

SEX DIFFERENCES IN THE INCIDENCE OF THE
ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED AND UNEMPLOYED
PERSONS IN KANSAS AND THE UNITED STATES,
1975-1982 [Analysis of Data From Survey
of Income and Education and Current
POPULATION SURVEY]

Dr. Kenneth F. Walker
Dr. Anthony L. Redwood, Director

July 1983

Monograph # 9

Kansas Labor Market Research Series

Institute for Economic and Business Research

University of Kansas

The Kansas Labor Market Information Project is funded by the State of Kansas through the Governor's Special Grant Component of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, and is sponsored by the State Employment and Training Council and the Kansas Department of Human Resources. All Views expressed are solely those of the authors. The assistance for this project was provided by Dan Petree, Marty Jensen, and Chris Rott.

ABSTRACT

This monograph reviews sex differences in the incidence of economic disadvantaged and unemployed persons in Kansas and the United States for the periods 1975-76 and 1978-82. For 1975-76, information for Wichita SMSA is also analyzed.

A general pattern of a higher incidence of poverty and unemployment among females than among males was found in most years for most age-groups and most ethnic groups. Exceptions to this general pattern were few. In most years and for most groups, the predominance of females over males followed a similar pattern in Kansas. In 1975, the predominance of females in most groups was greater in Wichita than in Kansas and the nation as a whole.

In Kansas, the relationship between fewer years of schooling and a higher incidence of CETA-eligibility was stronger than at the national level. Unemployment among more educated females in Kansas became severe in 1982.

Finally, three policy issues which take into account the higher incidence of poverty and unemployment among females in Kansas are raised for consideration.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Abstract | i |
| Table of Contents | ii |
| List of Tables | iii & iv |
| I. Purpose and Scope of Monograph | 1 |
| A. Purpose | 1 |
| B. Sources of Data | 1 |
| 1. Survey of Income and Education, 1975-1976 | 1 |
| 2. The Current Population Survey (CPS) | 2 |
| 3. Definition of CETA Eligibility and Other Terms | 2 |
| II. Sex Differences in Poverty, 1975 | 6 |
| III. Unemployment Among Economically Disadvantaged and Total Population, 1976 | 14 |
| IV. CETA-Eligibility, 1978-82 | 17 |
| V. Unemployment, 1978-82 | 17 |
| VI. Education Level and CETA-Eligibility | 21 |
| VII. The Percentages of Females in the Total CETA-Eligible Population, 1978-1982 | 25 |
| VIII. Conclusions and Policy Implications | 27 |
| Previous Monographs in This Series | 31 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | | <u>Page</u> |
|----------|--|-------------|
| Table 1 | CETA Eligibility | 3 |
| Table 2 | Data-Element Definitions | 4 & 5 |
| Table 3 | Incidence and Relative Sex Incidence of Poverty Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975 | 7 |
| Table 4 | Relative Sex Incidence of Poverty in Age-Groups Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975 | 8 |
| Table 5 | Relative Sex Incidence of Poverty by Ethnic Group Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975 | 9 |
| Table 6 | Relative Sex Incidence of Poverty by Race and Age Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975 | 10 |
| Table 7 | Relative Sex Incidence of Poverty in Families by Ethnic Group of Family Head Kansas, Wichita United States 1975 | 12 |
| Table 8 | Relative Sex Incidence of Severe Poverty in Families by Ethnic Group of Family Head Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975 | 13 |
| Table 9 | Relative Sex Incidence of Unemployment Among Disadvantaged and Total Population by Race 1976 | 15 |
| Table 10 | Relative Sex Incidence of Severe Unemployment Among Disadvantaged and Total Population by Race, 1976 | 16 |
| Table 11 | Incidence of CETA-Eligibility by Sex Kansas and United States 1978-82 | 18 |
| Table 12 | Relative Sex Incidence of CETA-Eligibility by Age Kansas and United States 1978-82 | 19 |
| Table 13 | Incidence of Unemployment by Sex Kansas and United States 1978-82 | 20 |
| Table 14 | Incidence of Unemployment by Sex Among CETA Eligible Population (Kansas and United States) 1978-82 | 22 |
| Table 15 | Education Levels of CETA-Eligible Population and Total Population, 1978-82 Kansas and United States | 23 |

LIST OF TABLES cont.

| | | |
|----------|---|----|
| Table 16 | Relative Incidence of CETA-Eligibility by Education Level, 1978-1982 Kansas and United States | 24 |
| Table 17 | Percentage of Females in the Total CETA-Eligible Population by Age Group Kansas and United States, 1978-82 | 26 |
| Table 18 | Percentage of Females in the Total CETA-Eligible Population by Ethnic Group Kansas and United States, 1978-82 | 28 |

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF MONOGRAPH

A. Purpose

This monograph investigates the following questions:

- a. the extent of differences in the incidence of poverty among males and females in Kansas in 1975 (in various age groups and ethnic groups);
- b. how such differences in Kansas compared to similar differences in the United States in 1975;
- c. the extent of differences in the incidence of unemployment among males and females in Kansas in 1976;
- d. how such differences in Kansas compared to similar differences in the United States in 1976;
- e. the extent of differences in incidence of CETA-eligibility among males and females in Kansas during the period 1978-1982;
- f. the education level and the incidence of CETA-eligibility among males and females in Kansas, 1978-1982; and
- g. how this relationship in Kansas compared with the analogous relationship in the United States during the same period.

B. Sources of Data

1. The Survey of Income and Education, 1975-1976

The Survey of Income and Education (SIE) was a one-time nationwide survey conducted by personal interview from April to July 1976. The sample used for the SIE was 190,000 designated addresses. Interview records were obtained for 150,170 households, including 336,045 people 14 years or older of which 2,765 were members of the armed forces. In addition, there are records of 160,963 families residing in these households.

The Survey provides demographic and socio-economic information on the non-institutional population and on their labor market activity and experience. Although the Survey was made between April and July 1976, some of the data relates to 1975. Data are available for the nation, for states and certain substate areas.

2. The Current Population Survey (CPS)

The Current Population Survey (CPS) which has been conducted by the Bureau of the Census for over 35 years, covers monthly interviews with about 68,000 households, scientifically selected on the basis of area of residents to represent the nation as a whole, individual states, and other specified areas. Each household is interviewed for four consecutive months in one year and again for the corresponding time one year later.

From the data collected by the Current Population Survey, estimates were made of the CETA-eligible population of Kansas and the United States for 1978 and published in Monograph 5 in this series.¹ CETA-eligibility may be taken as a practical definition of "disadvantaged worker," but it should be noted that this definition differs from that of the Survey of Income and Education.

3. Definition of CETA Eligibility and Other Terms

Persons may be eligible for CETA programs under various titles in the legislation. Table 1 shows the various categories of eligibility. Table 2 gives the definitions of various terms used in defining these categories.

The term "poverty level" used in Table 2 in defining the "economically disadvantaged" group in the population is established by the Census each year as a certain level of family income considered to cover basic needs. Families with incomes below this level are said to be living in "poverty". The "poverty threshold income" is calculated by first establishing the cost of the minimum diet considered essential for health. From extensive family budget studies conducted over the years, the proportion of income spent on food by families with low incomes is known. The poverty threshold income is calculated by multiplying the cost of the minimum diet by the reciprocal of this proportion.

¹ A list of previous monographs in this series is given on page 31.

Table 1

CETA Eligibility

| Title | Criteria |
|--|---|
| IIB, VII | The individual is: |
| Economically disadvantaged | and CETA-unemployed, or CETA-underemployed, or in school |
| IID | The individual is: |
| Economically disadvantaged and unemployed 15 or more weeks | or In a family receiving public assistance |
| YETP | The individual is between 16 and 21 years of age (inclusive) and: |
| CETA-unemployed, or CETA-underemployed, or in high school or lower grade | and Economically disadvantaged |
| YCCIP | The individual is: |
| Between 16 and 19 years of age (inclusive) | and CETA-unemployed |
| SYEP | The individual is: |
| Between 14 and 21 (inclusive) | and Economically disadvantaged |
| VI | The individual is: |
| Unemployed 10 or more weeks | and In a family that received public assistance |
| Any listed | The individual is eligible for CETA title IIB, VII, IID, YETP, YCCIP, SYEP, or VI |
| Any youth | The individual is eligible for Title YETP, YCCIP, or SYEP |
| Other listed | The individual is eligible for Title IIB, VII, IID or VI |

Table 2

Data-Element Definitions

| Element | Definition |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Civilian Population | Total interviewed non-Armed Forces, non-institutional population. |
| CETA-Family Income | Total family income less Supplemental Security Income, public assistance, welfare, veteran's payments, unemployment and worker's compensation. |
| Economically Disadvantaged | The individual received public assistance, welfare, or had a family income less than the family poverty level. |
| Education | Years of school completed. |
| CETA-Unemployed | The individual is looking for work or is part-time for economic reasons and working 10 or fewer hours per week, or is greater than 18 years old and in a family receiving public assistance. |
| CETA-Underemployed | The individual is part-time for economic reasons, or the individual is full-time and has a wage below the poverty level and is not CETA-unemployed. |
| CETA-in-school | The individual is not CETA-Unemployed, CETA-Underemployed, and the individual's major activity is in school. |
| CETA-Employed | The individual is either working or with a job but not at work and is not CETA-Unemployed, CETA-Underemployed or CETA-in-school. |
| Part-Time for Economic Reasons | The economic reasons include: slack, work, material shortages, repairs to plant or equipment, start or termination of job during the week, and inability to find full-time work. p 55, 57 |
| Family Received Public Assistance | The family received SSI, welfare or other public assistance. |
| Hispanic | Mexican-American, Chicano, Mexican, Mexicano, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American or other Spanish. |
| SSI | Supplemental security income is made up of payments from federal, state and local welfare agencies to low income persons who are age 65 or older, blind, disabled. |
| Public Assistance | Public assistance and welfare payments include aid to families with dependent children and general assistance. |

Table 2
(continued)

Data-Element Definition

| Element | Definition |
|------------------------------------|--|
| Family | A group of two or more persons residing together and related by birth, marriage or adoption. |
| Unemployed for 10 weeks or more | The individual is classified as looking for work and has been looking for a job 10 or more weeks. |
| Unemployed for 15 weeks or more | The individual is classified as looking for work and has been looking for a job for 15 or more weeks. |
| Total Minority | Civilian non-institutional population less white non-Hispanic. |
| Employed Full-Time | Individual has a job and works 35 hours or more in the last week. |
| Welfare Status | The individual received public assistance or SSI. |
| 2-Parent Family | Individual is married with civilian spouse present and resides in a family with related children present. Individual is the family head or spouse. |
| 1-Parent Family | Individual resides in a family with related children present. Individual is family head or spouse and is not classified as married with civilian spouse present. |
| Non-Dependent Individual | Individual is not in a family. |

II. SEX DIFFERENCES IN POVERTY, 1975

Table 3 shows that the incidence of poverty was one-third higher among females than among males in Kansas in 1975. In the Wichita SMSA, the female incidence of poverty was 45% above the male. The difference in the female and male incidence of poverty in the United States was approximately the same as in Kansas, but somewhat lower than the difference observed in the Wichita SMSA.

Table 4 shows the relative sex incidence of poverty in various age groups. In Kansas and the United States, the female incidence of poverty was above that of males in all age groups. In Wichita SMSA, the female incidence of poverty was above the male incidence in all age groups except those aged 25-44 years of age. The difference in female and male incidence of poverty was not significant in the group under 16 years of age, but substantial in some other age groups. In Wichita SMSA, the female incidence of poverty among those aged 65 and over was more than 10 times as great as that among males. In Kansas as a whole, the female incidence of poverty in this age group was twice as great as that among males.

From Table 5, which shows the relative sex incidence of poverty by race, it can be seen that only among the Hispanics in Kansas was the female incidence of poverty lower than the male incidence. The relative sex incidence of poverty in Kansas was lower among whites than in the United States as a whole, and approximately the same as in the United States among blacks. In Wichita SMSA, the relative sex incidence of poverty was much higher among blacks than at the national level; whereas, among whites the relative incidence was similar to that among whites nationally.

In Table 6, the relative sex incidence in poverty by race and age combined is shown. Among whites, the female incidence of poverty was higher than the male incidence in all age groups in Kansas, Wichita, and the United States. The

Table 3

INCIDENCE* AND RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE \emptyset OF POVERTY

Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975

| | Incidence Male | Female | Relative Sex Incidence |
|---------------|-------------------|--------|---------------------------|
| | % | % | |
| Kansas | 6.90 | 9.17 | 1.33 |
| Wichita SMSA | 6.05 | 8.78 | 1.45 |
| United States | 9.93 | 12.86 | 1.30 |

*Number of persons below poverty threshold as a percentage of total persons of that sex.

\emptyset Incidence among females divided by incidence among males

Source: Calculated from Survey of Income and Education, 1976.

Table 4

RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE* OF POVERTY IN AGE-GROUPS

Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975

| AGE | KANSAS | WICHITA | UNITED STATES |
|----------------|--------|---------|---------------|
| Under 16 years | 1.08 | 1.07 | 1.04 |
| 16 - 24 | 1.45 | 1.86 | 1.31 |
| 25 - 44 | 1.52 | 0.93 | 1.71 |
| 45 - 64 | 1.26 | 1.30 | 1.43 |
| 65 and over | 2.07 | 10.25 | 1.66 |

*Incidence among females divided by incidence among males.

Source: Calculated from Survey of Income and Education, 1976

Table 5

RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE* OF POVERTY BY ETHNIC GROUP

Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975

| | Kansas | Wichita | United States |
|-----------|--------|---------|---------------|
| TOTAL | 1.33 | 1.45 | 1.30 |
| WHITES | 1.19 | 1.43 | 1.50 |
| BLACKS | 1.22 | 1.48 | 1.21 |
| HISPANICS | 0.68 | n | 1.19 |

*Incidence among females divided by incidence among males

Note: n = number too small to provide reliable estimate.

Source: Calculated from Survey of Income and Education, 1976

Table 6
RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE* OF POVERTY BY RACE AND AGE
Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975

| Race and Age Group | KANSAS | WICHITA | UNITED STATES |
|--------------------|--------|---------|---------------|
| <u>WHITE</u> | | | |
| Under 16 years | 1.20 | 6.78 | 1.05 |
| 16 - 24 | 1.32 | 9.16 | 1.32 |
| 25 - 44 | 1.38 | 2.60 | 1.57 |
| 45 - 64 | 1.18 | 5.69 | 1.38 |
| 65 and over | 1.78 | 17.42 | 1.82 |
| <u>BLACK</u> | | | |
| Under 16 years | 0.82 | 0.91 | 0.99 |
| 16 - 24 | 2.36 | 3.98 | 1.27 |
| 25 - 44 | 5.12 | + | 1.30 |
| 45 - 64 | 3.88 | 1.03 | 1.57 |
| 65 and over | 0.87 | ++ | 1.25 |

*Incidence among females divided by incidence among males.

Note: + = numbers too small to provide reliable numerical estimates,
but ratio must be positive.

++ = numbers too small to provide reliable numerical estimates,
but ratio must be strongly positive.

... = ratio cannot be calculated.

Source: Calculated from Survey of Income and Education, 1976

differences in the relative incidence of poverty in the various white age groups were approximately the same in Kansas as in the United States but much greater in Wichita.

Among the blacks there were some age groups in which the male incidence of poverty slightly exceeded that among females. These groups were the group under 16 years of age in Kansas, the Wichita SMSA, and the United States and the group aged 65 and over in Kansas. The small size of the sample made it impossible to make reliable estimates for two age groups in the Wichita SMSA. The differences in the relative incidence between the sexes among blacks were twice as great in Kansas as they were in the United States.

In Table 7, the ratio of the incidence of poverty in families with female heads to the incidence in families with male heads is shown for white, black, and Hispanic groups. It can be seen that these ratios are considerably larger than the ratios in Table 5 which compared the incidence of poverty among persons of different ethnic groups. This finding implies that the sex of the family head has a greater impact on the incidence of poverty than the sex of family members. In Kansas, the relative sex incidence of poverty was much more marked among the black and Hispanic groups than among the white; whereas, in the United States the relative sex incidence was greater among the whites than among the other two groups. In the Wichita SMSA the relative sex incidence was very much greater among the white groups than among the black. (Numbers were too small to provide a reliable estimate for the Hispanic group.)

Table 8 provides similar information for "severe poverty" and "very severe poverty". Except for the Hispanics in Kansas and the United States, the relative sex incidence was considerably greater in the groups subject to "severe" and "very severe" poverty than among the total poverty groups shown in Table 7.

Table 7

RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE* OF POVERTY IN FAMILIES BY
ETHNIC GROUP OF FAMILY HEAD
Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975

| Family Head | KANSAS | WICHITA | UNITED STATES |
|-------------|--------|---------|---------------|
| White | 4.15 | 11.64 | 4.99 |
| Black | 7.13 | 4.55 | 3.57 |
| Hispanic | 7.16 | n | 2.65 |

*Ratio of incidence of poverty in families with female heads to incidence in families with male heads.

Note: n = number too small to provide reliable estimate.

Source: Calculated from Survey of Income and Education, 1976.

Table 8

RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE* OF SEVERE POVERTY **

IN FAMILIES BY ETHNIC GROUP OF FAMILY HEAD

Kansas, Wichita, United States, 1975

| Family Head | KANSAS | | WICHITA | | UNITED STATES | |
|-------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | Severe Poverty | Very Severe Poverty | Severe Poverty | Very Severe Poverty | Severe Poverty | Very Severe Poverty |
| White | 10.19 | 4.29 | 21.78 | 19.37 | 5.97 | 6.53 |
| Black | 8.19 | 9.10 | 2.80 | 3.50 | 4.44 | 5.44 |
| Hispanic | 7.16 | n | n | n | 2.71 | 5.32 |

* Ratio of incidence in families with female heads to incidence in families with male heads.

** "Severe Poverty" is defined here as having a family income of less than three-quarters of the poverty threshold income. "Very Severe Poverty" is defined as having a family income of less than half the poverty threshold income. Families in "Severe Poverty" include the families in "Very Severe Poverty."

Note: n = number too small to provide reliable estimate.

Source: Calculated from Survey of Income and Education, 1976.

III. UNEMPLOYMENT AMONG ECONOMICALLY DISADVANTAGED AND TOTAL POPULATION, 1976

From Table 9 it can be seen that, in the population as a whole, the female incidence of unemployment was higher than that of males in Kansas, the Wichita SMSA, and the United States. Within the economically disadvantaged section of the population, the female incidence of unemployment was higher than that among males in Kansas and the United States, but this difference was smaller than the difference observed in the population as a whole. In the population as a whole, the difference in the female and male incidence of unemployment was more marked in the United States and Wichita than in Kansas. In the disadvantaged group, however, the difference between the female and male incidence of unemployment was greater in Kansas than in the United States. This difference was also greater in Kansas than in Wichita where the male incidence of unemployment exceeded that among females.

Table 10 presents similar information concerning "severe" unemployment (15 weeks or longer). In the national population, the male incidence of "severe" unemployment exceeded that of females in the white and black groups and equalled it in the total of all groups. In Kansas, however, the female incidence of "severe" unemployment exceeded that of males among both whites and blacks and also in the total population. However, among the economically disadvantaged in Kansas, the male incidence of "severe" unemployment was substantially higher than that among females. The male incidence of unemployment was also higher than that of females among whites in the United States, but not among blacks. In the Wichita SMSA, the female incidence of "severe" unemployment was very much greater than that of males in the population as a whole and only somewhat greater among whites. Numbers were too small to provide a reliable estimate for blacks.

Table 9

RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE*
OF UNEMPLOYMENT
AMONG DISADVANTAGED
AND TOTAL POPULATION
BY RACE, 1976

| Race | Kansas | | Wichita | | United States | |
|--|--------|------|---------|------|---------------|------|
| | ED | P | ED | P | ED | P |
| Whites | 1.19 | 1.46 | 0.61 | 2.09 | 1.13 | 2.02 |
| Blacks | ++ | 2.09 | ++ | + | 1.17 | 1.29 |
| Total (includes Hispanics & others) | 1.84 | 2.13 | 0.88 | 2.36 | 1.29 | 2.07 |

* Incidence among females divided by incidence among males.

Note: + = numbers too small to provide reliable numerical estimate, but ratio must be positive.

++ = numbers too small to provide reliable numerical estimate, but ratio must be strongly positive.

ED = Economically disadvantaged (below poverty threshold income).

P = Total population.

Source: Calculated from Survey of Income and Education, 1976

Table 10

RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE*
OF SEVERE UNEMPLOYMENT**
AMONG DISADVANTAGED
AND TOTAL POPULATION
BY RACE
1976

| Race | Kansas | | Wichita | | United States | |
|--|--------|------|---------|-------|---------------|------|
| | ED | P | ED | P | ED | P |
| Whites | 0.40 | 1.90 | — | 1.69 | 0.65 | 0.97 |
| Blacks | + | 1.85 | n | n | 1.05 | 0.79 |
| Total (includes Hispanics & others) | 0.64 | 2.00 | — | 12.00 | 0.83 | 1.00 |

* Incidence among females divided by incidence among males.

** "Severe unemployment" is defined as unemployed for 15 weeks or more at the time of the survey (1976).

Note: ED = Economically Disadvantaged (below poverty threshold income)

P = Total population

n = number too small to provide reliable estimate

+ = numbers too small to provide reliable numerical estimate, but ratio must be positive

— = numbers too small to provide reliable numerical estimate, but ratio must be negative

Source: Calculated from Survey of Income and Education, 1976

IV. CETA-ELIGIBILITY, 1978-82

Table 11 shows that eligibility for CETA was consistently higher among females than among males throughout the period in both Kansas and the United States. (Data are not available at the sub-state level for Kansas.) Although the incidence varies in different years--as does the relation between the incidence in Kansas and the incidence in the United States--no time-trend is discernible in the relative sex incidence of CETA-eligibility, either in Kansas or in the United States. The relative sex incidence was not markedly different in Kansas as compared with the United States. It may be noted that in 1982 the incidence of CETA-eligibility both among males and females in Kansas was approximately 90% of the United States figure.

From Table 12 it is apparent that the higher incidence of CETA-eligibility among females as compared to males applied to all age groups in the United States throughout the period and to all age groups in Kansas, except those aged 16-21 years in 1981 and 1982. In this age group, the male incidence of CETA-eligibility was approximately the same as that among females in 1981 and slightly exceeded that among females in 1982.

V. UNEMPLOYMENT, 1978-82

Table 13 shows that the incidence of unemployment among females in the United States was higher than the incidence among males in 1978 and 1979, equalled the male incidence in 1980, and fell below the male incidence in 1981. The incidence of unemployment among females dropped still further below that among males in 1982, by which time it was only two-thirds of the male incidence. In Kansas, the female incidence of unemployment remained above the male incidence throughout 1978-81, and then fell dramatically to half the male incidence in 1982.

Table 11

INCIDENCE OF CETA-ELIGIBILITY* BY SEX

Kansas and United States

1978-82

| Year | KANSAS | | | | Relative Sex Incidence [∅] | UNITED STATES | | |
|------|---------|----------------|-----------|----------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|-----------|------------------------|
| | % Males | $\frac{K}{US}$ | % Females | $\frac{K}{US}$ | | % Males | % Females | Relative Sex Incidence |
| 1978 | 8.80 | 85 | 11.03 | 84 | 1.25 | 10.31 | 13.15 | 1.28 |
| 1979 | 7.54 | 75 | 9.22 | 71 | 1.22 | 10.00 | 13.04 | 1.30 |
| 1980 | 5.86 | 59 | 7.91 | 63 | 1.35 | 9.88 | 12.62 | 1.28 |
| 1981 | 8.90 | 83 | 10.32 | 78 | 1.16 | 10.68 | 13.32 | 1.25 |
| 1982 | 10.18 | 91 | 12.19 | 89 | 1.20 | 11.18 | 13.65 | 1.22 |

* Number of persons in sex group who were eligible for CETA under any title as a percentage of total number of persons aged 14 years and over in that sex group.

[∅] Incidence among females divided by incidence among males.

Note: $\frac{K}{US}$ = incidence in Kansas as a percentage of the incidence in the United States.

Source: Calculated from Current Population Survey.

Table 12

RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE*
OF CETA-ELIGIBILITY
BY AGE
Kansas and United States
1978-82

| Year | KANSAS | | | | UNITED STATES | | | |
|------|--------|-------|-------|------|---------------|-------|-------|------|
| | 16-21 | 22-44 | 45-64 | 65+ | 16-21 | 22-44 | 45-64 | 65+ |
| 1978 | 1.15 | 1.48 | 1.28 | 1.29 | 1.14 | 1.47 | 1.31 | 1.35 |
| 1979 | 1.12 | 1.60 | 0.92 | 1.12 | 1.49 | 1.45 | 1.32 | 1.55 |
| 1980 | 1.07 | 1.70 | 0.94 | 2.52 | 1.16 | 1.45 | 1.24 | 1.51 |
| 1981 | 0.97 | 1.20 | 1.04 | 3.93 | 1.14 | 1.37 | 1.28 | 1.61 |
| 1982 | 0.90 | 1.26 | 1.26 | 2.92 | 1.08 | 1.34 | 1.31 | 1.54 |

* Female incidence divided by male incidence. Incidence is defined as the number of persons in an age and sex group who were eligible for CETA under any title as a percentage of the total number of persons in that age and sex group.

Source: Calculated from Current Population Survey.

Table 13
INCIDENCE* OF
UNEMPLOYMENT BY SEX
Kansas and United States
1978-82

| | <u>Males</u> | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|------|------|------|-------|
| | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 |
| United States | 6.42 | 5.88 | 6.69 | 8.22 | 10.34 |
| Kansas | 3.27 | 3.36 | 4.47 | 4.50 | 8.97 |

| | <u>Females</u> | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|------|------|------|------|
| | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 |
| United States | 7.07 | 6.63 | 6.68 | 7.67 | 7.06 |
| Kansas | 4.09 | 4.38 | 4.86 | 5.41 | 4.44 |

RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE^Ø

| | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| United States | 1.10 | 1.13 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.68 |
| Kansas | 1.25 | 1.30 | 1.09 | 1.20 | 0.49 |

* Percentage of male or female population over 14 years of age who were unemployed at date of survey.

Ø Incidence among females divided by incidence among males.

Source: Calculated from Current Population Survey.

Table 14 shows the incidence of unemployment in the CETA-eligible population. In the United States, the female incidence of unemployment in the CETA-eligible population was only slightly above the male incidence in 1978 after which it fell to a little below the male incidence, to an increasing extent with each successive each year. In Kansas, the female incidence of unemployment in the CETA-eligible population was below the male incidence from 1978 to 1980: the female incidence then climbed above the male incidence until by 1982, the female rate of unemployment was 80% higher than the male rate. The table also shows that the incidence of unemployment among CETA-eligible females was considerably higher than that among CETA-eligible males in Kansas in 1981 and 1982. In these years, the incidence of unemployment among CETA-eligible females in Kansas was approximately the same as that observed at the national level.

VI. EDUCATION LEVEL AND CETA-ELIGIBILITY

Table 15 shows that throughout the period, except for 1982, the median number of years schooling of the female national CETA-eligible population was above that of the male CETA-eligible population. The same was true in Kansas in 1978-79, however, from 1980-82, the female median number of years schooling was about the same as that for males.

From Table 15 it may also be calculated that in Kansas the median years schooling of CETA-eligible females was closer to that of the total female population than was the median years schooling of CETA-eligible males to that of the total male population. The same pattern was evident at the national level, but was not as marked.

In monograph #8, an inverse relationship between years of schooling and CETA-eligibility was demonstrated--those with more years schooling being less likely to become CETA-eligible. Table 16 shows that this relationship was more marked among females than among males in some years, both in the United States

Table 14

INCIDENCE* OF UNEMPLOYMENT
BY SEX AMONG CETA-ELIGIBLE POPULATION
 (Kansas and United States)
1978-82

| | <u>Males</u> | | | | |
|---------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 |
| United States | 31.43 | 29.87 | 30.41 | 37.02 | 41.36 |
| Kansas | 23.45 | 21.83 | 26.67 | 24.81 | 19.03 |

| | <u>Females</u> | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 |
| United States | 32.18 | 28.60 | 30.06 | 33.31 | 36.02 |
| Kansas | 18.80 | 21.25 | 17.92 | 33.84 | 34.51 |

RELATIVE SEX INCIDENCE^Ø

| | 1978 | 1979 | 1980 | 1981 | 1982 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| United States | 1.02 | 0.96 | 0.99 | 0.90 | 0.87 |
| Kansas | 0.80 | 0.97 | 0.67 | 1.36 | 1.81 |

* Percentage of male or female CETA-eligible population who were unemployed at date of survey.

Ø Incidence among females divided by incidence among males.

Source: Calculated from Current Population Survey.

Table 15

EDUCATION LEVELS OF CETA-ELIGIBLE POPULATION
AND TOTAL POPULATION*, 1978-1982

KANSAS AND UNITED STATES

| Years of Schooling | <u>Kansas</u> | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|---------------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1978 | | 1979 | | 1980 | | 1981 | | 1982 | |
| | M% | F% | M% | F% | M% | F% | M% | F% | M% | F% |
| Less than 9 | 33 | 27 | 34 | 23 | 32 | 26 | 26 | 28 | 17 | 15 |
| 9-11 | 29 | 31 | 25 | 23 | 24 | 35 | 32 | 29 | 22 | 20 |
| 12 | 14 | 29 | 23 | 38 | 27 | 18 | 32 | 31 | 39 | 54 |
| 13-15 | 12 | 12 | 8 | 13 | 15 | 14 | 7 | 8 | 11 | 8 |
| 16 and over | 12 | 1 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 4 | 11 | 3 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Median | 9.78 | 10.33 | 9.90 | 11.26 | 10.30 | 10.09 | 10.35 | 10.35 | 11.59 | 11.58 |

| Years of Schooling | <u>United States</u> | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| | 1978 | | 1979 | | 1980 | | 1981 | | 1982 | |
| | M% | F% | M% | F% | M% | F% | M% | F% | M% | F% |
| Less than 9 | 35 | 33 | 34 | 31 | 34 | 31 | 32 | 30 | 29 | 29 |
| 9-11 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 32 | 32 | 32 | 31 | 31 | 31 | 30 |
| 12 | 20 | 25 | 21 | 26 | 21 | 26 | 24 | 28 | 26 | 29 |
| 13-15 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 8 | 9 | 9 |
| 16 and over | 5 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 3 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| Median | 9.48 | 9.69 | 9.61 | 9.82 | 9.61 | 9.80 | 9.83 | 10.01 | 10.80 | 10.13 |

* Population aged 14 years and over.

Note: M = Males; F = Females

Source: Calculated from Current Population Survey.

Table 16

RELATIVE INCIDENCE OF CETA-ELIGIBILITY
BY EDUCATION LEVEL*, 1978-1982
KANSAS AND UNITED STATES

Kansas

| Years of Schooling | 1978 | | 1979 | | 1980 | | 1981 | | 1982 | |
|--------------------|------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|------|------|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| Less than 9 | 3.57 | 30.63 | 3.96 | 6.55 | 16.24 | 3.52 | 8.86 | 7.23 | 2.24 | 4.00 |
| 9-11 | 2.25 | 25.09 | 2.78 | 5.63 | 14.86 | 3.81 | 10.98 | 5.71 | 2.86 | 4.00 |
| 12 | 0.60 | 11.23 | 1.13 | 3.24 | 5.96 | 0.71 | 4.25 | 2.41 | 1.86 | 3.90 |
| 13-15 | 1.20 | 9.29 | 0.64 | 2.48 | 6.30 | 1.40 | 2.21 | 1.56 | 1.17 | 1.50 |
| 16 and over | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

United States

| Years of Schooling | 1978 | | 1979 | | 1980 | | 1981 | | 1982 | |
|--------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F | M | F |
| Less than 9 | 5.54 | 7.89 | 5.88 | 6.91 | 6.82 | 8.13 | 6.88 | 6.78 | 6.61 | 7.40 |
| 9-11 | 5.10 | 6.89 | 5.17 | 6.34 | 6.19 | 7.39 | 6.30 | 6.29 | 6.52 | 6.73 |
| 12 | 2.05 | 2.98 | 2.19 | 2.61 | 2.48 | 2.98 | 2.72 | 2.67 | 3.00 | 3.01 |
| 13-15 | 1.69 | 2.59 | 1.85 | 2.28 | 2.17 | 2.45 | 2.23 | 2.11 | 2.10 | 2.25 |
| 16 and over | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |

* Incidence in each education level group divided by incidence in the group with 16 and over years of schooling

Source: Calculated from Current Population Survey.

and in Kansas; however, the relationship was more marked among males in 1980 and 1981. In most years, the difference between the two sexes in the strength of the relationship between the level of education and incidence of CETA-eligibility was greater in Kansas than in the United States.

It may be noted that from 1981 to 1982 a large increase in Kansas occurred in the number and the percentage of CETA-eligible females with 12 years of schooling; whereas, in the United States female CETA-eligible population, no such increase occurred. A similar increase took place in Kansas between 1981 and 1982 in the number and percentage of CETA-eligible males with 12 years schooling, but the increase was less marked than that among females. This suggests that a sudden deterioration took place in Kansas in the employment prospects of females with 12 years schooling between 1981 and 1982, a deterioration more marked than that which occurred among males with the same level of education.

VII. THE PERCENTAGES OF FEMALES IN THE TOTAL CETA-ELIGIBLE POPULATION, 1978-1982

As is implied by the higher incidence of CETA-eligibility among females, the CETA-eligible populations of Kansas and the United States are predominantly female.

Table 17 shows that females predominated in all age-groups throughout the period, more so in some than others, in both Kansas and the United States. For all 5 years, females comprised the largest proportion of the total in the CETA-eligible population group aged 65 years and over. The percentage of females in this age-group was about the same in Kansas as in the United States in 1978. In 1979, this percentage fell below that of the United States, but rose sharply in subsequent years, substantially exceeding the national figure.

Table 17

PERCENTAGE OF FEMALES IN THE TOTAL
CETA-ELIGIBLE POPULATION BY AGE GROUP
KANSAS AND UNITED STATES, 1978-82*

| Age Group | 1978 | | 1979 | | 1980 | | 1981 | | 1982 | |
|-------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | K | US | K | US | K | US | K | US | K | US |
| 16-21 | 52.30 | 53.94 | 53.45 | 54.17 | 55.64 | 54.25 | 50.17 | 53.73 | 53.56 | 52.42 |
| 22-24 | 62.48 | 61.09 | 61.09 | 61.37 | 62.11 | 60.69 | 55.40 | 58.90 | 56.61 | 58.51 |
| 45-64 | 61.45 | 58.78 | 53.13 | 59.05 | 50.88 | 54.56 | 53.66 | 58.70 | 57.76 | 59.30 |
| 65 and over | 66.46 | 66.24 | 61.31 | 68.95 | 75.54 | 68.39 | 83.33 | 69.92 | 80.12 | 69.06 |
| Total | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 and over | 59.47 | 58.53 | 57.44 | 59.05 | 58.81 | 58.54 | 56.25 | 57.99 | 57.23 | 57.49 |

* e.g., in Kansas in 1978, 52.30% of the CETA-eligible persons aged 16-21 years were female

Source: Calculated from Current Population Survey.

In 1978-1981, the age-group with the second highest percentage of women among its total CETA-eligible population was the group aged 22-44 years, both in Kansas and the United States. However, in 1982, women comprised a slightly higher proportion of the total CETA-eligible group aged 45-64 years than of the 22-44 age group, both in Kansas and in the United States.

As indicated in Table 18, females were in the majority among both whites and minorities throughout the period in Kansas and the United States. Except for 1979 in Kansas, minorities had a greater proportion of women in the total CETA-eligible population than did whites in all 5 years, both in Kansas and in the U.S. The proportion of females among minorities in Kansas was higher than that for the nation as a whole. Among whites, the percentage of females was higher in Kansas than in the United States in 1978-1980, but lower than the United States in 1981-1982.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

This review of sex differences in the incidence of economically disadvantaged and unemployed persons shows a general pattern of higher incidence among females in Kansas, Wichita SMSA, and the United States. There were few exceptions to this general pattern, the most important being:

- a higher male than female incidence of poverty among Hispanics and among blacks under 16 years and blacks aged 65 and over in Kansas in 1975;
- a higher incidence of unemployment among the economically disadvantaged males than economically disadvantaged females in Wichita in 1976;
- a male incidence of severe unemployment equal to or higher than the female incidence in the general population at the national level, and in the Kansas economically disadvantaged population, in 1976;
- a lower female than male unemployment rate in the Kansas CETA-eligible population from 1978 to 1980;
- a higher unemployment rate among males than females in the Kansas general population in 1982; and

Table 18

PERCENTAGE OF FEMALES IN THE TOTAL
CETA-ELIGIBLE POPULATION BY ETHNIC GROUP
KANSAS AND UNITED STATES, 1978-82

| Year | KANSAS | | | UNITED STATES | | |
|------|--------|------------|-------|---------------|------------|-------|
| | White | Minorities | Total | White | Minorities | Total |
| 1978 | 57.45 | 71.58 | 59.47 | 56.75 | 62.17 | 58.53 |
| 1979 | 60.79 | 41.89 | 57.44 | 57.58 | 61.93 | 59.05 |
| 1980 | 58.47 | 58.91 | 58.80 | 56.70 | 62.04 | 58.54 |
| 1981 | 53.50 | 68.70 | 56.25 | 56.37 | 61.13 | 57.98 |
| 1982 | 53.71 | 69.49 | 57.22 | 55.43 | 61.69 | 57.48 |

Note: "White" includes Hispanics.

Source: Calculated from Current Population Survey.

- an incidence of CETA-eligibility among males aged 16-21 in Kansas equal to that of females in 1981 and above that of females in 1982.

In most groups for most years, the the greater proportion of females over males demonstrated a pattern in Kansas similar to that of the United States. In 1975, Wichita demonstrated noticeably greater proportions of women in most groups in comparison to Kansas and to the nation as a whole.

The greater proportion of females over males was more marked in certain groups than in others, being most notable in the following cases:

- poverty among white females aged 65 and over in 1975, especially in Wichita;
- poverty in families with female heads in 1975, especially among blacks and Hispanics in Kansas and among whites in Wichita;
- severe poverty in families with female heads in 1975, especially among whites in Kansas and Wichita and among blacks in Kansas
- more CETA-eligibility among females aged 65 and over in Kansas, 1980-82
- more unemployment among females in Kansas in 1982.

The relationship between fewer years of schooling and a higher incidence of CETA-eligibility was found to be stronger among females in some years and among males in other years. The sex difference in the strength of the relationship was greater in Kansas than in the nation as a whole.

Between 1981 and 1982, a marked increase occurred in the number and percentage of CETA-eligible females in Kansas with 12 years schooling. A similar increase among Kansas males was less marked. At the national level no such increase occurred.

In Monograph #1 of this series, the lack of employment opportunities for women was listed as one of seven major issues and problems of the Kansas labor market. The present study has documented the greater incidence of poverty and unemployment among females in most sections of the labor force. It has also highlighted the unemployment problem of more educated females in 1982.

In light of the above conclusions, the following policy issues may be raised:

- the need to ensure that job training programs are suitably adapted to the needs of specific groups of disadvantaged females;
- the need to ensure that the education of females is appropriate to the demands of the labor market; and
- the need to take into account the potential supply of more educated females in developing strategies for economic development in Kansas.

MONOGRAPHS FROM THE KANSAS LABOR MARKET INFORMATION PROGRAM

INSTITUTE FOR ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS RESEARCH

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

1. The Kansas Labor Market: Trends, Problems and Issues (November 1981)
2. Kansas Labor Market and Migration: A Note from Continuous Work History Sample (May 1982)
3. Kansas Labor Market Information System: A Technical Note (August 1982)
4. Economically Disadvantaged Workers in Kansas: Analysis of Data from the Survey of Income and Education [1975-76] (November 1982)
5. CETA Eligibility Estimates for Selected Demographic and Targeted Groups in Kansas and the United States [1978-82] (November 1982)
6. Demographic Characteristics and Trends of the CETA-Eligible Population of Kansas and the United States, [1978-82] (December 1982)
7. Factors in Firms' Decisions to Locate or Expand in Kansas: A Sample Survey (April 1983)
8. Education Levels of the CETA-Eligible Population of Kansas and the United States, [1978-1982] (April 1983)