of Oakland. No determination had been made of the percentage of "repeats" that were in the tally—i.e., the percentage of people who had "appointments" with more than one firm. No accurate determination had been made of the ratio of employed (who could afford to leisurely "shop around") to unemployed persons. No analysis had been made of the quality of the jobs for which "appointments" had supposedly been made. In short, extremely incomplete data were available, and no responsible analysis of those which were available had been performed.

The summary of the three Job Fair critique sessions were mailed to participants during the first week in December. The following paragraph was included (the underlining is ours):

¹Oakland Tribune, November 27, 1966.

"The experience of firms varied as to obtaining employees for their plants. On the whole, for some reason or another, desirable candidates did not follow-up on their referrals. (One agency, however, made 60 referrals, had about 47 show up, and hired most of the 47.) The Job Fair Chairman cautioned jumping at value judgments in these cases, since the reasons for people not responding are unknown. He indicated that a study was in progress to uncover these factors."¹

Discussion

From the brief descriptions given in this section, it may be seen that the Project is still subject to internal and external influences that appear to limit the ability of the staff to reach the goals stated in the proposal. The three key influences described were the California State Employment Service, the Advisory Committee, and the City of Oakland.

Discussion of the Project's relationship with CSES is apt to be confusing, since the Project must be considered both a part of CSES and an entity dealing with CSES. This duality of roles is inherent in the nature of the Project—an experimental subsidiary of CSES that must abide by its rules and yet seek to be creative and innovative. It does not seem that CSES, as judged by certain policy statements made by the field supervisor, is willing to be as flexible as the Advisory Committee feels is appropriate. It is true that only a few examples were cited, and that they are not in themselves conclusive, but they must be considered as potentially indicative.

The Advisory Committee, although established in part to make policy for the Project, is not in the best position to do so because it does not obtain a complete picture of the Project's activities, partially because it does not demand the information, and partially because it is not readily volunteered by the Project Director. The Committee, during this past year, had not been a very significant force one way or another. It has been beset with reorganizational problems. On the one hand, it has finally been able to successfully resolve the problem of obtaining labor representation again, and on the other, its chairman has attempted, through subcommittee reorganization, to force it to come to grips with certain basic issues it never faced in the past. It did, however, lose in its effort to retain the services of the Specialists; and will not, it appears, be forced to assume the primary responsibility for job development or rely entirely on the efforts of the CSES staff.

The government of the City of Oakland, in those activities mentioned in this section, does not seem to be helping the Project reach its goals. The Port of Oakland, which will receive the largest local grant from BDA, has such high standards on its training positions, that the more disadvantaged among Project applicants will probably not be able to compete for the openings. The Mayor, in his unawareness of the existence of the Project, his refusal to encourage a guarantee of job openings from employers participating in the Job Fair, and his value judgments about Job Fair results--

¹"Summary of Topics - Job Fair Critique" (City of Oakland, California, December 1966), p. 2. (Mimeographed.)

judgments not based on a sound interpretation of well-collected data---has probably contributed to the maintenance of a community atmosphere which will make bold, imaginative and responsible solutions to the problems concerning minority employment more difficult rather than easier. In this way, the new Mayor seems to have done more, albeit indirectly, to damage the Project than to assist it.

SECTION 6

CONCLUDING STATEMENT

Analyses of the data collected for this report are no less disappointing than the analyses of data collected for the first interim report; in fact, the results are even more discouraging. In the first report, we discovered that the proportion of minority group persons who obtained jobs through the Project was no different from the proportion of minority group persons who obtained jobs through the main Oakland Employment Office. In this report, it became clear that less than seven per cent of the male minority group applicants to the Project obtained a job, within three months, that did not involve downgrading, which was scheduled to last three days or more and which the person still held at the end of 30 days. This result for minority group Project applicants was not significantly different from results for minority and for non-minority group Main Office applicants. In the first report, we discovered that the Project received a small proportion (17 per cent) of its job orders directly and that the jobs received seemed contrary to the "new doors" goal of the Project. In this report, we found out that an even smaller proportion (12 per cent) of job orders were received directly and that there were indications that these direct orders were for less desirable jobs which had more rigorous entrance requirements than was the case with orders sent first to the Main Office. In both reports we discovered that applicants were much more likely to be offered jobs on direct than on indirect openings. In the first report, we pointed out that no real headway had been made toward the goal of training 500 persons until late 1965. In this report, we find that nearly \$200,000 of training funds originally allocated for the Project has been returned to the Bureau of Employment Security without the knowledge of the Project Director, and also, that it is improbable that more than half of the 500 persons originally proposed for training will actually complete courses funded for the Project. Only one of the seven courses will have been designed for a skilled occupation. It is true, however, that the opening of the Skills Center has apparently increased considerably the potential training opportunities for Project applicants.

In addition to these disheartening results, there still are remnants of the internal difficulties discussed in the last report, plus new and severe external influences which should have more negative than positive effects on the Project. The Advisory Committee has devoted a considerable amount of its time since June to reorganizational matters. It has regained Labor representation, but not from the members of the AFL-CIO Central Labor Council whose resignations were unclear at the time of the last report. The Advisory Committee Chairman has also formed two essentially new subcommittees and charged them with the responsibility of examining the basic issues related to the Project's existence and operation. In many ways, these occurrences have been the most promising developments since the last report. However, inadequate communication between the Project Director and the Advisory Committee, as well as evidences of rigidity on the part of the Department of Employment in policy matters, tend to offset whatever gains the Advisory

Committee might be in the process of making.

Events external to the Project, but ones which are nevertheless closely associated with it, have occurred which, in our opinion, will have deleterious effects on the Project. It will be difficult, if not impossible, to measure such effects, but it seems quite likely that they will occur. Recent changes in the Skills Center funding procedure threaten to make it impossible for those Project applicants who have severe educational handicaps to avail themselves of training at the Center. The Economic Development Administration's grant of \$10,000,000 which has associated with it the training of approximately 1,150 mechanics in the next five years will now be of questionable advantage to Project applicants with severe educational deficiencies because the time permitted for training would not be sufficient to bring such persons up to the minimal educational requirements for trainees. Perhaps the most damaging blow to the Project was the new Mayor's statements in the press after the Job Fair. The comments which left the impression that minority group persons are not interested in finding jobs and that they, therefore, did not follow through on the efforts made in good faith by industry, cannot help but convey a distorted picture to the public. At a time when clear, considered and imaginative thinking is needed to attack the minority employment problem in a city which has been noted for its racial discrimination, the Mayor's statement provided none of these.

We would speculate that, for a Project of this type to be successful in finding long-term jobs for minority group persons, especially in occupations and industries which have previously not hired minority group persons, and for creating opportunities for more minority group persons to move into such jobs, what is needed is a strong, assertive, creative and intelligent director working for an organization or group which has collectively similar characteristics; working in a system which makes funds and resources relatively easily available; and located in an environment where the economy is generally thriving. None of these situations seem to hold in the case of the Oakland Adult Project. There is little wonder that the results are so disappointing. Many changes seem needed at this point, but we have the impression that minor changes which do not include a facing of certain basic issues by the members of the Advisory Committee would be fruitless. In order to focus on the issues as we see them, let us paraphrase parts of the concluding pages of our first report:

The employer representatives on the Advisory Committee need to demonstrably serve as catalysts so that the business community will (1) examine the role it has played in contributing to the current situation, (2) take a closer look at the validity of the screening process used in hiring, and (3) consider the social obligation business may have in instituting programs of compensatory hiring and/or training independent of governmental funds...

The labor representatives on the Advisory Committee need to demonstrably play an active role in (1) encouraging unions to examine their contribution to some of the restrictive hiring practices resulting from union contracts, (2) reevaluating the entrance requirements for their apprenticeship programs, and (3) examining their possible obligation for compensatory admission into training programs, union membership and job assignment from hiring

halls.

The minority group members need to become aware of the complex issues involved, and need to have representatives who can intelligently and incisively contribute to the attempted resolution of problems facing the Project.

The California State Employment Service needs to assign personnel who can effectively carry out the extremely difficult role of directing the Project, and it needs to be consistently alert to building in true flexibility and independence for the Project.

APPENDIX A

NARRATIVE SUMMARY
OF
EXECUTION OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING COURSE

NARRATIVE SUMMARY
OF
EXECUTION OF INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING COURSE

Phase I — Establishing the Need

1. Possible occupations for training should be existing and/or projected shortage occupations. These should be identified on the basis of unfilled orders, labor market studies, and successful MDTA programs elsewhere.

2. Potential demand for the occupations should be determined from labor market studies, local Advisory Council meetings, and information from employers and unions concerned with the occupations, vocational education personnel in public and private schools, and Employer Relations representatives of the various agencies who make regular visits to employers. Demand is also determined from local records, i.e., the number of orders received, the number of placements, and the number of cancellations. In order to obtain the net demand, i.e., training need, an attempt should be made to survey the supply of qualified applicants to determine how many are usually on hand, how many qualified applicants move into the area, and how many qualified people move out of the schools and other training facilities into the labor market.

3. The potential supply of trainees for the occupation should be determined by examining the characteristics of local applicants, discussing with counselors and placement interviewers the characteristics of their clients, and by contacting schools, unions, and other public and private community agencies. (The use of sources outside the Department of Employment is a means of reaching out to those disadvantaged individuals who do not ordinarily register for employment with local CSES offices.) The objective is to estimate the number of potential trainees with common training interests, skill level, and knowledge who will be available for the training.

4. A Notification of Occupational Training Need, MDT-1, is written for occupations where there is some indication that employment can be anticipated after completion of training. In multi-occupational projects, MDT-1's are often written for basic and remedial education for those trainees who need such education before they can assimilate vocational training.

Phase II — Obtaining Local Consent

5. Local labor unions and other organizations representing employees in the occupation are contacted for endorsement of the need for training. Lacking such endorsement, the comments of the unions or organizations are requested.

6. The MDTA Coordinating Committee considers the apparent interest in the training, and then decides whether the course should be institutional, OJT, or coupled. The committee is usually composed of representatives from the:

- a. State Department of Education

- b. Federal Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training
- c. State Division of Apprenticeship Standards
- d. Local Schools
- e. Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs
- f. Local CSES office
- g. State Department of Welfare

7. The Alameda County MDTA Advisory Council -- made up of representatives from labor, management, minority groups, and interested agencies other than those on the Coordinating Committee (when appropriate, and as ex-officio participants) -- considers the MDT-1 and advises the local office manager regarding the feasibility of the proposal.

8. The manager of the CSES Local Office decides on the training need and signs the MDT-1 if he approves of it. Even if the Advisory Council disapproves the MDT-1, the Local Office manager may approve and forward it, giving his reasons.

Phase III -- Obtaining Employment Department Approval

9. The Coastal Area Office (San Francisco) of CSES reviews the MDT-1 and approves or disapproves it.

10. The Central Office of CSES (Sacramento) reviews and then approves or disapproves the MDT-1. Any MDT -1 received in Central Office CSES which reflects serious objections from the Advisory Council, Labor, or Management, is carefully reviewed and one or more steps are taken: (1) the course is returned for possible negotiation and amendment which will satisfy the objecting parties; (2) the course is referred to members of the Governor's Manpower Advisory Committee for comments and/or recommendations; or (3) the course is approved or disapproved after due consideration of the objections and receipt of the comments and/or recommendations from the Manpower Advisory Committee.

Phase IV -- Designing the Course

11. The MDT-1 is forwarded to the State Director of Vocational Education who in turn transmits it to the appropriate Vocational Education Bureau Chief.

12. The Vocational Education Bureau Chief refers the MDT-1 to the Regional Supervisor who makes an assessment of job performance requirements.

13. The Regional Supervisor surveys the local training agencies and recommends selection of the appropriate training agency.

14. When the designated training agency has agreed to submit a training proposal, it prepares a training-plan (Form OE-4014), an estimated budget (Form OE-4000) complete with back-up sheets explaining each budgeted item, an Application for Approval of Training Project (Form VEMDT-1 or -2), a Form MT-2, and a reproduction of the original MDT-1.

15. The training facility gives copies of the proposal to both the CSES Local Manager and the Vocational Education Regional Supervisor.

16. The Regional supervisor forwards copies to his Bureau Chief with recommendations, including an original with original signatures throughout.

17. The Bureau Chief reviews the proposal, recommends approval or disapproval, and forwards copies to the State Director of Vocational Education.

18. The proposal is reviewed (usually in Sacramento) by a Review Team composed of representatives from the regional offices of the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The Team meets with representatives from the Sacramento offices of the Department of Employment and the Department of Vocational Education. Occasionally, projects are forwarded directly to the regional offices of the Department of Labor, and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare because of an urgent need for quick review.

19. After review in Sacramento, copies of projects are forwarded directly to San Francisco for a special approval and funding review by representatives of the Department of Labor and the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

20. If the course is approved and funds have been previously allocated, the Review Team funds the Project when it is approved. If all regular appropriations for MDTA projects have been exhausted, the Review Team must submit the project to Washington for funding.¹ (State allocations are usually recalled to Washington during the last six months of the fiscal year. The recall may be accomplished upon 30 days notice). The State agencies (Employment and Education) are officially notified of a project's approval seven days after funding.

Phase V -- Conducting the Course

21. The Local Office and the training facility are officially notified by the state agencies that the proposal is approved and funded; they negotiate on starting dates and set them. (CSES Local Office needs time for recruiting trainees, and the schools need time for arranging for facilities, e.g., room, supplies, equipment, instructor, etc.)

22. While the course is being conducted, communication should be maintained between the Local Office, the trainees, and the training facility in order to resolve difficulties that may arise. The regional representatives of the Department of Education have an important role in seeing that training courses are conducted with a minimum of difficulty.

23. When the course terminates, the Local Office (Employment) is responsible for engaging in placement activities.

24. After termination of the course, follow-up activities are under-taken to determine post-training employment status and course evaluation.

¹ All Redevelopment Area Resident courses are returned to Washington for review and funding by representatives of the Bureau of Employment Security, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the Economic Development Administration.

APPENDIX B
LISTS OF TRAINING COURSES

Key:

E = entry

R = re-entry

ER= entry, remedial

SS = Spanish speaking

ARA = Area Redevelopment Administration

RAR = Redevelopment Area Residents

List I -- List of training courses, in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants, that had started or were completed as of October 30, 1966^a.

Type of Funding	Occupational Classification	Course Title	Number of Trainees
Project			
Cal 308	Professional & Managerial	Radio Dispatcher (E)	15
Cal 308	Clerical and Sales	Clerk-General (E,SS)	53
Cal 308	Clerical and Sales	Grocery Checker (E,SS)	42
Cal 308	Semi-skilled	Taxi-driver (ER)	81
Cal 308	Services	Ass't. Jailer (E)	16
Skills Center	Professional & Managerial	Map Draftsman	9
Skills Center ^b	Skilled	Office Machine Serviceman	14
Skills Center	Skilled	Combination Welder	28
Skills Center	Skilled	Central Office Installer	25
Skills Center	Services	Cook & Pantryman	32
RAR	Skilled	Combination Welder	31
Main Office			
MDTA	Clerical and Sales	Clerk General (R, Adult Preparation)	56
RAR	Clerical and Sales	General Salesperson	57
RAR	Clerical and Sales	Bank Teller	53
RAR	Services	Ward Maid	50
RAR	Services	Working Housekeeper	20
RAR ^b	Agriculture	Groundsman	22

^a For all courses, the actual number of Project applicants referred is used.

^b Originally a Cal 308 course.

List II -- List of training courses, in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants,^a that were pending as of October 30, 1966.

Approval Status	Occupational Classification	Course Title	Number of Trainees
Not Presented to Advisory Council			
	Clerical and Sales	Careerist Aide (SS)	165
	Clerical and Sales	Stenographer	33
RAR	Skilled	Aircraft & Engine Mechanic	137
RAR	Skilled	Aircraft Electrician	47
RAR	Skilled	Radio Mechanic (Aircraft)	47
Not Presented to Schools			
Skills Center	Professional & Managerial	Licensed Vocational Nurse	55
Skills Center	Clerical & Sales	Transcribing Machine Operator	22
Skills Center	Clerical & Sales	Ward Clerk	14
Skills Center	Skilled	Federal Government Pre-Apprenticeship	55
Skills Center	Services	Orderly	27
At the Schools			
Skills Center	Professional & Managerial	Radio Dispatcher	27
Cal 308	Clerical & Sales	Central Office Operator (E)	50
Skills Center	Clerical & Sales	Central Office Operator	22
Skills Center	Clerical & Sales	Shipping, Receiving, & Stocking Occupations	28
Skills Center	Skilled	Diesel Mechanic	22
Skills Center	Skilled	Automobile Mechanic	22

^a For Skills Center courses, the expected number of Project trainees (55% of total) was used.

List II -- Continued

Skills Center	Skilled	Metal Automobile Body Repairman	22
Skills Center	Skilled	Automobile Brakeman & Front End Man	11
Skills Center	Skilled	Gas & Water Utility Worker	22
Skills Center	Skilled	Aircraft & Engine Mechanic	55
Skills Center	Skilled	Coin Machine Serviceman	11
Skills Center	Skilled	Occupations in the Graphic Arts Industry	28
Skills Center	Skilled	Upholsterer	22
Skills Center	Services	General Machine Operator	50
Skills Center	Services	Automobile Accessories Installer	11
Skills Center	Services	Driver Salesman (Routeman)	16
Skills Center	Services	Policeman (Government Service)	82
Skills Center	Services	Jailer	55
Skills Center	Services	Waiter or Waitress	14

Awaiting Funding

Skills Center	Professional & Managerial	Mechanical Draftsman	22
Skills Center	Professional & Managerial	Dental Technician	28
Cal 308 b	Clerical & Sales	Clerk Typist (ER)	50
RAR	Clerical & Sales	Duplicating Machine Operator V	75
Skills Center	Skilled	Electrical-Appliance Serviceman	22

Funded but not Started

Skills Center	Skilled	Calculating Machine Serviceman	22
Skills Center	Skilled	Typewriter Serviceman	22

^bOriginally a Cal 308 course

List II -- Funded but not Started (Continued)

Skill Center^b	Services	Automobile Service Station Attendant	11
Skill Center	Services	Patrolman II	41

^b Originally a Cal 308 course.

List III - List of training courses, in which at least a majority of the trainees were Project applicants,^a that had been cancelled as of October 30, 1966.

Point of Cancellation	Occupational Classification	Course Title	Number of Trainees
Prior to Advisory Council			
Skills Center	Professional & Managerial	Dental Technician	6
Skills Center	Skilled	Baker	5
Skills Center	Skilled	Electronics Mechanic	6
Skills Center	Skilled	Ship Electrician	5
Skills Center	Skilled	Aircraft Electrician Apprentice	14
Skills Center	Skilled	Molder (Foundry)	8
Skills Center	Skilled	Millman	14
Skills Center	Skilled	Aircraft Painter	14
Cal 308	Services	Beauty Operator (E)	50
Cal 308	Services	Mechanical Trades Helper	50
Skills Center	Unskilled	Assembler (auto mfg.) II	41
At Advisory Council			
Skills Center	Professional & Managerial	Display Man	8
Skills Center	Skilled	Baker (Upgrading & Refresher)	11
Skills Center	Skilled	Truck Mechanic	9
Skills Center	Skilled	Automotive Electrician	10
Skills Center	Skilled	Air-conditioning Mechanic	10
Skills Center	Skilled	Industrial Truck Mechanic	10
Skills Center	Skilled	Offset Pressman	22

^aFor Skills Center courses, the expected number of Project trainees (55% of total) are used.

List III - Continued

Skills Center	Services	Formal Waiter (Upgrading & Refresher)	27
Skills Center	Services	Pantryman (Upgrading & Refresher)	22

At Area Level

Skills Center	Professional & Managerial	Architectural Draftsman	22
Skills Center	Clerical & Sales	Insurance Clerk	14
Skills Center	Clerical & Sales	Medical Records Clerk	13
Skills Center	Skilled	Duplicating-machine Serviceman	22
Skills Center	Skilled	Cash-register Serviceman	22
Skills Center	Services	Nurse Aide	55
Skills Center	Services	Surgical Technician (Medical Services)	14

At State Level

Skills Center ^a	Professional & Managerial	Licensed Vocational Nurse (basic education)	27
Skills Center ^a	Services	Orderly (E)	22
Skills Center ^a	Services	Nurse Aide (E)	28
Skills Center ^a	Services	Ward Maid (E)	22
Skills Center ^a	Services	Janitor (Porter I)	28
Skills Center ^a	Services	Kitchen Helper (E)	16
Skills Center ^a	Services	Trayline Worker (Waiter, hospital) (E)	16
Skills Center ^a	Unskilled	Municipal Service Laborer	28

^aOriginally a Cal 308 course

APPENDIX C

RESPONSIBILITIES OF NEW SUBCOMMITTEES
OF THE
OAKLAND ADULT PROJECT ADVISORY COMMITTEE

OAKLAND ADULT MINORITY EMPLOYMENT PROJECT
610 - 16th Street, Room 323
Oakland, California

August 12, 1966

TO: Members, Oakland Minority Employment Project Advisory Committee

FROM: Don McCullum, Chairman

SUBJECT: (1) Employment Development Sub-Committee
(2) Public Information & Education Sub-Committee

As a result of further discussion within the Committee around the follow-up study, and in an effort to ameliorate some of the internal problems pointed up by the study, the Chairman was directed by the Committee to augment the Employment Development Sub-Committee and provide guidelines for the operation of the sub-committee.

The following recommendations are submitted:

EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT SUB-COMMITTEE
(EDS)

1. The EDS shall be composed of a chairman and no less than six members of the full Committee with representation from labor, industry and minority as practicable.
2. The EDS shall report its findings and recommendations to the full Committee and authorization for implementation of programs shall emanate from the full Committee.
3. The Employment Development Sub-Committee shall recommend policy to the full Committee for total development of employment opportunities for minorities, the poor and other disadvantaged persons in the labor market.
 - (a) The EDS shall recommend methods of opening "new doors" of employment opportunity.
 - (b) The EDS shall identify "new doors" of occupations and industries.
 - (c) The EDS shall develop priorities and make specific assignments to Committee members for opening new occupations and industries.
 - (d) The EDS shall make suggestions to, and cooperate with the Public Information and Education Sub-Committee in carrying out its responsibilities.
 - (e) The EDS shall determine and recommend methods for soliciting jobs and effective utilization of job developers, from industry, labor, CSES staff and the minority community.
 - (f) The EDS shall confer with and review the day to day operations of the assigned staff job developers who presently are acting in

- the role of industry and labor liaison.
- (g) The EDS shall make monthly reports to the full Committee as to progress, problems, and future plans.
 - (h) The EDS shall identify various practices in employment and placement that militate against minorities, the poor, and the disadvantaged. It shall further develop means, where feasible, for encouraging compensatory hiring, realistic testing procedures, preferential admission to apprenticeship training, realistic entry criteria and creation of individual training programs by employers.
 - (i) The EDS shall review periodically the plans and progress of CSES in diminishing the applicant pool.

PUBLIC INFORMATION AND EDUCATION SUB-COMMITTEE
(PIES)

1. The Public Information and Education Sub-Committee (PIES) shall be composed of a chairman and no less than six members of the full Committee with representation from labor, industry and the minority as practicable.
2. The PIES shall report its findings and recommendations to the full Committee and authorization for implementation of program shall emanate from the full Committee.
3. The PIES shall have the responsibility for interpreting the role of the Project to the community and developing community attitudes for the total utilization of the minorities, the poor and other disadvantaged persons in the labor market.
 - (a) The PIES shall encourage creative ideas from CSES staff and present them to the full Committee and afford the CSES staff an opportunity to make suggestions for change in Committee policy or format.
 - (b) The PIES shall determine method and tactics for dissemination of information of the Project and shall cooperate with the EDS in carrying out the Committees' responsibility
 - (c) The PIES shall identify the persons the Project is designed to serve and develop a program of education to best reach and serve the persons identified.
 - (d) The PIES shall interpret to the Committee the reports, plans and projections of the Project and develop future programs to effectuate the purposes of the Committee.