

37 percent of the migrants cited hired farmwork as their primary activity (fig. 2). Many of them held a series of migrant and nonmigrant farm jobs during the year; most did not work at nonfarm jobs. They generally averaged more days of farmwork than other migrants and thus had higher farm earnings. Because of their dependence on low-wage farmwork, however, their total earnings tended to be low.

This group (whose farmwork is their primary activity) closely resembles the general image of migrant farmworkers discussed above. These workers were more likely than other migrants to be minorities, to be older, and to work in fruit, nut, and vegetable production. In addition, their levels of education and family income were lower than those of the other migrants.

Another 10 percent of migrant farmworkers worked primarily in nonfarm occupations but did some migrant farmwork during the year. They worked only a few days at farmwork and because of their higher paying nonfarm jobs, their total earnings were higher than those of migrants employed primarily in farmwork.

A third group, accounting for 50 percent of the migrant workers, was comprised largely of students and homemakers who were in the labor force only part of the year. These workers did migrant farmwork for only a few days or weeks during the spring and summer. Some were earning spending money for their personal use, while others were contributing to overall family income. The remaining 3 percent of the migrants were unemployed for most of the year.

The findings make clear the considerable diversity in the social and economic characteristics of migrant farmworkers. This diversity is an important consideration in the development of farm labor policies and programs to improve the living and

working conditions of the Nation's migrant farmworkers. One set of policies and programs, for example, might be directed specifically to the educationally and economically disadvantaged migrants who depend heavily on farmwork for a significant part of their income. About a third of all migrants fall into this category. Efforts to help this group should focus on the issues of increased employment stability, improved wages and benefits, and improved levels of family well-being, including health, housing, and education of family members.

Another set of policies might be aimed at all migrants, regardless of their characteristics, attachment to farmwork, or low-income status. Such efforts should focus on employee benefits and workplace protections generally available to other U.S. workers, including minimum wage guarantees, farm safety regulations, workers' compensation, and unemployment insurance. In recent years, these protections have increased for farmworkers, although most of these Federal and State programs still have special exemptions for agriculture, based on the size of the farm operation.

Some migrants experience severe economic and educational problems and Federal, State, and local community efforts may all be needed to help improve their well-being. However, farm labor policies and programs designed to help them are likely to be most effective when based on accurate knowledge of the migrant population. We still need to improve information on this segment of the rural labor force.

**RDP**

Sigurd R. Nilsen and Frank A. Fratoe

## Job Training Partnership Act, CETA, and Rural Communities

*The Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) which replaced CETA (the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) a year ago, includes some new provisions that may work better than CETA in addressing rural unemployment issues. The principal objective of the new act is not appreciably different from that of CETA—to prepare certain groups of youths and unskilled adults for entry into the labor force and to provide job training to some economically disadvantaged groups.*

In this article, we briefly describe JTPA, highlight its differences from CETA, and outline some of its potential impacts on rural areas. Our interest in JTPA stems from the indifferent success of earlier employment legislation in meeting the special needs of rural people and small communities. An assessment of early CETA and pre-CETA public service employment programs found the pattern of funding to favor urban areas.<sup>1</sup> Funding of JTPA for fiscal year 1984 is estimated to be about the same level as during 1983, approximately \$3½ billion, down from the FY 1979 peak for CETA of nearly \$10 billion (table 1).

---

Sigurd Nilsen is an economist with the Human Resources Division, U.S. General Accounting Office. Frank Fratoe is a sociologist with the U.S. Department of Commerce, Minority Business Development Agency. Both were with USDA's Economic Development Division when this article was written.

<sup>1</sup> Martin, Philip L. "Public Service Employment and Rural America" *American Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 1977, 59(2), pp.257-82.

A major difference between CETA and JTPA is who has the major role in planning and implementing the training programs. Under JTPA, local private industry councils, called PIC's, are to assess an area's labor needs and devise a plan to meet those needs. Under CETA, such responsibilities rested with local elected officials and the local CETA administrative staff.

The basic administrative unit under CETA was the "prime sponsor," covering a minimum population of 100,000 and designated by the Labor Department. The basic unit of JTPA is the "service delivery area" (SDA). State Governors will designate SDA's and allocate Federal funds to them. Areas automatically entitled to be declared SDA's on petition to the Governor are units of local government with a population of 200,000 or more, consortia of contiguous government units with a total population of at least 200,000, and rural concentrated employment programs that operated under CETA (only four of the latter groups were incorporated in the CETA system and they are located in Minnesota, Wisconsin, Kentucky, and Montana).

The job training program in each SDA is run by a private industry council whose members are selected by the chief elected official or officials in that area. The chairperson must be a business representative, and a majority of the council must come from the local business community. Some PIC's have actually been in existence for several years, having been set up under a CETA pilot program. The rationale for creating them was that councils representing businesses could do a better job of designing training programs applicable to a local labor market than CETA training run by government officials.

The PIC's job training plan must be submitted by the SDA's chief elected officials to the State Governor. The PIC and local government must also agree on the agency to manage the program. Under CETA, the U.S.

**Table 1—Federal cost of employment and training**

Category	Fiscal year (Oct. 1–Sept. 30)						
	1978	1979	1980	1981	1982	1983 <sup>1</sup>	1984 <sup>1,2</sup>
	<i>Billion dollars</i>						
Public service employment <sup>3</sup>	5.0	3.5	1.4	0.8	0	0	0
Adult employment training programs <sup>4</sup>	2.9	3.7	3.3	3.7	2.1	2.2	1.9
Special programs for youths <sup>5</sup>	1.4	2.2	2.3	2.3	1.3	1.3	1.3
Other programs	.4	.5	.7	.7	.3	.3	.4
Total	9.7	9.9	7.7	7.5	3.7	3.8	3.6

<sup>1</sup> Proposed budget figures.

<sup>2</sup> JTPA fully operational in FY 1984.

<sup>3</sup> Terminated under CETA in FY 1982.

<sup>4</sup> Subsumed under a block grant to the States beginning in FY 1982.

<sup>5</sup> Primarily the Summer Youth Employment Program and Job Corps.

Source: U.S. Office of Management and Budget, Budget of the United States Government, FY 1980–84.

Department of Labor had authority to give final approval or disapproval for local projects. This authority now rests with the State Governors, although their decisions can be appealed to the U.S. Secretary of Labor.

JTPA provides very little money for stipends or allowances for trainees to live on. Unlike CETA, which had no percentage cost limitations on such items, JTPA requires that no more than 15 percent of funds be spent on nonadministrative support costs. Little money will therefore be available to pay supportive services, except under certain conditions. A Governor may waive the 15-percent limitation if a PIC makes a request for excess costs because of high unemployment in its SDA, high transportation or child care costs, or large numbers of participants needing supportive services. Transportation expenses, of course, would be a substantial portion of the budget for rural SDA's. Perhaps for that reason, rural concentrated employment programs are exempted from the 15-percent cost limitation.

The job training programs implemented by every PIC will be subject to performance standards established by the Labor Department and enforced by the State. Under CETA, responsibility for both definition and enforcement of performance standards was at the Federal level. If a local program fails to meet performance goals for two consecutive years, the Governor, subject to appeal to the Secretary of Labor, can reorganize or replace that program. Governors have the responsibility to monitor and audit programs organized by the PIC's.

#### **Training the Disadvantaged. . .**

JTPA funds two programs for the disadvantaged, one for adults and youths (Part A) and one for summer youth employment and training (Part B). Funds to the programs are allocated according to a three-part formula of a State's unemployment, its unemployment shares, and its share of persons in poverty. Within

each State, the Governor must allocate 78 percent of Part A funds to the SDA's in a manner analogous to the formula used to distribute funds to the States. The remaining funds are to be used by the Governor for State education programs, training programs for older persons, special programs for hard-to-serve individuals, and administrative costs.

Part A youth programs are to be targeted to 16–21 year olds and the adult programs for those 22 years and over. To be eligible for the program, the youths must come from families with incomes below the poverty line or be receiving some form of public assistance. The funds may be used for a wide range of services and training which includes job service assistance, job counseling, remedial education, basic skills training, institutional skill training, and on-the-job training.

Part B allocates funds for summer programs for economically disadvantaged youth. These programs may include any of the kinds of activities allowed under Part A, but are restricted to the summer months.

#### **. . . and the Dislocated**

Aid for dislocated workers is distributed among States based upon a State's share of unemployment and its share of those unemployed 15 weeks or more. To be eligible for training and related employment services, workers must be on permanent layoff, be eligible for or have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits, and be unlikely to return to their previous industry or occupation. Those who become unemployed as a result of the permanent closure of a plant or facility and the long-term unemployed with little likelihood of being re-employed in their former occupation or industry are also eligible.

Program funds may be used to help eligible persons obtain unsubsidized employment through training and related employment services. In addition, relocation assistance may be provided if suitable employment

<b>From CETA to JTPA—Major changes at a glance</b>		
	<i>JTPA</i>	<i>CETA</i>
Minimum population	200,000	100,000
Administration	State level	Federal Government
Allocation of program funds for job training	70% minimum	No such requirement
Funding for public service employment	Prohibited	Major portion of program
Funds for administration and other nontraining costs	30% maximum	No limit
Nonadministrative support costs	15%	No limit
Responsibility for implementing training programs	Local private industry councils	CETA staff

opportunities are not locally available and a job offer elsewhere has been obtained.

#### **Federal Programs**

While the new job training partnership system stresses more direction at the State and local levels, the Federal Government has the same responsibility that it did under CETA to operate programs for some groups. These training activities will particularly affect part of the rural population. These programs and groups include: the Job Corps; programs for Native Americans, migrant and seasonal farmworkers, and veterans; pilot projects; multistate programs; national labor market information systems; and funding for the National Commission for Employment Policy.

Programs for migrant and seasonal farmworkers should continue much the same as under CETA. The goal of these programs is to help migrant farmworkers obtain unsubsidized agricultural or nonagricultural employment. Programs for Native Americans relax the limitations on the use of work experience as a training method to help reduce the severe underemployment problem of this group.

The Job Corps will continue the CETA training programs for economically disadvantaged young people between the ages of 14 and 21. However, the State role in the Job Corps Program is increased by allowing the Governors a limited role in awarding Job Corps contracts. Also, greater coordination between Job Corps programs and other JTPA programs is mandated. Job Corps enrollees must include persons from rural areas. Some rural Job Corps sites will continue to house Civilian Conservation Centers as they have for many years.

A separate employment and training program is established for veterans, principally veterans of the Vietnam era, veterans recently separated from military duty, and those with service-connected disabilities.

#### **Implications for Rural Areas**

In 1983, 30.7 million persons were employed in nonmetropolitan areas, 30.4 percent of U.S. employment. The 3.5 million nonmetropolitan unemployed represented about 32 percent of the total U.S. unemployed. The annual average unemployment rate rose to 10.1 percent in 1982 and remained at that level in 1983 for nonmetro areas. There has been an

increase in the proportion of unemployment in nonmetro areas from under 28 percent in 1973 to over 32 percent in 1983 (table 2).

The factors used by JTPA to distribute funds to the States—the number unemployed, the share of excess unemployment, the share of the long-term unemployed, and the share of those in poverty—should yield about 30 percent of JTPA funds for nonmetro areas. This of course cannot be assured since many SDA's may include both metro and nonmetro counties, and a disproportionate amount of the funds could be allocated to metro areas. However, the figures presented in table 2 suggest that nonmetro area residents, on average, should receive funding on a per capita basis equal to metro area residents. Also, as the last column of the table illustrates, nonmetro area residents are still overrepresented in the proportion of the population in impoverished families, although the proportion has declined slightly.

Since most of JTPA is administered by the States, not at the Federal level as was the case with CETA, quality of service to rural communities may vary widely from one State to another. In addition, the requirement of a minimum population of 200,000 for automatic designation as an SDA may result in inadequate attention to rural employment problems: rural SDA's may be too widely dispersed or may become simply an add-on to urban SDA's, impeding their effectiveness.

If JTPA is to bring employment training to nonmetro or rural areas, especially to serve the poor and underemployed, it must overcome the problems that hampered CETA operations. Rural CETA programs faced high administrative and support costs because of the high transportation expenses involved in serving people widely scattered throughout a large geographic area. The JTPA legislation recognizes this fact by waiving the cost limitations for rural concentrated employment

**Table 2—Selected nonmetro labor statistics related to the Job Training Partnership Act**

Year	Nonmetro population	Nonmetro employment <sup>1</sup>	Nonmetro unemployment <sup>1</sup>	Nonmetro unemployment of 15 weeks or more	Nonmetro unemployment rate (annual average)	Percent of excess unemployment in nonmetro areas <sup>1,2</sup>	Nonmetro below the poverty line <sup>1</sup>
-----Percent of U.S. total-----				Percent	Percent of U.S. total		
1973	31.4	30.9	27.7	26.1	4.4	0	40.1
1974	31.5	30.8	28.2	24.5	5.1	17.8	39.9
1975	31.7	30.8	28.9	27.2	8.0	26.8	40.7
1976	31.8	31.0	28.0	26.1	7.0	24.0	39.4
1977	32.0	31.3	29.0	26.5	6.6	25.3	40.0
1978	32.4	31.6	30.4	28.4	5.8	29.9	38.4
1979	31.9	30.9	30.2	28.1	5.7	28.0	38.1
1980	32.1	31.0	31.7	31.3	7.3	32.9	38.1
1981	32.1	31.0	32.2	31.5	7.9	33.8	38.4
1982	31.8	30.5	31.9	31.2	10.1	33.0	38.2
1983	31.7	30.4	32.3	31.9	10.1	33.7	NA

NA = Not available.

<sup>1</sup> The percentages for metro areas are 100 minus the nonmetro percentages.

<sup>2</sup> Excess unemployment is that above 4.5 percent.

Source: Employment Data are unpublished from the Current Population Survey and the poverty data are from the *Current Population Series* P-60 reports.

programs that operated as CETA prime sponsors in four States. If that precedent is extended, other rural programs may also receive greater flexibility in meeting costs or receive additional aid to cover the large expenditures in furnishing administrative and support services to sparsely populated areas. A JTPA provision also authorizes each Governor to provide financial assistance for special programs and services designed to meet the needs of rural areas outside major labor market areas.

The JTPA legislation specifically addressed the failure of CETA to include private business in training activities. The private industry councils ought to give businesses an integral role in developing practical training programs and matching trainees with jobs in the private sector. According to *Business Week*, the experimental PIC's created under CETA successfully matched training to existing jobs, but they were generally unable to train and place the most seriously disadvantaged persons, those who are not attractive to business in the first place.<sup>2</sup> Thus, questions remain concerning rural, as well as urban,

PIC's effectiveness in reaching the poor, underemployed, and other special groups most in need of employment training assistance. Moreover, in many rural areas, PIC's are now little more than paper organizations barely beginning to function and, even where fully operational, are often not widely known among small businesses.

Other CETA shortcomings not directly resolved by the JTPA legislation include the failure to link training activities with economic development programs, inadequate development of rural labor market information, lack of entrepreneurship training, short duration of programs, insufficient emphasis on relocation assistance, and lack of outreach and public information activities to enhance user familiarity with program training opportunities. **RDP**

<sup>2</sup> *Business Week*. "Business Tackles Hard-Core Unemployment," Sept. 1982, pp. 86-88.