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Abstract
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Introduction

Unemployment:

The problem of black teenage employment has become one of the most pressing social problems in the United States. Vernon Jordan, President of the National Urban League, recently noted that three out of five black teenagers have been unemployed in each of the past three years. In addition, the majority of America's black youth escape their teens without any experience at all (Jordan, 1978). National statistics showed that in 1978 in the nation's Capitol alone, nearly one-half of the black youth between the ages of 16 and 19 seeking jobs were unsuccessful in obtaining them. In addition, the unemployment rate for black teens in the District in 1978 was 48.5 percent which was more than four times the unemployment rate for local white teens (Washington Post, August 5, 1978). The trend in youth unemployment by race, sex, and age for 1970-1978 is shown in Table 1.

Table 1 About Here

First we see that for black and white youth, age alone constitutes a liability in the labor market. This is especially true for 16 to 17 year old youth whose unemployment rates are much higher than persons 18 to 19 and 20 to 24. But apart from being young, being female and being black are additional disadvantages in the labor market. Of these two factors, race has the greatest effect, with black females having in general the highest unemployment rates among all age cohorts. Racial comparisons show that for any given year within each age cohort, unemployment rates were at least twice as high for blacks as for whites.
Table 2 shows the effects of education on the employment status of persons 16 to 24 years of age for the years 1970 to 1977. These distributions show that even when comparisons are made among high school graduates, unemployment rates remain twice as high among blacks than white high school graduates. More striking is the fact that when comparing the unemployment rate for high school graduates and high school dropouts, high school completion does offer some advantage for whites. Only 13.1 percent of white high school graduates were unemployed in 1977, while 23.7 percent of the white high school dropouts were unemployed. But among blacks, the unemployment rate for high school graduates and high school dropouts was approximately equal (41.8 v. 41.6). Therefore, in 1977, blacks between the ages of 16 and 24 who had obtained a high school diploma fared no better in the job market than black high school dropouts in this age category.

In addition to the problem of unemployment, many black youth are employed are under-utilized and severely underpaid. In fact, some researchers contend that a lack of adequate income attainment is one of the most pressing problems confronting urban racial minorities in general (Harrison, 1972; Gordon, 1972). For example, Harrison (1972) reported that in eight of the major urban ghettos, the problems of under-utilization and underpayment was two to six times as great as the problem of unemployment. The Urban Employment Survey (UES) data used by Harrison also showed that the low income urban minorities who were employed full-time were unable to earn an income adequate enough to support a family of four at a subsistence level. Similarly, in 1969, the National Industrial Conference Board noted that two-thirds of
the jobs developed by the National Alliance of Businessmen in fifteen
cities during the first year of the Job Opportunities in the Business
Sector (JOBS) program paid less than $2.00 an hour. Some evaluators of
this and other similar employment programs for the urban poor contend that
most of these programs paid sub-standard wages and did not offer opportu-
nity for vertical mobility to their employees.

Characteristics of the Youth Labor Market

Kalachek (1969) and others have noted that the youth labor market is
affected by several distinct factors that do not affect the adult labor
market, at least not to the same extent. For example, school attendance
laws exist which require youngsters to attend school at specific hours and
for a designated number of days. Similarly, state and federal legislation
exist regarding job safety and health conditions, overtime hours and child
labor. These laws often restrict the range of employment opportunity for
young workers. Also trade union restrictions that limit the age of admis-
sion of job candidates into its unions and apprenticeship programs, and
seniority provisions that protect older workers further limit the employment
access of young workers. Employment administrators often operate on the
assumption that young workers (blacks in particular) are unstable and high
risk workers. As a result, these officials often exaggerate the require-
ments of age and formal education and training as a means of discouraging
youth from seeking employment (Friedlander, 1972).

More objective factors like the location of jobs and the type of jobs
available also limit youth employment opportunity. For example, in terms
of job type, Table 3 presents for industry and occupation an "index of
inequality" by age. The index was constructed by expressing the percentage of all young workers (≤25) in each sector as a ratio of the percentage of mature workers (>25) in each sector (Freedman, 1976). The data show that the largest employer of young workers in industry in 1970 was the non-durable retailing sector. Jobs in this sector are relatively familiar to youth and require little knowledge of the product. Restaurants, hotels and motels are also a large employer of youth. Here again, these jobs require a minimum amount of skill and training. The indices for occupation suggest that the majority of the clerical, sales, laborers and service workers are young rather than mature workers. Lastly, as Freedman (1976) indicated, the overall data suggest that youth are primarily concentrated in the least structured sectors of the labor market.

Research Objective

As Kalachek (1969) noted, there are distinct characteristics of the youth market which affect their changes of employment in general. But despite these common factors for youth in general, black and other minority youth do not fare as well in the labor market as white youth. This report addresses the nature of the dilemma of black youth in the labor market. It reviews existing theories that may be applicable in explaining the causes and consequences of black youth unemployment. These theories include economic theories and sociological theories which identify structural and personal factors associated with youth employment. Structural factors include: job demand, job supply, job suburbanization, employer hiring
practices and structural discrimination. Personal factors include youth knowledge and their attitudes and motivations regarding the world of work, job skills, and job search techniques.

The second major feature of this report is that it offers a policy approach for dealing with the problem of black and disadvantaged youth unemployment. A major hypothesis underlying the suggested approach is that highly centralized and effective social network systems and sponsorship groups are needed to help presently unemployed youth gain entry and acceptance into the labor market.

Research Plan

The first part of this research presents traditional theories which have been applied to the problems of unemployment and the status achievement of individuals in society. The second part reviews empirical studies that have examined some of the major propositions of these traditional theories. The third section describes a set of sociological theories viewed relevant to approaching the problem of black youth unemployment, and the fourth section proposes a policy strategy which might be useful for dealing with the problems of black youth unemployment.

Finally, a set of exploratory propositions from the literature and this research (see Appendix) are presented for policy considerations.
Traditional Theoretical Explanations of Group Differences in Labor Market Outcomes

Sociological and economic theories have been used to explain group differences in various types of status outcomes, including educational achievement and job attainment and maintenance. From the sociological perspective, Kingsley Davis and Wilbert Moore (1954) have offered a functional theory of stratification, while Marx and his followers have suggested a theory of group conflict. In terms of economics, Human Capital and Dual Labor Market theory are the two most well-known theories advanced. These theories have been more directly applied to the problem of group unemployment. As shall be seen, the Davis and Moore argument and the Human Capital theory suggest that differences in individual investments and skills are crucial in explaining group differences in employment and occupational attainment. But in contrast, Marxian theory and Dual Market theory focus on the impact of structural factors in the labor market and in the larger social structure as perpetuating individual and group differences in employment and status opportunities.

Davis and Moore's Functional Theory of Stratification and Inequality

Davis and Moore's (1972) theory can be viewed as a theory of group differentiation and inequality. The basic assumptions of the theory are that: (1) inequality in society is inherent and necessary; and (2) that individuals are differentially ranked and placed into low and high status jobs according to their skills and talents as evaluated by society. The most talented individuals occupy the most scarce and prestigious jobs, and the less skilled and talented individuals occupy the lower status jobs that
are deemed less valuable to society. Thus, the theory assumes an aristocratic social system whereby individuals achieve and are rewarded social positions and status according to their demonstrated ability and their talents and skills.

In applying Davis and Moore's (1972) theory to the problem of black youth unemployment, the probable inference is that black youth possess a low level of skills and competencies which either make them ineligible for employment or else only eligible for low status, low paying level occupational positions. The theory does not take structural factors like discrimination and imperfections of the job market and other social systems into consideration. Instead it largely assumes an equitable system of achievement and social rewards.

**Economic Human Capital Theory**

Human Capital Theory was previously applied to problems associated with employment and urban poverty by a group of economists in the late 1960's and 70's (Becker, 1964, 1967; Mincer, 1970; Schultz, 1971; Thurow, 1970). These theorists also assume perfect competition and market equilibrium. Their thesis is that a worker's earnings are equivalent to his level of marginal productivity. In addition, Human Capital theorists contend that those workers who are in low paying low-level jobs have jobs that are commensurate with their ability, training and other human resources. Schultz (1971) and Becker (1964) further argue that the value of low level productivity workers will not increase until substantial investments are made to increase their level of education and training. Human Capital theorists also assume that the worker's productivity will be proportionately rewarded by employers.
With specific reference to the poor and minority workers, these theorists argue that an increase in education and training and subsequent job access will facilitate the migration of the urban poor from their impoverished surroundings. David Gordon (1971) summarizes the major premise of the Human Capital perspective as follows:

To improve the productivity of the low-skilled and the poor—in order to equalize their economic opportunities—we must raise their level of cognitive achievement by improving their abilities to read and reason; the schools can effect this increasing equality of opportunity because they have played that role historically; and in general, it is becoming easier for the schools to fulfill this equalizing function because our society is continuing to become more educationally mobile and simultaneously more meritocratic over time.

Many of the work and social programs designed for the poor during the War on Poverty years under the Johnson Administration were based on the Human Capital assumptions.

Marxian Conflict Theory

Karl Marx's (Mills, 1969) theory of class and class conflict is at the base of what most social and political scientists regard as conflict theory. The basic assumption of Marxian theory is that the organization and function of groups and social institutions can largely be understood as a function of competition and conflict between dominant groups (e.g., employers and the owners of production) and subordinate groups (e.g., employees and workers who provide and maintain the means of production). These groups are in constant competition for power and control over the scarce resources of society. The rudiments of the theory have been expanded to study conflict...
within dominant and subordinate groups. Also theorists who have employed Marxian conflict theory have noted that socio-economic status, age, sex and race are often used as a convenient basis of discrimination to promote the vested interest of groups that assume dominant positions in society.

Marxian conflict theory does not assume equality of opportunity for advancement and achievement. In contrast, it assumes the operation of structural elements of inequality that influence the placement of individuals and groups in social and economic positions. In accounting for the precarious status of black youth in the labor market, conflict theorists might argue that being black and being low-socioeconomic status constitute convenient attributes which employers often use as a mechanism to limit the employment opportunity of black and disadvantaged youth. Wright (1978), for example, recently employed a Marxian class conflict framework to show that the lower returns on education and income for blacks is not only attributed to being black but to a greater extent to low socioeconomic status origin. He also noted that the conflict over status and power that occurs between groups is not limited to dominant and subordinate group conflict. In addition this conflict takes place among subordinate groups themselves as a consequence of the dominant groups practice of "divide and conquer" over the latter groups (Wright, 1978).

Dual Labor Market Theory

Dual Labor Market Theory was formulated in the late 1960's by a group of economists who maintained that a "dual" or "split" market best accounted for phenomena such as poverty, unemployment, underemployment
and labor market discrimination against various minority groups.

Within the dual market are two separate and distinct markets: a primary market and a secondary market. Both markets are distinguished on the basis of job and individual characteristics. While individual mobility may occur within markets, little or no mobility occurs between markets. Wachtel and Betsey (1975) describe the differences between the primary and secondary labor markets as follows:

The primary sector contains the privileged members of the labor force. It is governed by an internal labor market in which there is relatively good working conditions, high pay, job security, administrative protection of jobs and mobility along seniority tracks. These jobs require a particular type of worker...with personality traits that are compatible with work in the primary sector...a substantial degree of work discipline, reliability, trustworthiness and receptivity to on-the-job training.

The secondary sector consists of jobs that do not possess much skill specificity...There is little or no on-the-job training required to perform these jobs and turnover is high. Further, as a consequence of the absence of union protection, there is no codification of work rules and seniority privileges...The workers who fill these jobs manifest traits that are compatible with these jobs--poor work discipline, high rates of turnover and instability, unreliability on the job. As a consequence, jobs in the secondary sector pay low wages, have poor working conditions, provide little job security and have high turnover (p. 289)

Wachtel and Betsey (1975), like Human Capital theorists, indicate a match between job and workers' characteristics. However, the former

Bonacich (1976 in defining a dual labor market notes that it refers to a difference in the price of labor between two or more groups of workers, holding constant their efficiency and productivity. The price differential includes not only wages but any costs incurred by the employer associated with his labor supply, such as housing, recruitment, training...Bonacich (1976) notes further that a racially (black-white) split labor market began with slavery and has persisted well into the twentieth century in industrial America.
theorists note that youth, blacks and women are often disproportionately placed in the secondary market sector as a result of employers biases and market discrimination. Also, Dual Market theorists have hypothesized that:

1. individuals channeled into the secondary market develop and display over time traits and behavior commensurate with secondary job characteristics;
2. certain workers who do qualify for primary market jobs lack access to these jobs because employers view the ascriptive characteristics of these workers as better suited for secondary jobs;
3. as unemployment increases and economic opportunity decreases, the primary and secondary markets become more segmented and discriminatory against youth, racial minorities, and women; and
4. racial minorities and the urban poor in general have not obtained gainful employment and earnings commensurate with their acquired stock of human capital.
Research Relevant to the Traditional Theories

Findings Related to the Davis and Moore and Human Capital Theories

As previously noted, individual abilities and talents and education and training are the major factors associated with black youth unemployment and underemployment from the Functionalist and Human Capital perspectives. Several investigations in the mid and late 1960's supported these views. For example, Moynihan (1965) reported from data on black-white earnings that the wages of both groups increased as their level of education increased. Similarly, Nathan Cohen (1969) reported from his Los Angeles Riot Study that when businessmen from Watts and other South Los Angeles riot areas were asked what one change would they make in these areas, a greater percentage indicated increased education and training as a response than an increase in employment opportunity. More recently, Tyler (1976) observed that basic job skills and competencies such as written and verbal communication and computational and interpersonal skills were particularly limited among low income nonwhite youth.

In response to studies supporting the importance of education and training, over thirty separate Federal educational and training programs were established between 1964 and 1975. Approximately six million dollars was appropriated to these programs alone (Levine, 1968). The Neighborhood Youth Program was established to encourage minority low-income youth to continue or resume their schooling. The program provided part-time employment for these youngsters. In addition, Job Corps was designed to send high school dropouts to cities away from their home for two years. Enrollees were to receive job training and basic skills in "richer" environments than
their home environment. Some evaluations of Job Corps and other training programs for low-income minorities concluded that pre and post job training had a positive impact on employment acquisition and retention (Somer, 1968; Taggart, 1970). However, critics of these program evaluations note that most of the evaluations lacked a representative proportion of the hard-core unemployed and employed (Harrison, 1972; Friedlander, 1972).

Research Relevant to Dual-Labor Market Theory and Conflict Theory

Most research regarding the Dual-Labor Market and conflict perspective has been coordinated by Econometricians and Dual-Labor Market researchers who have employed both theoretical perspectives. Some Dual-Market proponents have argued that Human Capital theorists and researchers have relied too heavily on strategies for improving manpower. These researchers have therefore concentrated efforts on examining the importance of labor demand and other structural factors that influence job opportunities for the urban poor. Research settings included: (1) Doeringer's et al. (1968) study of poverty areas in Boston; (2) Fusfeld (1968), Bluestone (1970) and Wachtel's studies of Detroit; and (3) Harrison's (1972) and Friedlander's (1972) more recent studies employing the U.S. Census 1966 Urban Employment Surveys (UES) and the 1967 Survey of Economic Opportunity (SEO). Both surveys included well defined racial minority poverty areas in the largest Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (Roxbury-Boston, Central and East Harlem, Bedford-Stuyvesant-NY, North Philadelphia, Mission-Fillmore-San Francisco, South and West Chicago).
Most of the investigations by Dual-Market researchers have analyzed the returns to investments in the human capital of non-white urban workers taking account of whether they live in a core city ghetto, core city non-ghetto, or in a suburban area. Harrison (1972), for example, has measured pay-offs for non-white investments in terms of weekly earnings, unemployment and occupational status. Human Capital investment variables include formal education and training. Dual-Market researchers have examined the extent to which investments in the latter human capital variables yield a different payoff for various age, sex and race groups.

**Investment in Education.** Based upon a comparison of white and non-white participants in the Census Survey of Economic Opportunity, Harrison (1972) observed that education was much more efficient for low income whites than non-whites. Whites in ten metropolitan urban ghettos were found to earn over twice as much per extra years of schooling than non-whites. Friedlander (1972) and Doeringer et al. (1969) also noted that education had only a limited impact on the probability of non-white employment. The problem of unemployment for Chicano educated youth in San Antonio was observed most severe among minority youth in that area. Harrison (1972) observed that the demand for a college-trained Chicano males was so low in 1966 in San Antonio that the probability of unemployment was 8 percent higher for these groups than for white workers who had never attended college. Similarly, Friedlander (1972) and Harrison (1972) noted that for Boston and San Francisco low income minority youth, the achievement of a high school diploma or some college training in some instances reduced their ability to
find and hold a job. The reason is that the levels of expectations of these youth were much higher than the employers' willingness to accommodate them. As a result these youth either quit work shortly after obtaining employment or either refused to take the job offered (Harrison, 1972).

**Investment in Training.** Some Dual-Market researchers have observed that job training programs have a limited effect on job acquisition and stability of the poor. Gordon (1972) found that trainees earned no higher wages after training than before, although some trainees were able to obtain jobs. Doeringer (1969) noted that many of the youth remained in these programs for short periods, earning small stipends and then permanently dropping out. Cumulative figures for 1968-1970 showed that of the 84,703 actual hires for the Job Opportunity in the Business Sector program (JOBS), 50,255 quit or were laid off (Harrison, 1972). Many of the hard-core participants in the program were found segregated from the main-stream workers. In his evaluation of the Work Inventive Program (WIN), Bradley Schiller (1972) reported that:

Variations in local job placement rates cannot be explained by local training efforts. Program inputs alone account for less than 15 percent of placement rate variations. When non-program forces are included in the analysis, the coefficient of determination jumps to 0.54. Apparently, WIN's ability to place clients on jobs is dictated more by non-program forces...than by program activities (p. 8).

Schiller (1972) concluded that job placement success at the local level depended primarily on the level and structure of the demand for labor and on employers' attitudes towards WIN-clients. Friedlander (1972) found that among Cleveland participants in the Concentrated Employment Program,
positive trainee attitudes toward work and work motivation were uncorrelated with higher job retention and job performance. Factors that were more important in differentiating successful workers from unsuccessful workers were various supports from peers and supervisors within the immediate work environment.

Impact of Suburbanization. Dual-Market researchers have also examined the hypothesis that increased job opportunities and higher income will accrue to blacks who are able to move out of the central city areas to suburbia. This movement has been viewed particularly important for minority youth achievement of employment in wholesale and retail industries which have relocated to the suburbs. However, Harrison's (1972) data did not support this hypothesis. Instead, he found that the economic returns to non-whites living in the suburbs were no greater than the returns for non-whites with comparable education who lived in the central city. Friedlander (1972) tested a similar job dispersal hypothesis. He found that while not statistically significant, greater job dispersion was associated with higher unemployment rates for 14-19 year olds. However, the opposite pattern held for young adults aged 20-24. Older youth apparently had greater access to private transportation and greater knowledge of jobs located in the suburbs than the younger youth.

Employers' Behavior and Structural Barriers to Youth Employment. Several researchers note that employers often inflate skill requirements for jobs and the extent of education required for job performance as a
method of controlling their intake of minority candidates. Green (1976) noted that in 1971, 8 out of 10 new jobs created only required a high school diploma. Similarly, the Bureau of Employment Security reported that the jobs that were selected in 1966 and 1972 as being of prime importance in urban areas required less than 12 years of high school education and less than two years of experience. Despite these indications, many minority youth with high school diplomas reported that employers indicated that they lacked adequate education for blue-collar jobs (Berg, 1970).

In terms of racial discrimination, Becker (1957) argued that "every employer has his price for hiring blacks" and that racial discrimination takes place at the point of job entry for blacks and other minorities. More recently, Bergmann (1971) observed that some employers will not hire blacks at any price. Bergmann further notes that:

The most important feature of an economy in which discrimination is practiced is the simple fact that some jobs are open to [blacks] and some are not. The jobs open to [blacks] are not a random selection, even allowing for [blacks'] relatively lower education. They tend to be predominantly low in status and to be concentrated very heavily in a few occupations... (p. 295).

Finally, Friedlander (1972) contends that discrimination by employers takes place within the larger context of institutional barriers. He identifies factors like the bureaucratic structure of industries, union policies and various obsolete employment laws which function to inhibit employment opportunities for youth and racial minorities.
Apprenticeships as Barriers to Minority Youth Employment. Derrick (1967) and Green (1976) found that apprenticeship organizations which have historically excluded young blacks offer a viable source of entry into the world of work. The importance of integrating low income youth into these programs as opposed to creating distinct training programs for poor youth has been suggested as an important strategy by these researchers. Manufacturing, construction, utilities and services are four major industries that employ these programs. Using the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training (BAT) guidelines, national and local Joint Apprenticeship Committees (JACs) have developed their own training and entry requirements for young adults between the age of 16-24. Formal entry requirements which often prove difficult for poor minority youth, include the passing of an aptitude exam, the submission of a high school transcript, proof of physical fitness and sometimes sponsorship by a JAC member. Successful candidates who complete the program usually have a good chance of gaining industrial employment. For example, Green (1976) reported that the returns from investment in apprenticeships were greater than returns from participation in other non-college training programs.

Currently, efforts are being made to increase the participation of females, blacks and other racial minorities in apprenticeship programs. However, efforts have resulted in only a few blacks gaining access to these programs. Most minority youth (women in particular) are not knowledgeable of these programs. In addition, school counselors and minority parents have not traditionally encouraged their youngsters to pursue apprenticeship training. Derrick (1967) suggests that apprenticeship program officers must
themselves in minority communities and local organizations and devise other outreach strategies to recruit minority youth.
The Concept of Sponsorship: An Approach to the Problem of Black Youth Unemployment

The theoretical explanations and research presently reviewed suggests a number of explanations regarding black youth unemployment. As previously noted, some of the explanations point to a lack of job skills and other deficiencies in black youth themselves as the source of the problem while other explanations focus on structural discrimination and similar factors external to black youth as casual factors. Assuming that some merit can be found in both sets of explanations, the important task becomes that of identifying a strategy for reducing the problem of black and disadvantaged youth unemployment. The major hypothesis underlying the strategy that will be presently suggested is that: Increased access of black and disadvantaged youth to the labor market can be achieved through the organization of effective social networks and sponsorship groups which function to: (1) better prepare black and disadvantaged youth for jobs and (2) facilitate actual job opportunity for these youth.

Previous manpower programs for black youth administered during the Johnson War on Poverty Era did attempt through their job training efforts to prepare black and disadvantaged youth for jobs. However, the short-term duration of these programs coupled with the limited number of black and disadvantaged youth participants were major factors that limited the success of these programs (Harrison, 1972; Plotnick and Skidmore, 1975; Haveman, 1977). In addition, very few of the War on Poverty programs and present job preparation programs for black and disadvantaged youth have devoted extensive efforts to directly interacting and negotiating with employers to
obtain jobs for these black youth. This type interaction is currently viewed as a strategy that should be immediately considered. In fact, in the absence of such immediate and direct assistance, black and disadvantaged youth (particularly those who have experienced chronic unemployment), may develop negative attitudes towards the world of work and society in general. More importantly, these youth may internalize and maintain these attitudes as adults and express them in various forms of antisocial behavior.

Three sociological theories are suggested as a basis for formulating policy to deal with the problem of black and disadvantaged youth unemployment: Reference Group Theory, Social Network Theory and Sponsorship Theory. All three theories together can be viewed as constituting a broad theory of "social support". However, sponsorship theory is highlighted as the major theory for policy intervention.

**Reference Group Theory:**

The basic notion of reference group theory advanced by Hyman (1958) and Merton (1957) is that individuals employ various groups of other individuals as frames of references. These groups vary in their availability to the individual and the extent to which they have characteristics similar to the individual employing them to a standard. The significant feature of reference groups is that they not only influence the individual's behavior, goals and aspirations, but they often set the norms by which individuals operate. The peer group, for example, has been observed by Sewell and Shah (1967) as very influential in influencing the educational plans of high school students. Shibutani (1965) and others who have studied more formal organizational behavior have noted influence of reference groups and the importance of reference group membership in influencing and structuring the types of
opportunities available to individuals. Phyllis Wallace (1976) noted that although many black youth have high educational and occupational aspirations, they lack functional reference groups and the types of supports necessary to help them transmit their aspirations into attainments. The need for functional and influential reference groups is even more important for "hard-core" youth whose backgrounds and experiences do not offer them much chance of success in the absence of influential reference groups.

Social Network Theory:

Social network theory was originally employed as an analytical method for studying formal and informal group patterns of communication and interaction. The technique is detailed in Moreno's (1953) *Who Shall Survive*. It consists of asking individuals to select their associates from any group to which they belonged. Individual responses are later analyzed and presented as a sociogram which reveals the group social structure that emerges from individual responses.

More recent investigations employing social network analysis have expanded the technique to examine the individual in a series of multiple relationships which cut across formal and informal social structures. Karweit (1976; 1977), for example, has studied the influence of friendship networks as a resource for fostering successful student relations within schools consisting of students from diverse backgrounds. Mitchell (1969) studied the interaction and influence of work and community group networks in employment and local community settings. Also, Becker (1977) has noted that employers develop among themselves formal and informal information and exchange networks for the purpose of obtaining data about employee prospects and other valuable information that they would not otherwise have access to.
Influential networks are also needed to aid black youth in obtaining relevant job information and job contacts. Parnes and Kohen (1976) reported that the information networks that black youth relied on for job information and job referrals were less influential than those relied on by white youth. White youth had greater access to private employment agencies and a wider variety of friends and relatives who had job contacts than black youth. Thus formal and informal organizations which are normally not very accessible to black youth may be useful as alternative networks for black youth.

**Turner's Conception of Sponsorship.** The concept of sponsorship that is presently emphasized as a strategy for dealing with disadvantaged youth unemployment is extracted from Ralph Turner's (1970) theoretical typology. Turner (1970) developed a descriptive framework for distinguishing between the American versus the English system of education. He noted that mobility and achievement in the American education systems is characterized by a "contest mobility" system which closely corresponds to the type of social mobility pattern operating in the American occupational structure and general stratification systems. In contrast, Turner (1970) viewed the traditional English school system as reflecting an achievement pattern of "sponsorship mobility" which also corresponded to the dominant pattern of mobility in traditional English society.

Turner (1970) used the "contest" versus "sponsorship" typology to demonstrate the differences in the manner in which the American and English school systems stratified, educated and socialized their students for future occupational and adult roles. For example, he described the U. S. educational system as an "open" system in which all students are given equal opportunity
to compete for grades and other scholastic rewards. In extending Turner's (1970) view of the U. S. mobility system to the American occupational structure, it can be similarly inferred that all youth have an equal opportunity to compete for jobs in the labor market.

In contrast to the U. S. open contest mobility system, Turner (1970) noted that the traditional English system of schooling was a "closed" system in which entry was based on a controlled system of recruitment and sponsorship. Thus, under the English educational system of "sponsorship," the most promising and talented students were sorted out at a very early age and exposed to a more competitive schooling curriculum than the remaining English students. Turner (1970) noted that state aptitude exams were administered as a basis of selecting students for entry into the sponsorship mobility system. More importantly, once students were selected on the basis of these exams, they were subsequently sponsored at every point in their schooling career (Turner, 1970: p. 52).

In terms of its theoretical utility, Turner's (1970) typology is very simplistic, narrow and subject to extensive qualifications. It is restricted to an ideal construct that has not been subject to empirical testing. For example, while it may be true that the American educational and occupational systems approximate to some extent "open" systems, norms of sponsorship and social inequality have been observed in these institutions (Bowles and Gintis, 1973; Persell, 1976; Clark, 1970). Also, Turner (1970) himself acknowledges the fact that modern English social institutions reflect both norms of "sponsorship" and "contest" mobility.
Despite the theoretical limitations of Turner's (1970) typology, it has practical value for the present inquiry. Its theoretical notions have been applied to investigations concerning race and social mobility (Porter, 1974; Portes and Wilson, 1976.) More importantly, it raises some crucial questions relevant to the problem of youth unemployment. For example, one question that Turner's (1970) discussion raises regarding the U. S.'s system of "contest" mobility is whether it can be assumed that all American youth are equally able to compete for achievement in the labor market. Obviously, an acceptance of this assumption would necessitate a denial of the current unemployment dilemma of black youth.

A second question that Turner's (1970) discussion raises which is more difficult to dismiss is: What youth should be sponsored in the American labor market and on what basis? Turner (1970) noted that under the traditional English system, the most talented youth were identified by standardized achievement tests administered by the state. Selected youth were then subsequently sponsored throughout their schooling career. With reference to the U. S. Labor market, it is presently argued that major attention must be devoted to providing intensive sponsorship for potentially talented disadvantaged youth. In addition, it is argued that these youth must be identified on a different set of criteria than standardized tests and other conventional criteria. Standardized achievement tests, for example, have been standardized on middle class white populations and are systematically biased towards blacks and other lower class minorities (Montagu, 1975). Also, with reference to academic performance, a substantial number of the presently unemployed disadvantaged youth are likely to be youngsters who are alienated from the school system and who are not likely to have impressive
records of school attendance and good grades.

The latter observations suggest that black and other disadvantaged youth are not likely to obtain sponsorship based upon conventional criteria of selection. However, the increasingly deteriorating status of these youngsters in the labor market independently establishes the need for sponsorship. Also, the fact that disadvantaged youth lack functional job referral networks and contacts further supports the need for sponsorship (Wallace, 1976; Parmes and Kohen, 1976; Becker, 1977). Therefore, the schools, local community and employment organizations are needed to provide external support and sponsorship for disadvantaged youngsters. The remainder of this report addresses a policy approach that might be useful in facilitating sponsorship and support services for unemployed black and disadvantaged youth.
Policy Program for Sponsorship
of Unemployed Black and Disadvantaged Youth

The target group for youth employment intervention presently proposed is black and other disadvantaged youth who are currently unemployed in cities with the highest unemployment rates. Relevant criteria for defining eligible youngsters might include: (1) the work aspirations and motivations of these youth; (2) the extent to which they have attempted to obtain employment; (3) the severity of their financial and home status; and (4) the extent to which they are committed to obtaining job training and continuing or resuming their formal schooling. But prior to identifying disadvantaged youth and focusing on strategies for selection and intervention, the severity of the youth unemployment dilemma must be recognized. More importantly, an immediate and aggressive national commitment to the problem must be taken. It is therefore proposed that a Youth Employment Service (YES) organization be established at the Federal governmental level for the purpose of setting up policy and legislation necessary to initiate a national centralized strategy for intervention.

The specific purpose of the Federal YES would be to serve as a centralizing and accounting agency for state and local manpower training and employment programs that currently serve youth. Two immediate activities should be pursued at the Federal level through YES. The first task should be to evaluate the utility of existing youth labor laws and to make recommendations to the Federal legislature for amending or eliminating laws accordingly. The second activity of YES should be to develop guidelines for state and local agencies to establish Youth Employment Affirmative Action programs for black and disadvantaged youth. These established programs would then serve as the prime agencies for providing
direct job sponsorship and support services to presently unemployed black and disadvantaged youth. Federal guideline specifications should provide for a youth affirmative action coordinator and staff in each state and local employment agency. Affirmative action program officials should function specifically to develop working network relations with the public schools, local chamber of commerces, public and private industries, apprenticeship program officers and local political and community leaders. The purpose of developing formal interaction with these organizations would be to promote a greater level of interest and support for increasing the job skills and job opportunity of black and disadvantaged youth. In addition a collective and broader assessment of the employment problems with reference to these youth should be obtained from this joint consortium effort.

Local affirmative action officers should also attempt to formally engage local organizations into a collective program planning strategy for increasing the employment opportunity of these youth. Figure 1 indicates the type of activities that affirmative action officials should attempt to coordinate among various groups. The upper half of Figure 1 shows the activities that the schools and local community organizations might engage in an attempt to improve the job competencies and job skills of black and disadvantaged youth. The lower half of Figure 1 represents the interaction of affirmative action officers with apprenticeship program representatives, business and industrial representatives and local politicians. The interaction of these groups should be directed at increasing the employment opportunity of black and disadvantaged youth.
This strategy should operate to: (1) influence the job knowledge, job confidence and motivation and job skills and training of black and disadvantaged youth; (2) make accessible, through the local schools and community organizations, peers and adults who have experienced success in the labor market; and (3) provide job training experiences and the development of job skills through local community organizations and the schools. In working with the public school boards, Affirmative Action officers should attempt to focus on three areas: (1) improving the quality and extent of occupational counseling offered to disadvantaged youth; (2) increasing the relevancy of public school curricula to jobs actually available to youth; and (3) increasing the availability of distributive educational opportunity and school work experiences for disadvantaged youth.

With reference to the need for occupational counseling, Wallace (1976) and others have noted that most of the American public schools are not adequately equipped with counselors that are able to provide vocational guidance for students who are not planning to attend college. Therefore certified occupational counselors need to be employed in the school and made available to black and disadvantaged youth who will be immediately entering the labor market. In addition, youth affirmative action programs in local employment agencies might also offer job counseling to black and disadvantaged youth.

Public schools must also be encouraged to increase the relevancy between the curricula offered students and the world of work. However, some educators maintain that public elementary and secondary schools cannot
expand their curricula to meet the needs of students from varying backgrounds. Others have argued that the major goal of lower level public schooling is to prepare students for college and higher education. However, investigators who have studied the problems of youth unemployment have noted that public schools should place greater emphasis on developing the technical skills in students necessary for acquiring jobs and lesser emphasis on a general college education for all students (Friedlander, 1972). Friedlander has described the public school situation in New York as follows:

"The city schools have failed to train and educate a substantial portion of black youngsters. A serious mismatch exists between the needs of these black students and the services provided by the educational institutions. A severe communication gap, preventing a productive exchange of information, ideas and services, is a root cause of many of the deficiencies in the school systems in serving the minority group of the cities. The extent of the misinformation and the communications gap is revealed by the large number of [students] who were involved in academic programs in the high schools. Their lack of interest in school and in academic subjects in particular was obvious to the most casual observer; yet, the school systems offered them no option to switch to another program or school. Moreover, an academic diploma may not be...so desirable as a certificate of graduation from a fine vocational high school. Unfortunately, there are too few "fine" vocational schools in New York City...where many minority students can enroll." (pp. 185-186)

In addition to encouraging greater relevancy between school curricula and available youth jobs, local affirmative action officers should also encourage extended job training opportunities for these youth. Affirmative Action programs themselves could offer weekend or other short-term job training activities. Program coordinators might also work with local and neighborhood community organizations in sponsoring youth job training activities. For example, Leon Sullivan's (Bray, 1970) Opportunities
Industrialization Centers programs for Philadelphia's disadvantaged youth represents the type of community job training efforts that might be encouraged. Sullivan's program concentrated on the development among youth of job skills, good etiquette, and good communication and interpersonal skills. The Urban League (Jordan, 1978) programs designed to aid youth ex-offenders and high school dropouts and Jessie Jackson's PUSH program might also be target programs for additional youth training efforts. Also, negotiations with local apprenticeship program representatives should be pursued. The object here would be to assist apprenticeship organizations in identifying and sponsoring a number of minority youth who may become strong candidates for program entry after intensive pre-tutoring and pre-counseling assistance.

Two final important groups that local youth affirmative action officers should establish working relations with are the Chamber of Commerce and local public and private industrial representatives. Updated information regarding job possibilities for youth should be frequently obtained from these organizations. In exchange for this information, affirmative action officials should have an active list of promising disadvantaged youngsters to recommend to interested employers. Becker (1977) suggests that this type of exchange might be welcomed by employers who frequently rely on formal and informal exchange networks for purposes of screening out employee prospects.

Evaluating youth labor laws and formulating youth affirmative action guidelines for state and local employment agencies are only two of the major activities that a Federal Youth Employment Service (YES) organization should assume. Other important activities are summarized in Figure 2. For example,
financial and technical assistants to state and local agencies for establishing youth employment affirmative action programs must be provided at the Federal level. In addition, extensive program evaluations must be planned and conducted at the Federal level. The purpose of these evaluations would be to systematically assess the progress of state and local youth affirmative action programs and all manpower and community training programs that receive Federal aid and that serve youth. These evaluations should prove useful in differentiating between successful and unsuccessful youth programs and providing guidelines for distributing future Federal funds. YES officials, with the assistance of Federal government, should also formulate financial incentive packages in the form of grant and contract awards for youth employment demonstration projects.

In addition, similar funding opportunities should be made available to public schools and vocational colleges for purposes of curriculum improvement and expansion.

Another major activity that must take place at the Federal level involves the actual expansion of job opportunity for black and disadvantaged youth. Federal support and achievement of this activity is paramount if the presently proposed youth affirmative action programs are to be successful. One method that might be useful in expanding youth employment opportunity is to provide Federal subsidies and grant competition opportunities to small expanding and developing inner city businesses. Major efforts should be particularly made to supplement small black and minority business owners. The reason is that minority businessmen should have a greater vested interest in their own youth. Also, minority business owners are probably in greater need of technical assistance than majority business owners.
Although subsidizing small business owners may be one alternative to expanding youth job opportunities, the major responsibility of providing black youth employment should not be restricted to these business owners. In fact, a greater commitment to black youth employment should be assumed by the larger public and private business and industrial sectors. Therefore, the presently proposed Youth Employment Service, with the support of Federal government, should execute legislation which assumes a more stringent posture towards encouraging Federally supported industries and businesses to hire a greater number of black and disadvantaged youth.

Harrison (1972) noted that the public industrial and business sector may be more receptive to Federal encouragement and incentives regarding minority youth hiring than the private sectors. In addition, the U. S. Department of Labor has recently designated a number of jobs in the public sector which have experienced expansion and which offer good possibilities for increased youth employment. These jobs include trade and communication services, banking and financing, real estate, transportation and public utilities (Dicesare, 1975; Gartaganis, 1974). The increase in financing and trade has contributed to the growth in clerical secretaries and typists (Dicesare, 1975). Also, the increase in self-service stores (e.g. supermarkets and clothing stores) have contributed to an increase in cashier and sales jobs (Dicesare, 1975).

Freedman (1976) similarly indicated that the best employment opportunities for youth in 1970 were in clerical, sales and service work and in the nondurable retailing industrial sector. These type jobs are considered
relatively familiar to youth and require a minimum amount of training and skills. In addition the U. S. Department of Labor projected an increase of 15.3 million new jobs between 1968 and 1980 in service industries with government alone contributing nearly a third of the new service jobs (Harrison, 1972). These observations suggest that a careful evaluation of the reality of youth employment opportunities in currently expanding jobs need to be pursued by any future established Federal Youth Employment Service and by currently existing Federal employment organizations. More importantly, methods of assuring the access of presently unemployed black and disadvantaged youth to all expanding job opportunities need to be immediately instituted.

A final issue which needs to be addressed at the Federal and State level concerns the provision of adequate child care facilities for disadvantaged female parents. The Department of Labor's New York Unemployment Survey (U.S. Department of Labor, 1971) indicated that 75 percent of low income minority women did not seek employment in 1970 due to child care difficulties. Similarly, Harrison's (1972) study of Bedford-Stuyvesant indicated that child care facilities were far below the existing demand and limited the employment opportunity of young women. If these women were included in current unemployment figures (which are generally restricted to civilians who are actively seeking employment), youth unemployment rates would be even higher for females. Therefore, extended child care facilities need to be provided so that these young women will also have the opportunity to seek employment.
The Time for Massive Intervention is Now

Conclusion

This inquiry and the current facts regarding black youth unemployment strongly indicate the need for an immediate massive Federal effort designed to attack the problem of disadvantaged youth unemployment. However, the current level of U. S. inflation and President Carter's budget cut in social service and domestic programs suggests bad timing and a lack of reality in initiating such massive effort. But, simultaneously, the increase in youth crime, in black youth high school attrition and the decline in job opportunities in general indicate bad timing for black and disadvantaged youth. Consequently, a serious reevaluation and possible reordering of national priorities must take place.

The presently proposed establishment of affirmative action efforts on behalf of youth is also likely to be problematic and suggests bad timing. This is particularly true given the current Weber litigation and similar reverse discrimination Title VII suits. An increase in opposition to affirmative action efforts may mean that the concept of affirmative action will increasingly become as distasteful to some Americans as the concepts of inequality and discrimination. Several measures might be taken, however, to counteract this possibility and to minimize opposition towards the type of affirmative action efforts presently suggested. The first measure might entail emphasizing the fact that the major intent of youth affirmative action programs would be to create more functional networks among the schools, community and employment sectors in an effort to include presently excluded disadvantaged youngsters in the job market.
Secondly, conscientious efforts must be made to develop a clear set of criteria for selecting black and disadvantaged youngsters based upon the severity of their unemployment situation. In addition, systematic and longitudinal assessments of the improvements in the group status of these youngsters should be conducted and well publicized. Thirdly, and most importantly, greater efforts must be made to educate the public regarding:

1. the necessity of developing and maintaining effective affirmative action programs until such time as race, sex and class equality are achieved; and
2. the social and economic costs required to maintain affirmative action programs.

In the absence of immediate efforts aimed at raising the public consciousness regarding the severity of the youth unemployment problem, the current deteriorating conditions of America's disadvantaged youth will continue to go largely unnoticed. Also, in the absence of a massive Federal response, small scale attempts to educate and train disadvantaged youngsters will be futile. In addition, theoretical inquiries like the present and future data collection activities will only represent added contributions to social scientific idealism.
Tables and Figures
Table 1: Unemployment Rates by Race, Sex, and Age 1970-78

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total 16 years and over</th>
<th>16 and 17 years</th>
<th>18 and 19 years</th>
<th>20 to 24 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>Black Males</td>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>Black Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>34.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>37.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977*</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978**</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977*</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978**</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1977 and 1978 figures are for blacks only; 1970-1976 include blacks and other minorities
**1978 figures are from the Office of Employment Statistics (Jan. 1979)

Table 2: Employment Status of High School Graduates not Enrolled in College and of School Dropouts as of October of Year of Graduation or Dropout, by Race and Sex 1970-77
[Persons 16 to 24 yrs. of age; numbers in thousands]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>High School Graduates</th>
<th>School Dropouts</th>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>High School Graduates</th>
<th>School Dropouts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>% of Labor Force</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>944</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,317</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>657</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Percents not shown where base is less than 75,000

Note: 1977 figures are for blacks only; 1970-1976 include blacks and other minorities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>All Ages</th>
<th>&lt;25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fisheries</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2340</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furniture and Wood Products</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>996</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Metals</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>1159</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fabricated Metals</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1848</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation Equipment</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>2307</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and Kindred, Tobacco</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1878</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile and Apparel</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2247</td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing and Publishing</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>1313</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemicals and Petroleum</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1163</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Manufacturing</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2799</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trucking and Warehousing</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>1035</td>
<td>295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1013</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale Trade</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2835</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail — Nondurables</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>6755</td>
<td>2112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail — Durableles</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1966</td>
<td>388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, Insurance, and Real Estate</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>3396</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Producer and Legal Services</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>2839</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Services</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>4120</td>
<td>503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Welfare, and Nonprofit Services</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7246</td>
<td>1537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants, Hotels, and Motels</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>2899</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Consumer Services</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>8032</td>
<td>873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Administration</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3932</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,673</td>
<td>13,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7308</td>
<td>963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semiprofessionals and Technicians</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8839</td>
<td>706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2600</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Clericals</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>6381</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoffice Clericals</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>5914</td>
<td>1072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6920</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Craftsmen</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>8677</td>
<td>1206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>12646</td>
<td>2393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laborers</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>4116</td>
<td>1386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Workers</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>1276</td>
<td>2168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>70,673</td>
<td>13,960</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The percentage of employed who were <25 in a particular sector divided by the percentage of employed who were <25 in that sector.*

Figure 1
Disadvantaged Youth Employment Policy Intervention Model at the State and Local Level

Youth Affirmative Action Coordinator (YAAC)

I. **Internal Supports**
   
   A. **Peer and Adult Moral Support:**  
   ---Interaction of disadvantaged youth with peers and adults who have experienced success in the labor market.
   
   B. **School and Community Support:**  
   ---Occupational counseling services  
   ---Provision of job training services by local employment and community organizations  
   ---Establishment of cooperative educational programs

II. **External Sponsorship**
   
   A. Multi-group consortium efforts to define issues and strategy by: YAAC, Public and Private Industrial Representatives, Apprenticeship Program Officers, Chamber of Commerce, Minority, and Small Business Owners, Community Leaders, Local School Board Officials and Politicians
   
   B. Multi-group Establishment of Youth Referral and Group Exchange Networks
   
   C. Multi-group Establishment of Job Acquisition Networks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning and Development</th>
<th>Administration and Coordination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Developing priorities and guidelines for local Youth Affirmative Action programs.</td>
<td>1. Coordinating and distributing future youth employment funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Developing grant and contract award opportunities for community organizations, small businesses and consulting firm implementation of youth employment demonstration projects.</td>
<td>2. Providing technical and financial assistance to local Youth Affirmative Action programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Developing grant and contract award opportunities for public school vocational and curriculum improvement.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Developing evaluation designs to assess the progress of local Youth Affirmative Action programs and youth training and employment programs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monitoring and Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Evaluating existing youth labor laws and relevant employment legislation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Evaluating progress of local Youth Affirmative Action programs, federally funded businesses and youth job training programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Evaluating child care facilities in low income communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix

Summary Propositions from Research and Literature Review
Exploratory Propositions

1. The greater the employment discrimination, the higher the unemployment among black and disadvantaged youth.

2. The segregation of black and disadvantaged youth from mainstreaming workers in employment settings will have a negative effect on job performance and job commitment and a positive effect on job absenteeism and overall job retention among black and disadvantaged youth.

3. Investing in the education and job training of black and disadvantaged youth without equal efforts to reorganize the employment structure to absorb a substantial proportion of disadvantaged youth will not have a significant effect on black and disadvantaged youth employment.

4. Increased sponsorship and support services rendered to black and disadvantaged youth by the school, community, and local employment organizations will have a positive effect on the employment opportunity of black and disadvantaged youth.

5. An increase in the provision of child care facilities in low income communities will have a positive effect on the employment of disadvantaged female youth.

6. An increase in public service jobs in the central city will have a positive effect on black and disadvantaged youth employment.

7. An increase in the concentration of jobs in the suburbs will have a negative effect on black and disadvantaged youth employment.

8. The greater the involvement of local schools in cooperative education and vocational training programs, the greater the chances of youth employment.

9. The greater the participation and completion of apprenticeship programs by black and disadvantaged youth the greater their chances of employment.

10. Employers will be more favorable towards employing black and disadvantaged youth who have participated in apprenticeship programs than towards youth who have participated in local community job training programs specifically designed for black and disadvantaged youth.

11. Increased contact and interaction of black and disadvantaged youth with supportive peers and adults who have experienced success in the labor market will have a positive effect on their motivations and aspirations towards work.

12. Chronic unemployment among black and disadvantaged youth will foster negative attitudes among these youth towards education and the world of work.

13. The higher the rate of black and disadvantaged youth unemployment, the greater the rate of participation of black and disadvantaged youth in crime and other illegal activities (murder, theft, drugs, gambling).